

# Kluwer Arbitration Blog

## German Court on Validity of Arbitration Clause: Partial Invalidity of Arbitration Clause; Notarization Requirement for Institutional Arbitration Rules

Karl Pörnbacher (Hogan Lovells) · Saturday, April 26th, 2014 · Hogan Lovells

By Karl Pörnbacher and Lars Pütz, Hogan Lovells LLP

An arbitral tribunal's preliminary ruling on its jurisdiction can be challenged by application for state court decision according to [Sec. 1040 \(3\) German Code of Civil Procedure](#), following the example of Art. 16 of the [UNCITRAL Model Law](#). Such a case has been decided by the Higher Regional Court of Munich (OLG Munich, decision dated 10 September 2013, [Case Number 34 SchH 10/13](#)) in a constellation where one party (the respondent in the arbitration case) invoked the invalidity of the arbitration clause on the grounds that (I) it contained an additional invalid competence-competence provision and (II), as part of a contract requiring notarization, the institutional arbitration rules referred to were not notarized themselves.

The OLG Munich rejected the application, thus upholding the arbitral tribunal's jurisdiction.

I. The arbitration clause to be assessed by the OLG Munich contained a so called competence-competence provision, i.e. it provided, in its second part, for final and binding arbitration with regard to the validity of the arbitration clause itself. German law, after its revision on the basis of the [UNCITRAL Model Law](#), does not anymore allow for such power to be vested in the arbitral tribunal.

However, the OLG Munich held that the parties had validly submitted their dispute to arbitration as the main part of the arbitration clause could not be affected by the invalidity of the additional competence-competence provision. According to the OLG Munich, the latter constitutes a second, independent arbitration agreement (in the meaning of [Sec. 1040 \(1\) 2 German Code of Civil Procedure](#)). Consequently, any invalidity due to the inclusion of the competence-competence provision has no effect on the validity of the main arbitration clause as such. The court has further pointed out that, even under the assumption that both parts constitute one single arbitration clause, the invalidity of the competence-competence provision would not render the remaining agreement invalid. Rather, one could assume (in line with [Sec. 139 German Civil Code](#)) that the parties had wanted to agree on arbitration for conflicts arising out of their contractual relationship, irrespective of whether it is possible to provide the

arbitral tribunal with the additional power to decide on its own jurisdiction.

II. The second issue that the OLG Munich had to consider was whether and to what extent the requirement of notarization (which, under German law is required, *inter alia*, for contracts for the transfer of real estate or of shares in a limited liability company) also applies to arbitration clauses. In the case at hand, the arbitration clause itself was contained in the main contract and duly notarized. However, the clause made reference to institutional arbitration rules that were not notarized.

The OLG Munich held that the arbitration clause met the applicable requirements and clarified that arbitration agreements are generally not subject to other formal requirements than the requirement of writing as set out in [Sec. 1031 \(1\) German Code of Civil Procedure](#). However, if the parties include an arbitration clause into their main contract (as opposed to forming a separate arbitration agreement) and if this main contract is subject to notarization, this also applies to the arbitration clause contained therein. Nevertheless, according to the OLG Munich, this does not necessarily mean that institutional arbitration rules, referred to by the arbitration clause, have to be notarized as well. In the case at hand, a dynamic reference, *i.e.* a reference to arbitration rules as applicable at the time of initiation of arbitration proceedings, was included. Such a dynamic reference does, according to the OLG Munich, not subject the rules themselves to the requirement of notarization.

---

*To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Arbitration Blog, please subscribe [here](#). To submit a proposal for a blog post, please consult our [Editorial Guidelines](#).*

**Kluwer Arbitration Practice Plus** now offers an enhanced Arbitrator Tool with 4,100+ data-driven Arbitrator Profiles and a new Relationship Indicator exploring relationships of 12,500+ arbitration practitioners and experts.

Learn how **Kluwer Arbitration Practice Plus** can support you.

## Kluwer Arbitration Practice Plus

Offers an enhanced **Arbitrator Tool** with 4,100+ data-driven Arbitrator Profiles and a new **Relationship Indicator** exploring relationships of 12,500+ arbitration practitioners and experts

The image displays the 'Explore Practice Plus' interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with a checkmark icon and the text 'Explore Practice Plus'. Below this, a profile card for 'Gary R. Egan' is shown, including a profile picture, name, and a 'View Profile' button. The main content area features several data visualizations: a 'Relationship Indicator' section with a 'By Relationship' filter, a '7 Results Found (Based on cases within Kluwer)' section, and three circular charts representing different data points. The interface is clean and professional, with a blue and white color scheme.

Kluwer Arbitration

 Wolters Kluwer

This entry was posted on Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 12:11 am and is filed under [Arbitration Agreements](#), [Arbitration clause](#), [Domestic Courts](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. You can skip to the end and leave a response. Pinging is currently not allowed.