## دیوان داوری دعادی ایران - ایالات مخل

182-113

## ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS IN SAFE

Case No. 182	Dat	e of filing:	27-10	-1992
** AWARD - Type of Awa		•		
- Date of Awa	ges in English		pages in	Farsi
** DECISION - Date of Decision -	ecision <u>27 oc</u> ges in English	T 1992	pages in	Farsi
** CONCURRING OPINION O	f			
pa	ges in English		pages in	Farsi
	ges in English		pages in	Farsi
** DISSENTING OPINION O	f			
	ges in English	Bernaler-sealinen semmente de dispublica	pages in	Farsi
** OTHER; Nature of doc	ument:			•
- Date				
pa	ges in English	On the second se	pages in	Farsi

## **IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL**

## دیوان داوری دعاوی ایران - ایالات متحده

PARVIZ KARIM-PANAHI,

Claimant,

and

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent.

Case No. 182 Chamber Two Decision No. DEC 108-182-2

الران داوری دیاوی CLAIMS TRIBUNAL (CLAIMS TRIBUNAL)

FILED 

DATE 270CT 1992

DECISION

- 1. On 27 July 1992 (Doc. 112), thirty days after the filing of the Tribunal's Award in <u>Parviz Karim-Panahi</u> and <u>Government of the United States of America</u>, Award No. 532-182-2 (26 June 1992), Parviz Karim-Panahi ("the Claimant") filed a letter protesting against the Tribunal's Award, and requesting its vacation due to his objections to, <u>inter alia</u>, the conduct of the proceedings by the Tribunal, the reasoning of the Award and its analysis of the evidence.
- 2. The Tribunal finds that neither the Tribunal Rules nor its practice contemplate post-award proceedings over the merits of an award. According to the Tribunal Rules, after a final Award has been rendered, the Tribunal may only "give an interpretation of the award" (Article 35), correct "any errors in computation, any clerical or typographical errors, or any errors of similar nature" (Article 36), or "make an additional award as to claims presented in the arbitral proceedings but omitted from the award" (Article 37).
- 3. Nothing in the Claimant's request falls within the scope of Articles 35, 36, or 37 of the Tribunal Rules. Indeed, the Tribunal has consistently held that there is no basis in the Tribunal Rules, or elsewhere, for the Tribunal to review its own awards when a party seeks to reargue the case or disagrees with the conclusions reached by the Tribunal. See, e.g., Norman Gabay/Nourollah Armanfar and Islamic Republic of Iran, Decision No. DEC 99-771-2, para. 8 (24 Sept. 1991), reprinted in 27 Iran-U.S. C.T.R. 194, 195. Likewise, there is no basis for the Tribunal to review its awards because of objections to the conduct of its proceedings.

4. For the foregoing reasons,

THE TRIBUNAL DECIDES AS FOLLOWS:

The request of Parviz Karim-Panahi is hereby denied.

Dated, The Hague 27 October 1992

José María Ruda

Chairman

Chamber Two

In the Name of God

Kowosh H Ameli

George H. Aldrich

Koorosh H. Ameli