

THE PUBLIC POLICY EXCEPTION  
UNDER THE  
NEW YORK CONVENTION

*History, Interpretation and Application*

SECOND EDITION

Anton G. Maurer

**JURIS**

### **Questions about This Publication**

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

[customerservice@jurispub.com](mailto:customerservice@jurispub.com)

For questions of an editorial nature, contact the Editorial Department at:

[editorial@jurispub.com](mailto:editorial@jurispub.com)

To obtain a copy of this book, or to find other titles related to this topic, please visit:

[www.arbitrationlaw.com](http://www.arbitrationlaw.com)

COPYRIGHT 2022  
by JurisNet, LLC

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 978-1-944825-62-1

JURIS  
52 Elm Street, Ste 7  
Huntington, New York 11743  
USA  
[www.arbitrationlaw.com](http://www.arbitrationlaw.com)

## CONTENTS

<i>Preface to the Second Edition</i> .....	xv
<i>Preface to the First Edition</i> .....	xvii
<i>About the Author</i> .....	xix
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	
<b>Interpretation of International Conventions</b> .....	5
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	
<b>Drafting History of Article V (2) (b) of the New York Convention</b> .....	11
I. The Geneva Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards 1927.....	12
II. The ICC Reviewed the Geneva Convention and Prepared the Preliminary Draft Convention .....	13
A. Study of Improvements to International Arbitration ...	13
B. The ICC Draft Convention .....	14
C. The ICC Draft Convention and the Public Policy Exception.....	14
III. ECOSOC's Ad Hoc Committee Prepared Draft Convention .....	16
A. Ad hoc Committee to Submit Draft Convention .....	16
B. Comments by Governments on the ICC Draft Convention.....	17
C. Meeting of the Ad hoc Committee .....	18
D. Discussion of the Public Policy Clause .....	18
E. Draft Convention of the Ad hoc Committee.....	23
IV. Comments from Governments and NGOs on the Draft Convention .....	26
A. Comments from Governments.....	26
B. Comments from NGOs.....	28
C. Comments and Recommendation of the Secretary-General .....	30
D. Memorandum by the Secretary-General.....	32
E. Further Comments .....	33
F. Consolidated Report by the Secretary-General.....	35

## CONTENTS

V. United Nations Conference on International Commercial Arbitration .....	35
A. General Debate .....	36
B. Proposals on, and Discussion of the Public Policy Clause in the Plenary Sessions.....	38
C. Discussion of the Public Policy Clause .....	41
D. Working Party No. 3 for Articles III–V .....	43
E. Discussion of the Proposal of Working Party No. 3 and Decision on Wording .....	45
F. Drafting Committee .....	47
G. Final Text Approval.....	48
H. Resolution on Measures for Increasing the Effectiveness of Arbitration.....	49
I. Signing.....	50

### CHAPTER 4

<b>Interpretation of Article V (2) (b)</b> .....	53
I. Limitation of Grounds.....	53
A. Literal Interpretation.....	53
B. Confirmed by Drafting History.....	54
II. Contrary to the Public Policy “of That Country” .....	54
A. Literal Interpretation .....	54
B. Not Governing Law Nor <i>Lex Arbitri</i> .....	54
C. No Transnational Public Policy Intended .....	55
D. Differences Were Accepted.....	57
III. Literal Interpretation: “Public Policy” Is Not Identical to “Domestic Law” .....	58
A. Making Enforcement Easier than under the 1927 Geneva Convention .....	58
B. Mistake in Fact or Law Is Not Included in Article V ...	59
C. Even the 1927 Geneva Convention Was Narrower than “Domestic Law”.....	59
D. Differences in the Wording of the Public Policy Clause .....	59
E. Confirmed by Drafting History.....	60
IV. “May Also Be Refused” .....	61
A. Discretion.....	61
B. Pro-enforcement Bias .....	61
C. Can Discretion Also Be Exercised in Implementing the Convention in Domestic Law? .....	62

## CONTENTS

V. “Public Policy”—Narrow or Wide Interpretation? .....	62
A. Goal to Uphold the Finality of an Award .....	63
B. Drafting Changes Support Narrow Interpretation.....	64
C. Guidance from Article 34 and 36 UNCITRAL Model Law? .....	65
D. Pro-enforcement Policy .....	66
VI. Relationship between Article V(1) and V(2)(b).....	67
A. Article V(1) Has Its Own Meaning and Is Not Included in Article V(2).....	67
B. Working Papers Support Backup Position of Public Policy .....	70
C. Party Autonomy and Burden of Proof .....	71
D. ILA Recommendation.....	71

### CHAPTER 5

<b>The Application of the Public Policy Exception in Various Countries</b> .....	73
I. Austria .....	73
A. Law .....	73
B. Public Policy: Violation Must Concern Basic Principles of the Austrian Legal System.....	73
C. Parties Cannot Waive the Public Policy Defense .....	75
D. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement .....	76
1. No Distinction between Domestic and International Public Policy .....	76
2. Irreconcilable with Austrian Fundamental Principles.....	77
3. Lack of Impartiality and Independence of Arbitrators .....	78
4. Different Standards Based on Closeness to Austria .....	79
5. Time of Violation Is Relevant.....	79
6. Burden of Proof.....	79
II. Canada.....	80
A. Law .....	80
B. Public Policy: Fundamental Notions and Principles of Justice .....	81
1. No Review of Facts or Law.....	82
2. Fundamentally Offensive to Canadian Principles of Justice and Fairness.....	84
C. Refusal Is Permissive, Not Mandatory .....	88

## CONTENTS

III. England .....	89
A. Law .....	89
B. Public Policy: Clearly Injurious to the Public Good or Wholly Offensive.....	90
1. International Public Policy .....	90
2. Serious Irregularity.....	92
3. Contrary to Natural Justice.....	95
4. Harmful to International Relations.....	96
5. Illegality .....	96
6. Contractual Penalty under Swiss Law Was Held Enforceable .....	97
C. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement.....	98
1. Illegal English Contract.....	99
2. Uncompromisable Moral Principles.....	100
IV. France.....	100
A. Law .....	101
B. Blatant, Actual, and Concrete Violation of International Public Policy.....	102
C. Judge of the Award, Not the Dispute?.....	106
D. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement.....	109
1. Lack of Impartiality.....	109
2. Failure to Comply with Time-Limit.....	110
3. Corruption .....	110
4. Procedural Fraud .....	110
5. Incompatibility with <i>Res Judicata</i> .....	111
V. Germany.....	111
A. Law .....	111
B. Ordre Public International .....	111
C. Only Severe Defects Can Violate International Public Policy.....	113
1. Grave Violation of Fundamental Principles of State and Economic Life .....	113
2. Decisive Impartiality.....	114
3. Violation of Competition Law .....	114
4. No Review of the Merits .....	116
5. The German Constitution Doesn't Demand an Oral Hearing.....	118
D. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement.....	118
VI. Hong Kong.....	121
A. Law .....	122

## CONTENTS

B. May Refuse .....	123
C. Narrow Interpretation .....	124
1. Violation of Most Basic Notions of Morality and Justice .....	124
2. International Public Policy .....	126
D. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement .....	129
VII. Hungary .....	130
A. Law .....	130
B. Foreign Award .....	131
C. Public Policy: Broad Interpretation .....	131
D. “High Amount” of Legal Fees Are Contrary to Public Policy .....	133
VIII. Ireland .....	134
A. Law .....	134
B. Public Policy: Narrow Scope .....	135
IX. Italy .....	136
A. Law .....	136
B. No Review of the Merits .....	138
C. International Public Policy .....	141
X. Japan .....	143
A. Law .....	143
B. Public Policy: Basic Principles or Rules of the Japanese Judicial Order .....	144
XI. Republic of Korea .....	146
A. Law .....	146
B. Foreign Awards Are <i>Res Judicata</i> .....	147
C. Public Policy: Narrow Interpretation .....	148
D. Good Morals and Social Order .....	150
E. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement .....	153
XII. Malaysia .....	154
A. Law .....	154
B. Convention Award—Foreign Award .....	157
C. Public Policy: Malaysian Law, Governmental Policy, and Moral Values .....	159
XIII. Mexico .....	160
A. Law .....	160
B. No Review of the Merits .....	162
C. Public Policy .....	163
D. Exception: <i>Amparo</i> Lawsuits .....	163

## CONTENTS

XIV. New Zealand.....	164
A. Law .....	164
B. Public Policy: Breach of Fundamental Principle of Law and Justice.....	165
C. Public Policy: Obvious, Substantial Miscarriage of Justice .....	166
XV. Republic of the Philippines.....	168
A. Law .....	168
B. Supreme Court Defines the Public Policy of the Philippines .....	168
XVI. Singapore.....	172
A. Law .....	173
B. Purpose of the International Arbitration Act: Establishing an International Arbitration Center .....	173
C. Primary and Secondary Jurisdiction .....	174
D. Public Policy: Extremely Narrow Interpretation .....	175
E. Application of Singapore Public Policy under Article V (2) (b).....	183
XVII. Spain.....	186
A. Law .....	186
B. Foreign Award.....	187
C. No Review of the Merits.....	187
D. International Public Policy.....	187
XVIII. Sweden.....	194
A. Law .....	194
B. Public Policy: Clearly Incompatible with Basic Principles .....	195
XIX. Switzerland.....	196
A. Law .....	196
B. Public Policy: Article V (1) Is <i>Lex Specialis</i> to Article V (2).....	196
C. International Public Policy.....	197
D. Independence and Impartiality of the Arbitrator .....	202
E. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement.....	206
XX. United States of America .....	210
A. Law .....	210
B. Public Policy: Pro-Enforcement Bias, and Very Narrow Interpretation .....	211
1. <i>M/S Bremen</i> , and <i>Scherk</i> .....	211
2. Most Basic Notions of Morality and Justice .....	212



## CONTENTS

3. Antitrust Claims .....	213
4. Manifest Disregard of the Law.....	215
5. Violations of U.S. Sanctions .....	217
6. Inconsistent Testimony and Forged Agreements.....	218
7. High Legal Fees .....	219
C. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement.....	221
D. Is Forum Non Conveniens Applicable?.....	224

### CHAPTER 6

<b>The Application of the Public Policy Exception in Brazil, Russia, India and China.....</b>	<b>227</b>
I. Brazil.....	227
A. Law .....	227
B. Foreign Awards .....	229
C. Brazilian Public Policy: No Review of the Merits.....	230
1. No Review of the Merits—Assessment of Formal Requirements Only.....	230
2. Public Policy Is Defined by Doctrine.....	234
D. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement.....	237
II. Russian Federation .....	243
A. Law .....	244
B. Public Policy: Basic Principles of Russian Law .....	250
1. Basics of the Social Formation of the Russian State.....	250
2. Informational Letter No. 96 .....	253
3. Informational Letter No. 156 .....	255
C. Enforcement Despite Broad Interpretation of Public Policy .....	257
D. Refusal of Recognition and Enforcement.....	261
E. Very Broad Interpretation Leading to Refusal.....	263
1. Social and Economic Interest.....	265
2. Review of Merits.....	267
3. Mandatory Russian Rules and National Property .....	268
4. Misapplication of Russian Law.....	269
5. Issue Estoppel and Public Order .....	273
6. Irreconcilable Later Judgment with Earlier Arbitral Award.....	274
7. Harming the Budgetary Interests of the Russian Federation.....	274

## CONTENTS

8. Failure to Comply with Amicable Settlement Efforts .....	275
9. Indication of One-Sidedness Violates Public Policy .....	275
10. Failure to Notify Respondent by Special Letter through the Russian Ministry of Justice .....	276
F. Other Ways to Refuse Enforcement: Third Party Litigation.....	276
G. Very Mixed Picture.....	278
III. India.....	280
A. Indian Arbitration Laws Are Generally Enacted Prospectively.....	281
B. Implementation of the New York Convention.....	282
1. Foreign Awards (Recognition and Enforcement) Act, 1961 .....	282
2. Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.....	284
3. Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015.....	287
4. Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2019.....	290
5. Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2021 .....	290
C. Foreign Awards—Two Major Restrictions .....	291
1. Foreign Awards under the New York Convention.....	291
2. Foreign Awards under the Foreign Awards Act, 1961 .....	291
3. Foreign Awards under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 .....	295
4. Was Limitation “Governed by Indian Law” Dropped? .....	299
5. Indian Definition of “Foreign Award” Violates New York Convention .....	306
D. Public Policy Exception—Statutory Law.....	306
1. Foreign Awards Act 1961 .....	306
2. Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.....	307
3. Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015.....	308
E. Public Policy Is Not Limited to Fraud and Corruption .....	308

## CONTENTS

F.	The Philosophy of the Legal Interpretation of the Supreme Court of India .....	311
G.	Application of the Public Policy Exception by the Supreme Court of India: Meandering from Narrow to Broad Interpretation .....	314
1.	Public Policy Doctrine—Modifications and Expansion .....	314
2.	Application of the Public Policy Exception under the Foreign Awards Act .....	318
a)	<i>Cosid Inc. v. Steel Authority of India</i> : Domestic Policy Only .....	318
b)	<i>Renusagar Power Co., Ltd. v. General Electric Co.</i> : Narrow Interpretation .....	319
3.	Application of the Public Policy Exception under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 .....	326
a)	Definition of Public Policy Changed in the <i>Saw Pipes</i> Case—“Patent Illegality” .....	326
b)	<i>Hindustan Zinc v. French Coal Carbonisation</i> : Contrary to the Terms of a Contract .....	334
c)	<i>McDermott International v. Burn Standard Company Ltd.</i> : Setting Aside Awards Which Are Patently Illegal.....	335
d)	<i>Bhatia International v. Bulk Trading S.A.</i> : Part I Is Generally Also Applicable to Foreign Awards .....	337
e)	Choosing Foreign Law Is No Implied Exclusion of Part I of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 .....	342
f)	<i>DDA v. R.S. Sharma and Co.</i> : Broad Public Policy Interpretation .....	347
g)	<i>Venture Global</i> Case: Foreign Awards Can Be Set Aside in India.....	348
h)	High Courts Deviate Sometimes.....	355
i)	Hijacking General Indian Jurisdiction for Foreign Awards .....	356
j)	<i>Phulchand Exports v. Ooo Patriot</i> : Public Policy Exception for Domestic Awards Is Also Applicable for Foreign Awards .....	358

## CONTENTS

k)	Is There New Hope after <i>Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Service, Inc.</i> ? .....	359
l)	<i>Shri Lal Mahal Ltd. v. Progetto Grano SpA</i> : Overruled <i>Phulchand</i> .....	365
m)	<i>Oil &amp; National Gas Corp. Ltd. v. Western Geco International Ltd.</i> : Broad Interpretation of Fundamental Policy of India Includes Wednesbury's Principle of Reasonableness ..	368
n)	<i>Associate Builders v. Delhi Development Authority</i> Cautions Broad Western Geco Interpretation.....	372
o)	<i>Hrd Corporation (Marcus Oil and Chemical Division) v. GAIL (India) Ltd.</i> : Narrow <i>Renusagar</i> Principles Applicable.....	373
p)	<i>Venture Global III</i> : Indicate Conflicting Legal Opinions a Setback? .....	374
q)	Does "Venue" Exclude the Application of Part I?—Conflicting Judgments.....	375
r)	<i>SSangyong Engineering &amp; Construction Company Ltd. v. National Highways Authority of India</i> : 2015 Act Makes Patent Illegality Test Inapplicable for Foreign Awards .....	376
s)	<i>South East Asia Marine Engineering and Constructions Ltd. v. Oil India Ltd.</i> : Perverse Contract Interpretation Is against Public Policy .....	379
t)	<i>National Agricultural Cooperative Marketing Federation of India (NAFED) v. Alimenta S.A.</i> : Observance of Export Control Is Part of Fundamental Public Policy .....	380
u)	<i>Vijay Karia &amp; Ors. v. Prysmian Cavi E Sistemi SRL &amp; Ors.</i> .....	381
H.	Public Policy Exception as Gateway to Full Judicial Review .....	384
I.	Is There New Hope? .....	387
IV.	People's Republic of China .....	388
A.	Law .....	389
1.	Notice of the Supreme People's Court .....	390

## CONTENTS

2. Arbitration Law and Several Other Laws Are Applicable .....	392
B. Foreign Awards .....	395
1. Foreign Awards Rendered in Institutional and Ad Hoc Proceedings .....	395
2. Two Years' Deadline .....	399
C. Centralized Decision by Supreme People's Court in Case of Refusal .....	401
D. Several Interpretations and Notices by the Supreme People's Court .....	407
1. Notice on Issues concerning Setting Aside Foreign-Related Awards .....	408
2. Interpretation concerning concerning Some Issues on Application of the Arbitration Law of the People's Republic of China.....	408
3. Interpretation on the Application of the Civil Procedure Law.....	409
4. Notice on Certain Issues regarding the Centralized Administration of Judicial Review of Arbitration Cases .....	409
5. Provisions on Certain Issues concerning the Approval of Arbitration Cases That Are Subject to Judicial Review .....	410
6. Provisions on Issues concerning the Approval and Reporting in the Judicial Review of Arbitration Cases .....	412
7. Provisions on Certain Issues Relating to the Enforcement of Arbitral Awards.....	412
8. Invalid Arbitration Clauses, and Arbitration-Friendly Interpretation of an Arbitration Clause .....	413
9. One-Stop Procedure for Awards Rendered by Designated International Arbitration Institutions .....	415
10. Integrating Socialist Core Values into Court Judgments.....	416
E. Public Policy: Contrary to Social and Public Interest and Fundamental Principles .....	417
F. Inconsistent Interpretation of the Public Policy Exception .....	422

## CONTENTS

1. Insensitive to Feelings of Chinese People .....	422
2. Breach of Mandatory Provisions of PRC Laws ...	424
3. Mere Unfairness or Injustice .....	427
4. Violation of China's Judicial Sovereignty .....	429
5. Absolute Priority of Party Autonomy .....	437
6. Special Rules for Free Trade Zones .....	439
G. More Successes than Failures .....	440
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	445
Bibliography .....	451
Index .....	467