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Do violations of domestic anticorruption legislations influence the results of arbitrations?

Should that be the case?
International Investment Arbitration

- Corruption allegations made by States: Bribery of a senior member of government (*World Duty Free Co., Ltd. v. Republic of Kenya*); Secret participation of government officials or their families in the investment through a commission or agency agreement (*Wena Hotels Ltd. v. Arab Republic of Egypt*) or through shares in or other benefits from an entity involved in the investment (*Metalclad Corporation v. United Mexican States*)

- Corruption allegations made by foreign investors: Unlawful expropriation or unfair treatment of investor’s investment is caused by investor’s refusal to comply with demands for bribes from the government officials of the host state. (*EDF (Services) Ltd. v. Romania*)
Commercial Arbitration:

- Agency contracts are the most common type of commercial agreements giving rise to allegations of corruption. The dispute usually arises when the principal refuses to pay commission claiming that the agent involved in corrupt acts.

- China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission ruled that the two supplemental trademark agreements were invalid since Guangzhou Pharmaceutical’s original general manager Li Yiming accepted payment of 3 million HK dollars from Chan Hung To, the chairman of the board of Hung To Group, before signing the two agreements, thus Hung To Group and JDB had no right to use “Wanglaoji” trademark after the valid trademark agreement expired. (*Wang Laoji v. Jia Duo Bao*)
Should That be the Case?

- International public policy and morality
- “Clean hands doctrine”
- The contract is void under domestic laws
- International arbitrators may do a better job in redressing corruption than prosecutors or judges in some jurisdictions
Government enforcement of domestic anticorruption laws may be controversial, and may not be consistent. Relying on government enforcement results may create unequitable results. Government has broad power in interpreting the law. Review of government enforcement may not be transparent nor effective. Companies may be forced to settle for anti-corruption violations just in order to continue doing business. It will be inappropriate for such settlement to be used as evidence of violation of domestic anti-corruption legislation.

Corruption is usually secretive. What should be the appropriate evidentiary standard for proof of corruption? Certain type of behavior is regarded as corruption in one country while is not punishable in another country. A host state may use corruption as a defense while an investor alleges extortion by officials of the host state. What constitute extortion? Whether the investor is innocent and is entitled to the claim?

Judicial system in some country may not be truly independent. Decision on corruption case is especially prone to government influence. Relying on domestic court's judgment as evidence of violating domestic anticorruption laws may be unfair in certain cases.

If a host state takes no action to investigate or prosecute the corrupt acts of its own officials, it may be unfair to allow the state to rely on corruption as a defense in international investment arbitration.

Domestic anticorruption legislation may be vague and may be interpreted inconsistently in different cases.
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