

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.

Suitable for postgraduate and undergraduate students, *The International Law of Foreign Investment* is essential reading for anyone specialising in the law of foreign investments.

M. SORNARAJAH is C. J. Koh Professor at the Faculty of Law of the National University of Singapore.

THE INTERNATIONAL LAW ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT

M. Sornarajah
National University of Singapore



Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-13362-4 — The International Law on Foreign Investment
M. Sornarajah
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
4843/24, 2nd Floor, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, Delhi – 110002, India
79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.
It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of
education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107133624
DOI: 10.1017/9781316459959

© M. Sornarajah 2017

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2017

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Sornarajah, M., author.

Title: The international law on foreign investment / M. Sornarajah, National University of Singapore.
Description: Fourth edition. | Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press,
2017. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017007092 | ISBN 9781107133624 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9781107590144
(pbk. : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Investments, Foreign (International law)

Classification: LCC K3830.4 .S67 2017 | DDC 346/.092–dc23 LC record available at
<https://lcn.loc.gov/2017007092>

ISBN 978-1-107-13362-4 Hardback
ISBN 978-1-107-59014-4 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy
of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication
and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain,
accurate or appropriate.

Table of Contents

<i>Preface to the Fourth Edition</i>	<i>page</i> xiii
<i>Preface to the Third Edition</i>	xv
<i>Preface to the Second Edition</i>	xix
<i>Preface to the First Edition</i>	xxi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Definition of Foreign Investment	11
1.1.1 The Distinction between Portfolio Investment and Foreign Direct Investment	12
1.1.2 Definition of Foreign Investment in Investment Treaties	13
1.1.3 The Evolution of the Meaning of the Term ‘Investment’	14
1.2 The History of the International Law on Foreign Investment	23
1.2.1 The Colonial Period	23
1.2.2 The Post-colonial Period	26
1.3 An Outline of the Book	36
2 The Shaping Factors	42
2.1 The Historical Setting	46
2.1.1 State Responsibility for Injuries to Aliens	46
2.1.1.1 The Natural Resources Sector	48
2.1.1.2 The Plantation Sector	52
2.1.1.3 The Manufacturing Sector	53
2.1.1.4 The Financial Sector	55
2.1.1.5 Intellectual Property	56
2.2 Conflicting Economic Theories on Foreign Investment	60
2.2.1 The Classical Theory on Foreign Investment	61
2.2.2 The Dependency Theory	67
2.2.3 The Middle Path	69
2.3 Actors in the Field of Foreign Investment	75
2.3.1 The Multinational Corporation	77

2.3.2	State Corporations	80
2.3.3	International Institutions	82
2.3.4	Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs)	84
2.3.5	Other Actors	86
2.3.6	Sovereign Wealth Funds	86
2.4	Risks in Foreign Investment	87
2.4.1	Ideological Hostility	89
2.4.2	Nationalism	89
2.4.3	Ethnicity as a Factor	91
2.4.4	Changes in Industry Patterns	92
2.4.5	Contracts Made by Previous Regimes	94
2.4.6	Onerous Contracts	95
2.4.7	Regulation of the Economy	95
2.4.8	Human Rights and Environmental Concerns	96
2.4.9	The Law-and-order Situation	98
2.5	Sources of the International Law on Foreign Investment	98
2.5.1	Treaties	98
2.5.2	Custom	101
2.5.3	General Principles of Law	105
2.5.4	Judicial Decisions	107
2.5.5	Domestic Law	108
3	Controls by the Host State	110
3.1	Regulation of Entry	120
3.1.1	Guarantees against Expropriation	123
3.1.2	Guarantees Relating to Dispute Settlement	126
3.1.3	Tax and Non-tax Incentives to Foreign Investors	127
3.1.4	Screening of Foreign Investment Entry	128
3.1.5	Requirements of Local Collaboration	131
3.1.6	Capitalisation Requirements	133
3.1.7	Requirements Relating to Environmental Protection	134
3.1.8	Requirements Relating to Export Targets	137
3.1.9	Requirements Relating to Local Equity	138
3.1.10	Other Requirements	141
3.1.11	Regulation and Expropriation	141
3.2	New Forms of Foreign Investment	142
3.2.1	The Joint Venture	143
3.2.2	The Production-sharing Agreement	144
3.3	Constraints on Control: Customary International Law	145
3.3.1	State Responsibility for Injuries to Aliens	147
3.3.2	The Conflict between the United States and Latin American States	150

<i>Table of Contents</i>		vii
3.3.3	The Content of the International Minimum Standard	155
3.3.4	State Responsibility and Developing States	157
3.3.5	The ‘Noble Synthesis’	158
3.3.6	Damage to Property in the Course of Civil Disturbances	161
3.3.7	Validity of Conditions on Foreign Investment	164
3.3.7.1	Regulations on Screening of Foreign Investments	164
3.3.7.2	Local Equity Requirements	166
3.3.7.3	Export Requirements	169
3.4	Conclusion	170
4	The Liability of Multinational Corporations and Home State Measures	172
4.1	Obligations of Multinational Corporations	174
4.1.1	The Obligation Not to Interfere in Domestic Politics	177
4.1.2	Obligations Relating to Human Rights	178
4.1.3	Liability for Violations of Environmental Norms	182
4.1.4	The Obligation to Promote Economic Development	184
4.2	Extraterritorial Control by Home States	186
4.2.1	State Responsibility of Home States for Failure to Control Multinational Corporations	188
4.2.2	The Existing Rules on State Responsibility	188
4.2.3	The Duty to Control Nationals Abroad	196
4.2.4	State Responsibility and the Duty to Provide Remedies to Victims	201
4.3	Conclusion	202
5	Bilateral Investment Treaties	204
5.1	Introductory Survey	209
5.2	Treaties of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation	214
5.3	Reasons for Making Bilateral Investment Treaties	217
5.4	Features of Bilateral Investment Treaties	222
5.4.1	The Statement of the Purpose of the Treaty	223
5.4.2	Definitions	226
5.4.2.1	Investments	226
5.4.2.2	Limitation on the Definition of Investment	230
5.4.2.3	Portfolio Investments	232
5.4.2.4	Corporate Nationality and the Protection of Shareholders	233
5.4.3	Standard of Treatment	238
5.4.3.1	National Standard of Treatment	238
5.4.3.2	Fair and Equitable Standard	240
5.4.3.3	Most-favoured-nation Treatment	241
5.4.3.4	Full Protection and Security	242

5.4.4	Performance Requirements	242
5.4.5	Repatriation of Profits	243
5.4.6	Nationalisation and Compensation	244
5.4.6.1	Compensation for Destruction during Wars and National Emergencies	250
5.4.7	Protection of Commitments	253
5.4.8	Dispute Resolution	254
5.4.9	Arbitration and the Exhaustion of Local Remedies	257
5.4.9.1	Arbitration between States	259
5.4.9.2	Subrogation	260
5.4.10	Safeguard Provisions and Exceptions	261
5.5	‘Balanced’ Investment Treaties	263
5.5.1	Environmental Concerns	265
5.5.2	Human Rights	267
5.5.3	Sustainable Development	270
5.5.4	International Concerns	271
5.5.5	Regulatory Space and Balanced Treaties	272
5.5.6	Bilateral Investment Treaties and Customary International Law	273
5.5.7	Carve Out of Areas	275
5.5.8	Liabilities of Foreign Investors	275
5.5.9	Dispute Settlement	276
5.5.10	The Termination of Treaties	276
5.6	Conclusion	278
6	Multilateral and Regional Instruments on Foreign Investment	280
6.1	The International Norms on Multinational Corporations	283
6.2	The Draft Codes on Multinational Corporations	287
6.2.1	Description of the UNCTC Draft Code	287
6.2.1.1	The Preamble	287
6.2.1.2	Definition	288
6.2.1.3	Respect for National Sovereignty	288
6.2.1.4	Renegotiation of Contracts	289
6.2.1.5	Non-interference in Domestic Affairs	290
6.2.1.6	Abstention from Corrupt Practices	292
6.2.1.7	Economic and Other Controls	293
6.2.1.8	Disclosure of Information	293
6.2.1.9	Treatment of Transnational Corporations	294
6.3	The Outstanding Issues	294
6.3.1	The Relevance of International Law	294
6.3.2	Non-interference in Domestic Affairs	296
6.3.3	Permanent Sovereignty and International Obligations	297
6.3.4	The UN Global Compact	298

Table of Contents

ix

6.4	The Regional Agreements	298
6.4.1	NAFTA	298
6.4.2	The ASEAN Agreements	300
6.4.3	The South African Development Community Model Investment Treaty	303
6.5	The Multilateral Agreement on Investment	304
6.6	The WTO and Foreign Investment	309
6.6.1	Investment in the Uruguay Round	310
6.6.2	GATS	311
6.6.3	TRIPS	312
6.6.4	TRIMS	313
6.7	An Investment Regime under the WTO	314
6.7.1	The Definition of Investment	314
6.7.2	Definition and Preservation of Regulatory Control	315
6.7.3	Definition of Investor	316
6.7.4	Treatment Standards	317
6.7.4.1	Most-favoured-nation Treatment	318
6.7.5	Performance Requirements	318
6.7.6	Expropriation	319
6.7.7	Balance-of-payment Safeguards	319
6.7.8	Dispute Resolution	320
6.8	The Right to Regulate Foreign Investment	320
6.9	The Mega-regional Treaties: TPP and TTIP	322
6.10	Conclusion	323
7	Settlement of Investment Disputes: Contract-based Arbitration	324
7.1	Contractual Devices for Foreign Investment Protection	328
7.1.1	The Essential Clauses	330
7.1.1.1	The Stabilisation Clause	330
7.1.1.2	Choice-of-law Clause	334
7.1.1.3	Arbitration Clause	336
7.2	The Internationalisation of State Contracts	339
7.2.1	The Origin of the Theory of Internationalisation	339
7.2.2	The ICSID Convention and International Law	349
7.2.3	The Continued Relevance of Contract-based Arbitration	351
7.2.4	<i>Lex mercatoria</i> and State Contracts	353
7.2.5	Umbrella Clauses and Internationalisation	354
7.2.6	Arbitration Based on Investment Legislation	355
7.2.7	Relevance of the Contract in Investment Treaty Arbitration	355
7.3	Conclusion	356

8	Treaty-based Investment Arbitration: Jurisdictional Issues	358
8.1	Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Materiae</i>	360
8.1.1	The Definition of Investment	361
8.1.2	Economic Development as a Characteristic of Investment	367
8.1.3	Does Portfolio Investment Qualify as Investment?	368
8.1.4	Pre-contractual Expenses as Investment	372
8.1.5	The Qualification of Investment as Subject to Local Laws and Regulations	373
8.1.6	Good Faith Limitations	374
8.1.7	Investments ‘Approved in Writing’	375
8.1.8	The Time Factor	375
8.1.9	Negotiations	376
8.1.10	The ‘Fork in the Road’ and Waiver	376
8.1.11	Most-favoured-nation Clause	378
8.1.12	Exhaustion of Local Remedies	379
8.2	The Investor as Claimant	379
8.2.1	Natural Persons	380
8.2.2	Juridical Person: Corporate Nationality	380
8.2.3	Locally Incorporated Company	381
8.2.4	The Wholly Owned Company as Claimant	382
8.2.5	The Migration of Companies	383
8.2.6	Shopping for Jurisdiction	385
8.2.7	Round-tripping and Corporate Nationality	386
8.2.8	Denial of Benefits	387
8.2.9	Protection of Minority Shareholders	387
8.3	Conclusion	388
9	Causes of Action: Breaches of Treatment Standards	390
9.1	The Customary International Law Standards	393
9.2	The Violation of National Treatment Standards	394
9.2.1	Performance Requirements and National Treatment	402
9.2.2	National Treatment and Infant Industries	403
9.2.3	Subsidies, Grants and National Treatment	404
9.2.4	Ethnicity and National Treatment	404
9.2.5	Conclusion	404
9.3	International Minimum Standard Treatment	405
9.4	Fair and Equitable Standard of Treatment	411
9.4.1	Violation of Legitimate Expectations	417
9.4.2	Denial of Justice	424
9.4.3	Due Process and Administrative Irregularity	425
9.5	Full Protection and Security	426
9.6	Conclusion	428

Table of Contents

xi

10 The Taking of Foreign Property	430
10.1 What Constitutes Taking?	432
10.1.1 New Forms of Taking	435
10.1.2 The Ideas of Property	438
10.1.2.1 Forced Sales of Property	446
10.1.2.2 Forced Sales of Shares	447
10.1.3 Privatisation and Forced Sales	450
10.1.3.1 Indigenisation Measures	451
10.1.3.2 Interference with Property Rights	453
10.1.4 Evolving US and European Notions of Property	454
10.1.5 The Impact on International Law	456
10.1.6 Regulatory Expropriations	460
10.2 The Exercise of Management Control over the Investment	475
10.2.1 Cancellation of Permits and Licences	477
10.2.2 Takings by Agents and Mobs	479
10.2.3 Excessive Taxation	480
10.2.4 Expulsion of the Foreign Investor	481
10.2.5 Freezing of Bank Accounts	481
10.2.6 Exchange Controls	481
10.3 Illegal Takings	482
10.3.1 The Taking Must Be for a Public Purpose	482
10.3.2 Discriminatory Taking	485
10.3.3 Takings in Violation of Treaties	486
10.3.4 The Role of the Proportionality Rule	487
10.4 Conclusion	488
11 Compensation for Nationalisation of Foreign Investments	490
11.1 The Competing Norms: The Views of the Capital-exporting States	492
11.1.1 The Claim that ‘Prompt, Adequate and Effective’ Compensation Must Be Paid	492
11.1.1.1 Treaties	494
11.1.1.2 Customary Practice	495
11.1.1.3 General Principles of Law	497
11.1.1.4 Unjust Enrichment	497
11.1.1.5 Acquired Rights	498
11.1.1.6 Right to Property	499
11.1.1.7 Foreign Investment Codes	503
11.1.1.8 Decisions of Courts and Tribunals	505
11.1.1.9 International Courts	505
11.1.1.10 Awards of Arbitral Tribunals	509
11.1.1.11 National and Regional Courts	521
11.1.1.12 Writings of Publicists	523

xii	<i>Table of Contents</i>	
11.2	The Competing Norms	525
11.2.1	The Claim That It Is Permissible to Deduct Past Excess Profits from Compensation	526
11.2.2	The Claim That the Taking Is a ‘Revindication’ for Which No Compensation is Necessary	527
11.2.3	The Claim That Appropriate Compensation Should Be Paid	527
11.2.3.1	Categories of Takings for Which Damages Rather Than Compensation Must Be Paid	529
11.2.3.2	Categories of Lawful Takings for Which Full Compensation Must Be Paid	530
11.2.3.3	Full Compensation Must Be Paid Where There Is a One-off Taking of a Small Business	531
11.2.3.4	Full Compensation Need Not Be Paid as Part of a Full-scale Nationalisation of a Whole Industry	531
11.2.3.5	Partial Compensation	532
11.3	Valuation of Nationalised Property	532
11.4	Conclusion	534
12	Defences to Responsibility	535
12.1	Treaty-based Defences	541
12.1.1	National Security	544
12.1.2	Economic Crises and National Security	546
12.1.3	Necessity	548
12.1.4	<i>Force Majeure</i>	553
12.2	Violation of the Fair and Equitable Standard by the Foreign Investor	554
12.3	<i>Ius Cogens</i> , Competing Obligations and Liability	557
12.3.1	Transactions with Undemocratic Governments	559
12.3.2	Investments in Areas of Secessionist Claims	559
12.3.3	Cultural Property and Foreign Investment	560
12.3.4	Environmental Obligations	560
12.3.5	Human Rights Considerations	561
12.4	Do the Balanced Treaties and the Defences Fix the Problems of Investment Arbitration?	561
12.5	Conclusion	563
	<i>Bibliography</i>	565
	<i>Index</i>	574

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 Dunlavy 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

Preface to the Third Edition

xvii

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 Joubin-Brett, Victoria Aranda and James Chan. It has also given me the opportunity to work with Arghyrios Fatouros, Peter Muchlinksi and Kenneth Vandavelde, 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

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

Table of Cases

- Abaclat v. Republic of Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/5 (Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility, 4 August 2011) 11, 13, 21, 233, 362, 371
- Abu Dhabi Arbitration (1951) 18 *ILR* 144 340
- Adel A. Hamadi Al Tamimi v. Sultanate of Oman, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/33 (3 November 2015) 424
- ADF Group Inc. v. United States, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/00/1 (Award, 9 January 2003) 391, 394, 397, 399, 402, 404–6, 408–9, 425–6, 479
- AGIP v. Congo (1982) 21 *ILM* 726 512
- Aguas del Tunari v. Republic of Bolivia, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/3 (Jurisdiction Award, 21 October 2005) 263, 374, 383, 385, 540
- Aguytia Energy v. Republic of Peru, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/13 397
- AHS Niger and Menzies Middle East and Africa S.A. v. Republic of Niger (AHS v. Niger), ICSID Case No. ARB/11/11 (Award, 15 July 2013) 56
- Akpan v. Royal Dutch Shell plc/SPDC (Nigeria) LJN: BY9854, Rechtbank's-Gravenhage, C/09/337050/HA ZA 09–1580, 30 January 2013 180
- Alabama Claim (1872) 1 Moore 495 191
- Al-Adsani v. Kuwait (1996) 106 *ILR* 536 196, 197
- Alcoa *see* United States v. Aluminium Company of America (Alcoa) 186
- Alemanni, Giovanni v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/8 (17 November 2014) 371
- Alps Finance and Trade v. Slovak Republic, UNCITRAL (Award, 5 March 2011) 225, 361
- Al-Warraq v. Indonesia, UNCITRAL (Award, 21 June 2012) 55, 75, 120, 183, 232, 275, 373, 375, 460–1, 473, 525, 556
- Ambiente Ufficio v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/0 (8 February 2014) 13, 21, 233, 362, 371
- Amco Asia Corporation v. Republic of Indonesia, ICSID Case No. ARB/81/1 (Award, 20 November 1984); (1984) 23 *ILM* 351; (1988) 27 *ILM* 1281; 1 *ICSID Reports* 589 64, 115, 120, 129, 133–4, 163, 167–9, 227, 234, 374, 381, 388, 425, 445, 464–6, 469, 478, 480, 499
- American International Group Inc. v. Iran (1983) 4 *Iran-US CTR* 96 514
- American Machine Tools v. Zaire (1997) 36 *ILM* 1531 148, 242, 256, 427, 480
- Aminoil v. Kuwait (1982) 21 *ILM* 976 49, 93, 326, 331–2, 343, 345, 464, 480, 531

- Amoco International Finance Corporation v. Iran (1987) 15 *Iran-US CTR* 189 341, 519
 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
 Asian Agricultural Products Ltd (AAPL) v. Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, ICSID Case No. ARB/87/3; IIC 18 (1990); (1990) 4 *ICSID Reports* 245; (1991) 6 *ICSID Rev* 526 3, 156, 162, 210, 236, 250, 252, 256, 260, 278, 299, 351, 358, 360, 379, 388, 394, 427–8, 480, 554
 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
 Autopista Concessionada de Venezuela v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (2001) *ICSID Reports* 417 362
 Aydin v. Turkey [1997] *IIHRL* 111 194
 Azinian (Robert) v. Mexico (1998) 5 *ICSID Reports* 269 73, 129, 163, 408, 466
- Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Chase Manhattan Bank, 658 F 2d 875 (1981) 522
 Barcelona Traction Case [1970] *ICJ Reports* 1 15–16, 48, 107, 129, 219, 233–4, 370, 380–1, 388, 429, 436, 447–9, 452, 466, 509
 Bayinder Insaat Turizm 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

- Biloune and Marine Drive Complex Ltd v. Ghana Investment Centre (1993)
 95 *ILR* 184 55, 346, 437, 465, 478, 481
- 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
- Bowoto v. Chevron, 312 F Supp 2d 1229 (2004) 182
- 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
- Cardoma 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
- Centros Ltd v. Erhverves-og Selskabsstyrelsen [2000] Ch 446; [2000] 2 WLR 1048; [1999] 2 *CMLR* 551 235
- Ceskoslovenská Obchodní Banka v. Slovakia (1999) 14 *ICSID Rev* 251 20, 256, 361
- 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
- Chevreau Case (1931) 27 *AJIL* 153 408
- Chevreau Case (1933) 27 *AJIL* 160 150
- Chinn (Oscar) Case (1934) PCIJ Series A/B No. 64 159, 421, 483
- Chorzow 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
- Clayton and Bilcon v. Canada, PCA Case 2009-04 (Award, 17 March 2015) 121, 135, 136, 183, 401, 411, 423–4, 488, 542
- CME v. Czech Republic, UNCITRAL Arbitration Proceedings (Award, 14 March 2003) 416, 427, 443, 465, 469, 478
- CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8 (Jurisdiction Award, 17 July 2003); (2003) 30/42 *ILM* 778; (2005) 44 *ILM* 1205 370, 377, 388, 417, 419–20, 469, 482, 548–9, 557
- Commonwealth Aluminium Corporation v. Attorney-General [1976] Qd 231 123
- Compagnie Européenne de Pétroles v. Sensor Nederland BV (1983) 22 *ILM* 320 234

- Compania de Aguas del Aconquijia and Vivendi Universal SA v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3 (Annulment Decision, 3 July 2003) 308, 351, 378, 446
 Conoco Phillips Ltd v. Venezuela, ICSID Arb (September 2013) 93, 235, 384, 434
 Continental Casualty Company v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/9 (Award, 5 September 2008) 419–20, 552
 Corfu Channel Case [1949] *ICJ Reports* 4 195
 Corn Products International Inc. v. Mexico, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/01 (Decision, 15 January 2008) 563
 Crude Oil Windfall Tax Case *see* United States v. Ptasynski
 CSOB *see* Československá Obchodní Banka v. Slovakia
 Czarnikow Ltd v. Rolimpex [1979] AC 351 333
- Dagi v. BHP [1997] 1 VR 428 180
 Daimler Chrysler AG v. Bauman, 571 US 748 (2014) 34
 De Jaeger v. Attorney-General of Natal [1907] AC 326 120
 De Sabla v. Republic of Panama (1934) 28 *AJIL* 602 433, 460
 Delagoa Bay Railway Company Case (1900) Whiteman, *Digest*, vol. 3, p. 1694 152, 339, 509–10, 531
 Desert Line Projects LLC v. Yemen, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/17 (Award, 6 February 2008) 427
 Deutsche Bank v. Sri Lanka, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/2 (31 October 2012) 13, 21, 362, 371
 Deutsche Schachtbau- und Tiefbohrgesellschaft mbH v. Ras Al-Khaimah National Oil Company [1988] 3 WLR 230; [1988] 2 All ER 833 334
 Dhabol Arbitration 269
 Diallo (Guinea v. Congo), ICJ (Judgment, 24 May 2007) 15, 48, 107, 233, 234, 370, 380, 388, 448
 Dillingham-Moore v. Murphyores (1979) 136 *CLR* 1 135
 Doe (John) v. Unocal ('Doe I'), 963 F Supp 880 (CD Cal., 1997) 197
 Doe v. Unocal, 27 F Supp 2d 1174 (1998) (CD Cal., 1997) 197, 293
 Duke Energy v. Ecuador, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/19 (18 August 2008) 419
- East Timor Case [1995] *ICJ Reports* 139 558
 Eastern Greenland Case (1933) PCIJ Series A/B No. 5 125
 Eastern Sugar v. Czech Republic, UNCITRAL SCC No. 08/2004 (27 March 2007) 276
 Electrabel v. Hungary, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/19 (30 November 2012) 417
 El Paso v. Argentina (Jurisdiction Award, 27 April 2006) 16, 356, 382, 388, 437, 460, 476
 Elf Aquitaine v. NIOC (1982) 11 *YCA* 112 345
 Eli Lilly and Co. v. Canada (UNCITRAL, 2013 pending) 16, 18, 57, 121, 228, 407, 540, 542
 Elkin v. United States, 142 US 65 (1892) 112

Table of Cases

xxvii

- El Paso v. Argentina, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/15 (31 October 2011) 132, 371, 382, 437, 450, 460, 476
- ELSI Case [1989] *ICJ Reports* 15 48, 107, 111, 156, 163, 167–8, 199, 214, 233–4, 236, 258, 409, 424, 447, 452, 463, 475–6, 479
- Empresa Luchetti SA v. Peru (2005) 20 *ICSID Rev* 376
- EnCana Corporation v. Ecuador, London Court of International Arbitration Case No. UN3481 (UNCITRAL) (27 February 2004) 472
- Enron Corporation and Ponderosa Assets LP v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3 417, 419, 544, 548–50
- Ethyl Corporation v. Canada (Ethyl Case) (1999) 38 *ILM* 708 31, 115, 305, 422, 442, 458, 468, 488
- Eureko BV v. Republic of Poland (Netherlands-Poland BIT Ad Hoc Award, 23 November 2006) 356, 427
- Fedax NV v. Venezuela (1998) 37 *ILM* 1378 12, 21, 233, 315, 361, 369–70, 385
- Feldman v. Mexico *see* Karpa (Marvin Roy Feldman) (CEMSA) v. United Mexican States
- Flughafen Zurich v. Venezuela, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/19 (14 November 2014) 259
- Foreign Investment Review Act (FIRA) Case, GATT BISD (30th Supp) (7 February 1984) 164, 310, 313
- Foresti (Piero), de Carli (Laura) and others v. Republic of South Africa, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/07/01 91, 452
- Fortino v. Quasar Company, 950 F 2d 389 (1991) 216
- Framatome and others v. Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (30 April 1982), (1983) 6 *YCA* 94; (1984) 111 *Journal du Droit International* 58 333
- 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
- Fraser Island sandmining dispute *see* Dillingham-Moore v. Murphyores
- French Nuclear Test Case [1974] *ICJ Reports* 253 125
- Fuji v. Kodak, WTO (Decision, 5 December 1997) 320
- Funnekotter (Bernardus Henricus) v. Republic of Zimbabwe, ICSID Case No. ARB/05/6 (Award, 22 April 2009) 432–3, 480, 486
- Gabcikovo–Nagymaros Case [1997] *ICJ Reports* 7 473, 550
- Gami Investments v. Mexico, NAFTA (Final Award, 15 November 2004); (2004) 44 *ILM* 811 401
- Garcia Armas v. Venezuela, UNCITRAL (15 December 2014) 380
- Gelbtrunk (Rosa) v. Salvador (1902) *Foreign Relations of 1902* 877 151
- Generation Ukraine v. Ukraine (Award, 16 September 2003); (2005) 44 *ILM* 404 387, 557
- Genin (Alex) v. Estonia, ICSID Case No. ARB/99/2 (2001); (2002) 17 *ICSID Rev* 395 377, 392, 415, 421, 426, 446, 460, 556

- Glamis Gold Ltd v. United States, NAFTA/UNCITRAL (Award, 8 June 2009) 157, 406, 411
- Goetz (Antoine) v. Burundi, ICSID Case No. ARB/95/3; (1999) 15 *ICSID Rev* 457; (2001) 26 *YCA* 24 461, 465–6, 477, 479, 555
- 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
- Government of the Lao People's Republic v. Sannum Investments Ltd (20 January 2015) 207
- 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
- Hartford Fire Insurance Company v. California, 509 US 764 (1993) 186
- Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff, 467 US 229 (1984) 502
- Himpurna v. Indonesia (2000) 25 *YCA* 13 89, 269, 352–3, 554
- Hoffman-La Roche v. Empagran SA (2004) 542 US 155 186
- Holiday Inns v. Morocco (1980) 51 *BYIL* 123 234, 381
- Holy Monasteries v. Greece (1995) 20 *EHRR* 1 456
- 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

xxix

- 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')
- Jota v. Texaco Inc., 157 F 3d 153 (2nd Cir., 1998) 293
- Joy Mining Machinery v. Egypt, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/11 (2004) 361–3
- Kahler v. Midland Bank [1950] AC 24 335
- Karaha Bodas Company LLC v. Perusahaan Pertambangan Minyak Dan Gas Bumi Negara (Pertamina), 364 F 3d 274 (2006) (USCA 5th Cir.); [2003] 380 HKCU 1 352–3, 554
- Kardassaopoulos 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 *ILR* 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
- Lena Goldfields v. USSR (1930) *The Times*, 3 September; (1930) Whiteman, *Damages*, vol. 3, p. 1652 339, 509–10
- 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 *ILR* 443 193

- 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
 Mamidoil v. Albania, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/24 (30 March 2015) 55, 129, 423
 Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions Case (1929) PCIJ Series A No. 2 148, 189
 Merrill and Ring v. Canada, UNCITRAL (Award, 31 March 2010) 149, 157
 Merrill Ring v. Canada, UNCITRAL (Award, 26 March 2010) 103
 Mesa Power Group v. Canada 406, 420, 424
 Metalclad v. Mexico (2001) 5 *ICSID Reports* 209 31, 135–6, 347, 410, 412–13, 417, 437, 441–4, 446, 462, 465, 469, 478
 Metal-Tech Ltd v. Uzbekistan, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/3 (4 October 2013) 55, 73, 75
 Methanex v. United States (2005) 44 *ILM* 1345 43, 46, 96, 135–6, 217, 230, 300, 318–19, 331, 356, 401, 441–2, 444, 458, 462, 468, 488, 536, 538, 542, 560
 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
 Mihaly v. Sri Lanka (2002) 17 *ICSID Rev* 21 20, 372
 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
 Mondev International v. United States, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/99/2 (1999), (2003) 42 *ILM* 85 149, 157, 257, 391, 393–5, 405–6, 408–10, 426
 MTD Equity v. Republic of Chile (2007) 12 *ICSID Reports* 6 417, 421
 Murphyores Ltd v. Commonwealth (1976) 136 CLR 1 477–8
 Mutasa v. Attorney-General [1979] 3 All ER 257 523
 Myers (S. D.) v. Canada (NAFTA/UNCITRAL Tribunal (21 October 2002); (2002) 121 *ILR* 1 96, 100, 136, 239, 266, 271, 318, 321, 396, 398–400, 413, 428, 435, 458–9, 469, 542
 National Grid v. Argentina (unreported) 552
 Nationalization of Gulf Oil in Bolivia (1969) 8 *ILM* 264 527
 Neer Claim (1926) 4 *UNRIIA* 60 148–50, 156–7, 406, 408–9, 415–16, 443, 557
 Nicaragua v. United States [1986] *ICJ Reports* 14 88, 102, 192–3, 196–7, 214, 216, 260, 290, 544
 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

xxxi

- North American Dredging Company of Texas v. United Mexican States (Mexico/USA General Claims Commission Award, 31 March 1926); (1926) 4 *UNRIAA* 26 378
- Norwegian Ship Owners' Claims (1922) 1 *UNRIAA* 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
- Palazzolo v. Rhode Island, 533 US 606 (2001) 440
- 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
- Parkerings-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
- Pelletier Claim, in C. C. Hyde, *International Law* (1945), p. 1640 190
- 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
- Petrobart v. Kyrgyz Republic (Energy Charter Treaty Case, 2005) (unreported) 373
- 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
- Phillips Petroleum (1989) 21 *Iran–US CTR* 79 499

- 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 Spinneri AG, US Ct Rest App 701 (1952) 446
- Poggioli Case (1903), in J. Ralston, *The Law and Procedure of International Tribunals* (1926), p. 847 191
- Pope and Talbot v. Canada, NAFTA/UNCITRAL Tribunal (26 January 2000) (2002) 41 *ILM* 1347 323, 410, 413, 415, 442–3, 458, 468–9
- Postova Bank v. The Hellenic Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/13/8 (9 April 2015) 13, 362–3, 371–2, 388, 420, 536–7
- PSEG Global Inc. v. Republic of Turkey (2005) 44 *ILM* 465 372, 378
- 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
- R. v. North and East Devon Health Authority, ex parte Coughlan [2001] QB 203 418–19
- R. v. Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, ex parte Pirbhai (1984) 129 SJ 56 523
- R. v. Secretary of State for Health, ex parte US Tobacco International Inc. [1992] QB 418
- Rafat Ali Rizvi v. Indonesia, ICSID Case No. ARB/11/13 (16 July 2013) 56, 129, 275, 378, 383, 460, 548
- Rainbow Warrior Arbitration (France v. New Zealand) (1987) 26 *ILM* 1346; (1990) 82 *ILR* 499 193, 196, 200–1
- 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 *UNRIIAA* 77 148, 156, 408
- Romak v. Uzbekistan, PCA AA280 (26 November 2009) 225, 361

- ‘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
 Sabbatino v. Banco Nacional de Cuba, 193 F Supp 375 (1961) 483
 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
 Saluka Investments BV v. Czech Republic (UNCITRAL Partial Award, 17 March 2006) 384, 409, 416–17, 419, 423, 427, 445, 471
 Sanchetti v. Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London [2008] EWCA Civ 1283 34, 216
 Santa Elena v. Costa Rica (2000) 5 *ICSID Reports* 153 3, 31, 79, 96, 135–7, 213, 265, 272, 347, 428, 444, 458–60, 462, 468–70, 472, 488, 560
 Sapphire International Petroleum v. National Iranian Oil Company (NIOC) (1963) 35 *ILR* 136 333, 345, 457, 462–3
 Sarei v. Rio Tinto, 221 F Supp 2d 1116 (CD Cal., 2002) 181
 Saro-Wiwa v. Shell, 226 F 3d 88 (2nd Cir., 2000) 179, 181, 290
 SAUR v. Argentina 268
 Schmidt v. Secretary of State for Home Affairs [1969] 2 Ch 149 111
 Schufeldt Claim (1930) 5 AD 179; (1930) *UNRIAA* 1079; (1930) 24 *AJIL* 799 152, 189, 339, 483, 510
 Sedco Inc. v. NIOC (1987) 23 *Iran–US CTR* 23 457, 516–17
 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
 Sideman de Blake v. Republic of Argentina, 965 F 2d 699 (1992) 432, 485
 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