

SCC ARBITRAL AWARDS

2004 – 2009

Linn Bergman

and

Stephen Bond

EDITORS

JURIS

Questions About This Publication

For assistance with shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call our Customer Services Department at:

1-631-350-0200

To obtain a copy of this book, call our Sales Department:

1-631-351-5430

Fax: 1-631-351-5712

Toll Free Order Line:

1-800-887-4064 (United States & Canada)

See our web page about this book:
www.arbitrationlaw.com

COPYRIGHT © 2011

by JurisNet, LLC and

The Arbitration Institute of the Stockholm Chamber of Commerce

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means including information storage and retrieval systems without permission in writing from the publisher.

All Rights Reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN: 978-1-933833-69-9

JurisNet, LLC

71 New Street

Huntington, New York 11743

USA

www.arbitrationlaw.com

SCC ARBITRAL AWARDS

FOREWORD	iii
ABOUT THE EDITORS.....	v
I. SCC CASE 60/2000.....	1
<i>SUBJECT-MATTERS:</i>	
(1) Carrier’s vicarious liability under the International Convention on Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR) of 1956; burden of proof.	
(2) Carrier’s wilful misconduct under the CMR, standard of evidence. Articles 29.1 and 29.2 CMR.	
<i>Observations by Lars Gorton</i>	13
<i>Observations by Johan Schelin</i>	22
II. SCC CASE 74/2000.....	25
<i>SUBJECT-MATTERS:</i>	
(1) Transfer of arbitration agreement. The meaning of an “express written consent” where the contract provides that assignment of the agreement or any part thereof requires the consent of the other party.	
(2) Validity of an arbitration clause under which one of the parties only had the right of choice to file its claims either before an arbitral tribunal or before a national court, and the other party could opt for arbitration only.	
<i>Observations by Pekka Puhakka & Johan Pråhl</i>	35
<i>Observations by Karl Johan Dhunér.....</i>	42
III. SCC CASE 124/2000.....	45
<i>SUBJECT-MATTERS:</i>	
(1) Parent company guarantee; elements of interpretation.	
(2) Character of guarantee – independent or accessory?	
<i>Observations by Talbot Lindström.....</i>	69

SCC ARBITRAL AWARDS

IV. SCC CASE 12/2002..... 73

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) *Prima facie* decision of jurisdiction of the Arbitration Institute of the Stockholm Chamber of Commerce (SCC Institute).
- (2) The law applicable to the transfer of the arbitration agreement.
- (3) Assignment of contract; validity of the arbitration clause when the assignee has not notified the remaining contract party of the assignment.

***Observations by Ivan Zykin* 84**

***Observations by Juan Carlos Landrove* 103**

V. SCC CASE 24/2002..... 127

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) The potential *res judicata* effect of the SCC Institute’s dismissal of Respondent’s counterclaim, after the counterclaim had been raised as part of an initial reply to the SCC Institute, but before the referral of the case to the Sole Arbitrator.
- (2) The proper law of the arbitration agreement, where the parties expressly chose to apply English law to the substantive contract, but did not make an express choice of law in respect of the arbitration agreement, and the seat of the arbitration proceedings was Sweden.
- (3) Whether the requirement of “mutual consultations” in the arbitration agreement was a condition precedent to the jurisdiction of the Arbitrator, or a contractual provision to be considered as part of the substantive arbitration proceedings, and whether the condition had been satisfied.

***Observations by Mary O’Connor*..... 138**

***Observations by John Gatenby & Kate Menin*..... 152**

SCC ARBITRAL AWARDS

VI. SCC CASE 49/2002..... 161

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) Interpretation of a Bilateral Investment Treaty.
- (2) Whether the Claimant had an asset which constituted an investment under the Bilateral Investment Treaty.
- (3) Period of limitation under the Bilateral Investment Treaty.
- (4) Costs incurred by the Respondent for legal representation.
- (5) Apportionment of the arbitration costs as between the parties.

***Observations by Sarah François-Poncet
& Caline Mouawad 195***

VII. SCC CASE 71/2002 203

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) Letter of credit – whether the paying bank is entitled to refuse to release the money when the documents presented by the seller contain some discrepancies with the conditions in the letter of credit.
- (2) Letter of credit – in case the issuing bank does ask for a waiver of discrepancies from the buyer, whether the buyer is obliged to give a waiver.
- (3) Buyer’s obligation to take delivery and make payment – after the expiry of the letter of credit.
- (4) Evidence – whether Claimant can submit new evidence outside Europe and there are sometimes difficulties with the communications.

Observations by Christina Ramberg 217

Observations by Ping Liu 222

SCC ARBITRAL AWARDS

VIII. SCC CASE 30/2003 227

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

Issue of jurisdiction. Did Claimant and Respondent sign the arbitration agreements and their capacity as agents under United Arab Emirates law?

Observations by Ania Farren 276

IX. SCC CASE 143/2003 283

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) Whether an entity that was not named as a respondent in the Request for Arbitration and therefore did not take part in the formation of the arbitral tribunal may be counted as a respondent in the arbitration.
- (2) Whether, by application of the alter ego doctrine to “pierce the corporate veil” of one entity, an arbitral tribunal may exercise jurisdiction over another entity that is not a party to the arbitration.
- (3) Whether an assignment merely of the proceeds from a cause of action, or rather an assignment of the cause of action itself, is effected by the following language: “The Assignor assigns to Assignee the right title of interest and sums of money recovered of the Defendant in the proposed action [Assignor] -v- [Defendants].”
- (4) Whether an aggrieved entity’s cause of action against a state and against a corporation designated by the state to administer the outstanding debts of a company liquidated by state decree is a dispute that would fall within the scope of an arbitration clause in a contract between the aggrieved entity and the company liquidated by state decree.
- (5) Allocation of costs.

Observations by David Goldberg & Gordon Blanke 295

SCC ARBITRAL AWARDS

X. SCC CASE 90/2004 309

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) Truncated Tribunal – Subsequent to the oral hearing the SCC informs the arbitral tribunal that the arbitrator appointed by the claimant had resigned and could not be reached.
- (2) Interpretation of an international purchase agreement under the CISG.

Observations by Teresa Giovannini. 329

XI. SCC CASE 7/2005 339

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) Jurisdiction under an arbitration clause not expressly referring to the SCC Institute
- (2) Failure of respondent to appear (procedural default)
- (3) Applicable substantive law
- (4) No oral hearing
- (5) Application *sua sponte (ex officio)* of contractual penalty provisions to claimant’s potential detriment
- (6) Recovery of arbitration costs when claim partly withdrawn

Observations by Patrik Schöldström 363

XII. SCC CASE 10/2005 369

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) Jurisdiction
 - a) Pathological arbitration agreement lacking a clear identification of any arbitration institution
 - b) Two-tier clause (negotiation before arbitration)
 - c) Whether entry into a new arbitration agreement before arbitrating the dispute was necessary
- (2) Arbitrability – The arbitration agreement was allegedly against public policy in the respondents’ country.

SCC ARBITRAL AWARDS

- (3) Were the claimant and the second respondent parties to the arbitration agreement?
- (4) Applicable law as to the arbitration agreement.
- (5) Applicable law as to the substance of the dispute.

***Observations by Phillip Capper*..... 392**

XIII. SCC CASE 21/2005 403

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

- (1) Has the buyer’s notice of termination of a sale of goods contract governed by Swedish law been served in a timely fashion (within “a reasonable period of time”)?
- (2) Has the seller, who negotiated with the buyer “without prejudice”, forfeited its right to object to the purported untimely notice of termination?
- (3) Could the limitation of liability clause be modified with the application of Section 36 of the Swedish Act on Contracts and thereby entitle the buyer to consequential damages since the clause purportedly was unfair?
- (4) Could the Court of Appeal set aside the award on the basis that the objection to the purported untimely notice of termination was raised against the seller’s better judgment?

***Observations by Torgny Håstad* 424**

***Observations by Pontus Ewerlöf* 430**

XIV. SCC CASE O53/2005 439

SUBJECT-MATTERS:

The law applicable to determining the jurisdiction of the Arbitral Tribunal when Respondent in liquidation invokes non-arbitrability *inter alia* under its national legislation.

***Observations by Carita Wallgren-Lindholm
and Mari Antila* 458**

***Observations by Eric M. Runesson* 469**

SCC ARBITRAL AWARDS

XV. SCC CASE 33/2007	473
<i><u>SUBJECT-MATTERS:</u></i>	
Applicable law.	
<i>Observations by Therese Isaksson and Natalie Holm</i>	481
<i>Observations by Niklas Åstenius and Lisa Björk</i>	486
XVI. SCC CASE 113/2007	497
<i><u>SUBJECT-MATTERS:</u></i>	
Separate award on costs – Claimant had paid the full Advance on Costs and requested the arbitrator to issue a separate award ordering the Respondent to reimburse the Claimant for its share.	
<i>Observations by Christer Söderlund</i>	501
INDEX	507

