



The European Arbitration Review 2019

Published by Global Arbitration Review in association with

Association for International Arbitration

Billiet & Co

BonelliErede

Clyde & Co LLP

De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek

Dittmar & Indrenius

FTI Consulting

GESSEL

Jenner & Block London LLP

Konrad & Partners

Manner Spangenberg

MARCHENKO PARTNERS

Menard Ltd and Ulčar & Partners Ltd

Pérez-Llorca

Peter & Partners International Ltd

PLMJ Lawyers

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP

Swiss Arbitration Association

Vinge

VMB Law Firm

Wikborg Rein

The European Arbitration Review 2019

A Global Arbitration Review Special Report

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd
This article was first published in October 2018
For further information please contact Natalie.Clarke@lbresearch.com



The European Arbitration Review 2019

Business development manager Gemma Chalk

Insight account manager Marta Jurkowska

Head of production Adam Myers

Editorial coordinator Hannah Higgins

Production editor Harry Turner

Subeditor Gina Mete

Publisher David Samuels

Cover image iStock.com/blackdovfx

Subscription details

To subscribe please contact:

Global Arbitration Review

87 Lancaster Road

London, W11 1QQ

United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 3780 4134

Fax: +44 20 7229 6910

subscriptions@globalarbitrationreview.com

No photocopying. CLA and other agency licensing systems do not apply.

For an authorised copy, contact claire.bagnall@globalarbitrationreview.com.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer–client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of October 2018, be advised that this is a developing area.

ISBN 978-1-78915-095-7

© 2018 Law Business Research Limited

Printed and distributed by Encompass Print Solutions

Tel: 0844 2480 112



The European Arbitration Review 2019

A Global Arbitration Review Special Report

Published in association with:

Association for International Arbitration

MARCHENKO PARTNERS

Billiet & Co

Menard Ltd and Ulčar & Partners Ltd

BonelliErede

Pérez-Llorca

Clyde & Co LLP

Peter & Partners International Ltd

De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek

PLMJ Lawyers

Dittmar & Indrenius

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP

FTI Consulting

Swiss Arbitration Association

GESSEL

Vinge

Jenner & Block London LLP

VMB Law Firm

Konrad & Partners

Manner Spangenberg

Wikborg Rein

Preface vi

Overviews

Energy Arbitrations 1

Richard Power and Paul Baker

Clyde & Co LLP

Joint Venture Disputes..... 9

Daniel Greineder and Konstantin Christie

Peter & Partners International Ltd

Limits to the Principle of 'Full Compensation' 15

Matthias Cazier-Darmois

FTI Consulting

Country chapters

Austria..... 21

Christian W Konrad and Philipp A Peters

Konrad & Partners

Belgium 28

Johan Billiet

Billiet & Co and the Association for International Arbitration

England & Wales..... 35

Charlie Lightfoot, Jason Yardley and Thomas Wingfield

Jenner & Block London LLP

Finland..... 41

Jussi Lehtinen and Heidi Yildiz

Dittmar & Indrenius

Georgia..... 47

Helene Gogadze

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP

Germany 59

Jan Erik Spangenberg and Simon Manner

Manner Spangenberg

| | | | |
|---|----|--|-----|
| Italy | 64 | Slovenia..... | 97 |
| Andrea Carlevaris | | Maja Menard and Matjaž Ulčar | |
| BonelliErede | | Menard Ltd and Ulčar & Partners Ltd | |
| Montenegro | 69 | Spain..... | 102 |
| Vesko Božović | | Mercedes Romero and Javier Tarjuelo | |
| VMB Law Firm | | Pérez-Llorca | |
| Netherlands | 74 | Sweden | 105 |
| Bommel van der Bend and Stefan Derksen | | Fredrik Lundblom and David Henningson | |
| De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek | | Vinge | |
| Norway..... | 80 | Switzerland..... | 111 |
| Aadne M Haga, Gaute Gjelsten and Ola Ø Nisja | | Alexander McLin | |
| Wikborg Rein | | Swiss Arbitration Association | |
| Poland..... | 85 | Ukraine | 115 |
| Beata Gessel-Kalinowska vel Kalisz, Natalia Jodłowska, Joanna Kisielińska-Garncarek and Konrad Czech | | Oleh Marchenko | |
| GESSEL | | MARCHENKO PARTNERS | |
| Portugal..... | 91 | | |
| Pedro Metello de Nápoles | | | |
| PLMJ Lawyers | | | |

Global Arbitration Review is delighted to publish *The European Arbitration Review 2019*, one of a series of special reports that deliver business-focused intelligence and analysis designed to help general counsel, arbitrators and private practitioners to avoid the pitfalls and seize the opportunities of international arbitration. Like its sister reports, *The Arbitration Review of the Americas*, *The Asia-Pacific Arbitration Review* and *The Middle Eastern and African Arbitration Review*, provides an unparalleled annual update – written by the experts – on key developments in the region.

In preparing this report, **Global Arbitration Review** has worked exclusively with leading arbitrators and legal counsel. It is their wealth of experience and knowledge – enabling them not only to explain law and policy, but also to put theory into context – that makes the report of particular value to those conducting international business in Europe today.

Global Arbitration Review would like to thank our contributors, specialists in arbitration across Europe, who have made it possible to publish this timely regional report.

Although every effort has been made to provide insight into the current state of domestic and international arbitration across Europe, international arbitration is a complex and fast-changing field of practice, and therefore specific legal advice should always be sought.

Subscribers to **Global Arbitration Review** will receive regular updates on changes to law and practice throughout the year.

Global Arbitration Review

London

October 2018

Mercedes Romero and Javier Tarjuelo Pérez-Llorca

Under article 11.1 of the Spanish Arbitration Act,¹ an arbitration agreement binds the parties to its terms and prevents courts from hearing disputes which are submitted to arbitration, provided that the concerned party invokes said arbitration agreement and raises an objection to jurisdiction within 10 days of the service of process. This is the ‘negative effect’ of the arbitration agreement.

In 2018, Spanish courts have rendered a large number of interesting decisions that clarify some of the conditions for bringing an objection to jurisdiction. The aim of this article is to provide an overview and analysis of the conclusions reached in these rulings.

The submission of a dispute to arbitration cannot be assessed ex officio, as it can only be assessed following a motion from a party by means of an objection to jurisdiction which is filed in due time and form

Under Spanish law, the existence of an arbitration agreement cannot, under any circumstance, be assessed ex officio. A recent decision from the Court of Appeal of Bilbao, dated 18 May 2018,² has confirmed that it is the party that wishes to invoke the arbitration agreement who carries the procedural burden to file the objection to jurisdiction in due time (ie, within 10 days of the service of process) and form (the brief containing the objection must be accompanied by the piece of evidence on which it is based).³ Thus, the judge before which a claim is filed cannot dismiss it ex officio and nor do so based on belated allegations made by a party in its statement of defence.

In view of the above, the Court of Appeal of Bilbao dismissed the objection to jurisdiction that was alleged by the defendant in its statement of defence, in which the defendant argued the existence of a framework agreement of sanitary assistance which established that the parties must submit any controversy regarding the said agreement to arbitration.

In the same vein, the Court of Appeal of Málaga decision dated 8 January 2018⁴ found that if the defendant appears in the court proceedings without duly filing an objection to jurisdiction, the defendant is tacitly renouncing the arbitration agreement, thus preventing a solution by means of arbitration in relation to that specific dispute.

Only those actions aimed at challenging corporate resolutions which are contrary to public order shall be excluded from the possibility of being submitted to arbitration proceedings

With regard to corporate arbitration, a decision from the Court of Appeal of Valladolid, dated 5 March 2018,⁵ addressed the question of whether a claim against corporate resolutions should be considered as a public order issue for the parties, and therefore cannot be decided in arbitration proceedings, or if the claim is actually subject to the parties’ decision according to the principle of autonomy of the will. In the case at hand, the Court of Appeal of Valladolid accepted the objection to jurisdiction filed by the

defendant and decided to refrain from hearing the dispute as it considered that, according to the relevant clause of the company bylaws, the matter was subject to arbitration.

In particular, the Court of Appeal of Valladolid found that only actions aimed at challenging corporate resolutions that are contrary to public order are excluded from the possibility of being submitted to arbitration proceedings, as they are issues outside the scope of decision of the parties. Actions aimed at challenging corporate resolutions which are merely contrary to the law, the company bylaws or corporate interests are not excluded. In this regard, an infringement of a legal rule is not enough on its own to be considered as an infringement of public order, and requires a higher degree of unlawfulness or severity, such as if it is contrary to constitutional principles, a criminal offence or a contradiction of the essential principles for society that could be considered under the scope of public order.

Dismissal of an objection to jurisdiction due to the inclusion of the arbitration clause in a letter of intent

A decision from the Court of Appeal of Madrid, dated 19 February 2018,⁶ revoked a first instance ruling that upheld an objection to jurisdiction based on an arbitral agreement included in a letter of intent. Letters of intent are contractual entities in common law, whose incorporation into the Spanish legal system has arisen as a result of its wide use by economic operators. Consequently, they are a strange element for the Spanish legal system, and lack any legal regulation, but have been accepted by means of the principle of autonomy of the will,⁷ meaning that its content is decided by the parties, and could contain a binding offer, or not. Therefore, general rules on its effects, characteristics or concept cannot be extracted solely from its denomination. It will depend on the degree of determination of the key elements, the content of the document and the behaviour of the parties.

Under these circumstances, the Court of Appeal found that the letter of intent entered into by PKG Holdings LLC and GEA Group AG and the named declaration of non-binding intentions for the acquisition of the Bossar business was a simple offer without any binding force (as clearly follows from its name, but also from its clauses), and therefore its arbitration clause (which submits all disputes arising out of or in connection with the letter of intent to the German Arbitration Institute) is inoperative.

Acceptance of an objection to jurisdiction for the clarity of the arbitration clause and the effective possibility of its knowledge by the parties

Unlike article 8.1 of the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration,⁸ article 11.1 of the Spanish Arbitration Act does not expressly stipulate that the success of the objection to jurisdiction is dependent on having an arbitration agreement which is not null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed. However, there is well-established case law⁹ supporting

the prevention of an arbitration clause that is null and void from having effect. In this regard, to be considered effective, the arbitration clause must state the unequivocal will of the parties to submit all, or some, of the issues that arise or that may arise from the relevant contract to the decision of one or more arbitrators.¹⁰ Therefore, the waiver of the exercise of actions before the courts through submission to arbitration must be explicit, clear, conclusive and unequivocal.¹¹

The above doctrine was applied by the Court of Appeal of Barcelona in its decision dated 29 June 2018.¹² In the case at hand, the claimant opposed the objection to jurisdiction, which had been filed in due time and form by the defendant, alleging that the arbitration agreement was ineffective due to a lack of express acceptance and ignorance of its real scope. The Court of Appeal of Barcelona has confirmed a first instance ruling that upheld the objection to jurisdiction. The Court of Appeal considered that the arbitration clause was grammatically comprehensible because of its simple wording. The Court of Appeal also felt it was clear that the claimant had the effective possibility of understanding the clause, as it appears to be in a specific titled section, with capital letters and emphasised. This section came at the end of the document, above the parties' representatives' signatures. But, moreover, the claimant's allegation that they had not noticed the arbitration clause cannot be accepted given that, before the agreement was signed, the claimant made some amendments to it, without expressing any concerns about the arbitration clause. Finally, the fact that the contract contained a submission to the courts of Madrid is irrelevant. Such a compromise does not contradict the main arbitration clause, as it specifies that it will only be applicable if the parties waive the arbitration agreement in writing.

The loss of economic resources suffered by one party after signing the arbitration agreement does not make the arbitration agreement ineffective

The Court of Appeal of Toledo decision dated 9 April 2018¹³ decided on the appeal filed by the claimant against the first instance ruling, which upheld an objection to jurisdiction filed by the defendant. In particular, the claimant alleged the *rebus sic stantibus* clause on the basis that, as a consequence of his current lack of financial resources, he was granted legal aid to afford legal representation and access to the court system, and therefore, if he was forced to go to arbitration, he would be deprived of his right to access justice as he was unable to afford the costs and expenses of arbitration proceedings.

The application of the *rebus sic stantibus* clause is exceptional as it clashes with the general principle *pacta sunt servanda*. In the case at hand, the Court of Appeal did not deem the imbalance due to a change in circumstances to have been proven, given that the unpredictability – the key element for the application of the *rebus sic stantibus* clause – has not been proven in this case, as at the time the arbitration agreement was signed, the consequences of a change in financial circumstances were easily foreseeable.

The Court of Appeal also dismissed the claimant's allegation regarding the breach of article 24 of the Spanish Constitution,¹⁴ which refers to the legal protection of citizens' rights. As the Court of Appeal indicates, arbitration is precisely an alternative means of resolving disputes without having to go to court. Therefore, the Court of Appeal did not accept the grounds for the appeal, as the acceptance of the objection to jurisdiction by the court of first instance is lawful, due to the existence of the parties' submission to arbitration. Those parties who agree on the

submission of disputes to arbitration should be aware of its implications, and it cannot be alleged that its fulfilment is impossible because of the loss of economic resources suffered by one party after signing the arbitration agreement, as this is a possibility that should be anticipated and assessed.

Final considerations

The 'negative effect' of the arbitration agreement gives rise to interesting questions and controversial situations to be addressed by courts and arbitral tribunals. One of the most common practical issues derived from objections to jurisdictions is the potential coexistence of two types of proceedings – court and arbitration – in relation to the same dispute. Indeed, article 11.2 of the Spanish Arbitration Act, as well as article 8.2 of the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration,¹⁵ states that the objection to jurisdiction shall not prevent the initiation or continuance of arbitration proceedings. As a consequence, an objection to jurisdiction filed in the court proceedings may not cause a stay of the concurrent arbitral proceedings, leading to an undesirable overlap between both the proceedings and the decision makers: the court and arbitral tribunal.

This article has also addressed other more specific and less common practical issues which arise from objections to jurisdiction that will help to gain a broader insight into the negative effect of the arbitration agreement under Spanish law, in relation to matters as diverse as corporate arbitration, letters of intent, *rebus sic stantibus* clause or the principle of autonomy of the will.

Notes

- 1 'Ley 60/2003, de 23 de diciembre, de Arbitraje'.
- 2 See Court of Appeal of Bilbao decision dated 18 May 2018 [LA LEY 94981, 2018].
- 3 Article 65.1 of the Spanish Civil Procedural Act ('Ley 1/2000, de 7 de enero, de Enjuiciamiento Civil').
- 4 See Court of Appeal of Málaga decision dated 8 January 2018 [JUR 2018, 185924].
- 5 See Court of Appeal of Valladolid decision dated 5 March 2018 [JUR 2018, 190040].
- 6 See Court of Appeal of Madrid decision dated 19 February 2018 [JUR 2018, 139580].
- 7 Article 1255 of the Spanish Civil Code (Real Decreto de 24 de julio de 1889 por el que se publica el Código Civil).
- 8 A court before which an action is brought in a matter which is the subject of an arbitration agreement shall, if a party so requests no later than when submitting his first statement on the substance of the dispute, refer the parties to arbitration unless it finds that the agreement is null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed.
- 9 See Spanish Supreme Court judgment dated 27 June 2017 [RJ 2017, 3021].
- 10 See Spanish Supreme Court judgments dated 27 June 2017 [RJ 2017, 3021] and 11 February 2010 [RJ 2010, 3771].
- 11 See Spanish Constitutional Court judgment dated 2 December 2010 [RTC 2010, 136].
- 12 See Court of Appeal of Barcelona decision dated 29 June 2018 [JUR 2018, 206788].
- 13 See Court of Appeal of Toledo decision dated 9 April 2018 [JUR 2018, 207569].
- 14 All persons have the right to obtain effective protection from the judges and the courts in the exercise of their rights and legitimate interests, and in no case may there be a lack of defence.
- 15 Where an action referred to in paragraph 1 of this article has been

brought, arbitral proceedings may nevertheless be commenced or continued, and an award may be made, while the issue is pending before the court.



Mercedes Romero
Pérez-Llorca

Mercedes Romero joined Pérez-Llorca in 2006 after practising law for a year and a half at a medium-sized law firm in Madrid. She made partner in January 2017. Mercedes holds a postgraduate degree in international commercial arbitration from Queen Mary University, London and a degree in law from Universidad Carlos III, Madrid.

Mercedes advises clients on international arbitration and litigation in various sectors, such as the financial, construction, engineering, corporate, energy and telecommunications sectors. Mercedes participates in complex judicial and arbitral proceedings, both nationally and internationally, regarding controversies arising from contractual obligations in purchase agreements, distribution agreements, financial operations, financial lease agreements, joint ventures, turnkey contracts, shareholder agreements and all types of contractual disputes. In addition, Mercedes participates in enforcement proceedings of foreign judgments and awards, as well as other issues relating to international private law.

Mercedes is a professor at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid and Universidad Europea de Madrid. She also participates as a regular speaker in arbitration courses and conferences.

Mercedes writes regularly for various publications, such as for the firm's national and international newsletters, and contributed to the reissue of the Arbitration Code Aranzadi (2009) and the new Arbitration Code which was published by *Thomson Reuters Aranzadi* in 2017.

Mercedes Romero is listed by the legal directory *Best Lawyers* for arbitration and mediation.



Javier Tarjuelo
Pérez-Llorca

Javier Tarjuelo joined Pérez-Llorca in 2015 and forms part of the litigation and arbitration team. Javier holds a postgraduate degree in business law from Universidad Pontificia Comillas and Universidad de Deusto, and a joint honours degree in law and business administration from Universidad Carlos III de Madrid. Javier's professional experience focuses on commercial litigation before the Spanish courts and tribunals, as well as in domestic and international arbitrations.

Javier has extensive experience in commercial and investment arbitrations, related to joint ventures, the construction of transport infrastructures, energy, and construction contracts, among others. At an international level, Javier has taken part in arbitrations before the ICC International Court of Arbitration and before the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes. Nationally, he has taken part in arbitrations before the Arbitration Court of Madrid and the Spanish Court of Arbitration.

Javier writes regularly for various publications and contributed to the Arbitration Code which was published by *Thomson Reuters Aranzadi* in 2017.

Javier is a member of the Spanish Arbitration Club.

Pérez-Llorca

Paseo de la Castellana, 50
28046 Madrid
Spain
Tel: +34 91 436 04 20
Fax: +34 91 436 04 30

Mercedes Romero
mromero@perezllorca.com

Javier Tarjuelo
jtarguelo@perezllorca.com

www.perezllorca.com

Pérez-Llorca is a preeminent law firm in Spain. We provide high-end advice to international and domestic clients in connection with the largest and most complex transactions and disputes in Spain or matters with a Spanish component. We pride ourselves on offering unrivalled quality, service and long-term commitment to clients. The majority of our work is cross-border and often involves several jurisdictions. As an independent law firm, we approach multi-jurisdictional work by providing turnkey solutions together with other leading independent firms from Europe, the Americas or Asia. We offer full-service advice on Spanish law and operate from our offices in Madrid, Barcelona, London and New York.

Since our founding in 1983, we have experienced continued growth both in number of lawyers and practice areas. This is down to our innovation, constant adaptation to the needs of our clients and the close attention we pay to market trends.

Our litigation and arbitration practice

This team is principally dedicated to defending the interests of the client companies, with lawyers acting before all legal forums throughout Spain. This team focuses on both commercial litigation and international and domestic arbitration. Its members have broad experience in complex cases relating to unfair competition, intellectual property, energy, construction, engineering, banking, tort liability, distribution and agency contracts. In addition, partners of the firm are regularly appointed as arbitrators in significant international and domestic arbitration proceedings.

Law
Business
Research