



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

International Arbitration 2014

11th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into international arbitration work

Published by Global Legal Group, in association with CDR, with contributions from:

Abreu Advogados – Sociedade de Advogados, RL.

Advokatfirman Vinge

Aivar Pilv Law Office

Akerman LLP

Akinci Law Office

Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro

Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

Ashurst

Baker & McKenzie.Habib Al Mulla

Batliner Gasser

Bizlink Lawyers & Consultants

Boss & Young, Attorneys-At-Law

Brödermann Jahn RA GmbH

Camilleri Preziosi

Cárdenas & Cárdenas Abogados Ltda.

Clifford Chance CIS Limited

Costa, Waisberg e Tavares Paes

Sociedade de Advogados

DLA Piper UK LLP

Dr. Colin Ong Legal Services

Ferreira Rocha Advogados

in Partnership with Abreu Advogados

Figueroa, Illanes, Huidobro y Salamanca

Geni & Kebe

Gleiss Lutz

Hajji & Associés

Haley & Co

Homburger

K&L Gates LLP

Kachwaha and Partners

KKG Kubas Kos Gaertner

Kobre & Kim

Law Office “Sysouev, Bondar, Khrapoutski SBH”

Lazareff Le Bars

Lendvai Partners

Linklaters LLP

Loyens & Loeff Luxembourg S.à r.l.

Luke & Associates

Macesic & Partners Law Offices

MARTIAL AKAKPO & Partners LLP

Matheson

Medina & Rizek Abogados

Mortimer Blake LLC

Motieka & Audzevičius

Nunziante Magrone Studio Legale Associato

Olleros Abogados, S.L.P.

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

PUNUKA Attorneys & Solicitors

Sedgwick Chudleigh Ltd.

Sefrioui Law Firm

Shuke Law

Sidley Austin LLP

Van Doorne N.V.

Vasil Kisil & Partners

Weber & Co.

Werksmans Attorneys

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP



GLG

Global Legal Group

Contributing Editors

Steven Finizio, Wendy Miles and Charlie Caher, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

Account Managers

Edmond Atta, Antony Dine, Dror Levy, Maria Lopez, Florjan Osmani, Paul Regan, Gordon Sambrooks, Oliver Smith, Rory Smith

Sales Support Manager

Toni Wyatt

Sub Editors

Nicholas Catlin
Sam Friend
Amy Hirst

Editors

Beatriz Arroyo
Gemma Bridge

Senior Editor

Suzie Levy

Group Consulting Editor

Alan Falach

Group Publisher

Richard Firth

Published by

Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design

F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source

iStockphoto

Printed by

Ashford Colour Press Ltd
July 2014

Copyright © 2014
Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-910083-09-3

ISSN 1741-4970

Strategic Partners



Preface:

- Preface by Gary Born, Chair, International Arbitration and Litigation Groups, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

General Chapters:

1	Recent Developments in the Regulation of Counsel and Professional Conduct in International Arbitration – Charlie Caher & Jonathan Lim, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP	1
2	Corruption as a Defence in International Arbitration: Are There Limits? – Tanya Landon & Diana Kuitkowski, Sidley Austin LLP	9
3	The Toolbox of International Arbitration Institutions: How to Make the Best of It? – Prof. Dr. Eckart Brödermann & Tina Denso, Brödermann Jahn RA GmbH	15

Asia Pacific:

4	Overview Dr. Colin Ong Legal Services: Dr. Colin Ong	20
5	Australia Ashurst Australia: Georgia Quick & Peter Ward	32
6	Brunei Dr. Colin Ong Legal Services: Dr. Colin Ong	43
7	China Boss & Young, Attorneys-At-Law: Dr. Xu Guojian	51
8	Hong Kong Haley & Co: Glenn Haley & Patrick Daley	62
9	India Kachwaha and Partners: Sumeet Kachwaha & Dharmendra Rautray	74
10	Indonesia Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro: Sahat A.M. Siahaan & Ulyarta Naibaho	84
11	Japan Anderson Mori & Tomotsune: Yoshimasa Furuta & Aoi Inoue	94
12	Singapore Ashurst LLP: Ben Giaretta & Rob Palmer	102
13	Vietnam Bizlink Lawyers & Consultants: Do Trong Hai & Tran Duc Son	110

Central and Eastern Europe and CIS:

14	Overview Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP: Kenneth Beale & Franz Schwarz	119
15	Albania Shuke Law: Enyal Shuke & Kleta Paloka	128
16	Austria Weber & Co.: Stefan Weber & Katharina Kitzberger	135
17	Belarus Law Office “Sysouev, Bondar, Khrapoutski SBH”: Timour Sysouev & Alexandre Khrapoutski	143
18	Croatia Macesic & Partners Law Offices: Ivana Manovelo & Mirosljub Macesic	155
19	Estonia Aivar Pilv Law Office: Pirkka-Marja Pöldvere & Ilmar-Erik Aavakivi	162
20	Hungary Lendvai Partners: András Lendvai & Gergely Horváth	170
21	Kyrgyzstan Mortimer Blake LLC: Stephan Wagner & Leyla Gulieva	178
22	Lithuania Motieka & Audzevičius: Ramūnas Audzevičius	186
23	Poland KKG Kubas Kos Gaertner: Rafał Kos & Maciej Durbas	194
24	Russia Clifford Chance CIS Limited: Timur Aitkulov & Julia Popelysheva	202
25	Turkey Akinci Law Office: Ziya Akinci	214
26	Ukraine Vasil Kasil & Partners: Oleksiy Filatov & Pavlo Byelousov	222

Western Europe:

27	Overview Gleiss Lutz: Dr. Stefan Rützel & Dr. Stephan Wilske	232
28	Belgium Linklaters LLP: Joost Verlinden & Olivier van der Haegen	237
29	England & Wales Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP: Wendy Miles & Charlie Caher	246
30	France Lazareff Le Bars: Benoit Le Bars & Raphaël Kaminsky	264
31	Germany DLA Piper UK LLP: Dr. Frank Roth & Dr. Daniel H. Sharma	273
32	Ireland Matheson: Nicola Dunleavy & Gearóid Carey	282
33	Italy Nunziante Magrone Studio Legale Associato: Prof. Dr. Gabriele Crespi Raghizzi	291

Continued Overleaf ➔

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

Western Europe, cont.:

34	Liechtenstein	Batliner Gasser: Dr. Johannes Gasser & MMag. Benedikt König	301
35	Luxembourg	Loyens & Loeff Luxembourg S.à r.l.: Véronique Hoffeld & Antoine Laniez	309
36	Malta	Camilleri Preziosi: Dr Marisa Azzopardi & Dr Kristina Rapa Manché	317
37	Netherlands	Van Doorne N.V.: Jasper Leedekerken & Bas van Zelst	325
38	Portugal	Abreu Advogados – Sociedade de Advogados, R.L.: José Maria Corrêa de Sampaio & Nuno Pimentel Gomes	333
39	Spain	Olleros Abogados, S.L.P.: Iñigo Rodríguez-Sastre & Elena Sevilla Sánchez	345
40	Sweden	Advokatfirman Vinge: Krister Azelius & Lina Bergqvist	353
41	Switzerland	Homburger: Felix Dasser & Balz Gross	361

Latin America:

42	Overview	Akerman LLP: Luis M. O’Naghten & Manuel F. Reyna	371
43	Brazil	Costa, Waisberg e Tavares Paes Sociedade de Advogados: Ivo Waisberg & Vamilson José Costa	381
44	Chile	Figueroa, Illanes, Huidobro y Salamanca: Juan Eduardo Figueroa Valdes & Sergio Huidobro Corbett	388
45	Colombia	Cárdenas & Cárdenas Abogados Ltda.: Alberto Zuleta-Londoño & Silvia Patiño-Rodríguez	396
46	Dominican Republic	Medina & Rizek Abogados: Fabiola Medina Games & Jose Alfredo Rizek	403

Middle East / Africa:

47	Overview – MENA	Baker & McKenzie.Habib Al Mulla: Gordon Blanke & Soraya Corm-Bakhos	411
48	Overview – Sub-Saharan Africa	Werksmans Attorneys: Des Williams	415
49	OHADA	Geni & Kebe: Mouhamed Kebe & Hassane Kone	418
50	Botswana	Luke & Associates: Edward W. F. Luke II & Galaletsang P. Ramokate	425
51	Libya	Sefrioui Law Firm: Kamal Sefrioui	434
52	Morocco	Hajji & Associés: Amin Hajji	442
53	Mozambique	Ferreira Rocha Advogados in Partnership with Abreu Advogados: Rodrigo Ferreira Rocha	449
54	Nigeria	PUNUKA Attorneys & Solicitors: Anthony Idigbe & Omone Tiku	457
55	South Africa	Werksmans Attorneys: Des Williams	473
56	Togo	MARTIAL AKAKPO & Partners LLP: Martial Koffi Akakpo & Dr. Jean Yaovi Dégli	484
57	UAE	Baker & McKenzie.Habib Al Mulla: Gordon Blanke & Soraya Corm-Bakhos	491

North America:

58	Overview	Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP: H. Christopher Boehning & Melissa C. Monteleone	501
59	Bermuda	Sedgwick Chudleigh Ltd.: Mark Chudleigh & Alex Potts	507
60	BVI	Kobre & Kim: Tim Prudhoe & Arielle Goodley	517
61	Cayman Islands	Kobre & Kim: James Corbett QC & Alison Maxwell	527
62	USA	K&L Gates LLP: Peter J. Kalis & Roberta D. Anderson	538

India

Sumeet Kachwaha



Dharmendra Rautray



Kachwaha and Partners

1 Arbitration Agreements

1.1 What, if any, are the legal requirements of an arbitration agreement under the laws of India?

No particular form is required by law. It may be in the form of an arbitration clause in a contract or in the form of a separate agreement. An arbitration agreement need not necessarily use the word “arbitration” or “arbitral tribunal” or “arbitrator”. The agreement however, must be in writing. The arbitration agreement shall be deemed to be in writing if it is contained in an exchange of letters or other means of communication which provide a record of the agreement. Further, the agreement need not be signed and an unsigned agreement affirmed by the parties’ conduct would be valid as an arbitration agreement. An arbitration agreement would also be considered to be in writing if there is an exchange of a statement of claim and defence in which the existence of the agreement is alleged by one party and not denied by the other. [Section 7 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 – (“Act”).]

1.2 What other elements ought to be incorporated in an arbitration agreement?

From an Indian point of view, the most significant element would be the seat of arbitration, for that would determine which part of the Act would apply to the proceedings. Domestic arbitrations are governed by Part I of the Act, while off-shore arbitrations are governed by Part II of the Act. While Part I contains a comprehensive scheme for the conduct of arbitration (based on the Model Law), Part II is essentially confined to enforcement of foreign awards (on the basis of the New York Convention). A long ranging controversy in India has been whether Indian courts can grant interim relief in relation to foreign arbitrations (in the absence of any enabling statutory provisions in Part II). The Supreme Court in a 2002 decision (*Bhatia International v. Bulk Trading* – (2002) 4 SCC 105) held that Indian courts could do so in certain circumstances. However, a larger five-judge Bench in *Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services* – (2012) 9 SCC 552 has recently reversed this (though prospectively, i.e. in relation to agreements entered into after 6.9.2012). The net effect is that, if the seat is offshore, there is no provision under Indian law for recourse to domestic courts for interim relief and also there is no provision for the court’s assistance to summon witnesses or compel production of documents; the provisions in this regard being in Part I of the Act (which as per the aforesaid Supreme Court pronouncement is not applicable to foreign seated arbitrations).

1.3 What has been the approach of the national courts to the enforcement of arbitration agreements?

Section 8 of the Act states that a judicial authority before which an action is brought, in a matter which is the subject matter of an arbitration agreement, shall refer the parties to arbitration – the only condition being that the party objecting to the court proceedings must do so no later than his first statement on the substance of the dispute. In the meantime, the arbitration proceedings may commence and continue, and an award can be rendered. The Supreme Court of India has held in *Rashtriya Ispat Nigam Ltd. v. Verma Transport Co.* – (2006) 7 SCC 275, that once the conditions of the Sections are satisfied, the judicial authority is “statutorily mandated” to refer the matter to arbitration. Section 5 supplements this and provides, through a non-obstante clause, that in matters governed by the Act, no judicial authority shall interfere except where so provided for. Thus, a judicial authority seized of a matter which contains an arbitration agreement must refer the parties to arbitration and it is up to the arbitral tribunal to determine any issue as to its jurisdiction, including objections in relation to the existence or validity of the arbitration agreement. However, this provision (Section 8) applies only to arbitrations where the seat is in India. Agreements for offshore arbitrations are governed by Section 45 of the Act, which is somewhat differently worded. Here it is provided that a judicial authority, when seized of any matter where there is an arbitration agreement, shall refer the parties to arbitration – “*unless it finds that the said agreement is null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed*”. The latter part is borrowed from Article 8 of the Model Law. Thus, India has retained court intervention (to the extent permitted by the Model Law) only in relation to foreign arbitrations. An issue arose in *Shin-Etsu Chemical Co. Ltd. v. Aksh Optifibre Ltd.* – (2005) 7 SCC 234, as to whether a ruling by court (in relation to offshore arbitrations) on the validity or otherwise of an arbitration agreement is to be on a *prima facie* basis or is to be a final decision. If it were to be a final decision, it would involve a full dress trial and consequently years and years of judicial proceedings, which would frustrate the arbitration agreement. Keeping this and the object of the Act in mind, the Supreme Court by a 2:1 decision held that a challenge to the arbitration agreement under Section 45 on the ground that it is “null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed” is to be determined on a *prima facie* basis.

At the same time, an issue would remain as to what is to be done in cases where the court does in fact come to a conclusion that the arbitral agreement is null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed. A decision to this effect is appealable under Section 50 of the Act. Thus, a ruling on a *prima facie* view alone would not be satisfactory. One of the judges addressed this and held

that if the court were to arrive at a *prima facie* conclusion that the agreement is in fact null and void, it would have to go ahead and hold a full trial and enter a final verdict (in order that it can be appealed if need be). In such a situation therefore, a foreign arbitration may well come to a halt pending final decision from an Indian court, but otherwise Section 45 proceedings would not have any significant impeding effect on the progress of a foreign arbitration.

A recent case of seminal importance is *Chloro Controls India Pvt. Ltd. v. Severn Trent Water Purification Inc.* – (2013) 1 SCC 641. Here, the court was faced with a situation where parties to a joint venture had entered into several related agreements – some with different entities from amongst their group. These agreements had diverse dispute resolution clauses: some with ICC arbitration in London; some with no arbitration clause; and one agreement with an AAA arbitration clause with Pennsylvania (USA), as its seat. The Supreme Court strongly came out with a pro-arbitration leaning stating that the legislative intent is in favour of arbitration and the Arbitration Act “would have to be construed liberally to achieve that object”. The Court held that non-signatory parties could be subjected to arbitration provided the transactions were within the group of companies and there was a clear intention of the parties to bind non-signatories as well. It held that subjecting non-signatories to arbitration would be in exceptional cases. This would be examined on the touchstone of direct relation of the non-signatory to the signatories, commonality of the subject matter and whether multiple agreements presented a composite transaction or not. The situation should be so composite that performance of the “mother agreement” would not be feasible without the aid, execution and performance of the supplemental or ancillary agreements.

2 Governing Legislation

2.1 What legislation governs the enforcement of arbitration proceedings in India?

The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 governs the enforcement of arbitration proceedings relating to domestic and international commercial arbitration conducted in India.

2.2 Does the same arbitration law govern both domestic and international arbitration proceedings? If not, how do they differ?

India has a composite piece of legislation governing both domestic and international arbitration. The Act has two main parts. Part I deals with any arbitration (domestic, as well as international), so long as the seat of arbitration is in India. Part II deals mostly with enforcement of foreign awards.

“International commercial arbitration” is defined as an arbitration where at least one of the parties is a national or habitual resident in any country other than India or a body corporate which is incorporated in any country other than India or a company or association of an individual whose “central management and control” is exercised in any country other than India (Section 2 (1) (f) of the Act). However, the Supreme Court of India in *TDM Infrastructure Private Limited v. UE Development India Private Limited* – (2008) (2) Arb LR 439 (SC), has held that if both parties are incorporated in India, then even if the control and management is from outside India, the arbitration would be “domestic” and not “international”. The difference between domestic and international arbitration (conducted in India) is minimal and discussed below.

The first difference is that if there is a failure of the parties’ envisaged mechanism for constitution of the arbitral tribunal, the

appointment shall be made, in the case of a domestic arbitration by the Chief Justice of the High Court and in the case of international arbitration by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India.

The second difference is in relation to governing law. In international commercial arbitration, the arbitral tribunal shall decide the dispute in accordance with the rules of law designated by the parties as applicable to the substance of the dispute and, failing any such designation, the rules of law the tribunal considers appropriate given all the circumstances. In domestic arbitration (arbitration between Indian parties) however, the tribunal can only apply the substantive law for the time being in force in India.

2.3 Is the law governing international arbitration based on the UNCITRAL Model Law? Are there significant differences between the two?

The law governing international arbitration is based faithfully on the UNCITRAL Model law and the UNCITRAL Rules 1976 (amended in 2010, but which has not yet been adopted by the Indian Legislature). There are a couple of departures designed to keep out court intervention. Thus, for instance, Section 8 of the Act departs from the Model Law in as much as it does not permit a court to entertain an objection to the effect that the arbitration agreement is “null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed”. (See also question 1.3 above.)

Section 16 (corresponding Article 16 of the Model Law) also makes a slight departure. Unlike the Model Law, no interim court recourse is permissible if the Tribunal declares that it has jurisdiction. In such case, the challenge is permissible only once the final award is passed. The *Kompetenz Kompetenz* principle of Article 16 suffered a modification at the hands of the Supreme Court in *S.B.P & Co. v. Patel Engineering Ltd.* – (2005) 8 SCC 618, where the court held that when a court is approached for constitution of the Arbitral Tribunal (i.e., where the parties’ envisaged mechanism for the same breaks down), the courts must decide whether there is an arbitration agreement. Further, the court may (at its discretion) decide whether the claim is dead or alive (including if it is time-barred) or whether there has been accord and satisfaction. This, the court held, was a necessary adjunct to its power to make an appointment (of the tribunal when called upon to do so) or otherwise refer the parties to arbitration.

2.4 To what extent are there mandatory rules governing international arbitration proceedings sited in India?

International arbitration proceedings taking place in India are governed by the same set of provisions as domestic arbitrations.

See question 2.2 above.

3 Jurisdiction

3.1 Are there any subject matters that may not be referred to arbitration under the governing law of India? What is the general approach used in determining whether or not a dispute is “arbitrable”?

The Act states that the relationship between the parties need not be contractual. Hence, disputes in tort (relating to the contract) can also be referred to arbitration. “Generally and traditionally all disputes relating to rights *in personam* are considered to be amenable to arbitration; and all disputes relating to rights *in rem* are required to be adjudicated by courts and public tribunals.” *Booz Allen & Hamilton Inc. v. SEBI Home Finance Ltd.* – (2011) 5 SCC

532. Examples of non-arbitrable disputes are: disputes relating to a criminal offence; matrimonial disputes; child custody; guardianship; insolvency; winding up; and testamentary matters. Where serious fraud has been alleged in the past the dispute was considered to be non-arbitrable. However, in a recent Supreme Court landmark decision in *World Sport Group (Mauritius) Ltd. v. MSM Satellite (Singapore) Pte. Ltd.*, pronounced on 24.1.2014, it was held that in the case of arbitrations covered by Section 45 of the Act (foreign seated arbitrations), the Court can decline to make a reference of a dispute covered by the arbitration agreement only if it comes to the conclusion that the arbitration agreement is null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed, and not on the grounds that allegations of fraud or misrepresentation are involved. This decision has watered down the Court's earlier decision in *N. Radhakrishnan v. Maestro Engineers* (2010) 1 SCC 72 where it was held that the court can only enquire about serious allegations of fraud and such cases are not arbitrable. Another (court sanctioned approach) to determine arbitrability is to see whether the parties can make the settlement regarding a subject matter of private contract. (*Olympus Superstructures v. Meena Khetan* – (1999) 5 SCC 651.) The court here relied on Halsbury's Laws of England stating that the differences or disputes which can be referred to arbitration must consist of "...a justiciable issue, triable civilly. A fair test of this is whether the difference can be compromised lawfully by way of accord and satisfaction" (4th Edition, volume 2, para. 503).

3.2 Is an arbitrator permitted to rule on the question of his or her own jurisdiction?

An arbitrator is permitted to rule on his or her own jurisdiction. This is provided for in Section 16 of the Act, which corresponds to Article 16 of the Model Law. (See question 2.3 above.)

3.3 What is the approach of the national courts in India towards a party who commences court proceedings in apparent breach of an arbitration agreement?

See question 1.3 above.

3.4 Under what circumstances can a court address the issue of the jurisdiction and competence of the national arbitral tribunal? What is the standard of review in respect of a tribunal's decision as to its own jurisdiction?

See questions 1.3 and 2.3 above.

Additionally, the issue of jurisdiction can be raised by a party before the court by way of an appeal under Section 37 (2) (a) on a finding of the Arbitral Tribunal refusing jurisdiction. On the other hand, if the Tribunal's finding is that it has jurisdiction, it can only be challenged after the award is rendered.

Indian courts have not yet determined the standard of review in respect of a Tribunal's decision regarding its own jurisdiction. However, it has interpreted its power to review a domestic award very widely. The Supreme Court has held in *ONGC v. Saw Pipes* – (2003) 5 SCC 705, that an award can be challenged if it contravenes the provisions of the Arbitration Act or the substantive law governing the parties or is against the terms of the parties contract. The court also expanded the "public policy" ground and held that an award would be contrary to public policy if it was "patently illegal". Applying this measure, it can be concluded that the court would not be restrained in its review of a tribunal's decision regarding its own jurisdiction.

3.5 Under what, if any, circumstances does the national law of India allow an arbitral tribunal to assume jurisdiction over individuals or entities which are not themselves party to an agreement to arbitrate?

Until recently, it was thought that this was not permitted. Indeed, the Supreme Court of India in *Sukanya Holdings v. Jayesh Pandya* – (2003) 5 SCC 521, refused to stay a court action when some of the parties had an arbitration agreement, on the grounds that the parties to the arbitration agreement and to the court action were not the same. Increasingly, however, the *Sukanya* principle has been diluted. First, Indian courts have held that they would examine if non-parties were actually germane to the dispute (or have unnecessarily been dragged in with clever drafting with a view to evade the arbitration clause). Moreover, in a recent landmark Supreme Court decision, *Chloro Controls India Pvt. Ltd. v. Severn Trent Water Purification Inc.* – (2013) 1 SCC 641, the court has stated the circumstances under which the arbitral tribunal would have jurisdiction over non-signatories to the arbitration agreement. For further details please see the latter part of question 1.3 above.

3.6 What laws or rules prescribe limitation periods for the commencement of arbitrations in India and what is the typical length of such periods? Do the national courts of India consider such rules procedural or substantive, i.e., what choice of law rules govern the application of limitation periods?

The Limitation Act, 1963 applies to arbitrations in the same way as it does to proceedings in court (Section 43 of the Act). For these purposes, arbitration proceedings are deemed to have commenced (unless the parties have agreed otherwise) on the date on which a request for the dispute to be referred to arbitration is received by the respondent (Section 21 of the Act). The Limitation Act provides that the party invoking the arbitration has three years from the date of commencement of arbitration proceedings to seek appointment of Arbitral Tribunal. The courts consider the limitation period as part of the substantive law.

Once time has started to run, no subsequent inability to bring the action stops the time running. However, well-known exemptions apply if:

- In good faith, proceedings are started in a court without jurisdiction.
- The case is based on subsequently discovered fraud or mistake.
- Any document necessary to establish the claimant's right has been fraudulently concealed from him.
- There is written acknowledgment of liability.
- There is a part payment of the debt.

3.7 What is the effect in India of pending insolvency proceedings affecting one or more of the parties to ongoing arbitration proceedings?

The law of insolvency (winding-up) of an incorporated company is contained in the Companies Act, 1956. Section 446 thereof provides that where a winding-up order has been made or a provisional liquidator or an official liquidator has been appointed, no suit or other legal proceeding shall be commenced or shall be proceeded with against the company without leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court may impose. Thus, once a winding-up order is passed or a provisional liquidator is appointed, all legal proceedings against the company have to come to a halt (subject to such orders as may be passed by the winding-up court).

It may be mentioned that besides the winding-up provisions, if a reference is made to the Board for Industrial & Financial Reconstruction (BIFR) under the provisions of Sick Industrial Companies Act, 1985 (SICA), then no award can be executed against the said company without the permission of BIFR. However, there is no stay of legal proceedings and the same can continue and an award rendered but the resultant award cannot be executed against the applicant company. A reference to the BIFR is mandatory where the company's accumulated losses exceed its net worth.

4 Choice of Law Rules

4.1 How is the law applicable to the substance of a dispute determined?

If the parties have Indian nationality (and in the case of companies, if they are incorporated in India), the tribunal can only apply Indian law to the substance of the dispute. In other cases, the parties may either make an express choice of law or the proper law may be inferred from the terms of the contract and surrounding circumstances. It is the law with which the contract is most closely connected. Factors such as the nationality of the parties, the place of performance of the contract, the place of entering into the contract, the place of payment under the contract, etc., can be looked at to ascertain the intention of the parties.

The proper law of the arbitration agreement is normally the same as the proper law of the contract. Where, however, there is no express choice of the law governing the contract as a whole, of the arbitration agreement as such, a presumption may arise that the law of the country where the arbitration is agreed to be held is the proper law of the arbitration agreement. But this is only a rebuttable presumption. (*NTPC v. Singer Co.* – (1992) 3 SCC 551.) See also question 2.2, last paragraph.

4.2 In what circumstances will mandatory laws (of the seat or of another jurisdiction) prevail over the law chosen by the parties?

In respect of procedural matters relating to the arbitration proceedings, the laws of the seat of jurisdiction shall prevail. The court may, invoking the principle of comity of nations, apply the mandatory laws of another jurisdiction if the contract is in breach of that law.

4.3 What choice of law rules governs the formation, validity, and legality of arbitration agreements?

The proper law of arbitration (i.e., the substantive law governing arbitration) determines the formation and legality of arbitration agreements. Please see question 4.1 above.

5 Selection of Arbitral Tribunal

5.1 Are there any limits to the parties' autonomy to select arbitrators?

The law does not impose any limits on the parties' autonomy to select arbitrators. An arbitrator need not have any special qualification or training or be a member of the Bar.

5.2 If the parties' chosen method for selecting arbitrators fails, is there a default procedure?

There is a default provision provided for vide Section 11 of the Act. The default provisions are triggered if:

- The parties cannot agree on the appointment of an arbitrator within 30 days of receipt of a request to do so.
- Two appointed arbitrators fail to agree on the third arbitrator within 30 days of the date of their appointment.
- The arbitration is to be heard by one arbitrator and the parties fail to agree on that arbitrator within 30 days of receipt of a request to agree on the appointment.
- The parties' mechanism for appointment of an arbitrator fails.

If the default is in relation to an international commercial arbitration, the appointment shall be made by the Chief Justice of India. In domestic arbitration, the appointment shall be made by the Chief Justice of the High Court who has jurisdiction in relation to the matter (determined by where the cause of action arises; or the respondent resides or carries on its business).

5.3 Can a court intervene in the selection of arbitrators? If so, how?

The court can intervene only in a default situation (see question 5.2 above).

After the arbitral tribunal is constituted, the jurisdiction of the court can be invoked only if an arbitrator has become *de jure* or *de facto* unable to perform his functions or fails to act without undue delay. If there is any controversy as to these circumstances, a party may apply to the court for a decision on the same.

5.4 What are the requirements (if any) as to arbitrator independence, neutrality and/or impartiality and for disclosure of potential conflicts of interest for arbitrators imposed by law or issued by arbitration institutions within India?

Like Article 12 of the Model Law and Article 10 of the UNCITRAL Rules 1976, the Act also requires the arbitrators (including party appointed arbitrators) to be independent and impartial and make full disclosure in writing of any circumstance likely to give rise to justifiable doubts on the same (Section 12 of the Act).

An arbitrator may be challenged only in two situations. First, if circumstances exist that give rise to justifiable grounds as to his independence or impartiality; second, if he does not possess the qualifications agreed to by the parties.

The Indian courts have held that "the apprehension of bias must be judged from a healthy, reasonable and average point of view and not on mere apprehension of any whimsical person. Vague suspicions of whimsical, capricious and unreasonable people are not our standard to regulate our vision". (*International Airports Authority of India v. K.D Bali* – (1988) 2 SCC 360.)

6 Procedural Rules

6.1 Are there laws or rules governing the procedure of arbitration in India? If so, do those laws or rules apply to all arbitral proceedings sited in India?

The arbitrators are masters of their own procedure and, subject to the parties' agreement, may conduct the proceedings "in the manner it considers appropriate" (Section 19). This power includes "the

power to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of any evidence” (Section 19). The only restraint on them is that they shall treat the parties with equality and each party shall be given a full opportunity to present its case, which includes sufficient advance notice of any hearing or meeting. Neither the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC) nor the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (Evidence Act) applies to arbitrations. Unless the parties agree otherwise, the Tribunal shall decide whether to hold oral hearings for the presentation of evidence or for arguments or whether to conduct the proceedings on the basis of documents or other material alone. However, the arbitral Tribunal shall hold oral hearings if a party so requests (unless the parties have agreed that no oral hearing shall be held).

The arbitrators have the power to proceed *ex parte* where the respondent, without sufficient cause, fails to communicate his statement of defence or appear for an oral hearing or produce evidence. However, such failure shall not be treated as an admission of the allegations and the Tribunal shall determine the matter on evidence, if any, before it. If the claimant fails to communicate his statement of claim, the Tribunal shall be entitled to terminate the proceedings.

6.2 In arbitration proceedings conducted in India, are there any particular procedural steps that are required by law?

See question 6.1 above. The other procedural steps are mostly as envisaged under the Model Law and UNCITRAL Rules 1976.

6.3 Are there any particular rules that govern the conduct of counsel from India in arbitral proceedings sited in India? If so: (i) do those same rules also govern the conduct of counsel from India in arbitral proceedings sited elsewhere; and (ii) do those same rules also govern the conduct of counsel from countries other than India in arbitral proceedings sited in India?

The conduct of Indian registered advocates is governed by the Rules of the Bar Council of India and the Advocates Act, 1961. These also govern the conduct of Indian advocates in arbitral proceedings sited elsewhere. There are no provisions guiding the conduct of foreign counsel in arbitrations sited in India.

6.4 What powers and duties does the national law of India impose upon arbitrators?

Apart from the provisions envisaged under the Act, the arbitrators are bound by the fundamental principles of natural justice and public policy in conducting the arbitration proceedings.

6.5 Are there rules restricting the appearance of lawyers from other jurisdictions in legal matters in India and, if so, is it clear that such restrictions do not apply to arbitration proceedings sited in India?

Foreign lawyers have no right of audience before Indian courts. However, they can appear and represent clients in arbitration proceedings. The position is, however, not crystal clear pending an appeal before the Supreme Court of India challenging this (*Bar Council of India v. A.K. Balaji* – SLP (Civil) No. 17150-54/2012).

6.6 To what extent are there laws or rules in India providing for arbitrator immunity?

There are none.

6.7 Do the national courts have jurisdiction to deal with procedural issues arising during arbitration?

No, the courts have no such jurisdiction. In relation to India-seated arbitrations, parties can, with the approval of the arbitral tribunal or otherwise, seek the court’s assistance in taking evidence. The court may issue summons to witnesses or order that evidence be provided directly to the Arbitral Tribunal (Section 27).

7 Preliminary Relief and Interim Measures

7.1 Is an arbitrator in India permitted to award preliminary or interim relief? If so, what types of relief? Must an arbitrator seek the assistance of a court to do so?

This is provided for vide Section 17 of the Act (corresponding to Article 17 of old Model Law). An Arbitral Tribunal may order interim measures of protection as may be considered necessary in respect of the subject matter of the dispute. The order is appealable and not enforceable without recourse to a separate court proceeding. India has not adopted the 2006 Amendments to the Model Law.

7.2 Is a court entitled to grant preliminary or interim relief in proceedings subject to arbitration? In what circumstances? Can a party’s request to a court for relief have any effect on the jurisdiction of the arbitration tribunal?

Section 9 of the Act enables a party to approach a competent court for any interim relief before or during the arbitral proceedings or even after the award is pronounced, but before it is enforced. The Model Law in fact has a more restrictive provision – it does not contemplate recourse to a court for an interim measure after the award is pronounced (Article 9).

The Supreme Court, in the case of *Sundaram Finance v. NEPC* – (1999) 2 SCC 479, held that if a court is approached before the arbitral proceedings are commenced, the applicant must issue a notice to the opposite party invoking the arbitration clause or, alternatively, the court would have to be first satisfied that the applicant shall indeed take effective steps to commence the arbitral proceedings without delay. Further, the court would have to be satisfied that there exists a valid arbitration agreement between the parties. The court previously had the power to grant interim relief even in proceedings outside India where parties have neither expressly nor impliedly excluded the applicability of Section 9 of the Act (*Bhatia International v. Bulk Trading SA* – (2002) 4 SCC 105). However, following the judgment of the Supreme Court of India in *Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services*, (2012) 9 SCC 552, the courts have reversed *Bhatia* and held that interim relief cannot be granted in relation to foreign seated arbitrations. This provision is independent of the arbitrator’s power to grant interim relief (see question 7.1 above).

7.3 In practice, what is the approach of the national courts to requests for interim relief by parties to arbitration agreements?

Indian courts have very wide powers to grant interim relief. Usually a three-fold approach is followed: (i) existence of a *prima facie* case in favour of the applicant; (ii) irreparable hardship, i.e. that which cannot be compensated in terms of money; and (iii) balance of convenience.

Indian courts are somewhat liberal in granting interim relief and rarely hold an applicant to terms such as security or costs.

7.4 Under what circumstances will a national court of India issue an anti-suit injunction in aid of an arbitration?

Injunctive relief is governed by the provisions of the Specific Relief Act and an interlocutory relief in relation thereto is governed by the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure. Interlocutory relief is granted on the principles highlighted in question 7.3 above. The same principles would apply to an anti-suit injunction. The Indian Supreme Court has held that, with regard to the principles of comity, this power will be exercised sparingly, as such injunction can interfere with the exercise of jurisdiction by another court (*Modi Entertainment Network v. W.S.G. Cricket Pte Ltd* – (2003) 4 SCC 341). In this case, the court also laid down some principles relating to an anti-suit injunction, as follows:

- The court must be satisfied that, if the injunction is declined, the ends of justice will be defeated and injustice will be perpetuated.
- The principle of comity must be borne in mind.
- The court will examine as to which is the appropriate forum (*forum conveniens*) and may grant an anti-suit injunction in relation to proceedings which are oppressive or vexatious or in a *forum non-conveniens*.

7.5 Does the national law allow for the national court and/or arbitral tribunal to order security for costs?

The Arbitral Tribunal can order security for costs (by way of deposit) that it expects to be incurred in relation to the claim or counterclaim (Section 38, Act).

8 Evidentiary Matters

8.1 What rules of evidence (if any) apply to arbitral proceedings in India?

Section 19 of the Act states that the Arbitral Tribunal shall not be bound by the provisions of the Evidence Act. However, decided cases have held that certain provisions of the Evidence Act, which are founded on fundamental principles of justice and fair play, shall apply to arbitrations.

Hence, “fundamental principles of natural justice and public policy” would apply, though the technical rules of evidence contained under the Indian Evidence Act would not apply (*State of Madhya Pradesh v. Satya Pal* – AIR 1970 MP 118).

8.2 Are there limits on the scope of an arbitrator’s authority to order the disclosure of documents and other disclosure (including third party disclosure)?

There are no limits prescribed under the Act on the power of the arbitrator to order disclosure of documents. Section 27 of the Act provides that the arbitral tribunal, or a party with the approval of the arbitral tribunal, may apply to the court for assistance in taking evidence, including any disclosure or discovery. Hence, (unless the parties voluntarily comply) disclosure/discovery can only be ordered through the court and in accordance with the provisions of the CPC.

Indian courts do not encourage wide requests for discovery. Generally, courts would order discovery if satisfied that the same is necessary for a fair disposal of the matter or for saving costs.

8.3 Under what circumstances, if any, is a court able to intervene in matters of disclosure/discovery?

Please see question 8.2 above.

8.4 What, if any, laws, regulations or professional rules apply to the production of written and/or oral witness testimony? For example, must witnesses be sworn in before the tribunal or is cross-examination allowed?

The Indian Oath’s Act, 1969 extends to persons who may be authorised by consent of the parties to receive evidence. Thus, this Act encompasses arbitral proceedings as well. Section 8 of the said Act states that every person giving evidence before any person authorised to administer an oath “shall be bound to state the truth on such subject”. Thus, witnesses appearing before an arbitral tribunal can be duly sworn by the tribunal and be required to state the truth on oath, and, upon failure to do so, commit offences punishable under the Indian Penal Code. Witnesses are generally required to give evidence by sworn affidavits (witness statements). However, a mere irregularity in the administration of an oath or affirmation does not invalidate the proceeding (Section 7, Indian Oaths Act, 1969).

The right of cross-examination would necessarily have to be granted as a principle of fairness. If cross-examination is not possible (say, due to subsequent death of a witness), the affidavit is disregarded.

8.5 What is the scope of the privilege rules under the law of India? For example, do all communications with outside counsel and/or in-house counsel attract privilege? In what circumstances is privilege deemed to have been waived?

The arbitral proceedings or record is not privileged. Indian law under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (Sections 122-129) recognises the following as privileged: (i) lawyer-client communications; (ii) unpublished official records relating to affairs of the State if detrimental to public interest; (iii) communications between husband and wife (during and even when the marriage is over); and (iv) communications made to a public officer in official confidence when he considers that it would be detrimental to public interest. All of the above are capable of waiver by the party affected.

Indian law provides that no attorney shall be asked to disclose any communication made to him by his client in the course of and for the purpose of his employment. There are some exceptions to this rule. For instance, there is no privilege if the communication is made in furtherance of an illegal purpose or if the attorney observes that some crime or fraud has occurred after commencement of his employment.

Privilege cannot be extended to in-house counsel as a lawyer is required to give up his certificate of practice (the same is suspended) so long as he is in full-time employment. (The relationship switches from a lawyer/client one to an employer/employee one.)

9 Making an Award

9.1 What, if any, are the legal requirements of an arbitral award? For example, is there any requirement under the law of India that the Award contain reasons or that the arbitrators sign every page?

An arbitral award must be in writing and signed by the arbitrators

(or a majority of them) and state the date and place of arbitration. It shall state reasons upon which it is based, unless the parties have agreed otherwise (Section 31 of the Act).

10 Challenge of an Award

10.1 On what bases, if any, are parties entitled to challenge an arbitral award made in India?

A challenge to an arbitration award would lie under Section 34 of the Act, corresponding to Article 34 of the Model Law. To paraphrase, an award can be set aside if:

- (a) the party making the application was under incapacity;
- (b) the arbitration agreement was not valid under the law agreed to by the parties (or applicable law);
- (c) the party making the application was not given proper notice of the appointment of the arbitrator or of the arbitral proceedings or was otherwise unable to present his case;
- (d) the award deals with a dispute not contemplated by or falling within the terms of submissions to arbitration or it contains decisions beyond the scope of the submissions to arbitration;
- (e) the composition of the Arbitral Tribunal or the arbitral procedure was not in accordance with the agreement of the parties;
- (f) the subject matter of the dispute was not capable of settlement by arbitration; or
- (g) the arbitral award is in conflict with the public policy of India.

In addition to the above grounds, the Supreme Court in *ONGC v. Saw Pipes* – (2003) 5 SCC 705, has held that a domestic award can be set aside if it is patently illegal, i.e., if the award is contrary to the terms of the contract entered into between the parties or the substantive law.

10.2 Can parties agree to exclude any basis of challenge against an arbitral award that would otherwise apply as a matter of law?

Though the Act is silent on the point, in law it may be possible to exclude certain grounds of challenge but judicial review as such cannot be excluded as that would be contrary to Public Policy of India and would be considered to be a restraint on legal proceedings (which is prohibited in law).

10.3 Can parties agree to expand the scope of appeal of an arbitral award beyond the grounds available in relevant national laws?

No, the courts cannot assume a new jurisdiction (which it otherwise does not have) on the basis of the parties' agreement.

10.4 What is the procedure for appealing an arbitral award in India?

An application for setting aside a domestic award can be filed under Section 34 of the Act. Such application must be made within three months from the date of receiving of the award. The court, if satisfied that the applicant was prevented by sufficient cause from making the application within the said period of three months, may condone delay of a further period of 30 days but not thereafter. A Supreme Court decision (*Oil & Natural Gas Corporation v. SAW Pipes* – (2003) 5 SCC 705) introduced the concept of a challenge to

a domestic award on the merits if the court finds it to be 'patently illegal' or 'against the terms of the parties' contract. There is no provision to set aside a foreign award (the only provision being to enforce or refuse to enforce the same on the New York Convention grounds). The Supreme Court in *Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services (supra)* has overruled an earlier controversial decision which permitted Indian courts in certain circumstances to entertain a set aside application of foreign awards.

11 Enforcement of an Award

11.1 Has India signed and/or ratified the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards? Has it entered any reservations? What is the relevant national legislation?

Yes. The relevant legislation is the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. India has made the 'reciprocity' and 'commercial' reservations under Article I of the New York Convention. As a result, the Central Government of India must further notify the foreign territory as a territory to which the New York Convention applies in order for the foreign award to be enforced. However, an award made in Ukraine after the breakup of the USSR was held to be an enforceable foreign award even in the absence of a separate notification recognising the new political entity as a reciprocating territory (*Transocean Shipping Agency (P) Ltd. v. Black Sea Shipping* – (1998) 2 SCC 281).

11.2 Has India signed and/or ratified any regional Conventions concerning the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards?

No, it has not.

11.3 What is the approach of the national courts in India towards the recognition and enforcement of arbitration awards in practice? What steps are parties required to take?

The general approach is to support the arbitral award – see *Bijendra Nath v. Mayank* – (1994) 6 SCC 117. The Supreme Court has held that "the court should approach an award with a desire to support it, if that is reasonably possible, rather than to destroy it by calling it illegal".

In case of a foreign award, a party seeking enforcement would have to file an application before the court where the defendant resides or has assets along with the original award, or a copy duly authenticated, original arbitration agreement, or a duly certified copy, and such evidence as may be necessary to prove that the award is a foreign award (Section 47(1) of the Act).

See also question 11.5 below.

11.4 What is the effect of an arbitration award in terms of *res judicata* in India? Does the fact that certain issues have been finally determined by an arbitral tribunal preclude those issues from being re-heard in a national court and, if so, in what circumstances?

Subject to any challenge to the arbitral award, the same is enforceable as a decree and in such a situation, the principles of *res judicata* would apply.

11.5 What is the standard for refusing enforcement of an arbitral award on the grounds of public policy?

There are two different regimes under the Indian Act for enforcement of an arbitral award. The domestic law regime is covered under Section 34 of the Act, which is based on Article 34 of Model Law. Enforcement of a foreign award is governed by Section 48 of the Act, which is based on the New York Convention. Section 34 stipulates that an award can be set aside if it is in conflict with the public policy of India. Section 48 stipulates that a foreign award will not be enforced if the enforcement would be contrary to the public policy of India. Indian courts have applied different standards in construing the “public policy” ground in the aforesaid sections. In relation to domestic awards, the Supreme Court in *ONGC v. Saw Pipes (supra)* has held that an award will be contrary to public policy “if it is patently illegal” (i.e., an award can be challenged on merits on the public policy ground). However, insofar as foreign awards are concerned, the public policy ground has been narrowly construed. In *Renusagar Power Co. v. General Electric Corporation – (1994) Suppl 1 SCC 644*, the Supreme Court held that “public policy” shall be confined to “the fundamental policy of Indian law or the interest of India or justice or morality”. The rationale for this diversity in approach is noted in the *Saw Pipes* case, viz. a foreign award may be questioned in the country in which or under the laws of which it was made. Hence a domestic award would have undergone a more vigorous judicial scrutiny before its enforcement in India.

12 Confidentiality

12.1 Are arbitral proceedings sited in India confidential? In what circumstances, if any, are proceedings not protected by confidentiality? What, if any, law governs confidentiality?

The law does not require arbitral proceedings to be confidential. If confidentiality is required, it must be provided for in the parties’ agreement. However, it is doubtful that such agreement would be effective or valid where large corporate entities or government companies are involved as they must act transparently.

12.2 Can information disclosed in arbitral proceedings be referred to and/or relied on in subsequent proceedings?

Yes it can, there is no bar.

13 Remedies / Interests / Costs

13.1 Are there limits on the types of remedies (including damages) that are available in arbitration (e.g., punitive damages)?

Arbitrators can grant declaratory relief and order specific performance. Damages can only be compensatory in nature. Liquidated damages must also fulfil the test of reasonableness. Punitive damages are not permitted. (Section 73 and 74 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872.)

13.2 What, if any, interest is available, and how is the rate of interest determined?

Subject to the party’s agreement, the Arbitral Tribunal may award

interest as it deems reasonable from the date of the award to the date of payment. Unless otherwise directed by the Tribunal, the award shall carry interest at 18% *per annum* from the date of the award until the date of payment. This provision shall apply only to awards rendered in India.

13.3 Are parties entitled to recover fees and/or costs and, if so, on what basis? What is the general practice with regard to shifting fees and costs between the parties?

Costs are at the discretion of the tribunal. The general principle is that costs follow the event. (Section 31 (8).)

Costs mean:

- Reasonable costs relating to the fees and expenses of the arbitrators and witnesses.
- Legal fees and expenses.
- Any administrative fees of the institution supervising the arbitration.
- Other expenses incurred in connection with the arbitral proceedings and the arbitral award.

Indian courts and arbitral tribunals, however, tend not to award actual costs.

13.4 Is an award subject to tax? If so, in what circumstances and on what basis?

An award is required to be stamped. The stamp duty depends on the amount involved in the award and varies from State-to-State. An award relating to immovable property must be registered under the Registration Act, 1908, within four months of its date. Registration fees also vary from State-to-State and are *ad valorem*.

13.5 Are there any restrictions on third parties, including lawyers, funding claims under the law of India? Are contingency fees legal under the law of India? Are there any “professional” funders active in the market, either for litigation or arbitration?

The Bar Council of India Rules prohibits lawyers from charging contingency fees or any fees dependent on the outcome of a matter. Hence, there have been no professional funders in the market so far. However, recently the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) have announced a decision to set up a fund to finance investor associations in class action litigation.

14 Investor State Arbitrations

14.1 Has India signed and ratified the Washington Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States (1965) (otherwise known as “ICSID”)?

No, it has not.

14.2 How many Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) or other multi-party investment treaties (such as the Energy Charter Treaty) is India party to?

India has signed 82 BITs and 72 have been ratified to date. India is not a party to the Energy Charter Treaty.

14.3 Does India have any noteworthy language that it uses in its investment treaties (for example in relation to “most favoured nation” or exhaustion of local remedies provisions)? If so, what is the intended significance of that language?

We have not come across any typical noteworthy language in investment treaties.

14.4 What is the approach of the national courts in India towards the defence of state immunity regarding jurisdiction and execution?

The defence of state immunity is all but disregarded by the national courts in India.

15 General

15.1 Are there noteworthy trends in or current issues affecting the use of arbitration in India (such as pending or proposed legislation)? Are there any trends regarding the type of disputes commonly being referred to arbitration?

Civil courts in India are typically bogged down with delays. Arbitrations are thus becoming increasingly popular and necessary. Traditionally, arbitrations are more common in shipping and construction-related disputes.

15.2 What, if any, recent steps have institutions in India taken to address current issues in arbitration (such as time and costs)?

The Delhi High Court Arbitration Centre (now known as the Delhi High Court International Centre) has issued the Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DAC) (Internal Management) Rules, 2012. These provide for stricter measures in relation to completion of pleadings and requests for adjournment.



Sumeet Kachwaha

Kachwaha and Partners
1/6, Shanti Niketan
New Delhi 110021
India

Tel: +91 11 4166 1333
Fax: +91 11 2411 0763
Email: skachwaha@kaplegal.com
URL: www.kaplegal.com

Sumeet Kachwaha has around 35 years' experience primarily in Dispute Resolution (Arbitration & Litigation). He has figured in Band One in Chambers Asia from 2009 through to 2014 in the Arbitration Section. He also figures in Asia Pacific Legal 500 in the Dispute Resolution Section as a "Leading Individual". He is currently Vice President of the Asia Pacific Regional Arbitration Group (APRAG). He is on the six-member Advisory Board of the Kuala Lumpur Regional Centre for Arbitration (KLCA) chaired by the Attorney General of Malaysia. He also recently completed a three-year term as Chair of the Dispute Resolution & Arbitration Section of the IPBA. Sumeet Kachwaha is a frequent speaker in various international forums on dispute resolution and also writes frequently on the subject.



Dharmendra Rautray

Kachwaha and Partners
1/6, Shanti Niketan
New Delhi 110021
India

Tel: +91 11 4166 1333
Fax: +91 11 2411 0763
Email: drautray@kaplegal.com
URL: www.kaplegal.com

Dharmendra Rautray completed his LL.M. in 1996 from the London School of Economics and was thereafter called to the England and Wales Bar in 2001. He is a member of the Lincoln's Inn. He is a faculty for the CLE Programme conducted by the New York City Bar, New York. He successfully argued the Constitution Bench matter of *Bharat Aluminium Co. Ltd. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc.* before the Supreme Court of India.

Mr. Rautray's main areas of practice are arbitrations, litigation, contracts, business transactions and international trade.

Mr. Rautray has authored a full-length Book on Arbitration published by Wolters Kluwer (2008) and several articles published in leading international law journals. He is also a member of the IBA APAG Working Group on Initiatives for harmonising Arbitration Rules and Practices.



Kachwaha and Partners is a multi-discipline, full-service law firm having its offices in Delhi and Mumbai (Bombay) and associate lawyers in most major cities of India. The main office of the firm is in New Delhi, conveniently located next to the diplomatic mission area. It is easily accessible from all parts of Delhi, as well as its suburbs.

The partners and members of the firm are senior professionals with years of experience behind them. They bring the highest level of professional service to clients along with the traditions of the profession, integrity and sound ethical practices.

Members of the firm are in tune with the work culture of international law firms, as well as the expectations of large corporate clients. The firm has, amongst its clients, multinationals and leading Indian corporations.

Current titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks



59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: sales@glgroup.co.uk

www.iclg.co.uk