
labour and employment lawflash

31 March 2014

French Constitutional Court Rules on the “Florange” Law

Court upholds some of the law’s requirements but deems provisions on sanctions to be unconstitutional.

The French Constitutional Court rendered an important decision on 27 March regarding the validity of the so-called “Florange” law, which was adopted by the French Parliament on 24 February 2014 in response to ArcelorMittal’s 2013 closure of the Florange blast furnace in northeast France.

The main measure of this law is the requirement that companies employing more than 1,000 employees in France and/or Europe must research a purchaser in the event that the company contemplates closing a profitable site that could potentially lead to a redundancy exercise.

According to the last version of the law adopted by the French Parliament on 24 February, when a company contemplates closing a site in France under the conditions above, it has to, among other things,

1. inform its work council and the labour administration of its intent to close the site no later than the consultation process for the contemplated collective redundancy exercise;
2. inform, by any appropriate means, the potential purchasers of its intent to sell the site;
3. draft a document presenting the site that provides the necessary information to potential buyers;
4. provide access to any necessary information to companies that want to acquire the site (except if this information could be harmful to the company’s interests or jeopardize its continued activity);
5. take into consideration any purchase offers; and
6. provide a motivated response to each of the purchase offers.

The version of the Florange law reviewed by the Constitutional Court also provided that, if the company refused a purchase offer, its works council could file a claim before the Commercial Court, which would determine if

- the company complied with its obligation to research a purchaser;
- the purchase offers submitted to the company were serious offers, in particular, that the offers could guarantee the company’s sustained activity and current employment at the site;
- the company could legitimately justify a reason to refuse a purchase offer, e.g., that the sale of the site could jeopardize the company’s continued activity.

If the Commercial Court found that the company breached one of these obligations, the Commercial Court could order the company to

1. pay a fine corresponding to a maximum of 20 times the monthly minimum wage per position eliminated (i.e., $20 \times \text{€}1,445.38 = \text{€}28,907.60$ per position eliminated); and/or
2. reimburse the public aids received by the company over the last two years regarding help to installation, economic development, or aid for employment.

The Constitutional Court considered the six obligations listed above and deemed them to be compliant with the

French Constitution.

However, the court ruled that the obligation to accept a purchase offer in the absence of a legitimate reason as well as the Commercial Court's jurisdiction to sanction any violation of this obligation were provisions that would unnecessarily affect companies' constitutional rights of property and entrepreneurial freedom.

The Constitutional Court also ruled that sanction 1 was out of proportion in light of the obligation sanctioned. However, sanction 2—applicable if a company fails to research a purchaser—was considered to be compliant with the French constitution.

The provisions of the law that were deemed compliant with the French constitution by the Constitutional Court will be applicable as of the publication of the law, which should take place in the next few days.

Contacts

If you have any questions or would like more information on the issues discussed in this LawFlash, please contact any of the following Morgan Lewis lawyers:

Paris

Sabine Smith-Vidal
Charles Dauthier

+33 1 53 30 44 60
+33 1 53 30 44 74

ssmith-vidal@morganlewis.com
cdauthier@morganlewis.com

About Morgan Lewis's Labour and Employment Practice

Morgan Lewis's Labour and Employment Practice includes more than 275 lawyers and legal professionals and is listed in the highest tier for National Labor and Employment Practice in *Chambers USA 2013*. We represent clients across the United States in a full spectrum of workplace issues, including drafting employment policies and providing guidance with respect to employment-related issues, complex employment litigation, ERISA litigation, wage and hour litigation and compliance, whistleblower claims, labour-management relations, immigration, occupational safety and health matters, and workforce change issues. Our international Labour and Employment Practice serves clients worldwide on the complete range of often complex matters within the employment law subject area, including high-level sophisticated employment litigation, plant closures and executive terminations, managing difficult HR matters in transactions and outsourcings, the full spectrum of contentious and collective matters, workplace investigations, data protection and cross-border compliance, and pensions and benefits.

About Morgan, Lewis & Bockius

Founded in 1873, Morgan Lewis offers more than 1,600 legal professionals—including lawyers, patent agents, benefits advisers, regulatory scientists, and other specialists—in 25 offices across the United States, Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. The firm provides comprehensive litigation, corporate, transactional, regulatory, intellectual property, and labour and employment legal services to clients of all sizes—from globally established industry leaders to just-conceived start-ups. For more information about Morgan Lewis or its practices, please visit us online at www.morganlewis.com.

This LawFlash is provided as a general informational service to clients and friends of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius. It should not be construed as, and does not constitute, legal advice on any specific matter, nor does this message create an attorney-client relationship. These materials may be considered **Attorney Advertising** in some jurisdictions. Please note that the prior results discussed in the material do not guarantee similar outcomes. Links provided from outside sources are subject to expiration or change. © 2014 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius. All Rights Reserved.