DIAC
Delhi International Arbitration Centre

NEWSLETTER

ISSUE IV

2025- YEAR AT A GLANCE

IN THIS ISSUE:

DIAC
Delhi International Arbitration Centre

MESSAGE FROM PATRON - IN - CHIEF, DIAC

HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA

MEMBERS OF HON'BLE ARBITRATION COMMITTEE

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V. Kameswar Rao

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dinesh Mehta

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Subramonium Prasad

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sanjeev Narula

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sachin Datta

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tejas Karia

Mr. Chetan Sharma, Additional Solicitor General

Mr. Rajeeve Mehra, Sr. Advocate

Ms. Maninder Acharya, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Nakul Dewan, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Jayant Mehta, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Shashank Garg Sr. Advocate

Mr. Sandeep Garg, Coordinator

Arbitration in today's times is one of the most preferred alternate dispute resolution mechanisms available for commercial disputes. The Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC), which is located in the Delhi High Court premises, has played a pivotal role in strengthening this ecosystem by offering world-class infrastructure, trained administrative support, and streamlined procedures. DIAC has significantly contributed to the growth of arbitration in India, facilitating efficient and timely resolution of disputes. At present, DIAC is one of the busiest arbitration centres in the country, offering an easily accessible venue for disputants, arbitrators, and lawyers. DIAC offers 19 fully equipped hearing rooms with projectors, consultation rooms, and facility for video conferencing, thereby facilitating seamless hybrid hearings. It offers a diverse panel of experienced arbitrators, including eminent legal luminaries like the former Chief Justices of India, Supreme Court Judges, former High Court Chief Justices and Judges, foreign Arbitrators, Senior Advocates and experienced experts from various other fields.

As the Patron-in-Chief of this esteemed institution, I extend my whole hearted support to the Delhi International Arbitration Centre. DIAC is continuing to uphold the highest standards of integrity, efficiency, and excellence in the field of alternative dispute resolution. I commend the tireless efforts of all members associated with DIAC and look forward to witnessing its continued growth and impactful contributions to the Arbitration ecosystem.

(CHIEF JUSTICE DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA)

MESSAGE FROM CHAIRPERSON, ARBITRATION COMMITTEE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

MEMBERS OF EDITORIAL BOARD

Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Chairperson(Officiating)/Director (Academics),Delhi Judicial Academy

Mr. Sandeep Garg, Coordinator DIAC

Ms. Abhilasha Singh, Additional Coordinator DIAC

Mr. Nakul Dewan, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Jayant Mehta, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Raj Shekhar Rao, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Shashank Garg, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Amit George, Advocate

DIAC holds the status of being India's first High Court–affiliated institutional arbitration centre, and has significantly contributed towards the development of institutional arbitration by effectively strengthening and accelerating the alternate dispute resolution framework. Established in November 2009, DIAC was designed to function as an independent and transparent institution, and has actively promoted the practice of arbitration. Today, after more than a decade of service, it stands as a leading choice for parties for resolving disputes.

In this spirit of constant growth and collaboration, DIAC organized the 3rd Edition of the Delhi Arbitration Weekend (DAW) 2025 which stands as a significant miles to nein DIAC's journey. DAW 2025 brought together, leading jurists, practitioners, scholars, and institutional experts from across the world, fostering meaningful dialogue and encouraging the exchange of ideas essential to shaping a modern arbitration ecosystem. The continued success of DAW in the years 2023, 2024 and now 2025 reflects the collective vision of the Supreme Court of India, the High Court of Delhi, and DIAC in strengthening India's position as a trusted seat for both international and domestic arbitration.

As we present this edition of our newsletter, I extend my support to all stakeholders whose commitment propels these initiatives forward. DIAC remains committed to advancing and strengthening dispute resolution through institutional arbitration.

(V. KAMESWAR RAO)

DELHI ARBITRATION WEEKEND' 2025

The Delhi Arbitration Weekend (DAW) 2025, held between 18 to 21 September, was one of India's most impressive arbitration gatherings, organised by the Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC) with the support of the High Court of Delhi. The event drew more than 40 judges and delegates from over 20 jurisdictions, including senior representatives from the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC), International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA), Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC), American Arbitration Association–International Centre for Dispute Resolution (AAA-ICDR), and Delos Dispute Resolution. Their presence gave DAW 2025 a truly global character. The week began with pre-conference dialogues and practical training modules from 15 to 18 September, focusing on institutional arbitration, cross-border disputes, and skill-building. Participants received resource materials after each session. A specialised workshop on Award Writing emerged as one of the most impactful sessions, appreciated for its clarity and hands-on structure.

The Inaugural Ceremony on 18 September held at the Supreme Court's auditorium reflected on the evolution of arbitration, the growing role of AI and technology, developments in the UNCITRAL framework, and the consolidation of India's arbitration ecosystem. Speakers highlighted the way DIAC has grown into a credible institution capable of handling both domestic and international disputes. The conference's major thematic events included discussions on India's evolving Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) landscape, institutional rule developments such as the 2025 SIAC Rules, emerging global challenges in arbitration, investor–state dispute settlement, and the future of India as a preferred arbitral seat. The technology segment, particularly the sessions on AI in arbitration and AI-assisted processes, was one of the most anticipated and widely attended tracks. From 19 September onwards, the entire conference moved to DIAC's premises.

This edition introduced several new features: live transcription of sessions, an interactive digital-timeline-wall showcasing DIAC's journey, and a popular "AI vs. Arbitrator" interactive game, which allowed participants to explore how AI responds to dispute scenarios. These additions made DAW 2025 more engaging and experiential than previous editions. DAW 2025 concluded on 21 September with a cultural performance and closing addresses from senior members of the judiciary and government, emphasising independence, credibility, and technological readiness as the foundations of India's arbitration future. Overall, DAW 2025 stood out for its scale, smooth execution, and forward- looking dialogue, reaffirming India's commitment to building a strong and globally respected arbitration ecosystem.

RECENT JUDGEMENTS ON ARBITRATION
SUPREME COURT of INDIA

Gayatri Balasamy v. M/s ISG Novasoft Technologies Ltd. 2025 INSC 605

[Judicial intervention under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996]

The underlying dispute involved an employment termination, with the Arbitral Tribunal awarding ₹2 crore in compensation to the Appellant. The award was challenged under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 The Single Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Madras High Court modified the award upwards to ₹3.68crore, while the Division Bench after modified it downwards to ₹2.05 crore, demonstrating judicial variance over the quantum of compensation. The case was referred to a Constitution Bench due to a fundamental conflict in Supreme Court precedents stated in NHAI v. M. Hakeem (2021) which strictly prohibited any modification, allowing only setting aside or upholding of the award and Larsen Air Conditioning v. Union of India (2002), which took a relaxed view by permitting the modification where necessary.

The issues presented before the Hon'ble Court concerned the true contours of judicial intervention under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. Specifically, the Court was required to determine whether the statutory power to "set aside" an arbitral award necessarily subsumes a more limited authority to modify or recalibrate the awards reasoning or quantum; whether the acts of setting aside and modifying constitute conceptually and qualitatively distinct remedial functions; whether recognition of a modification power would contravene the legislative commitment to minimal curial interference embodied in Section 5; and, finally, the extent to which the doctrine of severability manifested in pro tanto invalidation may be invoked both under Section 34(2)(a)(iv) and on appellate scrutiny under Section37 of the Act. The key questions before the Supreme Court were whether the authority granted under Section 34 of the Act to "set aside" an arbitral award implicitly includes the power to alter or adjust the award's reasoning or quantum; whether the concepts of "setting aside" and "modifying" constitute distinct judicial functions; whether allowing modification would conflict with the principle of minimal judicial intervention under Section 5; and what the exact limits of partial invalidation (pro tanto severance) are under Section 34(2)(a)(iv) and for appellate courts exercising powers under Section 37 of the Act. Moreover, employing a purposive interpretative framework, the Court held that the statutory silence regarding "modification" cannot be construed as an implied prohibition. It reasoned that the expression "recourse to a court" under Section 34 of the Act inherently encompasses the power to grant lesser or ancillary reliefs that fall within the broader remedial authority to set aside an award consistent with the maxim *omne majus continet in se minus (the greater includes the lesser).* Accordingly, a limited power of modification was held to be doctrinally compatible with both the text and the structure of the Act.

Saisudhir Energy Ltd. vs. NTPC Vidyut Vyapar Nigam Ltd. 2026 SCC OnLine SC 112

The Hon'ble Apex Court held on 30.01.2026 that Section 34 does not confine courts merely to setting aside awards; it permits limited modification where warranted. Setting aside the entire award would be inefficient when only a part is flawed. The Court recognised that the power to sever invalid portions necessarily includes the power to vary or modify them, and the silence of the 1996 Act cannot be read as a prohibition on such relief.

Hindustan Construction Company Ltd.v. Bihar Rajya Pul Nirman Nigam Ltd. (2025) SCC OnLine SC 2578

[Power of High Court to Review or Recall orders preferred under section 11(6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996]

The parties entered into a works contract containing an arbitration clause (Clause 25) which designated the Managing Director of the Respondent to appoint a sole arbitrator. When the dispute arose, the MD failed to appoint an arbitrator. Petitioner filed a petition U/s 11(6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (the Act) and the Patna High Court appointed a sole arbitrator in August 2021. Both the parties participated in the arbitration for over three years and, critically, jointly sought multiple extensions of the arbitrator's mandate u/s 29A of the Act. The Respondent belatedly filed a review petition. The High Court, in its order dated 09.12.2024, dismissed the Section 11 petition, ruling that the MD's statutory ineligibility to appoint an arbitrator triggered a "negative covenant" within the contract, thereby nullifying the entire arbitration agreement. The issues presented before the Court focused on questions relating to the scope of judicial power and the validity of the arbitral framework under the Act. First, the Court determined whether the High Court possessed the jurisdiction to review or recall its earlier order issued under Section 11(6), and whether such an exercise of power was legally sustainable. Second, it examined whether a valid and subsisting arbitration agreement existed between the parties within the meaning of Section 7, and specifically whether Clause 25 of the contract fulfilled the statutory criteria necessary for constituting a binding arbitration clause. Third, the Court considered whether the joint application filed by both parties for extension of the arbitral mandateunder section 29A of the Act amounted to an express or implied waiver of their objections, within the framework of Section 4 read together with the proviso to Section 12(5) of the Act, thereby precluding subsequent challenges to the arbitrator's eligibility or the validity of the arbitration agreement itself.

The Supreme Court set aside the judgment of the Patna High Court. The Hon'ble Court rejected the High Court's "negative covenant" theory, holding that the Managing Director's statutory ineligibility under Section 12(5) of the Act affects only the mechanism of appointment and does not invalidate the arbitration agreement itself; in such circumstances, the Court's obligation under Section 11(6) of the Act is to appoint an independent and neutral substitute arbitrator to preserve the efficacy of the clause.

The Hon'ble Court affirmed that a party's active participation in the arbitral process constitutes a waiver under Section 4 (read with the proviso to Section 12(5)) of the Act, of any subsequent challenge to the arbitral tribunal's jurisdiction or to the validity of

the arbitration agreement, thereby reinforcing the principle of finality highlighted in Vidya Drolia v. High Court of Calcutta. The Court held that a High Court has no statutory authority to review or recall a final order made under Section 11(6), reiterating that the A&C Act is a self-contained code that strictly circumscribes judicial intervention. It clarified that when a court-appointed arbitrator becomes unavailable, the appropriate legal recourse is the appointment of a substitute arbitrator under Section 15(2), who must resume the proceedings from the stage previously reached, ensuring continuity and prompt adjudication.

Finally, the Court censured the conduct of the respondent State entity, emphasising that public authorities must act as "model litigants" consistent with constitutional obligations under Articles 14 and 298, and issued a cautionary note to the then Managing Director for procedural evasiveness.

Central Organisation for Railway Electrification v. ECI SPIC SMO MCML (JV) (2025) 4 SCC 641

[Striking down unilateral arbitrator appointment clauses, reinforcing equal treatment and neutrality in tribunal constitution]

The dispute centred on the validity of the arbitration mechanism stipulated in the Contract. The clause empowered the General Manager of the Railways to unilaterally prepare a panel of at least four retired railway officers. The Respondent was restricted to suggesting two names from this panel, and the General Manager would then appoint the full three-member Tribunal, including the Presiding Arbitrator, thus ensuring dominance and control over the composition by one party.

The matter was referred to the Constitution Bench due to a conflict between the established principle that an ineligible person cannot appoint an arbitrator (TRF Ltd. and Perkins Eastman). The Constitution Bench had to decide whether a party especially a State entity can unilaterally appoint a sole arbitrator or curate the panel from which the other party must choose, and whether the same is violative of Sections 12(5) and 18 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (the Act). It also considered whether the principle of equal treatment under Section 18 of the Act applies at the stage of appointing the tribunal itself. Finally, it examined whether giving one party unilateral control over the appointment mechanism amounts to arbitrariness and thus violates Article 14 of the Constitution.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court, by a majority, delivered the judgment and affirmed that the principle of equal treatment of parties (Section 18) is a mandatory, non-derogable provision that applies at all stages of the arbitration proceedings, including the initial stage of constituting the Arbitral Tribunal. A person or authority who is rendered ineligible to act as an arbitrator under Section 12(5) (read with the Seventh Schedule) of the Act cannot, by application of the legal maxim *qui facit per aliumfacit per se* (he who acts through another acts himself), nominate, appoint, or curate a panel of arbitrators. Arbitration clauses granting one party the unilateral power to curate a panel from which the other party's choice is restricted are void as they violate both Section 18 and the mandatory principles of impartiality under Section 12 of the Act.

iThe 2020 CORE judgment was consequently overruled. Such unilateral appointment clauses in public contracts are also violative of Article 14 of the Constitution, as they embody a fundamental lack of fairness and equality in the contractual dispute resolution mechanism used by the State. The matter was remitted for the appointment of a neutral Arbitral Tribunal in accordance with the principles laid down. The operative effect of the judgment is to nullify all arbitration clauses that confer a unilateral right upon one party to dictate or restrict the choice of the Arbitrator/Panel. In the absence of a mutual agreement, the power to appoint the Tribunal is transferred to the High Court under Section 11 of the Act.

Lancor Holdings Ltd. v. Prem Kumar Menon (2025) SCC OnLine SC 2319

[Invoking Article 142 to cure an unworkable, delayed award and finally resolving a 16-year arbitration dispute]

In 2004, the developer and the landowners entered into a Joint Development Agreement, which involved a 50:50 sharing of land and constructed area along with refundable deposits. The developer claimed that the project was completed in 2008, but the landowners disputed this, especially after Lancor executed five sale deeds in its own favour using an escrowed photocopy of a power of attorney. The dispute was pending for adjudication by an arbitrator. The arbitrator had reserved the award on 28.07.2012 but pronounced it on 16.03.2016 i.e., three years and eight months later. Even after the delay monetary claims remained unresolved.

The award was challenged on various grounds including the ground of delay in making the award and that there were unadjudicated claims in the matter.

The challenge to the award reached the Supreme Court. The issue before the Supreme Court was to determine whether delay, by itself, or prejudice cause due to such delay can lead to setting aside of the award . Additionally, the Supreme Court had to determine whether an award that fails to conclusively resolve disputes and creates an unworkable outcome warrants judicial intervention under Article 142 of the Constitution or not. The Supreme Court held that the delay in the case materially affected fairness and that the arbitrator had failed to decide the issues pertaining to compensation. Therefore, the Supreme Court held that the award was unjust and unworkable. The Supreme Court also noted that the dispute was more than 16 years old. Since the award left the dispute unresolved with respect to the monetary claims it was a case of demonstrable prejudice or flawed reasoning that may vitiate the award. The Supreme Court held that an arbitrator is required to render a final adjudication of all disputes. Relying on Gayatri Balasamy v. ISG Novasoft Technologies Limited the Supreme Court held that Article 142 of the Constitution can be used when it is necessary to bring litigation to an end. Article 142 of the Constitution of India, 1950 empowers the Supreme Court to pass orders necessary to do complete justice, particularly where statutory remedies are inadequate due to irreversible factual circumstances. It upheld the sale deeds, forfeited the deposits, awarded ₹10 crores to the landowners, and restored possession to ensure complete justice.

The Supreme Court further held that each case must be decided on its own facts and delay alone does not vitiate the award rendered by an arbitrator. It is pertinent to mention that prior to the amendment of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (the Act), there was no statutory timeline was prescribed to render an arbitral award in domestic matters. Post the inclusion of Section 29-A of the Act, the timelines for rendering awards are fixed and the arbitrating parties are unlikely to face such an unexplained delay.

DELHI HIGH COURT

Kal Airways (P) Ltd. v. Spicejet Ltd. 2025/DHC/4230

[Delhi High Court dismisses Maran/KAL's Section 37 appeals for deliberate delay and concealment, terming it an abuse of process in a time-sensitive arbitration regime]

The dispute stemmed from the 2018 arbitral award rendered by three retired Supreme Court judges between Maran/KAL Airways and SpiceJet/Ajay Singh. After the Single Judge dismissed all Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (the Act) petitions on 31 July 2023, SpiceJet and Ajay Singh filed appeals under Section 37of the Act appeals within time. Maran/KAL filed their appeals 55 days late and left them under defects for 226 days, never serving them upon the respondents and never disclosing their pendency, even while fully participating in SpiceJet's appeals. Only after the Division Bench allowed SpiceJet's appeals and the SLPs on those appeals were dismissed did they hurriedly cure defects and seek condonation.

The Court dismissing the appeals as time-barred, held that leniency in refiling applies only when litigants act bona fide. Here, the apellants deliberately concealed their appeals from the respondents, the Division Bench, and even the Supreme Court, admitting that they refiled only after adverse orders. The court said that in commercial and arbitration cases, speed is important and delays should be treated strictly.

The court had to examine whether such delayed filing and prolonged defective refiling coupled with conscious oncealment of the appeals deserved condonation under Section 37's strict limitation scheme. Consequently, their appeals were dismissed outright. The Division Bench refused to condone Maran/KAL Airways' delay, holding that their 55-day late filing and 226-day defective refiling were deliberate and strategically concealed. Their conduct showed no bona fides and violated the strict timelines prescribed under Section 37 of the Act. Consequently, their appeals were dismissed outright. The Court found the conduct to be riddled with intentional "fence sitting" abuse of process, and procedural manipulation. Since the delay was deliberate and lacked bona fides, condonation of both the 55-day filing delay and the 226- day refiling delay was refused.

The appeals were dismissed without considering the merits. The Delhi High Court's ruling was later challenged before the Supreme Court, which affirmed the High Court's decision and dismissed the special leave petitions filed by KAL Airways and Kalanithi Maran on 23 July 2025.

The Supreme Court's refusal to interfere reinforced the principle that arbitration-related timelines are to be enforced strictly, and that litigants who engage in calculated delay or concealment cannot seek equitable indulgence from the Court.

Engineering Projects (India) Ltd. v. MSA Global LLC 2025 SCC OnLine Del 5072

[Delhi High Court halts ICC arbitration over undisclosed conflict, citing vexatious conduct and protecting the right to an impartial tribunal]

Engineering Projects (India) Ltd., a public sector undertaking, entered into a sub-contract dated 21.09.2015 with MSA Global LLC (Oman) for border security systems on the Oman-Yemen border. Article 19 of the contract provided that the New Delhi Courts will have exclusive jurisdiction but any reference to arbitration would be under ICC Rules, 2021 and the seat of the arbitration would be Singapore. A dispute arose over delays and the MSA Global LLC (Oman) invoked ICC arbitration, nominating Mr. Andre Yeap SC who declared "Nothing to disclose" (20.04.2023). Accordingly, the tribunal was constituted on 05.09.2023 with three arbitrators. The plaintiff later discovered Yeap's prior involvement with MSA Global LLC (Oman)'s MD, (Gujarat HC judgment, 05.07.2024). ICC rejected the challenge calling non-disclosure "regrettable" but immaterial. Thereafter, the Plaintiff filed a suit in the Delhi High Court seeking anti-arbitration injunction alleging vexatious proceedings.The Court held that the suit was maintainable under Section 9 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 despite Singapore being the seat for arbitration, as Civil Courts retain jurisdiction for vexatious/oppressive foreign arbitrations violating public policy/natural justice. The Delhi High Court distinguished the present case from ordinary arbitration suits, emphasizing that Sections 5 and 45 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 do not oust the jurisdiction of Civil Courts under exceptional circumstances where the arbitration proceedings are vexatious or oppressive.The Court held that Mr. Andre Yeap SC's non-disclosure was material under Article 11(2) of the ICC Rules, which requires disclosure of any circumstances likely to give rise to justifiable doubts about an arbitrator's independence or impartiality, going beyond the narrower IBA Guidelines. It found that the ICC Court had erred in assessing the non-disclosure retrospectively, and reaffirmed that proper disclosure confers a fundamental right on the affected party to challenge the arbitrator.

The Court further found a pattern of vexatious and abusive conduct by the defendant, including procedural manipulation, misrepresentations before the tribunal and parallel proceedings to undermine judicial scrutiny. Having found a *prima facie* case, balance of convenience, and irreparable harm, the Court granted an interim injunction restraining ICC Arbitration No. 27726/HTG/YMK in its present constitution as vexatious and contrary to Indian public policy.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION-INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION LAUNCHES AI-NATIVE ARBITRATOR FOR CONSTRUCTION DISPUTES

The AAA-ICDR has unveiled an "AI-native arbitrator" designed to decide document-only, low-value construction disputes, becoming the first major arbitral body to formally embed AI into the adjudicatory process. Supporters argue that this innovation will reduce costs, accelerate dispute resolution, and make arbitration more accessible. Skeptics, however, caution that it raises deep concerns—ranging from opacity and the risk of incorrect outcomes to unresolved questions of accountability, and the broader threat of undermining fairness and human judgment if AI is relied on without sufficient safeguards.

DEUTSCHE BANK CHALLENGES RUSSIA'S "LUGOVOY LAW" AT CONSTITUTIONAL COURT

Deutsche Bank has brought a constitutional challenge in Russia to the Lugovoy Law, which empowers Russian courts to grant anti-arbitration injunctions. The bank contends that the law unfairly targets foreign investors and restricts their ability to pursue arbitration, thereby weakening the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards.

GOLD RESERVE WINS $29 MILLION ICC AWARD AGAINST VENEZUELAN STATE BANK

Gold Reserve has secured a US$29 million ICC arbitral award against a Venezuelan state development bank, strengthening its leverage in pursuing a far larger investment-treaty claim against Venezuela. The ruling could ease enforcement of the broader award and offer renewed prospects of recovering funds that have been locked up in prolonged arbitration.

CHINESE COAL MINER THREATENS ARBITRATION AGAINST KENYA OVER STALLED $30-BILLION MINING PROJECT

A Chinese state-controlled mining firm has threatened to initiate arbitration proceedings against Kenya, claiming the Kenyan government has stalled or blocked a major coal-mining project valued at around US $30 billion. This foreshadows a potential investor-state dispute which highlights the risks sovereign states face from large foreign investments when project execution gets delayed or disrupted.

LONDON COURT REFUSES TO BLOCK MOSCOW-BASED MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE DESPITE ARBITRATION ARGUMENTS

The London Commercial Court declined to block foreclosure proceedings initiated in Moscow by Italy's UniCredit, dismissing the borrower's claim that the dispute had to be resolved through arbitration under the Vienna International Arbitral Centre rules. The decision highlights a cautious approach by English courts toward intervening in foreign enforcement actions, even where arbitration clauses exist, and underscores the practical limits of cross-border arbitration protection.

AAA's 2025 EMPLOYMENT RULES CHANGE: INCREASED COSTS AND REDUCED FLEXIBILITY FOR BUSINESSES

Effective May 1, 2025, the AAA's updated Employment Arbitration Rules shift most administrative costs to employers in disputes with solo independent contractors and discourage dispositive motions, making AAA arbitration less attractive for businesses.

EVENTS/ VISITS

VISIT OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATOR JOE TIRADO ON NOVEMBER 4, 2025

International arbitrator Joe Tirado visited the Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC) on 4 November 2025. A globally renowned practitioner with decades of experience in cross-border dispute resolution, Mr. Tirado engaged with the DIAC Secretariat and appreciated the Centre's modern infrastructure and institutional practices. His visit reflects DIAC's growing international recognition and its commitment to fostering global arbitration dialogue and collaboration.

VISIT OF DELEGATES OF STANDING INTERNATIONAL FORUM OF COMMERCIAL COURTS (SIFOCC) ON NOVEMBER 10, 2025

A delegation from the Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts (SIFoCC) visited DIAC on 10 November 2025. They were briefed on DIAC's evolution, institutional framework, and digital case management, followed by a tour of its facilities. Discussions focused on the interaction between commercial courts and arbitration and the importance of judicial support in enforcing awards.

VISIT OF DELEGATION OF HON'BLE JUDGES OF THE GUJARAT HIGH COURT ON AUGUST 30, 2025

A delegation of Hon'ble Justices of the Gujarat High Court visited DIAC on 30.08.2025, and interacted with the Hon'ble Arbitration Committee members as well as the officers of the DIAC Secretariat. They visited the Centre and were briefed about the facilities available at the Centre.

EVENTS/ VISITS

VISIT OF DR. FRANZ D. KAPS, ARBITRATOR AND PRESIDENT OF THE INDO-GERMANY LAWYERS ASSOCIATION ON OCTOBER 30, 2025

Dr. Franz D. Kaps, Arbitrator and President of the Indo-German Lawyers Association, visited DIAC on 30 October 2025. He met the Secretariat, reviewed DIAC's institutional framework, digital systems, and facilities, and toured the hearing rooms. Dr. Kaps praised DIAC's modern arbitration setup, and both sides discussed strengthening international cooperation and future collaborative initiatives.

VISIT OF LAW STUDENTS FROM SRM UNIVERSITY ON NOVEMBER 18, 2025

On 18 November 2025, a delegation of 18 final-year students from SRM University, Sonepat, accompanied by an associate professor, visited the Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC). The students were introduced to DIAC's institutional framework, arbitration processes, and digital case management systems. They also toured the Centre's hearing rooms and facilities, gaining practical insights into modern dispute resolution mechanisms. The visit reflected DIAC's ongoing commitment to academic engagement and capacity building in arbitration.

VISIT OF CHIEF JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT OF SRI LANKA

The Hon'ble Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Sri Lanka, accompanied by nine companion Judges and coordinators from the National Judicial Academy, visited DIAC on 12 December 2025. During their visit, they interacted with the officers of the DIAC Secretariat and were briefed on the DIAC Rules, institutional infrastructure, case statistics, and various operational features of the Centre. The delegation also inspected the facilities and engaged with key stakeholders, gaining a comprehensive overview of DIAC's functioning and its role in strengthening arbitration in India.