

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	page xiii
<i>List of Authorities</i>	xv
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxx

1 International State Responsibility for Wrongful Judicial Acts	1
I Introduction	1
A Scope and Thesis of the Study	2
B Structure of the Book	3
II Invoking State Responsibility for Judicial Acts under General International Law	5
A The Term ‘Judicial Act’	5
B Historical Evolution of the Modalities of Reparation under International Law	7
C Contemporary Understanding of State Responsibility for Judicial Acts	12
D Current Dynamics of Invoking State Responsibility	17
E Does International Law Distinguish Judicial Acts from Acts of Other State Organs for State Responsibility Purposes?	21
III Differentiation of Wrongful Judicial Acts: Denial of Justice and Breaches of Other International Obligations in the Exercise of Judicial Function	24
2 International Protection with Respect to Wrongful Judicial Acts in Investment Treaty Arbitration	30
I Investment Treaty Undertakings Relating to Judicial Acts	30
A Fair and Equitable Treatment	31
B Effective Means of Asserting Claims and Enforcing Rights	39
C Prohibition of Unlawful Expropriation	50
II International Causes of Action Relating to Judicial Acts Other Than Investment Treaty Undertakings	57
A Scope of Host State’s Offer to Settle Investment Disputes through Arbitration in the Dispute Settlement Provision of Investment Treaties	60

	B	Exclusivity of the Forum Designated in the Dispute Settlement Provision of the (Non-investment) Treaty	65
	C	Investor's Standing to Invoke the Particular Right Stipulated under the (Non-investment) Treaty	71
3		Completeness of the Breach and Exhaustion of Local Remedies as a Substantive Requirement	75
	I	Meaning of the 'Completeness' of the Breach	75
	II	Completeness of the Breach as an Issue of Substance and Distinction from the Procedural Rule of Local Remedies	77
	III	Exhaustion of Local Remedies as a Substantive Requirement in Denial of Justice Claims	82
	IV	Absence of Further Effective Remedies in Cases of Denial of Justice	86
		A Principle: Exhaustion of Local Remedies in the Whole System of Justice	86
		B Exception: Circumstances Not Requiring the Exhaustion of the Whole System of Justice	88
		C Ineffectiveness of Further Remedies	92
		D Economic and Financial Effectiveness of the Remedies and the <i>Loewen v USA</i> Case	97
	V	Maturity of Investment Treaty Claims	102
		A Completeness of an Expropriation	103
		B Completeness of a Breach of the Fair and Equitable Treatment Standard	106
		C Completeness of a Breach of the Effective Means Standard	110
4		Redressing Wrongful Judicial Acts in Investment Treaty Arbitration	114
	I	Investor's Legal Interest to Invoke State Responsibility for Wrongful Judicial Act	114
		A Lack of Legal Interest as a Ground for the Inadmissibility of the Claim	114
		B Determination of the Loss Incurred in the Course of Domestic Judicial Process as a Justification for Legal Interest in the Investment Claim	116
		C Incurrence of Loss Prior to the Finalisation of the Judicial Process: <i>Loewen v USA</i> as a Case Study	118
	II	Causality between the Wrongful Judicial Act and the Damage	121
		A Causal Link between the Breach and the Damage in Cases Involving State Responsibility for Judicial Acts	121
		B Causal Link in the <i>White Industries v India</i> Case	124
	III	Valuation of the Claim in Domestic Proceedings	126

CONTENTS

xi

A	Black Method: No Analysis of the Merits of the Domestic Claim, No Damage	127
B	White Method: No Analysis of the Merits of the Domestic Claim, Full Recovery for the Breach	128
C	Probability Method: Loss of a Chance	129
D	True Loss Method: Stepping into the Shoes of the Domestic Judge	131
IV	Availability of Non-pecuniary Remedies in Investment Arbitration for Redressing Wrongful Judicial Acts	134
A	Declaration of Wrongfulness of a Judicial Act	136
B	Juridical Restitution of Rights Involved in Domestic Court Proceedings	139
C	Injunctive Remedies against Wrongful Judicial Acts in the Form of Specific Performance of the Primary Obligation and Cessation of the Wrongful Act	145
D	First Case Study: <i>Chevron v Ecuador II</i>	147
E	Second Case Study: <i>ATA v Jordan</i>	152
5	Denial of Justice and Violation of Due Process	156
I	Concept of 'Denial of Justice'	156
A	Problem of Terminology	156
B	Controversy over the Scope of State Responsibility for Denial of Justice	158
C	Definition of the Term 'Denial of Justice'	159
II	Scope of the International Protection against Denial of Justice	161
III	Threshold of Wrongfulness in Cases of Denial of Justice	166
IV	Typical Cases of Denial of Justice	171
A	Denial of Access to Justice	171
B	Interference of the Executive in Judicial Proceedings	174
C	Non-execution of Judgments	176
D	Undue Delay	179
E	Manifest Injustice or Substantive Denial of Justice	184
V	Violation of Due Process and Denial of Justice: Two Sides of the Same Coin or Two Separate Causes of Action?	192
6	Supervisory Function of Domestic Courts over International Commercial Arbitration	199
I	Scope of Investment Claims Relating to Supervisory Function of Domestic Courts over International Commercial Arbitration	199
II	Qualification of the Rights Involved in Commercial Arbitration as 'Investment'	202
III	Intertemporal Principle with Respect to Substantive Protection in Relation to Commercial Arbitration Agreements and Awards	205

IV	Violation of International Obligations in Relation to Commercial Arbitration Agreements and Awards	209
V	Ordering Cessation of Court Proceedings to Protect the Integrity of the Arbitration Agreement	214
7	Coercive Measures of the Judiciary against the Investor	216
	I Criminal Proceedings	216
	II Bankruptcy/Liquidation Proceedings	225
	III Provisional Measures and Freezing Orders	230
8	Conclusion	234
	<i>Bibliography</i>	236
	<i>Index</i>	245