ARBITRATION AS THE PREFERRED MECHANISM FOR CROSS-BORDER COMMERCIAL DISPUTES: AN INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

Author's Name: Shri Nihar Ranjan Sahoo
Ph.D. Research Scholar, Utkal University

Co-Author: Prof. (Dr.) Sukanta Kumar Nanda
Prof. (Retd.) P.G. Dept. of Law, Utkal University

ABSTRACT

In an era of globalization, cross-border transactions have exponentially increased, leading to a rise in international commercial disputes. Arbitration has emerged as the preferred dispute resolution mechanism due to its flexibility, neutrality, and enforceability. India, with its evolving arbitration regime, is positioning itself as a global arbitration hub. This article critically examines India's arbitration framework, the role of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, its alignment with international conventions such as the New York Convention, and recent judicial pronouncements strengthening the pro-arbitration stance. The article also discusses India's potential as a preferred seat for arbitration, challenges faced, and the road ahead.

Keywords: Arbitration, Cross-Border Disputes, India, New York Convention, Enforcement, International Commercial Arbitration

INTRODUCTION:

Arbitration has emerged as the most effective mechanism for resolving cross-border commercial disputes, ensuring neutrality, efficiency, and enforceability. As businesses increasingly operate beyond national borders, disputes arising from international contracts necessitate an efficient, neutral, and enforceable dispute resolution mechanism. Arbitration has emerged as the preferred mode of dispute resolution in cross-border disputes due to its flexibility, confidentiality, and party autonomy[1]. Unlike traditional litigation, which often involves prolonged court procedures and jurisdictional complexities, arbitration offers a streamlined and internationally recognized approach for resolving disputes among businesses operating in multiple jurisdictions.

India, as one of the world's fastest-growing economies and a key player in international trade, has made significant strides in establishing itself as an arbitration-friendly jurisdiction. The Indian legal framework for arbitration is primarily governed by the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which aligns with the UNCITRAL Model Law on International

[2] G.K. Kwatra – *The Arbitration and Conciliation Law of India: With Case Law on UNCITRAL Model Law on Arbitration*, Universal Law Publishing, 2016.
[3] S.K. Chawla – *Law of Arbitration and Conciliation: Commentary on the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996*, Eastern Book Company, 2020.

Commercial Arbitration. Over the years, India has undertaken multiple legislative and judicial reforms to promote arbitration as the preferred mode of dispute resolution. These reforms aim to reduce judicial interference, enhance the efficiency of arbitration proceedings, and ensure the enforceability of arbitral awards in accordance with international standards[2].

The preference for arbitration in cross-border disputes stems from its numerous advantages over conventional litigation. Arbitration allows parties to select arbitrators with expertise in the relevant industry, ensuring that disputes are resolved by professionals well-versed in the subject matter. Moreover, arbitration proceedings are often conducted in a neutral venue, mitigating concerns about home-court bias that parties might face in national courts[3]. Additionally, arbitral awards are widely enforceable across jurisdictions due to international conventions such as the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, to which India is a signatory.

This article explores the significance of arbitration as the preferred mechanism for resolving cross-border disputes, particularly from an Indian perspective. It examines India's legal framework, recent judicial trends, legislative developments, and practical challenges in international arbitration. Furthermore, it assesses India's evolving role as an arbitration hub and the measures undertaken to enhance its credibility in the global arbitration landscape[4]. By analyzing these aspects, the article aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of arbitration's growing prominence in international dispute resolution and India's efforts to position itself as a pro-arbitration jurisdiction.

II. The Rise of Arbitration in Cross-Border Commercial Dispute Resolution:

The increasing complexity and volume of cross-border transactions have necessitated the adoption of efficient and effective dispute resolution mechanisms. Arbitration has emerged as the preferred choice for resolving international commercial disputes due to its flexibility, neutrality, and enforceability. Unlike traditional litigation, which often involves lengthy proceedings and jurisdictional complexities, arbitration provides a streamlined approach that caters to the needs of international businesses.

A. Advantages of Arbitration in Cross-Border Disputes:

1. **Neutrality** – Arbitration allows parties from different jurisdictions to select neutral arbitrators and procedural laws, avoiding potential bias associated with national courts. This ensures a level playing field for both parties, fostering trust in the arbitration process[5].
2. **Confidentiality** – Unlike litigation, arbitration proceedings are private, and the details of the case remain confidential. This aspect is particularly crucial for businesses seeking to protect sensitive commercial information and trade secrets from public disclosure[6].
3. **Flexibility and Autonomy** – One of the most significant advantages of arbitration is the ability of parties to tailor the dispute resolution process to their specific needs. They

[4] Toby Landau & Romesh Weeramantry – *The UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration: A Commentary*, Cambridge University Press, 2020.
[5] Redfern & Hunter, *Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration* (6th ed., Oxford, 2015).
[6] New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 1958.

can choose the governing law, procedural rules, language, venue, and even arbitrators, providing a high degree of control over the proceedings[7].

4. **Enforceability** – The 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards ensures that arbitral awards are recognized and enforced in over 170 countries. This global framework provides businesses with confidence that arbitration decisions will be honored internationally, reducing risks associated with non-compliance[8].
5. **Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness** – Arbitration often offers a faster resolution compared to court litigation, which can be time-consuming due to procedural delays and appeals. Although arbitration may have significant upfront costs, it can ultimately be more cost-effective than prolonged litigation, particularly in complex international disputes[9].
6. **Finality of Decisions** – Arbitral awards are generally final and binding, with limited scope for judicial review. This ensures certainty in dispute resolution and prevents prolonged litigation through multiple levels of appeal, as commonly seen in court proceedings.

B. Institutional vs. Ad-Hoc Arbitration in Cross-Border Contexts:

1. **Institutional Arbitration** – Administered by established arbitration institutions such as the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC), the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), and the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (ICDR), institutional arbitration provides structured rules, administrative support, and a degree of credibility that enhances the efficiency of the process. Institutions often have pre-established procedural frameworks that help streamline arbitration proceedings and reduce uncertainties[10].
2. **Ad-Hoc Arbitration** – In contrast, ad-hoc arbitration does not rely on a specific institution for administration. Instead, parties are free to determine the procedural rules governing the arbitration. While this approach offers greater flexibility and lower administrative costs, it may lead to inefficiencies in case of procedural disagreements. Ad-hoc arbitration may lack the structured oversight provided by institutions, potentially leading to delays and enforcement challenges[11].
3. **Global Preference for Institutional Arbitration** – With the rise of international commerce, businesses and investors increasingly prefer institutional arbitration due to its structured procedures, experienced arbitrators, and enforceability mechanisms. Many multinational corporations incorporate arbitration clauses in their contracts specifying the use of recognized arbitration institutions, ensuring clarity and consistency in dispute resolution.
4. **Emerging Trend in India** – Indian parties have historically relied on ad-hoc arbitration, but there has been a noticeable shift towards institutional arbitration in

[7]Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (India).
[8]Alan Redfen & Martin Hunter. "Law and practice of International Commercial Arbitration", London: Sweet and Maxwell, (1999), 24.
[9]Carbonneau, Thomas E. "The Law and Practice of Arbitration.", 2nd Ed. Juris Publishing, Inc., (2007), 194
[10]Ashwinie Kumar Bansal – *International Commercial Arbitration Practice: A Handbook for Indian Practitioners*, Universal Law Publishing, 2017
[11]R.S. Bachawat – *Law of Arbitration & Conciliation*, LexisNexis, 2019.
[12]Clyde Croft, Christopher Kee & Jeff Waincymer – *A Guide to the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules*, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

recent years. The establishment of domestic institutions such as the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration (MCIA) and the Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC) signifies India's growing recognition of the importance of structured dispute resolution mechanisms. Additionally, amendments to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, have encouraged institutional arbitration by promoting efficiency and reducing judicial intervention[12].

5. **Hybrid Models of Arbitration** – Some arbitration agreements incorporate elements of both institutional and ad-hoc arbitration. In such cases, parties may agree to appoint arbitrators independently but refer to institutional rules for procedural guidance. This approach seeks to combine the advantages of both systems, ensuring efficiency while retaining a degree of party autonomy.

C. Arbitration in Specific Cross-Border Sectors:

1. **International Trade and Commercial Contracts** – Arbitration plays a crucial role in resolving disputes arising from international sales contracts, distribution agreements, and supply chain disputes. It provides businesses with a predictable dispute resolution mechanism that reduces uncertainties in cross-border transactions[13].
2. **Investment Arbitration** – Foreign investors often prefer arbitration over litigation when dealing with host states, particularly in cases involving expropriation, regulatory changes, or breaches of investment treaties. Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) and multilateral agreements such as the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) facilitate investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) through arbitration.
3. **Maritime Arbitration** – Given the global nature of shipping and trade, arbitration is commonly used in resolving maritime disputes related to charter parties, shipbuilding contracts, and cargo claims. Institutions like the London Maritime Arbitrators Association (LMAA) provide specialized arbitration services for maritime disputes.
4. **Construction and Infrastructure Disputes** – Large-scale international construction and infrastructure projects often involve multiple stakeholders, complex contractual arrangements, and disputes over delays, cost overruns, and quality issues. Arbitration offers a specialized mechanism for resolving such disputes efficiently.
5. **Intellectual Property and Technology Disputes** – In technology and intellectual property-related disputes, arbitration provides an alternative to court litigation, allowing parties to resolve issues related to licensing agreements, patents, trademarks, and copyright in a confidential and neutral setting.

III. India’s Arbitration Regime: A Pro-Arbitration Shift:

India’s arbitration regime is primarily governed by the **Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996**, which aligns with the **UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial**

[13] Simon Greenberg, Christopher Kee & J. Romesh Weeramantry – *International Commercial Arbitration: An Asia-Pacific Perspective*, Cambridge University Press, 2011

[14]Cole, Sarah Rudolph, and Kristen M.Blankley. “Arbitration, in the Handbook of Dispute Resolution”, (2005), 318.

[15]Dev, Chopra. “Supreme Court’s Role vis a vis Indian Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996”, (2008)

[16]Fali S. Nariman & Remarks, “India and International Arbitration”, 41 Geo. Wash. Int’l L. Rev. (2009), 376

[17]Gupta Pankaj F.International Commercial Arbitration in India”,. International Proceedings of Economics Development & Research, Vol.2, (2011),6

[18]Kachwah, Sumeet, “The Arbitration Law of India a Critical Analysis.”, Asian International Arbitration Journal, ½(2005); 105-26

Arbitration[14]. The Act was designed to provide a robust legal framework, ensuring minimal judicial interference and expeditious dispute resolution[15].

The Act has undergone several amendments, notably in **2015, 2019, and 2021**, to enhance efficiency, reduce judicial intervention, and promote India as a pro-arbitration jurisdiction.

The Act provides for two types of arbitration: **domestic arbitration** (where both parties are Indian) and **international commercial arbitration** (where at least one party is foreign). It also recognizes **institutional and ad hoc arbitration**, giving parties the flexibility to choose their procedural framework.

One of the significant amendments in 201516[16] introduced **time limits for arbitration proceedings**, ensuring faster resolution of disputes. The 2019 amendment[17] emphasized institutional arbitration by establishing the **Arbitration Council of India (ACI)** to promote and regulate arbitration institutions. However, the **2021 amendment**[18] removed the automatic stay on enforcement of arbitral awards in cases where they were challenged, reinforcing the principle of minimal judicial interference.

Indian courts have played a crucial role in shaping the arbitration landscape. The **Supreme Court** and **High Courts** have consistently upheld the principles of party autonomy, limited court interference, and the enforceability of foreign arbitral awards under the **New York Convention**. However, issues like delays in enforcement and excessive court intervention in certain cases have sometimes hindered the growth of arbitration in India.

With increasing global investments and cross-border transactions, India has been striving to develop itself as an arbitration-friendly jurisdiction. The promotion of **institutional arbitration**, streamlining of **enforcement mechanisms**, and efforts to ensure **expeditious dispute resolution** are steps toward making India a preferred seat for arbitration.

IV. India's Compliance with the New York Convention:

India is a signatory to the **New York Convention, 1958**, ensuring recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral award[19]. The Supreme Court has consistently upheld the enforcement of foreign awards, limiting judicial interference[20].

In recent years, the Supreme Court of India has consistently upheld the enforcement of foreign arbitral awards, emphasizing minimal judicial interference. In the case of **Avitel Post Studioz Limited & Ors. v. HSBC PI Holdings (Mauritius) Limited**[21], the Court dismissed challenges

[19]Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration, Annual Report 2023.
[20]Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC), Case Reports 2023.
[21]Avitel Post Studioz Limited & Ors. v. HSBC PI Holdings (Mauritius) Limited: 2024 SCC OnLine SC 345
[22]M/S Larsen Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Company v. Union of India & Ors.: 2023 SCC OnLine SC 982.

to a 2014 SIAC arbitral award, underscoring the pro-enforcement bias of the New York Convention and the necessity for minimal judicial intervention.

Similarly, in **M/S Larsen Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Company vs. Union Of India & Ors**[22], the Supreme Court reinstated the original interest rate awarded by the Arbitral Tribunal, reiterating the limited scope of judicial interference in arbitral awards.

In **Government of India v. Vedanta Limited**[23], the Court upheld the enforcement of a foreign arbitral award, rejecting the government's objections and reinforcing the principle of limited judicial intervention.

In **Centrotrade Minerals & Metal Inc. v. Hindustan Copper Ltd.**[24], the Court upheld a foreign arbitral award, emphasizing that courts should not delve into the merits of the case during enforcement proceedings.

These judgments collectively demonstrate the Supreme Court's commitment to fostering an arbitration-friendly environment by limiting judicial interference in the enforcement of foreign arbitral

V. Challenges Hindering India's Potential as an Arbitration Hub:

A. Judicial Intervention and Delays:

Despite pro-arbitration reforms, excessive judicial interference in enforcement and appointment of arbitrators has been a concern. However, recent rulings signal a shift toward minimal court intervention[25].

B. Lack of Institutional Arbitration Culture:

While institutions like the **Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration (MCIA)** and the **Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC)** have gained prominence, India still lags behind **SIAC, ICC, and LCIA** in global preference.

C. Concerns Over Arbitrator Independence and Neutrality:

The independence and impartiality of arbitrators remain crucial. The 2019 Amendment sought to enhance transparency, but further reforms are necessary to address perceived biases[26].

D. Enforcement Bottlenecks:

- While enforcement of domestic awards is improving, challenges persist in executing foreign awards, particularly against state entities.

[23]Government of India v. Vedanta Limited: 2020 SCC OnLine SC 749
[24]Centrotrade Minerals & Metal Inc. v. Hindustan Copper Ltd.: 2016 SCC OnLine SC 940.
[25]Singh, R. "The Role of Indian Courts in International Arbitration." *International Arbitration Review*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2019, pp. 54–69

- The judiciary's evolving approach, as seen in **Amazon v. Future Retail (2021)**[27], indicates a growing recognition of arbitration agreements.

VI. India's Potential as a Global Arbitration Hub:

With progressive reforms and a strong legal foundation, India is well-positioned to become a global arbitration destination. Key factors supporting this shift include:

1. **Legislative Support** – Amendments aligning with global best practices.
2. **Judicial Precedents** – Pro-arbitration rulings reinforcing investor confidence.
3. **Growth of Institutional Arbitration** – Increased adoption of **MCIA** and **DIAC**.
4. **Cost-Effectiveness** – Lower costs compared to London, Singapore, or Paris.

However, India must address enforcement concerns, promote institutional arbitration, and streamline court interventions to enhance its appeal.

VII. Conclusion and the Road Ahead:

Arbitration has firmly established itself as the preferred mechanism for resolving cross-border commercial disputes, particularly in the Indian context. The evolution of arbitration in India, driven by legislative reforms and judicial pronouncements, reflects a growing commitment to providing a robust dispute resolution framework that aligns with international best practices. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, as amended, has significantly enhanced the efficiency, reliability, and enforceability of arbitration in India, making it an attractive jurisdiction for commercial entities engaged in cross-border transactions.

One of the critical reasons for arbitration's preference over traditional litigation is its ability to provide a neutral, efficient, and flexible resolution mechanism. Unlike conventional court proceedings, arbitration offers parties the autonomy to select their arbitrators, determine procedural rules, and ensure confidentiality, which is crucial in commercial dealings. Additionally, international conventions such as the New York Convention, to which India is a signatory, have facilitated the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards, further cementing arbitration's global appeal.

Despite its advancements, arbitration in India faces challenges that need to be addressed to enhance its effectiveness further. Delays in proceedings, judicial interference, and concerns over institutional arbitration remain areas of concern. The government and judiciary must continue working towards minimizing these roadblocks through sustained policy reforms, institutional strengthening, and fostering a pro-arbitration judicial approach. Encouraging alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms, particularly institutional arbitration, will further reinforce India's standing as an arbitration-friendly jurisdiction.

The Road Ahead

Moving forward, several key areas require focus to ensure India remains a preferred seat for arbitration in cross-border commercial disputes:

[27] Amazon.com NV Investment Holdings LLC v. Future Retail Ltd., (2021) SCC Online SC 557.

1. **Strengthening Institutional Arbitration**: While India has several arbitral institutions, such as the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration (MCIA) and the Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC), institutional arbitration remains underutilized. Strengthening these institutions by enhancing their administrative capabilities, streamlining procedures, and ensuring adherence to international standards will bolster confidence in arbitration as a dispute resolution mechanism.
2. **Reducing Judicial Intervention**: While Indian courts have demonstrated a more arbitration-friendly approach in recent years, instances of excessive judicial interference still pose a challenge. Courts must continue to uphold the principles of minimal intervention, particularly in the appointment of arbitrators, interim reliefs, and enforcement of awards. Training judges in arbitration law and practices can further support this objective.
3. **Enhancing Time and Cost Efficiency**: Arbitration is often preferred for its perceived efficiency compared to traditional litigation. However, delays and high costs associated with arbitration proceedings can undermine its benefits. Adopting best practices from international arbitration hubs such as Singapore and London, including setting strict timelines for award issuance and imposing cost-effective procedural structures, can improve efficiency.
4. **Promoting Digital Arbitration and Technology Integration**: The post-pandemic world has witnessed a surge in virtual hearings and online dispute resolution mechanisms. Leveraging digital platforms for case management, virtual hearings, and AI-based document review can significantly enhance the efficiency of arbitration proceedings in India.
5. **Developing Skilled Arbitration Professionals**: The success of arbitration depends on the availability of competent arbitrators, legal practitioners, and experts who understand complex commercial transactions. Establishing specialized training programs, certifications, and academic courses in arbitration law will contribute to building a skilled workforce capable of handling international disputes.
6. **Implementing Sector-Specific Arbitration Frameworks**: Given the growing complexity of cross-border trade in sectors such as technology, infrastructure, and finance, India should develop sector-specific arbitration frameworks. Tailored rules and specialized arbitrators with expertise in specific industries will improve the quality and effectiveness of dispute resolution.
7. **Harmonizing Domestic Laws with International Standards**: Continuous alignment of India's arbitration laws with global best practices, such as the UNCITRAL Model Law, will enhance India's credibility as an arbitration-friendly jurisdiction. Legislative amendments and policy measures should focus on simplifying procedural complexities and ensuring uniformity with international arbitration norms.

Conclusion:

India's growing prominence as a hub for international arbitration is a testament to the country's commitment to establishing a pro-arbitration legal framework. While significant progress has been made, sustained efforts are required to overcome existing challenges and enhance the overall efficiency of arbitration. By focusing on institutional reforms, reducing judicial interference, integrating technology, and nurturing arbitration professionals, India can emerge as a global leader in cross-border commercial dispute resolution.

As businesses increasingly rely on arbitration to resolve disputes, India must continue to evolve its arbitration landscape to meet the demands of global commerce. A concerted effort by

policymakers, the judiciary, and the arbitration community will ensure that India not only remains an arbitration-friendly jurisdiction but also becomes a preferred destination for resolving international commercial disputes efficiently and effectively.

***

References:

1. Gary Born, *International Commercial Arbitration* (2nd ed., Kluwer Law, 2014).
2. Redfern & Hunter, *Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration* (6th ed., Oxford, 2015).
3. New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 1958.
4. Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (India).
5. Alan Redfen & Martin Hunter. "Law and practice of International Commercial Arbitration", London: Sweet and Maxwell, (1999), 24.
6. Carbonneau, Thomas E. "The Law and Practice of Arbitration.", 2nd Ed. Juris Publishing, Inc., (2007), 194.
7. Cole, Sarah Rudolph, and Kristen M.Blankley. "Arbitration, in the Handbook of Dispute Resolution", (2005), 318.
8. Dev, Chopra. "Supreme Court's Role vis a vis Indian Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996", (2008)
9. Fali S. Nariman & Remarks, "India and International Arbitration", 41 Geo. Wash. Int'l L. Rev. (2009), 376.
10. Gupta Pankaj F.International Commercial Arbitration in India",. International Proceedings of Economics Development & Research, Vol.2, (2011),6.
11. Kachwah, Sumeet, "The Arbitration Law of India a Critical Analysis.", Asian International Arbitration Journal, ½(2005); 105-26.
12. Malhotra, Om Prakash, and Indu Malhotra. "The law and practice of Arbitration and Conciliation", 1st Ed, Lexis Nexis- Butterworths Publication: New Delhi (2006), 10.
13. N.V.Paranjape. "Law Relating to of Arbitration & Conciliation in Indfia", fourth Ed. Allahabad: General Law Agency, (2011), 16.
14. Olefirenko, Kostyantyn. "Applicable Procedural Law in International Commercial Arbitration.", Central European University, (2010).
15. Phjil, Graham. "Where is international Commercial Arbitration Going?"
16. Rajan, R.Desting. "A Primer on Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)" 1 st Ed. Barathi law Publications, (2005), 601.
17. S.C.Tripathi. "Law of Arbitration Conciliation in India with Alternative Means of Settlement of Disputes Resolution", Sixth ed. Allahabad: Central Law Publications, (2012).
18. Sarma. K, Momota. O, & Kaushik, A. "Development and Practice of Arbitration in India- Has it Evolved as an Effective Legal Institution", CDDRL working papers database, Freeman SPOPGLI Institute for International Studies Standford University. 103(2009), 2.
19. Sau, Samuel Marful, "Can International Commercial Arbitration Be Effective without National Courts? A Perspective of Courts Involvement International Commercial Arbitration", University of Dundee. (2008/09).
20. Singh, Priti. "Enforcement of foreign awards in India:
    Simpli0fication under the 1996 Act", Asian Dispute Review database, Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (2005).

21. UN working Group. “International Commercial Arbitration- UNCTAD”, Edin., 5.1: United Nations, New York and Geneva (2005), 21.
22. Vijay Reddy and V.Nagaraj. “Arbitrability: The Indian Perspective”, 198 J. Int’l 117, 118. No. 2. (2002), 135.
23. Xaxvier, grace, “Evolution of Arbitration as a Legal Institutional and the Inherent Powers of the Court: Putrajkaya Holdings Sdn. Bhd. V. Digital Green Sdn. Bhd.” Asia Law Institute, (2010), 2.
24. Simon Greenberg, Christopher Kee & J. Romesh Weeramantry – International Commercial Arbitration: An Asia-Pacific Perspective, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
25. George A. Bermann – Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards: The Interpretation and Application of the New York Convention by National Courts, Springer, 2017.

***