secondary value.

A clear-cut example of the foregoing statements is an interviewing made by a group of sociologists for the purpose of determining which reasons push young people to refuse of parenthood. Some of the most indicative answers of the youth will be represented further in this paper. One of the first respondents said that children were a waste of time and money: “Oh, you know, I see how much time my friends are killinfor the benefit of their children, and I also know how much money they spend on children. So I can say that children are waste of resources. I'd rather spend this money on traveling and self-development.” Another informant reported, “The surrounding people do not understand me. They ask me questions such as: “When are you going to have children?” and said that he felt as if everybody were pushing him to become a parent.

As we can see, the demographic situation is related to the values of the youth. Most of the childless people simply decide not to have children. So, the conclusion might be the following: young people aim at career building and self-development and cannot see such things in combination with parenthood Some young people consider children to be a waste of money and time. There are also some individuals who do their best to resist to being pushed to be a parent.

References

1. Isupova O. (2010) *Dobrovolno bezdetnie ili "svobodnye ot detey" [Voluntary childless or "childfree"]*. (in Russian). Available at: http://polit.ru/article/2010/10/15/childfree/

2. Osaulenko O. G. (2004) *Demografichna statistika v Ukrayini: suchasniy stan, problemi ta perspektivi rozvitku [Demographic statistics in Ukraine: the current state of the problem and prospects of development]* – Natsionalna akademiya nauk Ukrayini, Institut demografiyi ta sotsialnih nauk p. 21–27 (in Russian).

3. Polutova M. A. and Janbaz O. O. (2015). *Tsennostnye i motivatsionnye ustanovki obshestva "childfree" s pozitsyi [Value and motivational installation community «childfree» from the viewpoint of]*. Vestnik zabaikalskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, №1, p. 89–100 (in Russian).

4. Vildanova S. M., Granichnaya A. A., Mingalieva A. R. Salyahieva L. M. (2017) *A tendency towards child-free lifestyle in Russia and its influence on the crisis of the institution of family. Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes*.№ 3.p. 192205. DOI: 10.14515/ monitoring. 2017.3.13. 7. Vishnevskyi A. G. and Volkova A. G. (1983) *Vosproizvodstvo naselenya USSR [Reproduction of the population of USSR]* – Finance and statistics (In Russian). Available at: http://demoscope.ru/weekly/knigi/vospr_su/vospr_su.pdf

COMPETENCE OF ENGLISH COURTS IN THE MODERN WORLD

MYKYTA HRYHORCHUK, student
KSENIYA V. NESTERENKO, PhD, Associate Professor, Language Adviser
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Kharkiv

The competence or jurisdiction of the English courts, that is, the range of cases with an international element that the English courts consider themselves

authorized to resolve, is unusually broad compared to other countries. According to the traditional principles of common law, this competence is almost limitless and is limited only by certain procedural nuances associated with the notification of the defendant. However, one should not think that the English court will decide to decide any dispute between the inhabitants of any country at all. The court has great freedom, in its discretion, to accept or reject the consideration of an international dispute. Lawyers from the continent may find this strange, but neither the courts nor the legislators of England have ever considered it necessary to formulate in general the terms the principles on which the jurisdiction of the British courts is based, as done, for example, in the Russian procedural codes. In fact, this means an implicit presumption that any disputes are in the competence of the English court, with those exceptions that are discussed separately. However, most commercial disputes with a foreign element can in principle be the subject of an English court. "Under the rules of common law, any person on the globe can take advantage of the jurisdiction of the English court or fall under its jurisdiction, on the condition that the defendant is duly summoned to court", as formulated in the classic English treatise on private international law. That is, for the court to exercise its jurisdiction, it is necessary to fulfill only one procedural requirement, namely, proper notification of the respondent.

According to the general rule, consecrated by centuries-old precedents, such a proper notice necessary for the exercise by the English court of a "personal" (in personam) jurisdiction over the defendant is the personal delivery of the summons to the respondent, and the delivery must be in England. Thus, the simple fact of the delivery of the notification takes on a decisive, almost magical significance in establishing the jurisdiction of the case to the English court. Further, speaking of the jurisdiction of the English courts, it is important to note the following. In spite of the broadest, formally speaking, competence of the English courts, the range of really taken them to consideration of claims is substantially limited by the ability of the court, at its discretion, to refuse to consider those cases, the consideration of which in England for one reason or another is "inconvenient". "Convenient" place of consideration of disputes in this context means, in fact, the same as "proper", that is, the most appropriate to the interests of justice. When deciding whether to accept a case for consideration by a court, such factors as the location of the participants in the process, witnesses and evidence in the case, applicable to the relations of the parties to the law, etc. are taken into account. Accordingly, if it is a purely Ukranian commercial relationship between two Ukrainian residents or Ukrainian organizations , the English court will for sure find that the English court is an "inconvenient forum" for the consideration of this case.

Thus, in spite of the fact that formally the English courts have almost unlimited competence with respect to commercial disputes (subject to proper notification), in reality the courts, in essence, choose for themselves the cases for consideration. A judge, subject to a number of criteria, but ultimately at his own discretion, determines whether the English court is an "appropriate" and "convenient" place to settle the dispute. If so, the court accepts the claim for

consideration, even if for this it is necessary to give permission to notify the respondent abroad. If not, the court refuses to review the case, even with proper notice. The enforcement of the decision of the English court in the countries of the European Union (EU) does not cause any problems due to the relevant EU legislation.

With many jurisdictions, primarily with current and former members of the Commonwealth of Nations (British), Britain has bilateral agreements on the mutual enforcement of judgments. Accordingly, the execution of the English judgments in these countries also does not cause problems. The list of relevant countries is very big.

There are no bilateral agreements with some countries, but the English judicial decisions can be enforced on the basis of local legislation and the so-called "international comity" (comitas gentium) principle.

Thus, although the English judicial decision can not be recognized in all countries of the world and not under any circumstances, but still the spectrum of countries where such recognition is practically guaranteed is very wide. In particular, it includes all the EU countries, the USA, Canada and most of the offshore zones. The latter is very important in relation to Ukrainian disputes, since a significant part of Ukrainian commercial assets is traditionally registered with offshore companies. Accordingly, the plaintiff in this case has a real opportunity to enforce the judgment of the English court. It should be noted that the decision of the Ukrainian court will certainly be much more difficult to recognize and enforce in the offshore zone.

Drawing conclusions from all of the above, we can say that the main reasons for the trials of foreign billionaires in the English courts is

In any case, the trial will be maximally objectively and will base on the basis of the relevant facts and legal norms. At the same time, no "Ukrainian specificity" (or the specifics of another country) will not become an obstacle for the consideration of the case in accordance with the English legal standards.

References

1. *Ashton N.* From High Court to high street for secret Mr Chelsea as Abramovich speaks at last // MailOnline. 1 November 2011. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/football/article-2055901/Roman-Abramovich-From-High-Court-high-street-secret-Mr-Chelsea.html>.

2. Cheshire J., North P. International private law. M., 1982. P. 76.

3. *Leake Ch.* Battle of the oligarchs... the amazing showdown between Roman Abramovich and his arch rival // Daily Mail. 6 October 2007.

4. Berezovsky v Abramovich. Third witness statement of Roman Arkadievich Abramovich. 30 May 2011.