

Contact Persons:

12 NOVEMBER 2018

Lambert Rasa-Ratnam

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5859

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [lr@lh-ag.com](mailto:lr@lh-ag.com)

**BANKING & INSOLVENCY**

Kumar Kanagasingam

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5803

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [kk@lh-ag.com](mailto:kk@lh-ag.com)

Sean Yeow Huang-Meng

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5867

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [yhm@lh-ag.com](mailto:yhm@lh-ag.com)

Andrew Chiew Ean Vooi

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5852

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [ac@lh-ag.com](mailto:ac@lh-ag.com)

Mong Chung Seng

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5864

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [mcs@lh-ag.com](mailto:mcs@lh-ag.com)

Hoi Jack S'ng

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5908

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [hjs@lh-ag.com](mailto:hjs@lh-ag.com)

**CONSTRUCTION**

Dato' Nitin Nadkarni

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5866

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [nn@lh-ag.com](mailto:nn@lh-ag.com)

Darshendeve Singh

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5845

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [ds@lh-ag.com](mailto:ds@lh-ag.com)

**CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL DISPUTES**

Rosli Dahlan

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5804

Fax: +603 6201 0122

Email: [rd@lh-ag.com](mailto:rd@lh-ag.com)

G Vijay Kumar

**Partner**

DID: +603 6208 5870

**Losing Before You Begin: Imprecise Arbitration Clauses**

*Union of India v Hardy Exploration and Production (India) Inc* [2018] INSC 415

| by Abang Iwawan |

The seat of arbitration is an important consideration in arbitration proceedings, especially those involving cross-border disputes. The choice of seat determines the law governing the arbitration, the national court having supervisory jurisdiction over the arbitration, and ultimately the scope and extent of such supervisory powers.

In 2016, the Malaysian Federal Court in *Government of India v Petrocon India Ltd* held that the word “venue” used in the context of an arbitration agreement implicitly means the “seat of arbitration”.

However, in a recent case involving a similar arbitration clause, the Supreme Court of India rejected the Malaysian Federal Court’s position and made a distinction between the term “venue” and “seat” used in the context of an arbitration agreement. In *Union of India v Hardy Exploration and Production (India) Inc* (a case between a British company and the Government of India involving dispute over oil & gas exploration rights), the Supreme Court of India held that:

- (a) The “venue” of arbitration does not *ipso facto* equate the “seat” of arbitration, and these terms cannot be used interchangeably. The venue merely denotes the geographically convenient place chosen to conduct the arbitration hearings, while the seat is a juridical concept.
- (b) Consequently, although the arbitration agreement in that case expressly stipulated that the venue of arbitration shall be in Kuala Lumpur (i.e. a *neutral jurisdiction*), in the absence of an express agreement with regard to the “seat” of arbitration, and in the circumstances of the case, the seat was India, giving the Indian courts supervisory jurisdiction.

These two cases illustrate the inherent danger of imprecise language in international contracts; that ambiguous language may be interpreted

Fax: +603 6201 0122  
Email: [vkq@lh-ag.com](mailto:vkq@lh-ag.com)

SM Shanmugam  
**Partner**  
Tel: +603 6208 5865  
Fax: +603 6201 0122  
Email: [ssm@lh-ag.com](mailto:ssm@lh-ag.com)

Ang Hean Leng  
**Partner**  
Tel: +603 6208 5809  
Fax: +603 6201 0122  
Email: [ahl@lh-ag.com](mailto:ahl@lh-ag.com)

Ho Ai Ting  
**Partner**  
Tel: +603 6208 5907  
Fax: +603 6201 0122  
Email: [hat@lh-ag.com](mailto:hat@lh-ag.com)

differently in different jurisdictions, with unanticipated consequences. Parties are therefore reminded to be careful when drafting arbitration clauses in an international contract, as the use of the wrong expression (such as the use of the word “venue” when intending “seat”) may not have the intended result. For example, a Malaysian party which sought an advantage by stipulating Kuala Lumpur as the *venue* of the arbitration, may find that in fact the *seat* is a different jurisdiction which provides a “home court” advantage to the adverse party.

The Indian Supreme Court decision may be viewed [here](#).

The Malaysian Federal Court decision may be viewed [here](#).

**Abang Iwawan** ([ami@lh-ag.com](mailto:ami@lh-ag.com))

If you have any queries or would like to know more about arbitration, please contact the author or his team partner [Dato' Nitin Nadkarni](#) ([nn@lh-ag.com](mailto:nn@lh-ag.com)).

Lee Hishammuddin Allen & Gledhill

Level 6, Menara 1 Dutamas  
Solaris Dutamas  
No. 1, Jalan Dutamas 1  
50480 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia

T +603 6208 5888  
F +603 6201 0122/0136  
E [enquiry@lh-ag.com](mailto:enquiry@lh-ag.com)  
W [www.lh-ag.com](http://www.lh-ag.com)

Published by the Dispute Resolution Practice Group

© Lee Hishammuddin Allen & Gledhill. All rights reserved. The views and opinions attributable to the authors or editor of this publication are not to be imputed to the firm, Lee Hishammuddin Allen & Gledhill. The contents of this publication are intended for purposes of general information and academic discussion only. It should not be construed as legal advice or legal opinion on any fact or circumstance.

[Feedback](#)

[Unsubscribe](#)