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Subject-matters:

(1) Power of the Arbitral Tribunal to grant interim measures under the SCC Rules.
(2) Applicable law to the merits and to a retention of title clause.
(3) Enforcement of retention of title clause under Uzbek law.
(4) Right to restitution of delivered goods under Uzbek law.

Observations by Fernando Pombo
COURT DECISIONS ON ARBITRATION

England

Decision of England’s Court of Appeal (Civil Division) rendered in 2000 in case [2000] EWCA Civ 154 – the “Saudi Cable” case

Subject-matters:

(1) What constitutes bias on the part of an arbitrator?
(2) What constitutes misconduct on the part of an arbitrator?
(3) Whether an arbitral institution’s decision on a challenge of an arbitrator is final.
(4) Whether the arbitrator should be removed and awards set aside on ground of bias.

Observations by William K. Slate II, David P. Roney & Viviane Frossard and Stefano Azzali & Benedetta Coppo
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Subject matters:

(1) Dissolution of a joint venture – the relevance of mandatory rules according to Russian law.
(2) Whether the arbitral tribunal went beyond the scope of the arbitration clause.
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Judgment of the Supreme Court of Spain rendered in 2001 in Kern Electrónica SA v. Goldstar Company Ltd – the “Kern” case

Subject matters:

(1) Whether an arbitration clause is not binding since the parties’ choice of law did not have any connection with the contract or the dispute.
(2) Whether an arbitration clause is null and void because it does not include an explicit will of the parties to comply with the award.
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Judgment by the Svea Court of Appeal, Stockholm rendered in 2003 in case T 8735-01 – the “CME v. Czech Republic” case
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(1) Whether an arbitrator was excluded from the deliberations.
(2) Whether the tribunal failed to take into consideration applicable law.
(3) Whether the tribunal lacked jurisdiction due to lis pendens and res judicata.
(4) Whether the tribunal exceeded its mandate – the concept of joint tortfeasors.
(5) Whether the tribunal exceeded its mandate – decision concerning determination of the damage.
(6) Whether the tribunal exceeded its mandate – previous investors and prior breaches.
(7) Whether the judgment of the Court of Appeal may be appealed.
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The “SwemBalt” case - Decision of the Svea Court of Appeal, Stockholm rendered in 2002 in case Ö 7192-01

Subject-matters:

(1) Enforcement of an award rendered under the Agreement between Sweden and Latvia on the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments (SÖ 1992:93) (“the BIT”); question whether there was an investment in the meaning of the BIT.

(2) Should enforcement be refused on the ground that the arbitral tribunal lacked jurisdiction for reasons of *lis pendens*?

Decision of the Maritime and Commercial Court, Copenhagen rendered in 2003 in case S-22-01

Subject matters:

(1) Challenge of an arbitral award rendered under the Agreement between Sweden and Latvia on the Promotion and Reciprocal of Investments, SÖ 1992:93 (the “BIT”); question whether there was an investment in the meaning of the BIT.

(2) *Ne bis in idem* where two requests for arbitration made.

(3) Whether a Swedish court judgment declaring the award valid is also valid in Denmark pursuant to Article 26 of the European Court Convention.
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