

Global Arbitration Review

The Guide to Advocacy

General Editors

Stephen Jagusch QC and Philippe Pinsolle

Associate Editor

Alexander G Leventhal

Fourth Edition

The Guide to Advocacy

Fourth Edition

General Editors

Stephen Jagusch QC and Philippe Pinsolle

Associate Editor

Alexander G Leventhal

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd

This article was first published in September 2019

For further information please contact Natalie.Clarke@lbresearch.com



Publisher

David Samuels

Business Development Manager

Bevan Woodhouse

Editorial Coordinator

Hannah Higgins

Head of Production

Adam Myers

Deputy Head of Production

Simon Busby

Copy-editor

Caroline Fewkes

Proofreader

Gina Mete

Published in the United Kingdom

by Law Business Research Ltd, London

Meridian House, 34-35 Farringdon Street, London, EC2A 4HL, UK

© 2019 Law Business Research Ltd

www.globalarbitrationreview.com

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients.

Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided was accurate as at August 2019, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – David.Samuels@lbresearch.com

ISBN 978-1-83862-210-7

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: 0844 2480 112

Acknowledgements

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

3 VERULAM BUILDINGS

39 ESSEX CHAMBERS

ALEXIS MOURRE

AL TAMIMI & COMPANY

ARBITRATION CHAMBERS

ARNOLD & PORTER

AUGUST DEBOUZY

BAKER MCKENZIE

BÄR & KARRER

BONELLIEREDE

BRICK COURT CHAMBERS

CABINET YVES FORTIER

CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

CMS HASCHE SIGLE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP

Acknowledgements

DECHERT LLP CHINA
DERAINS & GHARAVI
DOUG JONES AO
DR COLIN ONG LEGAL SERVICES (BRUNEI)
EDISON SPA
ESSEX COURT CHAMBERS
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND
EVOKE LEGAL DESIGN
FCDG – FERRO, CASTRO NEVES, DALTRO & GOMIDE ADVOGADOS
HABERMAN ILETT
HANOTIAU & VAN DEN BERG
HENDEL IDR
HUGHES HUBBARD & REED LLP
KALICKI ARBITRATION
KIAP ATTORNEYS AT LAW
KING & SPALDING
LALIVE (LONDON) LLP
LONDON COURT OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION
MICHAEL HWANG CHAMBERS LLC
MORRILADR
OBEID LAW FIRM
ONE ESSEX COURT
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP

Acknowledgements

ROBERT H SMIT
SCHWARTZ ARBITRATION
SHARDUL AMARCHAND MANGALDAS & CO
SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
STANIMIR A ALEXANDROV PLLC
TEMPLARS
THREE CROWNS LLP
TWENTY ESSEX CHAMBERS
VANCOUVER ARBITRATION CHAMBERS
VIEIRA DE ALMEIDA
VON SEGESSER LAW OFFICES
WHITE & CASE
WILLIAM LAURENCE CRAIG
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
WONGPARTNERSHIP LLP
ZULFICAR & PARTNERS LAW FIRM

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| <i>Stephen Jagusch QC, Philippe Pinsolle and Alexander G Leventhal</i> | |
| 1 Case Strategy and Preparation for Effective Advocacy | 3 |
| <i>Colin Ong QC</i> | |
| 2 Written Advocacy | 20 |
| <i>Thomas K Sprange QC</i> | |
| 3 The Initial Hearing | 37 |
| <i>Grant Hanessian</i> | |
| 4 Opening Submissions | 51 |
| <i>Franz T Schwarz</i> | |
| 5 Direct and Re-Direct Examination..... | 69 |
| <i>Anne Véronique Schlaepfer and Vanessa Alarcón Duvanel</i> | |
| 6 Cross-Examination of Fact Witnesses: The Civil Law Perspective..... | 84 |
| <i>Philippe Pinsolle</i> | |
| 7 Cross-Examination of Fact Witnesses: The Common Law Perspective | 94 |
| <i>Stephen Jagusch QC</i> | |
| 8 Cross-Examination of Experts | 108 |
| <i>David Roney</i> | |

Contents

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 9 | The Role of the Expert in Advocacy | 127 |
| | <i>Philip Haberman</i> | |
| 10 | Advocacy and Case Management: An In-House Perspective | 140 |
| | <i>Marco Lorefice</i> | |
| 11 | Closing Arguments | 146 |
| | <i>Hilary Heilbron QC and Klaus Reichert SC</i> | |
| 12 | Tips for Second-Chairing an Oral Argument..... | 160 |
| | <i>Mallory Silberman and Timothy L Foden</i> | |
| 13 | The Effective Use of Technology in the Arbitral Hearing Room..... | 172 |
| | <i>Whitley Tiller and Timothy L Foden</i> | |
| 14 | Advocacy Against an Absent Adversary..... | 186 |
| | <i>John M Townsend and James H Boykin</i> | |
| 15 | Advocacy in Investment Treaty Arbitration..... | 197 |
| | <i>Tai-Heng Cheng and Simón Navarro González</i> | |
| 16 | Advocacy in Construction Arbitration | 207 |
| | <i>James Bremen and Elizabeth Wilson</i> | |
| 17 | Arbitration Advocacy and Criminal Matters: The Arbitration Advocate as Master of Strategy | 218 |
| | <i>Juan P Morillo, Gabriel F Soledad and Alexander G Leventhal</i> | |
| 18 | Advocacy in International Sport Arbitration..... | 233 |
| | <i>James H Carter</i> | |
| 19 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: East Meets West | 245 |
| | <i>Alvin Yeo SC and Chou Sean Yu</i> | |
| 20 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: India..... | 257 |
| | <i>Tejas Karia and Rishab Gupta</i> | |

Contents

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| 21 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: The Arab World – A Recast | 263 |
| | <i>Mohamed S Abdel Wahab</i> | |
| 22 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: Continental Europe | 282 |
| | <i>Torsten Lörcher</i> | |
| 23 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: United Kingdom | 295 |
| | <i>David Lewis QC</i> | |
| 24 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy in Latin America: Brazil | 302 |
| | <i>Karina Goldberg</i> | |
| 25 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: United States | 308 |
| | <i>Laurence Shore</i> | |
| 26 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: Russia and Eastern Europe..... | 317 |
| | <i>Anna Grishchenkova</i> | |
| Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: Africa | | |
| 27 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: English-Speaking Africa | 331 |
| | <i>Stanley U Nweke-Eze</i> | |
| 28 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: French-Speaking Africa..... | 336 |
| | <i>Wesley Pydiamah and Manuel Tomas</i> | |
| 29 | Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: Portuguese-Speaking Africa | 342 |
| | <i>Rui Andrade and Catarina Carvalho Cunha</i> | |
| | | |
| | The Contributing Authors | 349 |
| | The Contributing Arbitrators | 369 |
| | Contact Details | 389 |
| | Index..... | 397 |

Index to Arbitrators' Comments

Stanimir A Alexandrov

| | |
|--|-----|
| Closing arguments, answering the tribunal's questions | 154 |
| Cross-examination | |
| approach expert conferencing with caution | 123 |
| avoid harassing witnesses..... | 87 |
| legal experts | 115 |
| Direct examination, recommended | 72 |
| Initial hearing | |
| agreeing procedural issues in advance..... | 40 |
| backup hearing dates | 45 |
| Investment treaty arbitration, transparency is key | 203 |
| Opening submissions | |
| address weaknesses before hearing..... | 59 |
| avoid bombast | 54 |
| don't keep tribunal waiting..... | 61 |
| using PowerPoint..... | 64 |
| Re-direct examination, err on side of caution | 81 |
| Second-chairing oral argument, a smooth and efficient hearing..... | 163 |
| Written advocacy | |
| compelling narrative in requests for arbitration..... | 29 |
| explaining the respondent's motive | 31 |
| post-hearing submissions – focusing on the specifics | 32 |

Essam Al Tamimi

| | |
|--|-----|
| Arab world, embrace the differences..... | 267 |
|--|-----|

Henri Alvarez QC

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Initial hearing, general rules | 48 |
| Written advocacy, general rules..... | 24 |

David Bateson

Construction arbitration, assertive case management.....209
East meets West, traits of Asian witnesses.....253

George A Bermann

Closing arguments, map out your case for the tribunal148
Cross-examination, expert testimony can be critical126
Direct examination, invite written witness statements..... 72
Investment treaty arbitration, sovereign state as a party.....199
Role of the expert, filling gaps and winning cases129

Juliet Blanch

Closing arguments, what to address.....155
Cross-examination
 avoid over-preparing a witness.....106
 emulating an expert.....112
 good preparation takes time 98
 when a witness refuses to answer102
Initial hearing, a good investment..... 38
Opening submissions, tips for preparation..... 52
Re-direct examination, only when critical 81
Written advocacy, set out your case chronologically 22

Stephen Bond

Absent adversary, no guarantees of victory.....193
Cross-examination
 dealing with untruths 89
 differences between civil and common law 89
Role of the expert, invest in their knowledge.....128
United Kingdom, merits of memorial procedure.....297
Written advocacy
 importance of brevity 25
 using arbitration requests to seek early settlement..... 30

Stavros Brekoulakis

Absent adversary, trust the tribunal.....187
Construction arbitration, build on the evidence211
Cross-examination, map it out for the tribunal..... 86
Second-chairing oral argument, confidence in less senior counsel.....168

Charles N Brower

Case strategy, the arbitration clause..... 8
Continental Europe, extricating documents.....290
Direct examination, proper preparation of witness statements 76
Investment treaty arbitration
 catch everybody's every word204
 presence of witnesses204
Written advocacy, frame your case simply 33

Nayla Comair-Obeid

Arab world
 beware misunderstandings.....264
 detailed rules of procedure.....264

William Laurence Craig

Written advocacy, the language of contracts 23

Yves Derains

Absent adversary, the tribunal is not an opponent.....195
Continental Europe, re-direct without leading questions292
Direct examination, address embarrassing facts 74
French-speaking Africa, adapt to chair's culture337

Donald Francis Donovan

Closing arguments, closing down open points147
Cross-examination
 staying in command..... 95
 engaging with both adversary and tribunal.....100
Initial hearing, cooperate with tribunal from the outset 43
Opening submissions, using non-traditional media 66

Yves Fortier QC

Closing arguments, oral closing a rarity in international arbitration.....149
Cross-examination
 unsettling an adversary's witness.....103
 using experts against experts110
Opening submissions
 preparation without overkill 57
 targeting one arbitrator 53

Andrew Foyle

Opening submissions, use limited time effectively 60

Pierre-Yves Gunter

Closing arguments, advantages of an oral closing156

India, examples259

Jackie van Haersolte-van Hof

Cross-examination

remember the expertise of the tribunal109

spotting the tribunal's signals..... 90

United Kingdom

optimise your style299

what is normal procedure?.....301

Bernard Hanotiau

Closing arguments, post-hearing brief v. closing submission.....149

Cross-examination, traditional approach is unhelpful with legal experts115

Direct examination

expressing quantum in clear terms 75

language of arbitration 70

Initial hearing

seek extensions of time early on..... 46

beware flouting the rules 46

Opening submissions

quantum arguments also need detail..... 65

stick to the point 58

Hilary Heilbron QC

Cross-examination, common pitfalls..... 85

Re-direct examination, eliciting a favourable answer 81

Clifford J Hendel

Sport arbitration

keeping your distance236

specifics in basketball cases239

Kaj Hobér

Case strategy, convincing the tribunal..... 15

Closing arguments, getting a favourable award.....151

Ian Hunter QC

Case strategy, simply stay in control..... 11
Continental Europe, avoid open questions.....285

Michael Hwang SC

Cross-examination
 eliciting direct answers.....113
 quit while you're ahead..... 99
Re-direct examination, using re-direct for correction..... 80

Emmanuel Jacomy

East meets West, cross-examining Chinese speakers249

Doug Jones AO

Initial hearing, collaboration 44

Jean Kalicki

Cross-examination, alleging bad faith104
Opening submissions
 avoid bombast and exaggeration 54
 concise road map..... 56
 direct language 57
 speak slowly 54
 use of exhibits 64
Written advocacy, begin with your conclusion 26

Richard Kreindler

Criminal matters, addressing allegations early on228

Julian Lew QC

Case strategy, the importance of simplicity 11
Effective use of technology, demonstratives.....183
Opening submissions, overcomplication is no help to tribunal 68

Loretta Malintoppi

Investment treaty arbitration, focus on the essence of the case.....200

Mark C Morril

United States, learn to read the room313

Alexis Mourre

Case strategy, know and understand your tribunal 4

Jan Paulsson

Cross-examination

 establish the rules..... 96

 interruption is a distraction.....105

 keep objections to a minimum..... 91

Opening submissions, etiquette at hearings..... 53

Second-chairing an oral argument, how many mock arbitrators?161

Written advocacy

 characteristics of pleadings 34

 less is more, much more 21

David W Rivkin

Closing arguments, framing your case for decision-making.....148

Cross-examination, undermining an expert's credibility.....111

Initial hearing, create the right procedures..... 50

J William Rowley QC

Closing arguments, there is no substitute152

Cross-examination, defusing an expert's report..... 116-7

Direct examination, the 10-minute rule 73

Initial hearing, meeting face-to-face early on 39

Opening submissions, distilled statements delivered early 55

Written advocacy, dangers of overstatement 28

Eric Schwartz

Construction arbitration, don't plead, consult215

United States

 nothing to gain by standing up310

 use PowerPoint sparingly311

Georg von Segesser

Continental Europe

 mistakes to avoid in civil cross-examination291

 obligation to produce289

Cross-examination, technical witness conferencing.....124

Role of the expert, open discourse with tribunal.....137

Christopher Seppälä

Absent adversary, lessons to learn.....190

Robert H Smit

United States, speak with, not at, arbitrators.....312

Luke Sobota

Effective use of technology, supportive, not distracting.....173

Christopher Style QC

United Kingdom

concise written submissions296

early, comprehensive presentation.....297

Jingzhou Tao

East meets West, efficiency versus cultural sensitivity250

John M Townsend

Closing arguments

being mindful of time limits150

get the tribunal's attention153

Cross-examination, questioning the tribunal's expert121

Direct examination, know your arbitrators' backgrounds 77

Initial hearing, the chair is in control..... 41

Opening submissions

don't surrender control to PowerPoint 65

welcome tribunal questions 62

Written advocacy, convincing narrative 21

29

Cultural Considerations in Advocacy: Portuguese-Speaking Africa

Rui Andrade and Catarina Carvalho Cunha¹

In formal terms, Portuguese-speaking Africa, also known as Lusophone Africa, is made up of six countries in which Portuguese is an official language: Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, São Tomé and Príncipe, and Equatorial Guinea. The latter amended its Constitution in 2011 to include Portuguese as one of its official languages, tellingly, as part of a strategy to accede to the Lusophone Commonwealth or Community of Portuguese Language Countries, to which Brazil and Timor-Leste also belong.

Now, whereas Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and São Tomé and Príncipe were colonies of Portugal until the dissolution of its African Empire in the mid 1970s, Equatorial Guinea was claimed from Portugal by Spain in 1778 and remained part of the latter's empire until 1968. Thus, whereas the first five countries' legal regimes and advocacy culture stem from and were built upon the same backbone, this is not the case with Equatorial Guinea, whose law and regime, though also civil-law based, has significant differences. This chapter is therefore focused on those first five Portuguese-speaking African countries.

Since their independence from Portugal, Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe have developed and shaped their legal regimes, in the majority of sectors, to fit their own individual needs – quite significantly in Guinea Bissau's case since, in 1994, it acceded to the Organisation for the Harmonisation of Business Law in Africa (OHADA) Convention and adopted its Uniform Acts. Nevertheless, all these countries still incorporate as their own the 1966 Portuguese Civil Code (which is, for the most part, the same Code that is in force in Portugal to date) though with variances that have been adopted over time – mostly to do with family law – and the 1967 Portuguese Code on Civil Procedure. However, Mozambique and Cape Verde have since adopted new statutes to regulate insolvency – a field of law that was formerly provided for in

¹ Rui Andrade is a partner and Catarina Carvalho Cunha is a managing associate at Vieira de Almeida.

the Code on Civil Procedure – which they did, respectively, via Law No. 1/2013 dated 4 July 2013 and Law No. 116/VIII/2016, dated 22 March 2016, and Guinea Bissau has adopted the OHADA Uniform Acts on Insolvency, and on Simplified Recovery Procedures and Measures of Execution.

Thus, Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe all share a civil law legal system, with statutes as their primary source of law. Consequently, there is no system of precedent and case law, which are viewed as secondary sources of law, as is legal writing. Additionally, to date, none of these countries has set up case law records or databases to be available for consultation by the general public or those engaged in the legal profession, it being common for lawyers exercising law in these jurisdictions to revert to Portuguese jurisprudence as a means to sustain and uphold legal arguments in court. On the other hand, in certain areas of law, traditional customary law still has a crucial role in these countries.

Written stage of proceedings: pleadings

In Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe, civil proceedings are designed to incorporate four stages of written pleadings within specific deadlines.

To launch proceedings, the claimant must file a statement of claim (SOC)² before the court with an outline of its underlying factual and legal reasoning, the relief sought and an indication as to the claim's economic value, which must be submitted with all the necessary evidentiary documents to support it. Judicial costs (an initial fee) indexed to the claim's value must be paid when the SOC is filed.

As soon as the SOC has been filed, the court clerk verifies that all the necessary formal requirements have been met and summoning of the defendant to the proceedings follows.

Service under the law of Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe is, as a rule, carried out personally and not by post; in addition, personal service is exclusively carried out by judicial clerks or officials, that is to say the law does not allow for service to be rendered by attorneys or any other service agents. If the defendant is a company, service will be carried out before its legal representative at the company's headquarters or, if this is not possible, before any company employee.

When the defendant lives or is domiciled abroad, service is carried out in accordance with the provisions set forth in international treaties or conventions to which the relevant country is a party, or, and in the absence of any such provisions, through diplomatic means via rogatory letters. Naturally, this delays proceedings since serving parties abroad in all these jurisdictions typically takes up a great deal of time.

On this note, it is worth highlighting that although the law allows and foresees that when a defendant lives or is domiciled abroad and there is no applicable treaty or convention on the matter, he or she may be summoned to the proceedings by registered courier with acknowledgment of receipt, this never occurs in practice. This is because postal services in these countries, though they do exist, are very rudimentary. It also means that all subsequent notices to be made within proceedings are dependent on the relevant attorneys'

2 The Portuguese term is *petição inicial*.

visits to court. When proceedings are pending with courts that are a significant distance from the attorneys' or parties' offices, or both, this translates into added constraints, since parties and their attorneys are seldom contacted by the courts to arrange for transport of the relevant notices.

In its statement of defence, the defendant must offer all factual and legal grounds that make up for its defence, alongside all the evidentiary documents to support it. Counterclaims may also be filed by the defendant with its statement of defence so long as the grounds emerge from the facts and grounds of the SOC. Set-off claims are allowed so long as they are in accordance with the underlying legal requirements.

Joinder and rejoinder follow.

Pleadings are markedly formal in both style and language. Since judges are historically generalists, rather than specialists in specific areas of law – except those who preside over specialised courts, such as those set up to govern tax or maritime law issues – objective, clear-cut and succinct pleadings are advisable.

Once the written stage of proceedings is over, the judge may choose to convene a preliminary hearing with a view to reconciling the parties. If no such hearing is held, the judge then draws up a court order ruling on any pre-emptive issue of law raised by the parties in their pleadings and with a selection of facts (1) that are deemed to have already been established based on party confession or documents with full and complete evidentiary force and (2) that are still to be proven throughout the proceedings. At this stage, the presiding judge may find that he or she is already able to decide on the merits without going to trial either because the merits of the case are solely based on legal grounds or, when this is not the situation, he or she finds that the proceedings already contain all the necessary elements for a judgment to be delivered.

Courts' prerogatives

The Code on Civil Procedure in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe presents a mixed approach between the inquisitorial and adversarial systems. Thus, although the general rule is that each party must prove the facts that it claims, courts also have the duty to seek the truth, and in view of such a duty, are allowed to order that evidence be provided for this purpose *ex officio*. This means that in these jurisdictions the court may, on its own initiative, or following the request of one of the parties, request that certain information, specialist opinions, photographs, drawings, objects and any document necessary to the clarification of the truth be disclosed or brought before it. Should parties refrain from filing the requested documents, this may result in reverting to the rules on the burden of proof, or lead to the determination of fines or the court adopting coercive measures to guarantee proper filing.

The court will also decide whether to waive certain privileges, if so requested.

Court hearings and taking of evidence

The means of evidence available to counsel for parties under Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe law are evidence by party confession, documentary evidence, expert evidence, judicial inspections and witness statements. Though all these means are provided for in the law, as a general rule, parties tend to

stick to party confession, documentary evidence and witness statements. Further, although party representatives may be heard before court, their statements will only be admitted and weighed by the court to the extent that they are a confession of facts that have been claimed against them. This means that it is the counterparty who will ask that the other party's representative be heard on specific facts of which it has direct knowledge.

As to witness statements, these are, as a rule, offered in person before the court; the witnesses are generally questioned by the party that has presented them to the proceedings and then cross-examined by the counterparty's counsel. The presiding judge will intervene and ask questions whenever it is deemed fitting to do so – it is not unheard of for a judge to conduct all the questioning, leaving small requests for clarification to the parties' counsel.

Witness preparation is not just highly controversial, it is actually forbidden by most of statutes of the relevant bar associations. This does not mean that witnesses will not be approached by counsel prior to hearings (as a means of forestalling surprises), yet it must be carried out with utmost circumspection. Written statements are only allowed when the conditions for pretrial testimonies are met or when the witnesses live outside the district where the hearing is to take place. Those people who carry out public authority roles may be heard by the court at their own homes or place of work.

When pondering and weighing evidence, courts in these jurisdictions tend to focus more on the documentary evidence brought before them than on witness statements.

Further, there is no real-time transcription of witness statements nor are they generally recorded although the law foresees that parties may request that testimonies are recorded provided the court is appropriately equipped or parties bring their own equipment to court.

There is also still a level of bias (which varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction) towards domestic parties that cannot be overridden when advocating in these jurisdictions.

Closing arguments and final judgments

Closing legal arguments are typically rendered in writing. The judgment is then rendered by the judge. Now, whereas the judicial systems in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe have become increasingly reliant over time, they are also all exceedingly slow. Typically, it takes about five years for cases to be ruled on in the first instance and it is not impossible for cases to drag on for 10 years with appeals. These circumstances need to be amply discussed by attorneys and their clients when seeking to have disputes solved within the civil courts in these Portuguese-speaking African countries.

Generally, there are two levels of appeals available to parties, although in some cases, and subsequent to a given set of specific and limited prerequisites, it is further possible to launch appeals before the Constitutional Court.

Interim relief

To ensure the outcome of the proceedings when the effectiveness of a possible favourable ruling is at risk, an applicant may request the adoption of interim remedies. These measures may be requested before or after the main claim has been filed and will lead to independent and separate proceedings with a separate court order.

In general, when requesting interim measures, the applicant must demonstrate that the following requirements have been met: (1) *fumus boni iuris* – prima facie case, the applicant has a justifiable claim on the merits against the respondent; (2) *periculum in mora* – there are circumstances giving rise to the urgency of safeguarding the applicant's purported entitlement; and (3) the damage the applicant intends to avoid must not exceed the damage caused by the interim measure, if granted, to the counterparty.

As to the measures that may be requested, the law provides for an range of specified (such as provisional alimony, restitution of possession, lien on assets and preventive arrest) and unspecified measures.

Arbitration as a valid alternative dispute resolution mechanism

For a long time, arbitration was almost non-existent in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe. Although its legal provision dates back to the Portuguese 1876 Code on Civil Procedure, this alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanism was then subject to the control of state courts, the same solution having been adopted in the subsequent 1939 and 1961 versions of this statute, rendering it void of use.

However, the truth is that these countries have progressively become aware that commercial and investment arbitration has a key role in contributing to their economic development. Consequently, they have all devised and enacted their own statutes to govern this vital alternative dispute resolution mechanism:

- Angola enacted the Voluntary Arbitration Law – Law No. 16/03, dated 25 July – in 2003, which governs both domestic and international arbitration.
- Cape Verde's primary source of law relating to arbitration is the Law on Arbitration, Law No. 76/VI/2005 of 16 August, which also governs both domestic and international arbitration.
- In Guinea Bissau, although arbitration is foreseen in the country by Law No. 19/2010, dated 8 October, as an OHADA Member State, it is the OHADA Uniform Act on Arbitration, enacted on 11 March 1999, that applies to both domestic and international arbitrations when the seat of arbitration is in Guinea-Bissau.
- In Mozambique, the Law on Arbitration, Conciliation and Mediation, Law No. 11/99, dated 8 July, applies.
- In São Tomé and Príncipe, the matter is governed by Law No. 9/2006 of 2 November.

Further to this, the five countries have also established arbitration as an alternative to state courts transversely, it now being common to see this ADR mechanism provided for in the countries' private investment laws, laws regulating labour and public policy and those governing and regulating the energy and oil and gas sectors.

Another indication of these countries' growing and enhanced openness to arbitration is the fact that most of them – though only in the last decade in most cases – have acceded to the 1958 Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards: Angola in 2017, Cape Verde in 2018, Mozambique in 1998, and São Tomé and Príncipe,

2012,³ though in case of the latter, despite its instrument of accession being deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 November 2012, the Convention is not yet in force in the country. Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe are also all Member States of the 1965 Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of other States;⁴ however, it is not yet in force in Guinea-Bissau.

Considering all this, aligned with the time taken for proceedings to be ruled on by the courts of Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique or São Tomé and Príncipe, the level of bias that parties will still encounter when litigating against local entities or parties, and the lack of technical expertise of the more generalist judges presiding over such courts, has resulted in arbitration developing at a stout pace – most particularly during the past decade – and it is now generally and increasingly recognised by the relevant judicial courts and national authorities in these countries. As a consequence, arbitration is now the dispute resolution mechanism that is most often provided and resorted to in commercial agreements entered into by foreign companies and entities that have projects in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe, all of which have begun to set up a number of arbitration institutions in their territories.

So how do national courts deal with court proceedings that are instituted despite an existing arbitration agreement? An agreement to arbitrate implies a waiver by the parties to initiate state court action on the matters or disputes submitted to arbitration. As a result, in all the jurisdictions to which our discussion relates, once the parties have agreed to resort to arbitration to solve their underlying disputes, the intervention of the judicial court will be limited to those instances set forth in the relevant arbitration acts of each country. Consequently, should proceedings be filed with a judicial court in any of these countries, the relevant arbitration agreement may be relied upon by the defendant summoned to proceedings to have them dismissed, the court being prevented from ruling on the case's merits.

However, it must be said that given the way the subject matter is still dealt with within the Code on Civil Procedure, the court will not address this matter *ex officio*, and the interested party will have to make a plea in its statement of defence.

Further, according to the governing law in these countries, actions concerning the validity of an arbitration agreement (i.e., not involving a dispute covered by the arbitration agreement) that are filed with a judicial court after the arbitral tribunal is constituted will not be admissible, as per the principle of 'competence-negative effect of competence'.

This said, when deciding the seat for the arbitration, practice shows that when possible – and it is not always possible given the specific limitations provided for in local law intended to safeguard certain economic sectors deemed to be vital to the underlying economies – parties will almost always avoid opting for Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique or São Tomé and Príncipe, but instead will choose a neutral and more arbitration-friendly jurisdiction. Although this avoids having to interact with national

3 For a list of contracting states, see www.newyorkconvention.org/countries.

4 For a list of states that have signed the ICSID Convention, see <https://icsid.worldbank.org/en/Documents/icsiddocs/List%20of%20Contracting%20States%20and%20Other%20Signatories%20of%20the%20Convention%20-%20Latest.pdf>.

courts when their assistance proves necessary or launching set-aside proceedings with these same courts, whose experience in dealing with arbitration is still undeniably limited, it still does not avoid having to institute recognition proceedings prior to enforcement therewith when a party is a national of one of these countries or has assets located therein.

The down side of parties avoiding seating their arbitrations in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique or São Tomé and Príncipe is that it precludes the national courts and practitioners from dealing with arbitration more regularly. However, it is hoped that the growing use of domestic arbitration, and of the arbitral institutions that each country has been setting up, will balance this out.

Appendix 1

The Contributing Authors

Rui Andrade

Vieira de Almeida

Rui Andrade is a partner in the litigation and arbitration practice. He has extensive experience in coordinating matters of litigation, arbitration and labour in Angola, Mozambique, East Timor, Equatorial Guinea, São Tomé and Príncipe, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde, representing and advising the most relevant national and international companies, including oil industry corporations.

He has a law degree from the University of Lisbon, Faculty of Law, and is a postgraduate in community law from the Catholic University of Louvain, Faculty of Law, Belgium.

Catarina Carvalho Cunha

Vieira de Almeida

Catarina Carvalho Cunha is a managing associate with the firm's litigation and arbitration practice. Her work involves advising clients on matters linked with civil and commercial litigation, international and national commercial arbitration, and insolvency and restructuring.

Catarina has been actively involved in sponsoring clients in several commercial and civil judicial and arbitral suits pending in Portugal, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Equatorial Guinea, Cape Verde and East Timor.

She has advised several clients in sectors such as oil and gas, shipping, aviation, hotel management and telecommunications.

Catarina holds a degree in law from the Portuguese Catholic University of Lisbon, Faculty of Law, and has attended a postgraduate course on energy law administered by the same faculty.

Vieira de Almeida

Rua Dom Luís I, 28

1200-151 Lisbon

Portugal

Tel: +351 21 311 3488

Fax: +351 21 311 3406

rsa@vda.pt

acc@vda.pt

www.vda.pt

Successful advocacy is always a challenge. Throw in different languages, a matrix of (exotic) laws and differing cultural backgrounds as well and you have advocacy in international arbitration.

Global Arbitration Review's *Guide to Advocacy* is for lawyers who wish to transcend these obstacles and be as effective in the international sphere as they are used to being elsewhere. Aimed at practitioners of all backgrounds and at all levels of experience, this Guide covers everything from case strategy to the hard skills of written advocacy and cross-examination, and much more. It also contains the wit and wisdom on advocacy of more than 40 practising arbitrators, including some of the world's biggest names in this field.

Visit globalarbitrationreview.com
Follow @garalerts on Twitter
Find us on LinkedIn

ISBN 978-1-83862-210-7