

Arbitral Awards of the Cairo Regional Centre
for International Commercial Arbitration IV

Arbitral Awards of the Cairo Regional Centre for International Commercial Arbitration IV

Dr. Mohie-Eldin I. Alam-Eldin
Senior Legal Adviser of CRCICA



Wolters Kluwer
Law & Business

Published by:

Kluwer Law International
PO Box 316
2400 AH Alphen aan den Rijn
The Netherlands
Website: www.kluwerlaw.com

Sold and distributed in North, Central and South America by:

Aspen Publishers, Inc.
7201 McKinney Circle
Frederick, MD 21704
United States of America
Email: customer.service@aspenpublishers.com

Sold and distributed in all other countries by:

Turpin Distribution Services Ltd.
Stratton Business Park
Pegasus Drive
Biggleswade
Bedfordshire SG18 8TQ
United Kingdom
Email: kluwerlaw@turpin-distribution.com

Printed on acid-free paper.

ISBN 978-90-411-5840-6

© 2014 Kluwer Law International BV, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to:
Permissions Department, Wolters Kluwer Legal, 76 Ninth Avenue, Seventh Floor, New York,
NY 10011-5201, United States of America. E-mail: permissions@kluwerlaw.com.

Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd., Croydon, CR0 4YY

Table of Contents

Introduction	xiii
Case 1	
Malicorp Ltd. (UK) v. The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt and others	1
Summary	1
Held in the Award of March 7, 2006	2
Facts [in Brief]	4
Representations and Warranties by the Concessor	8
Reasons	12
Jurisdiction/Consent to Arbitrate	13
The International Character of the Concession Contract	16
Jurisdiction	17
The Administrative Judiciary Court Decision	18
Article 58 of Council of State Law No. 47 of 1972	18
The Significance of the UK–Egypt BIT	19
Breach/Annulment of the Concession Contract	20
Article 46 Arbitration Law No. 27 of 1994. Suspension for Criminal Proceedings	23
Damages	25
Award	27
A. Issues Subsequent to the Award of March 7, 2006	30
B. Challenges	32
C. Judgment of February 19, 2006	33
Case No. 18628 of the Year 59 before the Judicial Administrative Court	33
Text of the Judgment of February 19, 2006	33
D. Further Pending Cases	35
Procedure	36
E. Further Proceedings before the CCA	40
F. Commentary on the Constitutional Court Judgment of January 15, 2012	46
G. The ICSID Phase	46

Case 2

EU Joint Venture of Three Companies (Contractor) v. An African Tourism Company (Owner)	73
Summary	73
Held	74
Facts and Applicable Rules	79
1. The Claimants' Request for Arbitration	87
2. The Procedure	88
3. The Parties' Submissions	89
4. The Claimants' Statement of Case (Termination)	89
5. The Claimants' Statement of Case (Pre-Termination)	93
6. The Claimants' Statement of Case (Post-Termination)	94
7. The Respondents' Statement of Defense (Pre-Termination)	100
8. The Respondents' Statement of Defense (Termination)	103
9. The Respondents' Statement of Defense (Post-Termination)	104
10. The Respondents' Counterclaim	106
11. The Claimants' Reply to the Respondents' Defense	109
12. The Claimants' Defense to the Respondents' Counterclaim	112
13. The Hearing	114
14. The Claimants' Witnesses	118
15. The Respondent's Witness	133
16. Formal Closure of the Hearing	138
17. The Parties' Post-Hearings	138
17.1. The Validity of the Respondents' Termination of the Contract	138
The Claimants' Position	138
The Respondents' Position	139
17.2. The Tribunal's Jurisdiction to Deal with Matters in the Post-Termination Period	140
The Respondents' Position	140
The Claimants' Position	140
17.3. The Claimants' Justifications of the Delay in Performance of the Works	140
The Claimants' Position	140
The Respondents' Position	144
17.4. The Quantum of the Claimants' Claim	146
The Claimants' Position	146
The Respondents' Position	147
17.5. The Respondents' Counterclaim	148
The Respondents' Position	148
The Claimants' Position	148
18. The Tribunal's Analysis and Conclusions	148

18.1. Issue A: Was the Termination of Contract Justified?	149
Procedure	149
Grounds	150
18.2. Issue B: Are the Claimants Entitled to Relief During the Pre-Termination Period, and if so, to What Extent?	160
18.3. Issue C: Does the Tribunal have Jurisdiction in Respect of the Post-Termination Period?	165
18.4 Issue D: Are the Claimants Entitled to Relief During the Post-Termination Period and if so to What Extent?	169
18.5. Issue E: Are the Claimants Entitled to Relief as a Result of Loss of Opportunity?	171
18.6. Issue F: Are the Claimants Entitled to Relief as a Result of Loss of Profit?	172
18.7. Issue G: Are the Claimants Entitled to any Payments of Interest?	172
18.8. Issue H: Are the Respondents' Counterclaims Justified and if so, to What Extent?	173
19. Quantum	174
19.1. The Claimants' Claim	174
19.1.A. Reimbursement of Actual Costs Incurred in Performance of the Project	174
19.2. The Respondents' Counterclaim	180
Summary	180
20. Conclusion	181
21. Interest	181
21. Costs	181
22. The Tribunal's Decisions in this Award	182
Case 3	
J.V. of American and EU Dredging Companies v. Red Sea Public Authority (RSPA)	185
Summary	185
Held	186
Facts	196
1.1. Parties and the Project	196
1.2 Negotiations for the Contract/The Invitation to Tender	196
The Tender	197
The Clarifications Meetings	199
The Signature of the Contract	199
1.3 The Contract	199
1.4. Settlement of Disputes/ Arbitration Clause 20.3	200
The Purpose of the Contract	201
The Contract Price	201
The Guarantees	201
The Duration of the Contract	202

The Contract's Performance / Notice to Commence	202
The Design Works	202
The Dredging Works	203
The Presence on Site of the Quay Wall Contractor	204
The Equipment	205
1.5 The Completion of the Works	205
The Taking-over Certificate	205
The Statement at Completion	206
The Engineer's decision	206
The Report on Works	207
1.6 The Dispute	207
1.7 The Subsequent Facts	209
2. Procedure	209
2.1. Composition of the Arbitral Tribunal	209
2.2. Hearing Dated July 21 and 22, 2003	210
3. General Comments	210
3.1. The Claimants' Contentions	210
3.2. The Respondent's Contentions	212
3.3 The Arbitral Tribunal's Discussion	214
4. The Claimants' Claims	218
4.1. Claim 1: The Claimants' Claim Relating to the Non-Payment by the Employer of Certified Sums	218
4.1.1. The Claimants' Contentions	218
4.1.2. The Respondent's Contentions	220
4.1.3. The Arbitral Tribunal's Discussion	221
4.2 Claim 2: The Claimants' Claim Relating to the late Payments of Certified Sums	223
4.2.1. The Claimants' Contentions	223
4.2.2. The Respondent's Contentions	224
4.2.3 The Arbitral Tribunal's Discussion	225
4.3. Claim 3: The Claimants' Claims for Payment of Additional Works Performed and other Financial Items	228
4.3.1. Navigation Simulation: Additional Ship Navigation Simulation	229
4.3.2. Increase to the Depth of Tug Basin	231
4.3.3 Slope Protection between Ro-Ro Berths	233
4.3.4. Increase in Width of the Basin	235
4.3.5. Removal of Outcrops from Diaphragm Wall	236
4.3.6. Relocation of Navigation Leading Lights	237
4.3.7. Reimbursement of Additional Import Duties	238
4.3.8. Extended Bank Guarantees	239
4.4. Claim 4: The Claimant's Claim for Payment of Works Performed under Changed Circumstances	241
4.4.1. Ordnance Delays	242
4.4.2. Claim 3.2: Quay Wall Contractor Delays	253

4.4.3. Claim 5: Soil Conditions	265
4.5. Claim 5: The Late Release of the Contractor's Performance Letter of Guarantee	267
4.5.1. The Claimants' Contentions	267
4.5.2. The Respondent's Contentions	268
4.5.3. The Arbitral Tribunal's Discussion	269
5. Counterclaims	270
5.1. Counterclaim 1: The Respondent's Counterclaims Relating to the Contractor's Breaches of the Disposal Area	270
5.1.1. Parties' General Comments	270
5.1.2. The Costs of the Relocation of the Port South Fence	271
5.1.3. The Contractor's Failure to Protect the Bunds by Rock	276
5.1.4. The Contractor's Failure to Separate the Dredged Materials	279
5.1.5. The Increase of the Onshore Dumped Material	281
5.2. Counterclaim 2: The Respondent's Counterclaim for the Reimbursement of the Works to Repair the Quay Wall	284
5.2.1. The Respondent's Contentions	284
5.2.2. The Claimants' Contentions	285
5.2.3. The Arbitral Tribunal's Discussion	285
5.3. Counterclaim 3: The Respondent's Counterclaim Relating to the Damages to the Environment	286
5.3.1. The Respondent's Contentions	286
5.3.2. The Claimants' Contentions	289
5.3.3. The Arbitral Tribunal's Discussion	292
6. Interest	296
7. Costs	297
8. Award	297

Case 4

European Consortium of 4 Companies v. Ministry of Public Works and Water Resources of an African State (Partial)	299
---	------------

Summary	299
----------------	------------

Held	300
-------------	------------

Facts	301
--------------	------------

1. The Dispute between the Parties	301
2. Position of the Defendant	302
3. The Position of the Claimant	302
4. Position of the Tribunal in General	304
5. The Position: The Conclusions Based upon the Egyptian "Internal" Law	304
6. The Acceptance of International Arbitration by the Effect of the International Instruments to which the Arab Republic of Egypt is a Party	310
7. The Jurisdiction over the Claimant's Claims Regarding Stamp Duties	313
8. Conclusions of the Tribunal	313

Case 5**European Consortium of 4 Companies v. Ministry of Public Works and Water Resources of an African State (Interim) 315****Held 315**

The Tribunal's Analysis: Relationship between Article 25 and Clause 67 315

Facts 321

I. The Contract and the Reference to Arbitration 321

II. The Applicable Rules 325

III. The Arbitration Agreement and Applicable Laws 326

IV. The Present Issues: Outline 326

V. Summary of the Arbitration Proceedings 327

VI. Suspension or Termination of the Arbitral Proceedings 332

Issues [and Details] 332

Order dated July 1, 1995 333

Order dated July 31, 1994 333

Conclusions on Section VI 335

VII. The Relationship between Article 25 and Clause 67 335

Background facts 335

Further Matters Raised by the Pleadings 337

The Defendant's Requests 337

The Issues Raised by Article 25 and Clause 67 338

Time Limit 338

Reference to Arbitration 338

The Role of the Engineer's Representative 338

Article 388, Egyptian Civil Code 339

The Tribunal's Analysis 339

Conclusions 346

VIII. Clauses 44 and 52(5) of the General Conditions 346

Relevant Provisions 346

The Defendant's Requests 348

The Parties' Submissions 348

Construction of the Clauses: the Tribunal's Analysis 349

Factual Analysis 352

Conclusions 356

IX. Operative Part 356

Dissenting Opinion by the Defendant's Arbitrator 356**Case 6****European Consortium of 4 Companies v. Ministry of Public Works and Water Resources of an African State (Final) 359****Settlement Agreement [Text] 359****The Arbitral Tribunal 363**

Preamble 363

Article 1 – Definitions	364
Article 2	364
Article 3	366
Article 4	367
Article 5	367
Article 6	368
Article 7	368
Article 8	369
Article 9	369
Article 10	369
Article 11	369
Case 7	
Hotel Company v. Construction Company	371
Summary	371
Held	372
I. Arbitration Agreement	372
II. Factual Background and Arbitral Proceedings	373
III. Parties Submissions	376
A. Claimant’s Statement of Claim, Dated September 27, 2011	376
B. Respondent’s Statement of Defence, Dated November 3, 2011	377
The Arbitral Tribunal Lacks Jurisdiction over the Dispute	377
Inadmissibility of the Presented Case	377
Merits of the Case	378
C. Claimant’s Reply, Dated December 6, 2011 to Respondent’s Statement of Defense	379
Claimant’s Reply on the Arbitral Tribunal’s Lack of Jurisdiction	379
Claimant’s Reply in Relation to Legal Capacity of the Claimant’s Representative	379
Claimant’s Reply to the Respondent’s Presentation of the Merits of the Case	379
D. Respondent’s Rejoinder, Dated January 3, 2012	380
The Lack of Jurisdiction over the Dispute	380
Legal Capacity of Claimant’s Legal Representatives	380
Merits of the Case	380
E. Claimant’s Post Hearing Memorial Dated June 24, 2012	381
Certain Factual Considerations	381
The Legal Framework	381
Refuting the Respondent’s Contentions	382
Remedies and Relief Sought	385
F. Respondent’s Post Hearing Memorial Dated July 8, 2012	385
Defense	385
Claimant’s Submission that Its Case Is Not Characterized as a Contractual Default	386

Respondent's Relief Sought	386
IV. The Final Arbitral Award	386
A. Jurisdictional Pleas and Claims	387
Lack of Jurisdiction to the Esteemed Arbitral Tribunal	387
Inadmissibility of the Case: Claimant's Legal Representative Lacks Legal Capacity or Interest	388
The Case Is Not Subject to or Fall Within the Scope of the Contractual Arbitration Clause	388
B. Reimbursement of Interest on the Advance Payment	389
The Parties Agreement(s), Common Intention and Conduct	389
C. Claimant's Other Claims	394
Respondent's Alleged Breach of the Requirements of Good Faith (the Bona Fide Obligation)	394
Interest Rate of 4% on the L.E. 4,075,000 Covering the Period from Filing the Case till the Date of the Full Payment	394
Compensation for Damages due to Respondent's Default Amounting to L.E.1,800,000 (a Total of L.E. 1,800,000 + L.E. 4,075,000)	394
D. Arbitration Legal Costs and Expenses	395
E. The Dispositive	395
Annex - Arbitration Rules	397
Index	425