



RRLEX | RUMPF RECHTSANWÄLTE

# International Arbitration

## RUMPF RECHTSANWÄLTE

Lenzhalde 68 • 70192 Stuttgart  
Fon +49 711 997 977 0 • Fax +49 711 997 977 20  
[info@rumpf-legal.com](mailto:info@rumpf-legal.com)

## RUMPF CONSULTING

Danışmanlık Hizmetleri Ltd. Şti.  
Meclis-i Mebusan Cad. Molla Bayırı Sok. Karun Çıkması No.1 D.10  
34427 Kabataş-Beyoğlu/Istanbul  
Fon +90 212 243 76 30 • Fax +90 212 243 76 35  
[info@rumpf-consult.com](mailto:info@rumpf-consult.com)

December 2017

[www.rumpf-legal.com](http://www.rumpf-legal.com)

I. Einführung	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
II. Streitbeilegung in der Türkei	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
1. Allgemein	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
2. Verfahrensordnungen	3
III. Nationale Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
1. Vorbemerkung	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
2. Die einzelnen Regeln	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
3. Würdigung	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
IV. Internationale Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
1. Allgemein	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
2. Türkische Parteien in internationalen Schiedsverfahren	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
3. Anerkennung und Vollstreckung von ausländischen Schiedssprüchen	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
V. Das Schiedszentrum Istanbul	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.

## I. Introduction

Arbitration is an alternative kind of dispute resolution with the same purpose as state court procedure: to obtain a title which can be enforced with the support of the state where the enforcement shall take place.

Whereas state courts are strictly bound to procedures under their domestic law, arbitration leaves to the parties more room for setting their own rules and getting control over the appointment of the arbitrators, who replace the “natural judge”. In addition, the Parties keep control over the rules under which the arbitrators shall work. Arbitration is said to be less time wasting, but more expensive than state courts. However, in most cases, the calculation of costs and risks ends in favor of arbitration.

## II. Agreement of the Parties

Arbitration needs a clear agreement between the Parties, which should leave no doubt as to what the Parties wish. What Parties wish depends on what the Parties know about arbitration. In practice, most Parties have difficulties to comprehend and understand the meaning of core issues such as:

- How to make the proper choice of law?
- What does “place of arbitration” mean?
- What does the involvement of an “arbitration institution” mean?
- Which rules govern the arbitration?
- How is an arbitral award enforced?

An arbitration clause must make clear that the Parties wish to settle their disputes related to a specific contract or all of their legal agreements by arbitration. Further, it should contain procedures for appointment of the arbitrators, place of arbitration and language. Arbitration institutions (see below) provide model clauses and precise explanations as to how to

implement them in the contractual relationship. English is the most common language of arbitration; however, most institutions are able to administrate arbitrations in other languages.

### III. Choice of Law

The choice of law which is to govern a contract is often made following considerations such as “where do I feel at home”. Such consideration bears more risks than advantages. The agreement on a certain law to be applicable should take into account, whether the law is accessible not only to the parties but also to the judge and if it can be expected that the judge is able to apply it. A national judge cannot be expected to be able to read and apply a foreign legislation. He/she will need expertise from outside the court. Here the difficulty already starts with the selection of an appropriate expert and ends with additional costs.

In arbitration, the Parties have the possibility to chose their Tribunal in a manner that the arbitrators can be expected to be able to read, understand and apply the applicable law.

### IV. Place of Arbitration

Parties often wish to choose a “neutral” place of arbitration. However, the place of arbitration does not say anything about possible neutrality or partiality. Arbitration is “neutral” by its essence. Neutrality is preserved by the proper choice of the arbitrators. The importance of the place of arbitration depends on totally different issues.

Where the Parties do not agree on the procedure they wish to be observed by the Arbitral Tribunal, the local procedure law enters the game. The only important issue in this respect is the possibility to challenge an award. If the local law allows an “appeal”, the meaning of arbitration is deteriorated. In such case, the Parties must make clear in their arbitration clause that they wish to have a “final” award, which cannot be challenged by appeal. If the local law allows an application of “setting aside”, the Parties may exclude this in their arbitration clause. In some countries (i.e. at some places of arbitration) this makes sense, because the state courts when handling the application, interfere with the arbitration as if the application was an appeal. In Switzerland, the Federal Court is very restrictive: only in cases where the award violates most important principles of justice, the Court sets aside an award. In Turkey, the Court of Cassation often goes much further. This having in mind, our law office often prefers an arbitration clause where the place of arbitration is a Swiss city.

### V. Arbitration Institution

Arbitration as a method of “private” dispute resolution may cause problems when Parties and arbitrators try to set the rules for the proceedings. Arbitration without the support of institutions, the so-called “ad-hoc arbitration” often causes internal disputes not only on the rules but more often on the fees.

Therefore, it may be advisable to choose an institution which provides not only its own rules but administrative support, too. When a Party wishes to have “Paris” as the place of arbitration, it often confuses the place of arbitration (France) with the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), which is seated in Paris and provides both rules and support.

Under the ICC Rules, Parties can arbitrate anywhere. Many cases between international Parties are arbitrated in Switzerland under the Rules and administration of the ICC, though Switzerland has institutionalized arbitration with rules of their own.

The “German Institution of Arbitration” (DIS) is effectively seated in Berlin but is a neutral institution providing support and rules for international arbitration.

The difference between the ICC and the DIS consists in the support. Whereas the so-called “ICC Court of Arbitration” and its Secretariat use to interfere very far into the work of the arbitrators, the DIS administration is more restrained.

The London Court of International Arbitration, which is not a Court in its proper sense, but an institution resembling Institutions such as ICC, DIS or many others.

The Vienna Centre of Arbitration is the Austrian counterpart of the DIS.

Before making the choice of a specific institution, the Parties should have a look at the Rules of that institution, the practice of its administration and, of course, the costs. Because one of the advantages of an arbitration institution is that the rules contain regulations on the costs. ICC also takes care of the payments to be made by the Parties.

## **VI. Rules of Arbitration**

Arbitral Tribunals have to apply the law, including the procedure law at the place of arbitration. Many countries have adopted the UN Model Law on International Arbitration or similar regulations in their national civil procedure codes. Parties who make a certain choice of the place of arbitration should have some idea about the legal setting in that country.

The rules provided by the arbitration institutions are made to facilitate the work of the arbitrators. By following the small texts of such rules, arbitrators will have a guide through the main principles of procedure and ensure that their award will be enforced in the most countries of our world.

## **VII. Enforcement of Awards**

International arbitral awards are enforced in more or less the same way as foreign judgments. An arbitral award is considered in countries, which have ratified the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards of 1958 (most of the countries in the world have ratified this convention), as a foreign judgment. If the award complies with the most eminent principles of the rule of law, such as the right to be heard, compliance with the applications of the Parties, compliance with principles of jurisdiction etc., it must be enforced in the country. The compliance with such rules is examined by a national court, who either denies enforcement if the principles are violated or issues a title, which is the basis for the activities of the national execution offices.