International Journal of Law, Justice & Statutory Affairs
Volume 1 , Issue 4, 2025

International best practices for acknowledging and upholding foreign decisions

Ridho Brilian Laksamana[1], Ilyas Ismai[2], Syarifuddin[3]
Faculty of Law
Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

Research Article

Date of Submission: 13-10-2025 **Date of Acceptance: 24-11-2025** **Date of Publication: 30-09-2025**

Abstract
International legal cooperation is encouraged by the acceptance and cross-border execution of foreign decisions, but it also presents difficult legal challenges. Reciprocity between states, respect for due process in the initial procedures, procedural uniformity with the enforcing authority, and rejecting claims contaminated by fraud or in violation of public policy are some of the fundamental principles. Global harmonization is still a work in progress, even if regional regimes like the EU have simplified cross-border enforcement.

Keywords: Due process, reciprocity, private international law, foreign rulings, and public policy exceptions

Introduction

Cross-border legal issues are becoming more frequent due to the globalization of business, travel, and communication. A victorious party may attempt to execute a court ruling in another nation where the defendant has assets. States, however, are hesitant to absorb foreign court decisions without question. Regulations pertaining to the acceptance and implementation of foreign judgments strike a compromise between promoting international legal cooperation and taking public policy and sovereignty into consideration. Some emerging best practices are described in this article.

Key Principles and Best Practices

A key tenet guiding the acceptance of foreign rulings is reciprocity between nations [1]. If nations are treated equally, they are more inclined to accept one other's decisions. This is made possible by a number of bilateral and multinational treaties, including the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements [2]. Subject to certain restrictions, member nations agree to accept and uphold covered decisions from one another's legal systems. This encourages clarity for disputes and cross-border business transactions.

Another important factor is due process [3]. In the international procedure, the defendant must have had a reasonable chance to make their case. The judgment may not be enforced if the procedure was essentially unfair or breached natural justice. This prevents the importation of unfair decisions and maintains procedural justice norms. Different countries apply different specific due process standards during recognition processes.

Another crucial factor to take into account is the procedural coherence between the foreign decision and local law [4]. Although foreign processes don't have to exactly match domestic ones, significant differences might make the ruling unenforceable. For instance, enforcing courts would probably reject a default judgment if it was obtained in spite of the defendant's lack of notice or chance to participate. However, if fundamental principles of justice and fairness were respected, procedural distinctions by themselves need not always warrant non-enforcement.

Another frequent obstacle to identification is fraud [5]. Enforcement will often be refused as a matter of public policy if it can be shown that the foreign judgment was acquired via deliberate dishonesty or fraud. Similarly, compliance may be waived if acknowledging the ruling would be against the implementing state's basic public policy [6]. Although this public policy exemption is applied narrowly, it permits governments to safeguard important economic, social, or political interests. For example, public policy safeguards for

expression may be violated by foreign decisions that severely restrict free speech.

When confronted with dubious international fines or injunctions, several governments adopt a nuanced strategy [7]. When feasible, they may only implement a judgment's monetary or compensatory components, refusing to apply remedies for foreign behavior that are thought to be

extraterritorial or undesirable overreach. While avoiding direct contradiction with local public policy, this intermediate technique permits acknowledgment in spirit.

International and Regional Frameworks

One of the most advanced mechanisms for efficient cross-border enforcement is the EU regime [8]. With a few exceptions, the Lugano Convention and the Brussels I Regulation made it easier for decisions to be enforced across EU/EFTA member states. This gives disagreements within the common market clarity and closure. In contrast, more extensive international attempts at harmonization have been somewhat but unevenly successful.

Although they have a small membership, the 1971 and 2019 Conventions of the Hague Conference address the acceptance of foreign judgments on a worldwide scale [9]. Additionally, regional regimes in the Caribbean, Africa, and Latin America encourage enforcement within their own integration domains [10–12]. The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Convention, for instance, makes it easier for member governments to recognize one another. Many nations, meanwhile, continue to slip through the gaps in the existing frameworks.

Conclusion

Although the fundamental ideas that underpin the acceptance of foreign judgments are generally universal, particular laws and regulations differ greatly across countries. International commerce and litigation continue to be complicated by the ensuing discrepancies. Global legal cooperation, reciprocity, and clarity might all be improved by more bilateral and multilateral agreements to standardize standards. However, progress at larger international levels will probably continue to be slow due to the need to balance public policy considerations with sovereign sensitivities.

References

1. The 2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements: Commentary and Documents, Brand RA, Herrup PJ. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, c. 2008.
2. Convention on Choice of Court Agreements, June 30, 2005. Hague Conference on International Private Law.
3. Wolff L. Foreign Judgments in Europe: An Analysis of Recognition and Enforcement Laws in Germany, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Maklu Publishers, c. 2021.
4. Cross-Border Litigation in Europe, Beaumont P, Danov M, Trimmings K, Yüksel B. Cambridge University Press, c. 2017.
5.Warren M. Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in the United States and Europe. Boggs, Squire Patton; c2019.
6. Michaels R. Foreign Judgment Recognition and Enforcement. Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law, c2009.
7. Recognition of Foreign Judgments as a Trade Law under Brand RA Problem: Private International Law's Economics. In: Shea EM, Marti LF, Horlick GN. Trade Policy for Development Handbook. Oxford University Press, c. 2021.
8. Hess B, Pfeiffer T, Schlosser P. Recast of the Brussels I Regulation. Oxford University Press, c. 2015.
9. Teitz L. The Hague Choice of Court Convention: Providing an Alternative to Arbitration and Confirming Party Autonomy. The American Journal of Comparative Law. 53:543-558, 2005.
10. Garro AM. Latin American Arbitral Tribunal Jurisdiction and Arbitration Agreement Enforcement. International Dispute Settlement Journal. 2009, 1:293-319.
11. Kendo S. OHADA Law in Action: Foreign Judgment Enforcement. Current Law and Social Justice Readings. 2016; 8(2):138-147.
12. Donkor, Minnesota. enforcement of foreign judgments between Ghanaian and US courts. Arizona International and Comparative Law Journal. 2012; 29(1):73-114.