



**May & June  
2022**

# Highlights from the CISG Database

For more on recent  
updates check [here](#).

Contact us at [cisg@law.pace.edu](mailto:cisg@law.pace.edu)



- ✓ [Texas district court](#) renders a thorough decision on prejudgment interest
- ✓ [New York trial court](#) holds that promissory estoppel claims are not preempted by the CISG
- ✓ [New York district court](#) states that the elements of a breach of contract are the same under the CISG and New York law; difference lies in the parol evidence rule



- ✓ [Dutch court](#) holds that the parties cannot rely on error under national law for non-conformity claims
- ✓ [Dutch court](#) disregards CISG Art. 79 to analyze unforeseen circumstances due to COVID19
- ✓ [Dutch court](#) applies the “knock-out” rule to a CISG contract



- ✓ [The French CEPC](#) clarifies how to treat national affiliates (of foreign parent companies) in CISG contracts



- ✓ [Spanish court](#) holds that CISG applies to contracts signed after the date of accession of a member state

## Signatory States

- ✓ [Turkmenistan](#) joins as the 95<sup>th</sup> signatory
- ✓ The status of [Hong Kong](#) has been clarified

❖ Discussions on the application of the CISG in the U.S. has been published on [TLB](#)