

# INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION LAW REVIEW

Vol.17 Issue 6, 2014

## ARTICLES

Paul Coates      The UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration: Continuing the Evolution of Investment Treaty Arbitration

Mary Sabina Peters and Manu Kumar R      Introspect "Special and Differential Treatment" given to Developing Countries under the WTO Dispute Settlement System

## NEWS SECTION



Int. A. L. R.      Int. A. L. R.

Copies of articles from the *International Arbitration Law Review*, and other articles, cases and related materials, can be obtained from DocDel at Sweet & Maxwell's Yorkshire office.

Current rates are: £7.50 + copyright charge + VAT per item for orders by post and DX. Fax delivery is guaranteed within 15 minutes of request and is charged at an additional £1.25 per page (£2.35 per page outside the United Kingdom).

For full details, and how to order, please contact DocDel on

- Tel: 01422 888 019.
- Fax: 01422 888 001.
- Email: [sweetandmaxwell.docdel@thomson.com](mailto:sweetandmaxwell.docdel@thomson.com).
- Go to: <http://www.sweetandmaxwell.co.uk/our-businesses/docdel.aspx>.

Please note that all other enquiries should be directed to Sweet & Maxwell, Friars House, 160 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8EZ. Tel: 020 7542 6664. Fax: 020 7449 1144.



SWEET & MAXWELL

## Editorial Board Page

### General Editor

DAVID HOLLOWAY  
Barrister  
No5 Chambers, London  
Lecturer in International Commercial  
Law, University of Edinburgh

### Editorial Board

MARIE BERARD  
Clifford Chance  
London

STEPHEN BURKE  
Baker Botts LLP  
Dubai  
United Arab Emirates

NORAH GALLAGHER  
Senior Visiting Lecturer  
Queen Mary  
University of London

CAROLYN B. LAMM  
White & Case LLP  
Washington

DR MARKUS RIEDER  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
80539 Munich  
Germany

MATTHIAS SCHERER  
Lalive & Partners  
Geneva

STEWART R. SHACKLETON  
SR Shackleton LLP  
London

HONG-LIN YU  
Reader in Law,  
University of Stirling

**News Section Editor**  
CONSTANTINE PARTASIDES  
Freshfields  
London

PATRICK TAYLOR  
Freshfields  
London

### Senior Advisory Board

JOHN BEECHEY  
International Court of Arbitration  
ICC  
Paris

MATTHIEU DE BOISSESON  
Darrois Villey Maillot Brochier  
Paris

EMMANUEL GAILLARD  
Shearman & Sterling  
Paris

PROFESSOR MARTIN HUNTER  
Barrister  
London

SIGVARD JARVIN  
Linklaters & Alliance  
Paris

NEIL KAPLAN QC  
Hong Kong

PROFESSOR DR RICHARD H.  
KREINDLER  
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP  
Frankfurt am Main

DR STEFAN KRÖLL  
Cologne

PROFESSOR VAUGHAN LOWE  
Chichele Professor of Public  
International Law  
University of Oxford

DR JULIAN LEW  
20 Essex Street Chambers  
London

ARTHUR MARRIOTT QC  
Dewey & LeBoeuf  
London

FALI S. NARIMAN  
International Council for  
Commercial Arbitration  
New Delhi

NIGEL RAWDING  
Freshfields  
London

ALAN REDFERN  
Barrister  
London

DAVID RIVKIN  
Debevoise & Plimpton  
New York

AUDLEY SHEPPARD  
Clifford Chance  
London

LAURENCE SHORE  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP  
New York


PROFESSOR HANS VAN  
HOUTTE  
University of Leuven  
Belgium

DAVID A. R. WILLIAMS QC  
Barrister  
Bankside Chambers  
Auckland

PROFESSOR IVAN ZYKIN  
International Court of  
Commercial Arbitration  
Moscow

## LEGAL TAXONOMY

FROM SWEET & MAXWELL

Each article in this issue has been allocated keywords from the Legal Taxonomy utilised by Sweet & Maxwell to provide a standardised way of describing legal concepts. These keywords are identical to those used in Westlaw UK and have been used for many years in other publications such as Legal Journals Index. The keywords provide a means of identifying similar concepts in other Sweet & Maxwell publications and online services to which keywords from the Legal Taxonomy have been applied. Keywords follow the Taxonomy logo  at the beginning of each item. The index has also been prepared using Sweet & Maxwell's Legal Taxonomy. Main index entries conform to keywords provided by the Legal Taxonomy except where references to specific documents or non-standard terms (denoted by quotation marks) have been included. Readers may find some minor differences between terms used in the text and those which appear in the index. Please send any suggestions to [sweetandmaxwell.taxonomy@thomson.com](mailto:sweetandmaxwell.taxonomy@thomson.com).

## Guidelines for Authors

- The Editorial Board welcomes the submission of articles which break new ground on legal issues, provide an in-depth discussion of current developments and timely issues, or survey the law in a particular jurisdiction.
- Material to be considered for publication by the Editorial Board should be sent to David Holloway, No 5 Chambers, 76 Shoe Lane, London, EC4A 3JB, DX 449 London Chancery Lane, or email [dh@no5.com](mailto:dh@no5.com).
- Articles should be approximately 7,000–10,000 words; Opinions and Comments 3,000–5,000 words; Book Reviews 1,000–2,000 words; and News items 500–1,000 words.
- Except in special circumstances, the Editorial Board will not consider articles published or to be published elsewhere. Authors are asked to confirm that their typescript is not and will not be so published, or to explain the relevant circumstances.
- Title and author of the article should be clearly indicated together with brief personal description (max. 50 words) that the author would wish to see appear.
- Authors are asked to provide a 60 word summary of the article for inclusion in the At a Glance section of the publication.
- Authors are asked to use the approved form of citation of legal materials common in their own country.
- All materials for the journal will be published in English. Articles written in a foreign language will be considered for translation and publication. Such articles when submitted to the Editorial Board must be accompanied by a synopsis in English.
- The citation for the journal is in the following style: [2014] Int. A.L.R. 000.
- All submissions should be clearly typed, double-spaced on A4 paper and must be accompanied by a copy of the article either on computer disk or as an email attachment.
- Authors are recommended to retain a copy of their article.
- The author should supply his or her contact details for future correspondence.

### Subscriptions

Annual subscription of six issues plus index: £662 (€905) for United Kingdom, £683 (€934) for Europe, £689 (\$1,197) for Rest of the World (Air); including bound volume: £912 (€1,249) for United Kingdom, £943 (€1,292) for Europe, £956 (\$1,660) for Rest of the World.

Orders to: Sweet & Maxwell, PO Box 1000, Andover, SP10 9AF. Tel: 0845 600 9355.  
Email: [TRLUKI.orders@thomsonreuters.com](mailto:TRLUKI.orders@thomsonreuters.com).

### International Arbitration Law Review

The *International Arbitration Law Review* is published by Thomson Reuters (Professional) UK Limited trading as Sweet & Maxwell, Friars House, 160 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8EZ (Registered in England & Wales, Company No.1679046. Registered Office and address for service: 2nd floor, Aldgate House, 33 Aldgate High Street, London, EC3N 1DL).

For further information on our products and services, visit <http://www.sweetandmaxwell.co.uk>.

Computerset by Sweet & Maxwell. Printed and bound in Great Britain by Hobbs the Printers Ltd, Totton, Hampshire.

ISSN: 1367-8272.

Thomson Reuters (Professional) and the Thomson Reuters Logo are trademarks of Thomson Reuters. Sweet & Maxwell® is a registered trademark of Thomson Reuters (Professional) UK Limited.

Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, or transmitted in any form, or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without prior written permission, except for permitted fair dealing under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or in accordance with the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency in respect of photocopying and/or reprographic reproduction. Application for permission for other use of copyright material, including permission to reproduce extracts in other published works, shall be made to the publishers. Full acknowledgement of the author, publisher and source must be given.

## THE MEANING AND VALIDITY OF AN “ARBITRATION, IF ANY” CLAUSE

☞ Applicable law; Arbitration clauses; China; Seat of arbitration; Validity

In some maritime contracts, for example, charter party, the parties may agree to the following clauses: “Arbitration if any to be Settled in Hong Kong with English Law to Apply”, “Arbitration, if any, in Hong Kong and English law to apply”. How’s the validity of such arbitration clauses? Are such arbitration clauses mandatory to the parties? In the event of a dispute, do the parties still have the options to refer the dispute to litigation or arbitration? Various opinions exist.

In the case of *Mangistaumunaigaz Oil Production Association v United World Trading Inc*,<sup>1</sup> the parties agreed to a clause providing “Arbitration, if any, by ICC rules in London”. The English court held that such clause was a mandatory arbitration agreement because the words “if any” were either surplusage or an abbreviated reference to “if any dispute arises”. Therefore, the parties can only refer the disputes to arbitration, rather than litigation.

In contrast, in the case of *Eurosteel Corp v M/V Millenium Falson*,<sup>2</sup> the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois adopted a different view. In this case, the parties agreed to a clause, which provided that “Arbitration, if any, to be settled in Paris”. The court held that

“the prepositional phrase ‘if any’ indicates that arbitration will take place in Paris if arbitration takes place. In other words, the parties could arbitrate a dispute; and, if they chose to do so, such arbitration would take place in Paris. The mandate is that if arbitration does take place, it must be conducted in Paris by Chambre Arbitrale.”

However, such clause does not exclude the jurisdiction of the court to hear disputes arising from the contract. The parties may choose to refer the dispute to either arbitration or litigation.

In the mainland China, there have been several cases involving similar clauses. From the PRC courts’ opinions in such cases, we can observe that the PRC courts adopt the latter view. For example, in a *Reply Letter of the Supreme People’s Court on Request for Instructions Regarding Objection over Jurisdiction in Contract Dispute for Carriage of Goods by Sea in the Case of International Economic & Trading Corp WISCO (Appellant) v Fuzhou Tianheng Shipping Co Ltd and Caifu International Shipping Co Ltd (Appellees) (Reply Letter)*,<sup>3</sup> where the arbitration clause involved was “Arbitration if any to be Settled in Hong Kong with English Law to Apply”, the Supreme People’s Court considered the meaning of such clause as “if an arbitration proceeding is to be launched, it shall be conducted in Hong Kong and under English Law”. The Supreme People’s Court further elaborated that:

“This clause is a special agreement between the parties regarding the place of arbitration and the applicable law when they refer the disputes arising from this contract to arbitration. However, it does not provide as the only and exclusive method of dispute resolution between the parties for disputes arising from the contract and does not exclude the jurisdiction of the court.”

Hence, when Fuzhou Tianheng Shipping Co Ltd and Caifu International Shipping Co Ltd (the plaintiffs) initiated a lawsuit before the Wuhan Maritime Court, the International Economic & Trading Corp WISCO raised objection to jurisdiction over contract disputes according to the arbitration clause excerpted above. The Wuhan Maritime Court rejected its objection to the court’s jurisdiction, stating that the court would have jurisdiction over this matter. The International Economic & Trading Corp WISCO appealed to the Higher People’s Court of Hebei Province, who, after reporting this matter to

<sup>1</sup> *Mangistaumunaigaz Oil Production Association v United World Trading Inc* [1995] 1 Lloyd’s Rep. 617.

<sup>2</sup> *Eurosteel Corp v M/V Millenium Falson* No.01 C 8817 (N.D. Ill. August 22, 2002).

<sup>3</sup> *Reply Letter of the Supreme People’s Court on Request for Instructions Regarding Objection over Jurisdiction in Contract Dispute for Carriage of Goods by Sea in the Case of International Economic & Trading Corp WISCO (Appellant) v Fuzhou Tianheng Shipping Co Ltd and Caifu International Shipping Co Ltd (Appellees)* [2009] Min Si Ta Zi No. 36 (November 4, 2009).

the Supreme People's Court and receiving the Supreme People's Court's *Reply Letter* (as mentioned above), decided to maintain its lower court's decision.

The view of the Supreme People's Court in the *Reply Letter* has been followed by several lower courts. For example, in a case concerning voyage charter party disputes between *Shanghai C-sky International Logistics Co and Huiyang International (HK) Shipping Ltd* appealed to the Higher People's Court of Shanghai Municipality,<sup>4</sup> the arbitration clause agreed to by the parties was "Arbitration, if any, in Hong Kong and English law to apply". The Higher people's Court of Shanghai Municipality also held that this clause was

"a special agreement between the parties regarding the place of arbitration and the applicable law when they refer disputes arising from this contract to arbitration. However, it does not provide as the only and exclusive method of dispute resolution between the parties and does not exclude the jurisdiction of the court."

Moreover, in the following two cases appealed to the Higher People's Court of Fujian Province, the Court rendered its rulings in line with the opinion in the *Reply Letter*: a case involving disputes over the court's jurisdiction between *Yang Chun Ocean Shipping Co Ltd and Jiuzhou Shipping Ltd*<sup>5</sup> and another case also involving disputes over the court's jurisdiction between *Xiamen Yaozhong Asia-Pacific Trading Co Ltd and Shanghai Union Ocean Shipping Co Ltd*.<sup>6</sup>

Given the Supreme People's Court's *Reply Letter* and the lower courts' rulings following the opinion in the *Reply Letter*, we can conclude that the PRC courts do not regard an "arbitration, if any" arbitration clause as a mandatory arbitration agreement and the parties may still refer the disputes to litigation. Such opinion is different from what had been held by the English court in *Mangistaumunaigaz Oil Production Association v United World Trading Inc* and thus worth noting.

Generally speaking, in comparison to UNCITRAL Model Law, the PRC Arbitration Act sets forth more stringent requirements for a valid arbitration agreement. For example, a valid arbitration agreement shall specify an arbitration commission, see art.16 of the PRC Arbitration Act. The requirements for a valid arbitration agreement in domestic arbitration are different from those in foreign-related arbitration. Hence, it is always advisable to seek professional consultations before entering into an arbitration agreement under PRC law or to be enforced in the mainland China so as to make sure that the arbitration agreement will be regarded as valid and enforceable by the PRC courts.

**Helena H.C. Chen**  
*Partner of Pinsent Masons LLP*

<sup>4</sup> *Shanghai C-sky International Logistics Co v Huiyang International (HK) Shipping Ltd* (2009) Hu Gao Min Si (Hai) Zhong Zi No.275 (March 30, 2011).

<sup>5</sup> *Yang Chun Ocean Shipping Co Ltd v Jiuzhou Shipping Ltd The Higher People's Court of Fujian Province* (2010) Min Min Zhong Zi No.683, a Civil Ruling (October 19, 2010). The arbitration clause involved in this case was "Arbitration if any in Hong Kong and English Law to be Applied".

<sup>6</sup> *Xiamen Yaozhong Asia-Pacific Trading Co Ltd v Shanghai Union Ocean Shipping Co Ltd The Higher People's Court of Fujian Province*, (2011) Min Min Zhong Zi No.818, a Civil Ruling (November 4, 2011). The arbitration clause involved in this case was "Arbitration if any to be Settled in Hong Kong with English Law to Apply".

<sup>\*</sup> Partner of Pinsent Masons LLP; Ph D in Law, Peking University; Ph D in Law, National Taiwan University; Qualified in the mainland China, Taiwan and the New York State; listed on the panels of arbitrators of SIAC, ACICA, CIETAC, KLRCA, KCAB, CAA, etc. She can be contacted at: [helena.chen@pinsentmasons.com](mailto:helena.chen@pinsentmasons.com)