

2022
Volume 4, Issue 1



Institute for Transnational Arbitration
ITA IN REVIEW

ITA IN REVIEW

The Journal of the Institute for Transnational Arbitration



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES

DETERMINING QUESTIONS OF ARBITRABILITY: WHERE DO WE STAND AFTER SCHEIN?	<i>William W. Russell</i>	1
PARTY AUTONOMY AND ARBITRATOR’S LACK OF REASONING BRING DOWN SUBWAY AWARD	<i>Sean C. Sheely</i> <i>Arantxa Cuadrado</i>	17
THE SULTAN OF SULU AWARD: IS IT ENFORCEABLE IN THE US UNDER THE NEW YORK CONVENTION?	<i>Gary J. Shaw &</i> <i>Rafael T. Boza</i>	23

BOOK REVIEW

INTERNATIONAL ENERGY INVESTMENT LAW: THE PURSUIT OF STABILITY (2ND ED.) BY PETER CAMERON	<i>Elizabeth J. Dye</i>	43
--	-------------------------	----

ITA CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

ETHICALLY CHALLENGED? A COMMENTARY	<i>Francis Ojok</i>	55
“BODYGUARDS” OR “POLICE,” WHO CAN ESCORT US TO A MORE SUSTAINABLE FUTURE? A DEEP DIVE INTO “ELITE EIGHT” IN 2021 INTERNATIONAL ENERGY ARBITRATION	<i>Lawrence (Yichu) Yuan</i>	65
THE SALEM TRIALS REDUX? PERU & ARBITRATOR’S MISCONDUCT: A COMMENTARY ON THE FERNANDO CANTUARIAS CASE	<i>Paula J. Tellez</i>	92
REFLECTIONS FROM THE “PRESERVING PERSPECTIVE PROJECT” INTERVIEW WITH JUDGE GABRIELLE KIRK McDONALD	<i>Jessica Sblendorio</i>	104

YOUNG ITA

“DA MIHI FACTUM, DABO TIBI IUS”	<i>Viktor Előd Cserép</i>	110
---------------------------------	---------------------------	-----

FACT FINDING AND IURA NOVIT CURIA IN
ARBITRATION: HOW FAR DO ARBITRATORS'
POWERS REACH?



ITA IN REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Rafael T. Boza
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP,
Houston

Charles (Chip) B. Rosenberg
King & Spalding L.L.P., Washington, D.C.

MEDIA EDITOR

Whitley Tiller
EVOKE Legal, Washington D.C.

EXECUTIVE EDITORS

Enrique A. Jaramillo
Locke Lord, LLP, Houston

Albina Gasanbekova
Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp L.L.P.,
Washington, D.C.

CONTENT EDITORS

Thomas W. Davis
Case Manager & Arbitral Secretary,
Arbitration Place, Cleveland

Menalco J. Solis
White & Case L.L.P., Paris

ASSISTANT EDITORS

TJ Auner
Holland & Knight LLP, Dallas

Julie Bloch
B. Cremades & Asociados, Madrid

Emma Bohman-Bryant
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP,
London

Matthew J. Brown
Houthoff Coöperatief U.A., New York

Jose Angelo (Anjo) David
GST, LLP, Washington, D.C.

Rinat Gareev
Russian Arbitration Centre, Moscow

J. Brian Johns
US Federal Judiciary, Washington, D.C.

Naimeh Masumy
Arbitration Center of Iran Chamber
(ACIC), Tehran

Raúl Pereira Fleury
Ferrere Abogados, Paraguay

Julia Sherman
Three Crowns, Washington, D.C.

Raquel Martinez Sloan
White & Case L.L.P., Washington, D.C.

Pem Tshering
Sidley Austin LLP, Singapore

ITA in Review
is
a Publication of the
Institute for Transnational Arbitration
a Division of the
Center for American and International Law
5201 Democracy Drive
Plano, TX 75024-3561

© 2022 - All Rights Reserved.

PARTY AUTONOMY AND ARBITRATOR’S LACK OF REASONING BRING DOWN SUBWAY AWARD

by Sean C. Sheely & Arantxa Cuadrado

I. INTRODUCTION

Senior District Judge Rakoff in the US District Court for the Southern District of New York recently vacated an international arbitration award on the grounds that the arbitrator exceeded her powers by deciding a claim that “was not presented by the parties and was not addressed in the underlying opinion.”¹ This decision reinforces the principle of party autonomy by confirming that New York courts will enforce the agreement to arbitrate as written and offers important considerations for arbitration parties and practitioners in New York-seated international arbitrations. The relevant background, the court’s reasoning, and a few key takeaways are addressed below.

II. BACKGROUND

The arbitration arose out of a dispute under a Master Franchise Agreement (“MFA”) between Subway International B.V. (“SIBV” or “Respondent”), the international franchisor for the Subway quick service restaurant chain, and Subway Russia Franchising Company, LLC (“Subway Russia” or “Claimant”), its Russian franchisee. Subway Russia commenced an arbitration before the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (“ICDR”) seeking a declaration that it had the right to renew the MFA for a two-year renewal term and that SIBV’s notice of termination of the MFA was invalid (the “Renewal Claim”). In the alternative, Subway Russia argued that in July 2020 it had formed a new MFA, separate and apart from any renewal rights allegedly vested in the MFA, by accepting SIBV’s December 2019 counter-offer to renew the MFA on new terms (the “Offer-Acceptance Claim”).

The arbitrator found in Respondent SIBV’s favor. In a partial final award, the arbitrator decided that “Claimant ha[d] no right to renew the MFA, in light of its existing defaults under the MFA at the time that Claimant provided notice of its intent

¹ *Subway Int’l, B.V. v. Subway Russ. Franchising Co., LLC*, 21-cv-7362 (JSR), 2021 WL 5830651, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 8, 2021).



to renew and thereafter.”² The arbitrator made no findings of fact and did not expressly rule on Subway Russia’s alternative Offer-Acceptance Claim. In her Final Award issued without any further substantive proceedings, the arbitrator stated that the award was “in full settlement of all claims and counterclaims submitted to this Arbitration.”³

Subway Russia opposed SIBV’s petition in the District Court to confirm the award which, “if enforced, would result in a loss to Subway Russia of its \$60 million business.”⁴ The District Court vacated the award under 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(4) pursuant to which an award may be vacated “where the arbitrators exceeded their powers, or so imperfectly executed them that a mutual, final, and definite award upon the subject matter submitted was not made.”⁵

III. SUBWAY RUSSIA DID NOT SEEK THE ARBITRATOR’S DETERMINATION ON THE OFFER-ACCEPTANCE CLAIM

First, the District Court found that the arbitrator erred by purporting to determine Subway Russia’s Offer-Acceptance Claim when the Parties had not presented that issue to the arbitrator for determination as part of their cross-motions for partial summary judgment.⁶ Subway Russia submitted a motion for summary judgment⁷ seeking declaratory relief from the arbitrator that SIBV invalidly terminated the MFA and Subway Russia was entitled to renew the MFA on the same terms and conditions.⁸ Subway Russia, however, reserved its alternative Offer-Acceptance Claim “for determination in further proceedings in this arbitration.”⁹ The arbitrator, however, issued the Final Award, following the Parties’ motions for

² Subway Int’l, B.V. v. Subway Russ. Franchising Co., LLC, ICDR, Partial Final Award, 22 (July 14, 2021).

³ Subway Int’l, B.V. v. Subway Russ. Franchising Co., LLC, ICDR, Final Award, 3 (July 26, 2021).

⁴ Respondent’s Answer to Petition and Cross-Petition to Vacate Arbitration Award at ¶ 3, *Subway Int’l, B.V. v. Subway Russ. Franchising Co., LLC*, 21-cv-7362 (JSR), 2021 WL 5830651 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 8, 2021).

⁵ 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(4).

⁶ *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, 2021 WL 5830651 at *4.

⁷ The Case Management Order allowed the Parties to file dispositive motions. *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, ICDR, Partial Final Award, 1-2.

⁸ *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, ICDR, Partial Final Award, 2-3.

⁹ *Id.*, at n.14.



summary judgment and without any evidentiary hearing “in full settlement of *all* claims and counterclaims submitted to this Arbitration,”¹⁰ therefore including the Offer-Acceptance Claim. According to the District Court, the Final Award “decided a claim that the [Partial Final Award] had expressly acknowledged was not presented by the parties.”¹¹

The District Court’s decision to set aside the award for deciding the Offer-Acceptance Claim is consistent with *Matter of Colorado Energy Mgmt., LLC v. Lea Power Partners, LLC*. In that case, the court held that the arbitrator exceeded his authority by finding that respondent breached an Engineering Procurement and Construction contract and awarding damages for cost overruns where claimant only presented a claim alleging a gross negligence theory for recovery.¹²

IV. THE ARBITRATOR MADE NO FACTUAL FINDINGS OR LEGAL CONCLUSIONS ON THE OFFER-ACCEPTANCE CLAIM

Second, the District Court held that the Arbitrator “provide[d] no findings of fact or conclusions of law that support the decree in SIBV’s favor on the question of whether Subway Russia consummated a new MFA via acceptance of the allegedly open offer extended on December 19, 2019.”¹³ In other words, the arbitrator decided the Offer-Acceptance Claim without setting forth in the award any legal or factual basis for the determination. Because the Arbitrator did not “provide . . . even a barely colorable justification for the arbitrator’s interpretation of the contract,” the District Court vacated the award under 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(4).¹⁴

Judge Rakoff’s decision is noteworthy because it navigates a path that courts have

¹⁰ *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, ICDR, Final Award, 3 (emphasis added).

¹¹ *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, 2021 WL 5830651, at *4.

¹² *Matter of Colorado Energy Mgmt., LLC v. Lea Power Partners, LLC*, 114 A.D.3d 561, 564 (1st Dep’t 2014); see also *Fahnestock & Co., Inc. v. Waltman*, 935 F.2d 512, 515 (2d Cir. 1991) (“if arbitrators ‘rule . . . on issues not presented to [them] by the parties, [they have] exceeded [their] authority and the award must be vacated”). See also *Emilio v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, 508 F. App’x 3, 4 (2d Cir. 2013) (“A district court may vacate an arbitral award under §10(a)(4) if ‘the arbitrator[] exceeded [her] powers,’ which may be evidenced by (1) consideration of issues beyond those submitted by the parties, or (2) resolution of issues ‘clearly prohibited by law or by the terms of the parties’ agreement”).

¹³ *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, 2021 WL 5830651 at *5.

¹⁴ *Id.*



“consistently accorded the narrowest of readings” to vacate an award under 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(4).¹⁵ “It is only when [an] arbitrator strays from interpretation and application of the agreement and effectively dispense[s] his own brand of industrial justice that his decision may be unenforceable.”¹⁶ For Judge Rakoff, not including any factual or legal basis to decide a claim met the standard to vacate an award under 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(4).

V. SUBWAY RUSSIA REQUESTED AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING

Third, the District Court found that Subway Russia was entitled to an evidentiary hearing on its alternative Offer-Acceptance Claim, “rather than a decision on the papers,”¹⁷ which it did not get. Arbitration is a creature of contract and, here, the Parties’ arbitration agreement expressly provided that “an award should be made on the basis of the files and records unless one of the parties expressly desires an oral hearing.”¹⁸ Subway Russia requested an evidentiary hearing in its Statement of Claim¹⁹ and, then again, asked for an evidentiary hearing on the Offer-Acceptance Claim during the hearing on the cross-motions to dismiss.²⁰ But the arbitrator ruled on Subway Russia’s Offer-Acceptance Claim without an evidentiary hearing, noting in a footnote that “the parties agreed that if it [was] determined that Subway Russia was properly terminated or had no right to renew, then there would be no need to proceed to the evidentiary hearing on any other claims.”²¹

Judge Rakoff’s decision to set aside the award based on the language of the arbitration agreement and Subway Russia’s repeated requests that an evidentiary hearing be held, is consistent with the recognition by US courts of party autonomy

¹⁵ *ReliaStar Life Ins. Co. of New York v. EMC Nat’l Life Co.*, 564 F.3d 81, 85 (2d Cir. 2009).

¹⁶ *Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v. AnimalFeeds Int’l Corp.*, 559 U.S. 662, 671 (2010) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted; alterations in original).

¹⁷ *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, 2021 WL 5830651 at *5.

¹⁸ Master Franchise Agreement between Subway International B.V. and Subway Russia Franchising Company, LLC ¶ 23(A)(2) (July 25, 2013).

¹⁹ Respondent’s Answer to Petition and Cross-Petition to Vacate Arbitration Award, ¶ 114 at *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, 21-cv-7362 (JSR) (Oct. 4, 2021).

²⁰ Hearing on the Dispositive Motions, 8–9 at *Subway Int’l, B.V., LLC*, 21-cv-7362 (JSR) (July 1, 2021).

²¹ *Subway Int’l, B.V.*, ICDR, Partial Final Award, n.4.



and a party's right to a hearing as fundamental principles in arbitration.²²

VI. IMPACT OF THE DECISION

The District Court's decision is an instructive reminder of the importance of the concept of party autonomy in international arbitration. In *Subway International, B.V. v. Subway Russia Franchising Co., LLC*, the applicable arbitration agreement provided a streamlined procedure for a determination without a hearing unless one of the parties requested a hearing. By setting aside the arbitration award where the arbitrator did not hold a hearing as requested by one of the parties during the proceedings, the District Court recognized the parties' freedom to define and control the procedural aspects of the arbitration.

The District Court's decision also sets parameters for arbitrators, counsel, and courts in relation to future applications to confirm and vacate arbitration awards. In particular, under 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(4), arbitrators should be mindful to draft an award determining only the issues presented by the parties and including findings of fact or conclusions of law to support each decree. In *Subway International, B.V. v. Subway Russia Franchising Co., LLC*, the District Court decided that the Offer-Acceptance Claim was not presented by the parties and concluded that the arbitrator's award which was "in full settlement of all claims and counterclaims submitted to this Arbitration" contained no reasoning sufficient to support any factual or legal basis to decide Russia Subway's alternative Offer-Acceptance Claim.



SEAN C. SHEELY is a partner in the Litigation and Dispute Resolution Practice Group at Holland & Knight LLP in New York. He represents clients in international commercial arbitration proceedings under the rules of ICC, ICDR and AAA as well as *ad hoc* cases under the UNCITRAL rules. He has acted as lead counsel for clients in an array of multi-jurisdictional disputes in such sectors as energy, pharmaceutical, life sciences and technology. He has

²² *Smaligo v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co.*, 247 A.2d 577, 580 (PA. 1968) ("an award is not binding where there has been a denial of a hearing."); see also RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF INT'L COM. ARB. § 4-19, Rep. n.c (2019) ("Generally, denial of a party's request to have even a single oral hearing may be grounds for denying recognition or enforcement.").



substantial experience with all aspects of arbitration-related litigation, including discovery and enforcement proceedings and strategies.



ARANTXA CUADRADO is an associate at Holland & Knight LLP's International Arbitration and Litigation Team in New York. She is dual-qualified as an attorney in New York and Spain and handles commercial and investment arbitrations in both English and Spanish governed by the laws of common law and civil law jurisdictions. She also assists clients in French. She has substantive experience in arbitrations involving the mining, transport, and pharmaceutical sectors, among others.



INSTITUTE FOR TRANSNATIONAL ARBITRATION

of

THE CENTER FOR AMERICAN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

The Institute for Transnational Arbitration (ITA) provides advanced, continuing education for lawyers, judges and other professionals concerned with transnational arbitration of commercial and investment disputes. Through its programs, scholarly publications and membership activities, ITA has become an important global forum on contemporary issues in the field of transnational arbitration. The Institute's record of educational achievements has been aided by the support of many of the world's leading companies, lawyers and arbitration professionals. Membership in the Institute for Transnational Arbitration is available to corporations, law firms, professional and educational organizations, government agencies and individuals.

MISSION

Founded in 1986 as a division of **The Center for American and International Law**, the Institute was created to promote global adherence to the world's principal arbitration treaties and to educate business executives, government officials and lawyers about arbitration as a means of resolving transnational business disputes.

WHY BECOME A MEMBER?

Membership dues are more than compensated both financially and professionally by the benefits of membership. Depending on the level of membership, **ITA Members** may designate one or multiple representatives on the Institute's **Advisory Board**, each of whom is entitled to attend, without charge, the ITA Annual Meeting and Workshop in Dallas or the annual Americas Workshop in Latin America. Advisory Board members also receive a substantial tuition discount at all other ITA programs.

Advisory Board members also have the opportunity to participate in the Institute's leadership, professional initiatives, practice committees and a variety of other free professional and social membership activities throughout the year. Advisory Board members also receive a free subscription to ITA's e-journal *ITA in Review*, newsletter *News and Notes*, and all ITA video and audio online educational products. Your membership and participation support the activities of one of the world's leading forums on international arbitration today.

THE ADVISORY BOARD

The work of the Institute is done primarily through its Advisory Board, and its committees. The current practice committees of the ITA are the **Americas Initiative Committee** (comprised of Advisory Board members practicing or interested in Latin America), the **Young ITA Committee** (comprised of Young ITA Members and Advisory Board members under 40 years old) and the **In-House Counsel Committee**. The **Annual Meeting** of the Advisory Board and its committees occurs each June in connection with the annual ITA Workshop, including a variety of social activities and the **ITA Forum**, a candid off-the-record discussion among peers on current issues and concerns in the field. Other committee activities occur in connection with the Americas Workshop and throughout the year.

PROGRAMS

The primary public program of the Institute is its annual **ITA Workshop**, presented each year on the third Thursday in June in connection with the ITA Annual Meeting. Other annual programs include the **ITA-ASIL Conference** in Washington, D.C., the **ITA-IEL-ICC Joint Conference on International Energy Arbitration** in Houston, and the **ITA Americas Workshop** customarily in Latin America. ITA conferences customarily include a **Young Lawyers Roundtable** organized by Young ITA, which also presents a variety of **#YoungITATalks** events in cities around the world throughout the year. For a complete calendar of ITA programs, please visit our website at www.cailaw.org/ita.

PUBLICATIONS

ITA is a founding sponsor of **KluwerArbitration.com**, the most comprehensive, up-to-date portal for international arbitration resources online. The **ITA Arbitration Report**, a free email subscription service available at *KluwerArbitration.com* and prepared by the **ITA Board of Reporters**, delivers timely reports on awards, cases, legislation and other current developments from over 60 countries, organized by country, together with reports on new treaty ratifications, new publications and upcoming events around the globe. All ITA members receive a free subscription to **ITA in Review**, an e-journal edited by its **Board of Editors**. The Institute's acclaimed **Scoreboard of Adherence to Transnational Arbitration Treaties**, a comprehensive report on the status of every country's adherence to the primary international arbitration treaties, is published on ITA's website and in its quarterly newsletter, **News and Notes**. The **Online Education Library** on the Institute's website presents a variety of educational videos, mock arbitrations, recorded webinars, oral history interviews and books, many of them produced by the **Academic Council** for the benefit of professors, students and practitioners of international arbitration. **ITAFOR** (the ITA Latin American Arbitration Forum), a listserv launched in 2014 is the leading online forum on international arbitration in Latin America. International dispute resolution instructors are welcome to explore the course curricula and other pedagogical materials shared by leading professors on the website's **Legal Educators Resources Collection** and to participate in the accompanying **ITA-LEL listserv**. Young ITA members receive the **Young ITA Newsletter**.

Please join us. For more information, visit ITA online at www.cailaw.org/ita.

INSTITUTE FOR TRANSNATIONAL ARBITRATION

2022 Annual Membership Dues and Benefits

Sustaining Membership – \$6,000

(open to corporations, firms, and other organizations)

- Eight Advisory Board representatives (two under 40) with all **Advisory Board Member benefits** described below
- The right to designate an unlimited number of additional Advisory Board representatives for \$500 each
- The right to designate up to four additional Advisory Board members under 40 for \$300 each
- All employees entitled to member discount at ITA Programs
- Recognition as a *Sustaining Member* in publications

Supporting Membership – \$3,000

(open to corporations, firms, and other organizations)

- Four Advisory Board representatives (one under 40) with all **Advisory Board Member benefits** described below
- The right to designate an unlimited number of additional Advisory Board representatives for \$600 each
- The right to designate up to two additional Advisory Board members under 40 for \$300 each
- All employees entitled to member discount at ITA Programs
- Recognition as a *Supporting Member* in publications

Sponsoring Membership – \$1,250

(open to individuals, corporations, firms, and other organizations)

- One Advisory Board representative with all **Advisory Board Member benefits** described below
- Recognition as a *Sponsoring Member* in publications

Associate Membership – \$725

(open to individuals)

- Membership on the Institute Advisory Board, with all **Advisory Board Member benefits** described below
- The opportunity to use the Center's facilities in Plano for education-related activities
- Recognition as an *Associate Member* in publications

Academic / Government / Non-Profit Membership - \$395

(open to universities, government agencies, judicial and arbitral institutions, non-profit corporations and full-time employees or students of such organizations)

- One Advisory Board representative with all **Advisory Board Member benefits** described below
- Recognition as an *Academic/Government/Non-Profit Member* in publications

Arbitral Institution Membership – Invitation Only

(open by invitation only to select Arbitral Institutions with significant international caseloads)

- One Advisory Board representative with all **Advisory Board Member benefits** described below
- An opportunity to co-sponsor the annual Americas Workshop in Latin America
- Recognition as an *Arbitral Institution Member* in publications

Young ITA Membership - \$0

(open to individuals under 40)

- Free membership in ITA as a *Young ITA Member* (does not include membership on the Advisory Board)
- Free attendance at Young ITA programs and meetings and the annual ITA Forum in Dallas
- Young ITA member discount at the annual ITA Workshop and all other ITA programs, publications and online educational products
- Opportunity to serve in the Young ITA leadership
- Opportunity to participate in Young ITA online fora
- Free subscription to the ITA e-journal *ITA in Review* and e-newsletter *News & Notes*
- Recognition as a *Young ITA Member* in publications

Advisory Board Member Benefits

- Free attendance at the ITA Annual Meeting and Workshop OR the Annual Americas Workshop
- Free attendance at the members-only ITA Forum
- Member discount at all other ITA programs
- Free subscription to all ITA video and audio online educational products
- Free subscription to ITA's e-journal *ITA in Review* and quarterly newsletter *News and Notes*, with its *Scoreboard of Adherence to Transnational Arbitration Treaties*
- Opportunity to participate in the committees, leadership and other activities of the Advisory Board
- Recognition as an Advisory Board member in publications
- If qualified, the right to appear on the IEL Energy Arbitrators List



Table of Contents

ARTICLES

DETERMINING QUESTIONS OF ARBITRABILITY:
WHERE DO WE STAND AFTER SCHEIN? *William W. Russell*

PARTY AUTONOMY AND ARBITRATOR'S LACK OF
REASONING BRING DOWN SUBWAY AWARD *Sean C. Sheely
Arantxa Cuadrado*

THE SULTAN OF SULU AWARD:
IS IT ENFORCEABLE IN THE US UNDER THE NEW
YORK CONVENTION? *Gary J. Shaw &
Rafael T. Boza*

BOOK REVIEW

INTERNATIONAL ENERGY INVESTMENT LAW:
THE PURSUIT OF STABILITY (2ND ED.)
BY PETER CAMERON *Elizabeth J. Dye*

ITA CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

ETHICALLY CHALLENGED? A COMMENTARY *Francis Ojok*

"BODYGUARDS" OR "POLICE," WHO CAN ESCORT
US TO A MORE SUSTAINABLE FUTURE? *Lawrence (Yichu) Yuan*

THE SALEM TRIALS REDUX? PERU & ARBITRATOR'S MISCONDUCT:
A COMMENTARY ON THE FERNANDO CANTUARIAS CASE *Paula J. Tellez*

REFLECTIONS FROM THE "PRESERVING PERSPECTIVE PROJECT"
INTERVIEW WITH JUDGE GABRIELLE KIRK MCDONALD *Jessica Sblendorio*

YOUNG ITA

"DA MIHI FACTUM, DABO TIBI IUS"
FACT FINDING AND IURA NOVIT CURIA IN ARBITRATION:
HOW FAR DO ARBITRATORS' POWERS REACH? *Viktor Előd Cserép*

AND MORE.

www.itainreview.com

The Institute for Transnational Arbitration
A Division of The Center for American and International Law

5201 Democracy Drive
Plano, Texas, 75024-3561
USA