
DISPUTE RESOLUTION JOURNAL®

A Publication of the American Arbitration Association®-
International Centre for Dispute Resolution®

January-February 2025

Volume 78, Number 5

Editor's Note: The Disappearing Arbitral Forum

Victoria Prussen Spears

The Case of the Disappearing Arbitral Forum: The *Baker/Dynamic* Decision and What It Means for Parties That Have Designated the DIFC-LCIA as the Arbitral Administrator

Greg Waddoups, Courtney Sader, and J.P. Duffy

When a Dollar Today May Be Worth More Than Two Speculative Dollars Tomorrow: Unlocking the Value of Arbitral Awards Early Through Monetization Finance

Viren Mascarenhas and Kamel Aitelaj

U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit Resolves District Court Split on the Enforcement of Intra-EU Investment-Treaty Awards in the United States

Danielle Morris and Alex L. Young

The Journey from Judge to Neutral

Rebecca Love Kourlis

When Attorneys Abuse the Arbitration Process: What Are the Arbitrator's Options?

Dana Welch

Russia: Investment Protection and Arbitration—Part III

Volodymyr Yaremko, Vadym Miller, and Vladlena Lavrushyna

How to Avoid a Pyrrhic Victory in International Arbitration—Part IV

Timothy Cooke, Anand Tiwari, and Melissa Lim

Child Custody Mediation with Domestic Violence, Substance Abuse, and Child Abuse—Part I

Toran Hansen, Alexia Georgakopoulos, and Lizzyvette Ramos

Dispute Resolution Journal®

A Publication of the American Arbitration Association®-
International Centre for Dispute Resolution®

Volume 78, Number 5

January-February 2025

- 423 Editor's Note: The Disappearing Arbitral Forum**
Victoria Prussen Spears
- 427 The Case of the Disappearing Arbitral Forum: The Baker/Dynamic Decision and What It Means for Parties That Have Designated the DIFC-LCIA as the Arbitral Administrator**
Greg Waddoups, Courtney Sader, and J.P. Duffy
- 445 When a Dollar Today May Be Worth More Than Two Speculative Dollars Tomorrow: Unlocking the Value of Arbitral Awards Early Through Monetization Finance**
Viren Mascarenhas and Kamel Aitelaj
- 451 U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit Resolves District Court Split on the Enforcement of Intra-EU Investment-Treaty Awards in the United States**
Danielle Morris and Alex L. Young
- 457 The Journey from Judge to Neutral**
Rebecca Love Kourlis
- 465 When Attorneys Abuse the Arbitration Process: What Are the Arbitrator's Options?**
Dana Welch
- 473 Russia: Investment Protection and Arbitration—Part III**
Volodymyr Yaremko, Vadym Miller, and Vladlena Lavrushyna

481 How to Avoid a Pyrrhic Victory in International Arbitration—Part IV

Timothy Cooke, Anand Tiwari, and Melissa Lim

489 Child Custody Mediation with Domestic Violence, Substance Abuse, and Child Abuse—Part I

Toran Hansen, Alexia Georgakopoulos, and Lizzyvete Ramos

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President

Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President

Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

STACY A. ALEXEJUN

Partner

Quarles & Brady LLP

B. TED HOWES

Partner

Mayer Brown LLP

ALBERT BATES JR.

Partner

*Troutman Pepper Hamilton
Sanders LLP*

PATRICK R. KINGSLEY

Partner

*Stradley Ronon Stevens &
Young LLP*

JOHN D. BRANSON

Partner

Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP

TIMOTHY K. LEWIS

Senior Counsel

Blank Rome LLP

THEO CHENG

Arbitrator and Mediator

ADR Office of Theo Cheng LLC

GREGORY R. MEEDER

Partner

Holland & Knight LLP

WADE CORIELL

Partner

King & Spalding LLP

ELIZABETH ZAMORA MERAZ

Partner

Nixon Peabody LLP

SASHE D. DIMITROFF

Partner

Baker & Hostetler LLP

KEVIN O'GORMAN

Partner

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP

ELIZABETH A. EDMONDSON

Partner

Jenner & Block LLP

NATHAN D. O'MALLEY

Partner

Musick Peeler

DAVID E. HARRELL JR.

Partner

Locke Lord LLP

DHARSHINI PRASAD

Partner

Willkie Farr & Gallagher (UK) LLP

L ANDREW S. RICCIO

Partner

Baker & McKenzie LLP

LISA M. RICHMAN

Partner

McDermott Will & Emery LLP

CHIRAAG SHAH

Partner

Morrison & Foerster LLP

ERIC P. TUCHMANN

Chief Legal Officer

American Arbitration Association

LAURA K. VEITH

Partner

K&L Gates LLP

DANA WELCH

Arbitrator

Welch ADR

FREDA L. WOLFSON

Partner

Lowenstein Sandler LLP

LOUISE WOODS

Partner

Vinson & Elkins RLLP

DISPUTE RESOLUTION JOURNAL®

The Journal of the American Arbitration Association®-International Centre for Dispute Resolution® (AAA®-ICDR®)

ISSN 1074-8105 (print) and 25733-606X (digital).

© American Arbitration Association-International Centre for Dispute Resolution. All rights reserved under the U.S. Copyright Act. No part of this publication may be reproduced, reprinted, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including but not limited to digital, electronic, mechanical, recording, or photocopying, without prior written permission.

The Dispute Resolution Journal is © 2025 American Arbitration Association, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of the Dispute Resolution Journal may be reproduced, transmitted or otherwise distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical without written permission from the American Arbitration Association, Inc. Any reproduction, transmission or distribution of the material herein is prohibited and is in violation of US and international law. American Arbitration Association, Inc., expressly disclaims any liability in connection with the articles contained in the Dispute Resolution Journal or its contents by any third party. The views expressed by authors in these articles are not necessarily those of the American Arbitration Association, Inc. The American Arbitration Association, Inc., assumes no responsibility for the content and materials contained in these articles. The information provided in these articles do not, and is not intended to, constitute legal advice; instead, all information, content, and materials are for general informational and educational purposes only. Information in these articles may not constitute the most up-to-date legal or other information. Use of, and access to, these articles or any resources contained within the articles do not create an attorney-client relationship between the readers, authors, contributors, contributing law firms, or the American Arbitration Association, Inc. Do not consider these articles to be a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your state.

Article Submissions

Direct editorial inquiries and send materials for publication to: Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541.

Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to arbitrators and mediators, attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, corporate officers, government agencies and their counsel, senior business executives, and anyone interested in dispute resolution.

This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering dispute resolution, legal, accounting, or other professional services or advice in this publication. If dispute resolution, legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

Subscriptions

Digital and print subscriptions to the Dispute Resolution Journal are available for purchase through the AAA-ICDR's online store, <https://aaaeducation.org/bookstore>.

Reprint Permissions

Please send requests to reproduce Dispute Resolution Journal articles to the AAA-ICDR's Publications Department Elizabeth Bain, Director of Publications, at baine@adr.org.

ISSN 1074-8105 (print) and 25733-606X (digital).

The cover of this journal features the painting *Close Hauled*, a drawing by Rockwell Kent, 1930, electrotype on paper.

Publishing Staff

Director of Publications: Elizabeth Bain

Production Editor: Sharon D. Ray

Cover Design: Sharon D. Ray

Cite this publication as:

Dispute Resolution Journal® (The Journal of the American Arbitration Association®-International Centre for Dispute Resolution® (AAA®-ICDR®))

Editorial Office

American Arbitration Association

120 Broadway, Floor 21

New York, NY 10271

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to American Arbitration Association-International Centre for Dispute Resolution, 120 Broadway, 21st Floor, New York, NY 10271

To reach Customer Service:

Elizabeth Bain

Available 8:00 AM-5:00 PM Eastern Time

(401) 431-4837

baine@adr.org

U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit Resolves District Court Split on the Enforcement of Intra-EU Investment-Treaty Awards in the United States

Danielle Morris and Alex L. Young¹

In this article, the authors review a decision by a U.S. federal circuit court of appeals holding that U.S. district courts have jurisdiction to enforce arbitral awards issued in intra-EU disputes under the Energy Charter Treaty.

In a highly anticipated ruling, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled in *NextEra Energy v. Spain*² that U.S. district courts have jurisdiction to enforce arbitral awards issued in intra-EU disputes under the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT).

On its face, this ruling would appear to be a major victory for holders of intra-EU awards and pave the way for the enforcement of those awards in U.S. courts. However, as discussed below, the District of Columbia Circuit's ruling also severely limits the ability of U.S. district courts to issue anti-anti-suit injunctions to protect their own jurisdiction and, in doing so, may have actually created a significant barrier for EU investors.

¹ The authors, attorneys with Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, may be contacted at danielle.morris@wilmerhale.com and alex.young@wilmerhale.com, respectively.

² No. 23-7031, 2024 WL 3837484 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 16, 2024).

Background

The circuit court decision resolved appeals from three cases: *NextEra*,³ *9REN Holding v. Spain*,⁴ and *Blasket Renewable Investments v. Spain*.⁵ The investors (or, in *Blasket*, the investor's successor-in-interest) held ECT awards against Spain and petitioned the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to confirm their awards—with mixed results.

In *NextEra* and *Blasket*,⁶ Spain moved to dismiss the petitions for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that it possessed sovereign immunity under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA). One exception to foreign states' FSIA immunity, however—the “arbitration” exception—applies where a case is brought “either to enforce an agreement made by the foreign state with or for the benefit of a private party to submit to arbitration all or any differences which have arisen . . . or to confirm an award made pursuant to such an agreement.”⁷

Spain argued that this exception did not apply because there was no valid “agreement to arbitrate” with EU investors in the ECT, as such agreements are contrary to EU law. According to Spain, it was therefore entitled to sovereign immunity under the FSIA, and U.S. courts do not have jurisdiction to enforce the awards at issue.

As an additional defensive measure, Spain also filed its own lawsuits in the courts of the Netherlands and Luxembourg, seeking to enjoin the investors from proceeding with their petitions in the United States (an anti-suit injunction). The petitioners in each case subsequently sought anti-anti-suit injunctions from the District of Columbia District Court to stop Spain from seeking its anti-suit injunctions.

³ *NextEra Energy v. Spain*, 656 F. Supp. 3d 201 (D.D.C. 2023) (*NextEra*).

⁴ No. 19-CV-01871 (TSC), 2023 WL 2016933 (D.D.C. Feb. 15, 2023) (*9REN*).

⁵ 665 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2023) (*Blasket*).

⁶ A motion to dismiss was not at issue in *9REN*, only the petitioner's request for an anti-anti-suit injunction (which nevertheless required the court to first determine it possessed jurisdiction).

⁷ 28 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(6).

The District Court Rulings

On 15 February 2023, the District of Columbia District Court in *NextEra* and *gREN* held that it had jurisdiction under the FSIA's arbitration exception. The court held that Spain's arguments as to the validity of its agreement to arbitrate with EU investors went to the scope of the agreement, not the agreement's existence, and were therefore not jurisdictional but, rather, a question for the merits. The court thus denied Spain's motion to dismiss in *NextEra* and granted the *NextEra* and *gREN* petitioners their anti-anti-suit injunctions.

However, just six weeks later, on 29 March 2023, the District of Columbia District Court in *Blasket* reached a different result. Contrary to the *NextEra* and *gREN* court, the *Blasket* court held that the question of whether the parties were capable of entering into an agreement to arbitrate was not one of scope but, rather, went to whether there existed a valid agreement to arbitrate. The court further determined that it must decide this question, as it could not rely on the decision of an arbitral tribunal formed under the potentially invalid agreement. The court concluded that "[b]ecause the agreement to arbitrate between Spain and the Companies was invalid under EU law, there was no valid agreement to arbitrate."⁸ The court therefore granted Spain's motion and dismissed the case.

The Circuit Court Decision

Spain (in *NextEra* and *gREN*) and *Blasket* appealed these decisions to the District of Columbia Circuit, which heard the appeals for the three cases together. In its 16 August 2024 decision, the District of Columbia Circuit held that the district courts had jurisdiction to confirm the intra-EU arbitral awards under the FSIA's arbitration exception—but also held that the district court abused its discretion in issuing the anti-anti-suit injunctions in *NextEra* and *gREN*.

⁸ *Blasket*, 665 F. Supp. 3d at 11.

With respect to the jurisdictional question, the District of Columbia Circuit largely followed the reasoning laid out by the district court in *NextEra* and *9REN*. The District of Columbia Circuit explained that the question is whether such an agreement exists, not whether the dispute at issue actually falls within the scope of such an agreement (which instead goes to the enforceability of the award on the merits). Here, the appellate court determined that the ECT was unquestionably an agreement signed by Spain for the benefit of private parties and that Spain's argument that the ECT was not for the benefit of EU investors goes to the scope, not the existence, of the arbitration provision. Thus, "[w]hether the ECT applies to [a] dispute" is not "a jurisdictional question under the FSIA."⁹

Notably, while the District of Columbia Circuit stated that there are "powerful reasons to conclude that the standing offer to arbitrate contained in the ECT's arbitration provision extends to EU nationals," the court's decision did not go that far.¹⁰ The District of Columbia Circuit cautioned that its holding is only that the district courts have jurisdiction to enforce (or to decline to enforce on the merits) intra-EU arbitral awards. The District of Columbia Circuit was clear that it was taking no position on the ultimate enforceability of the awards and therefore left open the merits question of whether the ECT's arbitration provision extends to EU nationals.

In addition, despite finding that the district courts had jurisdiction under the FSIA's arbitration exception, the District of Columbia Circuit (by majority) determined that the district court in *NextEra* and *9REN* abused its discretion in issuing the anti-anti-suit injunctions. According to the appellate court, the district court did not properly consider (1) the fact that the injunctions were directed to a foreign sovereign (as opposed to a private entity), and (2) whether any domestic interests were strong enough to warrant the injunctions. The District of Columbia Circuit explained that the injunctions would impinge on the sovereignty of both the Spanish government to litigate and the Dutch and Luxembourgish courts to decide important questions

⁹ *NextEra*, 2024 WL 3837484, at *10.

¹⁰ *Id.* at *9.

of EU law and that anti-anti-suit injunctions against foreign sovereigns are nearly unprecedented. Moreover, given that the underlying disputes did not involve any U.S. parties or interests, the only domestic interest at issue was the public interest in encouraging arbitration, which the District of Columbia Circuit found insufficient to justify the injunctions.

Conclusion

For holders of intra-EU awards contemplating enforcement in the United States, the takeaways from the District of Columbia Circuit's decision are mixed.

On the one hand, the District of Columbia Circuit's holding that district courts have jurisdiction under the FSIA's arbitration exception removes one hurdle from the enforcement process. Further, while the District of Columbia Circuit did not decide the merits of Spain's intra-EU arguments, in practice, with jurisdiction established, EU state-respondents may now not have the opportunity to raise such merits arguments at all in cases involving International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) awards (such as *NextEra* and *gREN*). In such cases, the district court's role in confirming the award is "exceptionally limited," constrained to ensuring that it has subject matter and personal jurisdiction, that the award is authentic, and that its enforcement order tracks the award.¹¹ An EU state-respondent could therefore have little opportunity to assert its intra-EU arguments to avoid enforcement in those ICSID cases. (We note that in cases involving awards issued by tribunals under other rules and seated outside of the United States, such as *Blasket*, the district court's review is coextensive with the New York Convention and therefore provides EU states more room to challenge the validity of the underlying arbitration agreement as a basis for the court to refuse to confirm the award.¹²)

¹¹ *TECO Guatemala Holdings, LLC v. Republic of Guatemala*, 414 F. Supp. 3d 94, 101 (D.D.C. 2019); see also 22 U.S.C. § 1650a(a).

¹² See 9 U.S.C. § 207; United Nations Convention on the Recognition & Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958), at art. V(1)(a).

On the other hand, the District of Columbia Circuit's decision would seem to severely limit district courts' ability to protect their own jurisdiction with anti-anti-suit injunctions. The heart of the appellate court's reasoning—that anti-anti-suit injunctions enjoining foreign sovereigns raise serious comity concerns—arguably applies in every case. While the District of Columbia Circuit stated that it was not categorically foreclosing anti-anti-suit injunctions against foreign sovereigns, there may be few, if any, fact patterns that would persuade the court that such an injunction is justified under the court's guidance. As a result, while EU investors may, in theory, be able to enforce their intra-EU awards in the United States, such investors could be left largely defenseless (in the U.S. proceedings) to the EU state-respondents' anti-suit injunctions brought in EU courts.