THE INTERNATIONAL LAW ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Following TPP and TTIP, the demonstrations against investor–state arbitration, the wide discussion during the 2016 US Presidential election and the US withdrawal from TPP, the climate surrounding foreign investment law is one of controversy and change, and with implications for human rights and environmental protection, foreign investment law has gained widespread public attention and visibility.

Addressing the pressing need to examine foreign investment law in the context of public international law and the role of the multinational corporation in foreign investment and issues of liability for environmental and other damage, this new edition analyses contractual and treaty-based methods of investment protection and examines the effectiveness of bilateral and regional investment treaties. By offering thought-provoking analysis of the law in historical, political and economic contexts, this fully updated edition of Sornarajah’s classic text captures leading trends and charts the possible course of future developments.
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Preface to the Fourth Edition

This edition is published at a time of much controversy in the international law on foreign investment. The need for investment treaties is coming to be questioned by economists. Some of them argue that the original premises of greater flows of foreign investment resulting from such treaties or that they lead to economic development are not provable assumptions. If they are correct, the system has been built on wrong premises. The thrust of neo-liberalism that dominated events in the field and shaped the law is on the wane. The low visibility of the subject is no more, as disputes such as cigarette labelling in Australia and Uruguay, the water dispute in Bolivia or the use of nuclear power in Germany have brought high visibility and public concern with the subject. The old view that a foreign investment dispute concerns only the parties to it is now considered archaic as extraneous factors such as environmental considerations, human rights, labour rights, cultural rights, the rights of indigenous peoples and other factors are considered relevant to such disputes. Increasingly, vocal interest groups espouse these interests. The escapades of arbitral adventurism have created public anxiety. The protests against the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) exclusively in developed countries indicate the extent of this public anxiety.

States have responded to these developments in many ways. Some have withdrawn from the system. Others have toyed with the idea of doing away with treaty-based investment arbitration. Most have come up with the so-called ‘balanced’ treaties based on the reconciliation of the two incompatible ideas of investment protection and regulatory space for the state. How this will be worked out is yet to be seen as there have been no cases on the exceptions to liability in the balanced treaties which essentially cater for the preservation of the regulatory space.

The fact is that investment arbitration is a regime that can mutate into new shapes. This is demonstrated by its capacity to create new rules, such as the legitimate expectations rule, when the door of expropriation closes and to create the proportionality rule when the legitimate expectations rule retreats in the face of criticism. Balanced treaties may not provide a cure to the anxieties that have been expressed. There is too much at stake for interested groups like the global law firms and the investment arbitration industry to restrict the system of investment arbitration.
The criticism of this work on the ground that it focuses too much on the North–South divide is misplaced. Developing countries bear the brunt of the system still. The concepts that continue to be used, like the international minimum standard, denial of justice, expropriation law and the rules of state responsibility for injuries to aliens, were developed in the context of an asymmetry between capital-exporting and capital-importing states. These old concepts form the bedrock of the newer treaties. The sovereignty-based defences that are formulated are often the discovery of old principles that existed in the law. They were defences used by developing countries. To sanitise the law from the asymmetries is to participate in the old positivist game of hiding the reality that private power has no role in shaping the principles of international law. This work refuses to participate in this endeavour and causes discomfort to some. But that is in the nature of academic scholarship.

I thank my students for being active participants in the debates in the area of the law and thereby provoking thought as to the soundness of the positions in this book as well as affirming them. I thank my doctoral students in the period after the previous edition – Trinh Yen, Prabhakar Singh, Aniruddha Rajput and Inga Martinakute – for their stimulating discussions.

As usual, I must report to my readers about my family. Thanga continues her work as a scientist at the Human Tissue Authority and looks forward to moving with me to our ancestral village in Jaffna in Sri Lanka. Ahila is now a diplomat, the First Secretary to the British Delegation at the United Nations, doing more good to international law than I ever did (which some wits would say is easy). Ramanan is at the Australian Bureau of Statistics enjoying the beaches around Sydney as much as working at the ABS. Vaishnavi is a medical doctor just beginning her career.

I am fortunate in having a supportive wife, loving children, caring colleagues at the Law School of the National University of Singapore, which is climbing fast in the league tables of top law schools of the world, and students who are as good as any in the world. The future is with them.
Preface to the Third Edition

Since the second edition of this book, the international law on foreign investment has witnessed such enormous activity that a new edition is justified within five years. The number of arbitration awards based on investment treaties has increased, resulting in several books written solely on the subject of investment treaty arbitration. New works have appeared on several aspects of the law on foreign investment. This work has held the area of the law together without fragmenting it any further. The carving out of an international law on foreign investment itself may have furthered fragmentation in international law. Yet, the aim was to ensure that the base remained clearly in international law principles. That aim does not appear to have been preserved in many of the later works which sought to carve out further areas as free-standing ones. The original niche of this work remains unaffected. It seeks to establish the foundations of the law clearly in the international law rules on state responsibility and dispute resolution rather than approach it with the central focus on investment treaties and arbitration which seems to have attracted the practitioner more than the scholar.

It also has a focus that is different from that of the other works in the field. It is written from the perspective of development. The claim to neutrality of the works in the field cloaks the fact that they deal with an asymmetrical system of the law created largely to ensure investment protection. The fact that it does not follow this routine does not by itself make it a partial work. As before, the criticisms of this work have been made best by my students who have come from all over the world. I have taught courses based on this book in London, at the Centre for Transnational Legal Studies, in Toronto, at Osgoode Hall Law School, at Dundee at the Centre for Petroleum and Natural Resources Law and at my own home institution, the National University of Singapore, which, through its joint programme with the New York University Law School, attracts a global body of students. All possible criticisms that could be made of its central approach are reflected in the work. No criticism can be more valuable to an academic than those made by young minds coming fresh to the subject. In many ways, the stances that were taken in the first two editions seem to be justified in light of the global economic crisis and the retreat of some of the tenets of free market liberalisation that it is alleged to have brought about.

That the subject will continue to undergo rapid changes is very clear. Even as the preface is written, new developments are taking place. As I sat to write it, the Lisbon Treaty of the...
European Union came into effect giving the EU competence over investment policy and investment treaties. It is not possible in this edition to speculate what the effects of the Treaty might be. States, particularly in Latin America, are pulling out of investment treaties and the ICSID Convention. The United States and South Africa have announced major reviews of their investment treaties. Some treaties are being made without an investor-state dispute-resolution provision. There is an evident retreat from the perception that investment protection is the only purpose of the investment treaty by the recognition of defences often on the basis of the relevance of the international law generally and of the international law on human rights and the environment in particular. In any event, the newer treaties are beginning to include concerns relating to labour rights, human rights and the environment. The impact of sovereign wealth funds as foreign investors has to be assessed. These changes are captured in this edition, but the manner in which they will take hold is still unclear.

As indicated in the previous editions, this area of the law is in constant change simply because different interests clash and outcomes differ based on constantly changing power balances. As a consequence, it is not an area to be studied by looking at only the language of the treaties and the awards interpreting them (the approach taken in the conventional texts on the subject), but in light of a variety of factors, among them the movement of power balances among states, the dominance and retreat of particular economic theories at given periods and the prevailing viewpoints within the arbitral community. This edition seeks to capture these changing factors which are responsible for the rapid developments that have taken place in the law.

As in the case of the previous editions, I thank those who have travelled the same path with me in the study of this exciting branch of international law. Working with those at the Division on Investment and Enterprise at UNCTAD, particularly with James Chan and Anna Joubin-Brett, has enabled me to keep abreast of the new developments that have taken place, especially in the economic aspects of the field. My academic friends, Peter Muchlinski, Frederico Ortino, Gus van Harten, Kerry Rittich, Karl Sauvant, Wenhua Shan, David Schneiderman, Kenneth Vandevelde, Jiangyu Wang and Jean Ho, have always been good sources of information, criticism and commentary, for which I am grateful. The work was first written at the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law at Cambridge. Its Directors, Sir Eli Lauterpacht and Professor James Crawford, have remained supportive. I thank also my graduate students, Huala Adolf, George Akpan, Lu Haitian and Adefolake Oyewande Adeyeye, who worked with me in aspects of this field.

I thank Finola O’Sullivan, Sinéad Moloney, Richard Woodham, Daniel Dunlavey and Martin Gleeson for the care taken over the production of my book.

The National University of Singapore has facilitated my research in every way I wished for. It has been a pleasure to be an academic at the NUS.

I commend to the readers of this work the excellent website run by Professor Andrew Newcombe of the University of Victoria, Canada, at http://ita.law.uvic.ca, which provides the texts of and other documents concerning investment treaty awards, and the equally
excellent website run by Luke Peterson, www.iareporter.com, which reports on developments in the field. Both are free services of immense help to students of this field. Most of the arbitral awards cited in this work are to be found on these websites.

Thanga was there, as always. Ahila has now studied this area of the law. Ramanan and Vaishnavi have careers of their own. The book has grown up with them.
Preface to the Second Edition

The international law on foreign investment has witnessed an explosive growth since the last edition. The decade had witnessed a proliferation of bilateral and regional investment treaties, and a dramatic rise in litigation under such treaties. The attempt to fashion a multilateral instrument on investment within the World Trade Organization has given the debate on issues in the area a wider focus. This edition seeks to capture such developments.

In the course of the decade, I have had the good fortune of being involved actively in many facets of the operation of this area of the law. During such activity, I have acquired many friends who work in the area. My association with UNCTAD has brought me in contact with Karl Sauvant, Anna Jouhin-Brett, Victoria Aranda and James Chan. It has also given me the opportunity to work with Arghyrios Fatouros, Peter Muchlinksi and Kenneth Vandevelde, the academic leaders of this field. They have added much to my understanding of the law. The many hours of arguments with them, in various parts of the world, have added to the pleasure of studying this area of the law.

The first edition was written while I was a visiting fellow at the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law, University of Cambridge. The successive Directors of the Centre, Professor Sir Eli Lauterpacht and Professor James Crawford, have continued to encourage my efforts in this and other areas of international law.

My many students in Singapore and Dundee have always challenged me so that I was taught by them to know and remember that there are other ways in which the law could be looked at. To my critics, my answer would be that I am constantly made aware of their criticisms in the classroom. I have accommodated those criticisms in the text.

I thank Finola O’Sullivan, Alison Powell and Martin Gleeson for the care taken over the production of my book.

My research student, Lu Haitian, prepared the bibliography.

Thanga was there, as always. Ahila, Ramanan and Vaishnavi happily are now old enough to let their father alone.
Preface to the First Edition

This book was written while I was on sabbatical leave from the National University of Singapore. I thank the Vice-Chancellor, the Council and Dean of the Faculty of Law for the generous terms on which I was granted the leave.

I spent the sabbatical year as a Visiting Fellow at the Research Centre for International Law of the University of Cambridge. I thank Eli Lauterpacht, the Director of the Centre, for many acts of kindness in making this year a happy and productive one.

I am grateful to Professor James Crawford, Whewell Professor of International Law at Cambridge, who read and commented on an early draft of this work, to Professor Detlev Vagts, Bemis Professor of International Law at Harvard, who enabled me to spend a month of research at the Harvard Law School and to Robin Pirrie, Fellow of Hughes Hall, Cambridge, who was helpful with his advice. I remain responsible for any errors and omissions.

As always, Thanga has been an unfailing source of strength. Ahila, Ramanan and Vaishnavi have given up time that should have been theirs.
List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Appeal Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Annual Digest of Public International Law Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJIL</td>
<td>American Journal of International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ER</td>
<td>All England Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALR</td>
<td>Australian Law Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIL Proceedings</td>
<td>American Society of International Law Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYIL</td>
<td>British Yearbook of International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR</td>
<td>Commonwealth Law Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMLR</td>
<td>Common Market Law Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRR</td>
<td>European Human Rights Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJIL</td>
<td>European Journal of International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Supp</td>
<td>Federal Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hague Recueil</td>
<td>Hague Recueil des Cours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLQ</td>
<td>International and Comparative Law Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSID Rev</td>
<td>ICSID Review – Foreign Investment Law Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILJ</td>
<td>International Law Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILM</td>
<td>International Legal Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran–US CTR</td>
<td>Iran–United States Claims Tribunal Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIA</td>
<td>Journal of International Arbitration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIL</td>
<td>Journal of International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWTL</td>
<td>Journal of World Trade Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>King’s Bench Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Law Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQR</td>
<td>Law Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>Law Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR</td>
<td>Modern Law Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCIJ</td>
<td>Permanent Court of International Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>Solicitors Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRIAA</td>
<td>United Nations Reports of International Arbitral Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>Weekly Law Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCA</td>
<td>Yearbook of Commercial Arbitration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abaclat v. Republic of Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/5</td>
<td>11, 13, 21, 233, 362, 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arbitration (1951)</td>
<td>18 ILM 144 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adel A. Hamadi Al Tamimi v. Sultanate of Oman, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/33</td>
<td>(3 November 2015) 424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF Group Inc. v. United States, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/00/1</td>
<td>391, 394, 397, 399, 402, 404–6, 408–9, 425–6, 479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGIP v. Congo (1982)</td>
<td>21 ILM 726 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguas del Tunari v. Republic of Bolivia, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/3</td>
<td>263, 374, 383, 385, 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguaytia Energy v. Republic of Peru, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/13</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Claim (1872)</td>
<td>1 Moore 495 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Adsani v. Kuwait (1996)</td>
<td>106 ILM 536 196, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoa see United States v. Aluminium Company of America (Alcoa)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alemani, Giovanni v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/8</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alps Finance and Trade v. Slovak Republic, UNCITRAL (Award, 5 March 2011) 225, 361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Warraq v. Indonesia, UNCITRAL (Award, 21 June 2012)</td>
<td>55, 75, 120, 183, 232, 275, 373, 375, 460–1, 473, 525, 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiente Ufficio v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/0 (8 February 2014) 13, 21, 233, 362, 371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminoil v. Kuwait (1982)</td>
<td>21 ILM 976 49, 93, 326, 331–2, 343, 345, 464, 480, 531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Cases

Amphitrite v. R. [1921] 3 KB 300 333
AMT see American Machine Tools v. Zaire
Anatolie Stati v. Kazakhstan, SCC Case No. 116/2010 (19 December 2013) 437, 460
Anderson v. Costa Rica, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/07/3 (19 May 2010) 229, 373–4
Anglo-American Oil Company Case [1952] ICJ Reports 93 508
Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Ltd v. Jaffrate (The ‘Rose Mary’) [1953] 1 WLR 246 27, 326
Apotex Holdings Inc. and Apotex Inc. v. United States of America, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/12/1 (Award, 25 August 2014) 16, 56, 149, 228, 239, 396
Apotex Holdings v. USA, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/12/1 (Award, 20 August 2014);
ARB(AF)/07/01 128
Aramco Arbitration (1958) 27 ILR 117 340
Argentine Bribery Case, ICC Case No. 1110 (1963) 516
Arif v. Moldova, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/23 (8 April 2013) 259, 421
Asurix v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12 (Award, 14 July 2006) 427, 474
ATA v. Jordan 421
Atlantic Triton v. Guinea (1986) 3 ICSID Reports 13 362
Attorney-General for Canada v. Cain [1906] AC 542 111
Aydin v. Turkey [1997] IIHRL 111 194
Azinian (Robert) v. Mexico (1998) 5 ICSID Reports 269 73, 129, 163, 408, 466

Bayinder Insaat Ticaret ve Sanayi v. Pakistan, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/29 (2005) 362, 417, 421
Baywater Irrigation District v. Mexico (NAFTA/ICSID), ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/05/1 (Award, 19 June 2007) 269, 474
Beanal v. Freeport-McMoran, 969 F Supp 362 (ED La, 1997) 179, 197, 293
Bear Creek Mining Corp. v. Peru, ICSID Case No. ARB/14/2 (pending) 474
Belokon v. Kyrgyz Republic, PCA Case No. AA518 (24 October 2014) 472
Benvenuti and Bonfant v. Congo (1982) 21 ILM 740 350, 512
Berschader v. Russia, SCC Case No. 080/2004 378
BG v. Argentina 539
Bilcon v. Canada see Clayton and Bilcon
Table of Cases

Biwater Gauff (Tanzania) Ltd v. United Republic of Tanzania, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/22 (Award, 24 July 2008) 269, 376, 421, 423, 475, 540, 555
Border Timbers Ltd v. Zimbabwe 418
Bosnia Genocide Case [1996] ICJ Reports 595 193
BP v. Libya (1977) 53 ILR 296 483, 516
Brickworks Ltd v. Warrigah Shire Council (1963) 108 CLR 568 125
Burlington v. Ecuador, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/5 (14 December 2012) 460
Campaña del Desarrollo de Santa Elena SA v. Republic of Costa Rica see Santa Elena v. Costa Rica
Cape plc v. Lubbe [2001] 1 WLR 1545 180
Cardona v. Chiquita Brands (2014) 760 F 3d 1185 (11 Circ.) 290
Cargill Inc v. Mexico, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/05/2 (18 September 2009) 394, 406, 538
Carl Zeiss Stiftung Case [1967] 1 AC 853 227
CEMSA see Karpa (Marvin Roy Feldman) (CEMSA) v. United Mexican States
Champion Trading Company and Ameritrade International Inc. v. Egypt, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/9 (Award, 27 October 2006); (2006) IIC 57 380
Charanne BV v. Spain, SCC Case No. 062/2012 (21 January 2016) 386
Chemtura Corp. v. Government of Canada, UNCITRAL (Award, 2 August 2010) 31, 136, 444, 474
Chevreaux Case (1931) 27 AJIL 153 408
Chevreaux Case (1933) 27 AJIL 160 150
Chinn (Oscar) Case (1934) PCIJ Series A/B No. 64 159, 421, 483
Chorzwow Factory Case (1928) PCIJ Series A No. 17 56, 105, 148, 226, 486, 505, 508, 515–16, 519–20, 532
Churchill Mining v. Indonesia, ICSID Case No. ARB/12/14 (24 February 2014) 120, 375
CME v. Czech Republic, UNCITRAL Arbitration Proceedings (Award, 14 March 2003) 416, 427, 443, 465, 469, 478
## Table of Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compania de Aguas del Aconquijia and Vivendi Universal SA v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3 (Annulment Decision, 3 July 2003)</td>
<td>308, 351, 378, 446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conoco Phillips Ltd v. Venezuela, ICSID Arb (September 2013)</td>
<td>93, 235, 384, 434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Casualty Company v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/9 (Award, 5 September 2008)</td>
<td>419–20, 552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfu Channel Case [1949] ICJ Reports 4 195</td>
<td>351, 378, 446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com Products International Inc. v. Mexico, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/01 (Decision, 15 January 2008)</td>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude Oil Windfall Tax Case see United States v. Ptasynski</td>
<td>233, 351, 378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOB see Ceskoslovenská Obchodní Banka v. Slovakia</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czarnikow Ltd v. Rolimpex [1979] AC 351 333</td>
<td>233, 351, 378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagi v. BHP [1997] 1 VR 428 180</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daimler Chrysler AG v. Bauman, 571 US 748 (2014)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jaeger v. Attorney-General of Natal [1907] AC 326 120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sabla v. Republic of Panama (1934) 28 AJIL 602 433, 460</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Line Projects LLC v. Yemen, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/17 (Award, 6 February 2008)</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhabol Arbitration 269</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diallo (Guinea v. Congo), ICJ (Judgment, 24 May 2007)</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham-Moore v. Murphyo (1979) 136 CLR 1 135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe (John) v. Unocal (‘Doe I’), 963 F Supp 880 (CD Cal., 1997) 197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Energy v. Ecuador, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/19 (18 August 2008)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Timor Case [1995] ICJ Reports 139 558</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Greenland Case (1933) PCIJ Series A/B No. 5 125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Sugar v. Czech Republic, UNCITRAL SCC No. 08/2004 (27 March 2007)</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrabel v. Hungary, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/19 (30 November 2012)</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso v. Argentina (Jurisdiction Award, 27 April 2006) 16, 356, 382, 388, 437, 460, 476</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elf Aquitaine v. NIOC (1982) 11 YCA 112 345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Canada (UNCITRAL, 2013 pending) 16, 18, 57, 121, 228, 407, 540, 542</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkin v. United States, 142 US 65 (1892) 112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EnCana Corporation v. Ecuador, London Court of International Arbitration Case No. UN3481 (UNCITRAL) (27 February 2004)</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enron Corporation and Ponderosa Assets LP v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3 417, 419, 544, 548–50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureko BV v. Republic of Poland (Netherlands-Poland BIT Ad Hoc Award, 23 November 2006) 356, 427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman v. Mexico see Karpa (Marvin Roy Feldman) (CEMSA) v. United Mexican States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flughafen Zurich v. Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/19 (14 November 2014) 259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Investment Review Act (FIRA) Case, GATT BISD (30th Supp) (7 February 1984) 164, 310, 313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresti (Piero), de Carli (Laura) and others v. Republic of South Africa, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/07/01 91, 452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortino v. Quasar Company, 950 F 2d 389 (1991) 216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraport AF Frankfurt Airport Services v. Republic of the Philippines, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/25 (Award, 16 August 2007) 14, 54–5, 76, 95, 116, 119, 129, 140, 232, 326, 345, 374, 462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Island sandmining dispute see Dillingham-Moore v. Murphyoresh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Nuclear Test Case [1974] <em>ICJ Reports</em> 253 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuji v. Kodak, WTO (Decision, 5 December 1997) 320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funnekotter (Bernardus Henricus) v. Republic of Zimbabwe, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/6 (Award, 22 April 2009) 432–3, 480, 486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gami Investments v. Mexico, NAFTA (Final Award, 15 November 2004); (2004) 44 <em>ILM</em> 811 401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia Armas v. Venezuela, UNCITRAL (15 December 2014) 380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelbtrunk (Rosa) v. Salvador (1902) <em>Foreign Relations of 1902</em> 877 151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Ukraine v. Ukraine (Award, 16 September 2003); (2005) 44 <em>ILM</em> 404 387, 557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Cases

Glamis Gold Ltd v. United States, NAFTA/UNCITRAL (Award, 8 June 2009) 157, 406, 411
Gold Reserve Inc. v. Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/09/1 (22 September 2014) 486
Goldberg (David) Case (1930) 2 UNRIAA 901 483
Goldenberg and Sons v. Germany (1928) AD 542 152, 510
Grand River Enterprises Six Nations v. United States, UNCITRAL Arbitration
Proceedings (Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction, 20 July 2006) 474
Grueslin (Philip) v. Malaysia (2000) 5 ICSID Reports 483 14, 231, 244, 371, 375, 546
Gudmundson v. Iceland (1960) 30 ILR 253 464
Guinea v. Republic of Congo, ICJ (Judgment, 24 May 2007) 380
H&H Enterprises Inc. v. Egypt, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/15 (5 June 2012) 129
Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff, 467 US 229 (1984) 502
Holiday Inns v. Morocco (1980) 51 BYIL 123 234, 381
Home Missionary Society Case (1920) 6 UNRIAA 42 152, 162, 199
Hubco v. WAPDA (Pakistan Civil Appeal Nos. 1398 and 1399 of 1999), 16 Arb Intl (No. 4, 2000) 439 269, 352
Ikale v. Turkmenistan (8 March 2016) 421
INA Corporation v. Iran (1985) 8 Iran–US CTR 373 492, 515
Inceysa Vallisoletana v. El Salvador, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/26 (Jurisdiction Award, 2 August 2006) 128, 232, 373–4
Indonesia (Republic of) v. Newmont (unreported ad hoc award under UNCITRAL Rules, 2009) 264
International Bank of Washington v. OPIC (1972) 11 ILM 1216 135, 271
International Thunderbird Gaming Corporation v. United Mexican States, NAFTA/UNCITRAL (Award, 26 January 2006) 42, 396, 417–18, 557
Ioannis Kardassopoulos v. Georgia, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/18 (Jurisdiction Award, 6 July 2007) 374
James v. United Kingdom (1986) 8 EHRR 123 456, 484, 501–2
Jan de Nul Dredging International NV v. Arab Republic of Egypt, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/13 (Jurisdiction Award, 16 June 2006) 367, 376
Janes Claim (1926) 4 UNRIAA 82 156
Table of Cases

John Doe v. Mobil see Doe (John) et al. v. Exxon Mobil et al. (‘Doe I’)
John Doe v. Unocal see Doe (John) v. Unocal (‘Doe I’)  

Kahler v. Midland Bank [1950] AC 24 335
Kardassapoulos v. Georgia, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/18 (3 March 2010) 467
Karpa (Marvin Roy Feldman) (CEMSA) v. United Mexican States, ICSID Case No. ARB (AF)/99/1 (Award, 16 December 2002), (2003) 42 ILM 625 239, 245, 374, 380, 398, 400–1, 458, 467–9, 480
Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Shell, 133 S. Ct 1659 (2013) 34, 97, 179, 290, 542
Klockner v. Cameroon (1983) 2 ICSID Reports 16 381
Kozacioglu v. Turkey (European Court of Human Rights, Application No. 2334/03, Judgment of 19 February 2009) 230
Kugele v. Polish State [1931–2] AD 69 477

La Brea y Parinas (1968) 7 ILM 1201 527
Land Sale to Aliens Case (1973) 77 I LR 433 131
Lauder v. Czech Republic, UNCITRAL Arbitration Proceedings (Final Award, 3 September 2001) 416, 427, 436, 453, 465, 478
Le Courturier v. Rey [1910] AC 262 227
Lemenda Trading Co. Ltd v. African Middle East Petroleum Co. Ltd [1988] 1 All ER 513 292
Lemire v. Ukraine, ICSID ARB/06/18 (28 March 2011) 396–7
LESI SpA and Astaldi SpA v. Algeria, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/3 367
Letelier v. Chile, 488 F Supp 665 (1980) 196
LG&E v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/1 (Award, 3 October 2007) 263, 417–18, 474, 538, 545, 548
Libyan American Oil Company (Liamco) v. Libya (1981) 20 ILM 1 338, 343, 484, 511
Link-Trading Joint Stock Company v. Republic of Moldova, UNCITRAL (Final Award, 18 April 2002); (2002) IIC 154 472
Lithgow v. United Kingdom (1986) 8 EHRR 329 501, 522
Lockerbie Case see Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971 Montreal Convention Arising from the Aerial Incident at Lockerbie (Libya v. UK and Libya v. US) (Judgment, 27 February 1998)
Loewen v. United States (2003) 42 ILM 811 127, 400, 424, 466
Loizidou v. Turkey (1996) 108 ILM 443 193
xxx

Table of Cases

Maffezini v. Kingdom of Spain (2000) 5 ICSID Reports 396 241, 276, 376, 378–9, 391
Malaysian Historical Salvors SDN BHD v. Malaysia, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/10 (Award, 17 May 2007) 185, 225, 362, 364–7, 373, 560
Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions Case (1929) PCIJ Series A No. 2 148, 189
Merill and Ring v. Canada, UNCITRAL (Award, 31 March 2010) 149, 157
Merill Ring v. Canada, UNCITRAL (Award, 26 March 2010) 103
Mesa Power Group v. Canada 406, 420, 424
Metal-Tech Ltd v. Uzbekistan, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/3 (4 October 2013) 55, 73, 75
Middle East Cement Shipping and Handling Co. v. Egypt, ICSID Case No. ARB/99/6 (12 April 2002); (2002) 7 ICSID Reports 2 373, 392, 425, 426, 436–7, 442, 465, 478
Military and Paramilitary Activities In and Against Nicaragua see Nicaragua v. United States
Minnotte (David) and Lewis (Robert) v. Poland, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/10/1 (16 May 2014) 119
Mitchell (Patrick) v. Congo, ICSID Case No. ARB/99/7 (Award, 1 November 2006) 130, 185, 224, 362–3, 367
Mobil Oil Case see Doe (John) et al. v. Exxon Mobil et al. (‘Doe I’)
Mobil Oil v. Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/27 (10 June 2010) 384
MTD Equity v. Republic of Chile (2007) 12 ICSID Reports 6 417, 421
Murphylores Ltd v. Commonwealth (1976) 136 CLR 1 477–8
Mutasa v. Attorney-General [1979] 3 All ER 257 523
National Grid v. Argentina (unreported) 552
Nationalization of Gulf Oil in Bolivia (1969) 8 ILM 264 527
Neer Claim (1926) 4 UNRRAA 60 148–50, 156–7, 406, 408–9, 415–16, 443, 557
NIS v. Ukraine see Western NIS Enterprise Fund v. Ukraine; ICSID Case No. ARB/04/2 (Order, 16 March 2006)
NML Capital Ltd v. Republic of Argentina, 699 F. 3d 246, 248 (2d Cir. 2012) 13
Table of Cases

North American Dredging Company of Texas v. United Mexican States (Mexico/USA General Claims Commission Award, 31 March 1926); (1926) 4 UNRIA 26 378

Norwegian Ship Owners’ Claims (1922) 1 UNRIA 307 515

Nottebohm Case [1955] ICJ Reports 4 380

Novartis v. The Union of India (2006) 57, 60

Nova Scotia Power Incorporated v. Bolivian Republic of Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/11/1 (Award (excerpts), 30 April 2014) 362, 367

Occidental v. Ecuador, London Court of International Arbitration (Award, 1 July 2004) 376–7, 396, 398, 400–1, 417, 420, 427

Oil Fields of Texas v. Iran (1982) 1 Iran–US CTR 347 125

Oil Platforms Case [1996] ICJ Reports 8 216, 544

Olguin v. Paraguay, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/5 (Final Award, 26 July 2001) 557

Oppenheimer v. Cattermole (Inland Revenue Commissioner) [1975] 1 All ER 538 131, 485

Osthoff v. Hofele, 1 US Ct Rest App 111 (1950) 446

Oxus Gold v. Uzbekistan, UNCITRAL (Award, 17 December 2015) 423, 437

Pac Rim Cayman v. El Salvador, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/12 (1 June 2012) 387


Panevezys–Saldutiskis Railway Case (1939) PCIJ Series A/B No. 76 147–8, 150

Pantechniki SA Contractors & Engineers v. Republic of Albania, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/21 (Award, 30 July 2009) 362, 427

Parkersing-Compagniet AS v. Republic of Lithuania, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/8 (Award, 11 September 2007) 418

Patrick Mitchell see Mitchell (Patrick) v. Congo

Payne (Thomas Earl) v. Iran (1987) 12 Iran–US CTR 518


Peña-Irala v. Filartiga, 630 F 2d 876 (2nd Cir., 1980) 180

Penn Central v. New York City, 438 US 104 (1978) 439, 455

Perenco Ecuador Ltd v. The Republic of Ecuador, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/6 (11 August 2015) 31, 140, 538, 540


Phaiton Energy Company v. Pertamina Perusahaan Tambang Minyak Negara (unreported) 352, 554

Phelps Dodge Corporation v. Iran (1986) 10 Iran–US CTR 157 518

Philip Morris Asia Limited (Hong Kong) v. Australia, UNCITRAL (Award, 17 December 2015) 56, 458, 536

Philip Morris v. Uruguay, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/7 (Award, 8 July 2016) 56, 458–60, 473, 538

xxxii  

**Table of Cases**

Phoenix Action Ltd v. The Czech Republic (Award, 19 April 2009) ICSID Case No. ARB/06/5 360, 367, 374–6, 385–6, 429, 474, 558

Pickerings v. Lithuania 560

Piero Foresti, Laura de Carli and Others v. South Africa, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/07/01 91, 452

Ping An v. Belgium, ICSID Case No. ARB/12/29 (25 April 2015) 35, 207, 390, 536

Pinochet Case see R. v. Bow Street Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate, ex parte Pinochet Ugarte (No. 3)

Plama Consortium Ltd v. Republic of Bulgaria, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/24 (Award, 27 August 2008) 241, 374, 376, 474

Poehmann v. Kulmbache Spinnerei AG, US Ct Rest App 701 (1952) 446


Qatar Arbitration (1953) 20 *ILR* 534 340

Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971 Montreal Convention Arising from the Aerial Incident at Lockerbie (Libya v. UK and Libya v. US) (Judgment, 27 February 1998) 193

Quiborax v. Bolivia, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/2 (19 September 2015) 465, 472

R. v. Bow Street Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate, ex parte Pinochet Ugarte (No. 3) (unreported) 177, 180


Revere Copper and Brass Inc. v. Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) (1978) 56 *ILR* 258 65, 237, 344–5, 463

RFCC Consortium v. Kingdom of Morocco, ICSID Case No. ARB/00/6 (Award, 22 December 2003) 397

Roberts Claim (1926) 4 *UNRIAA* 77 148, 156, 408

Romak v. Uzbekistan, PCA AA280 (26 November 2009) 225, 361
Table of Cases

‘Rose Mary’, The see Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Ltd v. Jaffrate
RSM Production Corporation v. Grenada, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/14 (Award, 13 March 2009) 362, 372, 554

S. D. Myers v. Canada see Myers (S. D.) v. Canada
Saipem v. Bangladesh, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/07 (Decision, 30 June 2009) 259, 352
Salini Costruttori SpA v. Kingdom of Morocco, ICSID Case No. ARB/00/4 (Jurisdiction Award, 23 July 2001); (2001) 42 ILM 577 362–3, 367
Sanchetti v. Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London [2008] EWCA Civ 1283 34, 216
Sarei v. Rio Tinto, 221 F Supp 2d 1116 (CD Cal., 2002) 181
SAUR v. Argentina 268
Schmidt v. Secretary of State for Home Affairs [1969] 2 Ch 149 111
Schufeldt Claim (1930) 5 AD 179; (1930) UNRIA/A 1079; (1930) 24 AJIL 799 152, 189, 339, 483, 510
Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16 388, 417, 419, 474, 544, 548, 550
Serbian Loans Case (1929) PCIJ Series A No. 20 150, 335, 340
Settebello v. Banco Totta e Acores [1985] 2 All ER 1025; [1985] 1 WLR 1050 82, 95, 333
SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA v. Pakistan (unreported, 2004) 211, 253, 354–6, 362
SGS Société Générale de Surveillance SA v. Republic of the Philippines, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/06 (Award, 29 June 2004) 253, 351, 354–6, 362, 553
Shaffer v. Heitner, 433 US 188 (1977) 112
Short v. Iran (1987) 16 Iran–US CTR 76 192
Short v. Iran (1989) 23 Iran–US CTR 351 140
Short v. Iran (1990) 24 Iran–US CTR 203 55
Siemens v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/8 (Award, 6 February 2007) 379, 398, 420, 552
Smith (Walter Fletcher) Case (1930) 24 AJIL 384 483
Sociedad Minera el Teniente SA v. Aktiengesellschaft Nordeutsche Affinerie (1973) 12 ILM 251 522