

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	v
<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>About the Authors</i>	ix
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxiii
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxxv
<i>Table of Practice Directions</i>	xli
<i>Table of Other Enactments</i>	xliii

CHAPTER 1 ARBITRATION IN HONG KONG

1. Introduction	2
2. The Model Law	2
2.1 Principle: Hong Kong is a Model Law jurisdiction	2
3. Hong Kong Specific Approaches to Arbitration	3
3.1 Principle: Hong Kong has adopted the doctrine of absolute immunity in regards to state immunity since 1 July 1997, but the situation is less clear regarding crown immunity	3
3.2 Principle: State-owned enterprises or similar entities formed to carry out commercial activities are unlikely to enjoy sovereign immunity in Hong Kong	6
3.3 Principle: There is a growing movement towards 'green' arbitration and an increasing number of arbitral institutions have signed up to the Green Pledge	8
3.4 Principle: For legal and geopolitical reasons, Hong Kong enjoys unique advantages as a seat of arbitration	9
3.5 Principle: Hong Kong benefits from a wide range of arbitral institutions which are globally recognised. In recent years, specialist arbitral institutions have been formed to better meet the demands of the Hong Kong market	11
3.6 Principle: Arbitrations administered by CIETAC Hong Kong are quite different from arbitrations administered by CIETAC	13
4. The Road Ahead	13
4.1 Principle: Hong Kong continues to enjoy strong numbers in terms of caseload and amounts in dispute. Participants to arbitrations held in Hong Kong continue to come from all over the world and arbitration in Hong Kong remains popular	14
4.2 Principle: Hong Kong is looking into the possibility of introducing Outcome Related Fee Structures for arbitration, a strong departure from the stance taken in regard to litigation	16

CHAPTER 2 ARBITRATION AT A GLANCE

1. Introduction	21
2. Arbitration	22
2.1 Principle: At its heart, arbitration is a flexible, private and voluntary form of dispute resolution featuring an adversarial process	22

2.2	Principle: Parties may elect for institutional arbitration or ad hoc arbitration. Both forms are recognised in Hong Kong as valid arbitrations.....	22
2.3	Principle: Arbitration is privately conducted and the parties are generally obliged to confidentiality in regards to both the substance of the arbitration, and the very fact of arbitration.....	23
2.4	Principle: Subject to mutually agreed upon criteria and processes, parties are generally free to appoint any third parties as the adjudicators of their dispute.....	25
2.5	Principle: Arbitral awards benefit from the ease of enforceability due to the near-global adoption of the New York Convention.....	25
2.6	Principle: Hong Kong Courts have taken a pro-arbitration approach and will generally maintain a policy of non-interventionism.....	27
3.	Arbitration vs Litigation.....	28
3.1	Principle: The flexible nature of arbitration allows for parties to pick and choose the procedure they desire to adopt by agreement. However, in litigation, rules are formally prescribed by law.....	28
3.2	Principle: The parties are free to determine the identity of arbitrators and the manner by which the Arbitral Tribunal is composed in arbitration. In litigation, the parties are heard before a neutral, court-appointed judge or other judicial officers.....	29
3.3	Principle: While arbitration is said to be quicker and cheaper than litigation, there are additional considerations and costs in arbitration which may mean that arbitration ends up being the more expensive option, although often faster.....	29
3.4	Principle: Litigation may be more appropriate for less sophisticated parties who require the court's assistance and guidance.....	30
3.5	Principle: Arbitration will be an inadequate form of dispute resolution where publicity, binding precedent or a special form of remedy is required.....	30
4.	Arbitration vs Mediation.....	31
4.1	Principle: Arbitration and mediation are different processes with different aims and purposes. Arbitration seeks a binding decision of a neutral third party arbitrator(s) based on the merit of the case whereas mediation requires the parties themselves to come to a resolution acceptable to them.....	31
4.2	Principle: Mediation is a voluntary process. However, unlike arbitration, parties participating in mediation are generally free to terminate the proceedings after they have participated up to their agreed minimum level with little to no consequence.....	32
4.3	Principle: Mediations take on a more flexible nature than arbitrations.....	33
4.4	Principle: Mediation can be split into several styles, with the two main approaches being facilitative mediation and evaluative mediation.....	34
4.5	Principle: While confidentiality is a cornerstone of both arbitration and mediation, confidentiality in arbitration is to the process, information and among all parties and the arbitrator, whereas confidentiality in mediation is to the process, information among all parties and the mediator and separately between each party and the mediator.....	35
4.6	Principle: Mediation is an important feature of the Chinese legal culture such that mediation will often feature as part of the arbitration or litigation experience.....	36

5.	Arbitration vs Med-Arb.....	37
5.1	Principle: In the aftermath of <i>Keeneye</i> , the Courts in Hong Kong have been open to decisions achieved in Med-Arb and will only refuse to enforce Med-Arb Awards where to do the same would be contrary to the fundamental conceptions of morality and justice.....	37
5.2	Principle: The Hong Kong Med-Arb experience is different to that in China and envisages less proactive use of the form, save for the agreement of the parties.....	39
5.3	Principle: Despite its wide use in China, the Med-Arb process faces considerable suspicion elsewhere in the common-law world owing to concerns regarding due process and impartiality.....	39
5.4	Principle: Ultimately, the decision to embark on Med-Arb can be either full of advantages or fraught with disadvantages.....	40

CHAPTER 3 INTRODUCTION TO THE ARBITRATION ORDINANCE (CAP 609)

1.	Introduction.....	44
2.	The Model Law.....	45
3.	Schedule 2 Opt-In and Automatic Provisions.....	46
3.1	Principle: Parties are generally completely free to adopt none, some or all of the optional provisions as set out in Schedule 2.....	47
3.2	Principle: Schedule 2 applies by default to 'domestic' arbitrations either entered into before the commencement of the Arbitration Ordinance or within six years after the commencement of the Arbitration Ordinance.....	48
3.3	Principle: The term 'domestic arbitration' no longer attracts the inclusion of the provisions of Schedule 2 for arbitral agreements dated on or after 1 June 2017.....	49
4.	Confidentiality Provisions.....	50
4.1	Principle: Confidentiality is expressly provided for in the Arbitration Ordinance and forms a key pillar of the same.....	50
5.	Subsequent Legislations.....	51
6.	Arbitration of Intellectual Property Rights.....	52
6.1	Principle: IPRs are broadly defined under the Arbitration Ordinance.....	52
6.2	Principle: IPRs are capable of being arbitrated in Hong Kong. Arbitral awards concerning IPR disputes shall not be set aside or refused enforcement only because the award concerns an IPR dispute.....	53
6.3	Principle: Arbitral awards concerning IPRs only have an inter partes effect.....	53
7.	Third Party Funding.....	53
7.1	Principle: The obligation of confidentiality is waived insofar as it is for the purpose of obtaining third party funding.....	54
7.2	Principle: The funding arrangement between a third party funder and the funded party must be disclosed to every other party to the arbitration.....	55
7.3	Principle: Third party funders shall not seek to influence the funded party or its representatives to take control or conduct of the funded proceedings.....	55
7.4	Principle: A funded party's third party funding costs may be recoverable from the losing party.....	56

8. The Interim Measures Arrangement.....	57
8.1 Principle: To benefit from the Interim Measures Arrangement, an arbitration must be seated in Hong Kong and administered by one of the six named arbitration institutions	58
8.2 Principle: Under the Interim Measures Arrangement, the PRC Courts may grant three types of interim measures, only.....	58
8.3 Principle: Applications for interim relief under the Interim Measures Arrangement can be sought before or after the commencement of proceedings under the relevant arbitration administrative body	59
8.4 Principle: In the time since the introduction of the Interim Measures Arrangement both foreign and Mainland parties have sought its use, leading to billions of RMB worth of interim measures.....	59

CHAPTER 4 JURISDICTION

1. Introduction	62
2. The Separability Principle	62
2.1 Principle: The principle of separability allows for an arbitration agreement to be considered separately from the underlying contract in which it is contained.....	63
2.2 Principle: Separability also means that an arbitration agreement within a contract may not be governed by the same law as the main contract.....	64
3. Establishing Jurisdiction.....	66
3.1 Principle: In Hong Kong, asymmetrical arbitration clauses are upheld so long as they are not null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed.....	67
3.2 Principle: While the Court is not required to allow the matter to be resolved by an arbitral tribunal first, the arbitral tribunal will generally have the first opportunity to decide on jurisdictional issues in Hong Kong.....	68
3.3 Principle: To determine whether to grant a stay to arbitration under section 20, the Court will consider four main questions.....	69
3.4 Principle: In proceedings to stay court proceedings in favor of arbitration, the applicant for stay bears the burden to demonstrate that there is a clear prima facie case that the parties are bound to arbitrate.....	71
3.5 Principle: If properly proclaimed, a party's commencement of or submission to arbitral proceedings may not equate to an unequivocal election to arbitration.....	72
3.6 Principle: Under a section 34 challenge, the Court has a limited and narrow role of confining the scope of the review and its intervention to true questions of pure jurisdiction only.....	73
3.7 Principle: The arbitral tribunal's decision on jurisdiction can only be reviewed if they find themselves to have jurisdiction in the matter. A ruling of no jurisdiction cannot be challenged.....	74
3.8 Principle: The failure to adhere to pre-arbitration conditions are questions of admissibility before an arbitral tribunal and not its jurisdiction, and the Courts will not intervene in these decisions	74
3.9 Principle: In considering arbitration clauses involving the CIETAC Shenzhen or Shanghai Sub-committees, due regard must be paid to the PRC Supreme Court's 'Golden Rule'.....	77

3.10 Principle: In situations where linked contracts have competing dispute resolution clauses, the Court will consider which contract has the closest connection to the dispute to decide which clause should apply	79
4. The Effect of Arbitration Clauses on Winding Up Petitions	80
4.1 Principle: A winding up petition based on just and equitable grounds will only be stayed in favor of arbitration where the dispute referred to arbitration would be central and probably determinative of the factual issues raised by the petition	81
4.2 Principle: A winding up petition on the basis of a company's inability to pay its debts will not be automatically stayed even if an arbitration clause is alleged to cover the dispute.....	82
4.3 Principle: In divergence to the approach in Hong Kong, other commonwealth jurisdictions have preferred the approach adopted by the English Court of Appeal in <i>Salford Estates</i>	84

CHAPTER 5 THE ARBITRATION AGREEMENT, LAW OF THE SEAT AND ARBITRAL RULES

1. Introduction	88
2. The Arbitration Agreement.....	88
2.1 Principle: Arbitration proceedings and arbitral awards can only be enforced against parties who have been deemed to have entered into the arbitral agreement.....	89
2.2 Principle: Whether an arbitral clause has been incorporated into a contract is a matter of construction	92
2.3 Principle: Arbitration agreements cannot be incorporated from a charterparty	95
2.4 Principle: Arbitral clauses are not necessarily defeated by clauses in a supplemental agreement conferring non-exclusive jurisdiction on the Hong Kong Courts.....	97
3. Law of the Seat.....	98
3.1 Principle: In the appropriate circumstances, the reference to a venue in an arbitral clause may be interpreted to refer to the seat.....	99
3.2 Principle: References to China as the seat of arbitration may include Hong Kong if there are contextual grounds to support this interpretation.....	100
4. The HKIAC Arbitral Rules.....	103
4.1 Principle: Parties should adopt the model clauses to avoid unnecessary uncertainty in the interpretation of their arbitral clauses.....	103
4.2 Principle: The 2018 HKIAC Administered Arbitration Rules feature key additions and amendments from previous sets of rules which seek to increase flexibility and efficacy in its administration of arbitral proceedings.....	104
4.3 Principle: The HKIAC is not the proper party to sue when challenging decisions of the Arbitral Tribunal and parties have no cause of action against the HKIAC to require it to assume legal liability.....	106
4.4 Principle: Reference in the Arbitral Clause to the incorporation of the HKIAC Rules can be sufficient in identifying the HKIAC as the Arbitral Institution.....	107

CHAPTER 6 ARBITRATORS

1. Introduction	110
2. Impartiality and Independence	111
2.1 Principle: An arbitrator is duty bound to act impartially and independently	111
2.2 Principle: The burden of proving actual bias or apparent bias is on the challenging party	112
2.3 Principle: An actual bias is an unequivocal basis for removal	113
2.4 Principle: Where a reasonable apprehension of bias exists, an arbitrator will also be removed from the tribunal for apparent bias	113
2.5 Principle: An arbitrator has an ongoing duty to disclose circumstances likely to give rise to justifiable doubts as to his impartiality or independence	114
2.6 Principle: Where an arbitrator has pecuniary interest in the outcome of proceedings, he will be automatically disqualified from serving on the Tribunal	116
2.7 Principle: An arbitrator who can be said to be dependent on the instructions of a party or their solicitors will generally be disqualified from the tribunal	118
2.8 Principle: A personal conflict of interest will disqualify an arbitrator in cases where the nature of the relationship is so close as to give rise to a real possibility of bias	119
2.9 Principle: An apprehension of bias may arise in circumstances where an arbitrator accepts multiple appointments in different arbitrations from the same party, where the arbitrations concern the same or overlapping subject matters	121
2.10 Principle: There are no inherent reasons why barristers from the same chambers cannot respectively serve as arbitrator and counsel in the same proceedings. Any justifiable doubts must arise from specific allegations of the chambers or the barristers	124
2.11 Principle: Arbitrators can be removed from the tribunal if previously expressed views indicate a pre-disposition to a party or an issue in question	126
2.12 Principle: If an arbitrator is found not to possess the requisite requirements as agreed upon by the parties, he will be removed from the arbitral tribunal	127
3. Reasonable Opportunity to Present and Defend Case	127
3.1 Principle: An arbitrator must act fairly and impartially and allow the parties a reasonable opportunity in presenting their cases	127
3.2 Principle: A party will have been denied a reasonable opportunity to present his case where the conduct complained of is serious or egregious	128
3.3 Principle: The autonomy of parties in agreeing procedural steps is subject to the arbitrator's overriding objective to seek that parties are treated equally and have a full opportunity of presenting their cases	129
4. Procedural Considerations	130
4.1 Principle: After ensuring themselves that there are justifiable doubts as to an arbitrator's impartiality or independence, the party seeking to challenge an arbitrator should seek to follow the rules governing the arbitration. If there are none or none have been agreed upon, the party should undertake the procedure under section 26 of the Arbitration Ordinance	130

4.2 Principle: The time-limit for contesting the appointment of an arbitrator is generally considered to be a rigid one	130
4.3 Principle: A replacement arbitrator shall be appointed by the same method which governed the arbitrator whom he is replacing	131
4.4 Principle: In general, a challenged arbitrator may continue to hear the arbitration whilst the challenge is pending decision	132
4.5 Principle: The unilateral withdrawal of an arbitrator need not be explained or lead to a necessary implication of bias	132

CHAPTER 7 ANTI-SUIT INJUNCTIONS

1. Introduction	134
2. The EU Experience	134
2.1 Principle: Anti-suit injunctions prohibiting a party from bringing proceedings in the court of another EU Member State were previously regarded as an inadmissible interference in breach of the Brussels Regulations	134
2.2 Principle: Anti-suit injunctions issued by an Arbitral Tribunal are not in breach of the 'recast' Brussels Regulations	137
2.3 Principle: It is uncertain whether or not the 'recast' Brussels Regulations have changed matters such that national courts in the EU can now issue anti-suit injunctions to protect arbitration agreements	140
3. The UK Experience	140
3.1 Principle: While an English court may be precluded from granting an anti-suit injunction within the EU, nothing would preclude an arbitral tribunal of its jurisdiction from awarding damages against a party who has commenced judicial proceedings in breach of an obligation to arbitrate	141
3.2 Principle: Courts have the power to grant anti-suit injunctions even when no arbitration has been commenced or contemplated	142
4. The Hong Kong Experience	143
4.1 Principle: Hong Kong courts will ordinarily be prepared to grant anti-suit injunctions	143
4.2 Principle: Anti-suit injunctions in Hong Kong are granted under section 21L of the High Court Ordinance (Cap 4), rather than section 45 of the Arbitration Ordinance (Cap 609)	145
4.3 Principle: Anti-suit injunctions should be sought without any undue delay	146
4.4 Principle: Anti-suit injunctions can be sought against third parties in circumstances where they are bound by an arbitration agreement	148

CHAPTER 8 EMERGENCY ARBITRATION

1. Introduction	151
2. The Nature of Emergency Relief in Hong Kong	152
2.1 Principle: The updates to the 2018 HKIAC Adminstrated Arbitration Rules include important amendments to the emergency arbitration provisions	153
2.2 Principle: The emergency arbitrator mechanism does not generally provide for ex parte applications	155

- 2.3 Principle: In general, a party cannot apply for emergency recourse against a third party to an arbitral clause.....157
- 2.4 Principle: While section 45 allows for parties to apply to the court for interim relief prior to the establishment of the Arbitral Tribunal, its application is not always straight forward158
- 2.5 Principle: Generally speaking, it is expected emergency arbitrators in Hong Kong will follow, or at least consider, the *American Cyanamid* principles in deciding whether or not to award relief.....160
- 2.6 Principle: In Hong Kong, decisions of an emergency arbitrator are enforceable in the Hong Kong courts as if it were a conventional arbitral award.....163
- 2.7 Principle: While emergency arbitration is not recognised in the PRC, institutions in Mainland China have sought to introduce the concept of emergency relief165

CHAPTER 9 SETTING ASIDE ARBITRAL AWARDS

- 1. Introduction171
- 2. General Principles171
 - 2.1 Principle: Under the Arbitration Ordinance (Cap 609), section 81 provides the only mandatory means by which parties may apply to a court to set aside an arbitral award. There is no longer any distinction between international and domestic awards171
 - 2.2 Principle: Applications to set aside awards should generally be made to the supervisory court at the seat of the arbitration.....172
 - 2.3 Principle: Applications that do not adhere to the requirements of Order 73, rule 5 of the Rules of the High Court (Cap 4A) are an abuse of process and are liable to be struck out.....173
 - 2.4 Principle: The court is directed to favor remission over setting aside an award or declaring it to be of no effect. Courts will only set aside awards if serious irregularity or substantial injustice has occurred174
 - 2.5 Principle: An applicant will be prevented from setting aside an arbitral award if they have waived their right to object, or are estopped from doing so176
- 3. Setting Aside under Section 81177
 - 3.1 Principle: Section 81 is not concerned with the jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal, unless the jurisdictional ruling is made as part of an award on the merits.....177
 - 3.2 Principle: The grounds of incapacity and invalidity will often require peculiar and unique circumstances for the court to set-aside the award178
 - 3.3 Principle: A party who is able to establish an inability to present their case will often succeed in setting-aside an arbitral award.....180
 - 3.4 Principle: Any claim that an award is beyond the terms of the submission to arbitration is narrowly construed.....181
 - 3.5 Principle: Complaints against the composition of the arbitral tribunal or arbitral procedure must be raised before the tribunal and must be of sufficient severity182
 - 3.6 Principle: In practice, very few matters in Hong Kong are not arbitrable.....183

- 3.7 Principle: Hong Kong courts take a narrow interpretation of the public policy exception and awards will only be set aside in circumstances where substantial injustice has occurred.....183
- 3.8 Principle: The court has the residual discretion to refuse to set aside an award even if a ground to set aside contained in section 81 can be made out184
- 4. Setting Aside under Schedule 2.....185
 - 4.1 Principle: A losing party should seek a correction, interpretation or additional award under section 69 before applying to the court to review the award under sections 4–6 of Schedule 2.....185
 - 4.2 Principle: The court has supplementary powers under section 7 of Schedule 2 for the ordering of reasons, the ordering of costs or payment into court.....187
- 5. Setting Aside Under Section 4 of Schedule 2.....188
 - 5.1 Principle: An application to set-aside the arbitral award under section 4 of Schedule 2 for serious irregularity is not an appeal, on facts or on law. The court is only concerned with the structural integrity of the arbitration proceedings.....188
 - 5.2 Principle: The test of a serious irregularity giving rise to substantial injustice involves a high threshold189
 - 5.3 Principle: Substantial injustice is additional to that of a serious irregularity and the applicant must establish both.....190
 - 5.4 Principle: There is significant overlap between the specific grounds of serious irregularity under section 4 of Schedule 2 and the specific grounds for setting aside under article 34191
 - 5.5 Principle: In considering whether the arbitral tribunal has exceeded their powers under section 4(2)(b) of Schedule 2, a distinction needs to be made between an arbitral tribunal exercise a power they did not have, and exercising a power they had erroneously192
 - 5.6 Principle: In consideration applications under section 4(2)(d) of Schedule 2, it is not necessary for the arbitral tribunal to deal with each and every argument raised by the parties193
- 6. Setting Aside Under Section 5 of Schedule 2.....193
 - 6.1 Principle: Under section 6(3) of Schedule 2, the court must determine section 5 of Schedule 2 application for leave to appeal without a hearing, unless the court determines that a hearing is required.....193
 - 6.2 Principle: Appeals against an arbitrator's decision under section 5 of Schedule 2 must be based on a question of law, not fact and the question must be one of domestic law194
 - 6.3 Principle: Under section 6(4) of Schedule 2, leave to appeal is only granted if the decision of the arbitral tribunal on the question of law is obviously wrong, or the question is one of general importance and the decision of the arbitral tribunal is at least open to serious doubt.....195
 - 6.4 Principle: Time to launch a further appeal against a section 5 of Schedule 2 determination by the Court of First Instance only begins to run after a decision over dismissal, variation, remission or setting aside is made197
 - 6.5 Principle: In considering leave for further appeal, the applicant will have to demonstrate that the grounds of intended appeal are arguable or have a reasonable prospect of success.....197

CHAPTER 10 THE ENFORCEMENT OF ARBITRAL AWARDS

1. Introduction	200
2. General Principles	201
2.1 Principle: While a summary enforcement procedure exists for all types of awards, a party may choose to enforce an arbitral award by taking out an action on the award	201
2.2 Principle: In a common law action to enforce an arbitral award, the court can grant a full range of remedies which may differ from the original terms of the award	202
2.3 Principle: A strong presumption in favor of enforcement exists and it is incumbent on the party whom the award is sought against to convince the court otherwise	202
2.4 Principle: Enforcement of an award will be refused if the award has not yet become binding on the parties or if it has been set aside or suspended by a competent authority of the country in which or under the law of which it was made	203
2.5 Principle: Parties may seek to enforce only part of the award so long as it is severable from the objectionable part	204
2.6 Principle: An action to enforce an award in Hong Kong is time-barred after the expiration of six years from the date on which the cause of the action accrued	205
3. Hong Kong and Non-Convention Awards	206
3.1 Principle: Hong Kong awards and non-Convention awards are enforced in the same manner under the Arbitration Ordinance and there is no longer any distinction between 'domestic' and 'international' Hong Kong awards	206
3.2 Principle: Statutory enforcement of arbitral awards are designed to be summary in nature	207
3.3 Principle: Winning parties will not be required to pay security for costs in enforcing their judgment at the Court of First Instance. While the Court of Appeal has the jurisdiction to order security for costs against a winning party, it will be generally inappropriate for the court to do so	208
3.4 Principle: The grounds for refusing enforcement of a Hong Kong or non-Convention award are identical to those regarding Convention, Mainland or Macao awards, save that the court retains a residual discretion to refuse enforcement in cases where the court considers it just to do so	209
4. Mainland and Macao Awards	213
4.1 Principle: The Convention is not applicable to inter-regional enforcement. As such, Hong Kong awards are not enforceable in Mainland China or Macao and vice-versa based on the Convention	213
4.2 Principle: Since the introduction of the Supplemental Arrangement, all Mainland awards are enforceable in Hong Kong	214
4.3 Principle: Winning parties are now permitted to launch simultaneous enforcement applications in both Hong Kong and the PRC	215
4.4 Principle: The Mainland Arrangement has not been applied in the same manner in Hong Kong and the PRC	216
4.5 Principle: The procedure for enforcing Mainland or Macao awards is identical to that of Hong Kong awards. The grounds for resisting enforcement are identical to that of Convention awards	217

4.6 Principle: Hong Kong courts have approached the public policy exception with a strong deference to a judgment of a supervisory court, while PRC courts have been more keen to protect judicial sovereignty	217
5. Convention Awards	219
5.1 Principle: The procedure for enforcing Convention awards is identical to that of Hong Kong or non-Convention awards. Convention awards may only be refused enforcement if one of the grounds in section 89(2) is established	219
<i>Index</i>	221