Position Paper

European Commission's Proposal for a Regulation on the 28th Regime Corporate Legal Framework

Presented by the European Union of Judicial Officers

June 2026

Created in 1952, the purpose of the UIHJ is to represent its members to international organisations and ensure collaboration with national professional bodies. It works to improve national procedural law and international treaties and makes every effort to promote ideas, projects and initiatives which help to move forward and elevate the independent status of judicial officers.

1. Position statement

On 18 March 2026, the European Commission published COM (2026) 321 final — its proposal for a Regulation on the 28th Regime Corporate Legal Framework, introducing 'EU Inc.' as an optional, directly applicable European corporate form. Objective of the Regulation proposal is to create, at EU-level, a common legal framework for companies, in particular startups and scaleups in the European Union. It's about to provide simple and efficient corporate rules and procedures throughout the company lifecycle and to ensure that corporate rules provide an enabling framework to invest.

The Commission's proposal for this Regulation from the perspective of enforcement officers deserves cautious support. EU Inc. offers genuine benefits: BRIS-connected digital registration creates an authoritative, instantly accessible, EU-wide company identity that will materially improve the ability of enforcement officers to identify the legal status and registered address of debtor companies across the EU-market. The mandatory use of electronic auction platforms interconnected via the European e-Justice Portal for insolvency asset realisation is the first time a major EU corporate instrument has legislated for digital enforcement infrastructure. These are real advances. However, the Proposal as drafted contains several design choices that create enforcement risks that the Commission has not adequately addressed. Such legal features of EU Inc. that affect the quantum, location, or accessibility of a debtor company's assets directly affects the ability of enforcement officers to satisfy creditors'

legitimate claims. Enforcement officers who are not a peripheral audience for corporate law reform — but are the last institutional line between a paper judgment and a paid debt.

Zero minimum capital and the replacement of capital maintenance with solvency and balance-sheet tests create new challenges for enforcement officers who must identify and realize debtor assets against companies that may carry no paid-up capital cushion. Free registered-office choice with limited substance requirements creates forum-shopping pressure for enforcement jurisdiction. The simplified insolvency procedures with mandatory stays of individual enforcement actions risk displacing enforcement officers from proceedings they are professionally and legally equipped to conduct.

2. Enforcement positive features

Business Register Interconnection System (BRIS) integration and mandatory digital registration

The Proposal's reliance on BRIS as the backbone of EU Inc. company data is a significant enforcement-positive feature. At present, civil enforcement officers pursuing cross-border enforcement against foreign companies must navigate different national business registries, most of which are not yet interoperable in real time. Identifying the current registered address, legal representatives, and basic financial data of a debtor company registered in another member state can take days and incur significant investigation costs.

Under the Proposal (Article 20), all EU Inc. company data is exchanged via BRIS and accessible through the EU e-Justice Portal with multilingual labels. This is a direct improvement in cross-border enforcement effectiveness.

The automatic assignment of a European Unique Identifier (EUID) to every EU Inc. company further assists enforcement: the EUID provides a single, permanent reference number that follows the company across the single market regardless of changes to trading name, address, or branch structure. An enforcement officer who locates a debtor's EUID can track its corporate structure comprehensively.

Mandatory electronic auction platforms in insolvency

The Proposal's provisions for mandatory use of electronic auction platforms (articles 97-102) interconnected via the European e-Justice Portal for asset realisation in simplified insolvency proceedings is the first time a major EU legislative instrument has directly legislated for digital enforcement infrastructure as a mandatory feature of a corporate legal form.

For civil enforcement officers, this is a significant precedent. Electronic auction platforms produce higher recovery prices than in-person physical auctions. Cross-border bidder access via the e-Justice

Portal means that assets of EU Inc. companies in insolvency will be exposed to EU-wide competitive bidding — improving recovery for creditors across the entire insolvency estate. The mandatory character of this provision, rather than a merely permissive one, ensures that all member states cannot revert to physical-only auction formats for EU Inc. insolvencies.

Directors' joint and several liability post dissolutions

The Proposal retains directors' continuing joint and several liability for unsatisfied claims (article 83) after removal from the register in fast-track liquidation. For enforcement officers, this creates an additional enforcement target where the company itself is dissolved — the directors remain personally liable for unpaid claims that were not satisfied before removal. This liability creates an enforcement avenue that does not depend on the company continuing to hold seizable assets.

Automatic EU-wide recognition without apostille of legalisation

The abolition of apostille and legalisation requirements for EU Inc. corporate documents across the internal market (article 30) benefits enforcement. Currently, an enforcement officer executing against EU Inc.-held assets in another member state may need to certify the enforceability of their title through apostille or equivalent procedures before local courts recognise it. The automatic EU-wide recognition of EU Inc. documents, combined with existing EU enforcement instruments (Brussels I Bis, EU Account Preservation Order), should reduce procedural obstacles to cross-border enforcement against EU Inc. debtors.

3. Enforcement negative features

The UEHJ supports the objectives of modernization, digitalization and simplification pursued by the proposed regulation establishing a harmonized European legal framework for so-called 'EU Inc.' companies. The development of innovative businesses and the strengthening of European competitiveness are legitimate objectives.

However, this simplification must not be achieved at the expense of legal certainty, economic transparency and the protection of creditors. A high-performing economy also relies on the reliability of registers, the clear identification of economic actors and the effective enforcement of obligations and court decisions.

The UEHJ therefore wishes to draw the attention of the European institutions to several major risks linked to the weakening of preventive control mechanisms and the excessive reduction of legal formalities.

Position Paper
European Commission's Proposal for a Regulation on the 28th Regime Corporate Legal Framework

The UEHJ is particularly concerned about the significant reduction in formal requirements in several sensitive areas, notably the entirely digital incorporation of companies provided for in Articles 16 to 18, the limitation of preventive checks in Article 14, the absence or low level of minimum capital in Articles 64 to 77, the simplification of share transactions, and the simplified liquidation and insolvency procedures set out in Articles 80 to 95.

Legal formalities are not merely an administrative requirement. They also represent an essential mechanism for economic protection, transparency and transaction security.

The weakening of these mechanisms' risks encouraging the creation of short-lived companies, the development of fraudulent schemes, the emergence of structures lacking any real economic substance, and asset transfers that are difficult to trace. There is also a real risk of an increase in the number of insolvent or artificially undercapitalized companies.

Judicial officers are already observing, in several Member States, growing difficulties linked to complex corporate structures, directors who are difficult to identify, and assets that are rapidly transferred or dematerialized. These situations considerably complicate the effective enforcement of court decisions and increase the costs borne by creditors.

The risk appears particularly high in a system relying primarily on ex post judicial remedies rather than on effective ex ante controls. Such an approach shifts the costs and risks onto creditors, the courts and enforcement systems.

The European Union currently enjoys a major advantage based on confidence in its legal systems, the reliability of its registers, the quality of its preventive controls and the effectiveness of its enforcement mechanisms. These elements are key factors in its economic attractiveness.

Excessive simplification would, on the contrary, risk increasing litigation, undermining investment, reducing creditor confidence and increasing the economic costs associated with business failures and enforcement difficulties. The UEHJ therefore considers it essential to strengthen the safeguards provided for, in particular, in Articles 14, 64 to 77 and 80 to 95, in order to ensure a reasonable balance between digital innovation, administrative efficiency and legal certainty.

Legal certainty is a prerequisite for the proper functioning of the internal market (Articles 13 to 18)

The proposal is based on a logic of speed, digitalisation and automation of company formation procedures, notably through Articles 13 to 18 relating to fully digital formation, the central European interface and accelerated registration procedures. Whilst these objectives may enhance Europe's

economic attractiveness, they must not lead to preventive controls being regarded as mere administrative burdens.

The preliminary legal formalities provided for in particular in Article 14 fulfil an essential function in preventing disputes, fraud and insolvency. They ensure the reliable identification of founders, the verification of their powers, the transparency of corporate structures and the reliability of the information recorded in public registers.

For enforcement practitioners, these safeguards are fundamental. Effective enforcement requires the ability to identify the debtor, their representatives, their assets and the actual legal structure of the company concerned quickly and with certainty.

Experience shows that a weakening of initial controls frequently leads, in the medium term, to significant difficulties during recovery or insolvency proceedings.

UEHJ considers it necessary that certain minimum enhanced qualification requirements be established for directors of EU Inc. companies as well. We believe that the declaration obligation provided for in Art. 22 of the draft regulation alone is insufficient to keep out persons unknown from previous business activities, i.e. persons with potential high business risks. We propose to supplement Article 42 of the draft regulation with the corresponding qualification requirements.

Zero minimum capital

The UEHJ considers that the protection of creditors remains insufficiently guaranteed in the current text. The absence of a minimum capital requirement, resulting in particular from the regime set out in Articles 64 to 77 concerning capital structures and non-capitalised shares, is not necessarily problematic if it is offset by robust and genuinely effective alternative mechanisms. However, the current proposal does not provide for a sufficiently coherent system of safeguards to ensure the solvency of companies throughout their life cycle.

An EU Inc. company may carry €0 in paid-up capital throughout its entire existence (article 62 par. 1). There is no obligation to accumulate capital or legal reserves over time. The Commission has replaced capital maintenance with a balance sheet test (total assets must exceed total liabilities at the time of any distribution) and a 12-month forward solvency test (article 72: the company must be able to pay its debts as they fall due during the next 12 months before any distribution). This way no minimum asset base for creditors has been provided.

For civil enforcement officers, the practical consequence is direct: an EU Inc. company against which a creditor holds an enforceable title may have no paid-up capital, no legal reserves, and (if operations

are failing) no readily seizable tangible assets except (maybe) computers and office equipment. Consequently, the EU Inc. company will pose an increased risk for creditors.

The balance sheet and solvency tests as it is mentioned in article 72, protect against extractive distributions by shareholders — they do not create a positive asset base. A company that has never made a distribution, has consumed its working capital in operations, and has €0 in equity is fully compliant with the capital regime as mentioned in the proposal. The 12-month solvency test assesses future payment capacity, not current asset coverage. If an EU Inc. company passes the solvency test in January and is insolvent in November, no balance sheet test was breached — the directors simply failed to predict correctly. Directors' liability in such circumstances requires the creditor to prove wrongful conduct, which is a separate and much harder enforcement task.

In our opinion the zero minimum capital is inappropriate for EU Inc. companies that operate as going concerns with trade credit, commercial contracts, and involuntary creditors (e.g., tort claimants, employees, tax authorities). The Proposal should introduce a minimum paid-up capital threshold. Alternatively, enhanced personal directors' liability for distributions made in violation of the solvency test should be made strict liability (not fault-based) to provide enforcement officers with a more readily accessible enforcement target when the company is asset-stripped.

The need for reliable registers and verified information (Articles 13, 14, 20, 25 and 27 of the proposal)

The proper functioning of enforcement depends directly on the quality and reliability of public registers.

Judicial officers use company information on a daily basis to identify debtors, locate registered offices, determine authorized representatives, trace assets and implement enforcement measures.

The mechanisms provided for in Articles 13, 20, 25 and 27 rely heavily on digital declarations and automated data exchanges between registers. The UEHJ considers that registers relying primarily on insufficiently verified declarations risk undermining the security of transactions and the effectiveness of enforcement procedures.

Where information relating to directors, beneficial owners or transfers of shares is not subject to sufficient checks as part of the preventive screening provided for in Article 14, the risks of fraud, concealment of assets and organized insolvency increase considerably.

The UEHJ considers that automated digital identification cannot fully replace a reliable verification carried out under the supervision of public authorities or qualified professionals.

Confidence in the internal market depends directly on the quality and reliability of the information available to creditors, investors and judicial authorities.

Free registered office choice and risks in cross border enforcement

Founders are free to choose where to incorporate the company within the EU, regardless of where business activities are conducted, employees are based, or economic substance is located (chapter 1). The only address requirement is a registered office in the chosen state (article 5) .

The proposal aims to facilitate cross-border activities and strengthen the integration of the internal market. However, several provisions of the draft Regulation, in particular Articles 4, 19, 21 and 103 concerning the relationship between European and national law, as well as Articles 80 to 95 concerning simplified liquidation and insolvency proceedings, could also increase the difficulties associated with cross-border enforcement.

The existence of companies with highly flexible structures, low capitalization, operating in several Member States and benefiting from simplified liquidation procedures risks complicating the tracing of assets, the determination of the competent jurisdiction, cooperation between national authorities and the effective enforcement of court decisions.

If EU Inc. subsequently fails to meet its obligations, the contracting party must be able to seek redress. This access to justice is determined by access to a court. The question is: which court? The proposed EU Inc. risks creating a more complex situation. The company will be subject to a European company law framework, whilst procedural law, enforcement law and large parts of insolvency law will remain organized at national level. This creates a risk whereby it is not always immediately clear to creditors which court has jurisdiction, which law applies and how a judgment can actually be enforced.

The Brussels I-bis Regulation stipulates that a company may be sued before a court of its domicile (Article 4(1)) or of an establishment (Article 7(6)). Unlike under Dutch law, an EU Inc. must also specify an address alongside its registered office. However, this address can be changed very easily and very quickly (Article 54). Many digital (digital native) companies no longer have physical offices and, due to their travelling staff and the supply of digital products, do not have a definable place where the contract is to be performed. What, then, counts as the place of domicile on the day the proceedings commence?

Legal proceedings in the EU member states commence with the service of the writ of summons. The Brussels I bis Regulation is based on the bringing of a case (Articles 29 and 32). Now, an EU Inc. may be established in one country on the day the writ of summons is served, but with a minor change in the European register, it may be established in another country on the day the case is brought. What if the

statutory seat is moved repeatedly? How can creditors and judicial authorities reliably determine where the company can be addressed and sued?

Moreover, what exactly constitutes the statutory seat of an EU Inc.? Is it merely the designation of a city, as is currently possible under Dutch company law, or does it require an actual and identifiable address? Where should legal documents be served if there is no physical office and no clearly traceable center of main interests (COMI), particularly in the case of so-called "digital nomad" companies? Should service upon the residential address of the directors be considered a valid alternative? Such addresses are generally more stable and easier to identify than a frequently changing statutory seat.

For enforcement officers, the registered-office member state determines which national courts supervise enforcement challenges; which national enforcement rules apply; which enforcement officer has competence; and which registry data is the authoritative source of company information. For enforcement officers, the residual national law dimension (article 4) creates a series of potential enforcement regimes applicable to EU Inc. companies, potentially determined by a choice of registered-office jurisdiction that bears no relationship to where the debtor's assets are located or where the creditor's claim arises. To give a practical example: an EU Inc. company incorporated in Estonia (low registration fees, fast registry, English-language procedures) but operating entirely in France, with French employees, French customers, and French bank accounts, creates a structural mismatch: French creditors who obtain French judgments must execute enforcement through procedures governed partly by Estonian law and partly by French law, with the potential for competence challenges at every step.

Judicial officers are already observing that cross-border enforcement procedures are becoming increasingly complex when corporate structures lack transparency or when assets are rapidly moved between several Member States.

The risk of forum shopping and strategic relocation of assets or registered offices must not be underestimated, particularly in view of the relationship between the European Regulation and national laws as set out in Article 4 of the draft regulation.

The UEHJ points out that the proper functioning of the internal market, and the development of a genuine European Area of Justice, depends not only on the free movement of economic activities and capital, but also on the effective, predictable and secure enforcement of obligations and court decisions.

In our opinion real substance requirements for the registered office should be introduced. The current 'registered office' requirement permits letter-box formations in any member state regardless of economic substance. An EU Inc. whose economic activity (turnover, employees, management

decisions) is concentrated in a different member state than its registered office should be required to register the center of its actual operations as an additional 'operational address' publicly accessible through BRIS. This would provide enforcement officers with a reliable address for service of process and enforcement documents in the member state where the debtor's assets are actually located.

Simplified insolvency

Explanatory note 67 of the draft regulation refers to the need for simplified winding-up procedures for insolvent EU Inc. companies due to the unique characteristics of innovative start-ups and their specific needs in financial difficulties, in particular the need for faster, simpler and more affordable procedures. Such an approach is generally contrary to the main task of bankruptcy proceedings, which is to satisfy the creditor's claims to the greatest extent possible, i.e. to protect the property interests of creditors, but more generally also to ensure the balance and effective operation and development of society as a whole in the interests of society. In addition, the draft regulation does not clarify what the unique characteristics of innovative start-ups are?

In view of the above, the UEHJ proposes to exclude Art. 90 p. 2 from the draft regulation, since the task of the bankruptcy trustee is not to distribute the existing assets of the bankrupt debtor among the creditors, but also to determine the claims of the creditors, manage the bankruptcy estate, recover transactions if necessary, and also to determine the cause and time of the debtor's insolvency. The mere proof of the insolvent EU Inc. company that it has an up-to-date balance sheet and that it has submitted its last required annual report to the relevant state authorities, as provided for in Art. 90 p. 2 of the draft regulation as a basis for not appointing a bankruptcy trustee, does not eliminate the need for an impartial and professional performer of the aforementioned functions (bankruptcy trustee). The proposal in the draft regulation that the bankrupt debtor performs procedural acts by himself (e.g. compiling a list of creditors and claims, selling bankruptcy assets) must certainly be excluded.

Mandatory stay of individual enforcement

A debtor EU Inc benefits from a stay of individual enforcement actions either by operation of law or upon decision of the competent authority, in simplified winding-up proceedings.

This stay provision (article 94) displaces the enforcement officer from the moment the simplified procedure opens. The enforcement ceases; the insolvency practitioner or the debtor in possession (article 90) takes over the asset realization.

For enforcement officers, there are two concerns. First, the definitional question: what is considered, as mentioned before, an "innovative startup" (as referred to in chapter 10) for the purposes of

triggering simplified insolvency? Another concern is the speed: the simplified procedure is targeted at 6 months, extendable once to 12 months (article 102). An enforcement officer who has spent months identifying assets, serving orders, and progressing an enforcement file can be displaced by a simplified insolvency opening that terminates all enforcement. The professional expertise of the enforcement officer in asset identification, valuation, and realization — developed over years of specialist practice — is not available to the insolvency practitioner (article 90) appointed in the simplified procedure, many of whom will not be enforcement specialists. Recovery outcomes may suffer.

Such an enforcement stay that opens automatically within weeks of a startup's insolvency filing, without mandatory professional oversight, creates enforcement risk for creditors who have legitimate claims against EU Inc. debtors.

A solution could be that at the time of BRIS registration, an EU Inc. company registers its banking relationships in a secure, enforcement-authority-accessible layer of BRIS. This would enable enforcement officers applying for an EU account preservation order to identify the bank accounts subject to preservation without requiring a separate asset discovery exercise.

Dematerialized shares and enforcement against equity interests

EU Inc. shares are fully dematerialized and registered in a digital share register (article 53). A transfer is only effective upon registration (article 59). No physical share certificates exist; no notarial deed is required for transfer.

Such simplification, for enforcement officers, creates a new technical challenge: attaching and realizing equity interests in EU Inc. companies. In most EU member states (e.g. Netherlands, Belgium) for the attachment of shares specific procedures are required. If the debtor is not the EU Inc. itself, but the owner of the shares in the EU Inc., enforcement law in the EU member states provides for the possibility of attaching such shares. In such case, an enforcement agent serves the writ of attachment and enters a note of the attachment in the register of shareholders, in which, for example, charges on shares are also registered. Dematerialized shares in a digital register present a technical challenge: what document serves as the legally effective attachment instrument? Which authority registers the attachment against the digital share register? What prevents the transfer of shares before attachment is registered?

According to the draft regulation, transfers are only effective upon registration in the digital share register, which provides a clear moment of constitutive effect (article 59). In fact, this is enforcement-friendly: a creditor who registers an attachment before a share transfer is registered should have priority over the transferee. However, the procedure for registering enforcement claims against the digital share register is not specified in the draft regulation. Consequently, national law will apply. This

creates 27 potentially different procedural approaches to the same EU Inc. form's enforcement of shares.

In our opinion, the mandate for electronic auction platforms in simplified insolvency proceedings should be extended to require that the management of those auctions — including the conduct of the tender procedure, the award of assets, and the drafting of sale certificates — be entrusted to a licensed enforcement officer or insolvency practitioner who meets the same qualification standards as member state enforcement agents. This is also in line with the CEPEJ framework. the CEPEJ's 2023 Guide on Judicial E-Auctions (CEPEJ(2023)11)[1], requires that e-auction management remain with a professional acting as 'a guarantor of the proper conduct of the procedure.'

Digital incorporation without notarial verification

In a number of member states (e.g. France, the Netherlands, and Belgium) incorporation requires the involvement of a notary (or equivalent officer) who performs identity verification, UBO (Ultimate Beneficial Owner) due diligence, and anti-money laundering checks before a company acquires legal personality. Notaries have a gatekeeper role when it comes to incorporation: identity verification, UBO due diligence, and AML compliance.

For enforcement officers, such gatekeeper's role is vital. An EU Inc. company that has been incorporated without notarial verification, the link between the company's registered identity and the beneficial owners who control its assets may be obscure or deliberately broken. The no-notary digital registration may create enforcement risks, including the risk of deliberate use of EU Inc. formations for asset-concealment structures.

Disputes involving an EU Inc.

Clarity should be established at the very outset of the future Regulation regarding the competent court in disputes involving an EU Inc. Although existing European instruments, such as the Brussels I bis Regulation, remain applicable, a company that is incorporated digitally and operates across borders may give rise to new discussions regarding jurisdiction and the choice of forum. After all, a company may have its registered office in one Member State, its management in a second Member State and carry out its economic activities primarily in a third Member State.

E-auction

UEHJ proposes to supplement the proposed article 101 with the conditions for informing about auctions, similar to those set out in enforcement legislation in EU member states. For example, the

[1] https://rm.coe.int/cepej-2023-11-en-guide-on-judicial-e-auctions-1-/1680abb674

current draft does not provide that creditors must also be notified publicly about the auction. There are also no notification deadlines.

As an example we can mention article 84 of the Estonian enforcement law:

> (1) An auction announcement states:
> 1) the beginning and place of the auction and the rules and time limit for registering for the auction;
> 2) a general description of the items of property to be auctioned;
> 3) the starting price, the rules for payment, the amount of the deposit and the time limit for the payment of the purchase price and of the deposit;
> 4) the time and place for examining the items of property to be auctioned;
> 5) any ascertained rights of third parties encumbering the item of property to be auctioned and other encumbrances and restrictions relating to such an item;
> 6) an invitation to members of the public to inform, before the auction, the enforcement agent of their rights concerning the item of property to be auctioned – If the agent has not yet been informed of such rights – and to substantiate such rights if this is required by the agent;
> 7) an invitation to persons who hold rights that constitute an obstacle to the auction, to obtain, before the date of distribution of the proceeds, the termination or suspension of the auction under an agreement with the party seeking enforcement or under a judicial disposition;
> 8) [Repealed]
> 9) where an auction is held electronically, the time when the auction is scheduled to end and its dynamic extension period.
> (2) The announcement is published at least ten days before the auction in the publication Ametlikud Teadaanded and in a public computer network. The enforcement agent may also publish the announcement in a newspaper which is circulated in the locality where the auction is to be held. At the request of the party seeking enforcement or of the debtor, the enforcement agent publishes the announcement in other publications at the expense of the party seeking enforcement or of the debtor.
> (3) The debtor and the party seeking enforcement are informed of the substance of the auction's announcement at least ten days before the auction.
> (4) The enforcement agent may also publish the announcement less than ten days before the auction or the auction may be given notice of by a method or within a time limit different from that provided by subsections 2 and 3 of this section if the item of property is likely to be destroyed or damaged or its value may decrease significantly."

4. Conclusion

The combination of rapid, automated company formation, limited liability, high cross-border mobility and reduced controls risks leading to a significant increase in the number of companies unable to meet

their obligations. In practice, the first to be affected will be SMEs, workers, suppliers, public authorities and citizens acting as creditors. For enforcement professionals, this development will result in a proliferation of enforcement proceedings where there are no assets that can actually be seized, an increase in recovery costs and a decrease in debt recovery rates.

The EU Inc. will succeed as a corporate form only if creditors trust it. Creditors extend credit — trade credit, bank loans, professional services on deferred payment — to companies because they believe that if the debtor defaults, there is a functioning enforcement system that will enable recovery. Without such creditor trust, EU Inc. companies will face higher credit costs, more demanding payment terms, and reputational barriers. Zero minimum capital, free registration-jurisdiction choice, and fast-track liquidation procedures are creditor-unfriendly according to creditors. Offsetting these with a well-organized enforcement infrastructure — registry interconnectivity, professional enforcement officers, e-auction platforms, directors' liability — restores that credibility. UEHJ urges the European Commission to perform an explicit assessment of the implications for creditor protection.

The enforcement officer is the institutional guarantee that makes creditors willing to deal with EU Inc. companies in the first place. They are uniquely positioned to see these risks, because they are the professionals who arrive when corporate relationships break down. The draft regulation is designed for company formation; it needs to be equally designed for company failure.

The UEHJ calls on the European institutions to maintain a reasonable balance between administrative simplification, digital innovation and legal certainty.

The development of a harmonized European framework for businesses must not be at the expense of creditor protection, economic transparency, fraud prevention and the enforceability of judicial decisions.

The UEHJ considers it essential to maintain effective preventive control mechanisms, to ensure reliable registers, to provide robust mechanisms for creditor protection, and to strengthen safeguards against abuse and organized insolvency.

Effective cooperation on cross-border enforcement also remains essential to ensure the proper functioning of the internal market and to the development of a genuine European Area of Justice.

A modern and competitive economy relies not only on speed and flexibility, but also on trust, accountability and the effective enforcement of rights and court decisions.

Position Paper
European Commission's Proposal for a Regulation on the 28th Regime Corporate Legal Framework

UEHJ
Avenue Henri Jaspar, 93
B-1060 Brussels - Belgium
Tel : +33 (0)1 42 40 89 48

uehj@uehj.eu