
INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LITIGATION

SECOND EDITION

RICHARD FENTIMAN



OXFORD

INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LITIGATION

SECOND EDITION

RICHARD FENTIMAN

*Professor of Private International Law, University of Cambridge
Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge*

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Richard Fentiman 2015

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2010

Second Edition published in 2015

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014950940

ISBN 978-0-19-871291-6

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LITIGATION

SECOND EDITION

For Alicia

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

Richard Fentiman has combined scholarly analysis and practicality in a formidable new work on international commercial litigation. Since Lord Mansfield's day, such litigation has been a core area of English legal activity, shaping much of our substantive law of contract. However, as practitioners and clients know, the enforcement of rights and a satisfactory outcome to disputes often depend more on the forum in which they are resolved than on substantive law.

Hence, the remarkable prevalence of jurisdictional disputes in the English Commercial Court, over recent decades. *Ubi jus, ibi remedium* might, for a practitioner, read *ubi remedium, ibi jus*. Disputes often settle without difficulty, once parties know the forum where they will be decided (or - since putting off the evil hour can be a reason for invoking particular jurisdictions - not decided). The European Community's valiant attempt in the Brussels Regulation and Lugano Convention to produce a simple and 'certain' scheme eliminating or resolving all jurisdictional issues has led to a body of jurisprudence sometimes adding to the scope for procedural manoeuvring. Some aspects of the Regulation are happily under review by the European Commission, as the book explains.

The insight guiding Richard Fentiman's excellent book is that parties to international commercial transactions need to know how private international law addresses the legal risks involved in their transactions. They wish to eliminate the risks of uncertainty and of an unfavourable outcome. To do this, they must address both litigational risks (e.g. where litigation will occur) and substantive transactional risks (how far their legitimate expectations may be undermined by unforeseen legal principles or obstacles wherever litigation does occur).

This insight dictates the content and order of the book. After detailing the relevant legal risks, it sets out schematically to discuss the principles governing choice of law, choice of forum and jurisdiction, procedural risks, pre-emptive proceedings, anti-suit injunctions, interim measures, remedies, and enforcement. Throughout, the text contains both a full review of domestic and, where relevant, European Court of Justice authority, with footnote references to a wide range of secondary and academic material, including overseas sources. It is enriched by passages which, after stating the current legal position, invite consideration of the possibility that, on some points, the law may or should change direction in the future.

The book will be of great value - to practitioners and clients seeking to address these risks in advance of entering into transactions, and to those seeking to understand and resolve issues arising out of transactions already concluded. It is a pleasure to read and commend it and to congratulate Richard Fentiman on a very substantial achievement.

Jonathan Mance
Justice of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom

PREFACE

Nothing since the first edition of this book has diminished the intellectual interest and practical importance of its themes. Economic recession triggered a stream of cross-border cases in the English courts, ensuring the significance and vitality of the law governing such disputes, even if the anticipated deluge of claims never materialized. The revolution in English law's approach to multistate litigation, begun three decades ago, has been further consolidated, as the courts continue in particular to explore the frontiers of transnational injunctive relief and hone their adjudicatory discretion. The courts have further refined these technologies, building on the principles established in the landmark decisions in *Spiliada*, *Aérospatiale*, *Airbus*, *Babanaft*, *Donohue*, and *Credit Suisse*. So too, the parallel, if starkly contrasting, evolution of European private international law, embodied in the corpus of regulations on jurisdiction, evidence, service, and choice of law, has continued apace, with the reworking of the Brussels jurisdiction regulation at its heart. And, all the while, the tension between the national and EU projects, with their radically different assumptions and contested frontier, has continued as a recurring leitmotif in the cases and commentary. Against this background, international commercial litigation remains a subject uniquely engaging in its combination of intense practicality, concerning the tactics and micro-economics of litigation, and conceptual fascination, involving the most intricate and challenging problems of private international law.

Like its predecessor, this edition is concerned with the high-value, multi-venue disputes which characterize the business of the English Commercial Court (and sometimes the Chancery Division), and with the rules of private international law and international civil procedure applicable in such cases. This second edition is markedly different, however, from the first. It has been possible to expand considerably the discussion of jurisdiction agreements in Chapter 2, and transnational injunctions in Chapters 16 and 17, reflecting the central importance of those topics. Chapter 2 especially has been augmented to consider such matters as the effectiveness of asymmetric jurisdiction agreements, the award of damages for breach of jurisdiction agreements, and the effect of such agreements on third parties. Chapters 16 and 17 now include enhanced consideration of the jurisdictional basis of cross-border injunctive relief, and the moderating effect of comity in such cases. New sections have also been introduced addressing, in Chapters 6 and 19, the important ways in which the award of interest, the currency of judgment, and the assessment of costs, affect the value of recovery, and the economics of cross-border litigation. The modalities of effecting service and obtaining evidence abroad also receive expanded treatment (in Chapters 8 and 19), acknowledging the practical importance of those matters, and the perhaps surprisingly profound issues of principle which they generate.

More significantly, the law has changed much in the lifetime of the first edition, leaving little in the following chapters unaffected. Most obviously, the activation of the recast Brussels Regulation on 10 January 2015 has required much additional discussion. Similarly, the European Commission's proposal to approve the Hague Convention on choice of court agreements (not implemented at the time of writing) has demanded the addition of much new material. The amendments to the Regulation are in places significant, by offering a

solution (although merely partial) to the notorious *Gasser* problem, and by determining finally which law governs the validity of jurisdiction agreements. But such changes are incremental, stopping short of the wholesale abolition of national rules of jurisdiction that was predicted. Nor will the Hague Convention have the practical effect that its promoters might wish, when it comes into force. Engaged only in connection with bilateral, exclusive jurisdiction agreements designating the courts of Contracting States, its immediate importance should not be exaggerated. Nonetheless, the changes effected by the recast Regulation are in some respects highly significant, and may spawn much litigation. Most importantly, perhaps, the operation of the new regime regulating parallel proceedings in EU and third states remains unclear, as does its impact on national law, matters addressed in Chapter 12. It is equally uncertain how the enhanced insulation of arbitration from the Regulation affects the possible restraint of proceedings in EU states in breach of arbitration agreements, a debate considered in Chapter 16. It is possible that national law survives in some cases at least concerning alternative proceedings in non-EU states, and that anti-suit injunctions may again be deployed within the EU in defence of arbitration agreements. As this suggests, the recast regulation has far from quieted old debates surrounding such *causes célèbres* as *Owusu* and *West Tankers*.

The advent of the recast Regulation, and the likelihood that the Hague Convention will enter into force, dictate the organization of much of what follows. The Regulation will apply from 10 January 2015 to all commercial proceedings initiated, and to judgments obtained, after that date. Where appropriate, the primary discussion centres on the recast Regulation, but consideration is also given to those cases which might yet come to court concerning earlier proceedings and judgments. Separate reference is also made to cases subject to the 2007 Lugano Convention, whose provisions track those of the superseded Brussels I Regulation, but differ from those of Brussels I bis. Again, although at the time of writing the 2005 Hague Convention is not in force, the following discussion anticipates its implementation, and describes its operation in detail. Distinct but related questions concern the treatment of the 1980 Rome Convention on the law applicable to contractual obligations, in the light of the subsequent Rome I regulation, and of the Private International (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1995, now superseded by the Rome II regulation on the law applicable to non-contractual obligations. Primacy in the following pages is inevitably given to the Rome I regulation, governing contracts concluded after 17 December 2009, and the Rome II regulation, regulating non-contractual damage occurring after 11 January 2009. Although wasting assets, both the 1980 Convention, and the 1995 Act remain of some importance, however, the former because many pre-Rome I, long-term contracts continue to subsist, the latter because of numerous late-blooming, pre-Rome II mis-selling claims arising in the wake of the recession. Both are briefly considered where appropriate.

Numerous judicial decisions since 2010 have also expanded, and sometimes clouded, our understanding of the law, many of them important, some of them intriguing, and a few of them frustrating. They have addressed a range of practically important and conceptually challenging issues. These include (non-exclusively) such matters as the effectiveness of asymmetric jurisdiction agreements, the legitimacy of awarding damages against a counterparty for suing in an EU state in breach of a jurisdiction agreement, the growing issue of third parties in commercial disputes (as co-defendants, as silent parties to jurisdiction agreements, as repositories of a defendant's assets), the regulation of parallel proceedings in the EU, the reflexive effect of the EU jurisdiction regime, the legitimate scope of

transnational injunctive relief, and the proper approach to *forum conveniens* applications. In addition to decisions in the higher courts, many at first instance have added texture to the law, and demonstrate the attitudes and assumptions of the courts. Such decisions at the trial stage are of central importance, insofar as a proper understanding of the law requires not merely a grasp of doctrine, but of the ethnography of judicial practice. The volume of judicial decisions at all levels, driven by the ingenuity of lawyers, and the considerable sums at stake in commercial disputes, means that no account of the subject can remain definitive for long. The current edition seeks to present the law as it appeared on 1 October 2014.

Not all change, however, is unforeseeable, and it is possible to speculate on how the law may evolve even in this edition's lifetime. Three recent developments, in particular, may presage fundamental change in future. Discussion continues surrounding the possibility of a 'Rome 0' regulation, addressing those interstitial aspects of private international law not addressed in the existing Rome instruments, a debate given focus by the European Parliament's 2012 study, *A European Framework for Private International Law*. Controversially, any such development would doubtless involve a harmonized approach to the application of foreign law in EU national courts, an area of considerable practical importance, considered in Chapter 20, where English law's approach remains distinctive in a European context. More significantly, perhaps, in March 2014 the European Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee published its report on the *Possibility and Terms for Applying Brussels I Regulation (Recast) to Extra-EU Disputes*, advocating the extension of the rules of the Brussels jurisdiction regime to defendants domiciled in third states. Such a revival of the scheme to abolish national rules of jurisdiction entirely is a reminder that the decision to abstain from doing so in the recast Brussels Regulation was intended by some as merely a temporary reprieve. Were the traditional English approach abolished, founded on service, and the comfortingly lapidary *Spiliada* principles, the conduct of transnational disputes in the English courts would be transformed, a matter considered in Chapter 1.

Surprisingly, however, recent events suggest that change may come more immediately from a domestic source. In several recent decisions the English courts have disparaged the scale of interlocutory proceedings in international commercial disputes, a position notably endorsed by Lord Neuberger in *VTB v Nutritek*, but evident also in cases concerning the assessment of costs, exemplified by *Vitol v Nasdec* (considered in Chapter 19). They have deployed their enhanced powers to case-manage disputes, and prevent the recovery of excessive costs, as a disincentive to adversarial profligacy. Superficially, the avoidance of disproportionately complex and costly litigation is hardly controversial. But it may have serious consequences, perhaps unintended, for international commercial disputes in the English courts. Such disputes are invariably interlocutory, mainly concerning jurisdiction and injunctive relief, yet are hard-fought, with little expense spared. They proceed on the (correct) assumption that the result in such proceedings will determine the final outcome of the dispute, by prompting settlement or capitulation. Many judges may conclude that the scale and cost of such disputes is justified, given their importance, but others may assume that such complexity and expense is inherently disproportionate, given that such proceedings are interlocutory. Which view will prevail has important consequences for the shape of international commercial litigation in the English courts. It is not impossible that the near future will see a move away from the existing model of substantial interlocutory contests, in disputes which seldom proceed to trial on the merits, to a model, evident already in cases subject to the EU regime, with its emphasis on substantive disputes on issues of liability.

Although much has changed, this edition rests on the same assumptions as the first, and adopts the same perspective. Reflecting the reality of commercial litigation in the English courts, it has at its core the interlocutory disputes which dominate such cases, in particular those concerning jurisdiction, pre-emptive measures, and injunctive relief. Such matters are treated at length in Chapters 4–17. Given that such litigation very often (although not invariably) revolves around the effect of contractual jurisdiction agreements Chapter 2 is devoted to the management of jurisdictional disputes by prior agreement. The focus of international commercial disputes on issues of jurisdiction and injunctive relief does not entail, however, that other elements in the law of international civil procedure and private international law are of no importance. The trigger for any dispute is a contest about liability, and no litigant proceeds without formulating (and assessing) its substantive claim or defence. The intended outcome on the merits may also dictate the choice of forum, especially if a counterparty seeks to invoke local law to defeat an otherwise enforceable contract, and the strength of a claimant's case may have a direct bearing (in English law) on whether a claim may be served outside the jurisdiction. So too, such matters as the future enforceability of any judgment, the recovery of costs, the obtaining of evidence, and the mechanisms for applying foreign law, may significantly affect the parties' approach to proceedings. Any treatment of international commercial litigation must address, therefore, the legal framework of substantive disputes, their evidential infrastructure, and issues of enforcement, matters considered in Chapters 3–6, and 18–20.

Such matters give rise to important and sometimes challenging legal issues. The treatment of those issues, and the arrangement of the following chapters, is not, however, merely technical. It is intended to place them squarely in their practical and commercial context. In particular, the law must be seen in the light of three related considerations. First, the law's practical role is to supply the framework for the strategic choices of litigants and their advisers, matters addressed in Chapter 7. The rules of international civil procedure and private international law are not ends in themselves, but supply the levers, and the idioms, whereby litigants may seek advantage, especially in the matter of venue. Second, the purpose of litigation is settlement. No claimant claims, and no defendant defends, without thought of the final outcome, if only in the minimal sense that a claim or defence must be drafted, but nor do lawyers expect major commercial disputes to go to judgment, or even to a trial on the merits. The litigation process is the vehicle for compromise or capitulation. Third, commercial litigation is an investment. To paraphrase Clausewitz, it is a continuation of commerce by other means. Opting to sue or defend is a business decision, with attendant risks and opportunities, affecting each party's balance sheet, and their commercial reputation. It is not an end in itself, or a matter of vindicating legal rights for their own sake.

The reality that litigation is not an autonomous process, divorced from its commercial context, explains why litigants view such disputes in terms of risk, a perspective shared in this book, and developed in Chapter 1. The risks associated with litigation are both procedural, concerning the conduct of proceedings, and substantive, concerning the parties' rights and liabilities. The procedural risks involved concern especially the risk that proceedings will occur in a hostile or inappropriate venue, and the risk that any judgment will be unenforceable where the defendant's assets are located. These occupy much of this book, but issues of liability remain the fulcrum of any dispute. Transaction risk, the risk that a contractual agreement will be legally or practically unenforceable is the ultimate risk in any commercial proceedings, and is the subject of Chapters 3–6.

If, however, the law governing commercial disputes must be viewed in terms of the risks associated with litigation, so those risks must in turn be located in a wider commercial context. The procedural and substantive risks associated with litigation generate cost and uncertainty, but such risks do not become important only when they crystallize in court proceedings. Such risks matter because they may influence the price of transactions, and possibly the willingness of businesses to contract at all. This is not to say, however, that the law governing multistate disputes concerns merely the risk associated with particular disputes, and particular transactions. Such risk is also systemic risk, concerning how the threat to transactions from litigation affects markets, by increasing transaction costs and guiding market practice. This is then a book for litigators, concerning the regulation of multistate disputes, and the associated risks. But in so far as the legal risk to any transaction crystallizes only in the event of litigation, it is a book for transaction lawyers too.

If the scope and assumptions of this edition remain unaltered, so the debts acknowledged in the first edition still stand. Not least, this is as much the offspring of the Cambridge LLM course on International Commercial Litigation as its predecessor. It owes much to the constant testing of ideas in lectures and workshops, before an audience invariably informed and enthusiastic, if sometimes properly sceptical. I have also been able to experiment safely with some of the ideas that appear in the following pages (and some, wisely, that do not) because of invitations to speak extended by the University of Cyprus, the Australian and New Zealand Society of International Law, the International Law Association Australian Branch, Griffith University, the University of Zagreb, 2 Temple Gardens, and the Hague Academy of International Law. Many friends and colleagues have also shared their knowledge and insight, making this a better book. I must especially thank Karen Birch, Sarah Garvey, Nikitas Hatzimihail, Thomas John, Adam Johnson, Mary Keyes, Marie Louise Kinsler, Campbell McLachlan, James McComish, Louise Merrett, Arnaud Nuyts, Oliver Parker, Jason Rix, Pippa Rogerson, and Philip Wood.

As always, however, the roots of any academic effort are as much domestic as professional. My wife Alicia has borne over-exposure to the niceties of cross-border litigation with fortitude, and is truly the silent partner in this endeavour.

Richard Fentiman
Cambridge
1 October 2014

TABLE OF CASES

7E Communications Ltd v Vertex Antennentechnik GmbH [2007] EWCA Civ 140; [2007] 1 WLR 2175	2.82, 2.87, 2.89, 2.120
889457 Alberta Inc v Katanga Mining [2009] 1 BCLC 189	9.18
A Co Ltd v Republic of X [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 520	10.18
A v Secretary of State for the Home Department (No 2) [2006] 2 AC 22	10.02
A v United Kingdom (2002) 36 EHRR 917	16.102, 16.157
A/S D/S Svendborg v Akar [2003] EWHC 797 (Comm)	2.249
A/S Tallinna Laevauhisus v Estonian State Shipping Line (1946) 80 Lloyd's Rep 99 (CA)	20.21, 20.52, 20.53
Abbott v Abbott (1860) 29 LJPM & A 57	20.19
ABCI v Banque Franco-Tunisienne [2002] 1 Lloyd's Rep 511, aff'd [2003] Lloyd's Rep 146	8.47, 8.72, 9.70, 9.71
Abela v Baadarani [2013] UKSC 44	8.36, 8.59
Abidin Daver, The [1984] AC 398 (HL)	1.36, 13.01, 13.04, 13.05, 13.10, 13.42, 13.51, 13.55, 13.58, 13.59, 13.60, 13.105
Aboulloff v Oppenheimer (1882) 10 QBD 295 (CA)	18.38, 18.48
Ace European Ltd v Howden Group Ltd [2012] EWCA Civ 1624	15.75
Ace Insurance Ltd v Moose Enterprise Pty Ltd [2009] NSW 724	3.15, 16.62, 16.63, 16.64
ACE Insurance SA-NV v Zurich Insurance Company [2001] 1 Lloyd's Rep 618 (CA)	2.240, 2.241, 2.243, 2.245, 12.69
Adams v Cape Industries plc [1990] Ch 443	9.29, 9.37, 9.38, 18.26, 18.27, 18.28, 18.29, 18.30, 18.31, 18.38, 18.41, 18.43, 18.44, 20.38, 20.46
Adams v National Bank of Greece [1961] AC 255	3.114, 5.21
Addison v Brown [1954] 1 WLR 779	3.49, 3.56
Adhiguna Meranti, The [1988] 1 Lloyd's Rep 384 (CA, HK)	20.82, 20.84
Adoko v Jemal, The Times, July 8, 1999	1.41
AEL v Socofi SA [2009] EWHC 3223 (Comm)	2.120, 2.122
Aeolian Shipping SA v ISS Machinery Services Limited [2001] 2 Lloyd's Rep 641 (CA)	5.64, 5.77
Aeroflot v Berezovsky [2013] EWCA Civ 784	2.75, 2.77, 2.86, 2.87, 2.113, 2.153, 2.176, 9.90, 9.95, 9.99
Aeroflot v Berezovsky [2014] EWCA Civ 20	18.10, 18.14, 18.41, 18.44, 18.45
Aerospatiale v US Dis Court, 482 US 522 (1987)	19.32, 19.46
AES Ust-Kamenogorsk LLP v Ust-Kamenogorsk JSC [2013] UKSC 35; [2013] 1 WLR 1889 (SC); [2011] EWCA Civ 647	16.20, 16.34, 16.35, 16.41, 16.53, 16.54, 16.56, 16.57, 16.122, 16.124, 16.139, 16.156, 18.20, 18.21, 18.32, 18.33, 18.36
A-G for New Zealand v Ortiz [1984] AC 1 (CA)	10.01, 10.04, 20.46, 20.64
Agar v Hyde (2000) 173 ALR 665 (High Ct, Australia)	8.36
Aggeliki Charis Compania Maritima SA v Pagnan SpA (The Angelic Grace) [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 87	16.41, 16.42, 16.53, 16.58, 16.120
Agnew v Lansforsakringsbolagens AB [2001] 1 AC 223	4.50, 6.03, 8.79, 9.44, 9.81
Agrafax Public Relations Ltd v UCR Scottish Society Inc [1995] CLC 862	8.74
AIC Ltd v Nigeria [2003] EWHC 1357 (QB)	10.24
AIG (K) Ltd v The Ethniki [2000] 2 All ER 566 (CA)	5.122
AIG Capital Partners Inc v Kazakhstan [2006] 1 WLR 1420	10.26, 10.27, 10.30
AIG Europe SA v QBE International Ltd [2001] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 262	5.122
AIG Europe (UK) Ltd v The Ethniki [2002] 2 All ER 566	2.86, 2.120

Airbus Industrie GIE v Patel [1999] 1 AC 119; [1997] 2 Lloyd's Rep 8 (CA)	1.55, 1.56, 1.58, 13.11, 16.10, 16.13, 16.30, 16.35, 16.37, 16.38, 16.82, 16.111, 16.113, 16.116, 16.125, 16.126, 16.127, 16.150, 16.153, 17.99, 17.179, 18.12
Ajami v Comptroller of Customs [1954] 1 WLR 1405	20.19, 20.38
AK Investment CJSC v Kyrgyz Mobil Tel Ltd [2011] UKPC 7	8.33, 8.38, 8.39, 8.40, 8.41, 8.72, 9.89, 9.100, 9.101, 9.103, 9.104, 9.105, 13.09, 13.26, 13.27, 13.41, 13.81, 18.48, 18.49, 18.52, 18.53, 20.78
Akai Pty Ltd v People's Insurance Co Ltd [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 90; [1997] CLC 1508	1.55, 1.58, 2.229, 2.252, 13.63, 13.106, 16.126, 16.156, 18.32, 18.35, 18.36
Akers v Samba Financial Group [2014] EWHC 540 (Ch)	13.13
Al Bassam v Al Bassam [2004] EWCA Civ 857	18.42, 18.43
Al Jedda v Secretary of State for Defence [2010] EWCA Civ 758; [2009] EWHC 397 (QB)	4.36, 4.37, 10.06, 18.58, 20.47, 20.65, 20.67
Albaforth, The [1984] 2 Lloyd's Rep 91 (CA)	13.19, 13.20
Alberta Inc v Katanga Mining Ltd [2009] ILPr 14	8.70, 9.17
Albon (t/a NA Carriage Co) v Naza Motor Trading Sdn Bhd (No 4) [2007] EWHC 1879 (Ch); [2007] 1 WLR 2489	8.47, 16.20
Alcom v Republic of Colombia [1984] AC 580	10.18, 10.24, 10.25, 10.26, 10.27
Alexandros T, The <i>See</i> Starlight Shipping Company v Allianz Marine & Aviation Versicherungs AG (The Alexandros T)	
Alfa Laval Tumba AB v Separator Spares International Ltd [2012] EWCA Civ 1569; [2012] EWHC 1155; (Ch)	9.93, 9.95, 9.96
Alfred C Toepfer GmbH v Molino Boschi Srl [1996] 1 Lloyd's Rep 510	11.41, 11.88
Alfred Dunhill Ltd v Diffusion Internationale de Maroquinerie de Prestige SARL [2002] 1 All ER (Comm) 950; [2002] ILPr 13	9.69, 9.80, 9.81
Algosaibi v Saads Investments Company Limited (CICA 1 of 2010) (Cayman Islands Court of Appeal)	17.236, 17.238
Alliance Bank JSC v Aquanta Corp [2011] EWHC 3281 (Comm), aff'd [2012] EWCA Civ 1588	6.24, 6.63, 6.64, 9.74, 9.85
Alliance Bank JSC v Aquanta Corp [2012] 1 Lloyd's Rep 181	2.167
Allianz SpA v West Tankers Inc, Case C-185/07 [2009] AC 1138; [2009] ECR I-633; [2009] 1 Lloyd's Rep 413	1.73, 2.15, 8.13, 14.27, 16.123, 16.133, 16.134, 16.136, 16.137, 16.140, 16.142, 16.143, 16.144, 16.145, 16.146, 16.147, 16.148, 16.149, 18.104, 18.105
Al-Miznad v Azzaman Ltd [2003] EWHC 1783 (QB)	20.117
Altair, The [2008] 2 Lloyd's Rep 90	10.12
Alternative Investment Solutions (General) Ltd v Valle de Uco Resort and Spa SA [2013] EWHC 333 (QB)	17.38
Aluminium Industrie Vaasen BV v Romalpa Aluminium Ltd [1976] 1 WLR 676 (CA)	1.36
Amand, Re [1941] 2 KB 239	20.56
Amand (No 2), Re [1942] 1 KB 445	20.56
Amchem Products Inc v British Columbia Workers Compensation Board (1993) 102 DLR (4th) 96 (Sup Ct, Canada)	1.53, 13.07, 13.37, 13.106, 16.10, 16.113, 16.125, 16.150, 16.153, 16.155
American Motorists Insurance Co (Amico) v Cellstar Corporation [2002] EWHC (Comm) 421	5.65, 5.75
Amin Rasheed Corporation v Kuwait Insurance Co [1984] AC 50 (HL)	5.33, 5.71, 8.36, 8.68, 8.79, 8.81, 9.44, 9.73, 13.05, 13.51, 13.54
Amlin Corporate Member Limited v Oriental Assurance Corp [2012] EWCA 1341	14.21, 14.22
Amoco (UK) v British American Offshore Ltd [1999] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 772	1.60, 16.130
AMT Futures Limited v Marzillier, Dr Meier, Dr Guntner Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft GmbH [2014] EWHC 1085 (Comm)	2.272, 8.33, 9.66, 9.68
Andrea Merzario Ltd v Internationale Spedition Leitner Gesellschaft GmbH [2001] 1 Lloyd's Rep 490 (CA)	11.75
Anglo-Iranian Oil Co v Jaffrate (The Rose Mary) [1953] 1 WLR 246	18.58
Ankerl v Switzerland, ECHR, 23 October 1996	2.149
Anklagemyndigheden v Poulsen and Diva Navigation Corp'n, Case C-286/90 [1992] ECR I-6019	10.02

Annesley, Re [1926] Ch 692	20.39
Antec International Ltd v Biosafety USA Inc [2006] EWHC 47 (Comm)	2.213, 2.230, 2.244, 2.245, 2.246, 2.247, 12.72
Anton Durbeck GmbH v Den Norske Bank ASA [2003] 2 WLR 1296 (CA)	9.21, 9.22, 9.33
Antonio Gramsci Shipping Corporation v Lembergs [2013] EWCA Civ 730.	2.160, 2.164, 2.167, 2.170, 2.171, 2.172, 2.173, 2.177, 2.178, 2.179, 2.180
Antonio Gramsci Shipping Corporation v Recoletos Ltd [2012] EWHC 1887 (Comm)	8.74, 8.75
Antonio Gramsci Shipping Corporation v Stepanovs [2011] EWHC 333 (Comm)	2.180
Anziani, Re [1930] 1 Ch 407	5.140
Apex Global Management Limited v Fi Call Limited [2013] EWHC 1652 (Ch)	13.28
Apostilides v Orams, Case C-420/07 (judgment 28 April 2009)	3.53, 18.86
Apovododo v Collins [2008] EWHC 775 (Ch)	18.08
Apple Corps Ltd v Apple Computer Inc [2004] EWHC 768 (Ch)	5.84, 5.91, 5.95, 5.100, 5.101, 5.102
Apthorp v Neville (1907) 23 TLR 575	3.68
Aquavita International SA v Ashapura Minechem Ltd [2014] EWHC 2806 (Comm)	5.113
Arab Bank Ltd v Barclays Bank [1954] AC 495	3.49
Arab Bank plc v Mercantile Holdings Ltd [1994] Ch 71.	3.28, 3.30
Arab Monetary Fund v Hashim [1993] 1 Lloyd's Rep 543	6.97
Arab Monetary Fund v Hashim, 21 March 1997 (unreported).	17.49
Arab Monetary Fund v Hashim (No 3) [1991] 2 AC 114 (HL)	3.25, 3.101
Arbitration Between A/S Tank of Oslo and Agence Maritime L Strauss of Paris, Re an (1939) 65 Ll L Rep 87	20.104
Arkwright Mutual Insurance Co v Bryanston Insurance Co Ltd [1990] 2 QB 649.	12.47, 12.58, 12.70, 13.09, 13.52, 13.58, 13.59, 13.62, 13.64, 13.97, 15.52
Armagas Ltd v Mundogas SA [1986] AC 717 (CA).	6.27, 6.51
Armour v Tyssen Edelstahlwerke AG 1986 SLT 452.	3.125, 5.171
Arros Invest Limited v Rafik Nishanov [2004] IL Pr 22	20.21
Arrow Generics Ltd v Merck & Co Inc [2007] EWHC 1900 (Pat).	15.73, 15.79
Ashtiani v Kashi [1987] QB 888 (CA)	17.62, 17.107, 17.109
Ashville Investments Ltd v Elmer Contractors Ltd [1989] QB 488.	2.54
Askew, Re [1930] 2 Ch 259.	4.58
Askin v ABSA Bank Ltd; cf Askin v ABSA Bank Ltd [1999] ILPr 471 (CA)	13.35, 13.42, 13.48, 13.78, 13.87
Associated Shipping Ltd v Department of Private Affairs of HH Sheikh Zayed Bin Sultan al-Nahayan, Financial Times July 31 1990 (CA)	20.22, 20.52
Associated Shipping Services Ltd v Department of Private Affairs of the Ruler of Abu Dhabi, The Independent, 14 August 1990	20.19
Astrazeneca UK Ltd v Albermarle International Corp [2010] EWHC 1028 (Comm)	8.72, 8.74
Astro Exito Navagacion SA v WT Hsu (The Messiniaki Tolmi) [1984] 1 Lloyds Rep 266	9.10
Atlantic Emperor (No 2), The <i>See</i> Marc Rich & Co AG v Societa Italiana Impianti SpA (The Atlantic Emperor) (No 2)	7.10
Atlantic Star, The [1974] AC 436	17.54
Attorney-General v Times Newspapers Ltd [1974] AC 273	17.54
Attorney General of Ghana v Texaco Overseas Tankships Ltd (The Texaco Melbourne) [1994] 1 Lloyd's Rep 473	6.16, 6.19
Aveng (Africa) Limited v Government of the Gabonee Republic [2012] EWHC 1687 (Comm).	10.27
AXA Insurance UK plc v Thermonex Limited (in liquidation) [2012] EWHC B10 (Mercantile).	15.45, 15.72
Axa Re v Ace Global Markets Ltd [2006] Lloyd's Rep IR 683	2.61
Babanaft International Co SA v Bassatne [1990] Ch 13 (CA).	1.56, 17.16, 17.18, 17.25, 17.46, 17.56, 17.62, 17.69, 17.73, 17.95, 17.100, 18.03, 18.04
Baghlaif Al Zafer Factory Company & Anor v Pakistan National Shipping Company [2000] 1 Lloyd's Rep 1.	13.46, 13.82

Balmoral Group Ltd v Borealis UK Ltd [2006] 2 Lloyd's Rep 629	20.91, 20.98, 20.108
Baltic Shipping Co v Transatlantic Shipping Ltd [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 673	17.46, 17.97, 17.157, 17.170, 18.04
Banco Atlantico SA v British Bank of the Middle East [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 504 (CA)	13.84, 13.85, 13.100
Banco de Vizcaya v Don Alfonso de Borbon y Austria [1935] 1 KB 140	10.04
Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior SNC v Empresa de Telecomunicaciones de Cuba SA [2007] EWCA 662; [2007] 2 Lloyd's Rep 484 (CA)	17.16, 17.132, 17.136, 17.153, 17.154, 17.155, 17.156, 17.161, 17.188, 17.202
Banco Nacional de Cuba, Re [2001] 1 WLR 2039	9.86
Bank of Baroda v Vysya Bank Ltd [1994] 2 Lloyd's Rep 87.	1.65, 5.08, 5.69, 5.94, 5.95, 5.96, 5.97, 5.108, 8.68, 8.70, 8.79, 8.81, 9.60, 9.73
Bank of Boston v UBS [1990] 1 Lloyd's Rep 32 (CA)	15.54, 15.59, 15.76, 15.84
Bank of China v NBM LLC [2002] 1 WLR 844 (CA)	17.46, 17.65, 17.66, 17.97, 17.98
Bank of Credit and Commerce Hong Kong Ltd v Sonali Bank [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 227.	5.97
Bank of Ethiopia v National Bank of Egypt and Liguori [1937] Ch 513	3.102
Bank of New York Mellon v GV Films [2009] EWHC 2338 (Comm)	2.280, 16.43, 16.48
Bank of Scotland v Butcher (unreported) 28 July 1998 (CA)	5.91
Bank of Tokyo v Karoon [1987] AC 45 (CA)	16.34, 16.69, 16.70
Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi Ltd v Baskan Gida Sanayi Ve Pazarlama AS [2004] EWHC 945 (Ch); [2004] 2 Lloyd's Rep 395	2.86, 2.90, 11.41
Bank St Petersburg v Arkhangelsky [2014] EWCA Civ 593	16.04
Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart NV v Slatford [1953] 1 QB 248	5.140
Bankers and Shippers Co of New York v Liverpool Marine and General Insurance Co Ltd (1926) 24 Ll L R 85	20.39
Bankers Trust Co v PT Jakarta International Hotels & Development [1999] 1 Lloyd's Rep 910.	16.41
Bankers' Trust International plc v RCS Editori SpA [1996] CLC 899.	2.107
Bankhaus Wolbern AG v China Construction Bank Corp [2012] EWHC 3285 (Comm).	2.230, 14.08
Bannai v Erez [2013] EWHC 3689 (Comm)	16.20, 16.34, 16.35
Banque Cantonale v Waterlily Maritime Inc [1997] 2 Lloyd's Rep 347.	16.09
Banque Internationale de Commerce de Petrograd v Goukassow [1925] AC 150	3.102
Barber v Lamb (1860) 8 CBNS 95	15.09
Barclays Bank Ltd v Homan (1993) BCLC 680	1.53, 1.54, 16.74, 16.111, 16.113, 16.114, 16.118, 16.125, 16.150
Barford v Barford [1918] P 140.	20.17
Barings plc v Coopers and Lybrand [1997] ILPr 12 (CA)	9.100
Barnette v United States of America [2003] EWCA Civ 392	18.88
Barros Mattos Junior v Macdaniels Ltd [2005] ILPr 45	5.155, 11.20, 17.216
BAS Capital Funding Corp v Medfinco Ltd [2003] EWHC 1798 (Ch)	2.230
Base Metal Trading Ltd v Shamurin [2005] 1 WLR 1157 (CA)	4.43, 4.51
Bateman v Service (1881) 6 App Cas 386 (PC).	3.28, 3.30
Batsone & Firminger Ltd v Nasima Enterprises (Nigeria) Ltd [1996] CLC 1902	9.70
Baturina v Chistyakov [2014] EWCA Civ 1134; [2013] EWHC 3537 (Comm).	13.10, 13.33, 13.47, 20.80, 20.83
Beals v Saldhana [2003] 3 SCR 416 (Sup Ct Canada).	18.25, 18.53
Beatty v Beatty [1924] 1 KB 807	20.39
Beck v Value Capital Ltd (No 2) [1975] 1 WLR 6.	8.43
Behbehani v Salem [1989] 1 WLR 723.	17.43
Beirut-Racy v Hawila [2004] EWCA Civ 209	13.02, 13.49, 13.65, 14.10, 14.11, 14.12, 14.14, 14.16, 14.17, 14.18, 14.19
Bekhor Ltd v Bilton [1981] QB 923	17.12
Belhaj v Straw [2013] EWHC 4111 (QB)	20.117, 20.120
Bell & Co v Antwerp London and Brazil Line [1891] 1 QB 103	9.57
Belletti v Morici [2009] EWHC 2316 (Comm)	17.241, 17.242, 17.247, 17.248

Benincasa v Dentalkir Srl, Case C-269/95 [1997] ECR I-3767	2.75, 2.91, 2.107, 2.113, 8.18
Bentinck v Bentinck [2007] EWCA Civ 175	8.59
Berchtold, Re [1923] 1 Ch 192	5.133
Berezovsky v Abramovich (Rev 1) [2012] EWHC 2463 (Comm).	7.43, 13.81, 19.10
Berezovsky v Michaels [2000] 1 WLR 1004 (HL)	13.01, 13.10, 13.11, 13.20
Bergen, The [1997] 2 Lloyd's Rep 710.	13.51
Berkeley Administration Inc v McClelland [1995] ILPr 201	11.59, 18.81, 18.97
Berliner Verkehrsbetriebe (BVG) v JP Morgan Chase Bank NA [2011] All ER (D) 192 (May)	7.40
Berliner Verkehrsbetriebe (BVG), Anstalt des Öffentlichen Rechts v JP Morgan Chase Bank NA, C-144/10 [2011] 1 WLR 2087	2.208, 3.27, 3.29
Besix SA v WABAG, Case C-256/00 [2002] ECR I-1699.	8.25, 9.48
Besix SA v Wasserreinigungsbau Kretzschmar GmbH & Co KG [2003] 1 WLR 1113	9.46
Beximco Pharmaceuticals Ltd v Shamil Bank of Bahrain EC [2004] EWCA Civ 19	5.29, 5.30, 5.61
Bigio v Coca Cola Company 448 F3d 176 (2d Cir 2006).	13.03
Binder v Alachouzos [1972] 2 QB 151	3.64
Black-Clawson International Ltd v Papierwerke Waldhof-Aschaffenburg AG [1981] 2 Lloyd's Rep 446	5.56
Blanckaert & Willems v Trost, Case 139/80 [1981] ECR 819	9.24, 9.34
Blathwayt v Baron Cawley [1976] AC 397	4.37
Blight v Brewster [2012] EWHC 56 (Ch).	17.236
Blue Nile Shipping Co Ltd v Iguana Shipping & Finance Inc [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 13	11.47
Blue Sky One Ltd v Mahan Air [2010] EWHC 631 (Comm).	5.01, 5.137, 5.138, 5.150, 5.151, 5.152, 5.153, 5.164, 5.165, 5.166, 5.167, 5.169, 20.20, 20.48, 20.49, 20.50
Blue Tropic Limited v Chkhartishvili [2014] EWHC 2243 (Ch)	12.78, 12.79
BMG Trading Ltd v A S McKay Ltd [1998] ILPr 691	13.46, 13.52, 13.90
BNP Paribas SA v Anchorage Capital Europe LLP [2013] EWHC 3073 (Comm)	2.17, 2.61, 2.64, 2.66, 2.67, 16.52
Bodley Head Ltd v Flegon [1972] 1 WLR 680	3.32
Boissevain v Weil [1949] 1 KB 482, aff'd, [1950] AC 327.	4.20
Bols Distilleries v Superior Yacht Services (Gibraltar) [2006] UKPC 45.	2.106
Bols Distilleries v Superior Yacht Services [2007] 1 WLR 12	2.82, 2.89, 2.90, 8.71
Bonacina, Re [1912] 2 Ch 394	3.53
Booker v Bell [1989] 1 Lloyd's Rep 516.	15.45
Booth v Phillips [2004] EWHC 1437 (Comm)	9.70
Boss Group Ltd v Boss France SA [1996] All ER 970 (HL).	8.80, 9.44
Boss Group Ltd v Boss France SA [1997] 1 WLR 351 (CA)	9.43, 11.23, 15.45, 15.57, 15.64
Bouygues Offshore SA v Caspian Shipping Co [1998] 2 Lloyd's Rep 461	13.67
Boys v Chaplin [1971] AC 356	6.40
BP Exploration Ltd v Hunt [1976] 1 WLR 788	9.60
BP Exploration Ltd v Hunt [1980] 1 NSWLR 496.	20.118
BP plc v AON Ltd [2005] EWHC 2554 (Comm).	2.227, 2.240, 2.241, 2.243, 2.245, 2.246
BP plc v National Union Fire Insurance Co [2004] EWHC 1132 (Comm)	2.223, 2.229, 2.241, 2.245, 2.246, 2.247
Brabo, The [1949] AC 326	9.101
Bradford & Bingley Building Society v Seddon [1999] 1 WLR 1482	15.36
Brailey v Rhodesia Consolidated Ltd [1910] 2 Ch D 95	20.15, 20.18
Brandsma qq v Hansa Chemie AG (16 May 1997) (RvdW 1997, 126C) (Supreme Ct, Netherlands)	5.173, 5.186, 5.187
Brannigan v Davison [1997] AC 238 (PC).	19.43
Breams Trustees Ltd v Upstream Downstream Simulation Services [2004] EWHC 211 (Ch).	2.247
Breen v Breen [1964] P 144	20.46
Bremer v Freeman (1857) 10 Moo PC 306	20.39, 20.56
Brinkibon Ltd v Stahag Stahl GmbH [1983] 2 AC 34	9.60
Bristow v Sequeville (1850) 5 Exch 275	20.17
Bristow Helicopters Ltd v Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation [2004] EWHC 401 (Comm).	15.78

British Aerospace plc v Dee Howard Co [1993] 1 Lloyd's Rep 368	1.66, 2.63, 2.64, 2.66, 2.225, 2.227, 2.228, 2.230, 2.235, 2.241, 2.245
British Airways Board v Laker Airways [1985] AC 58 (HL)	16.60, 16.87, 16.104
British Arab Commercial Bank plc v Bank of Communications [2011] EWHC 281 (Comm)	5.107, 5.113, 5.114, 5.115, 5.117
Brodin v Seljan, 1973 SLT 198	6.99
Brogstetter v Fabrication de Montres Normandes EURL, Case C-548/12 [2014] EUECJ C-548/12 (judgment 13 March 2014)	9.77, 9.78, 9.79, 9.81
Brown v Stott [2003] 1 AC 681; [2001] 2 WLR 817	17.51
Buchanan v Rucker (1808) 9 East 193	18.25
Buerger v New York Life Assurance Co (1927) 96 LJKB 930 (CA)	20.22, 20.52, 20.53
Bumper Development Corp v Commissioner of Police [1971] 1 WLR 1362 (CA)	1.36, 20.21, 20.25, 20.30, 20.39, 20.50, 20.54, 20.56, 20.65, 20.87, 20.88, 20.89, 20.90, 20.131, 20.132, 20.134, 20.136, 20.143
Burrows v Jamaica Private Power Co Ltd [2002] Lloyd's Rep IR 466	15.61
Buttes Gas v Hammer (No 3) [1982] AC 888	10.06, 10.08
C Inc plc v L [2001] CLC 1054	17.243
Cadre SA v Astra Asigurari SA [2006] 1 Lloyd's Rep 560	16.38, 16.82, 16.86, 16.89
Caledonia Subsea Ltd v Microperi Srl 2002 SLT 1022	5.37, 5.105
Callwood v Callwood [1960] AC 659 (PC)	20.39
Calzaturificio Brennero SAS v Wendel GmbH, Case 258/83 [1984] ECR 3971	17.192, 17.219
Camdex International Ltd v Bank of Zambia (No 2) [1997] CLC 714 (CA)	10.01, 10.04
Camera Care Ltd v Hasselbad AB (1986) The Times, 6 January	8.47
Camilla Cotton Co v Granadex SA [1975] 1 Lloyd's Rep 470; [1976] 2 Lloyd's Rep 10	15.54, 15.59
Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation Inc v IRC [1954] Ch 672	20.53
Cammell v Sewell (1860) 5 H & N 728	5.140, 5.146
Canada Trust Co v Stolzenberg (No 2) [2002] 1 AC 1 (HL); [1998] 1 WLR 547 (CA)	2.90, 8.68, 8.69, 8.70, 8.72, 8.73, 8.74, 8.75, 9.14, 9.90
Car Trim GmnH v KeySafety Systems Srl, C-381/08 [2010] EUECJ	9.46
Caresse Navigation Ltd v Office National De L'Electricite [2013] EWHC 3081 (Comm)	13.09, 13.102
Carl Zeiss Stiftung v Rayner & Keeler Ltd (No 2) [1967] 1 AC 853	3.28, 3.30, 15.10, 15.13, 15.15, 15.16, 15.23, 15.24
Carl Zeiss Stiftung v Rayner & Keeler Ltd (No 3) [1970] Ch 506	3.103
Cartier parfums—lunettes SAS and Axa Corporate Solutions assurances SA v Ziegler France SA, Case C-1/13 (judgment 27 February 2014) nyr	11.74
Cartwright v Cartwright and Anderson (1878) 26 WR 684	20.18
Carvill America Inc v XL Speciality Insurance Co Ltd [2005] 2 Lloyd's Rep 457 (CA)	9.103
Casey v Casey [1949] P 420	20.104
Casio Computer Co Ltd v Sayo (No 3) [2001] EWCA Civ 661	9.93
Castanho v Brown & Root [1981] AC 557	16.10
Cecil v Bayat [2010] EWHC 641 (Comm)	8.74, 9.85
CEF Holdings Ltd v Munday [2012] EWHC 1524 (QB)	17.33, 17.37, 17.39
Centro Internationale Bank AG v Morgan Grenfell Trade Finance Ltd [1997] CLC 870	11.96, 11.98
Century Credit Corp v Richard (1962) 34 DLR (2d) 291	5.148
Ceska Sporitelna AS v Gerald Feichter, C-419/11 [2013] EUECJ (judgment 14 March 2013)	8.78, 9.76
Channel Ranger, The [2013] EWHC 3081 (Comm)	2.122
Channel Tunnel Group v Balfour Beatty [1993] AC 334	16.56
Charles Duval & Co Ltd v Gans [1904] 2 KB 685 (CA)	9.57
Charterers' Mutual Assurance Assn Ltd v British and Foreign [1998] ILPr 838	11.62, 11.88
Chatenay v Brazilian Submarine Telegraph Co [1891] 1 QB 79 (CA)	3.31
Cherney v Deripaska [2009] EWCA Civ 849; [2008] EWHC 1530	8.72, 8.73, 8.74, 13.10, 13.12, 13.32, 13.81, 13.87