

AMICUS CURIÆ

Journal of the Society for
ADVANCED LEGAL STUDIES

ISSUE 90
Summer 2012

IN THIS ISSUE

LEGAL HISTORY

Judah Benjamin: the Confederate
barrister 2

COMPANY LAW

Derivative claims under UK company
law and some related provisions of
German law 5

TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE AND THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY

How a country should deal with its
past and future after experiencing
radical change 16

ARBITRATION

The authority of a truncated arbitral
tribunal – straight path or puzzle? 22



GENERAL EDITOR

Professor Barry A K Rider, *Professorial Fellow, Development Studies Programme, University of Cambridge, Fellow Commoner and sometime Fellow, Dean and Tutor of Jesus College, Cambridge, Honorary Senior Research Fellow, IALS*

DEPUTY GENERAL EDITOR

Julian Harris, *Associate Research Fellow, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies*

ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED LEGAL STUDIES

Chairman: **The Rt Hon The Lord Hope of Craighead**

Professor Peter Alldridge, *Queen Mary, University of London*

Mr Mazhar Ilahi, *Student Representative, IALS*

Mr Daniel Bethlehem QC, *Legal Advisor, Foreign & Commonwealth Office*

Sir Geoffrey Bowman, *Former First Parliamentary Counsel*

Professor Fiona Cownie, *Keele University*

Professor Matthew Craven, *School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*

Professor Mike Edwards, *Institute of Classical Studies and Deputy Dean of the School of Advanced Study*

Dame Professor Hazel Genn, *University College, London*

Professor Rosa Greaves, *University of Glasgow*

Mr Christopher Hale, *Partner, Travers Smith*

Professor Patrick Hanafin, *Birkbeck, University of London*

Professor Roger Kain, *Dean of the School of Advanced Study*

Professor Martin Loughlin, *London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London*

Professor Timothy Macklem, *King's College, London*

The Rt Hon Lord Justice Mummery

The Rt Hon Lord Justice Munby, *Chairman, Law Commission*

Professor Alan Paterson, *University of Strathclyde*

Professor David Sugarman, *Lancaster University*

Professor Avrom Sherr, *Director, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies*

Jules Winterton, *Associate Director and Librarian, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies*

ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE SOCIETY FOR ADVANCED LEGAL STUDIES

Chairman: **Lord Scott of Foscote**

Mr Colin Bamford, *Barrister, 3–4 South Square*

Dr Evan Bell, *Senior Legal Assistant, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions for Northern Ireland*

Mr Michael Blair QC, *3 Verulam Buildings*

The Hon Mr Justice Cranston

Professor Rosa Greaves, *University of Glasgow*

Mr Peter Harris, *former Official Solicitor, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies*

The Rt Hon The Lord Hope of Craighead KT, *Chairman, Advisory Council of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies*

Ms Sonja Leydecker, *Partner, Herbert Smith*

The Rt Hon The Lord Mackay of Clashfern KT, *former Lord Chancellor*

The Rt Hon Lord Justice Mummery

Mr George Staple QC

Dame Heather Steel

Dr Edward Swan Skadden, *Visiting Professor, UCL*

Dame Juliet Weldon CB, QC

Mr Jules Winterton, *Associate Director and Librarian, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies*

Amicus Curiae is published quarterly by the Society for Advanced Legal Studies and issued free of charge to SALS members. The journal is also available on subscription (£75 per annum for four issues including p&p to UK and Europe, £85 pa for the rest of the world).

For further details please contact SALS, Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, 17 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DR (tel: 020 7862 5865; email: SALS@sas.ac.uk), or access the SALS website (<http://ials.sas.ac.uk/SALS/society.htm>).

Contributions to *Amicus Curiae* are welcomed. Articles should be accompanied by the name and address of the author. The journal can accommodate short pieces of approximately 700–1,200 words, and also longer articles of up to 4,000 words. Articles should be written in an informal style without footnotes. *Amicus Curiae* carries articles on a wide variety of topics including human rights, commercial law, white collar crime, law reform generally, and topical legal issues both inside and outside the UK.

Articles should be sent to Julian Harris at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, 17 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DR (tel: 020 7862 5868; email: Julian.Harris@sas.ac.uk). The Editorial Board reserves the right to refer articles to external referees for consideration.

The Society for Advanced Legal Studies does not accept responsibility for the accuracy of contributed articles or statements appearing in this publication. The views expressed by the authors of contributed articles should not be regarded as the official view of SALS except where stated.

Typeset and printed by Acorn Print Media, North Road, Loughborough, Leicestershire LE11 1LE.

ISSN 1461-2097

© 2012 Society for Advanced Legal Studies

The authority of a truncated arbitral tribunal – straight path or puzzle?

by A F M Maniruzzaman

The situation of a truncated arbitral tribunal may be caused by various factors. It may arise when a three-member tribunal during the course of the arbitral proceedings and before the rendering of the award does not remain the same at some point, meaning that one of the members of the tribunal dies, resigns or fails to attend the proceedings or deliberations leaving the two other members at the helm. In such a situation the following questions arise: what is the authority of a truncated tribunal? Can it go ahead and render a valid award? These issues have arisen frequently before arbitral tribunals and also before national courts at the stage of enforcement of arbitral awards, and they have had a rough ride at both levels. Arbitrators are often baffled with the prospect of the enforcement of their awards whilst exercising their authority as a truncated arbitral tribunal in the sense of the proverbial puzzle: “to be or not to be, that is the question”, ie whether or not to exercise the authority to go ahead with the arbitration and render an award. The purpose here is to examine the issues in light of modern international arbitration law and practice as well as most recent relevant domestic case law on arbitration, and to recommend some pragmatic approaches for the safe course of action.

On the issue of the power of a truncated arbitral tribunal the recent trends in international arbitration law and practice seem to be converging (ie a truncated tribunal’s authority to proceed), subject, however, to certain institution-specific approaches to the issue as will be clear from the following. Some international arbitration rules such as the LCIA (1998), WIPO (2002), ICDR (2011), PCA and JAMS (2011) invariably allow the truncated arbitral tribunal itself to go ahead with the arbitration if the situation arises at any stage. However, these rules have provided some balancing factors for the tribunal to weigh in determining whether to proceed or not. The common ones are:

- the stage of the arbitration;
- the explanation given by the non-participating arbitrator; and
- such other matters considered appropriate in the circumstances of the case.

Some other arbitration rules such as UNCITRAL (2010), ICC (2012), Swiss Rules on International Arbitration (2012), and CIETAC (2012) specifically point out the milestone that such a truncated situation will only be considered after the closure of the hearings or proceedings, meaning that the authority of the truncated tribunal may ensue after that point is reached but not before. And before that stage the defaulting arbitrator has to be replaced. Some rules such as UNCITRAL, CIETAC, Swiss, and ICC bestow the power to decide in such a truncated situation on the appointing authority and not on the tribunal itself. Thus, although modern international arbitration law is in favour of the truncated tribunal proceedings, the approach is not always straightforward as there are some hurdles to overcome in the sense of maintaining the balance of the situations.

It is noteworthy that in the UNCITRAL Model Law (Arts 14 and 15) and the ICSID Convention (Art 56) the truncated situation of the tribunal is dealt with differently. The mechanisms used in them underscore the continued cooperation and involvement of the members on a three-member arbitral tribunal and its non-frustration and the principles of expediency and immutability of the tribunal are encouraged. In such a truncated situation the emphasis under both the regimes is to fill in the vacancy by reappointment within short-time limits, hence little chance for a party for dilatory tactics. Thus, the Model Law and the ICSID prescriptions reinforce the original expectation of the parties that the decision be rendered by a three-member tribunal, no matter what deviation from that might have occurred after the commencement of the arbitration and for whatever reason.

International arbitral case law and juristic views seem to suggest a bias towards the tribunal’s authority to deal with the truncated situation in the exclusive sense, perhaps for the sake of the tribunal’s mission to settle disputes and its duty to fulfil that mission expediently. The approach appears to prove the tribunal’s inherent power to deal with the matter on its own. In the Iran-US Claims Tribunals’ practice this approach appears to be consistent. Furthermore, in the *Himpurna* case (1999) the remaining

two arbitrators gave a short shrift to the objection to its acting as a truncated tribunal in light of the existing precedents and concluded that:

“The weight of well-established international authority makes clear that an arbitral tribunal has not only the right, but the obligation, to proceed when, without valid excuse, one of its members fails to act, or withdraws or – although not the case here – purports to resign.” [Final award of October 16, 1999 in ad hoc arbitration Himpurna California Energy Ltd v Republic of Indonesia, XXV YBCA 186 (2000), 194].

This is in line with what the ICC tribunal expressed in the award in *Ivan Milutinovic PIM v Deutsche Babcock AG* that it is “more and more accepted that in international commercial arbitration the possibility of delaying tactics is a serious concern and the elimination of these effects is a primary task of all involved.”

In reference to the *Himpurna* tribunal’s view quoted above, Judge Schwebel opines that such a position of the tribunal is “the better, but not the only, view of the matter” (S Schwebel, “*Injunction of Arbitral Proceedings and Truncation of the Tribunal*,” (2003) 18:4]. He also concluded in his study on the subject that:

*“While the precedents are not uniform, and the commentators are divided, the weight of international authority, to which the International Court of Justice has given its support, clearly favours the authority of an international tribunal from which an arbitrator has withdrawn to proceed and to render a valid award.” [S Schwebel, *Justice in International Law: Further Selected Writings* (CUP, 2011), p 206].*

However, one has to be cautious in view of the recent wave of national court cases (ie Swiss, French, Russian, Chinese and US) where the enforcement of awards rendered by truncated tribunals was declined irrespective of whether an absentee or defaulting arbitrator was acting with the purpose of sabotaging the proceedings, or the truncated situation was caused by the death of an arbitrator or by the formal resignation of an arbitrator, or his participation in the arbitral proceedings was disabled by other exterior factors. The ground for such refusal of enforcement of awards was commonly found to be that an award rendered by only two arbitrators was not in accordance with the agreement of the parties on a three-member tribunal or in some cases contrary to the principles of equality of treatment and equal representation on the arbitral tribunal [eg *Cour d’Appel, Paris*, July 1, 1997; *Agence Transcongolaise des Communications – Chemin de fer Congo Océan (ATC-CFCO) v Compagnie Minière de l’Ogooué – Comilog SA*, XXIVA YBCA, 281 (1999); *Swiss Federal Court, Ivan Milutinovic PIM v Deutsche Babcock AG – the ICC Court of Arbitration in Case No 5017* (1987); *First Investment Corp of the Marshall Islands v Fujian Mawei Shipbuilding, Ltd*, 2012 WL 831536 (E.D. La. March 12, 2012)].


It is noteworthy that the courts of the traditionally popular hubs of arbitration and pro-arbitration countries

such as Switzerland and France questioned the validity of a truncated tribunal’s award.

In international arbitration case law and juristic views the issue of truncated tribunal has been dealt with from the tribunal’s own perspective, ie to give effect to the considerations of expediency, efficiency of the process and the accomplishment of the mission of dispute resolution. While, on the other hand, at the other end of the scenario when the award rendered by a truncated tribunal goes to the enforcement stage before a national court, the perspective turns out to be different which endorses the parties’ original wish to get the dispute resolved by a three-member arbitral tribunal.

What is then the takeaway from the above? Well, international arbitrators need to be pragmatic to give a 360 degree approach to the issue as at the end of the day they have to render an award that is enforceable. Thus, the tribunal can take some careful steps as follows:

1. If the truncated situation arises for whatever reasons at the beginning of the proceedings or at some stage where disruption of the proceedings is reasonably manageable, certainly replacement is inevitable unless the parties have provided otherwise in their agreement.
2. If the truncated situation arises at an advanced stage or at the close of the hearings, the absentee arbitrator, unless he has formally resigned, should be kept informed of the day-to-day developments of the proceedings and the tribunal’s deliberations and his feedback on them should be sought as from other members of the tribunal. In this situation the tribunal will be considered to be a fully constituted one and the absentee arbitrator will be deemed to have had the opportunity to act as any other member of the tribunal and the appointing party should be informed of the situation and non-cooperation, if any. In the circumstances, there is no reason why the tribunal should not proceed to render an award given the reasonable steps it has taken and the implications of time and expense factors for the parties if it did otherwise.
3. If the truncated situation arises at an advanced stage of the proceedings or at the close of the hearings because of the sudden death of an arbitrator or his participation is fully incapacitated by external factors, the reasonable step for the tribunal will be to consult the parties as well as the appointing authority and proceed accordingly and to weigh with them the time and expense factors and the expediency of the parties’ initial intention to get the dispute settled by a three-member arbitral tribunal.

This is not to say that the above prescription fully rids a truncated tribunal of its puzzle in some respects about the prospect of the enforcement of its award by a national court. It may, however, boost some confidence as logical steps in the circumstances have been taken. 

- This article was published in Kluwer Arbitration blog, July 2012.

Professor A F M Maniruzzaman, PhD (Cambridge), MCIArb, FRSA

The author is Chair in International Law and International Business Law & Director of Research and Postgraduate Research Degrees, School of Law, University of Portsmouth. He is also an Honorary Fellow (Professorial) at the Centre for Energy, Petroleum, and Mineral Law and Policy (CEPMLP), University of Dundee, Scotland and Visiting Professor of International Law, Faculty of International Law, China University of Political Science and Law, Beijing, China.

CONSULTANT EDITORS

Administrative Law

Prof Christopher Forsyth Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge

Sir Derek Oulton Life Fellow Magdalene College, Cambridge

Prof Alan C Page Professor of Public Law, University of Dundee

Arbitration

Julian Critchlow Fenwick Elliott

Samuel Haubold Littleton Chambers

Prof A F M Maniruzzaman Professor of International and Business Law and Director of Postgraduate Studies and Research in Law, School of Law, University of Portsmouth

Dr Colin Ong Essex Court Chambers

Banking Law and Practice

Prof Andrew Campbell Professor of International Banking and Finance Law, University of Leeds

Prof Richard Hooley Professor of Law, King's College London

Peter Richards-Carpenter Fried Frank LLP

Civil Litigation and Procedure

Saul M Froomkin QC, Mello Jones & Martin, Bermuda

Phillip Howell-Richardson Independent Mediator

Jon Lang Independent Mediator

Dick Pears Tanfield Chambers

Commercial Law

Prof Michael Bridge Cassel Professor of Commercial Law, LSE

Prof Stephen Weatherill Jacques Delors Professor of European Law, Oxford

Company Law

Prof Anthony Boyle Emeritus Professor of Law, Queen Mary, University of London

Tim Frazer Arnold and Porter LLP

Prof Joanna Gray Professor of Financial Regulation, University of Newcastle

Andrew Hicks former Senior Lecturer in Law, University of Exeter

Dr John McMullen Short Richardson & Forth LLP, Visiting Professor of Law, Durham University

Chris Riley Reader, Director of the Institute for Commercial and Corporate Law, University of Durham

Jerry Walter Fried Frank LLP

Prof Adrian Walters Professor of Corporate and Insolvency Law, Nottingham Trent University

Dr Frank Wooldridge

Competition Law

Tim Frazer Arnold and Porter LLP

Professor Richard Whish Professor of Law, King's College London

Computers and the Law

Prof Ross Anderson Professor of Security Engineering, University of Cambridge

Dr James Backhouse Reader, Information Systems and Innovation Group, LSE

Prof Michael Froomkin School of Law, University of Miami

Constitutional Law

Prof Robert Blackburn Professor of Constitutional Law, King's College London

Prof Robert Hazell Professor of British Politics and Government, Director of the Constitution Unit, UCL

Professor Colin Munro Emeritus Professor of Constitutional Law, University of Edinburgh

Contract

Dr Mahmood Bagheri IALS

Professor Andrew Tettenborn University of Swansea

Corporate Finance

Simon Gleeson Clifford Chance

Christopher Hale Travers Smith

Prof Andrew Haynes University of Wolverhampton
Ned Swan Skadden, Visiting Professor, UCL

Criminal Law

Prof Estella Baker Professor of European Criminal Law and Justice, University of Sheffield

Sheilagh Davies QC 9 Lincoln's Inn Fields

Prof David McClean CBE, QC Emeritus Professor, University of Sheffield

The Hon Mr Justice Silber

Prof Anthony Smith Professor of Criminal and Public Laws, University of Cambridge

Employment Law

Viv Du-Feu Capital Law LLP

Jennifer Eadey QC Old Square Chambers

Dr John McMullen Short Richardson & Forth LLP, Visiting Professor of Law, Durham University

Environmental Law

Richard Burnett-Hall Consultant, Bristows

David Ong Reader, University of Essex

European Law

Prof Estella Baker Professor of European Criminal Law and Justice, University of Sheffield

Prof Christopher Bovis H K Bevan Chair, University of Hull

Frédérique Dahan Senior Counsel, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Prof Jo Shaw School of Law, University of Edinburgh

Prof Stephen Weatherill Jacques Delors Professor of European Law, Oxford

Family

Graham Ritchie solicitor

Financial Crime

Rowan Bosworth-Davies AML Analytics

Prof Louis de Koker Professor of Law, Faculty of Business and Law, Deakin University, Australia

Dr Chizu Nakajima Director, Centre for Financial Regulation and Crime, Cass Business School, City University

Richard Parlour Financial Markets Law International

Prof Barry A K Rider Professorial Fellow, Development Studies Programme, University of Cambridge, Fellow Commoner and sometime Fellow, Dean and Tutor of Jesus College,

Cambridge, former Director, IALS

Financial Markets

Prof Eva Lomnicka King's College London

Prof Barry A K Rider Professorial Fellow, Development Studies Programme, University of Cambridge, Fellow Commoner and sometime Fellow, Dean and Tutor of Jesus College,

Cambridge, former Director, IALS

Financial Services

Dr Richard Alexander Lecturer in Financial Law, SOAS

Prof Joanna Benjamin Emeritus Professor of Law, LSE

Martyn J Bridges Bridges & Partners

Prof Alastair Hudson Professor of Equity and Law, Queen Mary, University of London

Dr Oonagh McDonald CBE

Dr Chizu Nakajima Director, Centre for Financial Regulation and Crime, Cass Business School, City University

Prof Barry A K Rider Professorial Fellow, Development Studies Programme, University of Cambridge, Fellow Commoner and sometime Fellow, Dean and Tutor of Jesus College,

Cambridge, former Director, IALS

Margarita Sweeney-Baird Part-time Honorary Visiting Lecturer, Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Birmingham

Human Rights

Prof Mads Andenas Professor of Law at the universities of Leicester and Oslo

Sir Geoffrey Bindman QC Bindmans LLP

Sir Nicholas Blake QC

Prof Steven Greer Professor of Human Rights, University of Bristol

Khawar Qureshi QC Serle Court, Visiting Professor in Commercial Law, SOAS

Geoffrey Robertson QC Doughty Street Chambers

Insolvency

Prof David Milman Professor of Law, University of Lancaster

Prof Dan Prentice Erskine Chambers, Emeritus Professor of Corporate Law, University of Oxford

Prof Adrian Walters Professor of Corporate and Insolvency Law, Nottingham Trent University

Intellectual Property

Paul Garland Kemp Little LLP

Paul Harris Speechly Bircham

International Financial Law

Prof Mads Andenas Professor of Law at the universities of Leicester and Oslo

Prof Ravi Tennekoon King's College London

International Trade Law

Prof Kern Alexander Professor of Banking and Financial Market Law, University of Zurich, Senior Research Fellow, IALS

Prof Joseph McMahon Professor of Commercial Law, University College Dublin

Prof A F M Maniruzzaman Professor of International and Business Law and Director of Postgraduate Studies and Research in Law, School of Law, University of Portsmouth

Jurisprudence

Prof William Twining Emeritus Quain Professor of Jurisprudence, UCL

Legal Education and Practice

Prof Kim Economides University of Otago, New Zealand

Prof Richard Moorhead Professor of Law, University of Cardiff

Prof Avrom Sherr Woolf Professor of Legal Education and Director of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies

Richard Susskind OBE Visiting Professor in Internet Studies, Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford

Maritime & Shipping Law

Richard Siberry QC Essex Court Chambers

Planning Law

Richard Harwood 39 Essex Street Chambers

Private International Law

Khawar Qureshi QC Serle Court, Visiting Professor in Commercial Law, SOAS

Public International Law

Prof Christine Chinkin Professor of International Law, LSE

Prof A F M Maniruzzaman Professor of International and Business Law and Director of Postgraduate Studies and Research in Law, School of Law, University of Portsmouth

Religion and Law

Prof Dr John Warwick Montgomery Professor Emeritus of Law and Humanities, University of Bedfordshire, Distinguished Research Professor, Patrick Henry College (USA)

Restitution and Contract Law

Prof Gerard McCormack Professor of International Business Law, University of Leeds

Professor Andrew Tettenborn University of Swansea

Trade Union Law

Jennifer Eadey QC Old Square Chambers

John Henty QC Old Square Chambers

Trusts and Equity

Hon Mr Justice David Hayton Caribbean Court of Justice

Professor Paul Matthews King's College London

Prof Sarah Worthington Professor of Law, LSE

