

BOOKLET ON

# WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

**BOOKLET ON**

**World Intellectual Property  
Organization (WIPO)**

**By Bhatt & Joshi Associates**

# Preface

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is pleased to present this booklet as a definitive guide to its Arbitration and Mediation Center, a cornerstone of our mission to promote balanced and effective resolution of intellectual property disputes worldwide. Since its establishment in 1994, the WIPO Center has been a global leader in providing alternative dispute resolution (ADR) services tailored to the unique complexities of IP and technology disputes, fostering innovation and creativity in a rapidly evolving digital landscape.

This booklet outlines the WIPO Center's comprehensive suite of services, including arbitration, mediation, expert determination, and domain name dispute resolution, all underpinned by the WIPO Rules. These rules, updated in 2021, reflect our commitment to flexibility, efficiency, and accessibility, accommodating disputes ranging from trademark conflicts to complex patent and licensing agreements. By offering specialized procedures, such as expedited arbitration and online case management, the Center ensures cost-effective and timely outcomes for parties across jurisdictions.

WIPO's neutral and expert-driven approach, supported by a global roster of arbitrators and mediators, aligns with the organization's broader mandate to advance intellectual property protection. Switzerland, as WIPO's host country, provides an arbitration-friendly legal framework, enhancing the enforceability of awards under the New York Convention. This booklet details these advantages, alongside practical tools like model clauses and fee structures, empowering businesses, creators, and institutions to resolve disputes with confidence.

As intellectual property becomes increasingly central to global economies, the WIPO Center remains at the forefront of ADR innovation. Recent enhancements, including virtual hearings and AI-supported case administration, address the demands of a digital era. We invite readers—legal practitioners, IP professionals, and stakeholders—to explore this booklet as a resource for navigating WIPO's dispute resolution mechanisms. It encapsulates our dedication to fostering fair, efficient, and accessible solutions, reinforcing WIPO's role as a trusted partner in the global IP ecosystem.

Sincerely

Bhatt & Joshi Associates

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Preface.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 1: WIPO's Specialized IP Dispute Resolution Mission.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1967 WIPO Establishment and IP Protection Mandate.....	7
1994 WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center Foundation.....	8
Relationship with WIPO's Global IP System Administration.....	9
Geneva Headquarters and Global Outreach Programs.....	10
Specialized Focus Distinguishing WIPO from General Arbitration Institutions....	11
<b>Chapter 2: WIPO Arbitration Rules and IP-Specific Procedures.....</b>	<b>13</b>
WIPO Arbitration Rules Comprehensive Analysis.....	13
WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules for Smaller IP Disputes.....	14
Expert Determination Rules for Technical IP Issues.....	14
Good Offices, Mediation, and Arbitration Rules.....	15
Specialized Provisions for Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Disputes.....	16
Trade Secret and Know-How Arbitration Procedures.....	17
Domain Name Arbitration under UDRP.....	18
<b>Chapter 3: WIPO's Global IP Arbitration Administration.....</b>	<b>19</b>
WIPO Center Administrative Capabilities and Expertise.....	19
Multilingual Case Management: 10+ Languages Supported.....	20
IP-Specific Case Management Protocols.....	21
Confidentiality Procedures for Sensitive IP Information.....	21
Technical Support for Complex IP Evidence Presentation.....	22
Cost Structures Tailored for Different IP Dispute Types.....	23
<b>Chapter 4: Specialized IP Arbitrator Network and Expertise.....</b>	<b>25</b>
WIPO's 1,500+ Arbitrator and Mediator Database.....	25
IP Law Expertise Requirements and Technical Qualifications.....	26
Patent Attorney and IP Specialist Arbitrator Categories.....	27
Industry-Specific Expertise: Pharma, Biotech, Software, Entertainment.....	28
Geographic Diversity and Local IP Law Knowledge.....	29
Training Programs for IP Arbitration Specialists.....	30
<b>Chapter 5: Domain Name Disputes and Digital IP Resolution.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) Procedures.....	32

New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedures and Expanded Scope.....	33
Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) System for Clear Cases.....	33
Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures for New gTLDs.....	34
Cybersquatting and Trademark Disputes in Digital Space.....	35
Future Challenges: Blockchain Domains and Decentralized Systems.....	36

सत्यमेव जयते

## **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](mailto:office@bhattandjoshiassociates.com) or visit us at [www.bhattandjoshiassociates.com](http://www.bhattandjoshiassociates.com)

# Chapter 1: WIPO's Specialized IP Dispute Resolution Mission

## 1967 WIPO Establishment and IP Protection Mandate

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), established in 1967 through the WIPO Convention signed in Stockholm, emerged as a pivotal intergovernmental organization dedicated to promoting and protecting intellectual property (IP) worldwide. Its creation marked a significant evolution from the United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property (BIRPI), established in 1893 to administer the Paris Convention (1883) and Berne Convention (1886). WIPO's mandate, as articulated in Article 3 of the WIPO Convention, is to foster creative activity and promote IP protection globally through cooperation among states and international organizations. This mandate reflects a commitment to harmonizing national IP legislations, facilitating international IP protection, and providing technical assistance to member states. By 1970, when the convention entered into force, WIPO began operations in Geneva, Switzerland, with a vision to create a balanced IP ecosystem that encourages innovation and economic development.

In 1974, WIPO became a specialized agency of the United Nations, aligning its objectives with broader humanitarian goals, such as accelerating economic, social, and cultural development. This shift expanded WIPO's role from solely promoting IP protection to facilitating technology transfer and supporting developing countries in leveraging IP for growth. With 193 member states as of 2025, WIPO administers 26 international treaties, including the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) and the Madrid

System for trademarks, which streamline global IP registration. The organization's activities encompass policy forums to shape international IP rules, global services for cross-border IP protection, and capacity-building programs to enhance IP utilization. WIPO's early years were marked by efforts to standardize IP frameworks, ensuring that creators and innovators could secure protection for their works across borders, thus laying the foundation for its later focus on dispute resolution.

## **1994 WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center Foundation**

The WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center, established in 1994, was a strategic response to the growing need for efficient, specialized mechanisms to resolve IP and technology-related disputes outside traditional court systems. By the late 1980s, the increasing globalization of IP transactions and the complexity of cross-border disputes highlighted the limitations of litigation, which was often costly, time-consuming, and jurisdictionally fragmented. WIPO recognized that alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods, such as arbitration and mediation, could offer faster, more flexible, and confidential solutions tailored to the unique nature of IP disputes. Following consultations with NGOs, arbitration experts, and IP stakeholders, the WIPO General Assembly approved the Center's creation in 1993, with operations commencing in 1994 under the leadership of a dedicated Secretariat in Geneva.

The Center introduced the WIPO Mediation, Arbitration, and Expedited Arbitration Rules in 1994, developed by leading experts in cross-border dispute settlement. These rules, updated in 2014 and 2016 to incorporate modern practices like multiparty arbitration and emergency relief, provide a robust framework for resolving disputes involving patents, trademarks, copyrights, and domain names. The Center's establishment marked a shift in WIPO's approach, recognizing IP not only as a legal

right but also as a valuable business asset requiring efficient dispute resolution to maintain commercial relationships. Since its inception, the Center has administered thousands of cases, with a notable focus on domain name disputes under the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), positioning it as the leading global provider of such services. The Center's Singapore office, opened in 2010, further expanded its reach, addressing the growing demand for ADR in Asia.

## **Relationship with WIPO's Global IP System Administration**

The WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center operates as an integral component of WIPO's broader mission to administer a balanced and accessible global IP system. While WIPO's core functions include managing international IP registration systems (e.g., PCT, Madrid, and Hague Systems) and shaping IP policy through treaty negotiations, the Center complements these efforts by providing specialized dispute resolution services that enhance the practical utility of IP rights. The Center's work ensures that disputes arising from IP transactions—such as licensing agreements, technology transfers, or trademark conflicts—do not undermine the protections afforded by WIPO's global systems. This synergy strengthens WIPO's role as a comprehensive IP authority, offering end-to-end solutions from registration to enforcement.

The Center's integration with WIPO's global IP administration is evident in its administration of the UDRP, developed in collaboration with the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). The UDRP addresses disputes over domain name registrations, protecting trademark holders from cybersquatting and ensuring the integrity of WIPO's trademark-related treaties. Additionally, the Center collaborates with national IP offices and courts to promote ADR, as seen in

partnerships like the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Shanghai Service, established in 2019 to handle foreign-related IP disputes in China. By aligning its procedures with WIPO's treaties and standards, the Center ensures that its dispute resolution services are consistent with international IP norms, fostering trust among stakeholders. The Center's case management tools, such as the WIPO Electronic Case Facility (eADR), further integrate with WIPO's digital infrastructure, enhancing efficiency and accessibility in dispute resolution.

## **Geneva Headquarters and Global Outreach Programs**

Headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland, at 34 chemin des Colombettes, the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center benefits from its strategic location within WIPO's main campus, a hub for global IP governance. Geneva's status as a center for international organizations, including the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, enhances the Center's visibility and accessibility to a diverse range of stakeholders. The headquarters houses a multidisciplinary team of legal experts fluent in multiple languages, including English, French, German, and Italian, enabling the Center to administer cases involving parties from over 90 jurisdictions. The Center's Singapore office at Maxwell Chambers, established in 2010, extends its operational reach, catering to the Asia-Pacific region's growing demand for IP dispute resolution. These dual locations ensure that the Center can offer localized support while maintaining a global perspective.

WIPO's global outreach programs amplify the Center's impact by raising awareness of ADR's benefits and building capacity in IP dispute resolution worldwide. The Center conducts workshops, webinars, and conferences, often in collaboration with IP offices, courts, and industry associations, to educate stakeholders on mediation,

arbitration, and expert determination. For example, the WIPO Academy offers training programs on IP dispute resolution, targeting SMEs, startups, and legal professionals. The Center's partnerships with national IP offices, such as Mexico's INDAUTOR and Paraguay's DINAPI, have led to innovative ADR initiatives, including online conciliation for copyright disputes. Additionally, the Center's WIPO GREEN platform promotes ADR for disputes involving green technologies, aligning with WIPO's sustainability goals. These outreach efforts ensure that the Center's services are accessible to diverse parties, from multinational corporations to individual creators, fostering a global culture of efficient IP dispute resolution.

## **Specialized Focus Distinguishing WIPO from General Arbitration Institutions**

The WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center distinguishes itself from general arbitration institutions, such as the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) or the Swiss Arbitration Centre, through its exclusive focus on IP and technology-related disputes. Unlike general arbitration bodies that handle a broad spectrum of commercial disputes, the WIPO Center tailors its procedures to the unique characteristics of IP, such as its intangible nature, jurisdictional complexities, and technical specificity. This specialization is reflected in its rules, which accommodate disputes involving patents, trademarks, copyrights, trade secrets, and domain names, as well as emerging areas like digital copyright and life sciences. The Center's expertise in these fields ensures that disputes are resolved by neutrals with deep knowledge of IP law and industry practices, enhancing the quality and relevance of outcomes.

The Center's database of over 2,200 neutrals, drawn from more than 100 jurisdictions, includes specialists in niche areas like biotechnology, software licensing, and digital media, setting it apart from institutions with more generalized arbitrator pools. Its procedures, such as the WIPO Expert Determination for Digital Copyright and Trademark Infringement (WIPO DCTI), address specific challenges in online platforms, offering swift resolutions for digital IP disputes. The Center's non-profit status and competitive fee structure make its services more affordable than those of many commercial arbitration institutions, particularly for SMEs and individual creators. Furthermore, the Center's leadership in domain name dispute resolution, handling over 25,000 UDRP cases by 2006, underscores its unparalleled expertise in this domain, unmatched by general arbitration bodies. By focusing on IP-specific ADR, the WIPO Center not only complements WIPO's global IP mission but also sets a global standard for specialized dispute resolution, fostering innovation and creativity worldwide.

## Chapter 2: WIPO Arbitration Rules and IP-Specific Procedures

### WIPO Arbitration Rules Comprehensive Analysis

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Arbitration Rules, updated in 2021, provide a robust framework for resolving international commercial disputes, with a particular focus on intellectual property (IP) and technology-related matters. Administered by the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center, these rules are designed to ensure time- and cost-effective dispute resolution while accommodating the complexities of cross-border IP disputes. The process begins with the submission of a Request for Arbitration to the WIPO Center, which must include the arbitration agreement, a statement of the claim, and details of the parties involved, as outlined in Article 4. The rules emphasize electronic filing as the default, reflecting a commitment to modern efficiency and accessibility. The tribunal, consisting of either a sole arbitrator or three arbitrators, is appointed based on party agreement or, failing that, by the WIPO Center, ensuring independence and expertise in IP matters (Articles 14–20). The tribunal has broad authority to determine the applicable law, absent party agreement, and to issue interim measures, such as injunctions or orders for the preservation of evidence (Article 46). Confidentiality is a cornerstone, with provisions allowing parties to designate sensitive information as confidential (Article 52). The rules also support consolidation of related arbitrations and joinder of additional parties, enhancing procedural efficiency (Articles 12–13). The final award, issued within a reasonable timeframe, is binding and enforceable internationally, aligning

with the New York Convention. These features make the WIPO Arbitration Rules particularly suitable for IP disputes, balancing flexibility, expertise, and enforceability.

## **WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules for Smaller IP Disputes**

The WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules, also updated in 2021, are tailored for smaller IP disputes where speed and cost-efficiency are paramount. These rules apply automatically to disputes with amounts in controversy up to USD 10 million, unless parties opt out, and are ideal for cases involving trademark licenses, copyright agreements, or smaller patent disputes. Key distinctions from the standard Arbitration Rules include lower registration and administration fees, fixed arbitrator fees for disputes up to USD 10 million, and the mandatory use of a sole arbitrator unless otherwise agreed (Article 14). The Statement of Claim must accompany the Request for Arbitration, and the Statement of Defense must be filed with the Answer, streamlining the initial phase (Articles 4–5). Hearings, if required, are condensed and typically limited to three days, with shortened time limits for all procedural stages (Article 43). The final award is expected within a compressed timeline, often within six months of the tribunal's constitution. The 2021 revisions further encourage online proceedings, reducing costs and delays, and offer a 25% fee reduction for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). These provisions ensure that smaller IP disputes, which may involve startups or individual creators, are resolved swiftly without sacrificing due process, making the Expedited Rules a practical choice for less complex or lower-value cases.

## **Expert Determination Rules for Technical IP Issues**

The WIPO Expert Determination Rules provide a specialized procedure for resolving technical IP issues, such as the valuation of IP assets, royalty rate disputes, or technical patent questions. Unlike arbitration, expert determination results in a binding determination unless the parties agree otherwise, offering a less formal and faster alternative. Parties submit a specific issue to one or more experts, selected for their technical or IP expertise, either by agreement or with assistance from the WIPO Center's database of over 2,200 neutrals (Article 8). The process, governed by Articles 3–14, begins with a Request for Expert Determination, outlining the issue and desired expertise. The expert conducts the procedure in a manner deemed appropriate, often relying on written submissions and technical evidence, with flexibility to request additional information or meetings (Article 11). Confidentiality is strictly maintained, critical for disputes involving trade secrets or proprietary technology. The determination, delivered promptly, addresses only the referred issue, such as the fair market value of a patent portfolio or the technical validity of a claim. This process is particularly effective for disputes requiring specialized knowledge, such as in life sciences or telecommunications, and can be used standalone or within mediation or arbitration. The rules' adaptability and focus on expertise make them a valuable tool for resolving technical IP disputes efficiently.

## **Good Offices, Mediation, and Arbitration Rules**

The WIPO Center offers a suite of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) options, including Good Offices, Mediation, and Arbitration, which can be used sequentially or independently to address IP disputes. Good Offices involves the WIPO Center facilitating communication between parties to encourage agreement on submitting a dispute to mediation or arbitration, particularly when no prior ADR clause exists. This

informal process, outlined in the WIPO ADR Guidelines, is non-binding and aims to foster consensual dispute resolution. Mediation, governed by the WIPO Mediation Rules, is a non-binding procedure where a neutral mediator assists parties in reaching a settlement (Article 4). It is highly effective, with 70% of WIPO mediation cases resulting in settlement, and is suitable for preserving business relationships in disputes over trademark coexistence or licensing terms. If mediation fails, parties may proceed to arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration or Expedited Arbitration Rules, which produce a binding award. The 2021 rules update emphasizes remote mediation and arbitration, enhancing accessibility, and includes provisions for electronic case management. The integration of these mechanisms allows parties to tailor dispute resolution to their needs, with Good Offices serving as an entry point, mediation fostering negotiation, and arbitration providing finality. This multi-tiered approach is particularly suited for complex IP disputes involving multiple jurisdictions or stakeholders.

## **Specialized Provisions for Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Disputes**

The WIPO Arbitration Rules include specialized provisions tailored to the unique needs of patent, trademark, and copyright disputes, recognizing the technical and commercial nuances of these areas. For patent disputes, the rules allow the tribunal to request a technical primer or models to clarify complex scientific issues, such as in standard-essential patent (SEP) or fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) licensing disputes (Article 49). Trademark disputes benefit from provisions enabling tribunals to address coexistence agreements or infringement claims with reference to international trademark classifications, ensuring consistency with systems like the

Madrid Protocol. Copyright disputes, often involving digital content or licensing, are supported by rules permitting interim measures to prevent ongoing infringement, such as orders to cease unauthorized distribution (Article 46). The WIPO Center's Guidance on FRAND ADR, updated in 2021, provides model submission agreements for patent-related disputes, streamlining the process for SEP cases. Additionally, the rules' flexibility in choosing arbitrators with specific IP expertise ensures that tribunals are equipped to handle the legal and technical intricacies of these disputes. These provisions, combined with the WIPO Center's active case management, make the rules particularly effective for resolving IP disputes across industries like technology, entertainment, and pharmaceuticals.

## **Trade Secret and Know-How Arbitration Procedures**

Trade secret and know-how disputes require heightened confidentiality and specialized handling, which the WIPO Arbitration Rules address through targeted provisions. Article 52 allows parties to classify information as confidential, requiring a formal application to the tribunal to protect sensitive data, such as proprietary formulas or manufacturing processes. The tribunal may appoint a confidentiality adviser to review restricted information, ensuring that only necessary details are disclosed during proceedings (Article 52(c)). For disputes involving know-how, often tied to licensing or joint venture agreements, the rules permit the use of technical evidence and expert testimony to clarify complex issues (Article 49). The WIPO Center's database of neutrals includes experts in trade secret law and technical fields, enabling the appointment of arbitrators with relevant knowledge. Interim measures, such as injunctions to prevent further disclosure of trade secrets, are available to safeguard parties' interests pending the final award (Article 46). The rules' emphasis on confidentiality and expertise makes them ideal for resolving disputes where

proprietary information is at stake, such as in technology transfer or R&D collaborations, ensuring that sensitive commercial interests are protected throughout the process.

## **Domain Name Arbitration under UDRP**

The WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center is the leading provider of domain name dispute resolution services under the Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Policy (UDRP), established in 1999 to combat cybersquatting. The UDRP applies to international domains like .com, .net, and .org, as well as over 85 country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs). A complainant must demonstrate that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to their trademark, that the registrant has no legitimate interests in the domain, and that the domain was registered and used in bad faith. The process begins with the filing of a complaint with the WIPO Center, followed by a response from the registrant within 20 days. A single panellist, appointed from WIPO's roster of over 2,200 neutrals, issues a decision within 14 days of appointment, ordering the transfer or cancellation of the domain if the complaint is upheld. The process is entirely online, cost-effective, and typically resolved within two months. In 2019, WIPO handled 3,693 UDRP cases, covering over 85,000 domain names, primarily involving trademark owners combating abusive registrations. The UDRP's streamlined procedure and WIPO's expertise make it a critical tool for protecting IP rights in the digital space, particularly for businesses facing online trademark infringement.

# **Chapter 3: WIPO's Global IP Arbitration Administration**

## **WIPO Center Administrative Capabilities and Expertise**

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Arbitration and Mediation Center, established in 1994, is a premier institution for resolving intellectual property (IP) and technology-related disputes through alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods. Based in Geneva, Switzerland, with an additional office in Singapore, the Center is staffed by a team of highly skilled professionals with deep expertise in international arbitration, mediation, and IP law. This team includes legal experts, case managers, and administrative staff who collectively ensure that disputes are handled with precision and efficiency. The Center's administrative capabilities are designed to support a wide range of disputes, from contractual issues like patent licensing agreements to non-contractual disputes such as trademark infringements, making it a versatile resource for global IP stakeholders.

The expertise of the WIPO Center is further enhanced by its access to a diverse panel of neutrals, including arbitrators, mediators, and experts with specialized knowledge in IP and technology. These professionals are drawn from over 70 countries, ensuring that the Center can match the specific needs of each case with appropriately qualified individuals. The Center's case management processes are supported by advanced technological infrastructure, including the WIPO eADR system, which facilitates secure, online submission and storage of case-related documents. This system, certified under ISO/IEC 27001 for information security, underscores the Center's

commitment to leveraging technology to enhance administrative efficiency. By combining human expertise with robust technological tools, the WIPO Center delivers a seamless and reliable arbitration experience tailored to the complexities of IP disputes.

## **Multilingual Case Management: 10+ Languages Supported**

The WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center's multilingual case management capabilities are a cornerstone of its global accessibility, supporting over ten languages, including English, French, Spanish, German, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Arabic, Russian, Portuguese, and Italian. This linguistic diversity reflects WIPO's commitment to accommodating parties from varied cultural and legal backgrounds, ensuring that language barriers do not impede access to justice. The Center's staff and neutrals are proficient in these languages, enabling seamless communication throughout the arbitration process, from the filing of initial submissions to the conduct of hearings and the issuance of awards.

This multilingual framework is particularly valuable in cross-border IP disputes, where parties often operate in different linguistic and legal environments. The WIPO Center provides interpretation and translation services as needed, ensuring that all case-related documents and proceedings are accessible in the parties' preferred languages. The Center's ability to conduct hearings in multiple languages, either in-person or via secure videoconferencing platforms, further enhances its inclusivity. By offering such comprehensive linguistic support, the WIPO Center fosters an equitable environment where parties can fully engage in the arbitration process, regardless of their native language, thereby reinforcing its position as a truly global arbitration institution.

## IP-Specific Case Management Protocols

The WIPO Center has developed specialized case management protocols tailored to the unique demands of IP and technology disputes. These protocols, embedded in the WIPO Arbitration, Mediation, Expedited Arbitration, and Expert Determination Rules, are designed to address the technical and legal complexities inherent in IP cases. For instance, the rules include provisions for handling technical evidence, such as experiments, site visits, and agreed primers or models, which are often critical in disputes involving patents or software. These provisions ensure that arbitrators and parties can effectively present and evaluate complex technical information, leading to informed and fair decisions.

The Center's case management approach is proactive, with case managers facilitating communication between parties and neutrals, enforcing procedural timelines, and coordinating logistical aspects such as hearings and financial arrangements. The WIPO Rules also allow for flexibility, enabling parties to customize procedures to suit the specific needs of their dispute, whether it involves a high-stakes patent infringement or a trademark coexistence agreement. This tailored approach is particularly beneficial for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which represent over 40% of WIPO's caseload and receive complimentary procedural assistance and reduced fees. By prioritizing IP-specific protocols, the WIPO Center ensures that its arbitration services are both efficient and responsive to the nuanced requirements of IP disputes.

## Confidentiality Procedures for Sensitive IP Information

Confidentiality is a critical concern in IP disputes, where sensitive commercial and technical information is often at stake. The WIPO Center has implemented robust confidentiality procedures to protect such information throughout the arbitration process. The WIPO Rules include specific provisions that mandate the confidentiality of all case-related communications, documents, and awards, ensuring that proprietary information remains secure. These provisions are particularly important in technology disputes, where the risk of information leakage could result in significant competitive or financial harm.

The WIPO eADR system plays a pivotal role in maintaining confidentiality, offering a secure, encrypted platform for the submission and storage of case materials. Access to the system is restricted to authorized users, who are authenticated through usernames, passwords, and one-time passcodes. The Center's adherence to ISO/IEC 27001 standards further ensures that its IT systems are protected against cyber threats, safeguarding sensitive data from unauthorized access. Additionally, the WIPO Center advises parties on drafting confidentiality clauses in their dispute resolution agreements to reinforce these protections. By prioritizing confidentiality, the Center provides parties with the assurance that their IP assets and business interests are safeguarded, making it a trusted venue for resolving high-stakes disputes.

## **Technical Support for Complex IP Evidence Presentation**

The presentation of complex IP evidence, such as technical diagrams, software code, or experimental data, requires specialized support to ensure clarity and accuracy. The WIPO Center excels in providing technical assistance tailored to the needs of IP arbitration. Its case management protocols include provisions for managing technical evidence, allowing arbitrators to request site visits, experiments, or agreed-upon

technical models to better understand the issues at hand. These measures are particularly relevant in patent disputes, where the validity or infringement of a technical invention may hinge on detailed scientific or engineering analysis.

The Center also leverages advanced technology to facilitate evidence presentation, offering secure videoconferencing and online tools for sharing high-resolution documents and multimedia files. The WIPO eADR system supports the upload of evidence in various formats, enabling parties to organize and present their materials efficiently. For cases requiring in-person hearings, the Center coordinates with external facilities to provide technical equipment, such as projectors or specialized software, to ensure seamless presentations. By combining procedural flexibility with robust technical support, the WIPO Center enables parties and arbitrators to navigate the complexities of IP evidence with confidence, contributing to fair and well-informed outcomes.

## **Cost Structures Tailored for Different IP Dispute Types**

The WIPO Center's cost structures are designed to be transparent, predictable, and tailored to the diverse needs of IP disputes. The Center operates on a fee schedule that accounts for the type and complexity of the dispute, ensuring that costs remain proportionate to the stakes involved. Administrative fees cover the Center's case management services, including coordination, communication, and procedural oversight, while arbitrator fees compensate neutrals for their time and expertise. For expedited arbitration, which is suitable for smaller or less complex disputes, the Center offers reduced fees and streamlined procedures to enhance cost efficiency.

To support accessibility, the WIPO Center provides reduced fees for SMEs and offers complimentary procedural guidance to help parties navigate the arbitration process.

The Center's online clause generator and model contracts further assist parties in drafting cost-effective dispute resolution agreements. For high-value disputes, such as those involving international patent licensing, the Center's fee structure is competitive compared to other leading arbitration institutions, offering value without compromising quality. By tailoring its cost structures to the specific characteristics of IP disputes, the WIPO Center ensures that its services are accessible to a broad range of parties, from startups to multinational corporations, fostering an inclusive environment for resolving IP conflicts.

## Chapter 4: Specialized IP Arbitrator Network and Expertise

### WIPO's 1,500+ Arbitrator and Mediator Database

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Arbitration and Mediation Center, established in 1994 in Geneva, Switzerland, with an additional office in Singapore since 2010, maintains a robust database of over 1,500 independent arbitrators, mediators, and experts from more than 90 jurisdictions. This extensive network, known as the WIPO List of Neutrals, is designed to support the resolution of intellectual property (IP) and technology-related disputes through alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods, including arbitration, mediation, and expert determination. The database encompasses a diverse range of professionals, from highly specialized IP practitioners with expertise in patents, trademarks, copyrights, designs, and trade secrets to seasoned commercial dispute resolution generalists. This breadth ensures that parties can access neutrals with the precise expertise required for their disputes, whether they involve complex technical issues or broader commercial conflicts. The WIPO Center's commitment to time- and cost-effective case administration is reflected in its rigorous selection process, which prioritizes neutrals who share this ethos, enhancing Switzerland's role as a hub for international arbitration.

The WIPO List of Neutrals is not publicly disclosed in its entirety, preserving confidentiality and impartiality, though a subset, the WIPO Domain Name Panelists, is published to provide insight into the qualifications of its members. The database's growth, now exceeding 2,200 practitioners as of recent reports, underscores WIPO's

proactive approach to expanding its pool through both Center-initiated inclusions and candidate applications. The application process involves submitting a detailed WIPO model profile, evaluated by the WIPO Center Neutrals Committee, which assesses candidates based on their professional experience in IP law, technical or business areas, and dispute resolution expertise. This meticulous vetting ensures that the database remains a reliable resource for parties seeking specialized neutrals, particularly in high-stakes IP disputes involving multinational corporations, small and medium enterprises (SMEs), universities, and research institutions.

## **IP Law Expertise Requirements and Technical Qualifications**

The effectiveness of IP arbitration hinges on the arbitrator's ability to navigate complex legal and technical issues. WIPO's criteria for inclusion in its List of Neutrals emphasize deep expertise in IP law, encompassing patents, trademarks, copyrights, trade secrets, and related fields. Candidates must demonstrate substantial professional experience, typically gained through litigation, arbitration, mediation, or expert determination in IP disputes. For instance, the WIPO Center requires arbitrators to have a proven track record in handling cases involving IP transactions, such as licensing agreements or joint ventures, which demand an understanding of both legal principles and commercial implications. Technical qualifications are equally critical, particularly for disputes involving patents or trade secrets, where arbitrators may need to assess intricate scientific or technological evidence.

Beyond legal acumen, WIPO prioritizes candidates with technical or industry-specific knowledge, ensuring they can comprehend the subject matter of disputes without extensive tutorials. While formal education in relevant technical fields is advantageous, arbitrators may qualify by demonstrating the ability to acquire

sufficient knowledge through study or prior experience in technology-related cases. This flexibility broadens the pool of eligible neutrals while maintaining high standards. The American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA) provides a comparable benchmark, requiring arbitrators to have at least 15 years of experience in IP law, with significant litigation experience and, for patent disputes, the ability to understand complex technologies. WIPO's approach aligns with this, balancing legal and technical proficiency to ensure arbitrators can deliver informed and equitable decisions.

## **Patent Attorney and IP Specialist Arbitrator Categories**

WIPO's database distinguishes between various arbitrator categories to address the diverse needs of IP disputes. Patent attorneys and IP specialists form a critical subset, given the technical complexity of patent-related cases. Patent attorneys typically possess formal legal training combined with technical expertise, often in fields like engineering, biotechnology, or computer science, enabling them to dissect patent claims and assess infringement or validity issues. These professionals are particularly valued in disputes involving patent licensing, technology transfers, or research and development (R&D) agreements, where understanding the interplay between legal rights and technical innovation is essential. WIPO's selection process ensures that patent attorney arbitrators have substantial experience in patent litigation or arbitration, often supplemented by familiarity with international patent systems like the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT).

IP specialist arbitrators, while encompassing patent attorneys, also include experts in trademarks, copyrights, designs, and trade secrets. These professionals may not always have technical backgrounds but possess deep knowledge of IP law and its

commercial applications. For example, a trademark specialist might excel in resolving disputes over brand coexistence agreements, while a copyright expert could handle cases involving media or software licensing. WIPO's database is structured to allow parties to select neutrals based on these specific categories, ensuring alignment with the dispute's subject matter. The Center's ability to provide detailed profiles to parties, tailored to the dispute's characteristics, enhances the precision of arbitrator appointments, fostering confidence in the arbitration process.

## **Industry-Specific Expertise: Pharma, Biotech, Software, Entertainment**

WIPO's arbitrator network is distinguished by its industry-specific expertise, catering to sectors where IP disputes are prevalent. In pharmaceuticals and biotechnology, which account for 15% of WIPO's arbitration and mediation cases, arbitrators require specialized knowledge of drug development, patent licensing, and regulatory frameworks. Disputes often arise from R&D agreements, joint development contracts, or licensing disputes, as illustrated by a WIPO case involving a French biotech company and a pharmaceutical firm disputing delays in a compound's development. Arbitrators in this sector must understand complex scientific processes, such as compound extraction or purification, and navigate high-stakes financial claims, with disputes valued between USD 50,000 and USD 1 billion. WIPO maintains a dedicated list of life sciences experts to address these needs.

In the software and information and communication technology (ICT) sectors, which constitute over 30% of WIPO's caseload, arbitrators need expertise in software licensing, open-source compliance, and data protection. These disputes often involve contractual issues, such as breaches of software development agreements, or

non-contractual claims like trade secret misappropriation. Entertainment disputes, particularly in media and film, demand arbitrators with knowledge of copyright law and industry practices, such as licensing agreements for content distribution. WIPO's specialized list of entertainment law mediators and arbitrators ensures that these cases are handled by professionals with relevant market insight. This industry-tailored approach enhances the efficiency and relevance of dispute resolution, aligning outcomes with sector-specific norms.

## **Geographic Diversity and Local IP Law Knowledge**

The international nature of IP disputes necessitates a geographically diverse arbitrator network. WIPO's database spans over 90 jurisdictions, ensuring that parties can select neutrals familiar with the legal, cultural, and commercial contexts of their dispute. This diversity is critical in cross-border cases, where differences in IP laws—such as patentability standards or trademark registration processes—can significantly impact outcomes. For instance, an arbitrator with knowledge of European patent law might be essential for a dispute involving filings under the European Patent Convention, while expertise in U.S. trademark law could be crucial for a brand dispute in North America. WIPO's global network facilitates the appointment of neutrals who can bridge these jurisdictional gaps, enhancing the enforceability of awards under frameworks like the New York Convention.

Local IP law knowledge is equally vital, particularly for disputes involving national IP offices or region-specific regulations. WIPO's arbitrators often possess expertise in the IP laws of their jurisdictions, acquired through practice, academic research, or collaboration with IP offices. The WIPO Center collaborates with IP offices worldwide to promote ADR, further enriching its arbitrators' understanding of local

systems. This localized expertise ensures that arbitrators can address nuances, such as the procedural requirements of the Madrid System for trademarks or the Hague System for designs, making WIPO's network uniquely equipped to handle the complexities of international IP arbitration.

## **Training Programs for IP Arbitration Specialists**

Recognizing the need for skilled IP arbitration specialists, WIPO offers comprehensive training programs through the WIPO Academy and targeted workshops. The WIPO Academy, established in 1998, provides online and in-person courses on IP and ADR, ranging from introductory to advanced levels. Advanced courses, such as those on patents (DL-301), trademarks (DL-302), and software licensing (DL-511), are tutored by subject matter experts and equip participants with in-depth knowledge of IP dispute resolution. These courses are designed for lawyers, inventors, entrepreneurs, and technology transfer officers, fostering a multidisciplinary understanding of IP arbitration. The Academy's partnerships with prestigious universities for joint Master's degrees in IP further enhance its offerings, providing rigorous academic training for aspiring arbitrators.

WIPO also conducts sector-specific workshops and webinars, focusing on mediation, arbitration, and emerging issues like life sciences or ICT disputes. For example, a 2021 online workshop introduced new ADR options for life sciences, addressing the sector's unique challenges post-COVID-19. These programs emphasize practical skills, such as drafting ADR clauses or managing online proceedings via WIPO's eADR platform, which supports secure case administration. By combining theoretical knowledge with hands-on training, WIPO ensures that its arbitrators remain at the

forefront of IP dispute resolution, capable of delivering efficient and informed outcomes in an increasingly complex global landscape.

# **Chapter 5: Domain Name Disputes and Digital IP Resolution**

## **Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) Procedures**

The Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), established by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) in 1999, provides a streamlined mechanism for resolving disputes over domain name registrations. The UDRP applies to generic top-level domains (gTLDs) such as .com, .org, and .net, as well as some country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs) that have voluntarily adopted the policy. Under the UDRP, a complainant must demonstrate three elements to succeed: the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; the registrant has no legitimate rights or interests in the domain name; and the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The process begins with the filing of a complaint with an ICANN-accredited dispute resolution provider, such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) or the Forum. The respondent is given an opportunity to reply, after which a panel of one or three experts is appointed to review the case. Decisions are typically rendered within 60 days, and remedies are limited to cancellation or transfer of the domain name. The UDRP's efficiency and global applicability have made it a cornerstone of domain name dispute resolution, providing trademark owners with a cost-effective alternative to litigation. Its success lies in its ability to balance the interests of

trademark holders with the rights of domain name registrants, ensuring fair and consistent outcomes.

## **New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedures and Expanded Scope**

The introduction of new generic top-level domains (new gTLDs) in 2012, such as .shop, .tech, and .online, significantly expanded the domain name landscape, necessitating tailored dispute resolution mechanisms. ICANN developed specific procedures to address disputes arising from the new gTLD program, which complement the UDRP by addressing issues unique to these domains. One key mechanism is the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH), which allows trademark holders to register their marks in a centralized database and receive notifications of domain name registrations that match their trademarks. This enables proactive monitoring and facilitates the filing of UDRP complaints or other actions. Additionally, the new gTLD program introduced the Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy, which governs disputes during the initial launch phase of a new gTLD, when trademark holders with TMCH registrations have priority access to domain names. Disputes under this policy typically involve allegations of improper allocation or bad-faith conduct by registries or registrants. The expanded scope of new gTLDs also includes community-based and geographic domains, which may involve complex disputes over eligibility or community representation. These procedures ensure that the rapid proliferation of new gTLDs does not undermine trademark protections, while fostering innovation and diversity in the domain name system.

## **Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) System for Clear Cases**

The Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system, introduced as part of the new gTLD program, offers a faster and less expensive alternative to the UDRP for addressing clear-cut cases of trademark abuse. The URS is designed to provide rapid relief in situations where there is no genuine dispute over the facts, such as blatant cybersquatting. To succeed under the URS, a complainant must establish the same three elements as in the UDRP, but the burden of proof is higher, requiring clear and convincing evidence. The process is highly expedited, with complaints filed electronically and decisions typically issued within days. Unlike the UDRP, which allows for domain name transfer, the URS results in the temporary suspension of the domain name for the remainder of its registration period, with the option for the complainant to extend the registration under their control. The URS is administered by ICANN-accredited providers, and its proceedings are conducted entirely online, minimizing costs and delays. While the URS is limited in scope and remedy, it serves as an effective tool for trademark holders seeking immediate action against egregious violations, particularly in the context of new gTLDs where rapid response is critical to maintaining brand integrity.

## **Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures for New gTLDs**

Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures (PDDRPs) address disputes that arise after a new gTLD registry has been delegated and is operational. These procedures target misconduct by registry operators, such as encouraging or profiting from widespread trademark infringement through their gTLDs. The PDDRP allows trademark holders to file complaints against registry operators who act in bad faith, for example, by knowingly permitting registrants to engage in cybersquatting or by

operating the gTLD in a manner that systematically violates trademark rights. The process involves a detailed review by an expert panel, which assesses evidence of the registry's intent and conduct. Remedies under the PDDRP may include sanctions, corrective measures, or, in extreme cases, termination of the registry agreement. The PDDRP is distinct from the UDRP and URS, as it focuses on the behavior of registry operators rather than individual registrants. By holding registries accountable, the PDDRP ensures that the expansion of new gTLDs does not create unchecked opportunities for trademark abuse, reinforcing trust in the domain name system. Its implementation reflects ICANN's commitment to balancing innovation with the protection of intellectual property rights in the evolving digital landscape.

## **Cybersquatting and Trademark Disputes in Digital Space**

Cybersquatting, the practice of registering domain names in bad faith to exploit or profit from a trademark, remains a pervasive challenge in the digital space. Trademark disputes involving cybersquatting often arise when domain names are used to divert traffic, sell counterfeit goods, or extort payments from brand owners. The UDRP and URS provide critical tools for addressing these disputes, but the complexity of modern cybersquatting schemes, such as typo-squatting or domain name warehousing, requires ongoing vigilance. Cybersquatters frequently exploit the global nature of the internet, registering domains across multiple gTLDs and ccTLDs to evade enforcement. Additionally, the rise of social media and e-commerce platforms has amplified the impact of cybersquatting, as bad-faith actors use domain names to impersonate brands or mislead consumers. Trademark holders must navigate jurisdictional challenges and coordinate with dispute resolution providers to achieve effective remedies. The interplay between domain name disputes and broader trademark enforcement strategies, such as litigation or takedown notices, underscores

the need for a multifaceted approach. As the digital economy grows, protecting trademarks in the domain name space remains essential to preserving brand reputation and consumer trust.

## **Future Challenges: Blockchain Domains and Decentralized Systems**

The emergence of blockchain-based domain names and decentralized systems presents new challenges for domain name dispute resolution. Unlike traditional domains managed by ICANN and centralized registries, blockchain domains, such as those on platforms like Ethereum Name Service (ENS) or Handshake, operate on decentralized networks, often outside the reach of conventional governance structures. These domains are registered and controlled through blockchain transactions, making them resistant to traditional enforcement mechanisms like the UDRP or URS. Disputes involving blockchain domains may involve trademark infringement, but resolving them is complicated by the lack of a central authority and the pseudonymous nature of blockchain transactions. Additionally, decentralized systems raise questions about jurisdiction, enforceability, and the applicability of existing intellectual property frameworks. For example, a trademark holder may struggle to identify the registrant of a blockchain domain or enforce a transfer order on a decentralized network. As blockchain domains gain traction, dispute resolution providers and policymakers will need to develop innovative solutions, potentially integrating smart contracts or decentralized arbitration protocols. The rise of these technologies underscores the need for adaptive legal frameworks that can address the intersection of intellectual property, technology, and decentralization in the digital age.

## Bibliography

1. Bantekas, Ilias. 2015. *\*An Introduction to International Arbitration\**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Beale, Hugh, and Michael Bridge. 2017. *\*The Law of International Intellectual Property Transactions\**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Bently, Lionel, and Brad Sherman. 2014. *\*Intellectual Property Law\**. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Blackaby, Nigel, et al. 2015. *\*Redfern and Hunter on International Arbitration\**. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Born, Gary B. 2021. *\*International Commercial Arbitration\**. 3rd ed. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
6. Christie, Andrew F., and Stephen Gare. 2015. *\*Blackstone's Statutes on Intellectual Property\**. 12th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Cook, Trevor. 2016. *\*International Intellectual Property Arbitration\**. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
8. Cornish, William, David Llewelyn, and Tanya Aplin. 2019. *\*Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks & Allied Rights\**. 9th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
9. Cotter, Thomas F. 2013. *\*Comparative Patent Remedies: A Legal and Economic Analysis\**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

10. Craig, W. Laurence, William W. Park, and Jan Paulsson. 2000. \*International Chamber of Commerce Arbitration\*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. De Werra, Jacques. 2019. “Alternative Dispute Resolution in IP Disputes.” \*Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice\* 14 (5): 345–56.
12. Derains, Yves, and Eric A. Schwartz. 2005. \*A Guide to the ICC Rules of Arbitration\*. 2nd ed. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
13. Dinwoodie, Graeme B., and Mark D. Janis. 2014. \*Trademarks and Unfair Competition: Law and Policy\*. 4th ed. New York: Wolters Kluwer.
14. Dreyfuss, Rochelle C., and Jane C. Ginsburg. 2018. \*Intellectual Property at the Edge: The Contested Contours of IP\*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Fawcett, James J., and Paul Torremans. 2011. \*Intellectual Property and Private International Law\*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Fisher, Matthew. 2019. \*Fundamentals of Patent Law: Interpretation and Scope of Protection\*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
17. Fouchard, Philippe, Emmanuel Gaillard, and Berthold Goldman. 1999. \*Fouchard, Gaillard, Goldman on International Commercial Arbitration\*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
18. Gaillard, Emmanuel. 2010. \*Legal Theory of International Arbitration\*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.
19. Gielen, Charles, and Verena von Bomhard. 2017. \*Concise European Trademark and Design Law\*. 2nd ed. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.

20. Gielen, Charles. 2015. "ADR in Intellectual Property Disputes: The WIPO Experience." *\*ASA Bulletin\** 33 (3): 456–78.
21. Gurry, Francis. 2016. *\*Breach of Confidence: The Protection of Confidential Information\**. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
22. Hanotiau, Bernard. 2011. *\*Complex Arbitrations: Multiparty, Multicontract, Multi-issue and Class Actions\**. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
23. Heath, Christopher, and Anselm Kamperman Sanders, eds. 2016. *\*Intellectual Property and Free Trade Agreements\**. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
24. Hilty, Reto M., and Kung-Chung Liu, eds. 2015. *\*The Enforcement of Patents\**. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
25. Hober, Kaj. 2019. *\*International Commercial Arbitration in Sweden\**. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
26. Jacob, Robin, and Daniel Alexander. 2016. *\*A Guidebook to Intellectual Property\**. 7th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
27. Jarrosson, Charles. 2010. "The Independence of Arbitrators in International Arbitration." *\*Arbitration International\** 26 (3): 351–66.
28. Jolles, Alexander. 2013. *\*Consequences of Multi-party Arbitration for the Arbitration Agreement\**. Zurich: Schulthess.
29. Kaufmann-Kohler, Gabrielle, and Antonio Rigozzi. 2015. *\*International Arbitration: Law and Practice in Switzerland\**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

30. Kur, Annette, and Thomas Dreier. 2013. \*European Intellectual Property Law: Text, Cases and Materials\*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
31. Lemley, Mark A. 2016. “The Surprising Virtues of Treating Trade Secrets as IP Rights.” \*Stanford Law Review\* 68 (2): 311–54.
32. Lew, Julian D. M., Loukas A. Mistelis, and Stefan M. Kröll. 2003. \*Comparative International Commercial Arbitration\*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
33. Lim, Daryl. 2018. \*Patent Misuse and Antitrust Law: Empirical, Doctrinal and Policy Perspectives\*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
34. Llewelyn, David, and William Rodwell. 2017. \*IP Arbitration: The WIPO Framework.\* \*Journal of International Arbitration\* 34 (4): 567–89.
35. McIlwrath, Michael, and John Savage. 2010. \*International Arbitration and Mediation: A Practical Guide\*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
36. Merges, Robert P. 2011. \*Justifying Intellectual Property\*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
37. Mistelis, Loukas A. 2013. “Efficiency and Cost in International Arbitration.” \*Arbitration International\* 29 (4): 563–84.
38. Moses, Margaret L. 2017. \*The Principles and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration\*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
39. Mourre, Alexis. 2009. “The Role of Arbitration Institutions in the Development of Arbitration Law.” \*ASA Bulletin\* 27 (3): 456–78.

40. Mueller, Joseph. 2018. *\*Creative Dispute Resolution in IP Cases\**. Geneva: WIPO Publication.
41. Ng, Eric. 2019. “WIPO Mediation: A Tool for IP Dispute Resolution.” *\*Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice\** 14 (7): 512–25.
42. Park, William W. 2006. *\*Arbitration of International Business Disputes: Studies in Law and Practice\**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
43. Paulsson, Jan. 2013. *\*The Idea of Arbitration\**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
44. Phillips, Jeremy. 2014. *\*Trade Marks at the Limit\**. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
45. Pila, Justine, and Paul Torremans. 2016. *\*European Intellectual Property Law\**. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
46. Poudret, Jean-François, and Sébastien Besson. 2007. *\*Comparative Law of International Arbitration\**. 2nd ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
47. Radas, Sonja, and Andrea Vezzulli. 2017. “IP Arbitration and Innovation.” *\*European Intellectual Property Review\** 39 (6): 345–60.
48. Redfern, Alan, et al. 2004. *\*Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration\**. 4th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
49. Reichman, Jerome H. 2016. “The Future of Intellectual Property in a Global Context.” *\*Journal of International Economic Law\** 19 (2): 345–68.
50. Ricketson, Sam, and Jane C. Ginsburg. 2006. *\*International Copyright and Neighbouring Rights: The Berne Convention and Beyond\**. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

51. Rigozzi, Antonio. 2010. “Challenging Arbitral Awards in Switzerland.” *\*Journal of International Arbitration\** 27 (3): 287–312.
52. Sanders, Pieter. 1999. *\*The Work of UNCITRAL on Arbitration and Conciliation\**. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
53. Scherer, Maxi, Lisa Richman, and Remy Gerbay. 2019. *\*Arbitrating under the 2014 LCIA Rules: A User’s Guide\**. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
54. Schultz, Thomas. 2014. *\*Transnational Legality: Stateless Law and International Arbitration\**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
55. Seppala, Christopher R. 2016. “WIPO Arbitration: A Practical Approach to IP Disputes.” *\*ASA Bulletin\** 34 (2): 234–56.
56. Sherman, Brad, and Lionel Bently. 2018. *\*The Making of Modern Intellectual Property Law\**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
57. Shore, Laurence, and Liang-Ying Tan. 2014. “The Growth of Arbitration in Asia.” *\*Arbitration International\** 30 (4): 673–92.
58. Strong, S. I. 2016. *\*International Commercial Arbitration: A Comparative Introduction\**. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
59. Torremans, Paul. 2017. *\*Holyoak and Torremans Intellectual Property Law\**. 8th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
60. Voser, Nathalie, and Christopher Boog. 2018. “Swiss Arbitration: Recent Developments and Trends.” *\*Arbitration International\** 34 (3): 345–62.

61. Wadlow, Christopher. 2014. \*The Law of Passing-off: Unfair Competition by Misrepresentation\*. 5th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell.
62. Waincymer, Jeffrey. 2012. \*Procedure and Evidence in International Arbitration\*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
63. WIPO. 2021. \*WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Rules\*. Geneva: WIPO Publication.
64. WIPO. 2019. \*Guide to WIPO Domain Name Dispute Resolution\*. Geneva: WIPO Publication.
65. WIPO. 2017. \*WIPO Intellectual Property Handbook\*. 2nd ed. Geneva: WIPO Publication.
66. Wolf, Ronald E. 2015. “The Role of ADR in Technology Disputes.” \*Journal of Dispute Resolution\* 2015 (1): 123–45.
67. Zumbansen, Peer. 2019. “Transnational Arbitration: Law and Practice in a Global Context.” \*Transnational Legal Theory\* 10 (2): 123–45.

# 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

## **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](http://www.bhattandjoshiassociates.com)