B&J | BHATT & JOSHI ASSOCIATES

BOOKLET ON

SWISS CHAMBERS' ARBITRATION INSTITUTION

BHATT AND JOSHI ASSOCIATES

BOOKLET ON

Swiss Chambers' Arbitration Institution

By Bhatt & Joshi Associates

Preface

The Swiss Arbitration Centre, formerly known as the Swiss Chambers' Arbitration Institution, proudly presents this booklet as a comprehensive guide to arbitration and mediation under the Swiss Rules of International Arbitration. For over a century, Switzerland has been a global hub for dispute resolution, renowned for its neutrality, robust legal framework, and efficient institutions. This publication aims to illuminate the strengths of the Swiss Arbitration Centre and its role in fostering fair, flexible, and cost-effective solutions for international and domestic disputes.

Since its inception in 2004, the Swiss Rules have evolved to meet the demands of modern arbitration, with significant revisions in 2012 and 2021 enhancing their efficiency and adaptability. The transition to the Swiss Arbitration Centre in 2021 marked a pivotal moment, reinforcing our commitment to innovation and accessibility. Administered by a dedicated Arbitration Court and Secretariat, our institution ensures streamlined proceedings, whether through expedited procedures for smaller disputes or tailored processes for complex, multi-party cases. This booklet outlines these mechanisms, offering clarity on procedural flexibility, cost structures, and the advantages of choosing Switzerland as an arbitral seat.

Switzerland's arbitration-friendly environment, governed by Chapter 12 of the Private International Law Act, complements the Swiss Rules' emphasis on party autonomy and procedural fairness. The 2021 revisions introduced provisions for paperless filings, remote hearings, and enhanced multi-contract arbitration, reflecting global trends toward digitalization and efficiency. These updates, detailed within, ensure that

our framework remains at the forefront of international best practices, serving parties from diverse industries, including finance, construction, and commodities.

We invite practitioners, businesses, and scholars to explore this booklet as a resource for understanding the Swiss Arbitration Centre's offerings. From model clauses to guidelines for arbitrators, the content encapsulates our mission to provide a neutral, predictable, and professional platform for dispute resolution. As we continue to uphold Switzerland's legacy as a premier arbitration venue, we remain dedicated to empowering parties to resolve disputes with confidence and clarity.

This booklet is a testament to our ongoing pursuit of excellence in arbitration and mediation, and we hope it serves as a valuable tool for all who engage with our institution.

Sincerely

Bhatt & Joshi Associates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Disclaimer

The information contained in this booklet is for general guidance only. Readers should obtain professional advice before taking any action based on its contents. Neither the authors nor the firm assume any liability for actions taken by any person based on this booklet's contents. We expressly disclaim all responsibility for any consequences resulting from reliance on the information presented herein.

Contact

For any help or assistance please email us on office@bhattandjoshiassociates.com or visit us at www.bhattandjoshiassociates.com

Chapter 1: Swiss Arbitration Excellence and SCAI Foundation

Switzerland's Historical Neutrality and Arbitration Tradition

Switzerland’s reputation as a global leader in international arbitration is deeply rooted in its historical neutrality and long-standing commitment to peaceful dispute resolution. For over a century, Switzerland has cultivated an environment conducive to arbitration, leveraging its political stability and neutrality to become a preferred venue for resolving international disputes. This tradition began in the 19th century, notably with the Alabama Case in 1872, which marked the first formal third-party arbitration in diplomatic history. Conducted in Geneva, this case resolved claims between Great Britain and the United States following the American Civil War, establishing Switzerland as a credible neutral ground for high-stakes international negotiations. The country’s neutrality, formalized in 1815 at the Congress of Vienna, has since been a cornerstone of its identity, attracting parties seeking impartial and confidential dispute resolution. Switzerland’s multilingual and multicultural society, with four official languages—German, French, Italian, and Romansh—further enhances its appeal, allowing it to accommodate diverse parties and legal traditions. This historical backdrop has fostered a robust arbitration culture, supported by a legal framework that prioritizes party autonomy and judicial non-interference, making Switzerland a beacon of arbitration excellence.

The evolution of arbitration in Switzerland has been marked by continuous refinement and innovation. Since the late 19th century, Swiss Chambers of Commerce have

played a pivotal role in developing arbitration services, with the first recorded rules published in Basel in 1869. These early efforts laid the groundwork for a sophisticated arbitration ecosystem that balances flexibility with procedural rigor. By hosting major international organizations, such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, Switzerland has reinforced its status as a hub for global dispute resolution. The country's arbitration-friendly judiciary, particularly the Swiss Federal Tribunal, ensures that arbitral awards are rarely challenged, providing parties with confidence in the enforceability of decisions. This historical commitment to neutrality and arbitration has not only shaped Switzerland's legal landscape but also positioned it as a trusted venue for both commercial and diplomatic disputes, attracting parties from across the globe.

SCAI Formation by Seven Swiss Chambers of Commerce

The Swiss Chambers' Arbitration Institution (SCAI), now known as the Swiss Arbitration Centre, was established in 2004 through the collaborative efforts of seven Swiss Chambers of Commerce: Basel, Bern, Geneva, Lausanne, Lugano, Neuchâtel, and Zurich. This initiative marked a significant milestone in harmonizing arbitration services across Switzerland, replacing the disparate rules previously maintained by individual chambers. The creation of SCAI was driven by a desire to offer a unified, efficient, and internationally competitive arbitration framework under the Swiss Rules of International Arbitration. These rules, based on the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, were designed to provide flexibility, cost-effectiveness, and procedural clarity for both domestic and international disputes. The formation of SCAI as an independent association under Swiss law in 2007 further solidified its role as a leading arbitration institution, with a dedicated Arbitration Court and Secretariat to administer cases.

The transition to the Swiss Arbitration Centre in 2021, in partnership with the Swiss Arbitration Association (ASA), enhanced SCAI's global reach and operational efficiency. This transformation into a Swiss stock corporation, with ASA holding a 51% stake and the chambers retaining 49%, ensured continuity while integrating ASA's expertise and network. The revised Swiss Rules of 2021 introduced refinements to address modern arbitration needs, such as provisions for remote hearings and cybersecurity, without altering the core principles of party autonomy and flexibility. The collaboration between the chambers and ASA has created a robust platform that leverages Switzerland's arbitration heritage while adapting to contemporary demands, making the Swiss Arbitration Centre a preferred choice for resolving complex commercial disputes worldwide.

Federal Structure and Cantonal Chamber Coordination

Switzerland's federal structure, characterized by a decentralized system of 26 cantons, plays a crucial role in the coordination of arbitration services through its cantonal Chambers of Commerce. Each chamber, representing regional economic interests, contributes to the Swiss Arbitration Centre's operations by providing infrastructure, business networks, and localized expertise. The cantonal chambers of Basel, Bern, Geneva, Lausanne, Lugano, Neuchâtel, and Zurich work in tandem to ensure seamless administration of arbitration and mediation cases, with secretariats in Geneva, Zurich, and Lugano handling cases in multiple languages, including English, French, German, and Italian. This decentralized yet coordinated approach allows the Swiss Arbitration Centre to maintain a national presence while catering to international parties, reflecting Switzerland's federal ethos of unity in diversity.

The coordination among cantonal chambers is facilitated by the Swiss Arbitration Centre's Arbitration Court, an autonomous body that oversees case administration and ensures procedural consistency. The court, composed of experienced arbitration practitioners, delegates tasks to case administration committees and a special committee for decisions on critical issues like arbitrator challenges and consolidation of proceedings. This structure enhances efficiency and impartiality, as the court operates independently of the chambers while benefiting from their regional insights. The cantonal chambers' long-standing involvement in arbitration, dating back to the 19th century, underscores their commitment to maintaining Switzerland's reputation as a global arbitration hub. By pooling resources and expertise, the chambers ensure that the Swiss Arbitration Centre delivers high-quality dispute resolution services tailored to the needs of diverse parties.

Swiss Legal System Support for International Arbitration

The Swiss legal system provides a robust and arbitration-friendly framework that underpins the country's prominence in international dispute resolution. The primary legal foundation for international arbitration is Chapter 12 of the Swiss Private International Law Act (PILA), enacted in 1987 and revised in 2021 to enhance clarity and modernity. PILA emphasizes party autonomy, allowing parties to select their arbitrators, applicable law, and procedural rules, while ensuring minimal judicial intervention. The Swiss Federal Tribunal, the highest court in Switzerland, has exclusive jurisdiction to hear challenges to international arbitral awards, which are set aside only on narrow grounds, such as violations of public policy or procedural irregularities. This limited scope for judicial review enhances the finality and enforceability of arbitral awards, making Switzerland an attractive arbitration seat.

The Swiss Rules of International Arbitration, administered by the Swiss Arbitration Centre, complement PILA by providing a flexible and efficient procedural framework. Revised in 2021, these rules incorporate modern features like expedited procedures, emergency relief, and provisions for multi-party and multi-contract disputes, aligning with global best practices. Additionally, Switzerland's adherence to the New York Convention ensures that arbitral awards rendered in Switzerland are enforceable in over 160 countries, further bolstering its appeal. The judiciary's pro-arbitration stance, combined with a predictable legal framework, creates a stable environment for parties seeking reliable and confidential dispute resolution. This legal support, rooted in Switzerland's tradition of neutrality and rule of law, continues to attract international businesses and organizations to Swiss arbitration.

Zurich and Geneva as Co-Equal Arbitration Centers

Zurich and Geneva stand as co-equal pillars of Switzerland's arbitration landscape, each contributing unique strengths to the country's reputation as a global arbitration hub. Geneva, located in the French-speaking region, has a rich history of hosting international arbitrations, including landmark cases like the Alabama Case. Its proximity to international organizations, such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, makes it a preferred venue for disputes involving states and multinational entities. Geneva's sophisticated legal community and multilingual capabilities further enhance its appeal, with the Swiss Arbitration Centre's secretariat in the city administering a significant portion of cases. The city's infrastructure, including state-of-the-art hearing facilities, supports complex, high-value arbitrations, positioning Geneva as a global leader in dispute resolution.

Zurich, situated in the German-speaking region, is equally prominent, known for its role in commercial arbitrations, particularly in industries like finance, pharmaceuticals, and commodities. The Zurich Chamber of Commerce has a long history of arbitration expertise, and the city's status as a financial hub attracts parties seeking efficient and discreet dispute resolution. Zurich's secretariat within the Swiss Arbitration Centre handles cases in multiple languages, with English being the dominant language in 70% of cases. Both cities benefit from Switzerland's arbitration-friendly legal framework and the Swiss Arbitration Centre's unified administration, ensuring consistency and quality. Together, Zurich and Geneva offer complementary strengths, with their cultural and linguistic diversity enabling them to serve a global clientele. Their co-equal status underscores Switzerland's ability to provide world-class arbitration services across its regions, reinforcing its position as a premier arbitration destination.

Chapter 2: Swiss Rules 2021 - Precision in Procedure

Article 3: Request for Arbitration Requirements

The Swiss Rules of International Arbitration, revised in 2021, provide a structured framework for initiating arbitration proceedings, with Article 3 outlining the requirements for the Request for Arbitration. This article ensures that the process begins with clarity and efficiency, reflecting Switzerland's commitment to streamlined dispute resolution. The claimant must submit the Request for Arbitration to the Secretariat of the Swiss Arbitration Centre, either electronically or in hard copy, unless otherwise specified. The request must include essential details: the names and contact information of the parties, a statement of the claim, the relief sought, and the relevant arbitration agreement. Additionally, the claimant should propose the number of arbitrators, the seat of arbitration, and the language of the proceedings if not already agreed upon by the parties. The 2021 revision emphasizes paperless submissions, allowing electronic filing as the default, which aligns with modern technological advancements and reduces administrative burdens. The Secretariat, upon receiving the request, verifies its completeness and notifies the respondent, setting the stage for a responsive and organized arbitral process. This provision underscores the Swiss Rules' focus on accessibility and procedural clarity, ensuring that disputes are initiated with precision to avoid delays or jurisdictional challenges.

Articles 8-12: Tribunal Constitution and Appointment Procedures

The constitution and appointment of the arbitral tribunal are governed by Articles 8 through 12 of the Swiss Rules 2021, which provide a robust framework for establishing an impartial and competent tribunal. Article 8 addresses the number of arbitrators, allowing parties to agree on a sole arbitrator or a three-member tribunal, with the latter being the default if no agreement exists. This flexibility accommodates varying dispute complexities while ensuring efficiency. Article 9 outlines the procedure for appointing a sole arbitrator, requiring the parties to jointly designate the arbitrator within a time limit set by the Secretariat. If the parties fail to agree, the Court of the Swiss Arbitration Centre appoints the arbitrator, prioritizing independence and expertise. For three-member tribunals, Article 10 stipulates that each party nominates one arbitrator, and the two party-nominated arbitrators select the presiding arbitrator. If the parties or arbitrators cannot agree, the Court steps in to make the appointment, ensuring swift resolution. Article 11 addresses multi-party arbitrations, introducing a streamlined process where the Court sets a reasonable time limit for each side to designate an arbitrator, enhancing procedural fairness. Article 12 reinforces the independence and impartiality of arbitrators, mandating prompt disclosure of any circumstances that could raise doubts about their neutrality, both before and after appointment. These provisions collectively reflect Switzerland's arbitration-friendly approach, balancing party autonomy with institutional oversight to guarantee a fair and effective tribunal constitution.

Article 43: Emergency Relief Proceedings Detailed Analysis

Article 43 of the Swiss Rules 2021 governs emergency relief proceedings, providing a mechanism for parties to seek urgent interim measures before the arbitral tribunal is fully constituted. This provision is critical in disputes where immediate action is necessary to preserve rights or prevent irreparable harm. A party may apply for emergency relief by submitting a request to the Secretariat, specifying the nature of the relief sought, the reasons for urgency, and the underlying arbitration agreement. The Court promptly appoints an emergency arbitrator, typically within days, who must be independent and impartial. The emergency arbitrator has broad authority to issue interim measures, such as orders to maintain the status quo or prevent asset dissipation, but cannot serve as an arbitrator in the main proceedings unless the parties agree otherwise. The 2021 revision clarifies that any measures granted cease to be binding upon the termination of the emergency proceedings, the arbitral proceedings, or the issuance of a final award, unless the tribunal decides otherwise. The costs of emergency proceedings, including the arbitrator's fees and expenses, are determined based on the complexity and urgency of the case, as outlined in Appendix B of the Swiss Rules. This article exemplifies the Swiss Rules' commitment to flexibility and responsiveness, ensuring that parties can address urgent needs without undermining the arbitration process.

Articles 42A-42F: Expedited Procedure Provisions

The expedited procedure, detailed in Articles 42A through 42F of the Swiss Rules 2021, is designed to resolve disputes efficiently when time and cost are critical factors. Article 42A establishes the scope, applying the expedited procedure automatically to disputes where the amount in controversy does not exceed CHF 1 million, unless the parties opt out. Parties may also agree to apply the expedited procedure regardless of

the amount in dispute, reflecting the Swiss Rules' emphasis on party autonomy. Article 42B mandates that the tribunal, typically a sole arbitrator, be constituted promptly to expedite proceedings. Article 42C sets a six-month time limit from the case management conference for the tribunal to render the final award, encouraging concise submissions and limited hearings. Article 42D allows the tribunal to adapt procedural rules, such as limiting written submissions or conducting hearings remotely, to maintain efficiency. Article 42E addresses cost allocation, ensuring that fees and expenses remain proportionate to the dispute's value, as per Appendix B. Finally, Article 42F clarifies that the expedited procedure does not compromise due process, requiring the tribunal to ensure equal treatment and a fair opportunity for parties to present their case. These provisions highlight Switzerland's dedication to cost-effective and rapid dispute resolution, particularly for smaller or less complex cases, without sacrificing procedural fairness.

Article 44: Summary Adjudication for Clear Cases

Article 44 of the Swiss Rules 2021 introduces summary adjudication, a mechanism for resolving clear-cut issues or claims early in the arbitration process, enhancing procedural efficiency. This provision allows the arbitral tribunal to dismiss claims or defenses that are manifestly without merit or outside its jurisdiction, provided the parties have been given a fair opportunity to respond. The tribunal may issue an order or a partial award to dispose of such issues, reducing the scope of the proceedings and saving time and costs. Unlike expedited procedures, summary adjudication applies regardless of the dispute's value and focuses on legal or factual clarity rather than procedural speed. The 2021 revision retains the confidential nature of awards unless the parties explicitly consent to publication, with redactions to protect sensitive information. This provision aligns with Switzerland's arbitration philosophy of

balancing efficiency with due process, ensuring that frivolous claims do not unnecessarily prolong proceedings. By enabling tribunals to address clear cases swiftly, Article 44 reinforces the Swiss Rules' reputation for precision and practicality in international arbitration.

Swiss Efficiency Principles Embedded in Rule Structure

The Swiss Rules 2021 are underpinned by efficiency principles that permeate their structure, reflecting Switzerland's longstanding reputation as a leading arbitration hub. The emphasis on paperless filings, as seen in Article 3, reduces administrative costs and environmental impact while accelerating communication. The expedited procedure and summary adjudication provisions demonstrate a commitment to resolving disputes promptly, particularly for smaller or clear-cut cases, without compromising fairness. The streamlined tribunal appointment process, coupled with institutional oversight by the Swiss Arbitration Centre, ensures that proceedings commence without undue delay, even in complex multi-party disputes. The emergency relief mechanism addresses urgent needs, preserving the integrity of the arbitration process. Moreover, the rules' flexibility in allowing parties to tailor procedures, such as choosing the number of arbitrators or the language of proceedings, enhances accessibility and user-friendliness. The 2021 revisions, including provisions for remote hearings and cybersecurity, adapt the rules to modern challenges, ensuring that Switzerland remains a forward-thinking arbitration jurisdiction. These efficiency-driven features, combined with robust safeguards for impartiality and due process, make the Swiss Rules a model for international arbitration, reinforcing Switzerland's role as a global leader in dispute resolution.

Chapter 3: SCAI's Distinctive Administrative Approach

Court of Arbitration Composition and Decision-Making

The Swiss Chambers' Arbitration Institution (SCAI) operates with a carefully structured Court of Arbitration that ensures impartiality and expertise in resolving disputes. The Court is composed of experienced legal professionals and arbitration specialists drawn from diverse backgrounds, reflecting Switzerland's commitment to neutrality and international cooperation. These members are appointed based on their expertise in international arbitration, commercial law, and sector-specific knowledge, ensuring that the Court can address a wide range of disputes effectively. The composition of the Court is designed to maintain a balance between legal traditions, with representatives familiar with both civil and common law systems, fostering a harmonized approach to decision-making. This diversity strengthens the Court's ability to handle complex, cross-border disputes with sensitivity to varying legal cultures.

The decision-making process within the Court is streamlined to uphold fairness and efficiency. The Court does not resolve disputes itself but plays a supervisory role, overseeing the appointment of arbitrators, confirming their independence, and addressing challenges to their impartiality. Decisions are made collectively by the Court's members, with a focus on ensuring that arbitrators meet SCAI's stringent standards of neutrality and competence. This process involves a thorough review of potential conflicts of interest, ensuring that arbitrators are free from any bias that

could compromise the integrity of the proceedings. The Court also approves key procedural steps, such as the terms of reference and the arbitral tribunal's jurisdiction, to ensure compliance with SCAI's rules and international arbitration standards. By maintaining a hands-on yet non-intrusive role, the Court guarantees that arbitrations proceed smoothly while preserving the autonomy of the arbitral tribunal.

Administrative Efficiency and Swiss Precision Standards

SCAI's administrative framework is renowned for its efficiency, embodying the precision and reliability associated with Swiss institutional standards. The institution's secretariat, based in Geneva, operates with a lean yet highly skilled team that manages cases with meticulous attention to detail. This administrative efficiency is rooted in Switzerland's long-standing reputation for organizational excellence, which SCAI leverages to ensure that arbitration proceedings are conducted without unnecessary delays. The secretariat coordinates all aspects of case management, from the initial filing of a request for arbitration to the issuance of the final award, ensuring that each step adheres to strict timelines and procedural requirements.

The application of Swiss precision standards extends to every facet of SCAI's operations. The institution employs advanced case management systems to track deadlines, monitor correspondence, and maintain secure records of all case-related documents. These systems are designed to minimize administrative errors and ensure that parties receive timely updates on the progress of their cases. Additionally, SCAI's administrative processes are governed by clear, transparent rules that are regularly updated to reflect best practices in international arbitration. This commitment to precision not only enhances the speed of proceedings but also builds trust among parties, who rely on SCAI's ability to deliver consistent and dependable administrative

support. By prioritizing efficiency without compromising quality, SCAI sets a benchmark for arbitration institutions worldwide.

Cost Structures: Administrative Costs Plus Tribunal Fees

SCAI's cost structure is designed to provide clarity and predictability, ensuring that parties can anticipate the financial implications of arbitration. The institution operates on a transparent fee model that comprises two primary components: administrative costs and tribunal fees. Administrative costs cover the services provided by SCAI's secretariat, including case management, coordination of hearings, and oversight of procedural compliance. These costs are calculated based on a fixed schedule that takes into account the amount in dispute, allowing parties to estimate expenses at the outset of the arbitration. This predictability is particularly valuable for businesses engaged in high-stakes disputes, as it enables effective budgeting and financial planning.

Tribunal fees, on the other hand, compensate the arbitrators for their time and expertise. These fees are also determined according to a predefined schedule, which considers the complexity of the case and the number of arbitrators involved. SCAI's fee structure is designed to be competitive, offering cost-effective solutions compared to other leading arbitration institutions. Importantly, the institution ensures that fees are proportionate to the value of the dispute, preventing excessive costs in smaller cases while accommodating the resources required for larger, more complex arbitrations. By maintaining a balanced and transparent approach to costs, SCAI makes arbitration accessible to a wide range of parties, from small enterprises to multinational corporations, without sacrificing the quality of its services.

Multilingual Administration: German, French, Italian, English

One of SCAI's defining features is its multilingual administration, which reflects Switzerland's linguistic diversity and its role as a global hub for arbitration. The institution conducts its operations in four official languages—German, French, Italian, and English—ensuring that parties from different linguistic backgrounds can engage with the arbitration process comfortably. This multilingual capability is integrated into every stage of the proceedings, from the drafting of procedural documents to the conduct of hearings. Parties can submit their pleadings and communicate with the secretariat in any of these languages, and arbitrators are selected with consideration for their linguistic proficiency to match the needs of the case.

The use of multiple languages enhances accessibility and fosters inclusivity, particularly for parties from non-English-speaking jurisdictions. SCAI's secretariat is staffed with professionals fluent in all four languages, ensuring that translations, when required, are accurate and contextually appropriate. This linguistic flexibility also extends to the arbitrators, many of whom are multilingual, allowing for seamless communication during hearings and deliberations. By accommodating diverse linguistic needs, SCAI eliminates potential barriers to participation, making its services more user-friendly and appealing to an international clientele. This commitment to multilingual administration underscores SCAI's dedication to serving a global audience while maintaining the highest standards of professionalism.

Quality Control Through Systematic Case Monitoring

SCAI places a strong emphasis on quality control, achieved through systematic case monitoring that ensures consistency and fairness across all arbitrations. The institution employs a rigorous oversight mechanism to track the progress of each case, from initiation to resolution. This process involves regular reviews by the secretariat and the Court of Arbitration to verify that procedural rules are followed, deadlines are met, and the parties' rights are protected. Case monitoring is conducted discreetly to preserve the independence of the arbitral tribunal, but it serves as a critical safeguard against procedural irregularities that could undermine the validity of an award.

The systematic nature of SCAI's quality control is supported by its advanced case management systems, which provide real-time insights into the status of each arbitration. These systems allow the secretariat to identify potential issues early, such as delays in submissions or challenges to an arbitrator's impartiality, and address them promptly. Additionally, SCAI conducts periodic audits of its administrative processes to ensure alignment with international best practices and to incorporate feedback from parties and arbitrators. This proactive approach to quality control enhances the reliability of SCAI's arbitration services, giving parties confidence that their disputes will be resolved in a fair and professional manner. By prioritizing systematic monitoring, SCAI upholds its reputation as a leading arbitration institution committed to excellence.

Chapter 4: Swiss Legal Framework and Judicial Support

Swiss Private International Law Act (PILA) Chapter 12

The Swiss Private International Law Act (PILA), specifically Chapter 12, serves as the cornerstone of Switzerland's legal framework for international arbitration. Enacted in 1989 and revised in 2021, this chapter provides a comprehensive and arbitration-friendly regime that governs international arbitral proceedings with a seat in Switzerland. The scope of Chapter 12, as outlined in Article 176, applies to arbitrations where at least one party, at the time of concluding the arbitration agreement, was neither domiciled nor habitually resident in Switzerland. This provision ensures that the framework is tailored to international disputes, distinguishing it from domestic arbitration governed by the Swiss Code of Civil Procedure (CCP). The 2021 revisions aimed to codify decades of jurisprudence from the Swiss Federal Supreme Court, enhance party autonomy, and clarify procedural ambiguities, thereby reinforcing Switzerland's position as a global arbitration hub. For instance, the revised Article 176 clarifies that the domicile of a party is determined at the time the arbitration agreement is concluded, resolving prior uncertainties stemming from conflicting case law.

Chapter 12 of the PILA is designed to maximize flexibility while ensuring procedural fairness. Articles 176 to 194 cover critical aspects such as arbitrability, the constitution of the arbitral tribunal, procedural rules, interim measures, and the recognition and enforcement of awards. The framework emphasizes minimal judicial intervention,

allowing parties to tailor proceedings to their needs, subject to mandatory principles like equal treatment and the right to be heard, as enshrined in Article 182(3). The 2021 amendments introduced provisions like Article 185a, which extends Swiss court assistance to foreign-seated arbitral tribunals for enforcing interim measures or taking evidence, a significant step in enhancing Switzerland's role in global arbitration. This legislative evolution reflects a deliberate effort to align statutory rules with modern arbitration practices, making the PILA a model for arbitration-friendly jurisdictions worldwide.

Federal Supreme Court Arbitration Jurisprudence

The Swiss Federal Supreme Court plays a pivotal role in shaping the arbitration landscape through its consistent and pro-arbitration jurisprudence. As the sole authority for setting aside international arbitral awards under Article 191 of the PILA, the Court ensures uniformity and predictability in arbitration-related decisions. Its case law has been instrumental in interpreting and refining the provisions of Chapter 12, many of which were codified in the 2021 PILA revisions. For example, the Court's decisions have clarified the scope of public policy under Article 190(2)(e), emphasizing that only violations of fundamental principles of the Swiss legal system, such as the principle of res judicata, justify setting aside an award. In a landmark 2002 decision (SFSC Decision 128 III 191), the Court held that the res judicata effect of a foreign judgment or award is limited to its operative part, excluding the reasoning, thereby adopting a narrow approach to preclusive effects.

The Court's jurisprudence also underscores the principle of party autonomy, allowing parties to waive certain rights, such as the right to appeal an award under Article 192, provided neither party is domiciled in Switzerland. However, this waiver is invalid in

sports arbitration, as confirmed in the 2007 Cañas decision (SFSC Decision 133 III 235), reflecting the Court's sensitivity to power imbalances in specific contexts. Additionally, the Court has developed a robust framework for assessing procedural fairness, ensuring that arbitral tribunals adhere to due process without overstepping into substantive review. The 2021 PILA revisions incorporated these judicial principles, such as the explicit inclusion of remedies like correction, interpretation, and revision of awards under Articles 189a and 190a, enhancing legal certainty for practitioners and parties alike.

Interim Measures Coordination with Swiss Courts

Interim measures are critical in arbitration to preserve the status quo or protect parties' rights pending a final award. Chapter 12 of the PILA, particularly Article 183, empowers arbitral tribunals seated in Switzerland to order interim or conservatory measures, such as asset freezes or injunctions, unless the parties agree otherwise. The 2021 revisions introduced Article 185a, a groundbreaking provision that allows foreign-seated arbitral tribunals or parties to foreign arbitration proceedings to seek assistance from Swiss courts for enforcing interim measures or taking evidence. This development eliminates the previous reliance on time-consuming international mutual legal assistance, which could take months, thereby streamlining enforcement processes in Switzerland.

Swiss courts complement arbitral tribunals by providing concurrent jurisdiction for interim measures, as Article 183 does not grant exclusive competence to tribunals. State courts can intervene when tribunals lack the authority to enforce measures, such as compelling third-party compliance or ordering measures before a tribunal is constituted. The revised Article 183(2) further facilitates direct applications to Swiss

courts for enforcing tribunal-ordered measures, enhancing efficiency. The Swiss Federal Supreme Court has emphasized that such judicial assistance is subject to summary proceedings, ensuring swift resolution. This coordinated approach underscores Switzerland's commitment to supporting arbitration, whether domestic or international, by providing robust judicial backing without undue interference in arbitral proceedings.

Setting Aside Procedures: Limited Grounds under Article 190 PILA

The procedure for setting aside arbitral awards in Switzerland is deliberately restrictive, reflecting the country's pro-arbitration stance. Article 190(2) of the PILA enumerates five exhaustive grounds for annulment: improper constitution of the arbitral tribunal, incorrect ruling on jurisdiction, decisions beyond the claims submitted (ultra petita), violations of procedural fairness, and awards contrary to public policy. These grounds align with those in the New York Convention, ensuring consistency with international standards. The Swiss Federal Supreme Court, as the sole authority for set-aside applications under Article 191, adopts a narrow interpretation of these grounds, upholding approximately 93% of awards, as noted in statistical analyses of its decisions from 1989 to 2019. Applications must be filed within 30 days of award notification, as stipulated in Article 190(4), with no minimum amount in dispute required, per Article 77(1) of the Federal Supreme Court Act.

The Court's restrictive approach is evident in its public policy jurisprudence, where only egregious violations, such as disregarding res judicata, warrant annulment. In a 2019 decision (SFSC Decision 4A_248/2019), the Court denied a stay of enforcement, finding no prima facie chance of success on the merits, illustrating the high threshold

for set-aside applications. Interim awards, which address preliminary issues like jurisdiction, can also be challenged under Article 190(3), but only on grounds of improper tribunal constitution or jurisdictional errors. The 2021 PILA revisions clarified additional remedies, such as revision under Article 190a, available when new evidence or criminal influences are discovered post-award, further codifying the Court's case law. This limited scope of review ensures that arbitral awards are final and binding, minimizing judicial overreach.

Enforcement Advantages under Swiss Law

Switzerland's arbitration framework offers significant advantages for the enforcement of arbitral awards, both domestic and foreign. International awards rendered in Switzerland are immediately enforceable as state court judgments, requiring no exequatur, as per Article 190(1) of the PILA. This streamlined process, coupled with the New York Convention's application to foreign awards under Article 194, ensures that Switzerland is an enforcement-friendly jurisdiction. Swiss courts interpret the Convention's grounds for refusing enforcement, such as public policy violations under Article V(2)(b), restrictively, facilitating swift recognition and enforcement. For monetary claims, enforcement proceeds through debt collection proceedings under the Debt Enforcement and Bankruptcy Act, while non-monetary claims are enforced via the CCP.

The Swiss Federal Supreme Court's pro-arbitration stance further enhances enforcement reliability. In exceptional cases, the Court may grant a suspensive effect to set-aside applications, but only upon demonstrating irreparable harm and a high likelihood of success, as seen in a 2007 ordinance (SFSC Ordinance 4A_204/2007). The 2021 PILA revisions, allowing English-language submissions in set-aside

proceedings under Article 77(2bis) of the Federal Supreme Court Act, improve accessibility for international parties, although decisions remain in Swiss official languages. By minimizing procedural hurdles and aligning with international standards, Switzerland ensures that arbitral awards are enforceable with minimal resistance, reinforcing its status as a premier arbitration seat.

Chapter 5: Arbitrator Selection and Swiss Expertise

SCAI Arbitrator Database and Qualification Standards

The Swiss Arbitration Centre (SCAI) maintains a comprehensive database of arbitrators, which serves as a cornerstone for ensuring high-quality arbitration proceedings. This database is meticulously curated to include professionals with extensive expertise in various legal and commercial fields, ensuring that parties can select arbitrators suited to the specific needs of their disputes. The SCAI database is accessible to parties involved in arbitration, providing detailed profiles that outline each arbitrator's qualifications, areas of specialization, and prior experience. These profiles are designed to foster transparency, allowing parties to make informed decisions when appointing arbitrators. To be included in the SCAI database, arbitrators must meet stringent qualification standards, which include advanced legal education, typically a law degree or equivalent, and a minimum number of years of professional experience in arbitration or related fields. Additionally, candidates are evaluated based on their reputation for integrity, impartiality, and analytical rigor. The SCAI's rigorous vetting process ensures that only individuals with a proven track record of competence and ethical conduct are listed, thereby safeguarding the credibility of the arbitration process. The database is regularly updated to reflect changes in arbitrators' availability and expertise, ensuring that it remains a reliable resource for parties seeking resolution through arbitration.

Swiss Legal Tradition and Civil Law Expertise

Switzerland's legal tradition, rooted in the civil law system, provides a robust foundation for arbitration proceedings conducted under the SCAI framework. The civil law system, characterized by codified statutes and a systematic approach to legal interpretation, emphasizes predictability and consistency, qualities that are highly valued in arbitration. Swiss arbitrators, trained in this tradition, bring a deep understanding of civil law principles, which is particularly advantageous in disputes involving contracts, commercial transactions, and other legal matters governed by civil law jurisdictions. The Swiss legal system's emphasis on precision and clarity in drafting legal documents translates seamlessly into arbitration, where arbitrators must interpret complex agreements and render decisions that are both legally sound and enforceable. Furthermore, Switzerland's long-standing role as a hub for international arbitration enhances the expertise of its arbitrators, who are well-versed in applying civil law principles to cross-border disputes. This expertise is complemented by Switzerland's multilingual environment, with arbitrators often fluent in German, French, Italian, and English, enabling them to handle cases involving diverse legal cultures and languages. The combination of civil law expertise and linguistic versatility positions Swiss arbitrators as uniquely qualified to address the complexities of international arbitration.

Independence Requirements and Conflict Procedures

Independence and impartiality are fundamental principles in arbitration, and the SCAI places significant emphasis on ensuring that arbitrators adhere to these standards. Arbitrators listed in the SCAI database are required to disclose any circumstances that could give rise to doubts about their independence or impartiality, such as prior

relationships with the parties, their counsel, or the subject matter of the dispute. These disclosures are governed by strict guidelines, which align with international standards, including those set forth by the International Bar Association (IBA) Guidelines on Conflicts of Interest in International Arbitration. The SCAI has established a robust conflict resolution procedure to address any challenges to an arbitrator's appointment. When a potential conflict is identified, the SCAI's Secretariat conducts a thorough review, considering factors such as the nature of the relationship, the significance of the conflict, and the stage of the arbitration proceedings. Parties are given an opportunity to present their views, ensuring a transparent and fair process. If a conflict is deemed to compromise an arbitrator's independence, the SCAI may remove the arbitrator and appoint a replacement, thereby preserving the integrity of the proceedings. This rigorous approach to managing conflicts reinforces the trust that parties place in the SCAI's arbitration process, ensuring that decisions are made free from bias or undue influence.

International Arbitrator Integration with Swiss Practitioners

The SCAI's arbitration framework is designed to facilitate the integration of international arbitrators with Swiss practitioners, creating a dynamic and diverse pool of expertise. While Swiss arbitrators bring a deep understanding of the local legal system and civil law principles, international arbitrators contribute specialized knowledge of other legal traditions, industries, and cultural contexts. This integration is particularly valuable in complex, multi-jurisdictional disputes, where a nuanced understanding of different legal systems is essential. The SCAI encourages collaboration between Swiss and international arbitrators by providing a platform for joint appointments, where parties can select a tribunal that combines local and global perspectives. To ensure seamless cooperation, the SCAI offers procedural guidelines

that harmonize the practices of arbitrators from different backgrounds, promoting consistency in decision-making and case management. Additionally, the SCAI organizes events and forums where Swiss and international arbitrators can exchange insights and best practices, fostering a sense of community and shared purpose. This collaborative approach not only enhances the quality of arbitration but also reinforces Switzerland's reputation as a global leader in dispute resolution, capable of accommodating the needs of parties from diverse legal and cultural backgrounds.

Continuing Education and Professional Development

The SCAI recognizes that the field of arbitration is constantly evolving, with new legal, technological, and commercial developments shaping the practice. To ensure that its arbitrators remain at the forefront of these changes, the SCAI places a strong emphasis on continuing education and professional development. Arbitrators listed in the SCAI database are encouraged to participate in regular training programs, which cover topics such as emerging trends in international arbitration, updates to arbitration rules, and advancements in dispute resolution technology. These programs are often conducted in collaboration with leading academic institutions and professional organizations, ensuring that they are both rigorous and relevant. In addition to formal training, the SCAI provides arbitrators with access to a wealth of resources, including research papers, case studies, and webinars, which enable them to stay informed about developments in their areas of specialization. The SCAI also fosters a culture of peer learning, where arbitrators can share experiences and insights through workshops and discussion groups. By investing in the ongoing development of its arbitrators, the SCAI ensures that they are equipped to handle the complexities of modern arbitration, delivering decisions that are informed, fair, and aligned with the highest standards of professional excellence. This commitment to continuous improvement underscores the

SCAI's dedication to maintaining its position as a trusted authority in international arbitration.

Chapter 6: Specialized Procedures and Industry Focus

Sports Arbitration Coordination with CAS

The realm of sports arbitration has evolved into a highly specialized field, requiring precise coordination with globally recognized bodies such as the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). This institution, headquartered in Lausanne, Switzerland, serves as the primary authority for resolving disputes in international sports, ranging from doping controversies to contractual disagreements between athletes, clubs, and federations. Arbitration under CAS is governed by a distinct set of procedural rules designed to ensure fairness, expediency, and expertise in handling sports-related disputes. These rules emphasize confidentiality and flexibility, allowing arbitrators to tailor proceedings to the unique circumstances of each case, such as urgent matters requiring expedited resolution before major sporting events. CAS panels typically consist of arbitrators with deep knowledge of sports law, ensuring decisions are informed by both legal principles and industry-specific nuances. Coordination with CAS involves meticulous preparation, including the submission of detailed statements of claim or defense, adherence to strict timelines, and compliance with the CAS Code of Sports-related Arbitration. Parties must also navigate the choice between ordinary arbitration proceedings for commercial disputes and appeal arbitration for challenging decisions made by sports governing bodies. This dual framework ensures that disputes, whether financial or disciplinary, are resolved with precision and authority, reinforcing CAS's role as a cornerstone of global sports justice.

The process of engaging with CAS demands a strategic approach to case presentation. Parties are required to provide comprehensive evidence, often including technical data, witness testimonies, and expert reports, particularly in cases involving complex issues like anti-doping violations or transfer disputes. The CAS's global reach means that arbitrators must consider diverse legal systems and cultural contexts, making the selection of counsel with international sports law expertise critical. Furthermore, CAS arbitration often involves high-stakes outcomes, such as an athlete's eligibility for the Olympics or a club's financial stability, necessitating a balance between legal rigor and sensitivity to the human elements of sport. The enforceability of CAS awards, recognized under the New York Convention, ensures that decisions carry weight across jurisdictions, providing finality to contentious disputes. This global enforceability, coupled with the CAS's reputation for impartiality, underscores its pivotal role in maintaining integrity within the sports industry.

Banking and Finance Dispute Specialization

Disputes in the banking and finance sector require a nuanced understanding of complex financial instruments, regulatory frameworks, and market dynamics. Arbitration in this field is often preferred due to its confidentiality, which protects sensitive commercial information, and the ability to appoint arbitrators with specialized expertise in areas such as derivatives, syndicated loans, or securities transactions. These disputes frequently arise from breaches of contract, misrepresentation in financial dealings, or non-compliance with regulatory standards set by bodies like the Financial Conduct Authority or the Securities and Exchange Commission. Arbitration proceedings in banking and finance are typically governed by institutional rules, such as those of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) or the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), which provide structured

frameworks for managing high-value, cross-border disputes. The flexibility of arbitration allows parties to address intricate issues, such as the valuation of complex financial products or the interpretation of ambiguous contractual terms, in a manner that courts may struggle to replicate.

A key aspect of banking and finance arbitration is the need for arbitrators to possess not only legal acumen but also a deep understanding of financial markets and regulatory environments. For instance, disputes involving interest rate swaps or collateralized debt obligations require arbitrators to analyze intricate financial models and market data, often with the assistance of expert witnesses. The global nature of financial markets means that disputes frequently involve multiple jurisdictions, necessitating careful consideration of choice-of-law clauses and the harmonization of differing legal standards. Arbitration's ability to deliver enforceable awards across borders, under frameworks like the New York Convention, makes it an attractive mechanism for resolving such disputes. Moreover, the confidentiality of arbitral proceedings safeguards proprietary strategies and client relationships, which are paramount in the competitive financial sector. This specialized approach ensures that disputes are resolved efficiently, with outcomes that reflect both legal precision and commercial realities.

Insurance Arbitration Procedures and Expertise

Insurance arbitration is a critical mechanism for resolving disputes arising from policy coverage, claims denials, or reinsurance agreements. The insurance industry's reliance on arbitration stems from the need for confidentiality and the complexity of disputes, which often involve intricate policy wording and actuarial considerations. Arbitration in this sector is typically conducted under institutional rules, such as those of the

American Arbitration Association (AAA) or the Arbitration and Mediation Center of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), which provide tailored procedures for handling insurance-related matters. Arbitrators in these cases must possess expertise in insurance law, as well as an understanding of industry practices, to interpret policy terms and assess the validity of claims. Disputes may involve issues such as the scope of coverage for natural disasters, the applicability of exclusions, or the allocation of liability in reinsurance contracts, each requiring a careful balance of legal and technical analysis.

The arbitration process in insurance disputes often begins with a detailed review of policy documents and claims submissions, followed by the presentation of expert evidence on matters such as loss adjustment or risk assessment. The confidentiality of arbitration is particularly valuable in this context, as it protects sensitive information about policyholders or proprietary underwriting practices. Additionally, the flexibility of arbitral proceedings allows parties to address unique challenges, such as the need for interim measures to preserve assets pending a final award. The enforceability of arbitral awards ensures that insurers and policyholders can rely on arbitration as a definitive means of dispute resolution, even in cross-border contexts. By leveraging arbitrators with specialized knowledge, insurance arbitration delivers outcomes that are both legally sound and aligned with the practical realities of the insurance market, fostering trust in the resolution process.

Construction and Engineering Dispute Resolution

Construction and engineering disputes are among the most complex in arbitration, given the technical nature of the projects and the multiplicity of stakeholders involved. These disputes often arise from delays, cost overruns, defective work, or

disagreements over contract specifications, and they frequently involve substantial financial stakes. Arbitration is favored in this sector due to its ability to accommodate technical expertise and manage multi-party proceedings. Institutions like the ICC and the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) provide robust frameworks for resolving construction disputes, with rules that allow for the appointment of arbitrators with engineering or project management backgrounds. The arbitration process typically involves detailed evidentiary phases, including site inspections, technical reports, and expert testimony on issues such as structural integrity or compliance with building codes.

A critical aspect of construction arbitration is the need to address the interplay between contractual obligations and practical project realities. For example, disputes over delay claims require arbitrators to analyze project schedules, assess the impact of unforeseen events, and allocate responsibility among contractors, subcontractors, and owners. The global nature of large-scale construction projects, such as infrastructure developments or energy facilities, adds further complexity, as parties must navigate differing legal systems and regulatory requirements. Arbitration's flexibility allows for tailored procedures, such as the use of fast-track processes for urgent disputes or the consolidation of related claims. The enforceability of awards ensures that resolutions are binding across jurisdictions, providing certainty to project stakeholders. By combining legal rigor with technical expertise, construction arbitration delivers outcomes that support project completion and financial stability.

Intellectual Property Arbitration Capabilities

Intellectual property (IP) arbitration has emerged as a vital tool for resolving disputes over patents, trademarks, copyrights, and trade secrets, particularly in industries

driven by innovation. The confidentiality of arbitration is a key advantage in IP disputes, as it protects proprietary information that could be compromised in public court proceedings. Arbitration also allows parties to select arbitrators with expertise in IP law and specific technical fields, such as biotechnology or software development, ensuring that complex issues are addressed with precision. Institutions like WIPO provide specialized arbitration rules for IP disputes, offering streamlined procedures for issues such as licensing agreements, infringement claims, or domain name conflicts. The arbitration process typically involves detailed analysis of IP rights, contractual obligations, and market impacts, often supported by expert testimony.

The global nature of IP rights necessitates a harmonized approach to dispute resolution, as conflicts frequently span multiple jurisdictions. Arbitration addresses this challenge by providing a neutral forum and enforceable awards under the New York Convention. For instance, a dispute over a patent licensing agreement may involve parties in different countries, each subject to distinct legal frameworks. Arbitration allows for the application of agreed-upon governing law and the resolution of disputes in a manner that respects the commercial value of IP assets. The flexibility of arbitral proceedings enables parties to address ancillary issues, such as the calculation of damages for infringement or the enforcement of confidentiality obligations. By leveraging arbitration, IP stakeholders can protect their innovations while achieving efficient and enforceable resolutions.

Energy Sector Dispute Resolution

The energy sector presents unique challenges for dispute resolution, given the scale of investments, the complexity of projects, and the interplay of geopolitical factors. Arbitration is widely used to address disputes arising from oil and gas contracts,

renewable energy projects, or power purchase agreements, as it offers confidentiality and the ability to appoint arbitrators with sector-specific expertise. Institutions like the Energy Charter Treaty's dispute resolution mechanism or the ICC provide tailored frameworks for managing energy disputes, which often involve issues such as price renegotiation, force majeure claims, or regulatory compliance. The arbitration process typically requires a detailed examination of contractual terms, technical data, and market conditions, supported by expert evidence on topics like reservoir performance or energy pricing.

Energy disputes frequently involve cross-border elements, as projects often span multiple jurisdictions with differing legal and regulatory regimes. Arbitration's ability to deliver enforceable awards across borders is critical in this context, ensuring that resolutions have practical impact. For example, a dispute over a gas supply agreement may require arbitrators to interpret complex pricing formulas while considering the impact of sanctions or environmental regulations. The flexibility of arbitration allows for the accommodation of multi-party disputes, such as those involving joint ventures or state-owned entities. By combining legal expertise with a deep understanding of the energy sector, arbitration provides a reliable mechanism for resolving disputes, supporting the stability of global energy markets.

Bibliography

1. Bärtsch, Philipp, and Angelina M. Petti. 2013. *Arbitration in Switzerland: The Practitioner's Guide*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
2. Berger, Bernhard, and Franz Kellerhals. 2021. *International and Domestic Arbitration in Switzerland*. 4th ed. Bern: Stämpfli Verlag.
3. Blackaby, Nigel, et al. 2015. *Redfern and Hunter on International Arbitration*. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Born, Gary B. 2021. *International Commercial Arbitration*. 3rd ed. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
5. Bühring-Uhle, Christian, Lars Kirchhoff, and Gabriele Scherer. 2006. *Arbitration and Mediation in International Business*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
6. Carbonneau, Thomas E. 2014. *The Law and Practice of Arbitration*. 5th ed. Huntington, NY: Juris Publishing.
7. Craig, W. Laurence, William W. Park, and Jan Paulsson. 2000. *International Chamber of Commerce Arbitration*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Derains, Yves, and Eric A. Schwartz. 2005. *A Guide to the ICC Rules of Arbitration*. 2nd ed. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
9. Fouchard, Philippe, Emmanuel Gaillard, and Berthold Goldman. 1999. *Fouchard, Gaillard, Goldman on International Commercial Arbitration*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
10. Fry, Jason, Simon Greenberg, and Francesca Mazza. 2012. *The Secretariat's Guide to ICC Arbitration*. Paris: ICC Publishing.
11. Girsberger, Daniel, and Nathalie Voser. 2020. *International Arbitration: Comparative and Swiss Perspectives*. 4th ed. Zurich: Schulthess.

12. Kaufmann-Kohler, Gabrielle, and Antonio Rigozzi. 2015. *International Arbitration: Law and Practice in Switzerland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Lew, Julian D. M., Loukas A. Mistelis, and Stefan M. Kröll. 2003. *Comparative International Commercial Arbitration*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
14. Moses, Margaret L. 2017. *The Principles and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Poudret, Jean-François, and Sébastien Besson. 2007. *Comparative Law of International Arbitration*. 2nd ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
16. Redfern, Alan, et al. 2004. *Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration*. 4th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
17. Sanders, Pieter. 1999. *The Work of UNCITRAL on Arbitration and Conciliation*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
18. Scherer, Maxi, Lisa Richman, and Remy Gerbay. 2019. *Arbitrating under the 2014 LCIA Rules: A User's Guide*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
19. Swiss Arbitration Centre. 2021. *Swiss Rules of International Arbitration*. Zurich: Swiss Arbitration Centre.
20. Tweeddale, Andrew, and Keren Tweeddale. 2005. *Arbitration of Commercial Disputes: International and English Law and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Voser, Nathalie, and Christopher Boog. 2018. "Swiss Arbitration: Recent Developments and Trends." *Arbitration International* 34 (3): 345–62.
22. Waincymer, Jeffrey. 2012. *Procedure and Evidence in International Arbitration*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.

23. Webster, Thomas H. 2014. *Handbook of UNCITRAL Arbitration*. 2nd ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
24. Weigand, Frank-Bernd, and Antje Baumann, eds. 2020. *Practitioner's Handbook on International Commercial Arbitration*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
25. Zuberbühler, Tobias, Christian Oetiker, and Thomas Rohner. 2021. *Practical Commentary on the Swiss Rules of International Arbitration*. 2nd ed. Zurich: Schulthess.
26. Alvarez, Henri C., and Melanie Willems. 2017. "The Role of Arbitration in International Trade." *Journal of International Arbitration* 34 (2): 123–45.
27. Bantekas, Ilias. 2015. *An Introduction to International Arbitration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. Blessing, Marc. 1999. "Arbitration Agreements under Swiss Law." *Arbitration International* 15 (4): 389–412.
29. Böckstiegel, Karl-Heinz, Stefan Kröll, and Patricia Nacimiento. 2015. *Arbitration in Germany: The Model Law in Practice*. 2nd ed. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
30. Brekoulakis, Stavros, Julian D. M. Lew, and Loukas Mistelis, eds. 2016. *The Evolution and Future of International Arbitration*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
31. Bühr, Andrea, and Michael Schneider. 2012. "Swiss Arbitration: A Practitioner's Perspective." *ASA Bulletin* 30 (1): 45–67.
32. Carlevaris, Andrea. 2016. "The Role of Arbitration Institutions in Shaping Arbitration Law." *Journal of Dispute Resolution* 2016 (1): 89–104.
33. Cuniberti, Gilles. 2017. *Rethinking International Commercial Arbitration: Towards Default Arbitration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

34. Dallafior, Robert, and Philipp Habegger. 2020. “Swiss Arbitration Centre: A New Era.” *Arbitration International* 36 (4): 567–80.
35. De Ly, Filip, and Audley Sheppard. 2009. “ILA Interim Report on Public Policy as a Bar to Enforcement of International Arbitral Awards.” *Arbitration International* 25 (2): 249–72.
36. Di Pietro, Domenico, and Martin Platte. 2002. *Enforcement of International Arbitration Awards: The New York Convention of 1958*. London: Cameron May.
37. Gaillard, Emmanuel. 2010. *Legal Theory of International Arbitration*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.
38. Geisinger, Elliott, and Elena Trabaldo de Mestral. 2014. “Swiss Arbitration: The Practitioner’s Perspective.” *ASA Bulletin* 32 (3): 456–78.
39. Gilliéron, Philippe. 2008. “The Swiss Private International Law Act and Arbitration.” *Journal of International Arbitration* 25 (4): 521–38.
40. Habegger, Philipp. 2015. “The Revised Swiss Rules of International Arbitration.” *ASA Bulletin* 33 (2): 234–56.
41. Hanotiau, Bernard. 2011. *Complex Arbitrations: Multiparty, Multicontract, Multi-issue and Class Actions*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
42. Hosking, James. 2013. “The Third Party Non-Signatory’s Ability to Compel Arbitration.” *Journal of International Arbitration* 30 (5): 469–88.
43. Houtte, Hans van, and Carlo de Bournonville. 2016. *The UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
44. Jarrosson, Charles. 2010. “The Independence of Arbitrators in International Arbitration.” *Arbitration International* 26 (3): 351–66.

45. Jolles, Alexander. 2013. *Consequences of Multi-party Arbitration for the Arbitration Agreement*. Zurich: Schulthess.
46. Kaufmann-Kohler, Gabrielle. 2007. "Arbitral Precedent: Dream, Necessity or Excuse?" *Arbitration International* 23 (3): 357–78.
47. Knoll, Joachim. 2019. "Swiss Arbitration: Efficiency and Flexibility." *ASA Bulletin* 37 (1): 89–112.
48. Lamm, Carolyn B., and Jocelyn A. Aqua. 2014. "Defining the Role of the Arbitration Institution." *Dispute Resolution Journal* 69 (2): 45–62.
49. Lévy, Laurent, and John Fellas. 2017. "The Future of Arbitration in Europe." *Arbitration International* 33 (4): 489–512.
50. Margules, David M. 2012. "The Role of Arbitration in Resolving International Commercial Disputes." *Journal of Dispute Resolution* 2012 (2): 231–50.
51. Mayer, Pierre. 2010. "The Limits of Severability of the Arbitration Clause." *Arbitration International* 26 (2): 235–48.
52. McIlwrath, Michael, and John Savage. 2010. *International Arbitration and Mediation: A Practical Guide*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
53. Mistelis, Loukas A. 2013. "Efficiency and Cost in International Arbitration." *Arbitration International* 29 (4): 563–84.
54. Mourre, Alexis. 2009. "The Role of Arbitration Institutions in the Development of Arbitration Law." *ASA Bulletin* 27 (3): 456–78.
55. Park, William W. 2006. *Arbitration of International Business Disputes: Studies in Law and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
56. Paulsson, Jan. 2013. *The Idea of Arbitration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
57. Petrochilos, Georgios. 2004. *Procedural Law in International Arbitration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

58. Rigozzi, Antonio. 2010. “Challenging Arbitral Awards in Switzerland.” *Journal of International Arbitration* 27 (3): 287–312.
59. Samuel, Adam. 2004. *Jurisdictional Problems in International Commercial Arbitration*. Zurich: Schulthess.
60. Scherer, Maxi. 2016. “The New York Convention and the Enforcement of Arbitration Agreements.” *Arbitration International* 32 (1): 45–66.
61. Schneider, Michael E. 2011. “The Swiss Rules of International Arbitration: A Modern Approach.” *ASA Bulletin* 29 (2): 234–56.
62. Shore, Laurence, and Liang-Ying Tan. 2014. “The Growth of Arbitration in Asia.” *Arbitration International* 30 (4): 673–92.
63. Strong, S. I. 2016. *International Commercial Arbitration: A Comparative Introduction*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
64. Trakman, Leon E., and Hugh Montgomery. 2017. “The ‘Judicialization’ of International Commercial Arbitration.” *Arbitration International* 33 (2): 143–66.

OUR TEAM

Adv. Aaditya D. Bhatt
Co-Founder

Adv. Chandni Joshi
Co-Founder

Adv. Sneh R. Purohit
Senior Associate

Adv. Arjun S. Rathod
Senior Associate

Adv. Dhruvil V. Kanabar
Associate

Adv. Vishal D. Davda
Associate

Adv. Harshika Mehta
Associate

Adv. Prapti B. Bhatt
Associate

B&J | BHATT & JOSHI ASSOCIATES

Adv. Aaditya Bhatt

Co-Founder, Bhatt & Joshi Associates

Advocate Aaditya Bhatt, co-founder of Bhatt & Joshi Associates, is a distinguished legal professional with a remarkable career. Renowned for his unwavering ethics and innovative problem-solving, he excels in various legal disciplines. Bhatt's leadership and analytical prowess make him an invaluable asset to the firm and legal community.

Adv. Chandni Joshi

Co-Founder, Bhatt & Joshi Associates

Advocate Chandni Joshi, co-founder of Bhatt & Joshi Associates, is a prominent legal expert with extensive knowledge across multiple disciplines. Her commitment to professional ethics and innovative solutions sets her apart. Joshi's exceptional interpersonal skills and sharp analytical mind make her an indispensable leader in both the firm and the wider legal sphere.

Office No. 311, Grace Business Park B/h. Kargil Petrol Pump, Epic Hospital Road, Sangeet Cross Road, behind Kargil Petrol Pump, Sola, Sagar, Ahmedabad, Gujarat 380060

www.bhattandjoshiassociates.com