



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **The regime for international air carrier liability: to what extent has the envisaged uniformity of the 1999 Montreal Convention been achieved?**

Grigorieff, C.I.

### **Citation**

Grigorieff, C. I. (2021, November 17). *The regime for international air carrier liability: to what extent has the envisaged uniformity of the 1999 Montreal Convention been achieved?*. Meijers-reeks. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3240115>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3240115>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## The Regime for International Air Carrier Liability

To what Extent has the Envisaged Uniformity of  
the 1999 Montreal Convention been Achieved?



# The Regime for International Air Carrier Liability

To what Extent has the Envisaged Uniformity of the 1999 Montreal Convention been Achieved?

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,  
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties  
te verdedigen op woensdag 17 november 2021  
klokke 10.00 uur

*door*

Cyril-Igor Grigorieff

geboren te Etterbeek, België

in 1982

Promotoren: Prof. dr. P.M.J. Mendes de Leon  
Prof. dr. V. Correia (University Paris Saclay, France)

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. S.J. Truxal  
Prof. dr. A. Masutti (University of Bologna, Italy)  
Prof. dr. W. Müller-Rostin (International University of  
Applied Sciences Bad Honnef/Bonn, Germany)  
Prof. dr. P. Delebecque (University of Paris 1/Sorbonne,  
France)

Lay-out: AlphaZet prepress, Bodegraven  
Printwerk: Ipskamp Printing

© 2021 C-I Grigorieff

*Behoudens de in of krachtens de Auteurswet van 1912 gestelde uitzonderingen mag niets uit deze uitgave worden verveelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen of enig andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de auteur.*

*No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission of the author.*

## Acknowledgments

This work is the result of several years of practice and research. Not a single line would have been possible without the constant encouragement of many caring and incredible people.

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors: Dr. Pablo Mendes de Leon, Professor of Air and Space Law at Leiden University, and Prof. Dr. Vincent Correia, co-Director of the *Institut Droit, Espaces et Technologies* of the Paris Saclay University, whose clear guidance and encouragement were invaluable to the process of this doctoral dissertation. My sincere gratitude also goes to the staff of the Institute of Air and Space Law, in particular Mrs Natascha Meewisse who skilfully guided me through the PhD related processes. I should also mention the outstanding members of my Doctorate committee and my incredible paranymphs Charlotte and Davinia Dusa.

Next, I would like first to thank to my family and particularly my parents, Danielle Bloem and Ghéorghii Vladimirovitch Grigorieff, for having taught me the importance of academic rigour, and who also initiated me from a young age to law, aviation and languages.

Further, I wish to thank all those who helped me during this extraordinary experience. Although I may not list all of them, I truly appreciated their assistance and friendship. Special thanks go to the Thijssen family for translation of the summary into Dutch.

Finally, I take full responsibility for any errors, omissions or inaccuracies which may be found in this work.



# Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	V
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	XIII
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Legal Context and Definitions	1
1.1.1 The Emergence of Aviation and the Need for an International Air Carrier Liability Regime	1
1.1.2 Possible Techniques of Approximation of Legislations	3
1.1.2.1 Harmonization and Unification Techniques	3
(1) <i>Preliminary Remarks</i>	3
(2) <i>Harmonization Techniques</i>	4
(3) <i>Unification Techniques</i>	4
(i) <i>Conflict of Laws Rules</i>	4
(ii) <i>Uniform Rules</i>	5
(4) <i>Distinction with Respect to the Techniques Used in European Union Law</i>	6
1.1.2.2 Other Techniques	7
1.1.3 Solutions Adopted for the International Air Carrier Liability Regime	9
1.1.3.1 Adopted International Conventions Governing the International Air Carriage Liability Regime	9
1.1.3.2 The Topology of Conventions Governing the International Air Carrier Liability Regime	12
(1) <i>Topology</i>	12
(2) <i>Final Clauses</i>	12
(3) <i>Uniform Rules</i>	12
(4) <i>Referrals to Domestic Legislation Clauses</i>	12
(i) <i>The Difference between Exclusions and Renvois</i>	12
(ii) <i>Exclusions</i>	12
(iii) <i>Renvois</i>	14
1.1.3.3 Concluding Remarks	14
1.2 Research Questions, Study Structure and Interest For Legal Science	14
1.2.1 The Formulation of Research Questions	14
1.2.2 Study Structure	15
1.2.2.1 Is Uniformity a Predominant Aim of the 1999 Montreal Convention?	15



1.2.2.2	If so, are there Factors Preventing this Aim from Being Achieved?	15
	(1) <i>Categorization</i>	15
	(2) <i>Internal Factors</i>	15
	(3) <i>External Factors</i>	16
1.2.2.3	Which Methods Can Enhance Uniformity?	16
1.2.2.4	Concluding Remarks	17
1.2.3	Interest for Legal Science	17
1.3	Methodological Framework	18
1.3.1	Legislative Instruments, International Customary Law and General Principles of Law	18
1.3.1.1	The 1999 Montreal Convention and the Warsaw Instruments	18
	(1) <i>The 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	18
	(2) <i>The Warsaw Instruments</i>	18
1.3.1.2	Methodology for Treaty Interpretation	20
	(1) <i>Authentic v. Judicial Interpretations</i>	20
	(2) <i>Judicial Interpretations: Articles 31, 32 and 33 of the 1969 Vienna Convention</i>	21
	(i) <i>The Scope of the 1969 Vienna Convention</i>	21
	(ii) <i>The Principles of Interpretation</i>	21
	(iii) <i>The Application of these Principles to the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	22
	(iv) <i>The Application of these Principles to the Warsaw Instruments</i>	23
	(v) <i>Understanding Articles 31 and 32 of the 1969 Vienna Convention in the Context of the Conventions</i>	24
	(vi) <i>Domestic Recognition of these Principles</i>	27
1.3.1.3	Other International Conventions	28
1.3.1.4	Regional Legislations	29
1.3.1.5	International Customary Law and General Principles of Law	29
1.3.1.6	Domestic Legislations	29
1.3.2	Judicial Decisions	29
1.3.2.1	Preliminary Remarks	29
1.3.2.2	Notions on the Implementation of International Conventions in Domestic Regimes	30
	(1) <i>A Variety of Implementation Methods</i>	30
	(2) <i>The Monist System</i>	30
	(3) <i>The Dualist System</i>	31
	(4) <i>Mixed Systems</i>	31
	(5) <i>The Potential Effects of the Variety of Implementation Methods</i>	32
1.3.2.3	Examined Jurisdictions Regarding Autonomy	32
	(1) <i>Preliminary Remarks</i>	32

(2) <i>Selected Jurisdictions</i>	33
(i) <i>Belgium</i>	33
(ii) <i>Canada</i>	34
(iii) <i>France</i>	34
(iv) <i>The United Kingdom</i>	38
(v) <i>The United States</i>	40
(vi) <i>The European Union</i>	41
1.3.2.4 <i>Judicial Decisions Made under the Warsaw Instruments</i>	44
1.3.3 <i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	46
1.3.3.1 <i>Their Relevance</i>	46
1.3.3.2 <i>Their Limitations</i>	47
1.3.3.3 <i>Their Importance for Research Questions</i>	48
1.3.4 <i>Other Sources</i>	49
1.3.5 <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	49
2 <i>UNIFORMITY AS A PREDOMINANT AIM OF THE 1999 MONTREAL CONVENTION</i>	51
2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	51
2.2 <i>Historical Context</i>	51
2.3 <i>Purposes</i>	52
2.3.1 <i>A Multiplicity of Purposes</i>	52
2.3.2 <i>Solving the Lack of Legal Certainty</i>	52
2.3.3 <i>Creating a Level Playing Field between Different Interests and Actors</i>	57
2.3.3.1 <i>Prior to the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	57
2.3.3.2 <i>Under the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	59
2.3.4 <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	60
2.4 <i>The Object of the Conventions: Unification of Certain Rules Through Uniform Rules and <i>Renvois</i></i>	60
2.4.1 <i>Preliminary Remarks</i>	60
2.4.2 <i>The Inadequacy of Most Approximation Techniques</i>	61
2.4.3 <i>The Adoption of Unification Techniques</i>	61
2.4.4 <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	63
2.5 <i>Specific Features of the Conventions</i>	63
2.5.1 <i>Determining the Scope of ‘Uniformity’</i>	63
2.5.2 <i>Uniform Application</i>	64
2.5.2.1 <i>Possible Approaches</i>	64
2.5.2.2 <i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	64
2.5.2.3 <i>Judicial Decisions</i>	66
2.5.2.4 <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	67
2.5.3 <i>Mechanisms Used to Ensure a Uniform Application</i>	68
2.5.3.1 <i>The Selection of Mechanisms</i>	68
2.5.3.2 <i>Exclusivity</i>	68
(1) <i>Introduction</i>	68
(2) <i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	70

	(i) <i>Prior to the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	70
	(ii) <i>Under the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	72
	(3) <i>Judicial Decisions</i>	74
	(4) <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	74
2.5.3.3	The Autonomy of the Terms Used	74
	(1) <i>Introduction</i>	74
	(2) <i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	75
	(3) <i>Judicial Decisions</i>	78
	(4) <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	79
2.5.3.4	The Applicability of These Mechanisms to the Rules of <i>Renvois</i>	80
2.6	Conclusions	81
3	INTERNAL FACTORS OF FRAGMENTATION	83
3.1	Introduction	83
3.2	Drafting Factors	83
3.2.1	Preliminary Remarks	83
3.2.2	The Lack of Autonomous Definitions: The Example of 'Accident'	84
3.2.2.1	'Accident' under Article 17 of the Conventions	84
3.2.2.2	'Accident' in the <i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	85
	(1) <i>Prior to the 1929 Warsaw Conference</i>	85
	(2) <i>The 1929 Warsaw Conference</i>	86
	(3) <i>The 1955 Hague Conference</i>	88
	(4) <i>The 1971 Guatemala City Conference</i>	88
	(5) <i>The 1999 Montreal Conference</i>	89
	(6) <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	90
3.2.2.3	The Interpretation of 'Accident' in Judicial Decisions	90
	(1) <i>Three Major Views</i>	90
	(2) <i>The 'External Definition' Approach</i>	91
	(3) <i>The 'Damage-Based' Approach</i>	92
	(4) <i>The Autonomous Approach</i>	92
	(i) <i>Identical Definitions?</i>	92
	(ii) <i>Common Law Jurisdictions</i>	93
	(iii) <i>Civil Law Jurisdictions</i>	94
	(iv) <i>Court of Justice of the European Union</i>	97
	(v) <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	98
3.2.2.4	Conclusions	99
3.2.3	The Use of Concepts Taken from Other International Instruments	99
3.2.4	The Interpretations of Terms of the 1929 Warsaw Convention and the 1999 Montreal Convention According to the <i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	101
3.2.4.1	Preliminary Remarks	101
3.2.4.2	Situational Application: The Example of Delay	101

3.2.4.3	An Unclear Common Position: The Example of Mental Injury	104
(1)	<i>Preliminary Remarks</i>	104
(2)	<i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	105
(3)	<i>The 'Draft Statement' of the Conference Preparing the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	108
(4)	<i>Declarations made by Argentina</i>	108
(5)	<i>Judicial Decisions</i>	109
(i)	<i>Preliminary Remarks</i>	109
(ii)	<i>Prior to the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	110
(iii)	<i>Under the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	111
(iv)	<i>Is an Evolutionary Interpretation Possible?</i>	112
(v)	<i>Conclusion</i>	113
3.2.4.4	Concluding Remarks	113
3.2.5	The Unclear Formulation of the Demarcation between the Uniform Rules and the <i>Renvois</i> Rules: The Example of Limitation of Actions	113
3.2.5.1	The Two-Year Limit to Initiating Legal Proceedings	113
3.2.5.2	Prior to the 1999 Montreal Convention	114
(1)	<i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	114
(2)	<i>Judicial Decisions</i>	115
3.2.5.3	Under the 1999 Montreal Convention	116
(1)	<i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	116
(2)	<i>Judicial Decisions</i>	117
3.2.5.4	Concluding Remarks	119
3.2.6	Confidence in a Uniform Interpretation: The Example of Multiple Possible Fora	120
3.2.6.1	Preliminary Remarks	120
3.2.6.2	Prior to the 1999 Montreal Convention	120
3.2.6.3	Under the 1999 Montreal Convention	122
3.2.6.4	Concluding Remarks	123
3.3	Other Factors Causing Fragmentation	124
3.3.1	Preliminary Remarks	124
3.3.2	Reservations and Declarations	124
3.3.3	The Lack of Uniform Jurisdiction and Interpretation Mechanisms	126
3.3.3.1	Preliminary Remarks	126
3.3.3.2	Lack of Uniform Jurisdiction	126
3.3.3.3	The Lack of Common Interpretation Mechanisms	129
3.4	Conclusions	132
4	EXTERNAL FACTORS OF FRAGMENTATION	135
4.1	Introduction	135
4.2	Regulatory Modifications	135
4.2.1	Evolution of the Regime	135

4.2.1.1	A Multi-Layered System	135
4.2.1.2	International Conventions	136
	(1) <i>Numerous Modifications</i>	136
	(2) <i>Consequences</i>	138
	(3) <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	139
4.2.1.3	Private Initiatives	139
4.2.1.4	Domestic and Regional Initiatives	141
4.2.1.5	Concluding Remarks	142
4.2.2	The Development of Consumer Rights at Regional and Domestic Levels	142
4.2.2.1	Preliminary Remarks	142
4.2.2.2	European Union	143
	(1) <i>Introduction to EU Regulation 261/2004</i>	143
	(i) <i>Scope</i>	143
	(ii) <i>Denied Boarding and Downgrading</i>	144
	(iii) <i>Cancellation</i>	145
	(iv) <i>Delay</i>	146
	(2) <i>The Possible Overlap with the Principle of Exclusivity of the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	146
	(3) <i>The Potential Impact of EU Regulation 261/2004 on the Autonomy of the Terms in the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	147
	(4) <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	150
4.2.2.3	Other Regional Legislations	151
	(1) <i>The African Union</i>	151
	(2) <i>The West African Economic and Monetary Union</i>	152
	(3) <i>The Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa</i>	154
	(4) <i>The Andean Community</i>	154
	(5) <i>The Association of Southeast Asian Nations</i>	155
4.2.2.4	Domestic Legislations	155
4.2.2.5	Concluding Remarks	156
4.3	Courts' Responses to Uniformity	157
4.3.1	Preliminary Remarks	157
4.3.2	Exclusivity	157
	4.3.2.1 A Large Spectrum of Variations	157
	4.3.2.2 A Strict Application	158
	4.3.2.3 A Liberal Application	161
	4.3.2.4 A Defective Application	162
	4.3.2.5 Conclusions	163
4.3.3	Autonomy	163
	4.3.3.1 Preliminary Remarks	163
	4.3.3.2 Preamble	165
	4.3.3.3 <i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	166
	4.3.3.4 Case Law	170

(1) <i>Foreign Case Law</i>	170
(2) <i>Case Law Developed Prior to the 1999 Montreal Convention</i>	172
4.3.3.5 Legal Instruments External to the 1929 Warsaw Convention and the 1999 Montreal Convention	174
(1) <i>Preliminary Remarks</i>	174
(2) <i>French Law</i>	174
(3) <i>Other Domestic Laws</i>	176
(4) <i>Other International Legislative Instruments</i>	177
4.3.3.6 Literature	177
4.3.3.7 Concluding Remarks	178
4.3.4 Concluding Remarks	179
4.4 Linguistic Elements	180
4.4.1 Preliminary Remarks	180
4.4.2 Translations	180
4.4.2.1 The Variety of Translation Issues	180
4.4.2.2 Inaccurate Translations	181
4.4.2.3 Various Translations in the Same Language	181
4.4.2.4 Various Translations within the European Union	182
(1) <i>The Example of the Use of the Dutch Language</i>	182
(2) <i>The Example of the Use of the Italian Language</i>	184
4.4.3 The Plurality of Authentic Versions	185
4.4.4 Concluding Remarks	187
4.5 Conclusions	187
5 SUGGESTIONS FOR ENHANCING UNIFORMITY	189
5.1 Introduction	189
5.2 Substantive Elements	190
5.2.1 Enhancing Autonomy	190
5.2.1.1 A Double-Edged Mechanism	190
5.2.1.2 Elements Requiring Amendments of the 1999 Montreal Convention	190
(1) <i>Amendments of the Preamble</i>	190
(2) <i>The Incorporation of Definitions</i>	191
(3) <i>The Identification of Uniform Rules</i>	193
5.2.1.3 Elements Not Requiring an Amendment to the 1999 Montreal Convention	193
(1) <i>The Dissemination of Knowledge</i>	193
(2) <i>A Database of Judicial Decisions</i>	194
5.2.2 Refining Exclusivity	195
5.3 Procedural Elements	198
5.3.1 The Establishment of a Common Court	198
5.3.2 The Formulation of Interpretation Rules	200
5.3.3 Intermediary Solutions	203
5.4. Prospective Elements Using Artificial Intelligence	204
5.4.1 A Proposal for a Robotic Court	204

5.4.2	Benefits	205
5.4.3	Risks	205
5.4.3.1	A Multiplicity of Risks	205
5.4.3.2	Software Design	206
5.4.3.3	Software Use by Courts	207
5.4.3.4	Software Use by Law Consumers	208
5.4.4	Concluding Remarks	208
5.5	Conclusions	209
6	GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	211
6.1	General Conclusions	211
6.2	Recommendations	212
6.2.1	Preliminary Remarks	212
6.2.2	The First Phase	213
6.2.3	The Second Phase	213
6.2.4	The Third Phase	215
6.3	Closing Words	215
APPENDIX: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AS AN AID IN THE DECISION- MAKING PROCESS		217
A.1	Introduction	217
A.2	Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Justice	217
A.2.1	The Role of the Machine	217
A.2.2	The Role of Humans	221
A.3	Artificial Intelligence and Interpretation	222
A.3.1	Researching a Coherent Algorithm	222
A.3.2	Translating a Hermeneutical Methodology into an Algorithm	222
A.4	The Dawn of Artificial Intelligence Law	225
SAMENVATTING (SUMMARY IN DUTCH)		227
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY		231
INDEX		263
ABOUT THE AUTHOR		265

## List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

The choice of abbreviations and acronyms tends to reflect, as much as possible, those used in each jurisdiction.

AC	Law Reports, Appeal Cases (UK)
Aff'd	Affirmed
ALADA	<i>Asociación Latino Americana de Derecho Aeronáutico y Espacial</i>
All ER	All England Law Reports
ALR	Australian Law Reports
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BCCRT	British Columbia Civil Resolution Tribunal (Canada)
BCE	Before the Common Era
B.O.	<i>Boletín Oficial</i> (Spain)
Bull.	<i>Bulletin</i> (France)
c.	<i>contre / contra</i> (against)
CA	<i>Cour d'appel</i> (Belgium, France, Luxembourg, Madagascar)
CAN	Canadian Dollar
Cass.	<i>Cour de cassation</i> (Belgium, France, Luxembourg) / <i>Corte de cassazione</i> (Italy)
CC	<i>Conseil Constitutionnel</i> (France)
CE	<i>Conseil d'Etat</i> (France)
CEMAC	Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa
Cert.	<i>certiorari</i>
CF	Federal Court (Canada)
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations (USA)
CINA	<i>Commission Internationale de la Navigation Aérienne</i>
Cir.	Circuit (USA)
CISG	United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods
CITEJA	<i>Comité International Technique d'Experts Juridiques Aériens</i>
Civ	Civil
CJEU/CJEC	Court of Justice of the European Union / Court of Justice of the European Community (before 2009)
CMR	Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road
Doc	Document
Dr.	Doctor
ECLI	European Case Law Identifier
E. a./ et. al.	<i>Et alii</i> (and others)
ECHR	European Court of Human Rights



ECR	European Court Reports
Eds	Editor(s)
Et seq.	<i>Et sequens</i> (and following)
EU	European Union
EWCA	England and Wales Court of Appeal
EWHC	England and Wales High Court
F.	Federal Reporter (USA)
F. App'x	Federal Appendix (USA)
FCA	Federal Court of Australia
Fasc.	<i>Fascicule</i> (booklet)
Fn	Footnote
F. Supp.	Federal Supplement (USA)
HCA	High Court of Australia
HCCH	Hague Conference on Private International Law
HKCA	Hong Kong Court of Appeal
HP55	1955 Hague Protocol
IATA	International Air Transport Association / International Air Traffic Association (before 1945)
Ibid.	<i>Ibidem</i> (the same)
ICHR	Inter-American Court of Human Rights
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICSID	International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes
i. e.	<i>Id est</i> (that is)
IEHC	Irish High Court
IESC	Irish Supreme Court
ILC	International Law Commission of the United Nations
Iss.	Issue
J. Air L. & Com.	Journal of Air Law and Commerce
JCP	<i>Juris-Classeur Périodique (Semaine Juridique)</i>
Lloyd's Rep.	Lloyd's Law Report
LNTS	League of Nations Treaty Series
MC99	1999 Montreal Convention
N.D. Tex	Northern District of Texas (USA)
No	Number
NSWCA	New South Wales Court of Appeal (Australia)
NZLR	New Zealand Law Reports
ODR	Online Dispute Resolution
OHADA	Organization for the Harmonization in Africa of Business Law
OJ	Official Journal of the European Union
Ors	Others
p.	page
para.	paragraph
PICAO	Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization

Phil	Philippines Reports
Prof.	Professor
QB	Queen's Bench (UK)
RFDA(S)	<i>Revue Française de Droit Aérien (et Spatial)</i>
s/	<i>sin</i> (without)
SARPs	Standards and Recommended Practices (of the ICAO)
SCC	Supreme Court Cases (India)
SCR	Supreme Court Report (Canada)
S.D.N.Y.	Southern District of New York (USA)
SDR	Special Drawing Right
t.	<i>Tome</i> (volume)
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
TOSC	Tonga Supreme Court
UEMOA	West African Economic and Monetary Union
UK	United Kingdom
UKHL	House of Lords of the United Kingdom
UKSC	Supreme Court of the United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law
UNIDROIT	International Institute for the Unification of Private Law
Unif. L. Rev.	Uniform Law Review
UNTS	United Nations Treaty Series
U.S.	Supreme Court of the United States of America
USA	United States of America
USD	United States Dollars
v.	<i>versus</i>
Vol.	Volume
VSC	Victoria Supreme Court (Australia)
WC29	1929 Warsaw Convention
WI	Supreme Court of Wisconsin (USA)
WLR	Weekly Law Reports
ZAWCH	High Court of South Africa, Cape of Good Hope division
ZLW	<i>Zeitschrift für Luft- und Weltraumrecht</i>

