

Twenty-First Century Remedies

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS
GLOBAL PAPERS SERIES

Edited by
Russell L. Weaver and Steven I. Friedland

VOLUME I

Recent Developments in Administrative Law and
Alternative Dispute Resolution

VOLUME II

Comparative Perspectives on Freedom of Expression

VOLUME III

Comparative Perspectives on Administrative Procedure

VOLUME IV

Privacy in a Digital Age

VOLUME V

Comparative Perspectives on Remedies

VOLUME VI

Cybersurveillance in a Post-Snowden World

VOLUME VII

Comparative Perspectives on Privacy in an Internet Era

VOLUME VIII

Free Speech and Media Law in the 21st Century

VOLUME IX

Administrative Law, Administrative Structures, and
Administrative Decisionmaking

VOLUME X

Twenty-First Century Remedies

VOLUME XI

Free Speech, Privacy and Media

Twenty-First Century Remedies

Comparative Perspectives

GLOBAL PAPERS SERIES
VOLUME X

Edited by

Russell L. Weaver

PROFESSOR OF LAW & DISTINGUISHED UNIVERSITY SCHOLAR
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUIS D. BRANDEIS SCHOOL OF LAW

Steven I. Friedland

PROFESSOR OF LAW & SENIOR SCHOLAR
ELON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Laetitia Tranchant

PROFESSOR OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF AIX-MARSEILLE FACULTY OF LAW

Guilhem Gil

PROFESSOR OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF AIX-MARSEILLE FACULTY OF LAW

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS
Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2020
Carolina Academic Press
All Rights Reserved.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Remedies Discussion Forum (2018 : Aix-en-Provence, France; Louisville, Ky.), author. | Weaver, Russell L., 1952- editor. | Friedland, Steven I., editor. | Tranchant, Laetitia, editor. | Gil, Guilhem, editor.
Title: Twenty-first century remedies : comparative perspectives / edited by Russell L. Weaver, Steven I. Friedland, Laetitia Tranchant, Guilhem Gil.
Description: Durham, North Carolina : Carolina Academic Press, LLC, 2019. | Series: The global papers series ; volume X | Includes bibliographical references.
Identifiers: LCCN 2019032206 | ISBN 9781531017347 (paperback) | ISBN 9781531017354 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Remedies (Law)--Congresses. | Comparative law--Congresses.
Classification: LCC K2315.A6 R46 2019 | DDC 347/.077--dc23
LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2019032206>

Carolina Academic Press
700 Kent Street
Durham, NC 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Series Note	ix
Introduction	
<i>Russell L. Weaver and Steven I. Friedland</i>	xi
Non-Disclosure Agreements, Liquidated Damages and Arbitration in Context: Contracts Drawn for Good or Evil	
<i>David Partlett and Paul J. Zwier</i>	3
A Journey into Things Lurid and Lascivious	8
The Lens of Law and Economics	11
The American Courts Remain Faithful to a Mystery	18
Cooperation and Contract Terms	20
The Lens of Equity and Remedies	22
Penalty Clauses and Liquidated Damages	24
Swimming against the Tide of Private Settlements and Mandatory Confidential Arbitration	28
The Recent Role of the Supreme Court: <i>Concepcion</i> , <i>Italian Colors</i> , and <i>Lewis</i>	31
A. <i>AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion</i> (2012)	31
B. <i>American Exp. Co. v. Italian Colors Restaurant</i> (2013)	32
C. <i>Epic Systems Corp. v. Lewis</i> (2018)	32
Confidential Arbitration Clauses with Built in Escape Clauses	35
Appendix A	38
Appendix B Non-Disclosure and Intellectual Property Rights Agreement	56
The Intersection of Restitution and Tort: A Comparative View	
<i>John D. McCamus</i>	61
Contents	61
1. Introduction	61
2. What Torts Can Be Waived?	65
(a) Jurisprudence	65

(b) Two False Starts: Proprietary Torts Claims or Anti-Enrichment Torts	67
(c) Two Types of Intention	70
(d) The True Principle: The Deterrence or Disincentive Rationale	72
(e) Beyond Intention: The Punitive Damages Analogy	73
(f) Tentative Conclusions	74
3. Is it Necessary to Establish a Corresponding Loss?	75
4. Is Restitution Available Only If a Tort Has Been Committed?	78
5. The Larger Birksian Project: Destruction of the Conceptual Framework of the American <i>Restatement of Restitution</i>	83
6. Summary of Conclusions	89
Digital Intermediary Liability or Greater Responsibility:	
A Remedy for Fake News?	
<i>Teresa Rodríguez de las Heras Ballell and Jorge Feliu Rey</i>	91
Abstract	91
I. Conceptualizing Misinformation in a Digital Society: The Biface Concept of ‘Fake News’	92
II. The Liability Regime in the Framework of the Layers of Digital Intermediation: Accessibility, Visibility, and Credibility	98
III. Digital Intermediaries in a Quandary	103
IV. Is Digital Intermediary Liability or Greater Responsibility a Remedy for Fake News?	109
A Comparative Consideration of the Penalties Doctrine in England and Australia	
<i>Katy Barnett and Sirko Harder</i>	115
1. Introduction	115
2. The Test Whether a Clause Is a Penalty	116
3. Is This a Clause to Which the Penalties Doctrine Applies?	117
4. On the Facts, Is This Clause a Penalty?	124
5. Conclusion: Should We Have a Law against Penalties at All?	128
Learning from Each Other: Can We Utilize Developments in Australian and American Constructive Trust Law to Assist Each Jurisdiction?	
<i>David Wright</i>	131
Part I: Introduction	131
Part II: Different Varieties of Unjust Enrichment	132
1. Anglo-Commonwealth Academic Developments in Unjust Enrichment Theory	132
2. The Role of Unjust Enrichment in Australia	135

a. Introduction	135
b. “Bottom Up” Reasoning	136
c. Australian Cases and the Relevant Rules in the <i>Third Restatement</i>	138
3. Unjust Enrichment in the United States—The Structure and Approach of the <i>Restatement</i>	139
a. Introduction	139
b. United States Approach to Unjust Enrichment	143
c. Proprietary Remedies in the <i>Third Restatement</i>	148
4. Conclusion on Unjust Enrichment	153
Part III: Equity as a Separate Body of Law	154
1. Introduction	154
2. Loss of Unity	157
a. Judicial Discretion	158
b. The Relationship of Rights and Remedies	159
c. Legal Education/Legal Scholarship	161
d. Trusts	163
Part IV: Conclusion	164
Musings on Volkswagen	
<i>Michael B. Kelly</i>	169
UCC: Value as Delivered	171
Unjust Enrichment: Fair Rental Value	174
Final Musing: Punitive Damages	175
The So-Called “University Constitutional Dispute” under German Administrative Law	
<i>Ines Gillich</i>	179
I. Introduction	179
II. Examples: Intra-University Disputes	181
III. The So-Called “University Constitutional Dispute”	182
IV. The Freedom of Science, Research and Teaching Pursuant to Article 5 para. 3 GG	184
1. “Defensive Liberty”	184
2. “Positive Liberty”	185
3. Basic Right of the University	185
4. Organizational Dimension	186
5. University Organization	186
a) The Professor	186
b) The Faculty	187

c) The Senate	187
d) The President	188
V. The Principles of Completeness and Coherence of the Legal System	188
VI. The Guarantee of an Effective Recourse to the Courts	189
VII. Procedural Law Principles with Respect to the “University Constitutional Dispute”	190
1. Distinction between Public and Private law	191
2. Legal Standing Originating from the Possible Infringement of an Individual Right	191
3. Types of Administrative Actions	192
4. Types of Actions before Administrative Courts	193
5. Classifying the “University Constitutional Dispute” into Administrative Court Procedure Law	194
VIII. Conclusion	196
Remedies for False Speech	
<i>Russell L. Weaver and András Koltay</i>	197
I. U.S. Perspectives on Fake News	199
A. False Speech in the Hierarchy of Speech Values	199
B. Remedies for “Fake News”	203
II. Hungarian Perspectives	207
A. Defamation Law	208
B. The Right of Reply	212
C. Genocide Denial	213
D. Scaremongering	215
Conclusion	216
Remedies for Fake News	
<i>Russell L. Weaver</i>	219
I. Defining “Fake News”	221
II. Possible Remedies for Demonstrably False News	229
A. Possible Criminal Prosecutions	230
B. Injunctions	232
C. Defamation Actions	234
D. Wrongful Interference with Plaintiff’s Business	236
E. Intentional Infliction of Mental and Emotional Distress Actions	237
F. Private Intervention	237
Conclusion	240

Series Note

The Global Papers Series involves publications of papers by nationally and internationally prominent legal scholars on a variety of important legal topics, including administrative law, freedom of expression, defamation and criminal law. The books in this series present the work of scholars from different nations who bring diverse perspectives to the issues under discussion.

Russell L. Weaver* and
Steven I. Friedland**

Introduction

During 2018, the Remedies Discussion Forum met twice: First, in Aix-en-Provence, France, in June, and then in Louisville, Kentucky, in early December. For the Aix forum,¹ there were several different topics under consideration: “Property remedies” (which could be analyzed from a variety of perspectives), “Intersections in Private Law” which could focus on intersections between private law areas (*e.g.*, contract and tort, contract and fiduciary obligations) and other legal fields (*e.g.*, private law and public law, tort law and corporate law), and “Recent developments in remedies” which could involve recent remedial developments from the writer’s own country. At the Louisville forum,² there were also three topics: “Recent developments in remedies” which could involve recent remedial developments from the writer’s own country or “controversial” remedies such as attempts to impose nationwide injunctions; “Comparative perspectives on remedies” which allowed the author to focus on any comparative aspect of remedies; and “Remedies in free speech cases,” par-

* Professor of Law & Distinguished University Scholar, University of Louisville, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law. Professor Weaver wishes to thank the University of Louisville’s Distinguished University Scholar program for its generous support of his research agenda, and he wishes to specifically thank Dean Colin Crawford for providing support for this forum from his research support program.

** Professor of Law & Senior Scholar, Elon University School of Law.

1. The authors wish to thank the forum’s sponsors for their generous support. Special thanks to the University of Aix-Marseille Faculty of Law, and also the Windsor University Faculty of Law (Canada), the University of Alabama School of Law, the University of Sydney Faculty of Law, the Washington & Lee University School of Law, and the University of Louisville’s Louis D. Brandeis School of Law.

2. The authors wish to particularly thank Dean Colin Crawford for supporting this particular forum out of his dean’s research development fund, and would also like to thank the Université Paris Dauphine PSL Research University (France), the Emory University School of Law (U.S.), the University of Paris I (Sorbonne) and IMODEV (France).

ticularly for fake news. The papers published here are “discussion drafts” which were submitted to, and discussed at, the fora.

Professors Partlett and Zwier’s article, *Non-Disclosure Agreements, Liquidated Damages and Arbitration in Context: Contracts Drawn for Good or Evil*, was submitted at the Aix forum. It examines non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) that are used to settle sexual harassment claims with confidentiality and liquidated damages provisions. The authors note that, not only are such agreements becoming increasingly common, they have troubling societal implications, especially when they are used by politicians to keep information from the public. The article attempts to draw a bright line between those agreements which should be regarded as permissible, and those that ought to be regarded as unenforceable.

Professor John McCamus’ *The Intersection of Restitution and Tort: A Comparative View* was also submitted at Aix. It explores the fascinating relationship between the causes of actions for tort and restitution. As he notes, the same set of facts might be subject to litigation under each theory, but the measure of recovery would be different under each theory. He begins by exploring the question of which torts can be waived, and then examines the question of whether restitution should be permitted in any tort case in which defendant’s conduct has produced a profit, or when defendant set out to enrich himself. He also explores whether waiver should be focused on situations when disgorgement would discourage or deter wrongful conduct. He ultimately concludes that the focus should be on “whether the tortuous misconduct in question is of such a nature that the deterrence or disincentive rationale is engaged and disgorgement of the profit secured through the wrongful conduct is an appropriate form of relief.” He also focuses on whether recovery must be premised on plaintiff having suffered a corresponding loss. He concludes by examining Birksian attempts to restructure restitution.

Professors Teresa Rodríguez de las Heras Ballell and Jorge Feliu Rey submitted their paper, *Digital Intermediary Liability or Greater Responsibility: A Remedy for Fake News?*, at the Louisville forum. Their article notes that digital intermediaries give perpetrators of “fake news” a way to effectively distribute disinformation, and regulators have inevitably turned their attention to those intermediaries in their efforts to control disinformation. They note that such intermediaries currently have a “safe harbor” and discuss the possibility that a change in liability rules might “radically transform the scenario.” In the process, they analyze “alternative regulatory models” and the implications of those models.

Professors Katy Barnett and Sirko Harder authored a piece entitled *A Comparative Consideration of the Penalties Doctrine in England and Australia* which

was also submitted at Aix. Their article focuses on liquidated damages clauses, and the idea that such clauses should be designed to compensate parties for expected losses rather than to impose penalties for non-performance. England differs from Australia in determining which types of provisions trigger the so-called “penalties doctrine.” However, the systems do not differ much in how they determine what constitutes a penalty. In general, Australia follows English law in terms of holding that most clauses will not be regarded as penalties when there is a “legitimate interest” to be protected, and the proposed detriment is proportionate to that interest.

Professor David Wright’s article is entitled *Learning From Each Other: Can We Utilize Developments in Australian and American Constructive Trust Law to Assist Each Jurisdiction?* was also submitted at the Aix forum. Professor Wright emphasizes U.S. constructive trust is based on unjust enrichment principles while the Australia constructive trust is not based on those principles. He notes that the High Court of Australia has skeptically received unjust enrichment principles. As a result, he reviews the development of unjust enrichment principles in the U.S., through the restatements, and offers insights into how the law has developed in the U.S. He then contrasts the U.S. approach with the approaches taken in England and Australia, and discusses the need for the proprietary constructive trust in the U.S.

Professor Michael Kelly’s *Musings on Volkswagen* focuses on Volkswagen’s false claims concerning the emissions of its TDI Clean Diesel engine. In particular, he examines the Uniform Commercial Code’s damage provisions as applied to this situation, which would ordinarily focus on the value of the product as delivered from the value as promised. He also examines the problem from an “unjust enrichment” perspective, as well as from the standpoint of whether punitive damages can be awarded.

Dr. Ines Gillich’s article, *The So-Called “University Constitutional Dispute” Under German Administrative Law*, was also submitted at the Aix forum. It focuses on whether there are effective remedies for disputes between different bodies within a university. Because of the need for academic freedom, public universities have the right to self-administration. These disputes can arise in various contexts, including situations in which a university rejects a unit’s hiring choice, a dean orders a faculty member to teach a higher number of hours, or a university-wide council decides to create a second vice-dean position within a particular unit. Even though such disputes are frequently referred to as “university constitutional disputes,” they are not really “constitutional” disputes. She concludes that only in rare cases does the law fail to provide for a remedy in such disputes.

Professor Russell Weaver and Andras Koltay's article, *Remedies for False Speech*, was also submitted at the Aix forum and explores these issues from both U.S. and Hungarian perspectives. Writing about the U.S., Weaver notes that certain types of false speech (e.g., perjury in judicial proceedings) may be prohibited. However, the U.S. Supreme Court has generally made it difficult to punish individuals for disseminating false speech, including the publication of defamatory falsehoods, and has also held that individuals cannot be prosecuted for falsely claiming that they have won the Congressional Medal of Honor. For example the Court has limited the ability of some defamation plaintiffs to recover civil damages absent proof that defendant knew that the defamatory statement was false or acted in reckless disregard for their truth or falsity. The Court has also made it clear that courts may not issue injunctions against allegedly defamatory statements. Such injunctions constitute impermissible prior restraints. Weaver then focuses on potential remedies for fake news, and concludes that there are few (if any) effective remedies.

Professor Koltay examines the problem of fake news from a Hungarian perspective. While Hungary does not rule out the possibility of criminal prosecutions for defamatory statements, it does permit courts to impose civil liability under certain circumstances. The Hungarian standard focuses on whether the publisher exercised sufficient "professional care." In addition "demonstrably false" statements are not protected under the Hungarian Constitution. Hungary distinguishes between facts and opinions, and permits the imposition of liability for "facts" because they can be verified as true or false. Hungarian law also contains a right to reply to false assertions of fact, and it prohibits Holocaust denial and "scaremongering."

Professor Russell Weaver's second article, *Remedies for Fake News*, continues the discussion began in his earlier article (*Remedies for False Speech*), but this article was submitted at the Louisville forum. This article focuses specifically on remedies that might be available against individuals who publish "fake news." The article begins by attempting to define the term "fake news," and analyzes various tort actions that might be used to sue someone who propagates fake news. As with the prior article, questions are raised regarding whether there any effective remedies.