

JAPANESE LAW

FOURTH EDITION



HIROSHI ODA

OXFORD

Japanese Law

Japanese Law

Fourth edition

HIROSHI ODA

Sir Ernest Satow Professor of Japanese Law

University College London

LL.B and LL.D (Tokyo)

Adjunct Professor, Waseda University

Distinguished Visiting Professor, Osaka University

Solicitor (England and Wales)

Attorney at Law (Japan)

Member of the ICC Court of International Arbitration (Paris) (2004–2016)

Member of the Panel of Arbitrators, ICSID

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Hiroshi Oda 2021

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 1992
Fourth Edition published in 2021

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2020948073

ISBN 978-0-19-886947-4

DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198869474.001.0001

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Preface

Ten years have passed since the third edition of this book was published. The period covered by the previous edition was a period of reform triggered by the collapse of the 'Bubble Economy' in 1990/1991. Japan embarked on a long process towards recovery. This necessitated a major reform of the regulatory framework which inevitably involved various areas of law. Just to mention a few, a new Company Law was enacted in 2005 and the Securities and Exchange Law was replaced by the Financial Instruments Exchange Law in 2006. By virtue of the 'Justice System Reform', the judicial system also underwent major reform. Now, a decade later, it is time to assess the outcome of those reforms. In some areas, the reform was successful, while in other areas, it did not work as had been envisaged. I believe the experience in Japan provides a lesson, positive or negative, to other countries contemplating legal reforms.

It should be added that amendments to the part of the Civil Code on the law of obligations took effect in 2020 after more than two decades of deliberation. These amendments are addressed in this edition.

The fourth edition is intended to analyse those reforms in a critical manner. As was the case with the third edition, the focus of this book is business and commercial law. On the other hand, in order to understand the system, knowledge of the basis of the legal system is needed, and therefore, these subjects are duly covered. Since case law plays a crucial role in Japan, decisions of the courts are extensively cited. In order to present the way the system operates in Japan, statistical surveys are cited as much as possible.

The Sir Ernest Satow Chair of Japanese Law at University College London (UCL) has recently celebrated its thirtieth anniversary. It was the first and still the only centre of Japanese law studies in the United Kingdom, and one of the few such institutions in Europe. Publication of this book represents one of the core activities of this Chair. On this occasion, as the holder of the Chair, I would like to thank all those in academia as well as in practice and business who have supported the Chair throughout those years.

I am indebted to Professor Sir Jeffrey Jowell QC, KCMG, former vice provost of UCL and the dean of the Law Faculty, for his commitment and support to the Chair. I am grateful to Professor Piet Eeckhout, the current dean of the Faculty, and colleagues for their understanding and warm support. My gratitude goes to Lord Harry Woolf, also at UCL, the former Master of Rolls and the former chairman of the UCL Council and Mr Victor Chu, the current chairman. I would like to thank Professor Paul Davies QC of Oxford University, Professor Klaus Milhaupt of

Stanford University, and Professor Gen Goto of the University of Tokyo for kindly joining UCL conferences on a regular basis.

I would also like to thank my German colleagues at the Max-Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law in Hamburg, namely Professors Dr Klaus Hopt and Dr.Juergen Basedow, former directors of the Institute, and Professor Dr Harald Baum, former head of Japanese Law Studies, for allowing me to work at the Institute whenever necessary and organizing conferences and seminars. My special thanks naturally go to my friends and colleagues in Japan including colleagues at Nagashima, Ohno, and Tsunematsu law Office, who have supported and assisted the Chair whose names I cannot mention individually because of there are so many of them.

I am also grateful to Mr Sadakazu Oosaki, senior fellow at the Nomura Research Institute, for reviewing key chapters in the manuscript and giving me useful comments.

In the process of publication, I am indebted to Ms Brianne Bellio at OUP, Mr Ashirvad Moses of Newgen and Janet Walker for their kind assistance and tolerance.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my wife Midori for her support and assistance over the years in preparing four editions of this book.

Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	xiii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xv
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxiii

Introduction	1
1. Japanese Law Viewed from Abroad	1
2. The Role of Courts in Japan—Judicial Activism?	5

I. THE BASIS OF THE SYSTEM

1. The History of Modern Japanese Law	11
1. The Period of Modernisation	11
2. Post-War Reforms	18
3. Contemporary Reforms	20
2. The Sources of Law	24
1. The Rule of Law	24
2. The Constitution	26
3. Statutory Laws	34
4. Delegated Legislation	38
5. International Treaties	39
6. Case Law	41
7. Circulars (<i>Tsūtatsu</i>)	44
8. Administrative Guidance	45
9. Local Regulations	48
10. Customary Law	50
11. Scholarly Opinion	51
3. The Administration of Justice	52
1. Historical Background	52
2. The ‘Justice System Reform’	54
3. The Court System	56
4. Lay Participation	62
5. Speeding up of the Court Proceedings	65
6. Alternative Dispute Resolution	66
7. International Commercial Arbitration	67

4. The Legal Profession	74
1. The <i>Hōsō</i>	74
2. Judges	75
3. Public Prosecutors	77
4. Attorneys	79
5. Para-Legals	81
6. Foreign Attorneys	84
7. The Uniform State Examination and Legal Training	86
5. The Protection of Fundamental Human Rights	89
1. Development of Human Rights Law	89
2. The Present Constitution	90
3. Potential Restrictions on Fundamental Human Rights	93
4. Tests Applied by the Courts for Determining Constitutionality	94
5. Freedom of Expression	97
6. Access to Information	102
7. Equal Protection	103
8. The Separation of the State and Religion and Freedom of Religion	107
9. Due Process of Law	108
10. Rights of Suspects and Defendants	109
11. Economic Rights	110
12. The Role of the Supreme Court	111
13. International Treaties and Human Rights	112

II. THE CIVIL CODE—THE CORNERSTONE OF PRIVATE LAW

6. General Rules and Institutions of Private Law	117
1. General	117
2. General Principles and Basic Rules	124
3. Legal Capacity	127
4. Piercing the Corporate Veil	132
5. Juristic Acts	133
6. Agency	138
7. Prescription	142
7. Law of Obligations and Contracts	144
1. General Rules of the Law of Obligations	144
2. The Law of Contract	159
3. Management of Another Person's Affairs and Unjust Enrichment	174
8. Property Law	176
1. The Concept of Real Rights	176
2. Registration	178
3. Ownership	180
4. Joint Ownership	183

5. The Right to Use Another Person's Property	184
6. Real Securities	186
7. Atypical Real Security Rights	188
9. Law of Torts	191
1. The Development of Tort Law	191
2. General Rules of Tort Law	192
3. The Scope of the Losses	199
4. Special Provisions on Tort Liability	204
5. Joint Liability	207
6. Remedies	208
7. Product Liability	209
10. Family Law and Inheritance	212
1. Historical Background	212
2. Marriage and Divorce	213
3. Family and Children	218
4. Procedure for Settling Disputes on Family Matters	220
5. The Law of Inheritance	221

III. BUSINESS-RELATED LAWS

11. Corporate Law	227
1. The History of Japanese Company Law	227
2. Types of Companies in Japan	229
3. Share Ownership Structure of Japanese Companies	236
4. Setting up Companies	238
5. Shares	242
6. Corporate Governance	253
7. Mergers and Splitting of Companies	274
8. Financing of Companies	289
9. Accounting	295
12. Insolvency Law	303
1. Basic Laws	303
2. Bankruptcy Procedure	304
3. Civil Rehabilitation Procedure	306
4. Corporate Reorganisation Procedure	308
5. International Insolvency Law	308
13. The Financial Instruments and Exchange Law	311
1. The Development of Securities Law in Japan	311
2. The Enactment of the FIEL	314
3. The Goal of the FIEL	318
4. The Scope of the FIEL	318
5. The Concepts of Securities and Financial Instruments	321

6. Share in the Collective Investment Scheme	323
7. Financial Instruments Business Operators	326
8. Conduct of Business by FIBOs	329
9. Conduct Rules Applicable to FIBOs	329
10. Compensation of Losses	331
11. Professional and Non-professional Investors	331
12. Financial Instruments Exchanges	332
13. Rules against Unfair Trading	332
14. Disclosure of Corporate Information	340
15. Tender Offer (Takeover Bids, TOB)	342
16. Supervision of the Financial Market	345
14. Anti-Monopoly Law	347
1. Historical Background	347
2. Outline of the Anti-Monopoly Law	352
3. Private Monopolisation	353
4. Prevention of Excessive Concentration of Economic Power	356
5. Unreasonable Restraint of Trade	363
6. Unfair Trade Practices	369
7. Application of the Anti-Monopoly Law on International Transactions	378
8. Procedures and Sanctions	380
15. Intellectual Property Law	387
1. 'An Intellectual Property-based Nation'	387
2. Patent Law	388
3. Copyright Law	395
4. Protection of Trademarks	400
5. Protection of Trade Secrets	402
6. Other Types of Intellectual Property	403
16. Labour Law	405
1. The Development of Labour Legislation	405
2. Constitutional Guarantees	408
3. Employment Relations	410
4. Collective Labour Relations	424
5. Procedure for Settling Labour Disputes	429

IV. OTHER LAWS

17. Civil Procedure	433
1. The Code of Civil Procedure	433
2. Jurisdiction	434
3. The Capacity to be a Party, Standing, and the Interest to Initiate an Action	435
4. Preliminary Procedure	437

5. Hearing	443
6. Appeals	447
7. Enforcement of Judgments	448
8. Small Claims Procedure	449
18. Criminal Law and Procedure	450
1. The History of Criminal Law	450
2. Basic Rules of Criminal Law	453
3. Specific Offences in the Special Part of the Criminal Code and other Laws	456
4. Criminal Procedure	459
19. International Relations	467
1. The Law on Nationality	467
2. The Status of Foreigners	469
3. Foreign Exchange and Foreign Trade Law	472
4. Rules on the Conflict of Laws	477
5. Marriage and Divorce	483
6. Inheritance	484
7. Public Policy	484
8. <i>Renvoi</i>	484
9. Problems Related to Cross-border Disputes	485
<i>Index</i>	493

Abbreviations

ADR	alternative dispute resolution
BGB	Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch
BIS	Bank of International Settlement
CIETAC	China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission
CPA	Chartered Patent Attorney
EDINET	Electronic Disclosure Network for Investors
FIB	Financial instruments business
FIBO	financial instruments business operators
FIEs	financial instruments and exchanges
FIEL	Financial Instruments and Exchange Law
FSA	Financial Services Agency
FSMA	Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 (UK)
FTC	Fair Trade Commission
HHI	Herfindale Hirschman Index
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPO	initial public offering
JASDAQ	Japan Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotation
JCA	Japan Credit Rating Agency
JCAA	Japan Commercial Arbitration Association
JPX	Japan Exchange Group
JSCC	Japan Securities Clearing Corporation
LLC	limited liability companies (US type)
LLP	limited liability partnerships
LPS	lender processing services
LPS	limited partnership for investment
METI	Ministry of Trade, Economy, and Industry
MSCB	moving strike convertible bonds
MTF	multiple trading facilities
NASDAQ	National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations
NBS	Nippon Broadcasting System Inc.
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PCT	Patent Co-operation Treaty
PTS	private trading system
R&I	Rating and Investment Information
ROE	return on equity
SCAP	Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers
SEC	Securities and Exchange Commission (US)

xiv ABBREVIATIONS

SESC	Securities and Exchange Surveillance Commission
SEL	Securities and Exchange Law (replaced by FIEL)
SII Talks	Structural Impediments Initiatives Talks
TDNET	Timely Disclosure Network
TOB	takeover bids
TOMAC	Tokyo Maritime Arbitration Commission
TOPIX	Tokyo Stock Price Index
TRIPs	Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Agreement on
TSE	Tokyo Stock Exchange
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on Trade Law
WTO	World Trade Organization
ZPO	German Code of Civil Procedure

Table of Cases

SUPREME COURT

Judgment of the Supreme Court, 12 March 1948 (<i>Keishū</i> 2-3-191)	110
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 20 September 1948 (<i>Keishū</i> 23-12-1625)	93
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 6 February 1951 (<i>Minshū</i> 5-3-36)	166
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 19 February 1952, (<i>Minshū</i> 6-2-110)	217
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 8 October 1952 (<i>Minshū</i> 6-9-783)	54
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 March 1953 (<i>Keishū</i> 11-3-997; Lady Chatterley's Lover case)	98
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 December 1953 (<i>Minshū</i> 7-12-1446)	150
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 December 1953 (<i>Minshū</i> 7-12-1515)	176
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 November 1954 (<i>Minshū</i> 8-11-2087)	137
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 March 1955 (<i>Minshū</i> 11-3-543)	208
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 7 October 1955 (<i>Minshū</i> 9-11-1616)	134
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 November 1955 (<i>Minshū</i> 9-12-1739; Dai-Nippon Bōseki case)	413
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 November 1955, (<i>Minshū</i> 9-12-1837)	217
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 4 July 1956 (<i>Minshū</i> 10-7-785)	149
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 31 January 1957 (<i>Minshū</i> 11-1-170)	200–1
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 7 February 1957 (<i>Minshū</i> 11-2-227)	140
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 July 1957 (<i>Minshū</i> 11-7-1254)	205–6
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 11 April 1958, (<i>Minshū</i> 12-5-789)	214, 218
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 1 May 1958 (<i>Keishū</i> 12-7-1272)	38
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 28 May 1958 (<i>Keishū</i> 12-8-1694; Uhoro Coal Mine case)	428, 456
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 July 1958, (<i>Minshū</i> 12-12-1823)	216–17
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 October 1958 (<i>Keishū</i> 12-14-3305)	49
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 14 July 1959 (<i>Minshū</i> 13-7-1023)	215
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 17 September 1959 (<i>Minshū</i> 13-11-1412)	146–47
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 November 1959 (<i>Minshū</i> 13-12-1573)	51
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 12 December 1959 (<i>Keishū</i> 13-13-3225; Sunagawa case)	32
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 March 1960 (<i>Minshū</i> 14-4-483)	135
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 21 April 1960 (<i>Minshū</i> 14-6-930)	146–47
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 20 July 1960 (<i>Keishū</i> 14-9-1243)	94–95, 97
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 21 October 1960 (<i>Minshū</i> 14-12-2661)	140
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 February 1961 (<i>Minshū</i> 15-2-244)	194
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 28 April 1961 (<i>Minshū</i> 15-4-1105)	150
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 May 1961 (<i>Minshū</i> 5-5-1440)	126
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 May 1962 (<i>Keishū</i> 16-5-4959)	110
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 May 1962 (<i>Minshū</i> 16-5-1108)	411
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 28 November 1962 (<i>Keishū</i> 16-11-1593)	33, 108–9
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 December 1962 (<i>Minshū</i> 16-12-2422)	435
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 January 1963 (<i>Minshū</i> 17-1-25)	134

Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 February 1963 (<i>Minshū</i> 17-1-235)	222
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 4 February 1964 (<i>Minshū</i> 18-2-252)	206
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 June 1964 (<i>Minshū</i> 18-5-854)	201, 204
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 28 July 1964 (<i>Minshū</i> 18-6-1220)	125
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 9 March 1965 (<i>Minshū</i> 19-2-233)	124
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 May 1965 (<i>Shūkei</i> 155-831)	333
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 29 June 1965 (<i>Minshū</i> 19-4-1045)	436
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 30 June 1965 (<i>Minshū</i> 19-4-1143)	156
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 3 December 1965 (<i>Minshū</i> 19-9-2090)	145–46
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 April 1966 (<i>Minshū</i> 20-4-752)	141
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 April 1966 (<i>Minshū</i> 20-4-849)	132
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 4 October 1966 (<i>Minshū</i> 20-8-1565)	158
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 October 1966 (<i>Keishū</i> 20-8-901)	43–44, 95, 112, 409
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 28 April 1967 (<i>Minshū</i> 21-3-780)	223
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 May 1967 (<i>Minshū</i> 21-5-1043)	93
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 1 November 1967 (<i>Minshū</i> 21-9-2249)	43, 202–3
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 November 1967 (<i>Minshū</i> 21-9-2278)	205–6
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 August 1968 (<i>Minshū</i> 22-8-1571)	179–80
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 27 August 1968 (<i>Minshū</i> 22-8-1404)	201
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 September 1968 (<i>Hanji</i> 539-40)	193
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 November 1968 (<i>Minshū</i> 22-12-2526)	6
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 November 1968 (<i>Minshū</i> 22-12-2614)	203–4
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 December 1968 (<i>Minshū</i> 22-13-3459)	413
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 January 1969 (<i>Minshū</i> 23-1-18)	180
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 17 February 1969 (<i>Minshū</i> 23-2-511)	132–33
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 April 1969 (<i>Keishū</i> 23-5-685)	427–28
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 June 1969 (<i>Keishū</i> 23-7-975)	101
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 October 1969 (<i>Keishū</i> 23-10-1239)	98
Decision of the Supreme Court, 26 November 1969 (<i>Keishū</i> 24-6-280)	95–96
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 December 1969 (<i>Keishū</i> 23-12-1625)	92
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 11 June 1970 (<i>Minshū</i> 24-6-516)	444
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 June 1970 (<i>Minshū</i> 24-6-587)	158–59
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 June 1970 (<i>Minshū</i> 24-6-625)	131
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 July 1970 (<i>Minshū</i> 24-7-909)	175
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 July 1970 (<i>Minshū</i> 24-7-1116)	180
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 28 July 1970 (<i>Minshū</i> 24-7-1220)	418
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 September 1970 (<i>Minshū</i> 24-10-1424)	136–37
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 October 1970 (<i>Hanji</i> 614-46)	155
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 20 January 1971 (<i>Minshū</i> 25-1-1)	39
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 March 1971 (<i>Minshū</i> 25-2-183)	260–61
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 March 1971 (<i>Minshū</i> 25-2-208)	190
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 23 April 1971 (<i>Minshū</i> 25-3-351)	206–7
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 3 June 1971 (<i>Minshū</i> 25-4-455)	140–41
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 December 1971 (<i>Minshū</i> 25-9-1472)	145–46
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 27 June 1972 (<i>Minshū</i> 26-5-1067)	127
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 November 1972 (<i>Keishū</i> 26-9-544)	109
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 4 April 1973 (<i>Keishū</i> 27-3-265)	32, 103–4
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 April 1973 (<i>Keishū</i> 27-3-418)	428
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 April 1973 (<i>Keishū</i> 27-4-547)	43–44, 409–10
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 7 June 1973 (<i>Minshū</i> 27-6-681)	151
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 9 October 1973 (<i>Minshū</i> 27-9-1129)	131
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 October 1973 (<i>Minshū</i> 27-9-1240)	125

Judgment of the Supreme Court, 12 December 1973 (<i>Minshū</i> 27-11-1536)	104, 413–14
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 March 1974 (<i>Minshū</i> 28-2-265)	418
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 March 1974 (<i>Minshū</i> 28-2-347)	196
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 April 1974 (<i>Minshū</i> 28-3-447)	200
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 10 July 1974 (<i>Minshū</i> 28-5-872)	201
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 September 1974 (<i>Keishū</i> 28-6-329)	33, 103–4
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 6 November 1974 (<i>Keishū</i> 28-9-393)	39, 95
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 17 December 1974 (<i>Minshū</i> 28-10-2040)	203
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 February 1975 (<i>Minshū</i> 29-2-143)	147–48
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 April 1975 (<i>Minshū</i> 29-4-456)	420
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 8 April 1975 (<i>Minshū</i> 29-4-401)	219
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 April 1975 (<i>Minshū</i> 29-4-481)	428
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 30 April 1975 (<i>Minshū</i> 29-4-572)	32, 111
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 July 1975 (<i>Minshū</i> 29-6-1061)	478
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 10 September 1975 (<i>Keishū</i> 25-8-489)	24, 50, 96
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 October 1975 (<i>Minshū</i> 29-9-1417)	198, 446
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 January 1976 (<i>Shōmu-geppō</i> 22-2-578)	41
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 14 April 1976 (<i>Minshū</i> 30-3-223)	32, 106
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 30 April 1976 (<i>Keishū</i> 30-3-452)	453–54
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 May 1976 (<i>Minshū</i> 30-4-554)	125–26
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 30 September 1976 (<i>Minshū</i> 30-8-816)	194, 195
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 31 January 1977 (<i>Saikōsai-saibanshū</i> 120-23)	420
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 July 1977 (<i>Minshū</i> 31-4-533)	107
Decision of the Supreme Court, 9 August 1977 (<i>Keishū</i> 31-5-821)	462
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 December 1977 (<i>Minshū</i> 31-7-974)	417–18
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 20 April 1978 (<i>Minshū</i> 32-3-616)	479
Decision of the Supreme Court, 31 May 1978 (<i>Keishū</i> 32-3-457)	103
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 4 October 1978 (<i>Minshū</i> 32-7-1223)	91, 469
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 20 August 1979 (<i>Minshū</i> 24-9-1268)	207
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 November 1979 (<i>Hanji</i> 952-49)	194–95
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 28 March 1980 (<i>Minshū</i> 34-3-244)	398
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 June 1980 (<i>Hanji</i> 978-112)	260–61
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 4 July 1980 (<i>Minshū</i> 34-5-570)	389
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 July 1980 (<i>Minshū</i> 39-5-989)	47
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 28 November 1980 (<i>Keishū</i> 34-6-433)	98
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 March 1981 (<i>Minshū</i> 35-2-300)	104, 134, 414
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 April 1981 (<i>Keishū</i> 35-3-84)	101
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 October 1981 (<i>Minshū</i> 35-7-1224)	485
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 8 April 1982 (<i>Minshū</i> 26-4-594)	99
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 8 March 1983 (<i>Keishū</i> 37-2-15)	98–99
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 27 April 1983 (<i>Minshū</i> 37-3-345)	34
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 September 1983 (<i>Rōhan</i> 415-16)	417
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 1 November 1983 (<i>Hanji</i> 1100-151)	417
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 7 November 1983 (<i>Minshū</i> 37-9-1243)	106
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 January 1984 (<i>Minshū</i> 38-2-53)	207
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 24 February 1984 (<i>Keishū</i> 38-4-1287)	364, 367
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 10 April 1984 (<i>Minshū</i> 38-6-557)	147–48
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 April 1984 (<i>Minshū</i> 41-3-408)	111
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 20 July 1984 (<i>Minshū</i> 38-8-105)	484
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 September 1984 (<i>Hanji</i> No. 1137)	162
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 12 December 1984 (<i>Minshū</i> 38-12-1308)	99–100
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 March 1985 (<i>Minshū</i> 39-2-124)	194–95

Judgment of the Supreme Court, 17 July 1985 (<i>Minshū</i> 39-5-1100)	32, 34, 106
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 23 October 1985 (<i>Keishū</i> 39-6-413)	49, 454
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 11 June 1986 (<i>Minshū</i> 40-4-872)	92, 100, 437
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 14 July 1986 (<i>Rōhan</i> 477-6)	422
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 4 September 1986 (<i>Hanji</i> 1215-47)	134
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 23 October 1986 (<i>Rōhan</i> 484-7)	422
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 April 1987 (<i>Minshū</i> 41-3-408)	32
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 July 1987 (<i>Minshū</i> 41-5-785)	385
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 July 1987 (<i>Minsū</i> 41-5-785)	385
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 September 1987 (<i>Keishū</i> 41-6-255)	217, 458
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 March 1989 (<i>Hanji</i> 1363-68)	113
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 8 December 1989 (<i>Minshū</i> 43-11-1259)	385
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 17 April 1990 (<i>Minshū</i> 44-3-526)	259
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 20 July 1990 (<i>Minshū</i> 44-5-876)	126-27
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 10 May 1991 (<i>Minshū</i> 45-5-919)	461
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 1 July 1992 (<i>Minshū</i> 46-5-437)	109
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 December 1992 (<i>Minshū</i> 46-9-2829)	111
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 February 1993 (<i>Minshū</i> 47-3-1687)	107
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 9 September 1993 (<i>Minshū</i> 47-7-481)	271
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 20 July 1994 (<i>Keishū</i> 48-5-201)	334
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 February 1995 (<i>Keishū</i> 49-2-1)	453-54
Decision of the Supreme Court, 5 July 1995 (<i>Minshū</i> 49-7-1789)	221
Decision of the Supreme Court, 17 July 1995 (<i>Minshū</i> 49-7-1789)	105
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 5 December 1995 (<i>Hanji</i> 1563-81)	104-5
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 December 1995 (<i>Keishū</i> 49-10-842)	91-92, 113
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 April 1997 (<i>Minshū</i> 51-4-1637)	108, 112
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 1 July 1997 (NBL No. 621)	377-78
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 11 July 1997 (<i>Minshū</i> 51-6-2573)	491
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 11 November 1997 (<i>Minshū</i> 51-10-4055)	485
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 February 1999 (<i>Jurist</i> , 1999, vol. 1154)	337
Judgement of the Supreme Court, 24 March 1999 (<i>Minshū</i> 53-3-514)	461
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 10 June 1999 (<i>Keishū</i> 53-5-415)	337-38
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 7 July 2000 (<i>Minshū</i> 54-6-1767)	263, 331
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 February 2002 (<i>Minshū</i> 56-2-331)	338
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 11 September 2002 (<i>Minshū</i> 56-7-1439)	33
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 September 2002, <i>Minshū</i> 56-7-1551	482
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 22 April 2003 (<i>Minshū</i> 57-4-477)	393
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 12 September 2003 (<i>Minshū</i> 57-8-973)	92
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 14 January 2004 (<i>Minshū</i> 58-1-56)	106
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 January 2005 (<i>Minshū</i> 60-1-1)	42
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 26 January 2005 (<i>Minshū</i> 59-1-128)	91
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 14 July 2005 (<i>Minshū</i> 59-6-1323)	330
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 September 2005 (<i>Hanji</i> 1912-8)	170
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 7 February 2006 (<i>Minshū</i> 60-2-480)	189
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 23 February 2006 (<i>Minshū</i> vol. 60, No. 2)	141
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 12 June 2006 (<i>Hanji</i> No. 1941)	170
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 21 July 2006 (<i>Minshū</i> 60-6-2542)	489
Decision of the Supreme Court, 3 October 2006 (<i>Minshū</i> vol. 60, No. 8)	101
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 2 February 2007 (<i>Minshū</i> vol. 61, No. 1)	134
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 6 February 2007 (<i>Minshū</i> 61-1-122)	126
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 27 February 2007 (<i>Hanji</i> No. 1964)	170
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 6 July 2007 (<i>Minshū</i> 61-5-1769)	194

Decision of the Supreme Court, 7 August 2007 (<i>Minshū</i> 61-5-2215)	286
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 18 September 2007 (<i>Minshū</i> 61-6-601)	96
Judgment of the Supreme Court 28 January 2008 (<i>Saibanshū Minji</i> 227-105)	264
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 4 June 2008 (<i>Hanta</i> 1267-92)	33, 105
Judgments of the Supreme Court, 18 December 2008 (<i>Minshū</i> 52-9-1866)	374
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 15 July 2010 (<i>Hanji</i> 2091-90)	264
Decision of the Supreme Court, 4 September 2013 (<i>Minshū</i> 67-6-1320)	33, 105
Decision of the Supreme Court 19 April 2011 (<i>Minshū</i> 65-3-1311)	278
Decision of the Supreme Court, 4 September 2013 (<i>Minshū</i> 67-6-1330)	91
Decision of the Supreme Court, 4 September 2013 (<i>Minshū</i> 67-6-6329)	213, 219
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 25 November 2015 (<i>Minshū</i> 69-7-2035)	106
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 December 2015 (<i>Minshū</i> 69-8-2427)	33, 104–5
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 16 December 2015 (<i>Minshū</i> 69-8-2586)	214–15
Judgment of the Supreme Court 1 March 2016 (<i>Minshū</i> 70-3-681)	195, 204
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 10 March 2016 (<i>Minshū</i> 70-3-846)	482–83
Decision of the Supreme Court, 12 December 2017 (<i>Minshū</i> 72-20-2106)	73
Judgment of the Supreme Court, 12 December 2017 (<i>Minshū</i> 71-10-1958)	380

SUPREME TRIBUNAL (PRE-WAR PREDECESSOR TO THE SUPREME COURT)

Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 21 May 1903 (<i>Keiroku</i> 9-14-874)	453–54
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 5 February 1906 (<i>Minroku</i> 12-136)	154
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 15 December 1908 (<i>Minroku</i> 14-1276)	179
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 6 July 1910 (<i>Minroku</i> 16-537)	153
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 4 July 1914 (<i>Keiroku</i> 20-1360)	196–97
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 26 January 1915 (<i>Minroku</i> 21–49)	218
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 22 December 1916 (<i>Minroku</i> 22-2474)	193
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 30 April 1917 (<i>Minroku</i> 23-715)	195
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 28 May 1920 (<i>Minroku</i> 26–773)	214
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 22 November 1922 (<i>Minroku</i> 27-1978)	147
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 28 November 1925 (<i>Minshū</i> 4-670)	196–97
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 22 May 1926 (<i>Minshū</i> 5-386)	151, 201
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 13 October 1926 (<i>Minshū</i> 5-785)	205–6
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 18 October 1926 (<i>Hyōron</i> 16)	50
Decision of the Supreme Tribunal, 28 December 1928 (<i>Minshū</i> 7-1128)	488–89
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 5 April 1929 (<i>Minshū</i> 8-373)	150
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 16 December 1929 (<i>Minshū</i> 8-12-944)	153–54
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 12 March 1935 (<i>Minshū</i> 14-482)	153
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 5 October 1935 (<i>Minshū</i> 14-1965)	126
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 8 April 1937 (<i>Minshū</i> 16–418)	218
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 23 January 1940 (<i>Minshū</i> 19–54)	219
Judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, 6 December 1944 (<i>Minshū</i> 23-19-613)	166

JUDGMENTS OF APPELLATE COURTS

Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 10 September 1951 (<i>Kōminshū</i> 4-14-497)	365
Decision of the Hiroshima Appellate Court, 19 June 1963 (<i>Kōminshū</i> 16-4-265)	218
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 17 October 1967 (<i>Gyōsai-Reishū</i> 18-10-1307)	389–90
Judgment of the Nagoya Appellate Court, 29 March 1971 (<i>Hanji</i> No. 634)	167–68
Judgment of the Nagoya Appellate Court, 10 April 1971 (<i>Rōmin</i> 22-2-453)	409

Decision of the Osaka Appellate Court, 12 July 1973 (<i>Kaminshū</i> 24-5/8-455)	445
Decision of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 30 April 1975 (<i>KōMinshū</i> 28-2-174)	372
Decision of the Fukuoka Appellate Court, 13 July 1977 (<i>KōMinshū</i> 30-3-175)	439-40
Decision of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 19 March 1979 (<i>Kō-Minshū</i> 32-9/12-1391)	439-40
Judgment of Tokyo Appellate Court, 29 October 1979 (<i>Rōmin</i> 30-5-1002)	420-21
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 26 September 1980 (<i>KōKeishū</i> 33-5-359)	353, 364, 366, 367
Decision of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 30 January 1981 (<i>Hanji</i> 994-53)	308-9
Judgment of the Osaka Appellate Court, 30 November 1982 (<i>Kagetsū</i> 36-1-139)	218
Judgment of the Osaka Appellate Court, 19 April 1984 (<i>KōKeishū</i> 37-1-98)	462
Judgment of the Sapporo Appellate Court, 19 June 1986 (<i>Hanta</i> 614-70)	218
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 25 August 1986 (<i>Hanji</i> 1208-66)	113
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 31 January 1990 (<i>Shiryōban Shōji-Hōmu</i> , 77-193), upheld by the Supreme Court, 5 October 1993.	280
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 14 September 1994 (<i>Hanji</i> 1507-43)	374
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 25 September 1995 (<i>Hanta</i> 906-136)	365
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 26 September 1995 (<i>Hanji</i> 1549-11)	373
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 22 March 1996 (<i>Hanji</i> 1566-143)	334-35
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 22 May 1997 (<i>Hanji</i> 1607-55)	330
Judgment of the Sapporo Appellate Court, 2 March 2006 (<i>Hanji</i> 1946-128)	264
Judgment of the Osaka Appellate Court, 18 January 2007	272-73
Judgment of the Fukuoka Appellate Court, 19 June 2007 (<i>Hanta</i> No. 1265)	168
Judgment of Fukuoka Appellate Court, 27 June 2014 (<i>Kinhan</i> 11462-18)	259-60
Decision of the Tokyo Appellate Court 1 August 2018.	72-73

JUDGMENTS OF DISTRICT COURTS

Judgment of the Kōbe District Court, 20 July 1956 (<i>Rōmin</i> 7-4-838)	413
Judgment of the Wakayama District Court, 14 March 1959 (<i>Rōmin</i> 10-2-127)	422
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 9 August 1959 (<i>KaMinshū</i> 11-8-1647)	489
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 28 September 1964 (<i>KaMinshū</i> 15-9-2317)	90
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 26 April 1965 (<i>Hanji</i> 408-14)	480
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 27 May 1965 (<i>Ka-Minshū</i> 16-5-923)	434, 482
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 20 December 1966 (<i>Rōmin</i> 17-6-1407)	104, 414
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 7 June 1967 (<i>KaMinshū</i> 18-5/6-607)	208
Judgment of the Tsu District Court, Yokkaichi Division, 24 July 1967 (<i>Hanji</i> 672-30)	208
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 9 August 1967 (<i>Rō-min</i> 18-4-872)	480
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 1 July 1969 (<i>Rōmin</i> 20-4-715)	414
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 19 July 1969 (<i>Rōmin</i> 20-4-813)	427
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 17 July 1970 (<i>Hanji</i> 604-29)	99
Judgment of the Nara District Court, 23 October 1970 (<i>KaMinshū</i> 21-9/10-1369)	403
Judgment of the Toyama District Court, 30 June 1971 (<i>KaMinshū</i> 22-5/6-1)	198
Judgment of the Osaka District Court, 10 December 1971 (<i>Rōmin</i> 22-6-1163)	414
Judgement of the Takamatsu District Court, 28 November 1973 (<i>Hanji</i> 721-7)	455
Decision of the Tokyo District Court, 23 July 1976 (<i>Hanji</i> No. 820)	422
Judgment of the Osaka District Court, 22 December 1977 (<i>Hanta</i> 361-127)	488
Judgment of the Okayama District Court, 31 July 1979 (<i>Rōhan</i> 326-44)	420
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 27 February 1981 (<i>Hanji</i> 1010-85)	484
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 30 March 1981 (<i>Hanji</i> 1363-68)	467
Judgment of the Niigata District Court, 29 September 1971 (<i>Hanji</i> 642-96)	193-94, 197-98

Judgment of the Fukuoka District Court, Kokura Division, 29 March 1982 (<i>Hanji</i> 1037-14)	194
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 27 March 1984 (<i>Hanji</i> 1113-26)	486
Decision of the Tokyo District Court, 28 September 1984 (<i>Hanta</i> 534-246)	397
Judgment of the Tokyo Appellate Court, 24 December 1984 (<i>Hanji</i> No. 1144)	167-68
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 20 June 1986 (<i>Hanji</i> 1196-87)	486
Judgment of the Kanazawa District Court, 27 November 1987 (<i>Hanji</i> 1268-143)	411
Judgment of the Osaka District Court, 30 November 1987 (<i>Hanji</i> 1269-147)	422-23
Interim Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 30 May 1989 (<i>Hanji</i> 1348-91)	488
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 29 March 1991 (<i>Hanji</i> 1424-84)	484
Judgment of the Yokohama District Court, 31 October 1991 (<i>Hanji</i> 1418-113)	484
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 28 January 1992 (<i>Hanji</i> 1437-122)	478
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 27 January 1994, (<i>Hanta</i> , 853-266)	71
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 18 July 1994 (<i>Hanji</i> 1474-25)	374
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 3 October 1994 (<i>Shiryō-ban Shōji-Hōmu</i> 128-166)	334
Judgment of the Matsue District Court, 8 November 1994 (<i>Hanji</i> 1549-109)	481
Judgment of the Nagano District Court, Ueda Division, 15 March 1996 (<i>Hanta</i> 905-276)	411-12
Judgment of the Fukuoka District Court, Kokura Division, 26 March 1996 (<i>Rōhan</i> 703-80;)	423
Judgment of the Osaka District Court, 18 March 1998 (<i>Hanji</i> 1658-180)	258
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 5 February 1999 (<i>Hanta</i> No. 1073)	168-69
Judgment of the Osaka District Court, 20 September 2000 (<i>Hanji</i> 1721-3)	263
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 30 January 2004 (<i>Hanji</i> 1852-36)	393
Decision of the Tokyo District Court, 28 June 2007 (<i>Shōji Hōmu</i> No. 1805)	286
Judgment of the Tokyo District Court, 20 September 2007 (<i>Hanji</i> 1985-140)	296
Decision of the Tokyo District Court, 13 June 2011	72-73

ADJUDICATIONS OF OTHER COURTS

Adjudication of Nagoya Family Court, 2 March 1974 (<i>Kagetsu</i> 26-8-94)	484
Adjudication of the Niigata Family Court, 10 August 1982 (<i>Kagetsu</i> 35-10-79)	219
Adjudication of the Maebashi Family Court, 14 July 1985 (<i>Kagetsu</i> , 38-12-84)	223

FTC DECISIONS

Hearing Decision of the FTC, 4 April 1952 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 4-1)	366
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 6 November 1953 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 5-61)	376
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 10 December 1955 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 7-99)	371
Hearing Decision of the FTC, 28 July 1956 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 8-12)	354, 355-56
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 30 January 1957 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 8-51)	358
Hearing Decision of the FTC, 19 April 1967 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 14-64)	371
Consent Decision of the FTC, 30 October 1969 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 16-46)	361
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 18 September 1972 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 19-87)	354, 355
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 27 December 1972 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 19-124)	378-79
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 20 February 1976 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 22-127)	375
Consent Decision of the FTC, 24 November 1977 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 24-50)	372
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 2 February 1980 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 26-85)	372
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 11 May 1981 (<i>Shinketsu-shū</i> 28-10)	374

Consent Decision of the FTC, 17 June 1982 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 29-31)	376
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 8 January 1992 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 38-150)	365
Hearing Decision of the FTC, 28 July, 1994 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 41-46)	364
Consent decision of the FTC, 30 November 1995 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 42-97)	373-74
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 22 March 1996 (<i>Shinketsushū</i> 42-195)	377
Recommendation decision of the FTC, 28 July 1998 (<i>Shinketsu-shū</i> 45-130)	374
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 3 September 1998 (<i>Shinketsu-shū</i> 45-148)	379
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 31 October 2000 (<i>Shinketsu-shū</i> 47-317)	371
Recommendation decision of the FTC, 27 July 2001 (<i>Shinketsu-shū</i> 48-187)	371
Recommendation Decision of the FTC, 26 December 2005 (<i>Shinketsu-shū</i> 52-436)	376

Table of Legislation

JAPAN

Constitution

Constitution (1946)	13, 14–15, 16, 18–20, 24, 25, 26–27, 28–31, 32, 34–36, 37–38, 39–40, 41, 42–43, 52–54, 56, 57, 58–59, 64, 76–77, 89–90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95–96, 97, 98–99, 100–1, 102, 103, 107, 108, 109–10, 111, 118–19, 181, 212, 219, 409, 427–28, 447, 468
Art 4	24
Art 3(1)	29, 30, 54
Art 8(1)	24
Art 9	27, 28
Art 11	29, 34, 38
Art 12	94
Art 12(1)	38
Art 13	91–92, 94, 113, 209
Art 14	414
Art 14(1)	48–49, 103, 468
Art 14(3)	48–49
Art 19	107
Art 20	107
Art 21	97, 99, 100
Art 21(1)	96
Art 22(1)	111
Art 24(2)	212
Art 27	408
Art 28	408, 409
Art 29	93, 111, 338
Art 29(2)	124, 181
Art 29(3)	181
Art 31	24, 96, 108
Art 32	64
Art 33	460
Arts 33–34	109–10
Arts 33–39	109
Art 35	110, 460
Art 36	110
Art 37(1)	110
Art 37(2)	110
Art 37(3)	110, 460
Art 38	460

Art 38(1)	110
Art 38(2)	110
Art 38(3)	110
Art 39	109
Art 41	34
Art 43	58–59
Art 48	76–77
Arts 60–61	39–40
Art 73(6)	38
Art 76(2)	53
Art 76(3)	42–43, 76–77
Art 77	58
Art 78	76–77
Art 79(1)	58–59
Art 79(2)	59
Art 79(3)	59
Art 81	53–54
Art 94	48–49
Art 96	29–30
Art 97	24
Art 98(2)	39–40, 41

Codes

Civil Code	1, 4, 6, 16, 18, 19, 22–23, 25, 33, 41, 42, 50, 104–5, 117–19, 120, 121–22, 123–25, 126, 127, 128, 129–30, 131, 133, 134, 136, 138, 139, 141, 142, 144, 146, 149, 152, 156, 157, 159–60, 162, 163, 165, 170, 173–74, 176, 176, 177–78, 180, 181, 182, 183–85, 186, 187, 188–89, 190, 191–92, 195, 199, 202, 203–4, 206, 212, 213, 214, 227, 229, 231, 234, 323, 324, 325, 405, 410, 414, 418, 471–72, 481
Art 1	50, 124, 134
Art 2(1)	210
Art 2(2)	210
Art 2(3)	211
Art 3	210
Art 3(1)	127
Art 3(2)	127–28
Art 4	128, 211

Art 4(1)	127–28	Art 189(1)	180
Art 5(1)	128	Art 192	181
Art 5(2)	128	Arts 197–200	180
Art 6	127–28, 210	Arts 197–202	177
Art 7	128	Art 206	181
Art 8	128	Art 239(1)	181
Art 9	128	Art 240	181
Art 11	128	Arts 242–246	181
Art 12	128	Art 249	183
Art 13(1)	128	Art 251	183
Art 13(4)	128	Art 252	183
Art 14	105, 418	Art 265	177–78
Art 17	482	Art 270	177–78
Art 30(1)	127	Art 280	177–78
Art 32–3	127	Art 295	186
Art 32(2)	127	Art 306	186
Art 34	131	Art 311	306
Art 35(1)	471	Art 325	306
Art 35(2)	471	Art 342	186
Art 36(1)	435	Art 344	186
Art 43	131	Art 349	190
Art 85	177	Art 356	186
Art 86(1)	177	Art 362	186
Art 86(2)	177	Art 369	187
Art 90	104, 124–25, 134, 135, 138, 409	Art 349	186–87
Art 91	135	Art 388	187–88
Art 92	50, 413	Arts 412–422	171
Art 93	136	Art 415	210
Art 93(2)	136	Art 416	199, 200, 201
Art 94(2)	136	Art 515	186–87
Art 95(1)	137	Art 521	186
Art 95(2)	137	Art 605	185
Art 95(3)	137	Art 612	125
Art 95(4)	137	Art 626(1)	418
Art 96(1)	138	Art 627(1)	419
Art 96(2)	138	Art 628	419
Art 96(3)	138	Art 629	418
Art 119	138	Art 644	263
Art 121	138	Art 676	183
Art 125	138	Art 709	41, 191–92, 195–97, 204, 210, 394–95
Art 126	138	Art 710	202
Art 162(1)	182	Art 711	202–4
Art 162(2)	182	Art 712	195
Art 166(1)	142	Art 713	195
Art 166(2)	142	Art 714	195–96
Art 167	143	Art 715(1)	204
Art 175	177–78, 190	Art 717(1)	206
Art 176	178–79	Art 719(1)	207, 208
Art 177	179	Art 720(1)	198–99
Art 178	179	Art 720(2)	198–99
Art 187	182	Art 721	127
Art 188	180		

Art 722.....	208	Arts 968–970.....	223–24
Art 723.....	208	Arts 1028–1036.....	223
Art 724–2.....	143	Art 1028.....	224
Art 731.....	214	Commercial Code	1, 16, 19, 21, 22–23,
Art 732.....	214		25, 36, 50, 117, 119, 122–23,
Art 733.....	214		138, 139, 140, 141, 151,
Art 734(1).....	214		159–60, 162, 172, 186–87,
Art 736.....	214		227, 228, 229, 231, 232, 252,
Art 737.....	214		254, 271, 276, 283, 292, 295–96,
Art 750.....	214–15		324, 325, 337–38, 341
Art 753.....	128, 214	Art 1.....	123
Art 756.....	215	Art 4(1).....	123
Art 758.....	215	Art 5.....	139
Art 760.....	216	Art 23.....	141
Art 761.....	216	Art 25.....	139
Art 762.....	215	Art 94.....	141
Art 763.....	216	Art 94(2).....	141
Art 766(1).....	217	Art 99(1).....	139
Art 768(1).....	217	Art 100.....	139
Art 768(3).....	217	Art 101(1).....	139
Art 770(1).....	216	Art 102.....	139
Art 770(2).....	216–17	Art 107.....	141–42
Art 771.....	217	Art 108.....	139
Art 772(1).....	214, 218–19	Art 109.....	140
Art 772(2).....	218–19	Art 109(1).....	140
Art 775.....	218–19	Art 110.....	140–41
Art 779.....	219	Art 111.....	141–42
Art 787.....	219	Art 112(1).....	142
Art 792.....	219	Art 113(1).....	142
Art 793.....	219	Art 114.....	142
Art 797.....	219	Art 115.....	142
Arts 817–2–817–11.....	219–20	Art 117(1).....	142
Art 821.....	220	Art 501.....	123
Art 823.....	220	Art 502.....	123
Art 823(1).....	220	Art 503.....	123
Art 826(1).....	220	Art 504.....	139
Art 834.....	220	Art 505.....	140
Art 884.....	222–23	Art 506.....	141–42
Art 886(1).....	127	Art 818.....	139
Art 887.....	221, 222	Art 838.....	139
Art 889.....	221	Art 952.....	139
Art 890.....	221	Art 1015.....	139
Art 891.....	222	Criminal Code	15, 15–16, 19, 25, 32,
Art 892.....	222		33, 36, 49–50, 91, 98, 100–1,
Art 898.....	222		103–4, 118, 129, 212, 233,
Art 900.....	221		427, 450–51, 452, 453
Art 904–2.....	223	Art 9.....	456
Arts 906–911.....	183	Art 31.....	453
Art 909(2).....	222	Art 35.....	427, 454
Art 920.....	222	Art 36.....	454
Art 922.....	222	Art 37.....	453
Art 938.....	222	Art 37(1).....	455

Art 39(1)	455	Arts 175– 178	442–43
Art 39(2)	455	Art 184	445
Art 41	455	Art 186	70
Art 60	456	Arts 190–206	70
Art 61	456	Art 191	445
Art 62	456	Art 196	445
Art 175	98	Art 197(1)	446
Art 199	456	Art 204	445
Art 205	454	Art 205	444
Art 230	100–1	Arts 212–217	70
Art 230–2	100–1, 451	Art 218	70
Code of Civil Procedure	16, 19, 22–23, 25, 29, 55, 58, 62, 65, 67–68, 69–70, 433, 435, 438, 439, 440–41, 482–83, 485, 489, 490	Art 220	440
Arts 3–2–3–5	434	Arts 220–225	70
Art 3–2(1)	486–87	Art 222(1)	440–41
Art 3–2(3)	487	Art 223(3)	440
Art 3–3	487	Art 223(4)	440
Art 3–4	487	Art 223(6)	440–41
Art 3–5	487	Art 234	438
Art 3–9	487	Art 224(1)	441
Arts 4–7	434	Art 224(23)	441
Art 4(4)	434	Art 225(1)	441
Art 4(5)	434	Arts 226–227	70
Art 5	434	Art 227	70
Art 6	434–35	Arts 232–233	70
Art 6–2	434–35	Art 248	446
Art 11(1)	434	Art 312	58
Art 19	445	Art 312(1)	447
Art 29	435	Art 312(2)	447
Art 30(1)	436	Art 312(3)	447
Art 30(2)	436	Art 318(1)	58, 447
Art 30(3)	436	Art 368(1)	62
Art 33	435	Art 369	449
Art 89	444	Art 370	62, 449
Art 118	490	Art 371	449
Art 132(1)	439	Art 372(1)	62, 449
Art 132–2	439	Art 373(1)	449
Art 132–3	439	Art 374(1)	449
Art 142	488	Art 375(1)	449
Art 147–2	443	Art 377	449
Art 147–3(1)	443	Code of Criminal Procedure	15–16, 19, 25, 43, 51, 52, 55, 58, 62–63, 64, 78, 79, 109, 459, 460
Art 147–3(2)	443	Art 33	460
Art 149(1)	443	Art 37–2(1)	460
Art 151	443	Art 37(2)	464–65
Art 156	444	Art 39(1)	461
Art 157	444	Art 39(3)	461
Art 157–2	444	Art 189	460
Art 163	438	Art 191(1)	460
Arts 164– 167	442	Art 193(1)	460
Arts 168– 174	442	Art 203(1)	460
		Art 208	461

Art 210.....	460	Art 2(7)	357
Art 212.....	460	Art 2(9)	352, 369
Art 320(1)	464–65	Art 2(9)(3).....	372
Art 321(1)(2).....	465	Art 2(9)(4).....	373
Art 248.....	462–63	Art 3	353–54, 363
Art 256(6)	464	Art 6.....	378–79
Arts 262–270.....	463–64	Art 7.....	380
Art 289(1)	464	Art 7–2(1)	382
Art 301–2.....	462	Art 7–2(2)	382
Art 318.....	465	Art 7–2(2)	382
Art 318(1)	43	Art 7–2(4)	382
Art 319(2)	465	Art 7–2(6)	382
Art 319(3)	465	Art 7–2(7)	382
Art 350–2.....	463	Art 8–2.....	353, 380
Arts 379–382.....	466	Art 9(1)	356
Art 405.....	466	Art 9(2)(4).....	356
Art 405(2)	43	Art 9(3)	357
Art 406.....	466	Art 10(1)	358
		Art 10(8)	358
Law on		Art 11(1)	357
Access to Information Held by		Art 13(1)	359
Administrative Agencies.....	102	Art 13(2)	359
Art 3.....	102	Art 15(1)	359
Art 5.....	102	Art 15(2)	359
Art 8.....	103	Art 15–2.....	359
Acquisition of Land for Public		Art 15–3.....	359
Purposes	111, 181	Art 17–2.....	359, 380
Art 1.....	181	Art 17–2(1)	358
Adjustment of Labour Relations.....	25	Art 18.....	359
Administrative Litigation	25, 29, 34,	Art 19.....	369
	41–42, 55, 430	Art 20.....	380
Administrative Procedure	29, 45, 46–47	Art 20–2.....	382
Art 2(6)	45	Art 20–3.....	382
Art 32(2)	46–47	Art 20–4.....	382
Art 33.....	47	Art 20–5.....	382
Art 34.....	46	Art 20–6.....	382
Art 35(1)	46–47	Art 24.....	386
Art 35(2)	46–47	Art 25.....	385–86
Agricultural Land	39, 181	Art 27.....	352
Art 3.....	181	Art 28.....	352
Aliens' Registration	113, 469, 471	Art 31.....	352
Anti-Monopoly Law	18, 19, 21,	Art 45(1)	381
	22–23, 25, 51, 53, 135, 313, 331,	Art 47(1)	381
	347–49, 351–54, 356, 357, 363, 364,	Art 48–3.....	381
	367–68, 369, 371, 372, 375, 377,	Art 49.....	381
	378–79, 380, 383–84, 385,	Art 52.....	381
	402, 435–36, 450	Art 70–4.....	361, 380
Art 1.....	352	Art 76.....	352
Art 2(1)	352–53	Art 84(1)	385
Art 2(5)	353–54	Art 89.....	384
Art 2(6)	363	Art 94.....	381
		Art 95.....	384

Art 95-2.....	384	Art 167(1)	306
Art 96.....	384	Art 170(1)	306
Art 101.....	384	Art 178(1)	306
Art 102.....	384	Art 186(1)	306
Application of Law (<i>Hōrei</i>)		Art 193(1)	306
(Repealed).....	477-78	Art 269.....	305
Arbitration.....	22-23, 55, 67, 68, 71	Bills.....	122
Art 4.....	68	Book-Entry Transfer of Corporate	
Art 12(2)	68	Bonds and other Securities.....	250
Art 13(1)	68	Cabinet.....	25, 34, 35-36, 38
Art 14.....	69	Certification of Public Interest	
Art 17(2)-(4).....	68	Associations and	
Art 19(4)	69	Foundations	121, 130
Art 23.....	69	Art 4.....	130
Art 23(1)	69	Art 29(1)	130
Art 23(2)	69	Art 29(2)	130
Art 23(5)	69	Art 29.....	130-31
Art 24.....	69	Cheques.....	122
Art 35.....	69-70	City Planning	181
Art 35(1)	69	Art 1.....	181
Art 44.....	69, 70, 72-73	Civil Composition (Repealed)	306-7
Art 46.....	69	Civil Conciliation	66
Architectural Standards.....	127, 170	Art 1.....	66
Attorneys	53, 79, 80, 84	Civil Enforcement... ..	25, 148, 153, 448, 449
Banking	25, 318-19, 320	Art 22.....	449
Bankruptcy	303, 304	Civil Provisional Remedies	25, 437
Art 3.....	304	Art 20(1)	437
Art 5(1)	304	Art 23(1)	437
Art 5(8)	304	Art 23(2)	437
Art 5(9)	304	Art 23(4)	437
Art 15(2)	304	Art 26.....	438
Art 16(1)	304	Art 27.....	438
Art 18.....	304	Civil Rehabilitation	
Art 19(1)	304	(<i>Minji-Saisei-Hō</i>)	303, 306, 308
Art 28(1)	304	Art 1.....	307
Art 30(1)	305	Art 17.....	308
Art 31(1)	305	Art 17(1)	308
Art 34(1)	305	Art 21.....	307
Art 36.....	305	Art 37.....	308
Art 40.....	305	Art 38(1)	307
Art 41.....	305	Art 41(1)	307
Art 62.....	305	Art 54(1)	307
Art 65.....	306	Art 64.....	307
Art 67(1)	305	Arts 127-127-3	307
Art 71(1)	305	Art 169(2)	307
Art 78(1)	305	Art 173(1)	307
Art 148(1)	306	Art 174(1)	307
Art 149(1)	306	Art 186(2)	307
Art 160(1)	305-6	Civil Status.....	214
Art 160(3)	305-6	Commercial Registration.....	122
Art 161(1)	305-6	Commodities Exchange.....	320, 323
Art 162(1)	305-6	Commodities Futures Trade ..	318-19, 320

Company Law	22–23, 25, 117, 122, 129, 228, 229–31, 232–33, 234, 246, 248–49, 253, 254, 276, 278, 280, 282, 295, 304, 450, 472	Art 88(1)	241
Art 2(1)	289	Art 93	241
Art 2(2)	472	Art 103(1)	241–42
Art 2(5)	234, 267	Art 103(2)	241–42
Art 2(6)	236	Art 107	244
Art 2(12)	254	Art 107(1)	247
Art 2(18)	247	Art 107(1)(3)	248
Art 2(19)	248	Art 108(1)	245
Art 2(21)	252	Art 108(1)(1)	245
Art 2(22)	292	Art 108(1)(2)	245
Art 2(29)	287	Art 108(1)(3)	246
Art 2(30)	287	Art 108(1)(4)	247
Art 2(31)	243–44	Art 108(1)(5)	247
Art 2(32)	243–44	Art 108(1)(6)	248
Art 25(1)	238	Art 108(1)(7)	248
Art 26(1)	238	Art 108(1)(8)	261
Art 26(2)	238	Art 108(1)(9)	249
Art 27	239	Art 108(2)(5)	247
Art 28	239	Art 115	246
Art 32(1)	240	Art120(1)	259
Art 32(2)	240	Art120(4)	263
Art 33(1)	239	Art 121	250, 251
Art 33(3)	239	Art 130(1)	251
Art 33(10)	239	Art 134(1)	251
Art 33(10)(3)	240	Art 134(2)	251
Art 34(1)	240	Art 136	251
Art 36	240	Art 137(1)	251
Art 37(1)	239	Art 138	251
Art 38	240	Art 138(1)	251
Art 39(1)	240	Art 144(1)–(3)	251
Art 39(2)	240	Art 145	251
Art 39(3)	240	Art 146(1)	251
Art 40(1)	240	Art 147(1)	251
Art 43(1)	241	Art 155	302
Art 46(1)	240	Art 156(1)	302
Art 47(1)	240	Art 158	302
Art 49	238	Art 159	302
Art 52(1)	241	Art 165(2)	302
Art 52(2)	241	Art 165(3)	302
Art 52(3)	241	Art 166(1)	247
Art 52–2(1)	241	Art 172(1)	248
Art 53(1)	241	Art 180(2)	243, 245
Art 57	241	Art 183	243
Art 58(1)	241	Art 188(1)	242–43
Art 58(2)	241	Art 188(2)	243
Art 60(1)	241	Art 192(1)	243
Art 65(1)	241	Art 199(1)	293–94
Art 67	257	Art 199(2)	294
Art 87	241	Art 199(3)	295
		Art 200(1)	294
		Art 201(1)	294
		Art 201(3)	294

Art 201(4)	294	Art 347	249
Art 202(1)	293–94	Art 347(1)	261
Art 202(3)	294	Art 348(1)	265
Art 210	294	Art 349(4)	264
Art 214	250	Art 355	263
Art 217(1)	250	Art 360(1)	262
Art 217(3)	250	Art 360(3)	262
Art 238(1)	253	Art 361(1)	264
Art 238(2)	253	Art 362(2)	265
Art 238(3)	253	Art 362(3)	262, 264
Art 241(2)	253	Art 362(4)	265
Art 247	253	Art 363(1)	265
Art 295(1)	256	Art 365	263
Art 295(2)	256	Art 369(1)	266
Art 296(1)	256	Art 369(2)	266
Art 296(3)	256	Art 327(2)	269
Art 297(1)	256	Art 327–2	268
Art 297(3)	256–57	Art 335(3)	269
Art 297(4)	256	Art 373(1)	266
Art 298(1)	256–57	Art 381(1)	269–70
Art 298(2)	257	Art 381(2)–(4)	269–70
Art 299(1)	256–57	Art 400(1)–(4)	268
Art 303(2)	256–57	Art 402(1)	262–63, 264–65
Art 304	256–57	Art 402(2)	262–63, 264–65
Art 308(1)	257	Art 424	258
Art 308(2)	257	Art 410(1)	262–63
Art 309(1)	257–58	Art 415	265
Art 309(2)	243, 244, 258, 269, 298, 302	Art 416(1)	267
Art 309(2)(5)	294, 295	Art 418	264–65, 267
Art 309(2)(6)	253	Art 419	263
Art 309(2)(9)	298	Art 423(1)	263–64
Art 309(2)(12)	278	Art 423(2)	263–64
Art 309(3)	258	Art 425	273
Art 309(4)	258	Art 426	273
Art 310(1)	257	Art 431	295–96
Art 312(1)	257	Art 432	295–96
Art 314	257	Art 433(1)	296
Art 323	261	Art 433(2)	296
Art 326(1)	261	Art 435(2)	296
Art 326(2)	261	Art 436(1)	296
Art 327(1)	261	Art 436(3)	296
Art 329(1)	261, 269	Art 444(3)	297
Art 330	263	Art 445(1)	242, 297–98
Art 331(2)	261	Art 445(2)	242, 297–98
Art 331(4)	261	Art 445(4)	298–99
Art 332(1)	261–62	Art 446	299
Art 332(3)	261–62	Art 447(1)	298
Art 336(1)	269	Art 448(1)(2)	298–99
Art 339(1)	262, 269	Art 449(1)	238
Art 341	257–58, 261, 262	Art 449(2)	238
Art 342(1)	261	Art 454(1)	299
Art 343(4)	269	Art 458	299

Art 459.....	299	Art 805.....	289
Art 461.....	299	Art 806.....	244
Art 461(1).....	302	Art 806(1).....	288–89
Art 462(1).....	299	Art 810(1).....	288–89
Art 462(2).....	299	Art 817(1).....	472
Art 510.....	304	Art 817(2).....	472
Art 511.....	304	Art 818(1).....	472
Art 515(1).....	304	Art 819(1).....	472
Arts 516–518.....	304	Art 821(1).....	472
Art 519(1).....	304	Art 828(1).....	253, 280
Art 563.....	304	Art 828(2).....	280
Art 567(1).....	304	Art 828(1)(2).....	294
Art 702.....	292	Art 828(1)(3).....	294
Art 704.....	293	Art 830(1).....	259
Art 705.....	292	Art 830(2).....	259–60
Art 710(1).....	293	Art 831(1).....	259–60
Art 710(2).....	293	Art 831(2).....	260–61
Art 749.....	276	Art 835.....	280
Art 749(1).....	276	Art 838.....	280
Art 750(1).....	280	Art 847(1).....	270
Art 751.....	276	Art 847(3).....	270
Art 753.....	276	Art 847(5).....	270
Art 755.....	276	Art 847–3(1).....	272–73
Art 758.....	288	Art 850(2).....	272
Art 763(1).....	288	Art 851.....	272
Art 782(1).....	278, 288–89	Art 854.....	262
Art 783(1).....	244, 278, 288–89	Art 911(3).....	238
Art 783(2).....	278	Art 970.....	259
Art 784(1).....	279	Compensation by	
Art 784(2).....	289	the State.....	25, 127–28, 207
Art 785.....	244	Art 2(1).....	207
Art 785(1).....	278, 288–89	Compensation for Loss caused by	
Art 789.....	278–79	Nuclear Damage.....	120, 192
Art 789(1).....	288–89	Compensation for Losses arising	
Art 789(5).....	279	from Car Accidents.....	120, 192, 206
Art 794(1).....	288–89	Art 3.....	206
Art 795(1).....	288–89	Compensation for Losses caused by	
Art 796(1).....	279	Pollution.....	120, 192
Art 796(3).....	279	Consumer Contracts.....	120, 163
Art 796(4).....	279	Contracts of Security by Provisional	
Art 797(1).....	288–89	Registration.....	178, 190
Art 799(1).....	278–79, 288–89	Copyright.....	25, 388, 395, 396–97, 446
Art 799(2).....	278–79	Art 2(1).....	396
Art 799(5).....	279	Art 2(1)(11).....	396
Art 794(1).....	278	Art 2(1)(15).....	397–98
Art 795(1).....	244, 278	Art 6.....	398–99
Art 797.....	244	Art 10(1).....	396
Art 797(1).....	278	Art 11.....	396
Art 797(2).....	278	Art 12(1).....	396
Art 797(3).....	278	Art 12–2.....	396
Art 803.....	288–89	Art 14.....	397
Art 804(1).....	244, 288–89	Art 15(1).....	397, 398

Art 16.....	398	Art 38.....	184
Arts 18–20.....	398	Art 46(1).....	184
Art 20(1).....	398	Art 57(1).....	184
Arts 21–26.....	397–98	Art 57(2).....	184
Art 26.....	398	Art 59.....	184
Art 26–2.....	397–98	Door-to-Door Sales.....	172–73
Art 27.....	397–98	Elderly Persons Employment	
Art 29(1).....	398	Security.....	423
Arts 30–47–7.....	400	Art 9.....	423
Art 38.....	400	Elimination and Prevention of	
Art 51.....	398	Involvement in Bid Rigging etc....	368
Art 52.....	398	Employment Insurance.....	408
Art 53.....	398	Employment Contract.....	410, 411
Art 54.....	398	Art 9.....	411
Art 91.....	399	Art 10.....	411
Art 92.....	399	Art 14.....	411
Art 95(1).....	399	Art 16.....	411
Art 95–2(1).....	399	Equal Opportunities in Employment for	
Art 96.....	399	Men and Women.....	406, 414
Art 97(1).....	399	Art 6.....	414
Arts 98–100.....	399	Establishment of the Financial	
Art 101.....	399	Services Agency.....	345–46
Art 112.....	399	Exceptions to the Civil Code on	
Art 113.....	400	Means of Publicity concerning	
Art 113(1).....	399	Assignment of Claims.....	152
Art 113.....	400	Financial Futures Trade.....	312, 316, 319
Art 116(1).....	399	Financial Instruments and Exchange	
Art 119.....	400	Law (FIEL).....	19, 22–23, 25,
Arts 119–122–2.....	400	38, 302, 311, 317, 318, 319, 320–21,	
Art 124.....	400	322, 323–323, 435–36, 450, 323,	
Corporate Reorganisation		325, 327, 328, 329, 331–32, 340	
(<i>Kaisha Kōsei Hō</i>).....	303, 306,	Art 1.....	20, 318
	307, 308	Art 2.....	315
Court Organisation (repealed)...	52, 53, 77	Art 2(1).....	321
Courts.....	29, 53, 54, 58–59, 75, 76–77	Art 2(2).....	321
Art 3(1).....	436	Art 2(2)(5).....	325
Art 45(1).....	62	Art 2(3).....	340
Criminal Procedure with the		Art 2(4).....	340
Participation of		Art 2(8).....	326
Lay Assessors.....	64	Art 2(2)(21)–(23).....	322
Customs Law.....	33, 99–100	Art 2(2)4.....	322
Art.69-11(1) Arts 36–38.....	401	Art 2(2)5.....	322
Arts 78–82.....	401	Art 4(1).....	340
Deposits.....	120	Art 5(1).....	340–41
Design.....	388, 404	Art 13(1).....	340–41
Art 2(1).....	404	Art 24(1).....	341
Art 3.....	404	Art 24–4–2.....	341
Art 9(1).....	404	Art 24–4–4.....	341
Art 21(1).....	404	Art 24–4–7.....	341
Divided Ownership of Buildings...	183–84	Art 24–4–8.....	341
Art 6(1).....	184	Art 24–6.....	341
Art 14(1).....	184	Art 27–2(1).....	344

Art 27–2(2)	344	Art 23(1)	476
Art 27–2(6)	342	Art 23(2)	475
Art 27–5	344	Art 23(4)	476
Art 27–10(1)	344	Art 26(1)	476
Art 27–10(11)	344	Art 26(2)	476
Art 27–13(1)	344	Art 27	477
Art 27–23(1)	341	Art 55(1)	474
Art 33(1)	328	Art 55–3	475–76
Art 33(8)	328	Art 55–5	477
Art 36(1)	329	Forestry Law	32, 111
Art 36(2)	329	Art 29	111
Art 36–3	330	Fundamental Law on Education	18
Art 37	330	Futures Trade in Overseas	
Art 37–2	330	Commodity Market	320
Art 37–3	330	General Associations and	
Art 37–4	330	Foundations	121, 129, 130, 132
Art 38	330	Art 10(1)	130
Art 38–2	330	Art 13	130
Art 39(1)	330, 331	Art 22	130
Art 40	330	Art 35(1)	132
Art 40–2(1)	330	Art 60(1)	132
Art 42–2	329	Art 60(2)	132
Art 157	332–33, 335	Art 78	132
Art 158	334–35	Art 83	132
Art 159(1)	333–34	Art 111(1)	132
Art 159(2)	333–34	Art 152(1)	130
Art 159(3)	334	Art 155	130
Art 164	338	Art 157	130
Art 166	336	Art 153(2)	130
Art 166(1)	336	Art 163	130
Art 166(2)	336	Art 170(1)	132
Art 166(3)	336	Art 197	132
Art 166(4)	337	Art 198	132
Art 167–2(1)	337	General Rules for the	
Art 193–2	341	Application of Laws	50, 472, 478
Art 197(1)	339	Art 3	50
Art 197–2	339	Art 3(1)	478
Art 207(1)	339	Art 3(2)	478
Financial Instruments Sale (renamed		Art 7	479
as Law on Providing of Financial		Art 8(1)	479
Services in 2020)	320	Art 8(2)	479
Fishery	178	Art 8(3)	480
Foreign Exchange and Foreign Trade		Art 11(1)	480
Law	20, 38, 127–28, 312,	Art 11(2)	480
	472–73, 474	Art 12(1)	480
Art 16(1)	474	Art 12(2)	480
Art 16(2)	474	Art 12(3)	480
Art 17	474	Art 13(1)	481
Art 18(1)	474	Art 14	481
Art 20	475	Art 15	481
Art 21(1)	474, 475	Art 18	483
Art 21(2)	474, 475	Art 19	483

Art 22.....	483	Art 31-2.....	429-30
Art 23.....	482	Art 34.....	429-30
Art 24.....	483	Art 35-2.....	430
Art 25.....	483-84	Art 35.....	430
Art 26(1).....	483-84	Art 38.....	430
Art 26(2).....	483-84	Labour Relations in Juridical Person which Perform Administrative Functions.....	406
Art 26(3).....	484	Labour Relations in Public Corporations (Repealed).....	406
Art 26(4).....	484	Labour Standards.....	25, 51, 406-7, 410-12, 414, 417, 419
Art 27.....	484	Art 3.....	413
Art 36.....	484	Art 4.....	414
Art 37.....	484	Art 9.....	411
Art 41.....	484	Art 13.....	410
Art 42.....	484	Art 19(1).....	420
Government Employees.....	112, 452	Art 20(1).....	420
Art 102.....	39	Art 32(1).....	415
Habeas Corpus.....	109-10	Art 32-2.....	415
Hypothec of Factories... ..	120, 178, 186, 187	Art 35(1).....	415
Hypothec over Automobiles.....	187	Art 36.....	415-16
Immigration Control and the Recognition of Refugees.....	469, 471	Art 39.....	416
Art 5.....	470	Art 56(1).....	416
Immigration Control of Those Who Lost Japanese Nationality by the San Francisco Peace Treaty (Law No. 71, 1991).....	470	Art 65(1).....	416-17
Art 22(2).....	470	Art 65(2).....	416-17
Impeachment of Judges.....	77	Art 90(1).....	412
Inheritance Law.....	117, 135	Art 92.....	412
Insurance Business.....	318-19, 320	Art 93.....	412
Intellectual Property, Basic Law on... ..	387	Large Retail Stores (Repealed).....	46
Intermediate Juridical Persons (Repealed).....	130	Layout of Semi-conductor Circuits.....	396
Investment Services.....	315	Lease of Land and Houses.....	17, 120, 181, 184-85
Investor Advisory Business.....	316	Art 5(1).....	181, 185
Job Stability.....	406-7	Art 6.....	181, 185
Judicial Scriveners.....	83	Art 10(1).....	185
Jury Trial (repealed).....	62-63	Art 22.....	185
Juveniles.....	61	Art 28.....	185
Labour Conciliation.....	430	Art 31(1).....	185
Labour Contracts... ..	22-23, 25, 42, 407, 418	Art 38(1).....	185
Art 9.....	413	Libel Act (Repealed).....	12
Art 10.....	413	Limitation of Interest Rates.....	42, 151
Art 14.....	423	Limited Liability Companies (Repealed).....	227
Art 16.....	420	Limited Liability Partnerships.....	234
Labour Relations Adjustment.....	406, 429	Local Self-Administration.....	48-49
Art 6.....	429	Maintenance of Public Security (Repealed).....	17-18, 90, 405
Art 10.....	429	Measures for Employment.....	406, 408
Art 12.....	429	Minimum Wages.....	415
Art 13.....	429	Art 5(2).....	415
Art 17.....	429	Art 24(1).....	415
Art 18.....	429		
Art 29.....	429-30		

Mining	178, 472	Art 79	390
Art 17	472	Art 100(1)	394
National General Mobilisation		Art 100(2)	394
(Repealed)	347	Art 101(2)	394
Nationality	33, 53–54, 105, 467	Art 102(1)	394–95
Art 2	467	Art 102(2)	394–95
Art 3(1)	467	Art 103	394–95
Art 5(1)	468	Art 105–4	388, 446
Art 7	468	Art 105–7	446
Art 8	468	Art 106	395
Art 12	469	Art 121(1)	392–93
Art 14(1)	468–69	Art 123	393
Art 14(2)	468–69	Art 125	392–93
Art 17	469	Art 126(1)	391
Ordinance on Public Meetings		Art 139	392
(Repealed)	12	Art 184–3(1)	391
Organ Transplant	457–58	Art 196	395
Organisation of State Administration ...	38	Art 201	395
Part–Time Work	412	Pharmaceutical Business	32, 111
Patent Law	25, 388–89, 397, 400, 446	Postal Law	33
Art 2(1)	389	Prevention of Capital Flight	
Art 2(3)	394	(Repealed)	472–73
Art 2(3)(1)	397	Prevention of Delay in Payment for	
Art 8(1)	391	Subcontracted Work	370
Art 25	390	Prevention of Transfer of Proceeds	
Art 29	389	from Crimes	450
Art 29(1)	389	Prevention of Subversion	97–98
Art 29(2)	389–90	Art 7	97–98
Art 30(1)	389	Private Schools	129
Art 32	390	Proceedings on Personal Status	61, 220–21
Art 35(1)	393	Art 20	220–21
Art 35(4)	393	Art 22(1)	220–21
Art 35(5)	394	Art 24	220–21
Art 35(7)	394	Product Liability	120, 192
Art 36–2	391	Promotion of the Justice System Reform	
Art 36(2)	391	22, 54, 64, 65, 67, 68
Art 36(4)	391	Art 2	54
Art 36(6)	391	Promotion of the Use of Out of Court	
Art 37	391	Dispute Resolution (ADR)	67
Art 39	389	Protection of Buildings	120, 184–85
Art 39(1)	390	Art 1	185
Art 43(1)	391	Protection of Computer Information	
Art 43(2)	391	on Individuals	102
Art 48	392	Protection of Information on	
Art 48–2	392	Individuals held by Administrative	
Art 48–3(4)	392	Agencies	103
Art 49	392	Protection of Specific Secrets	103
Art 64(1)	392	Providing of Financial Services (Sale of	
Art 64(2)	392	Financial Instruments renamed) ...	320
Art 65(1)	392	Public Election	32, 57
Art 66(1)	392	Public Prosecutor's Office	53, 78, 79
Art 67(1)	390	Art 15	79

Art 18.....	79	Special Measures on the Handling of Legal Business by Foreign Attorneys.....	69, 84, 85
Art 19.....	79	Art 5-3.....	85
Art 25.....	79	Art 10.....	84-85
Arts 56-71.....	80	Special Rules to the Civil Code concerning Electronic Consumer Contracts and Electronic Specific Joint Businesses on Real Estate. . .	320
Public Security and Police Law (Repealed).....	17, 405	Statute on Judicial Matters (repealed).....	52
Publication Ordinance (Repealed).....	14	Succession of Employment Contracts in Splitting of Companies.....	289
Punishing Organised Crimes and Regulation of Proceeds from Crimes.....	458-59	Art 2(1).....	289
Punishment of Pollution Offences against Human Health.....	458	Art 3.....	289
Art 2.....	458	Art 5(1).....	289
Art 3.....	458	Suretyship for Employment.....	157
Real Property.....	179	Tax Attorneys.....	82
Recognition and Assistance for Foreign Insolvency Proceedings.....	303, 309	Trademark.....	25, 388, 400
Art 2(2).....	310	Art 2(1).....	401
Art 4.....	309	Art 4.....	401
Art 5(1).....	309	Art 4(1)(10).....	401
Art 21.....	309	Art 4(1)(11).....	401
Art 32(1).....	310	Art 4(1)(16).....	401
Art 57(1).....	310	Art 18(3).....	401
Referendum for the Constitutional Amendments.....	27	Art 19(1).....	401
Registration of Immovables.....	120, 179	Arts 36-38.....	401
Art 4.....	179	Arts 78-82.....	401
Regulating the Commodity Investment Business.....	324	Trade Union.....	25, 199, 405-6, 424, 427, 430
Regulations on Newspapers (Repealed).....	12	Art 1(2).....	409, 427, 454
Religious Organisations.....	129	Art 2.....	424
Rights of Foreigners on Land.....	127-28	Art 5(1).....	424
Road Traffic.....	50, 110	Art 7.....	429, 430
Sale by Instalments.....	160	Art 7(1).....	408
Secured Bond Trusts.....	292	Art 7(2).....	408-9, 424-25
Securities and Exchange (replaced by Financial Instruments and Exchange Law).....	19, 21, 22-23, 297, 312, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318-19, 321, 328-29, 331-32, 338, 340, 342, 345	Art 8.....	199, 409, 427
Securities Investment Trust.....	324	Art 15(1).....	426
Securitisation of Assets through Special Purpose Companies.....	324	Art 16.....	411, 426
Security over Enterprises.....	186, 187, 292	Art 17.....	427
Seeds and Plants.....	388, 404	Art 19.....	429
Self Defence Force.....	457	Art 19(2).....	429
Special Measures against Terrorism.....	27	Art 20.....	429
Special Measures on the Audit of Large Companies Limited by Shares.....	228, 232	Art 27.....	425, 430
		Trees.....	177
		Trust Law.....	121, 130-31
		Trust Business.....	130-31, 324
		Unfair Competition, against.....	370, 388, 400, 402, 403, 434-35, 446, 452, 458
		Art 1(1).....	402
		Art 2(4).....	402

Art 2(4)	402	Unjust Premiums, Advertisements	
Art 2(6)	402	and Labelling	370
Art 2(7)	403	Utility Models	388–89, 403
Art 2(8)	403	Art 1	403
Art 3	403	Water Pollution Controls	
Art 4	403	Art 3(1)	38
Art 7	403	Art 48(1)	38
Art 21	403	Welfare of Working Women	414
Art 22(1)	403	Art 5	415
Art 92	446	Art 6	415
Unit Trusts and Investment		Art 11(1)	415
Corporations	324	Workers Dispatch	406–7

Introduction

1. Japanese Law Viewed from Abroad

The study of comparative law has attracted academics in Europe and the United States since the last century. In 1869, the *Société de Legislation Comparée* was founded in France. Legal systems outside the Common Law and Civil Law system were not entirely ignored. An article by T. Gorai on the influence of Code civil on Japanese law was published in a book commemorating the centenary of the French Code civil in 1904.¹

J. E. de Becker published a ‘commentary’ on the Japanese Commercial Code in 1913.²

In 1950, two books on comparative law were published in France. In the *Traité de droit comparé* by P. Arminjon, B. Nolde, and M. Wolf, the influence of German law on Japan was emphasised and Japanese law was characterised as German law in the Far East.³ This is primarily because the draft German Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch (hereinafter ‘BGB’) served as the basis for the Japanese Civil Code.

The view that Japanese law is part of the Romano-Germanic family had already been stressed in the early twentieth century by N. Hozumi, who was a Professor of Civil Law at the University of Tokyo. Referring to the Civil Code, he pointed out that Japanese law had shifted from the family of Chinese law to the family of Roman law: ‘... the new Japanese Civil Code stands in a filial relation to the European systems, and with the introduction of Western Civilization, the Japanese civil law passed from the Chinese Family to the European Family of law.’⁴

René David later elaborated on this topic in the *Major Legal Systems in the World Today*.⁵ Here, the connection of Japanese law with the Romano-Germanic family of legal systems is acknowledged, but with some reservation:

¹ T. Gorai, ‘Influence du Code Civil français sur le Japon’, in la Société d’études législatives ed., *Le Code Civil: Livre du Centenaire* (Paris, 1904), pp. 783–784.

² J. E. de Becker, *Commentary on the Commercial Code of Japan* (Yokohama, 1913).

³ P. Arminjon, B. Nolde, and M. Wolff, *Traité de droit comparé* (Paris, 1950), Tome II, pp. 427–428. R. David, *Traité centenaire de droit civil comparée* (Paris, 1950), pp. 388–399.

⁴ N. Hozumi, *Lectures on the New Japanese Civil Code as Materials for the Study of Comparative Jurisprudence* (Tokyo, 1904), p. 19.

⁵ R. David and J. E. C. Brierley, *Major Legal Systems in the World Today* (London, 1968), pp. 20, 450–460.

The reception of Western ideas and institutions, decreed by their rulers, has not wholly eliminated those traditional ideas which were considered as morality and the social order. For a long time yet modern law may very well remain a mere 'veneer', behind which the traditional ways of acting, thinking and living will be perpetuated.⁶

This pattern of thought was followed in the work by K. Zweigert and H. Kötz. In their view, positive law imported from foreign countries had not fully taken root in Japan. Instead of recourse to the courts, people resort to informal procedures of dispute settlement, characteristic of Confucianism which discourages the settlement of conflicts in public.⁷

In the second edition of Zweigert and Kötz's book, the tone has slightly changed:

... it is clear that until well into the twentieth century these imported statutes had very little practical effect on Japanese legal life. ... But it would be wrong to over-emphasise the Japanese preference for resolving disputes uncontentionally. Many people familiar with Japan believe it to be a myth that the Japanese are reluctant to litigate.⁸

In the third edition, there is a reference to the way 'the Japanese tenaciously cling to their old practices despite all changes in the circumstances of life'. The book proceeds to present some 'examples' of disputes being resolved by 'internal procedures', which seem to be rather exaggerated.⁹ Presumably these authors based their views on the work of Professors T. Kawashima and Y. Noda. In an article published in 1963, Professor Kawashima pointed out as follows:

Traditionally, the Japanese people prefer extrajudicial, informal means of settling a controversy. Litigation presupposes and admits the existence of disputes and leads to a decision which makes clear who is right or wrong in accordance with standards that are independent of the will of the disputants. ... There is a strong expectation that a dispute should not and will not arise; even when one does occur, it is to be solved by mutual understanding. ... Because of the resulting disorganisation of traditional social groups, resort to litigation has been condemned as morally wrong, subversive and rebellious.¹⁰

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ K. Zweigert and H. Kötz, *Einführung in die Rechtsvergleichung auf dem Gebiet des Privatrechts*, erste Auflage, Bd. 1, (Tübingen, 1971), S. 431–434. Translated into English by T. Weir, *An Introduction to Comparative Law*, vol. 1, (Oxford, 1977), pp. 362–365.

⁸ Zweigert and Kötz, *ibid.*, zweite Auflage (Tübingen, 1984), S. 416–419. Weir, *ibid.*, (Oxford, 1988), pp. 370–372.

⁹ Zweigert and Kötz, *ibid.*, dritte Auflage (Tübingen, 1996), S. 294–296. Weir, *ibid.*, (Oxford, 1998), pp. 300–302.

¹⁰ T. Kawashima, 'Dispute resolution in Contemporary Japan', in A. von Mehren, (ed.), *Law in Japan* (Ann Arbor, 1963), pp. 43–45.

Professor Noda went even further in his book, *Introduction to Japanese Law*:

Japanese generally conceive of law as an instrument of constraint that the State uses when it wishes to impose its will. Law is thus synonymous with pain or penalty. To an honourable Japanese the law is something that is undesirable, even detestable, something to keep as far away as possible. To never use the law, or be involved with the law, is the normal hope of honourable people. To take someone to court to guarantee the protection of one's own interests, or to be mentioned in court, even in a civil matter, is a shameful thing; and the idea of shame... will be the keystone to the system of Japanese civilisation.¹¹

Whether this notion of the 'non-litigiousness of the Japanese' is a myth or not was a focus of contention for some years. Serious doubts have been raised about the validity of this notion.¹²

There was a view that the small number of lawyers compared to other jurisdictions was a demonstration of the limited role of the formal system of dispute settlement in Japan. However, as the present author has contended in the past, a simple comparison of the number of practising attorneys in other countries can be misleading since the scope of work covered by practising attorneys varies from country to country. Although the number of attorneys per 1,000 inhabitants in Japan is much smaller than that in any other jurisdiction, as a recent survey by the Japan Federation of Bar Associations demonstrates, if the number of 'neighbouring professions' such as tax attorneys and patent attorneys are added, the number is not that different from other countries (see Figure 4.1, Chapter 4).¹³

According to a survey of users of the civil procedure, 0 per cent of respondents replied that the reasons for their hesitation to go to court are simply 'time and cost'. In a later survey, 53.3% of the respondents felt no reluctance to contest the case in court.¹⁴

David's view on Japanese law, largely shared by Zweigert and Kötz, regardless of its inappropriateness, deserves attention since it seems to represent a notion common to foreign observers. His view is essentially that due to the persistence of traditional morals and values, the 'imported' modern legal systems did not fully succeed in taking root in Japanese society. Therefore, 'the question is still very much open whether behind this facade of westernization, Japan really has undergone any kind of significant transformation and whether it has accepted the idea of justice and law as understood in the West'.¹⁵

¹¹ Y. Noda, *Introduction to Japanese Law* (Tokyo, 1976), pp. 159–160.

¹² J. O. Haley, 'The Myth of the Reluctant Litigant', *Journal of Japanese Law*, vol. 4 (1978), pp. 576–578.

¹³ https://www.nichibenren.or.jp/library/pdf/document/statistics/2019/1-3-7_2019.pdf.

¹⁴ *Minji-soshō riyōsha chōsa (Survey of the Users of Civil Procedure)*, 2006. Society for the Study of the Civil Procedural System ed., *Report on Japan's 2011 Civil Litigation Survey*, Tokyo 2014, pp.64–65.

¹⁵ David and Brierley, *supra*, p. 456.

It is natural in a way to imagine friction arising between imported foreign laws on one hand and traditional morals and values on the other. However, in Japan, in the period of modernisation, foreign law was imported and accepted fairly smoothly without any significant resistance. The gap between modern codes based upon foreign law and social reality in Japan has not been as wide as is believed by foreign observers (see Chapter 1).

In every legal system, there is a discrepancy between the law in books and the law in action. This applies to Japanese law as well, but the assumption that this gap is wider in Japan than in other countries simply because foreign law was introduced to a 'traditional' society cannot be substantiated.

The reception of foreign law in Japan took place without any substantial resistance. Although modernisation began in response to both pressure from foreign countries to open up and the desire of Japan to renegotiate unequal treaties, the need for modernisation itself was never doubted. The government's slogan of emulating and surpassing Western powers was shared by most political leaders and largely supported by ordinary people. Therefore, psychological barriers to the reception of foreign law were minimised, making the implementation of laws modelled on foreign laws easier than in countries where foreign law was imposed from above by colonial rulers. In the absence of commitment to a specific country, the Japanese legislature seldom carbon-copied foreign legislation in its entirety without considering its adaptability to Japanese society. At the very beginning of the modernisation there were attempts to translate French Codes and implement them directly, but these attempts were quickly abandoned, and a more prudent approach prevailed.

The reception of foreign law in Japan was selective, i.e. it was introduced only insofar as it met specific social demands at the time. It is often pointed out, for instance, that the present Civil Code is primarily influenced by German law, yet it is neither a replica of the draft German BGB nor even primarily influenced by the German Code. In fact, in the process of preparation, French law, German law, and English law were all studied, and the Code incorporated the parts considered to be most suitable, regardless of the source. One of the authors of the Code later stated that legislative materials were collected from all over the civilised world and that the Code was 'a fruit of comparative jurisprudence'.¹⁶

The legislature in the period of modernisation did not fail to take into account the existing customs and conventions in Japan, especially commercial practice. Naturally, some traditional customs and conventions needed to be abandoned for the sake of modernisation, but justifiable practices were preserved under the new regime. In order to meet specific conditions in Japan, foreign law was often

¹⁶ Hozumi, *supra*, pp. 21–22.

modified, sometimes to the extent that its origin became difficult to identify. This careful consideration of social reality existing in Japan minimised the friction between the new laws and established social practice.

Although modern Japanese law has been substantially influenced by foreign law, particularly German and French law, Japan has not taken over foreign legal institutions without considering their adaptability and suitability to Japan. Foreign law was carefully examined in light of the existing social reality of Japan, and only that which met the specific requirements of the day was accepted, often with substantial modification. This cautious approach still did not eliminate the possibility of discrepancy between law and reality. In such cases, it was not uncommon that a different practice which was not always compatible with the law emerged. This can be seen, for instance, in the area of atypical real securities, where a body of case law which was different from the statutory law developed. However, once established, these practices were endorsed by the court, if not by the legislature, and became fully compatible with the law.

In this way, Japan has been fairly successful in assimilating foreign laws and transplanting them on different soil. The gap that initially existed between the 'imported' laws and social reality has been filled in one way or another, and statutory laws are duly implemented and generally enforced. Therefore, an overemphasis on the disparity between law and practice is often misleading and results in 'mystification' of Japanese Law.

It should be added that in the process of the 'regulatory reform' in the past several decades, the above prudent approach seems to have given way to the need for urgent reform. An example is the successive amendments to Japanese company law, which culminated in the enactment of the 2005 Company Law. In this process, some components of the US system were transplanted into Japan, arguably without sufficient infrastructure. This is demonstrated in the takeover law, where various defensive measures were made available without necessary rules to regulate their use.

2. The Role of Courts in Japan—Judicial Activism?

If any uniqueness is to be found in Japanese law, it is not in the approach to dispute settlement but rather the role of courts in shaping the law and interpreting contracts.

There is a marked anti-positivist approach in the interpretation of law by the court in Japan.

When interpreting statutes, the Japanese court naturally places significance on the literal meaning of the statutes, but other factors such as the legislative history and the policy goals are taken into account. In cases where there is no alternative way to achieve an equitable solution, the court may deviate from the wording of

statutory law rather than adhering to the literal interpretation of the statutes. In some cases, the court may rule against an explicit provision of the law.

For instance, in cases involving loans, there is an explicit provision in the statute to the effect that the interest exceeding the limit set by the law which the debtor has paid voluntarily is not subject to reimbursement. When faced with cases involving consumer loans, where debtors had to pay interest above this limit and later claimed reimbursement, the Supreme Court ruled that the excess amount should be regarded as repayment of the principal sum, and if the principal and the statutory interest have been fully repaid, the excess amount should be returned to the debtor.¹⁷ One foreign observer characterised the role of the court in this respect as 'judicial activism'.¹⁸

In the area of labour law, according to the Civil Code, the employer is entitled to terminate an employment contract without a fixed period at any time. The termination takes effect in two weeks. The Labour Standards Law extended this period to one month. However, the doctrine of unfair dismissal has developed by case law. Termination of the contract by the employer is not allowed as an abuse of rights, if a compelling ground does not objectively exist, or if the dismissal is not compatible with socially acceptable standards (see Chapter 16).¹⁹ This doctrine was later reflected, in the newly enacted Labour Contract Law. In family law, although there is no specific restriction in the Code on the person who is entitled to initiate divorce proceedings, the court has long maintained that the spouse who is responsible for the collapse of the marriage is not entitled to initiate the proceedings despite the absence of any statutory basis.

General clauses accommodated in the Civil Code, such as the public order and good morals clause and the provision on good faith and fair dealing often serve as the basis of such an approach.²⁰ Naturally, one may question whether such an approach is compatible with the stability of law. In many areas where general clauses are utilised, a body of case law has been accumulated and a set of criteria is largely available. After all, these general clauses are designed to serve as a channel to reflect the values commonly shared by the public. The fact that judges in Japan are 'career' judges, and that as a result court practice is fairly standardised, may further reduce any concern about legal stability.

It should be added that, in general, legal training in Japan is against positivist thinking like that of the *Pandektenists*. Legal positivism was widely supported in

¹⁷ Judgment of the Supreme Court, 13 November 1968, *Minshū* 22-12-2526. See Hironaka, 'Wagatsuma Minpō-gaku to Minpō no Hanseitei-hō-teki Kaishaku (Prof. Wagatsuma's Theory and Anti-Literary Interpretation of the Civil Code)', *Jurist*, 1996, vol. 1096, pp. 74–83.

¹⁸ A. M. Pardieck, 'Japan and Moneylenders—Activist Courts and Substantive Justice', *Pacific Rim Law and Policy Journal*, 2015, vol. 17, No. 3, p. 532.

¹⁹ K. Sugeno, *Shin Kōyō-Shakai no Hō (New: Law of the Working Society)*, supplementary edition (Tokyo, 2004), pp. 64–66.

²⁰ T. Uchida, *Keiyaku no Jidai: Nihon Shakai to Keiyaku-hō (The Era of Contracts: Japanese Society and the Contract Law)* (Tokyo, 2000), p. 84. See also H. Tanaka, *The Japanese Legal System* (Tokyo, 1974).

the pre-war period in Japan, but even then, there was some opposition to it. The German *Freirechtslehre* in pursuit of *lebendes Recht*, as opposed to positivistic interpretation of law, had a significant influence in Japan before the war. This was reinforced after the war by the introduction of sociology of law from the United States. At present, it is generally accepted that the interpretation of law should not be limited to literal or logical interpretations; teleological and sociological interpretation is equally important.

Presumably influenced by the American jurisprudence of realism, there is an influential view which generally acknowledges that judges make value judgments in resolving specific cases. Judges identify the interests involved in the dispute and make a decision as to which interest should be protected more than others by weighing conflicting interests. In this process various factors are considered, including the intention of the legislature, and the intended goal of the statute. It is understood that the final decision of choosing the most appropriate alternative is a value judgment on the part of the judge, who substantiates or rationalises the conclusion by applying a suitable norm for the purpose.²¹

Whether this view reflects the true state of affairs may be arguable, but Japanese judges certainly seem to adopt a more liberal and flexible attitude in statutory interpretation than their counterparts in the Anglo-American jurisdictions.

Another unique characteristic of Japanese law is the way courts interpret contracts. In English law, contracts are to be interpreted in accordance with the 'ordinary grammatical meaning of the words' used in the contract.²² In interpreting a term of a contract, 'the word or a syntax should not be amended in order to protect one of the parties from having entered a bad bargain.'²³ As a general rule, pre-contractual negotiations are not permissible as evidence when interpreting contracts (Parol Evidence Rule).

This approach is in stark contrast to Japanese law. Courts in Japan take into consideration various factors and circumstances including the negotiation preceding the conclusion of the contract. In normal cases, naturally, literal interpretation would suffice in order to establish the intention of the parties, but in cases where there is a gap in the contract, the courts may fill the gap by surmising the intention of the parties (supplementary interpretation). If and when the contract leads to an unfair or inequitable outcome, courts may rectify the contract (revisional interpretation) on the basis of the doctrine of good faith and fair dealing, or public policy (see Chapter 6). While in English law, courts are not allowed to rewrite the contract for the parties, in Japan, depending on the circumstances, this is possible.

²¹ E. Hoshino, 'Minpō niokeru Rieki Kōryō-ron Minpō Ronshū, (*Treatise on Civil Law*)', vol. 8 (Tokyo, 1996), pp. 203–213.

²² *Lowell & Christmas Its v. Wall-Cozens Hardy* (1911) 104 LT 85, 162, 168.

²³ A. Burrows et al., *A Restatement of the English Law of Contract* (Oxford, 2016), pp. 84–85.

PART I

THE BASIS OF THE SYSTEM

The History of Modern Japanese Law

1. The Period of Modernisation

Foreign law was received into Japan in three different stages. The first stage was in the seventh and eighth centuries, when Japan imported the Chinese political and legal system.

The second stage occurred between the overthrow of the Tokugawa shogunate in the mid-nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, when the industrialisation of the country was accomplished. In this period of modernisation, European law—namely the French and German codes—was imported into Japan and served as a model for the major Japanese codes.

The third stage began after the Second World War and continued during the period of the allied occupation. During this stage, some laws were amended or replaced on the basis of US law. Nevertheless, the strong influence of the Civil Law system remains today. The second and third stages are of particular significance, since these two stages have direct bearing on contemporary Japanese law.

The modernisation process in Japan started with the fall of the Tokugawa shogunate, which ruled the country for two and a half centuries.¹ In 1867 the Emperor declared that imperial rule should be restored. A new government was first formed on the model of the archaic *dajōkan* system, which dates back to the eighth century.

When major reforms took place after the fall of the Tokugawa shogunate, the existing social and economic system in Japan was fairly well developed and certainly ready for another stage of development. A money-based economy had developed to such an extent that large mercantile and money-lending capital enjoyed dominant power in the economy. This enabled the introduction of the modern banking system under the new government. Despite lacking the modern concept of land ownership, some rights of land-holding had developed before the modernisation, and land was traded extensively under the Tokugawa shōguns' rule. This made it possible to introduce a modern system of land ownership smoothly.²

Despite their initial chauvinism, the ruling elites quickly realised that the knowledge of foreign civilisations and use of the advanced technology that had developed

¹ For the history of Japanese law in English, see R. Ishii, *A History of Political Institutions in Japan* (Tokyo, 1980). For the history after 1868, see W. Röhl (ed.), *History of Law in Japan since 1868* (Leiden, 2005).

² In general, see C. Nakane et al. (eds), *Tokugawa Japan: The Social and Economic Antecedents of Modern Japan* (Tokyo, 1990).

in the West were indispensable to the modernisation of Japan. Modernisation was considered to be an urgent task if Japan was not to be colonised like many other Asian countries. Therefore, after a brief return to the ancient *dajōkan* system, the new government turned to European countries for a model.

While in the Charter of Oath of the new regime in 1868, the emperor had proclaimed that public opinion should be consulted, this had merely meant that territorial lords should be consulted in decision-making. However, inspired by the parliamentary systems in Europe and strengthened by disillusionment and discontent with the autocratic system of the new government, a movement to establish a publicly elected parliament gained wide support in the 1870s. Different trends were discernible in this movement—the Popular Rights Movement (*jiyū-minken-undō*). Inspired by John Locke, John Stuart Mill, Jean Jacques Rousseau, and Jeremy Bentham, a charter of one of the earlier organisations declared that all Japanese were equally endowed with rights to life, liberty, property, livelihood, and the pursuit of happiness—rights that ‘no man can take away.’³ The movement had wide support; at one stage, 303 societies emerged in the provinces around Tokyo, at least 120 in the north-eastern region, and approximately 200 in western and south-western Japan.⁴ This eventually led to the emperor’s proclamation in 1881 that a national diet (parliament) would be established and a constitutional monarchy created by 1890.

In the meantime, the government became more autocratic in the early 1880s. Already in the mid-1870s, the government had enacted the Libel Act and the Regulations on Newspapers in order to limit the freedom of speech, attempting to keep dissatisfied people under control. A major rebellion by former *samurais* in Satsuma in 1877 certainly influenced the course of events. It was, in a way, impossible to implement unpopular economic measures and at the same time to grant political freedom to the people.⁵ The Ordinance on Public Meetings, which significantly restricted such meetings, was enacted in 1880. Further restrictions on public meetings were introduced in 1890, coinciding with the opening of the Imperial Diet.

After the Emperor’s proclamation of the intention to introduce constitutional democracy in 1881, the popular rights movement more or less lost its momentum. Moderate factions developed into political parties, while some factions ended up in outright rebellion caused by the serious economic difficulties experienced by people in rural areas. Such rebellions were quickly suppressed by the government.⁶

³ M. B. Jansen (ed.), *The Emergence of Meiji Japan* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 241.

⁴ Ibid. p. 243. See also D. Irokawa, *Kindai Kokka no Shuppatsu* (*The Emergence of the Modern State*), revised edition (Tokyo, 2006), pp. 126–159.

⁵ J. Banno, *Taikei Nihon no Rekishi* (*Compendium of the Japanese History*), vol. 13 (Tokyo, 1996), pp. 78–79.

⁶ K. Nakamura, *The Formation of Modern Japan: As Viewed from Legal History* (Tokyo, 1962), pp. 48–56.

In 1889, preceding the opening of the Imperial Diet, the first Constitution of Japan was 'granted' to the subjects by the Emperor. The enactment of a constitution was a development related to the establishment of the Imperial Diet. Already in the 1840s the Dutch Constitution had been translated into Japanese, followed by a translation of the French Constitution in 1873. Some Japanese therefore had a vague idea about the role of a constitution. The senate had drafted a constitution commissioned by the emperor in 1876, but this was considered to be unsuitable for Japan and was abandoned. It was the intention of the government to proclaim the divine origin of the imperial family and the sovereignty of the emperor, but the draft had been unsatisfactory from this point of view.

When the Popular Rights Movement was at its height, various private drafts of the constitution, primarily of a British parliamentary type, appeared. However, Tomomi Iwakura, who was a councillor at that time, considered it more appropriate to enact the constitution on the initiative of the emperor, rather than the people. In 1882, Hirobumi Itoh, later to become the first prime minister, was sent to Europe to study the constitutions of European countries. Germany was chosen as the primary place of research. Itoh consulted Friedrich Julius Stahl in Berlin and Rudolf von Gneist in Vienna, both of whom represented the conservatives among German and Austrian scholars. Germany was intentionally selected as a model, because it had just been unified and its situation was considered to resemble Japan's. In Germany, the Kaiser apparently had strong power and authority, while the British and French constitutions were regarded as being too liberal and democratic.

In contrast to the private drafts prepared by the supporters of the Popular Rights Movement, the government promoted an emperor-centred, semi-religious political system. Thus, Eifu Motoda's draft constitution provided for the divine character of the imperial family, as well as its perpetuity as the sovereign of Japan. It was a clear proclamation of emperor-centred absolutism.

Itoh prepared a draft constitution with the assistance of a German adviser, Hermann Roesler, after his return from Europe. Roesler defended a constitutional system based upon the Prussian Constitution of 1850, but without even the limited democratic institutions which had been imported into Prussia from England via France and Belgium. The Japanese members who participated in the drafting process went even further. One point of disagreement was the status of the emperor. Roesler refused to give the emperor a religious status, at least in the Constitution, while the Japanese side intended to provide for the eternity of the emperor's rule. Roesler defended universal suffrage for the lower house, which was naturally turned down.⁷

⁷ The history of this constitution is given in T. Fukase, 'Meiji kenpō Seitei o meguru Hō-shisō (Legal Thoughts Concerning the Enactment of the Meiji Constitution)', in Y. Noda and J. Aomi (eds), *Gendai Nihon Hō-Shisōshi (History of Modern Japanese Legal Thoughts)* (Tokyo, 1979), pp. 164–214.

There was a firm belief on the part of the Japanese participants that the power of the emperor should be left as free as possible from any control exercisable by the Diet. The imperial family was to be left outside the realm of the Constitution. To this end, rules concerning the succession of the emperor and other matters regarding the imperial household were left outside the Constitution, and a separate law on the Imperial household (*kōshitu tenpan*) was adopted. This law was not even promulgated, ostensibly because it was a private act of the imperial household.

The draft constitution was discussed at the privy council, rather than in the senate. People were not informed of its contents until the day of promulgation. The Constitution began by proclaiming the sanctity and inviolability of the emperor and the perpetuity of his rule. Accordingly, the legend that an ancestor of the emperor had founded the nation around two-and-a-half millennia ago, which has no historical basis, gained official endorsement. The emperor was the sovereign who ruled the country in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. However, a wide range of matters was left to the prerogative of the emperor. The Diet was there merely to assist and support the emperor. Laws were enacted by the Diet but needed imperial approval. The Emperor also had broad power to issue imperial edicts. It should be added that only 1.1 per cent of the populace even had a vote in this Diet with only limited power.

Cabinet ministers were appointed by the emperor, while the Diet had no say in the selection. Ministers were responsible to the Emperor, not to the Diet. Later it became constitutional practice that the power of the emperor as the supreme commander of the armed forces remained outside the control of the Diet and the cabinet.

The Constitution had a limited list of the 'rights and duties of subjects'. These included freedom of residence, rights not to be arrested and detained without a legal basis, freedom of correspondence, freedom of religion, and freedom of association and expression. These rights and freedoms were guaranteed only within the framework of statutory laws, i.e. the legislature was free to enact laws that restricted those rights and freedoms. Indeed, the Publication Ordinance, which was enacted in 1893, accommodated a system of strict censorship. Freedom of association was also severely restricted by later legislation. Freedom of religion presupposed the supremacy of Shintoism.

Supporters of emperor-centred nationalism were not fully satisfied with still relatively secular nature of the Constitution. They favoured an even more religious and ethical constitution. In order to appease them, the imperial rescript of education was promulgated by the emperor before the enactment of the Constitution. The Rescript was a mixture of archaic Confucianism and Shintoism targeted against western civilisation. It proclaimed that loyalty to the emperor, the Confucian obligation of filial piety and obedience were the essence and virtue of the nation. Subjects were to offer themselves courageously to the state—which was

identified with the emperor—should any emergency arise.⁸ This was intended to be the fundamental ethical code of the nation, and indeed served as such until the end of the Second World War.

It should be noted that the combination of Shintoism and the emperor's rule with elements of Confucianism had not always been the norm before the restoration of the emperor's rule in 1867. There is a tradition of syncretism of Shintoism and Buddhism in Japan. In fact, Shintoism and Buddhism were not necessarily strictly demarcated. There were instances where former emperors retired to a Buddhist temple, and some emperors were enthroned in a Buddhist manner. There was a school of thought maintaining that the supreme goddess of Shintoism was a reborn Buddha, and another school of thought reversing this order—Buddha was the reborn goddess. The government formed after the fall of the Tokugawa shogunate adopted a policy of favouring Shintoism in order to strengthen the authority of the emperor. Shintoism, which had largely been a spontaneous religion of the people, emanating from ancestor worship, was thus transformed into a state religion.⁹ The enactment of the Constitution, together with the introduction of the cabinet system and the opening of the imperial diet, marked the consolidation of the new regime. Now the government was in urgent need of a systematised legal system to replace the obsolete feudal law. Laws of the previous period were unsystematic and mostly differed from one domain to another. In order to consolidate the rule of the emperor, a powerful and highly centralised political system was required. Codified law was to play a significant role to support such a system.

There was another reason to develop a modern system of law. The Tokugawa shogunate had no choice but to sign unequal treaties with foreign countries at the end of its reign. These treaties had imposed unfavourable terms on Japan, in particular judicial immunity for foreigners, primarily because the Japanese legal system was thought to be insufficiently developed to be applied to them. Japanese rulers considered it necessary to modernise the legal system in order to convince foreign countries that there was no problem in acknowledging Japanese jurisdiction over foreigners in Japan.

The emperor's government initially looked towards Chinese law for a model. The first criminal code—*shinritsu-kōryō*—of 1870 was primarily based upon the *ritsuryō* codes of the seventh century, as well as the laws of Ming and Ching China. However, the *ritsuryō* and Chinese codes proved to be obsolete and unsuitable for a nation aspiring to achieve equal status with European countries in its economic and military strength. It was only natural that political leaders turned to Europe for a better model.

In fact, despite its long isolationist policy, some European political and legal ideas were already known to the Japanese under the Tokugawa shogunate through

⁸ R. Storry, *A History of Modern Japan*, revised edition (Harmondsworth, 1982), p. 119.

⁹ A. Yoshie, *Shinbutsu-Shūgō (Syncretism of Shintoism and Buddhism)* (Tokyo, 1996), p. 192.

the Dutch. The idea of natural law was imported into Japan from the Netherlands in the early nineteenth century. However, it was French rather than Dutch law which first influenced Japanese law. France was considered to have the most developed codified legal system at the time when the emperor's government started looking for a model in the 1870s. The first Minister of Justice, Shinpei Etoh, was particularly in favour of French law, and had French codes translated into Japanese. Two advisers from France, George Boussquet and Gustave Boissonnade, helped the Japanese to understand the French system. The first Criminal Code, enacted in 1880, was primarily based upon the French Code, though with some influence from the Belgian and Italian codes. The earlier judicial system, including the system of practising attorneys, closely reflected the French system. The first Code of Criminal Instruction, enacted in 1880, was also a replica of the French Code.

This period of French influence did not last long. There was a gradual shift towards German law in the 1880s. The fall of Etoh after a failed rebellion was not the only cause of this shift: it was the difference between the political systems of these countries that really mattered. In light of the Popular Rights Movement, which demanded the introduction of a democratic parliamentary system, the government presumably developed some reservations about the French system. The German monarchy suited Japanese requirements, since the Kaiser was almost free from parliamentary control. Moreover, Germany was in the process of enacting its own codes and therefore had the most recent codified laws. The adoption of the Constitution based on the German system was the final move away from French and towards German law.

First came the Code of Civil Procedure of 1890, which followed the German and Austrian model. The Commercial Code was drafted with the assistance of a German adviser and was promulgated in the same year. However, together with the Civil Code, which was based upon the French *Code Civil*, the Commercial Code was caught in a fierce controversy and it took another decade for the Code to take effect. The German influence was not limited to newly enacted laws. Some earlier laws of French origin were replaced by new laws of German origin. Thus, the Law on Court Organisation of 1890 partly replaced the Code of Criminal Instruction. The Criminal Code was replaced by a new Code in 1907.

The history of the Civil Code is more complicated and is dealt with in a separate chapter below. It is sufficient to mention here that the original Code was prepared by a French adviser, Gustave Boissonnade and was promulgated in 1890, but was abandoned in the face of strong opposition. A new Code, based primarily on the Pandekten system, was finally enacted in 1896–1898.

The enactment of the major codes was completed in the 1890s. In the meantime, legal education had developed rapidly. The Ministry of Justice founded a school of law in 1871. French law was primarily taught there, while in Kaisei School, which dated back to the Tokugawa period, lectures on English law were given. These schools merged and became the Law Faculty of the University of Tokyo. Private