Luzerner Beiträge zur Rechtswissenschaft (LBR)

Herausgegeben von Jörg Schmid im Auftrag der Rechtswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Luzern

Band 32

Juan Carlos Landrove

Assignment and Arbitration

A Comparative Study

Schulthess § 2009

sellier.
european law
publishers

Table of Contents

Summary of Contents		IX	
Tal	ble of Contents	XIII	
Lis	st of Abbreviations	XIX	
Bibliography		XXV	
I.	Introduction	1	
A.	Topic's Presentation	1	
B.	Scope of the Study (Limitation of the Topic)	3	
C.	Interest of the Study	5 5	
	2. Legal Interest	6	
D.	Map of the Study	7	
	1. Comparative Method	7	
_	2. Structure of the Study	9	
	Citation Format	10	
F.	Precise Terminology	10	
II.	Legal Nature of an Arbitration Agreement	11	
A.	Substantive v. Procedural Dimension	11	
B.	Accessory v. Independent v. Integral Part (Consubstantial)		
	1. Direct Accessory	18	
	2. Double (or Mediate) Accessory	19	
	3. Integral Part	20	
	a. Link between Substantive Right and Right to Sue	20	
_	b. Link between Right to Sue and Arbitration Agreement	23	
C.	«Compound of Rights and Obligations»	26	
	Substantive Duty v. Procedural Undertaking Procedural Undertaking	27 27	
	b. Substantive Duty	28	
	2. Nemo Plus Iuris Transferre Potest Quam Ipse Habet	30	
	a. Assignee receives no cleared right	31	
	b. Principle of the objective identity of the substantive right assigned	33	
ח	Personal v. Impersonal	35	
D .	1. Intuitu Personae Inferred from the Facts	35	
	a. Potential Examples	39	
	(1) Arbitrator Named	39	
	(2) Specialised Body	41	
	(3) Pactum de Non Cedendo as a Clue	41	
	(4) Contract for Personal Services as a Clue	42	
	b. Two Plausible Examples	42	
	(1) Confidentiality Clause as a Clue	42	
	(2) Public Policy Prohibition	44	

	2 7 1 1 Pour Describe Provided for her Contract	4.4				
	Intuitu Personae Expressly Provided for by Contract Consequences of Intuitu Personae	44 45				
	Consequences of Intuitu Personae Conclusion	40				
Ш	. Severability of the Arbitration Clause	51				
A.	Relevance	51				
B.	3. Concept and Aim					
	Impact of the Principle of Severability on the Transfer of the Arbitration Clause through Assignment of Rights	54				
	Degree of Dependency of the Arbitration Clause towards	<i>J</i> -				
	the Main Contract	54				
	a. Apparent Contradiction between Dependency and Independency					
	of the Arbitration Clause	55				
	b. No Permanent Separation of the Arbitration Clause from					
	the Main Contract	56				
	2. Consent	57				
	a. Severability or Different Law Applicable to the Arbitration					
	Agreement	57				
	b. Separate Consent	58				
	(1) Connecting Factors	59				
	(a) Solidarity of the Arbitration Clause	59				
	(b) Distributiveness of the Arbitration Clause	61				
	(c) Consequence of the Connecting Factors: Permanence of the Arbitration Clause	61				
	(2) Function of Severability	62				
	(a) On the Ratione Personae Scope of the Arbitration Clause	62				
	(b) On the Survival of the Arbitration Clause	63				
	3. Kompetenz-Kompetenz	65				
n	Conclusion	65				
		0.5				
IV.	Kompetenz-Kompetenz	69				
A.	Concept and Aim	69				
	Acceptance of the Doctrine of Kompetenz-Kompetenz Among					
	the Studied Jurisdictions	70				
C	Priority: Judge or Arbitrator?	73				
С.	Chronological Priority	73				
	Qualitative Priority: Depth of the Scope of Review	75				
	a. Prima Facie Review by Courts and Arbitral Institutions	75				
	(1) Prima Facie Jurisdictional Decisions by a Court	76				
	(2) Prima Facie Jurisdictional Decisions by an Arbitral Institution	79				
	b. Full review by Courts and Arbitrators	84				
	(1) Courts	84				
	(a) Preliminary Remarks	84				
	(b) Distinction Between Positive and Negative					
	Kompetenz-Kompetenz	84				
	(2) Arbitrators	87				

Ta	Table of Contents		
	(a) Doubly Relevant Facts	87	
	(b) Multiparty Situations	89	
	(c) No Full Arbitral Kompetenz-Kompetenz	89	
	(aa) Available Remedies	90	
	(ab) Sound Practice	91	
D.	Time to Avail Oneself of the Existence of the Assignment	94	
E.	Conclusion	95	
V.	Applicable Law	97	
A.	Lack of Uniform Approach	97	
B.	Different Approaches in the Studied Jurisdictions and in Arbitral Practice	97	
C.	Potential Methods	99	
D.	Relevant Policies	99	
E.	Evaluation of the Applicable Law Approaches	100	
	1. Non-viability of the Substantive Rule Approach	101	
	2. Non-practicability of the In Favorem Validitatis Approach	103	
	a. Risk of Transfer of a Naked Arbitration Agreement	103	
	b. Risk of Violation of Party Autonomy	104	
	and the Lex Contractus	105	

	(ab) Sound Practice			
D.	Time to Avail Oneself of the Existence of the Assignment			
E.	Conclusion			
V.	Applicable Law			
	Lack of Uniform Approach			
В.	Different Approaches in the Studied Jurisdictions and in Arbitral Practice			
	Potential Methods			
	Relevant Policies			
E.	Evaluation of the Applicable Law Approaches			
	1. Non-viability of the Substantive Rule Approach			
	2. Non-practicability of the <i>In Favorem Validitatis</i> Approach			
	a. Risk of Transfer of a Naked Arbitration Agreement			
	b. Risk of Violation of Party Autonomy			
	and the Lex Contractus			
	3. Conflict-of-Laws Approaches			
	a. Lex Fori			
	b. Lex Arbitrationis (Lex Fori of the Arbitrator)			
	c. Law Applicable to the Arbitration Agreement (Lex Compromissi)			
	(1) Dépeçage and Applicable Law			
	(2) Severability of the Arbitration Agreement and Applicable Law			
	(a) Judicial Approach Where Parties Have Not Determined			
	the Law Applicable to the Arbitration Agreement			
	(b) Arbitral Approach Where Parties Have Not Determined			
	the Law Applicable to the Arbitration Agreement			
	(c) Severability does not Automatically Lead to the Application			
	of a Specific Lex Compromissi(3) Limited Potential Impact of the Lex Compromissi Through Party			
	Autonomy			
	d. Lex Contractus			
	(1) Law of the Assignment Agreement or of the Main Contract?			
	(2) Impact of Consubstantiality on the Applicable Law			
F.	Conclusion			
	.Pactum de Non Cedendo			
Α.	Concept: Resurrecting the Relevance of the Obligor's Consent			
В.	Types of Pacta de Non Cedendo			
	Reasons for the Inclusion of a Pactum de Non Cedendo			
D.	Scope of the Effects of Pacta de Non Cedendo in the Studied Jurisdictions			
	1. Level of Deference Given to Pacta de Non Cedendo			

	Effect of Pacta de Non Cedendo on the Arbitration Agreement a. Non-applicability of Severability b. Application of Consubstantiality	134 138 139				
E. Balance of interests						
F.	Sole Option of the Obligor between Litigation and Arbitration	141 141 144				
G.	Conclusion	145				
VI	I. Consent	149				
Α.	Obligor	149				
	1. No Impact of Obligor's Protection	150				
	2. No Impact of the Lex Contractus Potential Notification Requirement	151				
B.	Assignee	153				
C.	Conclusion	157				
VI	II. Privity	159				
A.	Concept	159				
B.	Exception: Right of Action without Privity	160				
C.	Applicability of Privity to Arbitration Agreements in Assignment Instances 1. Assignee of Rights: Third Party to Main Contract Between Assignor and Obligor? a. Subjective Change: Substitution of Creditors b. Objective Permanence: Identity of the Substantive Claim 2. Assignee of Rights: Third Party to Arbitration Agreement Between	161 162 163 164				
_	Assignor and Obligor?	165				
	Practical Relevance of Privity of Contract in Assignment Instances	167				
	Partial Assignment	169				
	Concept	169				
B.	Divisibility of the Right of Action	169				
	 Situation of the Assignee Situation of the Assignor 	171				
_	Active Legitimacy and Capacity to be a Party	171				
	Conclusion	174				
		175				
	Form of the Arbitration Agreement and Form of Consent	177				
	Form of the Initial Arbitration Agreement	178				
	Form of the Assignment Agreement	181				
C.	Form of the Assignee's Consent	181				
	Duty for the Assignee to Check about the Existence of an Arbitration Agreement	184 186				
	a. Human Rights' Relevance: Due Process	186				

		(1) Due Process Considerations Represent No Automatic Bar for the Application of the Assigned Arbitration Agreement	
		to the Assignee	187
		(a) The New York Convention is the Arbitration Counterpart	107
		of the Due Process Protection Contained in the European	
		Convention on Human Rights	189
		(b) Unequivocal Waiver does not Require a Signature	
		by the Assignee	190
		(c) Assignee's Inquiry Possible	191
		(2) «Availability of Public Policy Review» Test	192
		(a) Ex Aequo Et Bono	192
		(b) Exclusion Agreements	193
		(aa) Concept	193
		(ab) Due Process at Public Policy Level	195
		(ac) Exclusion Agreements in Assignment Instances	197
	b.	General Principles of Law and National Policies	199
		(1) Protection of the Obligor	199
		(2) Policy Favouring Arbitration	199
XI.	Gene	al Conclusions	201
XI	(. Sum	nary	207
A.	Intro.		207
B.	Legal	Nature of the Arbitration Agreement	207
C.	Sever	ability of the Arbitration Clause	208
D.	Komp	etenz-Kompetenz	208
E.	Appli	cable Law	209
F.	Pactu	n de Non Cedendo	210
G.	Conse	nt	210
H.	Privit	y	211
I.	Partia	l Assignment	211
J.	Form	of the Arbitration Agreement and Form of Consent	212
K.	Concl	usion	213
χī	II. Inde	ey	215