

DUPLICATE ORIGINAL  
نسخه برابر اصل

CASE NO. 17

CHAMBER THREE

AWARD NO. 20-17-3

RAYGO WAGNER EQUIPMENT COMPANY;

Claimant,

and

STAR LINE IRAN COMPANY,

Respondents.

IRAN UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL  
دادگاه داورى دعاوى ايران - ايالات متحده  
ثبت شد - FILED  
Date ۱۳۶۲ / ۱۱ / ۲۴  
13 APR. 1983  
No. 17 17



Further Comments of Richard M. Mosk

My colleague, Judge Jahangir Sani, has filed a document entitled "Mr. Jahangir Sani's reply to Mr. Mosk's 'Comments' of 3 March 1983 Concerning Case No. 17." Such a document contains unfair complaints about the Chairman's internal administration of the Chamber and reflects bickering among members of the Tribunal which does little more than detract from the decorum of the Tribunal. As I have noted before,<sup>1</sup> It is unfortunate that the Tribunal has not enforced its own rules and traditional standards of propriety. The failure to do so can be particularly serious in government-established international tribunals which, throughout history, have been particularly fragile.

<sup>1</sup> See my concurring opinion in Award No. 21-132-3 (Rexnord, Inc.) which is attached hereto.

Although Judge Sani's statements are inaccurate and misleading, I do not intend to respond further at this time.<sup>2</sup> I will do so if the need for further comment arises in the future.

I again must state that I hope that the members of the Tribunal will not be affected by unfounded accusations and will decide cases impartially and on the basis of respect for law as required by the Claims Settlement Declaration.



Richard M. Mosk

Dated, The Hague

April 13, 1983

---

<sup>2</sup>Some of the inconsistencies in Judge Sani's remarks are noted in my earlier statement filed in this case and in my concurring opinion in Award No. 21-132-3. Just one of the many inaccuracies is demonstrated by Judge Sani's statement that "the meeting of 13 December 1982 was scheduled for the sole purpose of discussing the issue of 'interest' in Case No. 30." Yet Judge Sani attaches an internal memorandum from the Chairman to Judge Sani and to me in which it is stated with respect to the instant case, [w]e have discussed this case on several occasions . . . I therefore suggest that we deal with Case No. 17 again on Monday 13 December 1982 at the Chamber Meeting." The document also proposes a further deliberation in Case 132 on the same date.

Judge Sani's complaint seems to be that after the draft opinion was prepared,<sup>4</sup> he wanted more deliberations, despite the fact that he would not attend them and would not sign any award in any event. He admits that there was one "session" which he indicates was "brief". Of course, he could only know its length if he were present. Such an admission is inconsistent with his earlier statements concerning the absence of deliberations.<sup>5</sup> In another portion of his remarks, Judge Sani complains that "final deliberations had not yet taken place." (Emphasis added). In his Case No. 30 "opinion" attached to his remarks in the instant case, he complains that Case Nos. 17 and 132 were not "the subject of final deliberations" and that certain issues in Case No. 30 were not "adequately deliberated upon." He also admits he did not attend the "scheduled meeting."

Apparently under Judge Sani's theory, an award is invalid unless he has been able to deliberate not once, not twice, but as many times as he desires and only at the times which suit his preference. Under this theory, few of the thousands of cases before this Tribunal could be decided.

---

<sup>4</sup>After the award was prepared, but before its release, the Chamber was informed that the Respondents in the instant case initiated settlement discussions. See also my Concurring Opinion in Award No. 27-84-3 (Ultrasystems, Incorporated).

<sup>5</sup>As noted herein, there was more than a "brief session".

noted that in certain respects, I would have come to conclusions different than those reached in the award. But in order to form a majority for the award, I have concurred in it. See my Concurring Opinion in Award No. 18-30-3. Although I am tempted to respond to each of the points raised by Judge Sani, there is little reason to do so over three months after the Tribunal issued the award.

Dated, The Hague

April 12, 1983

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Richard M. Mosk", written in black ink.

Richard M. Mosk

UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL ثبت شد - FILED No. 17 / V Date 3 MAR 1983 شماره تاریخ	دادگاه داورى دعاوى ايران - ايالات متحده
---	--

3 March 1983

Comments of Richard M. Mosk with Respect  
to "Mr. Jahangir Sani's Reasons For  
Not Signing The Decision Made By  
Mr. Mangard and Mr. Mosk in Case No. 17"

The document entitled "Mr. Jahangir Sani's Reasons For Not Signing The Decision Made By Mr. Mangard and Mr. Mosk In Case No. 17" ("document") is both inappropriate and inaccurate. See Concurring Opinion of Richard M. Mosk in Case No. 30.

First, it is a violation of Tribunal Rules and generally accepted ethical standards to attempt to divulge the deliberations of an arbitral tribunal. Article 31, Note 2, Provisionally Adopted Tribunal Rules. As one authority has written,

Art. 54(3) of the ICJ Statute, which provides that "the deliberations of the Court shall take place in private and remain secret", represents a practice of such widespread application as to be arguably a general principle of law.  
1 Encyc. of Pub. Int. Law 185 (1981).

Such confidentiality is particularly essential in arbitration proceedings such as these in which arbitrators may, as the eminent Dutch arbitration expert, Professor Pieter Sanders has written, be "forced to continue their deliberations until a majority, and probably a compromise solution, has been reached." Sanders, Commentary on UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, II Yearbook Commercial Arbitration 172,208 (1977).

Second, an arbitrator should not participate in or aid efforts to attack Tribunal awards, because to do so may cast doubt on that arbitrator's impartiality.<sup>1</sup>

Third, Judge Sani, refused to participate in some of the deliberations in Case No. 17<sup>2</sup> and did not sign the Award. As Professor Sanders notes: "Refusal to sign is not looked upon favourably in arbitration practice." Sanders, supra at 208. It is for the signing members to provide the reasons for the absence of Judge Sani's signature, not Judge Sani.<sup>3</sup>

Fourth, under international law, Judge Sani cannot frustrate the work of the Chamber or the Tribunal by wilfully absenting himself and refusing to sign an award. See, e.g., Sabotage Cases (U.S. v. Gen.), 8 R. Int'l Arb.

---

<sup>1</sup> Within the same time period, all of the following events occurred: Iran suggested the possibility that it would challenge the award in this case in a Netherlands court; the Tribunal learned that the Iranian Government was attempting to induce the Algerian Central Bank not to perform its duties with respect to this award; and Judge Sani prepared his document claiming the award is invalid. Needless to say, I believe the award is valid.

<sup>2</sup> As noted below, Judge Sani participated in numerous deliberations concerning the case and received drafts of the proposed award and the final version in advance of its filing.

<sup>3</sup> In the legislative history of the UNCITRAL rules upon which the Provisionally Adopted Tribunal Rules are based, the following colloquy took place:

43. Mr. Roehrich (France) said that it was not clear who should give the reasons for an arbitrator's failure to sign an award.

44. Mr. Sanders (Special Consultant to the UNCITRAL secretariat) said that the two arbitrators who signed the award would give the reasons.

Summary of Discussion of the Ninth Session, UNCITRAL Committee II (A/CN.9/9/C.2/SR 11, p.7); see also Sanders, supra at 208.

Awards 225, 241-252, 458 (1939); Decision No. 32 (France v. Mex.), 5 R. Int'l Arb. Awards 510 (1929); Decision No. 22 (France v. Mex.) 5 R. Int'l Arb. Awards 512 (1929); Columbia v. Cauca Co., 190 U.S. 524; J. Voet, 1 The Selective Voet 749 (1955); R. Phillimore, 3 Commentaries on International Law 4 (1885); A. Mérignhac, Traité Théorique et pratique de l'arbitrage international 276-77 (1895); see Iran Code of Civil Procedure, Art. 660. (M. Sabi trans. 1972) ("Where one of the arbiters after he has been informed, does not appear in the session held for proceedings or consultations, or he appears but refuses to give award, the award given by the majority of votes shall be valid even if unanimity of votes has been a condition in the agreement for arbitration").

Fifth, Judge Sani's statement of facts is inaccurate. This case was heard on September 1 and 2, 1982. During the four months subsequent to the hearing there were numerous deliberations in the case. It should be noted that the Respondent admitted having Claimant's equipment and admitted not paying for it. Respondent promised to return it or pay for it, even subsequent to the hearing, but never fulfilled its promise.

Following deliberations, Judge Mangård, late in the week of December 5, 1982, distributed to all members of the Chamber the proposed award and invited all members, including Judge Sani, to comment on the proposed award. After the distribution of the proposed opinion, Judge Sani agreed to be present at a meeting scheduled for the following week (December 13, 1982) to discuss the case.<sup>4</sup> The date selected for such a meeting was based on Judge Sani's request. Subsequently, however, Judge Sani refused to appear at the scheduled meeting even though he was on the premises of the Tribunal during that same week. Judge Sani

---

<sup>4</sup> With thousands of cases pending and few of them decided, one could not reasonably complain that the Tribunal has proceeded in haste.

sent word that he had communicated to his Government his resignation as a member of the Tribunal.<sup>5</sup> Chairman Mangård then requested Judge Sani to attend a meeting of the Chamber on December 14, 1982. Again he refused. Judge Sani sent word that he would not appear and would not participate in any further deliberations because of the above mentioned communications concerning his resignation. No document or other notification concerning any such purported resignation was ever received by the Tribunal. Judge Sani's representatives then stated that Judge Sani might reconsider his purported resignation if the substance of this and the other awards was changed. On December 15, 1982 Judge Sani's representative reported that he had spoken to Judge Sani and that Judge Sani would not sign any awards. After Judge Sani's refusal to participate in further discussions, the award was signed and filed. The same basic events transpired with respect to two other awards (Case Nos. 30 and 132).

Late in the date on December 15, 1982 Judge Sani met with Judge Mangård and me at a hotel because he refused to come to the Tribunal premises (although after the meeting Judge Sani went to the Tribunal premises). Judge Sani also demanded revisions of this and other awards, the withdrawal of the awards and even more deliberations as a condition of his not resigning. Judge Mangård and I made absolutely no promises to Judge Sani. After the aforesaid meeting, Judge Mangård and I met with Judge Bellet and the President, Judge Lagergren. Judge Bellet and Judge Lagergren both said that the awards (including the one in Case 17) had been properly filed and that there was no reason to withdraw them.

---

<sup>5</sup> Of course one's resignation must be tendered to and accepted by the Tribunal. President Lagergren has stated, "when a Member of the Tribunal resigns, it is for the Full Tribunal to accept the resignation and to decide from which date the resignation shall take effect." Minutes of Tribunal's 67th meeting, Par. 3 (Dec. 6-8, 1982).

Nevertheless, Judge Mangård and I agreed to tell Judge Sani that the award would be held in the Registry until January 5, 1983, that there would be discussions concerning the case on January 4, 1983 and that an award in the case would be issued promptly thereafter (either the one on file or a new or revised one resulting from any further discussions). That proposed schedule was transmitted to Judge Sani. On December 17, 1982 Judge Sani's legal assistant reported that Judge Sani had agreed to this schedule. On January 4, 1983, Judge Sani, although present at the Tribunal, refused to discuss any substantive aspect of the case and stated that he wanted two more weeks before having even further deliberations in the case -- a clear violation of his promise. Judge Sani again stated that he would not sign the award. As a result, the award was released.

In short, Judge Sani used his purported or threatened resignation (which he noted would cause delay in Tribunal proceedings and jeopardize awards) to attempt to extract changes in awards and delays in proceedings. Judge Mangård and I have extended every courtesy to Judge Sani in connection with his schedule. Every reasonable effort has been made to accommodate his schedule, no matter how inconvenient to others. I have attended every scheduled meeting.

I do not feel it necessary at this time to give a point by point rebuttal to every assertion of Judge Sani. But other facts and representations by him are incorrect. The fact that this dialogue is taking place demonstrates the wisdom of rules of confidentiality of proceedings and the custom that legal opinions should be restricted to legal and factual issues on the merits of the case. Moreover, everything that Judge Sani says is irrelevant to his conclusion as to the validity of the award. The fact is that all applicable procedural rules were complied with. There was a majority in favor of the award and it was properly prepared and filed. Judge Sani is unable to point to any rule or law

which would affect the validity of the award or suggest any impropriety. What is important is that all members of the Tribunal be immune, and appear to be immune, from unfounded accusations and that they decide cases impartially, on the merits, in accordance with the evidence before them and on the basis of respect for law as required by the Claims Settlement Declaration.

Sixth, Judge Sani's statement that Iran had to be named as a party is not only wrong, but inconsistent with the position of Iran in other cases. Since Iran is defined in the Claims Settlement Declaration as including any "entity controlled by the Government of Iran" (Art. VII, paragraph 3), if such an entity is found liable, payment must be made out of the Security Account. The Government of Iran has agreed to pay the claims of "Iran", which is defined as including its controlled entities. Id.; Declaration of the Government of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algiers, paragraph 7; Technical Agreement with N.V. Settlement Bank of the Netherlands 1(e)(i). There is no requirement that the Government of Iran be specifically named as a party. The fact is, however, that the Government of Iran participated in every aspect of the proceedings and appeared at the hearing. Indeed, pleadings received were in official covers of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Seventh, Judge Sani's discussion in a section he entitled "Deficiencies in the Award Itself" is not in accord with the actual facts or the law. The Tribunal considered and weighed all relevant evidence submitted to it and accurately set forth the facts and the contentions. As just one example of the many errors in Judge Sani's discussion, he ignores the fact that the Claimant provided evidence of its United States nationality, which evidence included material on the American domicile of Claimant and its parent

Having refused to sign the award, it was not for the non-signing arbitrator to write his reasons for such refusal. Rather, the reasons are to be stated, and were stated, in the award by those who sign it. Article 32, paragraph 4, of the Provisionally Adopted Tribunal Rules; Sanders, Commentary On Uncitral Arbitration Rules, II Yearbook Commercial Arbitration-1977 172, 208.<sup>3/</sup>


It should be noted that confidentiality of deliberations is widely recognized as desirable and was supported by both the Governments of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United States of America. Such confidentiality is particularly essential in arbitration proceedings such as these in which arbitrators may, as Professor Sanders wrote, be "forced to continue their deliberations until a majority, and probably a compromise solution, has been reached." Id.

In the event that the Tribunal remains unwilling or unable to enforce its own rules and other generally recognized rules of conduct, such rules may no longer be of any effect.

---

<sup>3/</sup>The non-signing arbitrator has refused to sign other Tribunal awards and decisions, including one issued by the Full Tribunal. The eminent Dutch expert, Pieter Sanders has noted: "Refusal to sign is not looked upon favourably in arbitration practice." Sanders, supra.

Accordingly, I concur in the Final Award in favor of  
Claimant Granite State Machine Co., Inc.



Richard M. Mosk

Dated, The Hague  
25 January 1983