

INDEX

- Abbasi v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs & Secretary of State for the Home Department*, 18 n.77
- ABCI Investments N.V. v Republic of Tunisia*, 206 n.35, 208 n.46
- access to justice, denial of, 16–17, 98–99, 161–166, 171
- Accession Mezzanine Capital and Danubius Kereskedőház Vagyongézelő v Hungary*, 57 n.136, 57 n.139, 61 n.156
- ADF Group Inc v United States of America*, 167 n.46
- administrative denial of justice, 162–163
- ADP. *See* Articles on Diplomatic Protection (ADP)
- Aerts v Belgium*, 223 n.46
- AES Corporation and TAU Power B.V. v Republic of Kazakhstan*, 116 n.7
- African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (AfCHPR), 11 n.37, 26, 64 n.170
- Airey v Ireland*, 48 n.94
- Akdivar and Others v Turkey*, 92 n.70
- Aksoy v Turkey*, 92 n.70
- Al Tamimi v Sultanate of Oman*, 223 n.47
- Al-Bahloul v Tajikistan*, 34 n.20, 35 n.27, 164 n.34, 187–188, 193, 195 n.209
- Al-Warraq v Indonesia*, 59, 70 n.183, 122–123, 216 n.3, 219, 223, 225 n.66
- Ambatielos (Greece v The United Kingdom)*, 86, 87, 96 n.92
- Amco v Indonesia*, 128–129
- American Convention on Human Rights (AmCHR), 11 n.38, 64 n.170
- AMTO v Ukraine*, 31 n.4, 34 n.20, 87 n.56, 164 n.34, 165 n.39, 175
- bankruptcy/liquidation proceedings, 229–230
- effective means standard in, 40–41, 42, 43
- Andelkovic v Serbia*, 186
- Andrejeva v Latvia*, 192 n.182, 192 n.185
- Anglia Auto Accessories Limited v The Czech Republic*, 55, 56, 105 n.137, 202 n.11, 203 n.18
- Ankerl v Switzerland*, 192 n.184
- Anzilotti, Dionisio*, 13, 26 n.123, 185
- Apotex v USA, UNCITRAL*, 23, 84–85, 95 n.89
- Application of the Convention of 1902 Governing the Guardianship of Infants (The Netherlands v Sweden)*, 26
- Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Croatia v Serbia)*, 60
- ARA Libertad (Argentina v Ghana)*, 15–16
- arbitral award. *See also* commercial arbitration
- annulment of, 53, 55–56, 124–126, 152–155, 201, 208
- enforcement of, 37, 54–55, 69, 74
- expropriation and, 105–106
- as investment, 202–205

- arbitral award (*cont.*)
 investor's loss of right, 122
 juridical restitution of rights in, 145
 non-enforcement of, 56, 176–178,
 210–211
 reinstatement of, 144
 violation of international obligations
 and, 209–214
- arbitrariness, 35–36
 definition of, 167
 manifest, 28, 196
- arbitration agreements
 cessation of court proceedings,
 214–215
 failure to recognise, 212–213
 intertemporal principle with respect
 to substantive protection,
 205–209
 protecting integrity of, 214–215
 qualification of rights, 202–205
 supervisory function of domestic
 courts and, 199–215
 violation of international obligations,
 209–214
- Arif v Moldova*, 35 n.29, 37–38, 81,
 82 n.30, 83 n.34, 83 n.35,
 164 n.34, 165, 165 n.39
- Arlewin v Sweden*, 78 n.8, 174
- Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000*
(Democratic Republic of the
Congo v Belgium), 138, 140
- Articles on Diplomatic Protection
 (ADP)
 Article 3, 18 n.78
 Article 14, 18 n.79
 Article 14(1), 79
 Article 14(2), 86–87
 Article 15, 47, 92
 limb (a), 90, 91–92, 94–95, 99
 limb (b), 90, 91–92
 limb (c), 90, 91–92
 limb (d), 90, 98–99
 limb (e), 90, 91
 ILC Commentary to, 18 n.76,
 18 n.77, 87 n.52, 91 n.68,
 94 n.74, 94 n.82, 98–99
- Articles on Responsibility of States for
 Internationally Wrongful Acts
 (ARSIWA), 5–6
- Article 4, 83
 Article 4(1), 14
 Article 5, 226
 Article 13, 206–207
 Article 14, 206–207
 Article 44(b), 78
 ILC Commentary to, 136 n.73,
 136 n.75, 137
- Ashingdane v The United Kingdom*,
 172 n.83
- ATA Construction, Industrial and*
Trading Company v The
Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan,
 124, 152–155
- arbitral award as investment in,
 203
- breach of NY Convention in, 58, 154,
 213
- extinguishment of arbitration
 agreement in, 154, 208
- juridical restitution of rights in,
 153–154
- jurisdiction of tribunal in, 153
- remedies granted by investment
 tribunal in, 153, 154, 214
- scope of investment claim in,
 200–201
- Atanasovski v Macedonia*, 169 n.60
- Avena and Other Mexican Nationals*
(Mexico v United States of
America), 26, 70 n.183,
 140–141, 142
- Azinian, Davitian & Bacca v The*
United Mexican States, 61 n.159,
 164 n.34, 189 n.171
- Azurix Corp v The Argentine Republic*,
 33 n.16
- Bagge, Algot, 94
- Balkan Energy (Ghana) Limited v*
Republic of Ghana, 218 n.13
- Bangladesh-Italy BIT, 61, 202 n.10
- bankruptcy proceedings, 40–41,
 133–134, 144, 175, 225–230
- Barcelona Traction, Light and Power*
Company, Limited (Belgium v
Spain), 18 n.76, 19
- Barron (Great Britain) v United States*,
 188–189

- Belokon v Kyrgyzstan*, 218 n.10,
 219 n.19
- Biwater Gauff (Tanzania) Ltd v United Republic of Tanzania*, 116 n.7,
 122 n.24, 129 n.50
- Bönisch v Austria*, 193 n.186
- Bosca v Lithuania*, 29 n.143, 130 n.52
- Bosh International, Inc and B&P Ltd Foreign Investments Enterprise v Ukraine*, 193
- British-American Tobacco Company v The Netherlands*, 48 n.94
- broad consent, 62–64, 234. *See also* dispute settlement provision
- breach of investment treaty standard and, 201
- extinguishment of arbitration agreement and, 154
- jurisdiction of tribunal and,
 141–142, 200–201
- state responsibility and, 73–74
- Brown (USA) v Great Britain*, 176
- Brownlie, Ian, 23
- Brussels Convention, 66 n.174
- Brussels I Regulation, 66 n.173
- Burlington Resources Inc. v Republic of Ecuador*, 104–105, 105 n.136,
 108
- Calvo doctrine, 9–10, 21 n.93
- Caçado Trindade, Antônio Augusto,
 17–19
- Certain Norwegian Loans (France v Norway)*, 79 n.14, 94–95,
 100 n.115
- Charanne BV and Construction Investments v Kingdom of Spain*,
 42 n.68
- Chattin (United States) v United Mexican States*, 158 n.9,
 166 n.43, 179, 222 n.39
- Cheng, Bin, 210–211
- Chevron v Ecuador I*, 28 n.141, 40 n.56,
 41–42, 62, 102 n.122, 113,
 130 n.55, 132, 164 n.34,
 205 n.34, 207
- effective means standard in, 41–42,
 44–45, 46, 112, 113
- undue delay in, 179, 181–183
- valuation of claims in, 132, 137–138
- Chevron v Ecuador II*, 133, 147–151,
 152, 205 n.34
- Churchill Mining PLC and Planet Mining Pty Ltd v Republic of Indonesia*, 216 n.1, 217 n.6
- Çiraklar v Turkey*, 92 n.70
- City Oriente Limited v The Republic of Ecuador and Empresa Estatal Petróleos del Ecuador*, 224 n.57
- CMS Gas Transmission Company v The Argentine Republic*, 33 n.16,
 136 n.76
- commercial arbitration, 199–215. *See also* arbitral award
- Article 1, 202–205
- cessation of court proceedings,
 214–215
- intertemporal principle with respect to substantive protection,
 205–209
- violation of international obligations and, 209–214
- Commission of the European Communities v Lisrestal and Others*, 20 n.86
- completeness of the breach, 75–77, 118,
 120
- of effective means standard, 110–113
- of fair and equitable treatment,
 106–110
- incorrect rulings and, 77
- isolated action, 75–76, 83, 107,
 108–109, 120
- judicial function and, 76
- local remedies rule and, 77–82
- confiscation, 27, 217–218, 220
- Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities, 6
- Article 2, 7
- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (NY Convention), 37, 64, 153–154
- Article II, 53–54, 58, 139–145,
 200–201, 212–213
- Article II(3), 147, 154, 214

- Convention on the Recognition (*cont.*)
 Article III, 200, 212
 Article V, 74, 211–212
 breach of, 58, 74, 154, 201, 209–210,
 211–212, 213, 234
 ILC Commentary to, 87 n.55
 public policy exception under, 201
Corona Materials, LLC v Dominican Republic, 85 n.45, 163 n.27
Cotesworth & Powell (Great Britain) v Colombia, 184, 193 n.187
 Crawford, James, 14, 76
 criminal proceedings, 216–225
 abusive, 36–37, 220–221
 arrest of executives, 221
 delay in, 179
 denial of justice in, 59
 detention of suspect, 27, 96 n.96,
 122, 140, 222–223
 integrity of arbitration and,
 224–225
 interdiction measures in, 221
 length of, 221–222
 against managers, 218–219
 state responsibility for, 218
 state's sovereignty and, 216–217
 trial and conviction in *absentia*,
 122–123, 219, 223–224
 violation of rights and, 140
Croft (United Kingdom) v Portugal,
 12 n.40
- damage
 breach of investment treaty standard
 and, 64, 235
 causal link between the breach and,
 121–126
 due to provisional application of
 court decision, 197
 legal interest, 114–121
 loss incurred in domestic judicial
 process, 116–118
 loss incurred prior to finalisation of
 judicial process, 118–121
 from non-enforcement of arbitral
 award, 56, 123–124
 valuation of, 126–134
 wrongful judicial acts and, 121–126
- Dan Căte (Portugal) S.A. v Hungary*,
 164 n.34
 bankruptcy/liquidation proceedings,
 226, 227–228
 investor's true loss in, 133–134
 De Visscher, Charles, 1–2, 13, 19–20,
 21, 22, 160, 161–162, 174
 declaratory judgment, 115, 137,
 138–139
 declaratory reliefs, 136–139
 award of investment tribunal and,
 139
 domestic judgment and, 138–139
 establishment of wrongfulness, 137
 as form of satisfaction, 136–137
denegatio justitiae, 7–8
 denial of justice, 156–198
 absence of effective remedies, 86–102
 administrative, 162–163
 as breach of fair and equitable
 treatment, 33–34
 conceptualisation of, 16, 24
 definition of, 159–161, 235
 failure of judicial system, 83
 ineffectiveness of further remedies,
 92–93, 97
 circumstances of, 96–97
 determination of, 93
 establishment of, 101–102
 local remedies rule and, 81–82
 lower court's role in, 83
 modern doctrine, 234
 protection against, 34, 42–50, 82
 scope of international protection
 against, 161–166
 error in interpretation of facts,
 164–165
 factual and legal analysis by
 domestic courts, 163–164
 procedural irregularities and, 163
 review by international court or
 tribunal, 166
 review of substance, 165
 scope of state responsibility for, 158
 state responsibility for, 82
 substantive, 184–191, 196–197,
 222–223
 terminology, 156–158

- threshold of wrongfulness in,
 166–171
Mondev test, 166–167
Neer test, 166–167
 typical cases of, 171–191
 denial of access to justice, 171
 executive interference in judicial
 proceedings, 174–176
 manifest injustice, 184–191
 non-execution of judgments,
 176–178
 undue delay, 179–184
Desert Line v Yemen, 144–145
 detention, 27, 96 n.96, 122, 140,
 222–223
*Deutsche Bank AG v Democratic
 Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka*
 freezing of assets in, 232–233
 violation of due process in, 194,
 195–197
*Diallo (Republic of Guinea v Democratic
 Republic of the Congo)*, 11 n.37,
 19, 26, 87 n.52, 101–102
 Dispute Settlement Body (DSB), 66, 70
 dispute settlement provision, 59–60, 72,
 88
 admissibility requirements, 75
 arbitration, 60–70
 DSU of the WTO and, 70
 ECHR Article 32(1), 69–70
 exclusive jurisdiction, 69
 exclusivity of forum, 65–70
 expropriation claims, 201–202
 investor's standing and, 71–74
 scope of, 205–206
 scope of state's offer, 60–70
 treaty interpretation, 205–206
 Dispute Settlement Understanding
 (DSU), 65
 Article 23, 70
Diversion of Water from the Meuse,
 137 n.80
Dombo Beheer B.V. v The Netherlands,
 192 n.183
 domestic courts
 bankruptcy/liquidation proceedings,
 225–230
 coercive measures, 216–233
 criminal proceedings, 216–225
 factual and legal analysis by, 163–164
 freezing orders, 230–233
 non-execution of judgments,
 176–178
 provisional measures, 230–233
 refusal to give effect to valid
 arbitration agreement, 123–124
 supervisory function over
 international commercial
 arbitration, 199–215
 termination of contracts by, 56–57
 double taxation treaties, 73
 Douglas, Zachary, 1–2, 60–61, 62–64,
 116 n.7, 160, 162 n.25, 163–164,
 190, 205 n.34
 due process, 11, 23, 33, 35, 118–119,
 127, 133, 144, 198, 230
 Article 10 of UDHR and, 192
 customary international law and, 35,
 195–196
 as a fundamental human right,
 192–193
 right to, 192–193
 violation of, 192–198
 Dugard, John, 101
*Duke Energy Electroquil Partners &
 Electroquil SA v Republic of
 Ecuador*, 35 n.30, 43–44, 45–46,
 100 n.116
Duran v Turkey, 143 n.101
*Duzgit Integrity (Republic of Malta v
 Democratic Republic of São
 Tomé and Príncipe)*, 27 n.130
 Eagleton, Clyde, 12, 25, 29, 156
 ECHR. *See* European Convention on
 Human Rights (ECHR)
 ECJ. *See* European Court of Justice
 (ECJ)
 ECtHR. *See* European Court of Human
 Rights (ECtHR)
 effective means standard (asserting
 claims and enforcing rights), 31,
 39–46, 50, 124–126, 175, 179,
 181, 183–184, 201, 209–210,
 231, 234–235
 completeness of a breach, 110–113

- effective means standard (*cont.*)
 criticism of, 46–48
 interpretation of the right to effective remedies, 48–49
 investment treaty cases, 43–46
 nature of protection in, 40–42
 protection against denial of justice, 42–50
- Eggetsdóttir v Iceland*, 193 n.186
- El Oro Mining and Railway Company (Great Britain) v United Mexican States*, 180
- El Triunfo Company (United States) v El Salvador*, 96 n.96
- Elektronica Sicula S.p.A. (ELSI) (United States of America v Italy)*, 78 n.5, 80 n.20, 101, 104 n.132, 122 n.24, 167
- Eli Lilly v Canada*, 22 n.99, 24 n.113, 28 n.138, 34 n.23, 36, 37 n.40, 38 n.48, 56 n.135, 164 n.34, 167 n.50, 169–170, 186 n.151
- Emmis International Holding, Emmis Radio Operating and MEM Magyar Electronic Media v Hungary*, 57 n.136, 57 n.139, 61 n.156, 142 n.99
- Energy Charter Treaty
 Article 10(12), 39 n.55
 Article 26(1) of, 61, 62
 Article 26(8), 135 n.67
- European Commission of Human Rights, 87
- European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), 11 n.38, 17–19, 64 n.169, 70, 96 n.96
 Article 5(1)(c), 222 n.45
 Article 6, 20, 48, 143–144, 209
 Article 6(1), 20, 127, 170, 171–172, 192
 Article 13, 48–49, 50
 Article 19, 64 n.170
 Article 32(1), 69–70
 Article 33, 69–70
 Article 34, 69–70
 Article 35(1), 75 n.1, 78, 79
 Article 1 of Additional Protocol 1, 209
- European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), 17–19, 48–49, 50, 64 n.170, 69–70, 78, 92 n.70, 96 n.96, 104, 127, 128–129, 169–170, 171–172, 186, 204, 204 n.31, 209, 222–223
- European Court of Justice (ECJ), 14 n.54, 66–67
- Eustathiadès, Constantin Th, 15, 84, 188
- exhaustion of local remedies, 27–28, 29, 45, 55, 75 n.1, 78, 80–82, 86–87, 88, 93, 102 n.123, 105–106, 108, 112, 113, 118–119, 158, 180, 234–235
 denial of justice and, 82–86
 economic and financial effectiveness of remedies, 97–102
 effective and adequate redress, 98
 exceptions, 88–92
 internationally wrongful act and, 80
 limits of requirements, 90
 ordinary versus extraordinary instances, 87
 presumption of legality of remedies, 88–89
 as requirement in claims, 82–86
 finality rule, 83–84
 rationale in, 85–86
 as substantive condition, 84–85, 90
- expropriation, 27–28, 58, 67 n.176, 122, 126 n.42, 142–143, 194, 201–202, 207, 209–210, 217–218, 220, 227, 231–233
 completeness of, 103–106
 definition of, 103
 deprivation by temporary measure and, 104
 dispute settlement provisions, 61
 irreversible and permanent effect of, 104
 by judiciary, 51, 52
 state responsibility for judicial acts, 105
 termination of contract by domestic court, 56–57
 unlawful, prohibition of, 50–51

- Fabiani (France) v Venezuela*, 177
Factory at Chorzow case, 131–132,
 137 n.78, 141
 fair and equitable treatment, 28, 31–39,
 43–44, 50–51, 58, 59, 118, 120,
 122–123, 126 n.42, 143–144,
 165 n.37, 168, 169–170, 175,
 177–178, 193–196, 201, 209
 breach of, 33–34, 38–39, 106–110,
 209–211, 216–217, 218, 219,
 221, 232, 233
 completeness of a breach of, 106–110
 due process, 35
 juridical restitution of rights and,
 143–144
 legitimate expectations and, 37–38
 NAFTA and, 31–33
 protection under, 33, 34–35
 against abusive proceedings,
 36–37
 against arbitrariness, 35–36
 scope of, 33
 fair trial, 19–20, 177, 195–196, 198,
 204–205
 Article 6(1) of ECHR and, 170,
 171–172, 192, 209
 Article 10 of UDHR and, 192
 breach of right to, 169–170, 209
 customary international law and, 35,
 195–196
 as a fundamental human right,
 192–193
 requirements of, 170
 right to, 20, 48, 50, 92 n.70, 118–119,
 143–144, 171–172, 174, 192,
 219
 right to effective remedies and, 50
 Fawcett, J. E. S., 80
Fayed v The United Kingdom, 173 n.84
Feldman v Mexico, 177 n.105
 finality rule, 27–28, 45, 83–84
*Finnish Shipowners (Finland) v Great
 Britain (Use of Certain Finnish
 Vessels During the War)*, 89, 93,
 94, 96 n.92
 First Hague Peace Conference of 1899,
 10–11
 Fish, Hamilton, 92–93
 Fitzmaurice, Gerald Gray, 25, 115,
 188–189
*Flughafen Zürich AG and Gestión e
 Ingeniería v Bolivarian Republic
 of Venezuela*, 34 n.20, 171 n.73
Fogarty v The United Kingdom, 173 n.84
*Forests of Central Rhodope (Greece v
 Bulgaria)*, 96 n.93
 forum selection agreements, 68
 Freeman, Alwyn, 16 n.68, 159, 161–162
 freezing orders, 91, 230–233
*Frontier Petroleum Services v The Czech
 Republic*, 31, 33 n.14, 35 n.31,
 201, 210 n.55, 210 n.56
 bankruptcy/liquidation proceedings,
 229
 completeness of a breach of fair and
 equitable treatment standard in,
 107–108
 undue delay in, 180
 violation of due process in, 197
 Fuller, Lon, 163–164
*GAMI Investments, Inc. v The
 Government of the United
 Mexican States*, 107 n.145
Gavazzi v Romania, 203 n.18, 211 n.58
*GEA Group Aktiengesellschaft v
 Ukraine*, 31 n.2, 202–203
*Gemplus S.A., SLP S.A., Gemplus
 Industrial S.A. v United Mexican
 States*, 130 n.54
Gençel v Turkey, 143 n.101
Generation Ukraine v Ukraine,
 104 n.131, 109
*Getma International and Others v
 Republic of Guinea*, 67 n.176
*Glamis Gold, Ltd v United States of
 America*, 104–105
Golder v The United Kingdom, 48 n.94,
 171–172
Gómez de la Torre v Spain, 48 n.94
*Grand River Enterprises Six Nations v
 United States of America*,
 157 n.8
 Greenwood, Christopher, 91
 Guerrero Report, 16–17, 21 n.93,
 175 n.94

- Guggenheim, Paul, 217–218
 gunboat diplomacy, 9–10
Gustav F W Hamester GmbH v Republic of Ghana, 217 n.5
- H&H Enterprises Investments v Arab Republic of Egypt*, 164 n.34, 183 n.131
- Hafsteinsdóttir v Iceland*, 222 n.44
- Hague Conventions, 10–11
- Harvard Draft Convention, 184
- Helnan International Hotels A/S v The Arab Republic of Egypt*, 108–109
- Hentrich v France*, 48 n.94, 192 n.184
- Hornsby v Greece*, 96 n.96
- human rights, 35
 instruments, 65, 71, 78, 192
 international protection of, 17–19
 judicial due process/fair trial as
 fundamental, 192–193,
 195–196, 198
 local remedies rule and, 78
 treaties, 7, 11–12, 73, 195–196
 violations of, 218
- Iberdrola Energía SA v The Republic of Guatemala*, 34 n.22, 61 n.158, 165 n.37, 188, 194, 195–196
- ICJ. *See* International Court of Justice (ICJ)
- Içkale v Turkmenistan*, 50 n.98, 52 n.110
- ICSID Convention (Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of other States)
 Article 25 of, 202–203
 Article 26 of, 80–81, 109
- ILC. *See* International Law Commission (ILC)
- Institut de Droit International (IDI), 13
- Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, 64 n.170
- Interhandel (Switzerland v United States of America)*, 78 n.5, 79 n.14, 80 n.20, 180
- International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), 52, 80–81, 95–96, 109, 203, 204–205, 217 n.6, 224–225
- International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), 52
- International Court of Justice (ICJ), 13–14, 19, 26, 60, 71, 101–102, 114, 115, 138, 140, 141, 180
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), 11 n.37, 26, 219
 Article 14(1), 58, 192
 Article 14(3), 59, 223–224
 Article 14(5), 59, 224
 Article 28, 64 n.170
 Article 41(1)(c), 78, 79
- International Law Commission (ILC), 5–7, 76, 86–87
 Commentary to ADP, 18 n.76, 47, 86–87, 88–89, 91 n.68, 94 n.74, 94 n.82, 98–99
 Commentary to ARSIWA, 5–6, 14, 134–135, 136 n.73, 137
 Third Report on Diplomatic Protection, 93–94
- International Thunderbird Gaming Corporation v The United Mexican States*, 23, 34 n.20, 195 n.210
- International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), 15–16
- investment treaties
 dispute settlement provision of, 60–70
 broad consent, 62–64
 expropriation claims, 61, 62
 host state's consent, 62, 64
 types of, 60–61, 64–65
 effective means standard in, 43–46
 criticisms of, 46–48
 protection under provision, 46–47
 terminology, 47
 fair and equitable treatment, 31–39
 judicial acts, 30–57
 prohibition of unlawful
 expropriation, 50–57
 protection granted to investors
 under, 142, 209–210
- investment tribunals, 15, 23, 31, 37, 39–42, 50, 53–54, 57, 81, 98, 99, 104–105, 106, 107, 112, 113, 118, 120, 122–123, 132, 154,

- 168, 177–178, 187–188,
 193–194, 200–201, 204–205,
 231
 direct access to, 11–12
 exhaustion of local remedies and, 89
 jurisdiction of, 62–64, 141–142, 147,
 153, 214
 non-ICSID, 204–205
 Iran-Slovakia BIT, 28, 35 n.26, 196
 Iran-US Claims Tribunal (IUSCT),
 50–51, 103, 106
*Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazayeva v
 Russia*, 92 n.70
*Italba Corporation v Oriental Republic
 of Uruguay*, 216 n.1, 217 n.6,
 225 n.66
Italian Republic v Republic of Cuba, 174
*Jan de Nul NV & Dredging International
 NV v Arab Republic of Egypt*,
 34 n.20, 35 n.27, 83 n.33,
 85 n.45, 164 n.34, 180, 181,
 189–190, 195 n.209, 205 n.34
 Jay Treaty of 1794, 9
 Jennings, Robert, 166–167, 185
 Jiménez de Aréchaga, Eduardo, 15, 115
J.J. v The Netherlands, 192 n.184
 judicial acts
 definition of, 5–7
 international causes of action and,
 57–74
 international state responsibility for,
 1–2
 scope of, 6–7
 state responsibility for, 12, 17
 wrongful, 24–29
 cessation of, 145–155
 commitment of, 24–25
 emergence of, 22
 investor's legal interest to invoke
 state responsibility, 114–121
 redress of, 114–155
 valuation of claim in domestic
 proceedings, 126–134
 judicial finality. *See* finality rule
 judicial function, 1–2, 6, 15–16, 19–20,
 34–35, 36, 37–39, 50–51, 73,
 76–77, 81, 83–84, 157, 160 n.20,
 162–163, 177–178, 192
 breach of international law and, 23
 completeness of the breach and, 76
 conflicting arguments, 22
 emergence of wrong in, 22
 scope of, 6–7, 14
 state responsibility for, 21–24, 82
 wrongful judicial acts and, 24–29
*Jurisdictional Immunities of the State
 (Germany v Italy: Greece
 intervening)*, 138
Kart v Turkey, 173 n.84
 Khodorkovsky, Mikhail, 220
Kiliç Insaat v Turkmenistan, 39, 50 n.98,
 174 n.92
Kin-Stib and Majkic v Serbia, 204 n.28,
 209 n.53
Köbler v Republik Österreich, 14 n.54,
 15 n.59
Kress v France, 192 n.185
Kudla v Poland, 48–49
*LaGrand (Germany v United States of
 America)*, 14 n.53, 70 n.183,
 71
Lahoud & Lahoud v DRC, 52 n.109,
 193–194, 195–196
Lao Holdings v Laos, 224 n.61
Lauder v Tthe Czech Republic, 122 n.24
 legal interest, 29, 72–74, 114–121, 126,
 136–137, 145–146, 147, 149,
 200, 229
 legitimate expectations, 33, 37–38,
 169–170, 212–213
 Legnano, Giovanni da, 7–8
Levy de Levi v Peru, 35 n.32, 164 n.34,
 166 n.41
*Libananco Holdings Co Limited v
 Republic of Turkey*, 225 n.66
*Liman Caspian Oil BV and NCL Dutch
 Investment BV v Republic of
 Kazakhstan*, 23 n.101, 34 n.20,
 55 n.122, 164 n.34, 165 n.35,
 165 n.37, 189 n.168
 liquidation proceedings, 225–230
 Lissitzyn, Oliver, 156 n.4
*Lithgow and Others v The United
 Kingdom*, 172 n.83
Lizarraga and Others v Spain, 192 n.185

- local remedies rule, 17–19, 77–78, 80, 82, 89, 90–91, 92–93, 179
 basis of, 78–79
 customary international rule, 80–81
 in diplomatic protection, 86
 exceptions to
 based on futile remedies, 93–94
 under limb (a), (b), and (d), 92
 under limb (e), 90
 human rights and, 78
 investment treaty arbitration and, 81–82
 secondary rules of state
 responsibility and, 79–80
 state's waiver under limb (e), 90–91
Loewen v USA, 33 n.16, 34 n.20, 34 n.23, 81 n.25, 97–102, 158, 195 n.209
 access to appeal, 99
 application of reasonableness test in, 100–101
 burden of proof on ineffectiveness of remedy, 101–102
 domestic proceedings in, 118–119
 effective and adequate redress, 98
 exhaustion of local remedies in, 85
 fair and equitable treatment in, 120
 ILC's Commentary to ADP, 98–99
 investor's legal interest in claim, 120–121
 loss incurred prior to finalisation of judicial process in, 118–121
 state responsibility in, 158
 loss of a chance method, 129–131, 133–134
Lotus case, 185–186
Lukenda v Slovenia, 41 n.64, 92 n.70
Mamidoil Jetoil Greek Petroleum Products v Republic of Albania, 164 n.34, 168
 manifest injustice, 16–17, 118–119, 184–191, 194–195, 196–197
Martini (Italy) v Venezuela, 147
Matos e Silva, Lda., and Others v Portugal, 103 n.128
 maturity of investment treaty claims, 102–113
 breach of effective means standard, 110–113
 breach of fair and equitable treatment standard, 106–110
 expropriation, 103–106
McElhinney v Ireland, 172 n.83
 McNair, Arnold Duncan, 25
Mermaid (Great Britain) v Spain, 22 n.100
Methanex Corporation v United States of America, 167 n.48
Mifsud v France, 78 n.8
 Mirzayev, Ruslan, 220
Mondev International Ltd v United States of America, 20–21, 23 n.104, 32 n.12, 32 n.8, 33 n.13, 33 n.16, 34 n.20, 167 n.46, 167–168, 172–173, 205 n.34, 207
Montano (Peru) v United States, 89
Mytilineos Holdings SA v The State Union of Serbia & Montenegro and Republic of Serbia, 81 n.23
 NAFTA Free Trade Commission, 31–33
Neer (USA) v Mexico, 157 n.7, 166–167
 New York Convention. *See* Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (NY Convention)
Nideröst-Huber v Switzerland, 192 n.185
Nielsen v Denmark, 87, 89
 non-investment treaties
 dispute settlement provision in, 65–70
 individual rights in, 71–74
 investor's standing, 72
 procedural-direct theory, 71–72
 substantive-direct theory, 72
 violation of obligations, 72–73
 state responsibility in, 73
 non-pecuniary remedies, 134–155
 arbitral award reinstatement, 144
 award compensation, 144–145
 declaratory reliefs, 136–139

- juridical restitution of rights,
 139–145
 property rights, 142–143, 144
 North American Free Trade Agreement
 (NAFTA), 31–33
*Northern Cameroons (Cameroon v
 United Kingdom)*, 115, 137 n.81

Öcalan v Turkey, 92 n.70, 143 n.101
*Occidental Petroleum Corporation &
 Occidental Exploration and
 Production Company v The
 Republic of Ecuador*, 130 n.56
*OI European Group B.V. v Bolivarian
 Republic of Venezuela*, 34 n.23,
 85 n.45
*Oil Field of Texas v Iran & National
 Iranian Oil Company*, 51 n.100,
 106
*Oil Platforms (Islamic Republic of Iran v
 United States of America)*, 31 n.7
Olujic v Croatia, 192 n.185
Oostergetel v Slovakia, 33 n.14, 33 n.16,
 34 n.20, 97 n.98, 102 n.122,
 181 n.129, 186 n.150, 189–190
Oppenheim's International Law, 25, 185

Panevezys-Saldutiskis Railway, 96 n.91
*Pantehniki SA Contractors & Engineers
 v The Republic of Albania*,
 95–96, 191
*Papamichalopoulos and Others v
 Greece*, 104, 104 n.129
Paparinskis, Martins, 71, 166–167, 192
*Parkerings-Compagniet AS v Republic of
 Lithuania*, 23 n.104, 107 n.146
Paulsson, Jan, 8–9, 21, 26, 27, 84–85,
 89, 94, 95–96, 129–130,
 132 n.61, 133–134, 137–138,
 156, 159, 184
Pellegrini v Italy, 177 n.103
Perenco v Ecuador, 57
 Permanent Court of Arbitration,
 10 n.34
 Permanent Court of International
 Justice (PCIJ), 96 n.91,
 131–132, 137, 141, 185–186

*Petrobart Limited v The Kyrgyz
 Republic*, 41 n.66, 43, 175,
 203–204
Pey Casado v Chile, 31 n.2, 34 n.20,
 76 n.2, 126 n.42, 181, 207
Philip Morris v Uruguay, 102 n.123,
 164 n.30, 164 n.34, 170 n.65,
 170–171
*Ping An Life Insurance Company of
 China and Ping An Insurance
 (Group) of China v Kingdom of
 Belgium*, 206 n.35
*Plama Consortium Limited v Republic
 of Bulgaria*, 226
 provisional measures, 15–16, 52, 121,
 217 n.6, 224–225, 230–233
*PSEG Global Inc and Konya Ilgin
 Elektrik v Republic of Turkey*,
 33 n.16, 33 n.19, 34 n.25,
 177–178
Pudas v Sweden, 48 n.94

*Quiborax S.A., Non Metallic Minerals
 S.A. and Allan Fosk Kaplún v
 Plurinational State of Bolivia*,
 224–225

*Rainbow Warrior (New Zealand and
 France)*, 115, 136 n.75
 redress of wrongful judicial acts,
 114–155
 damages, 121–126
 investor's legal interest to invoke
 state responsibility, 114–121
 non-pecuniary remedies, 134–155
 arbitral award reinstatement,
 144
 declaratory reliefs, 136–139
 injunctive remedies, 145–155
 juridical restitution of rights,
 139–145
 specific performance of primary
 obligation, 145–155
 valuation of claim in domestic
 proceedings, 126–134
Regent Company v Ukraine, 204 n.27,
 209 n.51, 209 n.53

- reparation, 84 n.40, 126, 131–132,
 134–135, 136–137, 145–146
 of denial of justice, 8–9
 diplomatic protection by individual's
 home state, 11
 direct access to international courts
 and tribunals, 11–12
 gunboat diplomacy, 9–10
 historical evolution of, 7–12
 by reprisals, 7
 reprisals, 7
res judicata doctrine, 13, 14–15
 retrial, 142, 143–144
 right to effective remedies, 48–49
 Riphagen, Willem, 145–146
Romak v Uzbekistan, 204 n.23,
 204–205
 Rome Convention, 66 n.174
 Rome I Regulation, 66 n.173, 66 n.174
 Rome II Regulation, 66 n.173
 Rome III Regulation, 66 n.173
 Rome IV Regulation, 66 n.173
Rompetrol v Romania, 64 n.169, 123,
 216 n.2, 218 n.9, 218–219,
 221 n.37
 Root, Elihu, 15
*RosInvestCo UK v The Russian
 Federation*, 23 n.106, 51 n.103,
 159, 164 n.34, 227 n.82,
 231 n.118
Roussalis v Romania, 31 n.3, 34 n.20,
 36 n.38, 62 n.160, 193,
 193 n.188, 195 n.210, 221 n.38,
 222
*RSM Production Corporation v Central
 African Republic*, 130 n.53
*Rumeli Telekom and Telsim Mobil v
 Republic of Kazakhstan*, 33 n.14,
 34 n.20, 51 n.105, 51 n.99,
 189 n.171, 192 n.181
*Ryan, Schooner Capital LLC, and
 Atlantic Investment Partners
 LLC v Republic of Poland*,
 51 n.106

Saadi v The United Kingdom,
 222 n.44
Sahin and Sahin v Turkey, 170

*Saipem S.p.A. v The People's Republic of
 Bangladesh*, 52–54, 56, 204 n.25,
 212 n.60
 annulment of award, 53, 55–56
 dispute settlement provision in, 61
 domestic court's act as taking, 53
 exhaustion of local remedies, 55
 expropriation in, 51 n.104, 105–106
 ICC award, 52
 illegality of deprivation, 53–54
 judicial conduct as expropriatory
 measure, 54–55
 link between damages and wrongful
 judicial acts in, 122
 scope of investment claim in,
 201–202
 unlawful expropriation in, 27–28, 58
Salem (United States) v Egypt, 22,
 164 n.33
*Salini Costruttori S.p.A. and Italstrade
 S.p.A. v Kingdom of Morocco*,
 63 n.166
*Salini Costruttori v Federal Democratic
 Republic of Ethiopia, Addis
 Abada Water and Sewerage
 Authority*, 212 n.61
Santa Elena v Republic of Costa Rica,
 102 n.125
*Saudi Arabia v Arabian American Oil
 Company (Aramco)*, 137 n.79
 Second Hague Peace Conference of
 1907, 10–11
*SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA
 v Islamic Republic of Pakistan*,
 63 n.167, 217 n.6
*SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA
 v Republic of Philippines*,
 63 n.167
Siag and Vecchi v Egypt, 177–178,
 195 n.211
Silva v Luxemburg, 78 n.8
Sistem Mühendislik v Kyrgyz Republic,
 51 n.106
Somogyi v Italy, 143 n.101
Sprorrang and Lönnroth v Sweden,
 48 n.94
Spyridon Roussalis v Romania,
 193 n.188

- Sramek v Austria*, 127
Stans Energy Corp and Kutsay Mining v Kyrgyz Republic, 231 n.115
 state responsibility
 for breach of international obligation, 206–207
 for criminal proceedings, 218
 for denial of justice, 158
 international law and, 21–24
 invoking, 17–21
 overview, 1–2
 private international law instruments and, 73
 reluctance against upholding, 21–22
 secondary obligations, 23–24
 vis-à-vis individuals, 19
Stati v Kazakhstan, 36, 106, 107–108
Stran Greek Refineries and Stratis Andreadis v Greece, 172 n.75, 204 n.27, 209 n.53
 substantive denial of justice, 184–191, 196–197, 222–223. *See also* denial of justice
Swisslion v Macedonia, 34 n.20, 35 n.28, 36, 39, 56–57, 174 n.92, 221 n.36, 232

Talsud S.A. v United Mexican States, 130 n.54
 targeted discrimination, 28, 196–197
Tatneft v Ukraine, 24 n.113, 33 n.17, 34 n.23, 51 n.102, 164 n.34, 194–196, 197 n.213
Tecnicas Medioambientales Tecmed SA v The United Mexican States, 33 n.16, 104
Teinver S.A., Transportes de Cercanías S.A. and Autobuses Urbanos del Sur S.A. v Argentine Republic, 217 n.6
Tippetts, Abbott, McCarthy, Stratton v TAMS-AFFA, 103
Tokios Tokelés v Ukraine, 217 n.4, 221 n.37
Toto Costruzioni Generali S.p.A. v The Republic of Lebanon, 58, 179 n.110, 180, 181, 183

Traghetti del Mediterraneo SpA v Repubblica italiana, 22 n.97
 Treaty on European Union, 66 n.172
 Treaty on the Functioning of European Union, 66 n.172
 trial *in absentia*, 219, 223–224
 Turkey-Jordan BIT, 200–201
Tza Yap Shum v Peru, 164 n.34, 230 n.114, 232

 undue delay, 17–21, 45, 58, 92, 107–108, 132, 162–163, 177, 179–184
Unédic v France, 169 n.61
Unglaube v. Costa Rica, 165 n.36
Unión de Pequeños Agricultores v Council of the European Union, 20 n.87
 United Nations Charter, 10–11
 Article 2(4), 11
 United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, 25 n.114
 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), 27
 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 10 of, 192
 US Model BIT, 31 n.6, 39 n.55, 50, 135 n.67
 US-Ecuador BIT, 39 n.55

Vannessa Ventures v Venezuela, 32 n.9, 38, 174 n.92
 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations
 Article 36, 26, 140
 Article 36(1), 141
 Article 36(2), 141
 breach of, 11 n.37, 140
 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT), 206–207
 Article 28, 206–207
 Article 31(1), 69
 violation of due process, 23, 26, 28, 34 n.24, 118–119, 120, 151, 162 n.25, 177–178, 192–198, 219, 221, 221 n.38, 232–233. *See also* due process

- violation of due process (*cont.*)
 versus denial of justice, 192–198
 as distinct international cause of
 action, 197
 as independent internationally
 wrongful act, 195–196
 misapplication of procedural rule
 and, 197
 outcome of, 196–197
Vivendi v Argentina, 63–64
Voeklinghaus v Czech Republic,
 164 n.32, 164 n.34, 226 n.74
- Waite and Kennedy v Germany*,
 172 n.83
- Waste Management v The United
 Mexican States*, 31 n.2, 33 n.16,
 33 n.18, 34 n.20, 35 n.29,
 107–108, 109, 164 n.34,
 189 n.171
- Watts, Arthur, 185
- White Industries Australia Limited v
 The Republic of India*, 37, 112
 commercial arbitral award in, 212
- effective means standard in, 45–46,
 112
- expropriation in, 55
- link between damages and wrongful
 judicial acts in, 124–126
- undue delay in, 181, 181 n.129,
 183–184
- Wierzbicki v Poland*, 192 n.185
- Williamson County Regional Planning
 Commission v Hamilton Bank of
 Johnson City*, 104 n.134
- Witold Litwa v Poland*, 222 n.44
- World Trade Organization (WTO), 66,
 70
- X v Federal Republic of Germany*,
 96 n.97
- Yagci and Sargin v Turkey*, 96 n.97
- Yuille, Shortridge and Co.*, 12, 21 n.93
- Yukos Universal Limited (Isle of Man) v
 The Russian Federation*,
 130 n.56, 220–221, 227,
 231–232