

# The French Like It Delocalized: Lex Non Facit Arbitrum.

Arbitral awards remain delocalized under the French law of international arbitration. They can be recognised and enforced in France irrespective of the decision of the court of the seat of the arbitration to set them aside. F.A. Mann, and many in England are of the opinion that arbitration only exists if the seat of the arbitration allows it. Lex facit arbitrum. The French disagree and believe that arbitration is a private activity, which can be considered favorably or unfavorably, but certainly does not need to be empowered by any state ex ante. Thus, if the court of the seat nullifies the award, this does not mean that it cannot be recognised in another legal order. Would any court think of nullifying a road accident?

This delocalization doctrine builds on the [Hilmarton](#) precedent. On June 29, 2007, the French Supreme Court for Private Matters (*Cour de cassation*) confirmed in a case where the award had been set aside by the High Court in London. It held that the arbitral award did not belong to any state legal order, and that, as a consequence, it was an “international decision”, the effect of which was a matter for the courts where recognition or enforcement was sought. In other words, it was not an “English award” for the sole reason that it had been made by a tribunal seating in England. As usual, the *Cour de cassation* relied on article VII of the [1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards](#) to justify the application of the French law of arbitration when it is more favorable than the NY Convention.

The dispute had arisen between French company Est Epices and Indonesian company PT Putrabali Adyamulia. Putrabali had sold

white pepper to Est Epices, but the goods were lost during the carriage by sea. Est Epices refused to pay, and Putrabali initiated arbitral proceedings in London under the aegis of the [International General Produce Association](#). In 2001, an arbitral panel found that Est Epices was entitled not to pay the price. Putrabali challenged the award before the English High Court, appealing on a point of law as the [1996 Arbitration Act](#) allowed it to. The challenge was admitted and the award partially set aside. A second award was made in 2003, and found in favor of Putrabali, ordering Est Epices to pay Euro 163,086.

Est Epices sought recognition of the first 2001 award in France. The 2001 award was declared enforceable by the Paris court of appeal in March 2005. Putrabali appealed to the *Cour de cassation*. In a [first judgment of June 29, 2007](#), the Court dismissed the appeal on the grounds given above.

At the same time, Putrabali had sought the recognition of the second 2003 award. In November 2005, the Paris Court of Appeal held that it could not be declared enforceable. In a [second judgment of June 29, 2007](#), the *Cour de cassation* confirmed. It held that the recognition of the first award precluded the recognition of the second, as the first had res judicata. This was already held 13 years ago in *Hilmarton*.

The rationale behind the French solution is to limit the influence of local peculiarities. So, if a local mandatory rule obliges some witnesses to swear in a particular religious form, this should not be let jeopardize the whole arbitral process. In *Putrabali*, the award had been set aside as a consequence of a review of its merits. From France, this certainly looked like a shocking local peculiarity.