

Doc. pré. No 2
Prel. Doc. No 2

juillet / July 2008

**QUESTIONNAIRE DE JUILLET 2008 PORTANT SUR LA
CONVENTION DE LA HAYE DU 15 NOVEMBRE 1965 RELATIVE À LA SIGNIFICATION ET
LA NOTIFICATION À L'ÉTRANGER DES ACTES JUDICIAIRES ET EXTRAJUDICIAIRES
EN MATIÈRE CIVILE OU COMMERCIALE
(CONVENTION NOTIFICATION)**

établi par le Bureau Permanent

* * *

**QUESTIONNAIRE OF JULY 2008 RELATING TO THE
HAGUE CONVENTION OF 15 NOVEMBER 1965 ON THE SERVICE ABROAD
OF JUDICIAL AND EXTRAJUDICIAL DOCUMENTS IN CIVIL OR COMMERCIAL MATTERS
(SERVICE CONVENTION)**

drawn up by the Permanent Bureau

*Document préliminaire No 2 de juillet 2008
à l'intention de la Commission spéciale sur le fonctionnement pratique des
Conventions de La Haye Apostille, Notification, Preuves et Accès à la Justice*

*Preliminary Document No 2 of July 2008
for the attention of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the
Hague Apostille, Service, Evidence and Access to Justice Conventions*

**QUESTIONNAIRE DE JUILLET 2008 PORTANT SUR LA
CONVENTION DE LA HAYE DU 15 NOVEMBRE 1965 RELATIVE À LA SIGNIFICATION ET
LA NOTIFICATION À L'ÉTRANGER DES ACTES JUDICIAIRES ET EXTRAJUDICIAIRES
EN MATIÈRE CIVILE OU COMMERCIALE
(CONVENTION NOTIFICATION)**

établi par le Bureau Permanent

* * *

**QUESTIONNAIRE OF JULY 2008 RELATING TO THE
HAGUE CONVENTION OF 15 NOVEMBER 1965 ON THE SERVICE ABROAD
OF JUDICIAL AND EXTRAJUDICIAL DOCUMENTS IN CIVIL OR COMMERCIAL MATTERS
(SERVICE CONVENTION)**

drawn up by the Permanent Bureau

**Questionnaire of July 2008 relating to the
Hague Convention of 15 November 1965 on the Service Abroad
of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters
(Service Convention)**

At the latest meeting of the Council on General Affairs and Policy of the Hague Conference on Private International Law (1-3 April 2008), the Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference on Private International Law (HCCH) announced the holding of a **Special Commission on the practical operation of the Hague Service, Evidence, Apostille and Access to Justice Conventions.**¹

With a view to preparing for the discussions on the Service Convention, the Permanent Bureau has prepared the following comprehensive Questionnaire.² The information collected will assist the Permanent Bureau in defining the key issues that need to be addressed by the Special Commission. It will also assist the Permanent Bureau in its ongoing monitoring of the practical operation of the Service Convention and in completing and updating the information provided on the "Service Section" of the HCCH website (< www.hcch.net >). Finally, the information collected will also help the Permanent Bureau in assessing the possible need for an updated version of the Practical Handbook on the Operation of the Hague Service Convention (Service Handbook).

Non-Contracting States to the Service Convention are invited to respond to Questions 1) to 3), as well as to Questions 59), 60) and 66). Contracting States are invited to answer all questions, with the exception of Questions 1) to 3). Please note that some of the questions may require input from the relevant forwarding authorities of your State and from judicial officers, officials or other competent persons (including professionals) involved in the actual execution of requests for service.

The Permanent Bureau would very much appreciate receiving the answers from your State (in either English or French) **before 31 October 2008**. Answers should be sent via e-mail to < secretariat@hcch.net > with the following heading in the subject field: "Questionnaire – Service Convention – [name of the Member of the Organisation / Contracting State]".

Please complete this Questionnaire electronically and not by hand.³

Identification

Name of State: [Hungary](#)

For follow-up purposes

Name of contact person: [dr. Szabolcs Boreczki](#)

Name of Authority / Office: [Department of Civil Law Codification and Private International Law, Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement](#)

Telephone number: [+36 1 999 4349](#)

E-mail address: boreczkisz@irm.gov.hu

Uploading of the responses on the HCCH website

The uploading of the responses to the 2003 Questionnaire on the HCCH website has proven to be extremely useful. These responses are often consulted and referred to in

¹ The convocation for that Special Commission was sent by e-mail on 19 June 2008 and by post on 21 June 2008 to the National and Contact Organs of the Members of the HCCH. Copy for information was sent to the Embassies of the Member States, the Central Authorities designated under the Hague Apostille, Service, Evidence and Access to Justice Conventions and the participants in the Special Commission of October / November 2003.

² The practical operation of the Service Convention was reviewed at Special Commission meetings in December 1977, April 1989 and October/November 2003. The Conclusions and Recommendations arising from all these Special Commissions are available on the HCCH website (< www.hcch.net >).

³ Tick the relevant boxes by placing your cursor in the middle of the space between the two square brackets and inserting an X (so that [] becomes [X]). If you are invited to add text, place your cursor **directly before the relevant paragraph symbol** (they all appear in italic and in blue: ¶). This requires that you activate the option "Show / Hide ¶". Your text will appear in [blue](#).

the numerous items of correspondence that the Permanent Bureau receives. As a result, we envisage uploading the answers to the 2008 Questionnaire. Does your State agree to making its response available, or available in part, on the HCCH website?

- YES, the full response to the Questionnaire may be uploaded onto the HCCH website
- YES, but the following answers or details may not be uploaded onto the HCCH website (please indicate in particular whether or not you agree to have the title page and the answers to Questions 6) and 7) uploaded onto the HCCH website):
- NO – no detail of our response may be uploaded onto the HCCH website

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE – GENERAL INFORMATION AND STATISTICS	6
I. Questions for non-Contracting States	6
II. Questions for Contracting States.....	7
A. “Service Section” of the HCCH website.....	7
B. Contact details for designated Authorities.....	7
C. Statistics	9
D. General appreciation of the Service Convention.....	11
E. Case law and reference work	11
F. Service Handbook	14
PART TWO – SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	15
I. Non-mandatory but exclusive character of the Service Convention.....	15
II. Scope of the Service Convention.....	15
A. Interpretation of the phrase “civil or commercial matters”	15
B. Interpretation of “judicial and extrajudicial documents”	17
C. Service on States and State Officials.....	18
III. The main channel of transmission	19
A. Forwarding Authority (Art. 3).....	19
B. Methods of service (Art. 5)	20
C. Translation requirements (Art. 5(3))	23
D. Costs (Art. 12)	24
E. Modern Technologies	24
IV. Alternative Channels of Transmission (Arts 8, 9, 10).....	26
A. Translation requirements	26
B. Model Form.....	26
C. Diplomatic and Consular Channels.....	27
D. Article 10 a) – Postal Channel.....	29
E. Article 10 b) – Judicial Officers, Officials or Other Competent Persons.....	29
F. Article 10 c) – Interested Persons.....	30
V. Final refusal to execute the request (Art. 13).....	31
VI. Protection of the interests of the Plaintiff and Defendant (Arts 15 and 16).....	32
VII. Date of service	33
PART THREE – OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES	34
I. Model Form annexed to the Service Convention	34
A. Fillable PDF versions of the Model Form.....	34
B. Request Form (Art. 3)	34
C. Certificate (Art. 6).....	35
II. E-service.....	35
A. In strictly domestic situations	35
B. In cross-border situations outside of the Service Convention	35
C. E-service and the main channel of transmission under the Service Convention	36
D. E-service and the alternative channels of transmission under the Service Convention	38
E. Miscellaneous	38

PART ONE – GENERAL INFORMATION AND STATISTICS**I. Questions for non-Contracting States**

- 1) Please indicate why your State is not a Contracting State to the Service Convention (select as many answers as are relevant):
- The availability of possibilities for transmission of documents for service abroad, proof of service abroad and protection of the interests of plaintiffs and defendants under domestic law, bilateral or regional agreements, treaties or instruments means that so far it has not appeared to your authorities that there would be added value in becoming a Party to the Service Convention
 - The number of cross-border cases that require the service abroad of judicial or extrajudicial documents has so far been limited and has not required a global framework
 - There are legal obstacles in your domestic legal system that prevent your State from becoming a party to the Convention – if so, please specify what these are:

 - Your State considers that there are specific issues arising out of the Service Convention (*e.g.*, costs, the absence of specific deadlines for the transmission and execution of requests for service, the absence of a specific provision on how to determine the date of service, the need, where requested, to translate documents to be served in accordance with Art. 5(3), etc.) which dissuade your State from joining the Service Convention – please explain:

 - Your State does not have the means or resources to properly implement the Service Convention
 - The question of becoming a Party to the Convention has never been examined in detail
 - Other reason – please explain:
- 2) Please forward a list of any bilateral or regional agreements, treaties or instruments to which your State is a party and that provide rules for the transmission of documents to be served abroad, for proof of service, and for the protection of the interests of plaintiffs and defendants:
- 3) Is your State currently studying the Service Convention or does your State envisage studying it with a view to becoming a State Party in the near future?
- YES – please specify (status of considerations in your State, etc.):

 - NO

II. Questions for Contracting States

A. "Service Section" of the HCCH website

- 4) On the "Service Section" of the HCCH website, the Permanent Bureau currently provides practical information for each Contracting State that was mainly obtained from the responses to the 2003 Questionnaire accompanying the provisional version of the new edition of the Practical Handbook on the operation of the Service Convention (2003 Service Questionnaire). This practical information, which is presented in form of a chart, consists of the following:
- 1) Contact details of each of the Central Authorities (Arts 2 and 18)
 - 2) Forwarding authorities (Art. 3(1))
 - 3) Methods of service (Art. 5(1) and (2))
 - 4) Translation requirements (Art. 5(3))
 - 5) Costs relating to the execution of the request for service (Art. 12)
 - 6) Time for the execution of a request
 - 7) Judicial officers, officials and other competent persons (Art. 10 *b*) and *c*)
 - 8) Oppositions and declarations (Art. 21(2), in particular with respect to Arts 8(2), 10 *a*), *b*) and *c*), 15(2) and 16(3))
 - 9) Derogatory channels (bilateral or multilateral agreements or domestic law permitting other transmission channels (Arts 11, 19, 24 and 25)
 - 10) Useful links

The Permanent Bureau invites your State to peruse the "Service Section" and to verify if all the information contained in the practical information chart for your State is (still) correct or if it needs to be updated, amended or supplemented. **The States that currently do not have a chart of practical information on the "Service Section" are kindly invited to submit this information to the Permanent Bureau.**

- 5) Would your State consider that the information provided on the "Service Section" of the HCCH website is:
- [] Very useful
 [] Useful – would you have any suggestions for improvement?
- [] Not useful – would you have any suggestions for improvement?

B. Contact details for designated Authorities

- 6) Please check the contact information as contained on the HCCH website with regards to the **Central Authority(ies)** designated by your State (Arts 2 and 18(3)). If one of the following categories of information is missing then please provide it below (please provide both a postal address and a street address, if these are not identical):

Name of Authority:

Address:

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Website:

Language(s) of communication:

Name of contact person:

If your State is a federal State that has designated several Central Authorities under Article 18(3) and one of the above categories is missing for more than one Central Authority designated, please provide separate details for each of those Central Authorities (copy and paste if necessary – also, please provide both a postal address and a street address, if these are not identical):

Name of Authority:
 Address:
 Telephone:
 Fax:
 E-mail:
 Website:
 Language(s) of communication:
 Name of contact person:

- 7) Please also verify the contact information as contained on the HCCH website with regards to the following authorities in your State, *if applicable*. If one of the following categories of information is missing then please provide it below (please provide both a postal address and a street address, if these are not identical):

- a. **Other Authorities** that may have been designated in addition to the Central Authority (Art. 18(1)):

Name of Authority:
 Address:
 Telephone:
 Fax:
 E-mail:
 Website:
 Language(s) of communication:
 Name of contact person:

- b. An **Authority** that may have been designated instead of the Central Authority to complete the Certificate in the form of the model annexed to the Service Convention (Art. 6(1)):

Name of Authority:
 Address:
 Telephone:
 Fax:
 E-mail:
 Website:
 Language(s) of communication:
 Name of contact person:

- c. The **Competent Authority** that receives documents transmitted by indirect diplomatic or consular channels (Art. 9(1)):

Name of Authority:
 Address:
 Telephone:
 Fax:
 E-mail:
 Website:
 Language(s) of communication:
 Name of contact person:

- 8) In Conclusion and Recommendation No 48, the 2003 Special Commission invited all States to provide information on the forwarding authorities (the authority or judicial officer competent under the law of the requesting State to forward to the Central Authority of the requested State the request for service) and their competences for

this information to be posted on the HCCH website. If your State has not yet done so, please provide comprehensive information to this effect below (obviously, the Permanent Bureau is not asking for a comprehensive list of individuals who may be forwarding authorities, but rather for a reference to all the categories of authorities, officials or professionals that may be forwarding authorities, for example "the courts", "bailiffs", "(professional) process servers", etc.):

C. Statistics

Main Channel of Transmission (Art. 3)

Requests for Service – Incoming

- 9) The following questions relate to the number of requests for service *addressed to your State* under the Service Convention.
- a. Please complete the following table to indicate how many *incoming* requests for service the Central Authority(ies) of your State received in each of the past five years under the main channel of transmission. Please also note, if possible for each year, the country(ies) from which your State received the most requests for service.

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Number: Convention not in force State(s):	Number: Convention not in force State(s):	Number: State(s):	Number: State(s):	Number: State(s):

- b. Of the total amount of requests for service received in 2007, please divide these depending on the method of service that was used by your State and complete the following table with respect to the time that lapsed between the Central Authority(ies) of your State receiving a request for service and the relevant authority of your State forwarding the Certificate of service to the applicant in the requesting State.

For example, if your State executed 12 requests for service using personal service and the entire process took less than two months in each case, please write the number "12" in the relevant box. The total amount of incoming requests for service that your State received in the past year should therefore equal the sum of the figures appearing in the sub-totals line below:

Method of service	Less than 2 months	Between 2 and 4 months	Between 4 and 6 months	Between 6 and 12 months	More than 12 months	Returned un-executed (Art. 13)	Cases currently pending
Formal service (Art. 5(1) a))							
Service by a particular method (Art. 5(1) b)) ⁴							
Informal delivery (Art. 5(2))							
Sub-totals:							

Requests for Service – Outgoing

10) The following questions relate to the number of requests for service *sent by the forwarding authorities of your State* under the Service Convention. These questions are likely to require some consultation with the (main) forwarding authorities in your State that (may) have previously forwarded requests for service:

- a. Please complete the following table to indicate how many *outgoing* requests for service the forwarding authorities of your State have forwarded to Central Authorities of other States Parties in the past five years. If possible, please also note the country(ies) to which your State sent the most requests for service for each year listed below.

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Number: Convention not in force State(s):	Number: Convention not in force State(s):	Number: State(s):	Number: State(s):	Number: State(s):

- b. Of the total amount of requests for service sent in 2007, please complete the following table with respect to the *time that lapsed* between the forwarding authority of your State sending a request for service and the applicant receiving the Certificate of Service from the requested State. Please also divide these depending on the method of service that was used in the requested State.

For example, if your State is made aware that six requests for service were sent from your State and the entire process took less than two months in each case, please write the number "6" in the relevant box. The total amount of outgoing requests for service that your State is aware were sent in the past year should therefore equal the sum of the figures appearing in the sub-totals line below:

⁴ See Question 28) b. for an explanation as to the meaning of Art. 5(1) b) – please adopt that meaning to fill in the chart above, independently of your response to Question 28) b. (i).

Method of service	Less than 2 months	Between 2 and 4 months	Between 4 and 6 months	Between 6 and 12 months	More than 12 months	Returned un-executed (Art. 13)	Cases currently pending
Formal service (Art. 5(1) a))							
Service by a particular method (Art. 5(1) b)) ⁵							
Informal delivery (Art. 5(2))							
Sub-totals:							

D. General appreciation of the Service Convention

11) Please indicate below how your State rates the general operation of the Service Convention:

- Excellent
 Good
 Satisfactory
 Unsatisfactory

If your State considers that the general operation of the Service Convention is good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory, please indicate what particular aspects of the Convention your State considers require improvement or where your State has encountered difficulties. For any areas that require improvement, please also indicate whether your State considers that solutions could be developed in specific *Conclusions and Recommendations* to be adopted by the next Special Commission or by specific comments in a new edition of the *Service Handbook* or if a *Protocol* to the Convention is needed.

- *There are States from where we do not receive responses at all.*
- *In certain cases the time needed for service abroad is outstandingly long (one year or more).*
- *There are States where the standard form is not used to certify service or non-service, therefore we are unable to guess whether the service was successful, if not, why, or if yes, on what date.*
- *Lack of possibility for payment by bank transfer makes necessary to send requests through Hungarian Embassy or Consulate who can pay by cheque in the requested State, and this diplomatic channel causes huge delays in the process, depriving the Convention from one of its important advantages.*
- *The necessity to send two copies of documents is not useful, complicates things without any added value, since according to the Hungarian law, a copy of the served documents do not need to be returned.*

E. Case law and reference work

⁵ See Question 28) b. for an explanation as to the meaning of Art. 5(1) b) – please adopt that meaning to fill in the chart above, independently of your response to Question 28) b. (i).

- 12) The Permanent Bureau invites States Parties to provide copies of any guides, desk instructions or any other practical information that may have been produced for the assistance of their judicial authorities or other authorities when sending or executing requests for service under the Service Convention.
- 13) The Permanent Bureau invites States Parties to provide copies of decisions rendered after the publication of the Service Handbook (or from before this time if these have not already been provided to the Permanent Bureau) that apply or relate to the Service Convention. If the decision is in a language other than English or French, a summary into either of these languages would be appreciated.

- 14) The Permanent Bureau invites States Parties to forward a list of references of articles or books in connection with the Service Convention that do not already appear on the bibliography tab of the HCCH website or in the Service Handbook.
- 15) The Permanent Bureau invites States Parties to forward a citation for and / or a copy of the domestic legislation which implemented the Service Convention in their territory(ies), as well as any citations for and / or copies of any domestic laws which provide for the service of documents abroad.

- A polgári és kereskedelmi ügyekben keletkezett bírósági és bíróságon kívüli iratok külföldön történő kézbesítéséről szóló, Hágában, 1965. november 15. napján kelt Egyezmény kihirdetéséről szóló 2005. évi XXXVI. törvény - Act no. XXXVI of 2005 on transposing the Hague Convention of 15 November 1970 on the service abroad of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil and commercial matters

- A nemzetközi magánjogról szóló 1979. évi 13. törvényerejű rendelet - Law-Decree No. 13 of 1979 on International Private Law, sections 67 to 69 (see text in English attached in annex)

- 16) The Permanent Bureau invites States Parties to forward a list of any other bilateral treaties and / or international instruments to which they are a party and that provide rules for the service of documents abroad. In particular, States Parties are invited to identify those treaties that allow for direct judicial communication (see Art. 11 *in fine* of the Service Convention).

- Regulation (EC) No 1393/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents), and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1348/2000 (applicable to all [EU Member States](#))

-Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the People's Republic of [Albania](#) on legal assistance in civil, family law and criminal matters signed in Tirana on 12 January 1960

- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the Democratic and People's Republic of [Algeria](#) on legal assistance in civil, family law and criminal matters signed in Alger on 7 February 1976

- Hungarian-British Convention on legal assistance in civil matters of 25 September 1935 (applicable to [Australia, Canada, Fiji, Kenya, Lesotho, New-Zealand, Tonga](#))

- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the USSR on legal assistance in civil, family law and criminal matters signed in Moscow on 15 July 1958 and the Protocol to the Treaty signed in Budapest on 19 October 1971 (applicable to the [Russian Federation and Belarus](#))

- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the Yugoslav Socialist Federal Republic on mutual legal assistance signed in Belgrade on 7 March 1968, and the Protocol to the Treaty signed in Budapest on 25 April 1986 (applicable to [Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, FYR Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia](#))

- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the [French Republic](#) on legal assistance in civil and family law matters, recognition and enforcement of judicial decisions as well as on legal assistance in criminal matters and extradition signed in Budapest on 31 July 1980 (applicable to [Mayotte, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, Wallis-and-Futuna](#))

- Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Arab Republic of [Egypt](#) on legal assistance in civil and commercial matters signed in Cairo on 26 March 1996

- Treaty between the Republic of Hungary and the People's Republic of [China](#) on legal assistance in civil and commercial matters signed in Beijing on 9 October 1995

- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea on legal assistance in civil, family law and criminal matters signed in Pyongyang on 5 October 1970
- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the Republic of Cuba on legal assistance in civil, family law and criminal matters signed in Havana on 27 November 1981
- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the People's Republic of Mongolia on legal assistance in civil, family law and criminal matters signed in Budapest on 22 November 1986
- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the Arab Republic of Syria on legal assistance in civil and criminal matters signed in Damascus on 1 May 1986
- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the Republic of Turkey on legal assistance in civil and commercial matters signed in Ankara on 6 June 1988
- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the Republic of Tunisia on legal assistance in civil and criminal matters, recognition and enforcement of judicial decisions as well as on extradition signed in Budapest on 6 December 1982
- Treaty between the Republic of Hungary and the Ukraine on mutual legal assistance in civil matters signed in Budapest on 2 August 2001
- Treaty between the People's Republic of Hungary and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on legal assistance in civil, family law and criminal matters signed in Hanoi on 18 January 1985

F. Service Handbook

- 17) In 2006 during the Special Commission on General Affairs and Policy of the HCCH (now referred to as the "Council on General Affairs and Policy"), the Permanent Bureau distributed free copies of the Service Handbook to the heads of all delegations in attendance. Subsequently, the Permanent Bureau also sent free copies of the Service Handbook to the National Organs of Member States of the HCCH (in most instances for them to be passed on to the Central Authorities designated by their States), and the Central Authorities of non-Member Contracting States to the Service Convention. Additional copies of the Service Handbook may be ordered via the "Service Section" of the HCCH website (< www.hcch.net >). Do(es) the Central Authority(ies) of your State have copies of the Service Handbook at their / its disposal?
- NO – why not?
- YES
- a. Do(es) the Central Authority(ies) of your State regularly consult the Service Handbook when confronted with issues regarding the operation of the Service Convention?
- YES
- NO – why not?
- b. Do(es) the Central Authority(ies) of your State find the Service Handbook to be:
- Very useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Please indicate what particular aspects of the Service Handbook could be improved:
- 18) Do practitioners (attorneys, process servers, etc.) in your State also consult and rely on the Service Handbook?

- YES
 NO
 No information available for possible comment

Has the Service Handbook been quoted or referred to in judicial proceedings and / or court decisions in your State (please provide precise references and copies of the relevant decisions)? If a decision is in a language other than English or French, a summary into either of these languages would be appreciated.

YES – references / comments:

NO: [We have no information.](#)

PART TWO – SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

I. Non-mandatory but exclusive character of the Service Convention

19) In Conclusion and Recommendation No 73, the 2003 Special Commission unanimously confirmed the view that the Service Convention is non-mandatory but exclusive (see also Service Handbook, paras 24-45).

a. Has the non-mandatory but exclusive character of the Service Convention led to any questions or difficulties in your State since the 2003 Special Commission?

NO

YES – please explain what these questions or difficulties were and how they were addressed and solved:

b. Have any judicial proceeding and / or court decisions addressed this particular matter of the non-mandatory but exclusive character of the Service Convention?

NO

YES – please explain how the court(s) addressed and / or decided the matter (please provide precise references and copies of the relevant decisions; if a decision is in a language other than English or French, a summary into either of these languages would be appreciated):

II. Scope of the Service Convention

A. Interpretation of the phrase “civil or commercial matters”

20) In Conclusions and Recommendations Nos 69 to 72, the 2003 Special Commission urged for a broad and liberal interpretation of the phrase “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) and reaffirmed the Conclusions adopted at the 1989 Special Commission regarding the scope of the Service Convention.

- a. Has the interpretation of the phrase "civil or commercial matters" given rise to specific issues in your State (either as a requested or a requesting State) since 2003?

YES

(i) What were they and how have they been solved?

(ii) Have the authorities of your State followed the Conclusions and Recommendations of the 2003 Special Commission?

YES

NO – why not?

(iii) Please provide details and / or a copy of any relevant decision(s) (if these decisions are in a language other than English or French, a brief summary into either of these languages would be appreciated):

NO

- b. Has (any of) the Central Authority(ies) of your State been in direct contact with an authority of another Contracting State to discuss the interpretation of this phrase (so as to decide whether or not to execute a request for service)?

YES – please briefly explain the circumstances and modalities of any exchange:

NO – please explain why there was no communication on this issue:

- 21) Regardless of whether a matter has actually arisen, please indicate (by placing a “YES” or a “NO” in the relevant box) which of the following types of matters the authorities of your State consider as falling within the scope of the phrase “civil or commercial matters”:

Bankruptcy or insolvency in general

Reorganisation under bankruptcy laws

Insurance

Social security

Employment

Taxation

Anti-trust and competition

Consumer protection

Regulation and oversight of financial markets and stock exchange (e.g., in matters possibly involving insider trading)

Proceeds of crime

Other matters (please specify):

- 22) *This question is addressed to States that are also States Parties to the Evidence Convention:* Does your State interpret the expression “civil or commercial matters” in the same way under both the Service Convention and the Evidence Convention (see also Questions 17) and 18) in the Evidence Questionnaire, Prel. Doc. No 1 of May 2008 for the attention of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the Hague Evidence, Service, Apostille and Access to Justice Conventions)?

YES

NO – please explain the difference(s):

B. Interpretation of “judicial and extrajudicial documents”

- 23) The Service Convention applies to both judicial and extrajudicial documents (Art. 1(1) – see paras 65 to 70 of the Service Handbook).

- a. Is the concept of extrajudicial documents, which may have to be served on an addressee, known in the domestic law of your State?

NO

YES

- (i) What are the most important examples of extrajudicial documents generated in your State and which, under the domestic law of your State, may have to be served (e.g., consents for adoption, notarial documents)?

Documents issued by notary publics in succession cases, by guardianship authorities in family law cases, and by land registration offices concerning registration of property and other rights relating to immovable properties.

- (ii) Please explain in what circumstances these extrajudicial documents may have to be served abroad:

In case the addressee's address is abroad, and he/she/it has no domestic representative on whom service can be effected, service must be effected abroad.

- (iii) Who may serve these extrajudicial documents? Please specify in particular whether or not private persons may serve extrajudicial documents (see para. 70 of the Service Handbook).

These documents are domestically served by postal way. In case of service abroad documents are sent by the acting authorities to the Hungarian Authority for forwarding to foreign receiving bodies.

- (iv) How many extrajudicial documents has your State, as a requesting State, forwarded in 2007 to another State Party for service?

- 0
 1-10
 11-20
 more than 20

- b. In 2007, how many extrajudicial documents has(have) the Central Authority(ies) or other relevant authorities and officials of your State received under the Service Convention, as the requested State, for service in your State? *We have no such statistics.*

- 0
 1-10
 11-20
 more than 20

- (i) Please specify from which States these requests for service of extrajudicial documents emanated:

- (ii) Were all these requests executed?

- YES
 NO – why not?

C. Service on States and State Officials

- 24) Have the forwarding authorities of your State, as a State of origin, used any channel(s) of transmission available under the Service Convention when service has had to be effected upon a foreign State, head of State, a government entity, member of government, consular or diplomatic agent or any other official acting for a State or a State-owned company (see also Question 38))?

YES – please indicate:

- a. which channel(s) of transmission under the Service Convention has(ve) most commonly been used in this context:
- b. those State(s), or agents representing such State(s), for which / whom such requests for service have been forwarded:
- c. whether service was eventually effected, and if so, by what method:

d. any difficulties that were encountered in any of these cases:

NO – if applicable, please indicate the method(s) of transmission that was (were) used, not under the Service Convention, to transmit requests for service upon a foreign State, head of State, a government entity, member of government, consular or diplomatic agent or any other official acting for a State or a State-owned company, whether or not service was eventually effected, and, if so, by what method:

25) Has(have) the Central Authority(ies) or other authorities and officials in your State, as a State of destination, received requests for service upon your State, head of State, a government entity, member of government, consular or diplomatic agent or any other official acting for your State or a State-owned company?

YES – please indicate:

a. which channel(s) of transmission under the Service Convention has(ve) most commonly been used in this context?

b. from which State(s), or which agents representing that State, such requests for service were received:

c. if service was eventually effected after such requests for service were received, and if so, by what method:

d. any difficulties that were encountered in any of these cases:

NO – if applicable, please indicate the method(s) of transmission that was(were) used, not under the Service Convention, by other States to transmit requests for service upon your State, head of State, a government entity, member of government, consular or diplomatic agent or any other official acting for your State or a State-owned company, whether or not service was eventually effected, and, if so, by what method:

III. The main channel of transmission

A. Forwarding Authority (Art. 3)

26) In Conclusion and Recommendation No 49, the 2003 Special Commission advised that in case of doubt as to the competence of the forwarding authority, rather than rejecting the request for service, the authorities in the requested State should seek to confirm that competence by either consulting the HCCH website or by making informal enquiries, including by way of e-mail.

Has your State, as a requested State, experienced any difficulties in determining whether a specific forwarding authority was in fact a legitimate forwarding authority under the law of the requesting State?

NO

- [] YES – please specify whether or not the authorities of your State followed Conclusion and Recommendation No 49 of the 2003 Special Commission:
 [] YES
 [] NO – why not?

- 27) The Service Convention does not specify how requests for service should be sent by the forwarding authority of the requesting State to the relevant Central Authority of the requested State.
- a. Do the forwarding authorities of your State use the official postal mail service of your State to send most of their requests for service abroad?
 [] YES
 [] NO
- b. Do the forwarding authorities of your State also use *private* courier services to send requests for service abroad?
 [] YES – please explain in what circumstances they use private courier services:

 [] NO – please explain why:
- c. Do(es) the Central Authority(ies) of your State, as a requested State, accept requests for service when they are sent via a private courier service?
 [] YES
 [] NO – why not?

See also Question 32) regarding the use of modern technologies, in particular sub-questions b. and c.

B. Methods of service (Art. 5)

- 28) Please complete:
- a. Formal service (Art. 5(1) a))
- (i) Please describe the methods of service prescribed by the domestic law of your State to effect formal service of documents upon persons who are within the territory of your State (Art. 5(1) a)):
- The postal service provider attempts service of the official document that was posted with an acknowledgement of receipt, via service in person. If the first service is unsuccessful, i.e. if the postman was unable to hand the document over to the addressee or to a person authorised to receive it (a close relative or partner of the addressee), he leaves a notice with the acknowledgement of receipt there, stating that the postal service provider will attempt to serve the document on the fifth working day after the unsuccessful service. The official document can be received before the second service at the post office mentioned in the notice, upon proof of identity. If the second service is unsuccessful the postal service provider leaves a second notice informing the addressee that the official document can be received in the post office within five days of the second unsuccessful service. After another five days without result the postal service provider will send back the official document to the sender with a "did not look for it" notice. If the addressee declines to accept the delivery the first time it is served, i.e. the postal service provider finds the addressee at the*

indicated address but s/he is not willing to accept the official document, the document must be considered served on the day of the unsuccessful service. In that event the service provider sends back the official document without delay to the sender with the notice "declined to accept" and the legal consequences in connection with the served document are to be applied.

Sections 29 and 30 of Government Decree 79/2004 (IV.19.) on providing postal services contain the detailed regulations.

Section 30(5) states that, where necessary on grounds of urgency or other reasons, the authorities (courts or offices) may serve documents via their own delivery-person, who is employed on a standard contract, employed as a public servant or a public sector employee or as a judicial sector employee, rather than the postal service. In the case of service in person the accepting person confirms with his/her dated signature that the acceptance has taken place. If there is a form specifically for acceptance (acknowledgement of receipt), the fact that acceptance has taken place must be acknowledged on it. If service cannot be accomplished after two attempts, service must be attempted once more or it must be accomplished by ordinary post.

- (ii) Please indicate the method(s) generally used by your State when service is requested under Article 5(1) a) and no preference has been indicated as to the manner in which service should be effected (e.g., personal service, by post, etc. See also below Question 28) c. (ii) and (iii)). Please also indicate your State's reasons behind any such default choice:

b. Service by a particular method (Art. 5(1) b))

Pursuant to Article 5(1) b), service may be effected by a particular method requested by the applicant unless such a method is incompatible with the law

of the requested State (requests for the use of a particular method are fairly rare in practice, see para. 132 of the Service Handbook). The purpose of this provision is to enable requests for a particular method of service *contemplated by the law of the requesting State* to be applied in the requested State so that the validity requirements for service in the requesting State are met. However, it appears that some forwarding authorities are systematically requesting that their request for service be executed under Article 5(1) *b*) even in circumstances where they intend to have service effected by a method that is recognised under the laws of the *requested* State (such as personal service). The Permanent Bureau believes that this practice is erroneous and that such a request should instead be made and specified under Article 5(1) *a*).

- (i) Does your State agree with the position of the Permanent Bureau that a request for a method of service that is recognised by the law of the requested State (such as personal service) may be specified and effected under Article 5(1) *a*) and that Article 5(1) *b*) serves a separate purpose?

YES

NO – please explain why:

- (ii) If relevant, please describe the particular methods of service which your forwarding authorities have requested other States to use under Article 5(1) *b*) and whether these particular methods have in fact been used to effect service:

- (iii) If relevant, please describe the particular methods of service by which your State has been requested to effect service under Article 5(1) *b*) and whether these particular methods have in fact been used to effect service:

c. Informal delivery (Art. 5(2))

- (i) Does the law of your State provide for *informal delivery* of documents (understood to be a method of service where the documents to be served are delivered to an addressee who accepts them voluntarily)?

YES – please describe how service of documents via informal delivery is made in your State (Art. 5(2)):

NO

- (ii) As a matter of practice, does your State systematically attempt service of process by informal delivery if and when no particular method of service has been requested under Article 5(1) *a*) or *b*)?

YES

NO

- (iii) As a matter of practice, does your State systematically attempt service of documents via a *formal* method of service when informal delivery has proven to be unsuccessful?

YES – please specify if your State imposes any additional requirements before such formal service will be attempted (*e.g.*, a translation):

NO

C. Translation requirements (Art. 5(3))

29) Please indicate if your State, as a requested State, imposes any language or translation requirements for documents to be served in your State under Article 5(1) (see Conclusions and Recommendations Nos 67 and 68 of the 2003 Special Commission):

NO requirements

YES – please indicate what these requirements are, in each of the following set of circumstances:

a. Formal service (Art. 5(1) a)):

In circumstances where the / a Central Authority of your State, as a requested State, is in a position to assess the content and nature of the request for service based on the “Summary” section of the Model Form and where there is evidence that the addressee is fluent in the language in which the document to be served is written. Would your State then still insist, under Article 5(1) a), that the document be translated into another language (*i.e.*, one of the official languages of your State)?

YES – please indicate why:

Domestic rules of service can only be applied if Hungarian translation is provided according to the law. This is to safeguard addressee’s rights. Nevertheless if no translation attached informal delivery is attempted.

NO

b. Particular method requested by the applicant (Art. 5(1) b)):

In circumstances where the / a Central Authority of your State, as a requested State, is in a position to assess the content and nature of the request for service based on the “Summary” section of the Model Form and where there is evidence that the addressee is fluent in the language in which the document to be served is written. Would your State then still insist, under Article 5(1) b) that the document be translated into another language (*i.e.*, one of the official languages of your State)?

YES – please indicate why:

See previous point.

NO

c. Informal delivery (Art. 5(2)):

NO translation requirement for informal delivery

30) The Service Convention does not state how any translation of the documents to be served under Article 5(1) should be prepared or who should prepare it. According to your State, which law determines these issues?

The domestic law of the requesting State

The domestic law of the requested State

Both laws

Please specify / comment if needed:

D. Costs (Art. 12)

31) Please indicate the costs incurred (if any) for each of the following methods of service under the law of your State (as a requested State) in accordance with Articles 5 and 12:

a. Formal service (Art. 5(1) *a*):

(i) Who bears these costs?

Your State (requested State)

The applicant / forwarding authority / requesting State – please explain whether or not service will only be effected in your State, as the requested State, only once any costs have been reimbursed. Also, please explain the modalities of any reimbursement (to whom the costs are reimbursed (relevant Competent Authority of your State, judicial officer, other person, etc.), and how the reimbursement is effected (electronic bank transfers, cheques, etc.))

b. Particular method requested by the applicant (Art. 5(1) *b*):

(i) Who bears these costs?

Your State (requested State)

The applicant / forwarding authority / requesting State – please explain whether or not service will only be effected in your State, as the requested State, only once any costs have been reimbursed. Also, please explain the modalities of any reimbursement (to whom the costs are reimbursed (relevant Competent Authority of your State, judicial officer, other person, etc.), and how the reimbursement is effected (electronic bank transfers, cheques, etc.))

c. Informal delivery (Art. 5(2)):

(i) Who bears these costs?

Your State (requested State)

The applicant / forwarding authority / requesting State – please explain whether or not service will only be effected in your State, as the requested State, only once any costs have been reimbursed. Also, please explain the modalities of any reimbursement (to whom the costs are reimbursed (relevant Competent Authority of your State, judicial officer, other person, etc.), and how the reimbursement is effected (electronic bank transfers, cheques, etc.))

E. Modern Technologies

32) In Conclusions and Recommendations Nos 60 to 62, the 2003 Special Commission noted that the Service Convention does not on its terms prevent or prescribe the use of modern technologies to assist in further improving the operation of the Convention and that States Parties should explore all ways in which they can use modern technology. In Conclusion and Recommendation No 63, a variety of steps were identified for the exploration and use of modern technologies: in

communications between a requesting party and a forwarding authority, in communications between a forwarding authority and a Central Authority of a requested State, and in the retransmission of the certificate of execution by the Central Authority or the designated authority (Art. 6). In light of these Conclusions, and in the context of the main channel of transmission, please comment on the following (see also below Part Three, Section II. C.):

- a. Does the law of your State, as a requesting State, allow for documents to be forwarded *from a requesting party to a forwarding authority* by fax, e-mail or a similar technology?

YES – please specify what technologies are used in practice (e.g., (secured or unsecured) transmission via fax or e-mail) and any requirements of the law of your State (e.g., obtaining the consent of all / some of the authorities or parties involved, etc.):

NO – please explain / specify:

The same rules for authenticity of documents is applicable to domestic and foreign service, according to which documents must be authentic or authenticated.

- b. Does the law of your State, as a requesting State, allow for documents to be forwarded *from a forwarding authority to a Central Authority of a requested State* by fax, e-mail or a similar technology?

YES – please specify what technologies are used in practice (e.g., (secured or unsecured) transmission via fax or e-mail) and any requirements of the law of your State (e.g., obtaining the consent of all / some of the authorities or parties involved, confirming any requirements and / or capabilities of the Central Authority of the requested State in this regard, etc.).

NO – please explain / specify:

See answer above.

- c. Does the law of your State, as a requested State, allow for documents to be *received by your (one of your) Central Authority(ies) from a forwarding authority abroad* by fax, e-mail or a similar technology?

YES – please specify what technologies are used in practice (e.g., (secured or unsecured) transmission via fax or e-mail) and any requirements of the law of your State (e.g., obtaining the consent of all / some of the authorities or parties involved, etc., before being able to accept such documents for service).

NO – please explain / specify:

- d. Does the law of your State, as a requested State, allow for *the certificate of execution to be transmitted* from the relevant Central Authority of your State or the authority designated under Article 6 to the applicant by fax, e-mail or a similar technology?

YES – please specify what technologies are used in practice (e.g., (secured or unsecured) transmission via fax or e-mail) and any requirements of the law of your State (e.g., obtaining the consent of all / some of the authorities or parties involved, etc., before being able to transmit the certificate of execution):

Fax, e-mail.

NO – please explain / specify:

- e. Does the law of your State, as a requesting State, allow for the certificate of execution to be received from the requested State by fax, e-mail or a similar technology?

YES – please specify what modern technologies are used in practice (e.g., (secured or unsecured) transmission via fax or e-mail) and any requirements of the law of your State (e.g., obtaining the consent of all / some of the authorities or parties involved, etc., before being able to receive the certificate of execution):

Fax, e-mail.

NO – please explain / specify:

IV. Alternative Channels of Transmission (Arts 8, 9, 10)

A. Translation requirements

- 33) In Conclusion and Recommendation No 65, the 2003 Special Commission recognised that whilst no translation is required under the Service Convention for documents transmitted under the alternative channels of transmission, in isolated cases, translations are sometimes required in these circumstances by the domestic law of States. Does the domestic law of your State impose translation requirements on documents that are transmitted for service through an alternative channel of transmission?

NO

YES – please provide to the Permanent Bureau all relevant information pertaining to these internal legal requirements and to which alternative channel they relate. If this information is not in either French or English then a translation into one of these languages would be appreciated:

B. Model Form

- 34) The Fourteenth Session of the HCCH (held in 1980) recommended that the part of the Model Form that contains the “Summary”, accompanied by the “Warning”, not only be used under the main channel of transmission but also under the alternative channels of transmission of the Service Convention (the Recommendation and the accompanying Report established by Gustaf Möller are available on the “Service Section” of the HCCH website (< www.hcch.net >). Please indicate whether the forwarding authorities in your State systematically send the “Summary” accompanied by the “Warning” when requests for service are sent abroad using an alternative channel of transmission.

YES

NO – why not?

- 35) The Permanent Bureau approves and encourages the practice of certain States to return the Certificate to the applicant even if transmission of the request for service occurred via an alternative channel of transmission provided for in Article 10 *b*) and *c*) (see para. 119 of the Service Handbook). This practice may even be extended to Article 10 *a*), depending on the postal mail service used in the State of destination. Is it a practice within your State, as a State of destination, to use the “Certificate” part of the Model Form and to transmit this to the applicant in the

State of origin when the transmission of the request for service occurred under one of the alternative channels of transmission contained within Article 10 *a)*, *b)* and *c)*?

YES, the Certificate is transmitted to the applicant when the transmission of the request for service occurred under Article 10 *a)* – please provide further details:

YES, the Certificate is transmitted to the applicant when the transmission of the request for service occurred under Article 10 *b)* and / or *c)* – please provide further details, *i.e.*, what category of or which judicial officers, officials or competent persons exercise this practice:

NO: *Hungary has objected to those methods.*

C. Diplomatic and Consular Channels

Article 8 – Direct Channels

36) Have the diplomatic and consular agents of your State been used to directly effect service of judicial documents upon persons abroad in accordance with Article 8(1) in the past five years?

NO – why not?

Yes – please specify:

a. on how many occasions your diplomatic and consular agents abroad have been used to effect service in accordance with Article 8(1):

About 10.

b. in which States these diplomatic and consular agents were based:

Mexico. Argentina, USA.

c. the average time taken between the transmission of the documents for service and the execution of service:

No information.

d. whether your State considers this channel to be efficient and effective:

YES

NO – why not?

e. whether there have been situations whereby the diplomatic and consular agents of your State have attempted to directly effect service of judicial documents upon persons abroad but were unable to as a result of the addressee not voluntarily accepting delivery of the document:

YES – please indicate how this matter was dealt with:

NO

- f. whether the transmission of judicial documents to the diplomatic agents or consular officers of your State posted abroad, or the actual service of these judicial documents upon an addressee, have been executed by using electronic means (e.g., by fax or e-mail):

YES

NO – why not?

It is not allowed by Hungarian law.

Article 9 – Indirect Channels

- 37) In the past five years, has your State used consular channels to forward documents, for the purpose of service, to those authorities of another Contracting State which were designated by the latter for this purpose in accordance with Article 9(1)?

NO – why not?

YES – please specify:

- a. on how many occasions this channel has been used in the past five years:

- b. in which States these diplomatic and consular agents were based:

Canada

- c. the average time taken between the first transmission of the documents to be served and the execution of service:

No information.

- d. whether your State considers this channel to be efficient and effective?

YES

NO – why not?

It is necessary because only the Embassy/Consulate-General can pay cost of service by Canadian cheque.

- 38) In the past, have there been “exceptional circumstances” in accordance with Article 9(2) that required your State to use diplomatic channels to forward documents to another State Party for the purpose of service?

NO

YES – please describe what these exceptional circumstances were that warranted the use of diplomatic channels to forward documents for the purpose of service in another State Party. In particular, did any exceptional circumstances relate to the service of a claim on a foreign State, head of State, a government entity, member of government, consular or diplomatic agent or any other official acting for a State or a State-owned company (see para. 193 of the Service Handbook):

- 39) Has the transmissions of documents to either diplomatic agents or consular officers of your State located abroad for the purpose of service in the State in which they are based, or the actual service on these documents upon the addressee, occurred via electronic means (e.g., by fax or e-mail)?

YES

NO – why not?

It is not allowed by Hungarian law.

D. Article 10 a) – Postal Channel

40) If your State has opposed “the freedom to send judicial documents, by postal channels, directly to persons abroad” (Art. 10 a)), please indicate:

a. the reason(s) that motivated this opposition:

It would hurt sovereignty.

b. whether your State uses this channel of transmission to send judicial documents abroad for service by mail despite having filed an opposition under Article 10 a) (see paras 206-210 of the Service Handbook):

NO

YES – please explain:

Please go to Question 44).

41) Has the interpretation and application of Article 10 a) given rise to any difficulties in your State?

YES – please specify / comment:

NO

42) If possible, please comment upon how frequently judicial documents are sent for service upon persons abroad, by parties in your State, via postal channels:

We have no data.

43) In Conclusion and Recommendation No 56, the 2003 Special Commission concluded that for the purposes of Article 10 a), the use of a private courier was the equivalent of using the postal channel under the Service Convention.

a. Does the law of your State, as a State of origin, allow for private courier services to be used under Article 10 a), *i.e.*, are judicial documents sent from your State for service abroad via private courier services:

YES

NO – why not?

Hungarian law allows postal service by ordinary postal service provider.

b. Does the law of your State, as a State of destination, allow for private courier services to be used under Article 10 a), *i.e.*, are judicial documents received from abroad and served within your State by private courier services:

YES

NO – why not?

Hungary is opposed to postal service in its territory.

E. Article 10 b) – Judicial Officers, Officials or Other Competent Persons

44) If your State has opposed “the freedom of judicial officers, officials or other competent persons of the State of origin to effect service of judicial documents directly through the judicial officers, officials or other competent persons of the State of destination” (Art. 10 b)), please indicate the reason(s) that motivated this opposition: *Hungarian law does not know the system of service by judicial officers or officials.*

If your State does hold an opposition, please go to Question 46).

- 45) Provided the application of Article 10 *b*) has not been objected to by your State and that the law of your State presumably allows for service to be effected by “judicial officers, officials or other competent persons”, please answer the following:
- a. Which of the following would be considered to be “judicial officers, officials or other competent persons” under the law of your State (please tick all relevant boxes)? Please also note whether these categories differ depending on whether your State is a State of origin or a State of destination:
 - Attorneys or solicitors
 - Bailiffs
 - Huissiers*
 - Process servers
 - Court officials
 - Notaries
 - Officials of the executive branch
 - Other – please specify
 - b. How does this channel of transmission operate in practice – in particular, do (any of) the judicial officers, officials or other competent persons mentioned above send (or receive) the judicial documents *directly* to (or from) their counterparts abroad, or do they have to use some other channel? Please also indicate whether these channels differ depending on whether your State is a State of origin or a State of destination.
 - c. Are there any costs associated with the use of this alternative channel of transmission in your State, either in terms of sending or receiving judicial documents?
 - d. How frequently is this channel of transmission used in your State (either as a State of origin or as a State of destination)?
 - e. May any transmission between the judicial officers, officials or other competent persons be done via electronic means (*e.g.*, by fax or e-mail)?
 - YES
 - NO – why not?

F. Article 10 *c*) – Interested Persons

- 46) If your State has opposed “the freedom of any person interested in a judicial proceeding to effect service of judicial documents directly through judicial officers, officials or other competent persons of the State of destination” (Art. 10 *c*)), please indicate the reason(s) that motivated this opposition: *Hungarian law does not know the system of service by judicial officers or officials.*
- If your State does hold an opposition, please go to Question 48).*

- 47) Provided the application of Article 10 c) has not been objected to by your State, please answer the following:
- a. Which of the following would be considered to be “any person interested in a judicial proceeding” under the law of your State (please tick all relevant boxes):
 - Attorneys or solicitors
 - Bailiffs
 - Huissiers*
 - Process servers
 - Court officials
 - Notaries
 - Officials of the executive branch
 - Other – please specify

 - b. How does this channel of transmission operate in practice – in particular is any person interested in a judicial proceedings able to send the judicial documents *directly* to the judicial officers, officials or other competent persons of the State of destination or does another channel have to be used?

 - c. Are there any costs associated with the use of this channel of transmission in your State, either in terms of sending or receiving judicial documents?

 - d. How frequently is this channel of transmission used in your State (either as a State of origin or as a State of destination)?

 - e. May any transmission between a person interested in a judicial proceeding and the judicial officer, official or other competent person be done via electronic means (*e.g.*, by fax or e-mail):
 - YES
 - NO – why not?

V. Final refusal to execute the request (Art. 13)

- 48) According to Article 13 of the Service Convention a requested State may refuse to execute a request for service when this would infringe the “sovereignty or security” of the requested State.
- a. In the past five years, has your State, as a requested State, rejected the execution of any request for service under Article 13?
 - YES – please specify the grounds upon which your State rejected the execution. Please specify whether there is case law in your State that relates to this issue:

 - NO

- b. In the past five years, is your State aware of whether a(ny) request(s) for service forwarded by your State has(have) been refused by a requested State under Article 13?

YES – please specify the precise grounds upon which the(se) request(s) for service were rejected:

NO

VI. Protection of the interests of the Plaintiff and Defendant (Arts 15 and 16)

- 49) When a writ of summons or an equivalent document has been transmitted abroad for the purpose of service under the Service Convention, and the defendant has not appeared, Article 15(1) requires States not to give judgment unless certain requirements have been met. Nonetheless, and subject to States' declarations on this matter, a judge may give judgment if the conditions specified in Article 15(2) are fulfilled. One of these conditions is Article 15(2) c) which states that "no certificate *of any kind* has been received, even though every reasonable effort has been made to obtain it through the competent authorities of the State addressed" [emphasis added]. Please comment on the interpretation in your State of the expression "no certificate *of any kind*". In particular, would your State, as a requesting State, consider that the receipt of a certificate that stated that *no service* has occurred could nevertheless trigger the application of Article 15(2)? *We note that this question is to be assessed by the acting courts in the cases concerned.*

YES, the receipt of a certificate that states that no service has occurred may trigger the application of Article 15(2) (if all the other conditions are fulfilled).

NO, the receipt of a certificate that states that no service has occurred may not trigger the application of Article 15(2) – please explain why:

- 50) If a requesting State has made a declaration in accordance with Article 15(2) and considers that all conditions of Article 15(2) have been fulfilled and accordingly enters a default judgment, would your State, as a requested State, recognise and enforce the resulting judgment in these circumstances (assuming that all other conditions for the recognition and enforcement of the judgment are fulfilled)? *We note that this question is to be assessed by the acting courts in the cases concerned. According to our domestic law, the lack of due service of writ of summons can only be taken into account if the defendant invokes it. Therefore if the defendant does not oppose on this basis it can be possible.*

YES

NO – please indicate the grounds upon which your State would refuse to enforce a judgment in these circumstances:

- 51) If your State has not made a declaration under Article 15(2), please explain:

a. why your State has not made such a declaration:

b. whether or not your State is assessing the possibility of making such a declaration:

- 52) If your State has *not* made a declaration under Article 15(2), what actions would a judge in your State take (as a requesting State) if your State has not received a

certificate of service and the defendant has not appeared? For example, would the law of your State enable a judge to enter a default judgment, despite the absence of a declaration under Article 15(2)? Upon what grounds would such a judgment be made? If there were some evidence that service had actually been effected, would this change the options that may be available to a judge?

Not applicable (my State made a declaration under Art. 15(2))

53) If your State has not made a declaration under Article 16(3), please explain:

- a. why your State has not made a declaration:
- b. whether or not your State is assessing the possibility of making a declaration:

VII. Date of service

54) The Service Convention does not include a provision that determines the date of service (*i.e.*, the precise moment when the documents have actually been or are deemed to have been served). As a result, it is for the domestic law of the State(s) involved to determine the date of service.

- a. How is the date of service of documents determined in your State:
 - (i) in relation with the execution of a request for service forwarded under the main channel of transmission (please also specify whether your State relies on the date mentioned under point 1 of the Certificate to determine the actual date of service)? *The date is determined by the law of the place of the service. However service can be deemed due if it was in conformity with Hungarian rules on service, in which scenario the Hungarian law applies.*

(ii) when one of the alternative channels of transmission has been used?

- b. When the law of your State requires that documents be served within a specific period, does the law of your State also provide effective means to protect the interests of the applicant when the documents have to be served abroad and are thus subject to the effective operation of authorities or professionals abroad (*e.g.*, does the law of your State provide for extended periods of service or for fictitious dates of service based on the date when the documents are sent or ready to be sent abroad, etc.; see Conclusion and Recommendation No 75 of the 2003 Special Commission)?

YES – please specify:

NO

- c. Has the absence of an explicit rule on the date of service in the Convention caused any practical difficulties in your State?

YES – please specify:

NO

PART THREE – OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES

I. Model Form annexed to the Service Convention

A. Fillable PDF versions of the Model Form

- 55) The Permanent Bureau has made the Model Form annexed to the Convention available as a fillable PDF document on the HCCH website. This fillable version of the Model Form is currently available in English, French and in two trilingual versions (English / French / Ukrainian and English / French / Russian). These fillable forms have proven to be very useful. The Permanent Bureau would be pleased to make available other trilingual Model Forms in the same format (English / French / one of the official languages of a State Party). States that are interested in producing a Model Form with (one of) their official language(s) available as fillable PDF documents are invited to send to the Permanent Bureau a document in MS-Word with the text of the Model Form in the relevant official language. The Permanent Bureau will then create the fillable version and upload it onto the HCCH website.

Please feel free to comment further on the above:

B. Request Form (Art. 3)

- 56) The first box on the Model Form asks for the “[i]dentity and address of the *applicant*” [emphasis added]. The Permanent Bureau’s interpretation of the word “applicant” is that it refers to the *forwarding authority* referred to in Article 3(1) (see Service Handbook, paras 112-114). Does your State agree with this interpretation?

YES

NO – what then is the interpretation of this word in your State?

The plaintiff in the proceedings

Counsel representing the plaintiff (if different from the forwarding authority)

The court where the proceeding is taking place in the requesting State

Other – please specify:

- 57) In Conclusion and Recommendation No 48, the 2003 Special Commission unanimously approved the suggestion that the information regarding the forwarding authorities and their competences be included in the Model Form. Does your State systematically follow this Conclusion and Recommendation when sending a request for service?

YES

NO – why not?

We do not think that the competence of a Ministry of Justice to send requests is doubted anywhere.

C. Certificate (Art. 6)

58) Article 6(4) indicates that the Certificate shall be “forwarded directly to the *applicant*” [emphasis added]. The Permanent Bureau’s interpretation of the word “applicant” is again that it refers to the *forwarding authority* referred to in Article 3(1). Does your State agree with this interpretation?

YES

NO – to whom then do(es) the Central Authority(ies) of your State or the authority designated for this purpose forward the Certificate:

The plaintiff in the proceedings

Counsel representing the plaintiff (if different from the forwarding authority)

The court where the proceedings are taking place in the requesting State

The nearest Embassy representing the requesting State

Other – please specify:

II. E-service

A. In strictly domestic situations

59) Does the law of your State, in strictly domestic situations, allow for documents to be served by fax, e-mail, SMS, the posting of a message on a website, or by a similar modern technology?

NO – are there plans to introduce service by using such technologies?

YES – please specify:

Service of documents is only allowed in company registration cases.

NO

YES – please specify:

a. the legal framework and practical circumstances in which such technologies may be used (please describe for each if necessary):

b. whether a secured transmission has to be used for any / each of these technologies, and if so, which kind of secured transmission is used in practice:

c. if and how service upon the addressee is acknowledged or proven in such circumstances:

B. In cross-border situations outside of the Service Convention

60) Have the relevant authorities of your State served documents by fax, e-mail, SMS, the posting of a message on a website or by a similar modern technology in cross-border situations that did not fall within the scope of the Service Convention?

YES – please specify:

a. the legal framework and practical circumstances in which this occurred – in particular, whether the terms of a regional or bilateral instrument

provided for or otherwise allowed this (please describe for each if necessary):

- b. whether a secured transmission has to be used for any / each of these technologies, and if so, which kind of secured transmission is used in practice:
- c. if and how service upon the addressee was acknowledged or proven in such circumstances:

NO

C. E-service and the main channel of transmission under the Service Convention

61) Has the / a Central Authority of your State received requests for service that expressly asked for documents to be served by fax, e-mail, SMS, the posting of a message on a website or by a similar modern technology?

NO – please indicate how the Central Authority would respond if it were to receive such requests:

We would offer to serve documents on methods allowed by the Hungarian law.

YES

- a. From which State(s) did these requests emanate?
- b. Did the requests for service provide any particular circumstances or explanations as to why the execution of using such technologies was requested?
 - YES – what were these circumstances or explanations? (please tick all relevant boxes)
 - Urgency
 - Failure of previous attempts to serve process by traditional means
 - Use of such technologies approved by judicial authority of the forum or the domestic law of the forum
 - All parties involved gave their (prior or subsequent) consent
 - Other – please specify:

NO

c. Did your State in fact execute any of these requests for service by using any of these modern technologies?

NO – why not?

YES – please specify:

(i) the legal basis upon which these requests for service were executed:

(ii) whether a secured transmission was used or required or requested to be used, and if so, which kind:

(iii) if and how service upon the addressee was acknowledged or proven in such circumstances:

62) Has your State, as a requesting State under the Service Convention, sent requests for service abroad that expressly asked for documents to be served by fax, e-mail, SMS, the posting of a message on a website or by using a similar modern technology?

NO

YES

a. To which State(s) were these requests sent?

b. Did the requests for service provide any particular circumstances or otherwise provide explanations as to why the execution of service using such technologies was requested?

YES – what were these circumstances or explanations? (please tick all relevant boxes)

Urgency

Failure of previous attempts to serve process by traditional means

Use of such technologies approved by the relevant judicial authority or the domestic law of your State

All parties involved gave their (prior or subsequent) consent

Others – please specify:

NO

c. Were these requests for service in fact executed by using any of these modern technologies?

YES

NO – please provide any information you may have as to why these requests were not executed:

63) How likely is it that your State would recognise and execute a foreign judgment if the related writ of summons was served abroad by fax, e-mail, SMS, the posting of a message on a website or by using a similar modern technology (all other conditions for recognition being of course fulfilled)? *We note that this question is to be assessed by the acting courts in the cases concerned. According to our domestic law, the lack of due service of writ of summons can only be taken into account if the defendant invokes it. Therefore if the defendant does not oppose on this basis it can be possible.*

Very likely

Likely

Very unlikely

It depends on the technology used – please indicate which modern technology method of service your State would accept:

- 64) How likely is it that your State would recognise and enforce an agreement made by parties to a contract to the effect that they agree in advance to serve documents by fax, e-mail, SMS, the posting of a message on a website or by using a similar modern technology?

Very likely

Likely

Very unlikely

Please explain / comment:

Internal law does not allow such possibility.

D. E-service and the alternative channels of transmission under the Service Convention

- 65) Does your State interpret the expression "postal channels" in Article 10 a) as including transmissions by:

a. Fax

YES

NO

Comments:

b. E-mail

YES

NO

Comments:

c. SMS

YES

NO

Comments:

d. The posting of a message on a website

YES

NO

Comments:

E. Miscellaneous

- 66) Have there been any other recent developments in your State in relation to the service of documents by fax, e-mail, SMS, the posting of a message on a website or by using a similar modern technology (including in situations involving one of the alternative channels of transmission under the Service Convention where applicable)? Please describe below and provide the citations for and / or a copy of any relevant decision or article in this regard (if this information is not in English or French, a summary into one of these languages would be appreciated):

- 67) In Conclusions and Recommendations Nos 60 to 62, the 2003 Special Commission noted, amongst other matters, that the Service Convention does not on its terms prevent or prescribe the use of modern technologies to assist in further improving

- a. Specific Conclusions and Recommendations to that effect by the 2009 Special Commission

YES

NO

Comments:

- b. A Protocol to the Service Convention:

YES

NO

Comments:

Thank you!

* * *