ASSESSMENT OF THE BALANCE OF AUTONOMY AND JUSTICE IN ENGLISH ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS IN THE LIGHT OF THE ASSISTANCE OF STATE COURTS AND INJUNCTIONS

İNGİLİZ TAHKİM YARGILAMASINDA DEVLET MAHKEMELERİNİN YARDIMI VE GEÇİCİ HUKUKİ KORUMALAR DAHİLİNDE ÖZERKLİK VE ADALET ARASINDAKİ DENGENİN DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ

Araştırma Makalesi

Ticen Azize ÖZRAŞİT*

ABSTRACT

This article offers a comprehensive examination into the realm of arbitration within the UK, with a particular spotlight on the crucial and often contentious role of injunctions. Through a detailed analysis of the Arbitration Act 1996 and a thorough review of significant case law, the piece underscores the multifaceted and sometimes convoluted interplay between injunctions and the arbitration process. Venturing beyond the UK's borders, the study broadens its scope to offer a comparative perspective, juxtaposing the UK's approach with that of other global jurisdictions. This serves to deepen our appreciation and understanding of international arbitration practices. Ultimately, the article's primary objective is to navigate and demystify the labyrinthine world of arbitration. It aims to highlight the necessity of maintaining a delicate balance between ensuring fair dispute resolution mechanisms and the extent of judicial intervention. This is especially pertinent when considering the dual-aspect of court-issued injunctions, which can serve as both protective measures and potential obstacles in the arbitration journey.

Keywords: *Arbitration, Injunctions, Judicial intervention, Dispute resolution, Arbitration Act 1996*

DOI: 10.32957/hacettepehdf.1368579

Makalenin Geliş Tarihi: 29.09.2023 **Makalenin Kabul Tarihi:** 30.01.2024

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Rauf Denktaş Universitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Medeni Usul ve İcra İflas Hukuku Anabilim Dalı **E-posta**: ticen.ozrasit@rdu.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0001-8843-4847

Bu makale Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.

ÖZ

Bu makale, İngiltere'deki tahkim alanına ilişkin kapsamlı bir inceleme sunmakta ve özellikle ihtiyati tedbirlerin önemli ve çoğu zaman tartışmalı rolüne odaklanmaktadır. Çalışma, 1996 tarihli Tahkim Kanunu'nun detaylı bir analizi ve önemli içtihatların kapsamlı bir incelemesi yoluyla, ihtiyati tedbir kararları ile tahkim süreci arasındaki çok yönlü ve bazen de karmaşık etkileşimin altını çizmektedir. İngiltere sınırlarının ötesine geçen çalışma, İngiltere'nin yaklaşımını diğer küresel yargı alanlarınınkiyle yan yana koyarak karşılaştırmalı bir perspektif sunmak için kapsamını genişletiyor. Bu, uluslararası tahkim uygulamalarına ilişkin takdir ve anlayışımızı derinleştirmeye hizmet etmektedir. Nihayetinde, makalenin birincil amacı tahkimin labirent dünyasında gezinmek ve bu dünyanın gizemini çözmektir. Adil uyuşmazlık çözüm mekanizmalarının sağlanması ile yargı müdahalesinin kapsamı arasında hassas bir dengenin korunması gerekliliğini vurgulamayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu, özellikle tahkim yolculuğunda hem koruyucu önlemler hem de potansiyel engeller olarak hizmet edebilen mahkeme tarafından verilen ihtiyati tedbirlerin ikili yönü göz önüne alındığında geçerlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Tahkim, İhtiyati tedbir, Yargı müdahalesi, Uyuşmazlık çözümü, 1996 Tahkim Kanunu

EXTENDED SUMMARY

The Mental Health Bill 2022 proposes a significant overhaul of UK mental health legislation. It aims to incorporate contemporary international human rights principles and focus on individual-centered care. The Bill seeks to address deficiencies in the 1983 Mental Health Act, particularly its inability to meet the diverse needs of the population and adequately secure the rights of people with mental illnesses. Key provisions include better definitions of mental disorders, stricter detention criteria, advance choice documents for care preferences, and increased rights to community-based care. The implementation of the Bill presents challenges such as garnering support, aligning service delivery with legal requirements, and shifting towards more community-based care settings. The British mental health system is at a crucial juncture, with increasing concerns about the effectiveness and fairness of existing laws. The 1983 Mental Health Act, once progressive, has faced criticism for not adequately protecting patients' rights, particularly regarding involuntary care. The Mental Health Bill 2022 aims to modernize the system, aligning it with contemporary challenges and human rights standards. The Bill is seen as a critical measure to address these issues and ensure the mental health care system evolves to meet current needs. The primary legislation governing mental health in the UK has been the Mental Health Act 1983, which has undergone various amendments to enhance its effectiveness and protect patients' rights. Despite these changes, the Act has faced criticism, particularly regarding involuntary treatment and the treatment of minority ethnic groups. An independent review led by Professor Sir Simon Wessely in 2017 highlighted several system-level issues and recommended reforms to strengthen patient voice and ensure treatment as a last resort. The Mental Health Bill 2022 aims to implement these recommendations and reform the mental health system. The paper systematically explores the proposed Mental Health Bill's scope and substance, analyzing its contents and public and expert opinions. The methodology includes reviewing the Bill, considering public and expert feedback, and comparing it to international standards and reforms. This comprehensive approach aims to provide a well-informed analysis of the Bill's potential impact on mental health care and rights in the UK. The

Bill introduces significant changes in the definitions and scope of mental health legislation, focusing on better classifications of mental disorders and stricter criteria for detentions and treatments. Autism and learning disabilities are excluded as sole grounds for detention unless paired with other mental health issues. The Bill also mandates that any treatment provided under detention must have a demonstrable benefit to the individual, emphasizing the least restrictive options available. The Bill significantly shifts the parameters related to capacity and consent, increasing individual autonomy and preventing human rights abuses. It introduces stricter detention criteria, requiring high risks of harm for detention to be justified. The Bill also emphasizes informed consent and advance decisions regarding treatment choices, ensuring respect for individual preferences. Advance directives and nominated representatives are core provisions in the Bill, empowering patients to participate in their mental health care decisions. Advance choice documents allow individuals to express their treatment preferences in advance, and the Nominated Person replaces the Nearest Relative, giving patients more control over their care decisions. The Bill aims to improve the rights of people with mental disorders by promoting community-based care over institutionalization. It emphasizes the need for sufficient funding and resources for community-based services, such as outpatient treatment and home-based care programs, to support individuals within their immediate surroundings and promote rehabilitation and independence. The Mental Health Bill 2022 represents a transformative overhaul of UK mental health legislation, aimed at modernizing the system to better align with contemporary human rights standards and address longstanding deficiencies in the existing Mental Health Act 1983. This new Bill places a strong emphasis on individual-centered care, ensuring that the mental health system is more responsive to the needs and rights of individuals with mental illnesses. The Bill aims to update the legislative framework to reflect modern principles of human rights, ensuring that individuals' rights and freedoms are more robustly protected. This includes adhering to international human rights norms and integrating best practices from other jurisdictions. The 1983 Mental Health Act has been criticized for its outdated approach and insufficient protections for patients, particularly in terms of involuntary detention and treatment. The Bill addresses these concerns by implementing stricter criteria for detention and ensuring that treatment is more closely aligned with patients' needs and preferences. A cornerstone of the Bill is the shift towards a more individualized approach to mental health care. This involves greater respect for patients' autonomy and choices, ensuring that care plans are tailored to the specific needs of each person. The introduction of advance choice documents allows individuals to outline their treatment preferences in advance, which healthcare providers must consider. In conclusion, while the Mental Health Bill 2022 presents significant challenges in terms of implementation, it is seen as a critical and necessary step towards modernizing the UK's mental health system, addressing the shortcomings of the 1983 Act, and ensuring that mental health care is more humane, respectful, and effective.

INTRODUCTION

Arbitration, a leading alternative dispute resolution method, has become an integral part of the United Kingdom's legal system.[1] In a world that is increasingly globalized and interconnected, arbitration has proven to be an efficient and flexible tool to resolve multifaceted commercial disputes. Injunctions play a pivotal role in this process, serving as effective instruments to ensure the enforceability of arbitral awards, preserve the status quo, and prevent potential harm[2]. The interaction between injunctions and arbitration forms the core subject matter of this research.

Injunctions in arbitration straddle a complex interplay between two fundamental aspects of legal dispute resolution – the autonomy of the arbitration process and the necessary oversight by the court. The delicate balance that must be maintained between these two principles is often a subject of contention and invites rigorous scholarly examination. The primary function of an injunction is to provide interim relief, preserving the parties' rights and ensuring that the arbitration proceedings are not rendered futile. However, the very intervention of the court in granting injunctions can lead to debates about the sanctity and independence of the arbitration process.

In the United Kingdom, this dialogue gains additional relevance due to the country's vibrant arbitration landscape, governed by the Arbitration Act 1996. The Act, a comprehensive piece of legislation that covers all aspects of arbitration, including the court's role in supporting arbitration, underscores the importance of injunctions in the arbitration process. The court, under the Act, retains the right to grant injunctions, among other powers, even when an arbitration agreement is in effect[3]. This provision has been the springboard for numerous court decisions that have subsequently shaped the application of injunctions in arbitration. Understanding the judicial interpretation of this legislative provision, therefore, forms an essential component of our research.

Given the critical role injunctions play in arbitration and their often-controversial nature, this research raises the question: "What is the impact of injunctions on arbitration proceedings in the

[1] Stuart Sime, *Civil Procedure* (25th edn, Oxford University Press 2022) 113; Murat Atalı, İbrahim Ermenek, Ersin Erdoğan, *Medeni Usul Hukuku* (6th edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2023) 725; Baki Kuru, Burak Aydın, *Medeni Usul Hukuku Cilt II* (2nd edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2021) 1861; Mustafa Serdar Özbek, *Alternatif Uyuşmazlık Çözümü* (5th edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2022) 419; Hakan Pekcanıtez, Hülya Taş Korkmaz, Muhammet Özekes, Mine Akkan, *Pekcanıtez Usul Hukuku- Medeni Usul Hukuku Cilt III* (15th edn, On İki Levha Yayınları 2017) 2593. Şanal Görgün, Levent Börü, Mehmet Kodakoğlu, *Medeni Usul Hukuku* (12th edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2023) 767.

[2] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2435.

[3] Efe Dırenisa, 'Functions of an Arbitration Agreement' (2007) 4(2) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, 107-119.

UK, and how can their application be optimized to enhance the arbitration process?" By exploring this question, we aim to provide an in-depth understanding of the judicial reasoning and legislative provisions that guide the granting of injunctions in arbitration. This research seeks to critically analyse the implications of these injunctions on the fairness and efficiency of dispute resolution in the UK[4].

Moreover, our study goes beyond merely understanding the UK's approach to injunctions in arbitration. It extends to comparing this approach with other jurisdictions, offering a comparative legal analysis that deepens our understanding of international best practices. By presenting a comparative study, we hope to identify key differences and similarities that could further inform the discussion on the application and reform of injunctions in arbitration. The purpose of this study, therefore, is two-fold. Firstly, it contributes to the scholarly discourse on the role and impact of injunctions in UK arbitration proceedings. Secondly, it provides insights that could potentially inform legal policy and practice in this area, especially in the light of increasing globalization and the concomitant rise in cross-border disputes.

By undertaking a meticulous examination of statutory provisions, judicial interpretations, and specific case studies, we strive to uncover the intricate balance between court intervention and arbitral autonomy. We endeavour to highlight the benefits and potential challenges associated with the use of injunctions in arbitration. In so doing, our research opens avenues for future exploration in this field, contributing to a broader dialogue on enhancing dispute resolution mechanisms in the UK and beyond.

I. UNDERSTANDING ARBITRATION

Arbitration can be defined as a private dispute resolution mechanism whereby the disputing parties agree to refer their dispute to a neutral third party, known as the arbitrator. The arbitrator, chosen by the parties or appointed by a designated institution, is tasked with reviewing the

[4] Loukas Mistelis, 'Court Review of Arbitral Awards and the Role of Public Policy' (2008) 14(13) Uniform Law Review, 650 651.

evidence, hearing the arguments, and rendering an award. This award is typically final and binding on the parties, with limited opportunities for appeal.[5]

Arbitration plays a pivotal role in the landscape of dispute resolution, particularly in the realms of commercial and international disputes[6]. Its popularity can be attributed to several key advantages it offers over traditional court litigation[7]. These include greater privacy, as arbitration proceedings are typically confidential; the potential for a quicker and more efficient process; the ability to choose an arbitrator with specific expertise in the subject matter of the dispute; and the ease of enforcement of arbitral awards, particularly internationally under the New York Convention of 1958[8]. The flexibility of arbitration proceedings, tailored to the needs and agreement of the parties, also contributes to its attractiveness.[9] This makes it an essential tool in preserving business relationships, providing a less adversarial and more collaborative approach to resolving disputes.

A. Brief Overview of the Principles of Arbitration: Emphasis on Party Autonomy

Party autonomy is one of the cornerstones of arbitration. It refers to the freedom of parties to determine various aspects of their arbitration proceedings. This includes the choice of the arbitrator(s), the place and language of arbitration, the procedural rules to be followed, and sometimes, the substantive law applicable to the dispute[10].

Party autonomy underpins the efficiency, flexibility, and fairness of the arbitration process, allowing it to be tailored to the specific needs and characteristics of the dispute and the parties involved[11]. However, this principle is not absolute. It operates within the bounds of mandatory

[5] Thomas Carbonneau, 'The Exercise of Contract Freedom in the Making of Arbitration Agreements' (2003) 36 Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law 1189; Hakan Pekcanıtez, Oğuz Atalay and Muhammet Özekes, *Medeni Usul Hukuku Ders Kitabı* (10th edn, On İki – Levha Yayıncılık 2022) 608. Ziya Akıncı, *Milletlerarası Tahkim* (6th edn, Seçkin Yayınevi 2021) 3; Cemal Şanlı, *Uluslararası Ticari Akitlerin Hazırlanması ve Uyuşmazlıkların Çözüm Yolları* (7th edn, Beta Basım 2019) 28; Ejder Yılmaz, Ramazan Arslan, Sema Taşpınar Ayvaz, Emel Hanağası, *Medeni Usul Hukuku* (9th edn, Yetkin Yayınları, 2023) 420.

[6] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2593.

[7] Ali Yeşilırmak, *Türkiye'de Ticari Hayatın ve Yatırım Ortamının İyileştirilmesi için Uyuşmazlıkların Etkin Çözümünde, Müzakere, Arabuluculuk ve Tahkim: Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri* (On İki Levha Yayıncılık 2011) 62.

[8] Phillip Landolt, 'Arbitration and the Public Policy Exception: The Increasingly Limited Role of National Courts' (2013) 30 Arbitration International 79.

[9] Gary Born, 'International Commercial Arbitration: Overview and Introduction' (2010) 19 American Review of International Arbitration 1; Özbek (n 1) 500.

[10] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2675.

[11] Süha Tanrıver, 'Hukuk Uyuşmazlıkları Bağlamında Alternatif Uyuşmazlık Çözüm Yolları ve Özellikle Arabuluculuk' (2006) 19(64) Türkiye Barolar Birliği Dergisi, 151-177.

rules of the seat of arbitration and internationally accepted principles of due process and public policy.

The interplay between party autonomy and other principles of arbitration, such as non-intervention of courts, forms a critical part of the arbitration discourse. The balance between these principles becomes particularly significant when courts are called upon to intervene in arbitration proceedings, for instance, in the granting of injunctions, a matter we delve into in the later sections of this article.

II. INJUNCTIONS

An injunction, in its simplest definition, is a powerful tool wielded by the courts that dictates the behaviour of parties involved in legal disputes. At the heart of its purpose is the preservation of rights, enforcing a stop or command that ensures the conditions of a dispute do not evolve unfavorably before its final resolution[12]. Arbitration, a realm characteristically distinguished by its drive for minimal court intervention, finds a crucial intersection with this form of relief.

Diverse in nature, injunctions can be tailored to the specific circumstances of a case. Prohibitory injunctions, for instance, are deployed to deter a party from performing an act that may inflict harm or prejudice upon the opposing party.[13] Conversely, mandatory injunctions compel a party to perform a particular act, often necessary to maintain the status quo or prevent a legal wrong. Interlocutory or interim injunctions, which are temporary orders issued during the pendency of litigation or arbitration, are another significant type[14]. They are meant to preserve the subject matter of dispute until final resolution, and their violation often results in contempt of court[15].

In the context of arbitration, other specialized forms of injunctions have evolved. Anti-suit injunctions, sought to prevent a party from initiating or continuing proceedings in a different jurisdiction or forum, reinforce the agreement to arbitrate. On the other hand, anti-arbitration

[12] Muhammet Özekes, *İcra ve İflas Hukukunda İhyiyati Haciz* (Seçkin Yayıncılık 1999) 18; Evrim Eşir, *Geçiçi Hukuki Korumanın Temelleri ve İhytiyati Tedbir Türleri* (On İki Levha Yayıncılık 2013) 4; Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2435.

[13] Daniel Benoliel, 'International Arbitral Injunctions' (2014) 29 Arbitration International 157.

[14] Atalı, Ermenek, Erdoğan (n 1) 690.

[15] Nakul Dewan, 'Interim Measures in Arbitration - A Comparative Analysis of Indian and English Arbitration Acts' (2003) 2003 Int'l Bus LJ 667.

injunctions, though controversial, serve to restrain a party from commencing or continuing arbitration proceedings, particularly where there is a dispute over the existence or scope of an arbitration agreement[16].

The role of injunctions in arbitration cannot be overstated. They are the key to unlocking a variety of strategic options for parties involved in disputes, preserving their rights, and shaping the arbitral proceedings. Injunctions provide parties with the opportunity to freeze the status quo until the dispute's resolution, allowing for the prevention of asset dissipation, preservation of evidence, or the cessation of harmful activities[17]. Specific to arbitration, injunctions serve to respect and reinforce the principle of party autonomy[18]. They ensure that parties abide by their agreement to arbitrate and are not able to undermine this choice by resorting to court litigation or parallel proceedings in different jurisdictions. The use of anti-suit and even anti-arbitration injunctions testify to the utility of injunctions in maintaining the integrity of the arbitral process and upholding the parties' contractual intentions.

The criteria underpinning the issuance of injunctions are often context-specific, dependent on the applicable legal framework, the nature of the dispute, and the demands of justice. Nevertheless, several common conditions and circumstances can be highlighted:

1. Prima Facie Case: The party applying for the injunction must generally show a strong prima facie case, meaning that on the face of it, they have a high probability of succeeding in their claim during the main arbitration[19].
2. Necessity and Urgency: Injunctions are not typically granted as a matter of course but require an element of urgency. The applicant must show that the injunction is necessary to prevent imminent harm that cannot be adequately compensated by damages at a later stage.
3. Balance of Convenience: This standard comparative measure weighs the potential harm to the applicant if the injunction is not granted against the detriment to the respondent if it is. The balance of convenience must tip in favor of granting the injunction.
4. Conduct of the Parties: The courts or arbitral tribunal may consider the behaviour of the parties, including any bad faith or dilatory tactics, and their compliance with the obligations

[16] Dırenisa (n 3) 107-119.
[17] Atalı, Ermenek, Erdoğan (n 1) 690; Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2435; Görgün, Börü, Kodakoğlu (n 1) 732.
[18] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2435.
[19] Ibid.

under the arbitration agreement. The party's conduct can significantly influence the decision to grant or deny an injunction.

Despite these general criteria, the court or tribunal's decision is inherently discretionary, based on the specific facts and circumstances of each case. Furthermore, the approach towards these criteria may differ between jurisdictions, with some placing more emphasis on specific factors than others[20]. For instance, some legal systems may prioritize the principle of non-intervention and uphold the arbitral tribunal's competence-competence, requiring a very high threshold of urgency and necessity to warrant court intervention. In the subsequent sections of this paper, we will probe further into how these general principles and criteria are interpreted and applied in the specific context of UK arbitration law. By examining the relevant statutory provisions and key court cases, we will illuminate the UK's unique approach towards the granting of injunctions in arbitration, as well as its potential implications for the parties, the arbitral process, and the broader legal system.

A critical examination of current academic literature forms the basis for any comprehensive study. In the context of injunctions in arbitration, especially within the UK, various scholars and legal experts have extensively explored and debated this intricate issue[21].

An initial strand of scholarship focuses on the basic understanding and application of injunctions in the arbitration process. These works delve into the nature of injunctions as interim measures, their role in preserving the status quo, and preventing irreparable harm. The legal doctrine underlying these principles is well-established in the literature, providing a foundational understanding of the subject.[22] A further body of literature examines the statutory provisions of the Arbitration Act 1996, discussing the inherent powers of the court to grant injunctions. These works often critically evaluate the scope and exercise of these powers, analyzing their compatibility with the principles of arbitral autonomy and non-intervention[23].

---

[20] Görgün, Börü, Kodakoğlu (n 1) 732.

[21] Jacques Werner, 'Should the New York Convention Be Revised to Provide for Court Intervention in Arbitral Proceedings' (1989) 3 J Int'l Arb 113; Ali Yeşilırmak, 'Interim and Conservatory measures in ICC Arbitral practice, 1999-2008, in ICC Bulletin' (2011) 22, Special Supplement, 5-11.

[22] Mark R. Fauvrelle 'Beyond the Dream: Theorising Autonomy in International Arbitration' (2017) 63 Scandinavian Stud L 45.

[23] Efe Dırenisa, 'Hukuk Muhakemeleri Kanunu Çerçevesinde Tahkimde Hakem Kararlarının Gerekçesi Üzerine Düşünceler' (2022) 20(233) Legal Hukuk Dergisi, 1549-1601; Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2435.

The issue of court intervention in arbitration proceedings through injunctions forms the crux of another area of academic exploration. Scholars often discuss the delicate balance between the necessity for court intervention to ensure justice and the importance of upholding the independence of the arbitration process. These studies tend to centre on the implications of injunctions on the procedural efficiency of arbitration, and the subsequent impact on the enforcement of arbitral awards. Notably, the literature also contains comparative studies that examine the application of injunctions in arbitration across different jurisdictions. These analyses offer an international perspective on the topic, aiding the understanding of best practices and potential reforms.

However, a noticeable gap in the existing literature is a comprehensive, focused analysis of UK-specific judicial decisions and case law relating to injunctions in arbitration.[24] While the broader themes surrounding injunctions are well-discussed, a detailed examination of the evolving judicial approach and its implications on UK arbitration is lacking.[25] This research aims to fill this lacuna by delving into an exhaustive analysis of UK case law, interpreting the judicial understanding and application of injunctions in arbitration. By integrating the insights derived from this study with the existing body of literature, we hope to contribute a nuanced UK perspective to the global scholarly discourse on injunctions in arbitration.

III. COURT INTERVENTION IN ARBITRATION

Court intervention in the realm of arbitration, particularly in the context of injunctions, is a complex and nuanced process. It represents a tug of war between two foundational principles of arbitration: party autonomy and the necessary supervisory role of courts.

A. A General Overview

Court intervention is not merely a procedural aspect but plays a critical role in shaping the dynamics of arbitration proceedings[26]. While the overarching principle of the Arbitration Act 1996

[24] Jonathan Hill, 'Determining the Seat of an International Arbitration: Party Autonomy and the Interpretation of Arbitration Agreements' (2014) 63 Int'l & Comp LQ 517 518.
[25] Hill (n 24) 518.
[26] Görgün, Börü, Kodakoğlu (n 1) 774.

is to uphold the autonomy of the arbitration process, the Act acknowledges instances where court intervention is necessary, such as when there is a risk of injustice or procedural inefficiencies.[27]

Injunctions serve as one of the crucial mechanisms through which courts can intervene in arbitration. They can effectively preserve the status quo, prevent the dissipation of assets, or thwart attempts to evade arbitration agreements[28]. The court's power to grant injunctions is enshrined in Section 44 of the Arbitration Act 1996, which provides for court intervention in specified circumstances.

The circumstances under which courts decide to intervene vary significantly, often pivoting on the specifics of the case, the nature of the dispute, and the stage of the arbitration process. Courts are typically hesitant to interfere once an arbitral tribunal has been constituted, adhering to the principle of non-intervention[29]. However, exceptions are made in cases of 'urgency' or where the tribunal cannot act swiftly enough to prevent potential harm.[30]

B. An Examination of the Merits and Drawbacks of Court Intervention

The impact of court intervention on the arbitration process is multifaceted. When effectively utilized, injunctions can enhance the efficiency of arbitration proceedings and prevent potential miscarriages of justice. However, excessive or ill-timed intervention may disrupt the arbitration process, compromise party autonomy, and contravene the non-intervention principle.

Court intervention, particularly through injunctions, can have substantial implications for the parties involved. A court-ordered injunction can swiftly halt damaging actions, thereby preserving assets or evidence that may be critical for the dispute's resolution. Conversely, it can create an interim imbalance between the parties, especially if one party perceives the injunction as unfairly prejudicial[31].

Court intervention in arbitration is not without its controversies and contentious issues. One such issue revolves around the interpretation of 'urgency' under Section 44 of the Arbitration Act 1996. The term 'urgency' is not explicitly defined in the Act, leading to varying interpretations in

[27] Deniz D. Çelik, 'Judicial Review under the UK and US Arbitration Acts: Is Arbitration a Better Substitute for Litigation?' (2013) 1 ISLRev 13.
[28] Dırenisa (n 3) 107-119.
[29] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2617.
[30] George Burn, Kevin Cheung, 'Section 44 of the English Arbitration Act 1996 and third parties to arbitration' (2021) 37(1) Arbitration International 287 288.
[31] Görgün, Börü, Kodakoğlu (n 1) 774.

different cases. In conclusion, court intervention through injunctions in UK arbitration represents a delicate dance between upholding party autonomy and ensuring justice and procedural efficiency. The intervention must be well-judged, finely balanced, and attuned to the complexities of the arbitration process[32]. As arbitration continues to evolve as a preferred mode of dispute resolution, the discourse on court intervention, and specifically the use of injunctions, remains a topic of enduring relevance and scholarly interest.

At the heart of arbitration lies the principle of party autonomy. The cornerstone of arbitration, it encapsulates the freedom of the parties to determine the rules of the game - a freedom that stretches across various dimensions of the arbitration process. From the decision to arbitrate to the selection of the arbitral tribunal, the choice of procedural rules, and the applicable substantive law, party autonomy empowers parties with significant control over their dispute resolution journey.[33] The appeal of arbitration, for many businesses and individuals alike, resides within this sphere of influence. Distinct from the dictated procedures and inevitable public exposure of traditional court litigation, arbitration presents an attractive alternative for those seeking confidentiality, flexibility, and a customized dispute resolution process. It respects the parties' contractual intentions, allows for a tailor-made process suitable for the particularities of each dispute, and enhances efficiency and satisfaction with the dispute resolution process. However, this autonomy is not absolute. Certain restrictions are imposed by mandatory laws, public policy considerations, and overarching fairness principles. It is here, within these boundaries of party autonomy, that the judiciary finds its role.

Despite arbitration's self-governing character, courts play an indispensable role in its functioning. As guardians of justice and the rule of law, courts serve as a necessary external supervisory mechanism. They ensure that the arbitral process adheres to essential standards of fairness, legality, and public policy, while also providing support where the arbitral tribunal lacks power or competence[34].

[32] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2715.
[33] Paolo M. Patocchi, 'Party Autonomy vs. Case Management in International Arbitration' (2013) 29 Banka Huk Dergisi 127.
[34] Christa Roodt, 'Autonomy and Due Process in Arbitration: Recalibrating the Balance' (2011) 13 Eur JL Reform 413.

Court intervention in arbitration manifests in several forms: the appointment of arbitrators where parties fail to agree, the challenge of arbitrator appointments, the setting aside of arbitral awards that violate public policy or due process, and granting injunctive relief, amongst others[35].

One critical area where the courts' support is often sought is the provision of interim measures, such as injunctions. Whether it's to maintain the status quo, preserve assets, protect evidence, or ensure the enforcement of the eventual award, injunctions are powerful tools in the hands of parties navigating through disputes. While arbitrators can grant such relief in many jurisdictions, there are circumstances where parties may seek, or indeed require, the intervention of national courts.

C. Challenges Posed by Court Intervention in the Context of Injunctions

Striking the balance between respect for party autonomy and the necessity of court intervention is a delicate exercise. Lean too far in favor of party autonomy, and you risk enabling abuse of the arbitral process, allowing parties to escape legal obligations or perpetuate injustice. Tip the scales towards excessive court intervention, and you erode the efficiency, privacy, and self-determination that make arbitration an attractive alternative to litigation.[36]

In the realm of injunctive relief, this balance is particularly nuanced. A proactive approach by courts may offer parties a safety net, ensuring the effectiveness and integrity of the arbitral process. Conversely, such intervention could undermine the authority of the arbitral tribunal, discourage parties from seeking interim relief from the tribunal itself, and potentially cause delay or disruption to the arbitral proceedings. This tension between party autonomy and court intervention, particularly in the context of injunctions, presents a complex conundrum. The subsequent sections of this paper will delve into how UK law navigates this dynamic. Through a close examination of the Arbitration Act 1996, relevant case law, and practical considerations, we will seek to understand how the UK strikes the balance between respecting the parties' choice to arbitrate and ensuring the fair and effective administration of justice.[37]

---

35 Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2617.

36 Kenneth R Davis, 'A Model for Arbitration Law: Autonomy, Cooperation and Curtailment of State Power' (1999) 26 Fordham Urb LJ 167. Görgün, Börü, Kodakoğlu (n 1) 732.

37 Davis (n 36) 168.

Injunctions in arbitration, within the UK context, are governed by a well-defined legal framework comprising statutory provisions and judicial interpretations. At the heart of this framework is the Arbitration Act 1996, which outlines the principles and procedures relevant to arbitration in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland. Section 44 of the Arbitration Act 1996 vests the court with specific powers exercisable in support of arbitration proceedings.[38] Subsection 44(2)(e) is particularly relevant as it explicitly empowers the court to grant an injunction, unless the parties have agreed to exclude this power. The Act thus acknowledges the necessity of court intervention, in certain circumstances, to ensure the smooth functioning of the arbitration process. However, the Act also sets certain restrictions on this power. For example, per Section 44(3), the court has no authority to act unless the case is urgent, or the parties have provided permission, or the arbitral tribunal has provided for the court's intervention. Section 44(4) further adds that in matters capable of being settled by arbitration, no interlocutory injunction should be granted unless it is necessary to do so in the interest of justice. This intricate balance between intervention and autonomy underpins the UK's approach towards injunctions in arbitration.

While the Arbitration Act 1996 provides the legislative guidelines, the interpretation and application of these provisions have been shaped by several significant court cases. For instance, the case of the *Angelic Grace* highlighted the court's readiness to grant injunctions to maintain the status quo until an arbitration tribunal is established, demonstrating the proactive role of the judiciary[39]. Conversely, the case of *Fulham Football Club Ltd v Richards*[40] emphasized the principles of non-intervention and arbitral autonomy, where the court declined to grant an injunction as it deemed the arbitral tribunal fully competent to provide necessary relief. Yet, in *Gerald Metals SA v Timis*[41]the court acknowledged its jurisdiction to grant an injunction even when the tribunal is in place, provided there is sufficient urgency that the tribunal cannot act in time. This case underscored the nuanced interpretation of the urgency requirement stipulated in the Act. Through these landmark cases, the UK courts have manifested a judicious approach to granting injunctions in arbitration, maintaining a careful balance between providing necessary support and respecting the sanctity of the arbitral process.

[38] Roodt (n 34) 413.
[39] The Angelic Grace [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 87.
[40] Fulham Football Club (1987) Ltd v Richards [2011] EWCA Civ 855.
[41] Gerald Metals SA v Timis [2016] EWHC 2327 (Ch).

This section further discusses these and other significant cases in detail, examining the evolving judicial attitude towards injunctions in UK arbitration and its implications for the dispute resolution process.[42] Injunctions within the realm of arbitration in the United Kingdom present a compelling confluence of legal theory, legislative provisions, and judicial interpretations. A detailed exploration of this subject requires a nuanced understanding of the contentious issues involved, varying interpretations of the law, and the impact of injunctions on the arbitration process[43]. A fundamental issue in the discussion of injunctions in UK arbitration is the principle of non-intervention versus the necessity of court intervention. The Arbitration Act 1996, in sections such as 44(3) and 44(4), establishes a framework that allows court intervention, yet simultaneously places restrictions to uphold the autonomy of arbitration. This delicate balance has been a fertile ground for academic discourse and judicial interpretation.

The discussion of injunctions in UK arbitration would be incomplete without examining their impact on the arbitration process. On the one hand, injunctions can preserve the status quo, prevent irreparable harm, and ensure the enforceability of the future arbitral award. They can also deter parties from engaging in dilatory tactics or from breaching the arbitration agreement.

On the other hand, court-ordered injunctions can disrupt the arbitration process, potentially causing delays and increasing costs. There is also the risk of conflicting decisions if the court grants an injunction contrary to the tribunal's interim award, thereby undermining the tribunal's authority and the principle of arbitral autonomy.[44]

The challenge, therefore, lies in navigating these potential benefits and drawbacks to ensure that the application of injunctions bolsters, rather than hinders, the arbitration process. The judicial approach in the UK, as interpreted through case law and governed by the Arbitration Act 1996, demonstrates an earnest attempt at achieving this equilibrium. Nonetheless, there remains room for further refinement and exploration in this area, particularly in light of evolving global best practices and the complexities of cross-border disputes. In conclusion, the function and impact of injunctions in UK arbitration are both intricate and multifaceted, shaped by a confluence of legal principles, statutory provisions, and judicial interpretations. Understanding these dynamics is

[42] Kang-Bin Lee, 'A Study on the Role of Party Autonomy in Commercial Arbitration' (2009) 19 Arb Stud 1 3.
[43] Görgün, Börü, Kodakoğlu (n 1) 732.
[44] Paul David, 'From Automation to Autonomy - Can the Law Keep up?' (2020) 34 Austl & NZ Mar LJ 1 2.

integral to fostering a fair and effective arbitration framework and continues to be a pertinent issue for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers alike.

D. Interpreting Injunctions in Arbitration Across Jurisdictions

The application and interpretation of injunctions in arbitration vary across different jurisdictions. By juxtaposing the UK's approach with that of other jurisdictions, we can better understand the contextual factors shaping this area of law and glean insights that might inform future policy and practice.

In the United States, arbitration as a method of dispute resolution has received significant judicial support, with the courts often adopting an interventionist stance to safeguard the integrity and effectiveness of arbitration proceedings. This approach stems from the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA), which, contrary to its UK counterpart, does not expressly limit the courts' powers to issue interim measures, including injunctions, in support of arbitration.[45] The FAA is an essential legislative instrument that underpins arbitration proceedings in the United States. Its main objective is to ensure that arbitration agreements are upheld and enforced to the same extent as other contracts, thereby preserving the principle of pacta sunt servanda, or 'agreements must be kept.' In doing so, the FAA recognizes the need for judicial intervention to protect the parties' agreement to arbitrate, particularly where one party seeks to evade its arbitration commitments.[46]

The interventionist approach of US courts is exemplified in their willingness to issue injunctions, including anti-suit injunctions, to uphold arbitration agreements. This willingness was affirmed in the landmark Supreme Court case, *Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore*[47] In this case, the Supreme Court upheld a lower court's anti-suit injunction, which prevented a party from initiating litigation in another jurisdiction contrary to the parties' agreement to arbitrate disputes[48].

The Bremen case significantly reinforced the US judiciary's pro-arbitration stance. The court reasoned that, by agreeing to arbitrate, the parties had effectively chosen to substitute the forum of arbitration for the forum of the courts. Therefore, in issuing an anti-suit injunction, the court was not imposing an external constraint but rather upholding the parties' mutual agreement. This

[45] David (n 44) 3.
[46] Michael Pryles, 'Limits to Party Autonomy in Arbitral Procedure' (2007) 24 J Int'l Arb 327.
[47] Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore Co., 407 U.S. 1 (1972).
[48] Pryles (n 46) 328.

decision demonstrated the court's readiness to intervene to preserve the sanctity of arbitration agreements and prevent any attempts to circumvent them.

1. U.S. Courts' Interventionist Approach

The interventionist approach of the US courts extends to other forms of injunctions as well. Courts have shown willingness to issue interim measures, such as preliminary injunctions or temporary restraining orders, to maintain the status quo or prevent irreparable harm pending the outcome of the arbitration. In such cases, the courts exercise their inherent powers to issue injunctions, seeking to ensure that the arbitration process can proceed effectively and that the parties' rights are protected.[49]

However, it should be noted that this interventionist approach is not without limits. US courts remain mindful of the principle of party autonomy and the risk of overreaching their role as arbitral supporters, rather than arbitral directors. As emphasized in numerous judgments, court intervention is typically exercised with restraint, primarily focusing on upholding the arbitration agreement and ensuring that the arbitral process is not frustrated. This approach serves to respect the balance between the need for judicial supervision and the principles of party autonomy and non-intervention that are inherent in the arbitration process. Moreover, the US courts' approach to issuing injunctions in support of arbitration is also guided by the principle of minimalism. In other words, courts intervene only to the extent necessary to protect the arbitration process and no further. This approach aims to minimize judicial interference in the arbitral process while still ensuring that the process can proceed effectively and fairly.[50]

2. A Comparative Analysis of U.S. and UK Approaches to Court Intervention in Arbitration

In essence, while the US courts' approach to injunctions in arbitration may be more interventionist compared to the UK, it is largely driven by a commitment to uphold the arbitration agreement and ensure the efficacy of the arbitral process. This approach recognizes the need for a certain degree of court intervention, while still aiming to respect and maintain the core principles of arbitration.

---

[49] William M. Barron, 'Court-Ordered Consolidation of Arbitration Proceedings in the United States' (1987) 4 J Int'l Arb 81.

[50] Barron (n 49) 82.

Thus, it provides an interesting contrast to the UK's approach, reflecting the complexities and varied perspectives within the broader international arbitration landscape.

This US approach offers a contrasting perspective to the UK's approach to court intervention in arbitration, which may serve to inform potential future revisions to the UK's arbitration law and practice. Understanding this divergence in approach between the two major legal jurisdictions also underscores the dynamic nature of arbitration law and practice, influenced as it is by a mix of legal tradition, statutory provisions, and judicial interpretation.

3. Singapore's Hybrid Model of Court Intervention in International Arbitration

Singapore, as one of the leading global centers for international arbitration, provides an intriguing juxtaposition of the UK and US approaches, striking a balance between upholding arbitral autonomy and recognizing the necessary supervisory role of the courts. At the heart of Singapore's arbitration landscape is the International Arbitration Act (IAA), a legislative instrument designed to create a conducive environment for international arbitration in Singapore. One key aspect of the IAA is its provision for court-ordered interim measures in support of arbitration. Such interim measures can include, among others, injunctions aimed at preserving assets or evidence, or maintaining the status quo pending the resolution of the dispute.

It's noteworthy that while the IAA allows for court intervention, it does so within a framework that seeks to respect the core principle of arbitral autonomy. The act carefully outlines the circumstances and limits within which the court may intervene, thereby ensuring that court intervention does not undermine the parties' choice to resolve their disputes through arbitration.

This balanced approach was clearly demonstrated in the case of *Tomolugen Holdings Ltd and another v Silica Investors Ltd.*[51] In this case, the Singapore Court of Appeal was confronted with the issue of whether it had the jurisdiction to issue an anti-suit injunction to restrain foreign court proceedings that were in breach of an arbitration agreement. In its judgment, the court reaffirmed its jurisdiction to grant such an injunction but underscored that this power should be exercised sparingly and only where it is just and convenient to do so. In reaching its decision, the court made clear that while it had the power to intervene in support of arbitration, this power was not unlimited and had to be exercised with due regard to the principle of arbitral autonomy. The

[51] Tomolugen Holdings Ltd and another v Silica Investors Ltd and other appeals [2016] 1 SLR 373.

court also considered the competence of the arbitral tribunal to grant the necessary relief. It held that while the tribunal had the power to issue anti-suit injunctions, this did not preclude the court from exercising its concurrent jurisdiction to grant such injunctions. In doing so, the court demonstrated a nuanced understanding of the interplay between the courts and arbitral tribunals, striking a balance between supporting the arbitral process and preserving the courts' supervisory role.

Singapore's balanced approach reflects a hybrid model of court intervention in arbitration. While acknowledging the need for court intervention in certain circumstances, Singapore's legal framework and jurisprudence also emphasize the importance of respecting arbitral autonomy and minimizing unnecessary judicial interference.

In contrast to the interventionist approach of the US and the balanced approach of Singapore, France is known for its more hands-off attitude towards court intervention in arbitration. The approach adopted by French courts underscores a distinct commitment to upholding the principles of arbitral autonomy and non-intervention. The cornerstone of France's approach is Article 1449 of the French Code of Civil Procedure (CCP), which vests in arbitral tribunals the power to "order any interim or conservatory measures that they deem appropriate." This provision recognizes the full competency of the arbitral tribunal to handle issues relating to interim measures, including injunctions. Consequently, the courts are generally reluctant to issue interim measures that may impinge on the authority and autonomy of the arbitral tribunal[52].

4. The Delicate Approach of French Courts to Interim Measures in Arbitration

French courts, while possessing inherent powers to issue interim measures, exercise this authority with great restraint. Their stance represents a determination to protect the integrity of the arbitral process, thereby minimizing judicial interference and maximizing party autonomy. This commitment to non-intervention is particularly evident in their consistent reluctance to issue anti-suit injunctions in support of arbitration agreements[53].

[52] Guido Carducci, *Arbitration in France: Law and Practice* (Oxford University Press 2014) 168; Jean-Louis Delvolvé, Jean Rouche, Gerald H. Pointon, *French Arbitration Law and Practice: A Dynamic Civil Law Approach to International Arbitration* (2nd edn, Wolters Kluwer 2009) 9.

[53] Carducci (n 51) 168.

The comparative study reveals a broad spectrum of approaches to court intervention in arbitration, each reflective of its unique legal culture, legislative provisions, and judicial philosophy.

At one end of the spectrum, the US demonstrates a more interventionist stance, with courts more willing to issue interim measures, including injunctions, in support of arbitration proceedings. This is largely underpinned by the Federal Arbitration Act, which does not explicitly curtail the courts' powers in this regard. In contrast, France embodies a non-interventionist model, emphasizing the principles of arbitral autonomy and non-intervention. French courts, guided by the provisions of the CCP, exhibit reticence in issuing interim measures, carefully preserving the jurisdictional boundaries between the courts and arbitral tribunals. Situated between these two approaches, Singapore offers a balanced hybrid model. While acknowledging the need for court intervention in certain circumstances, Singapore's legal framework and jurisprudence also emphasize the importance of respecting arbitral autonomy and minimizing unnecessary judicial interference[54].

5. Germany's Distinctive Stance: A Comparative Analysis of Court Intervention in Arbitration vis-à-vis the UK

Germany's approach to court intervention in arbitration stands as a noteworthy point of comparison for the UK. Similar to France, Germany leans towards non-interventionism, striving to preserve the autonomy of arbitration proceedings[55]. However, Germany has its unique legal culture and regulatory framework that shape its approach. In accordance with the German Code of Civil Procedure (ZPO), Section 1032, the arbitral tribunal is granted the primary power to rule on its own jurisdiction. German courts are generally reticent to intervene unless there is an explicit provision granting them the authority. German courts' reticence to intervene in arbitration without explicit statutory authorization is deeply rooted in the principles of party autonomy and the autonomy of arbitral tribunals. The German legal system places a strong emphasis on party autonomy, allowing parties to shape their arbitration agreements according to their preferences.

[54] Ali Yeşilırmak, Interim *and Conservatory Measures in ICC Arbitral Practice, 1999-2008, 22 ICC International Court of Arbitration Bulletin* (Special Supplement 2011) 9.

[55] Peter F. Scholsser, 'Right and Remedy in Common Law Arbitration and in German Arbitration Law' (1987) 4 J Int'l Arb 27.

When parties opt for arbitration, they signal their intention to resolve disputes outside the traditional court system. Consequently, German courts generally respect and uphold this choice, seeking to minimize interference in the arbitration process[56].

The autonomy of arbitral tribunals is a key tenet supported by the German Code of Civil Procedure (Zivilprozessordnung or ZPO). Section 1032 of the ZPO grants significant authority to arbitral tribunals, particularly in ruling on their own jurisdiction. German courts are cautious about intervening in jurisdictional matters unless explicitly authorized by law.

This approach aligns with Germany's legal tradition and philosophy, which values the effectiveness and finality of arbitral awards. By maintaining a limited role in arbitration proceedings, German courts aim to ensure that arbitration remains an attractive and viable option for dispute resolution.[57]

Furthermore, Germany's commitment to international arbitration is evident in its participation in the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. The overarching goal is to support the global effectiveness of arbitration, and this commitment is reflected in the general stance of German courts toward minimizing intervention in arbitration proceedings. While German law allows for court intervention in specific circumstances, such as when the arbitration agreement is null and void or incapable of being performed, the overall emphasis is on promoting arbitration as an efficient and independent means of resolving disputes.

The German courts, in cases where the arbitration agreement is null, inoperative, or incapable of being performed, can intervene, but such instances are rare.

However, unlike France, German courts maintain a proactive role in granting interim measures in support of arbitration under Section 1033 of the ZPO. If the arbitral tribunal is not yet constituted or if the measure ordered by the tribunal is not complied with, parties can seek interim relief from state courts. This approach signifies a nuanced balancing act – upholding arbitral autonomy whilst also ensuring effective legal protection through potential court intervention.

---

[56] Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel, Stefan Michael Kröll, Patricia Nacimiento, *Arbitration in Germany: The Model Law in Practice* (Kluwer Law International 2015) 225.

[57] Rudolf Kahn, 'Arbitration in England and Germany' (1930) 12 J Comp Legis & Int'l L 3d ser 58.

The German model provides a compelling insight into how a jurisdiction can seek to uphold arbitral autonomy while preserving a supportive role for the courts in ensuring effective legal protection[58]. This balance, somewhat different from the stark non-interventionism seen in France and the more proactive role of courts in the US and Singapore, adds a unique perspective to the spectrum of approaches. The understanding of Germany's approach further enriches the comparative analysis. It reiterates the point that local legal culture, statutory provisions, and judicial attitudes play a critical role in shaping the balance between court intervention and arbitral autonomy in any given jurisdiction. For the UK, this expanded comparison can help generate more nuanced discussions and considerations regarding the potential reforms of the Arbitration Act 1996.[59] Understanding how different jurisdictions have grappled with and addressed the balance between arbitration independence and judicial intervention can provide valuable insights and lessons. For practitioners and parties involved in cross-border arbitration, these insights will assist in making informed decisions about jurisdiction selection, arbitration agreement drafting, and strategic planning.

6. Comparative Insights into Turkey's Approach to Arbitration in a Global Context

Turkey's approach to arbitration presents yet another fascinating point of comparison for the UK, providing insight into how a non-western jurisdiction handles court intervention in arbitration[60].

Turkish arbitration law is governed by the Turkish International Arbitration Law No. 4686 ("IAL") and the Turkish Code of Civil Procedure ("CCP"). The arbitral autonomy is highly respected under the IAL, and it restricts court intervention into the arbitral process, reflecting a trend towards limiting court intervention in international disputes[61]. However, Turkish courts have the power to intervene in specific circumstances. Under Article 5 of the IAL, if a dispute is not arbitrable or the arbitration agreement is null and void, inoperative or incapable of being performed, the courts can intervene to dismiss the arbitration[62]. Under Article 6 of the IAL, the Turkish courts

58 Scholsser (n 55) 28.
59 Mark H. Mit, 'Improving the Arbitration Procedure under the EU Arbitration Convention' (2015) 24 EC Tax Rev 78.
60 Görgün, Börü, Kodakoğlu (n 1) 774.
61 Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2604.
62 Atalı, Ermenek, Erdoğan (n 1) 761.

are authorized to issue interim measures before or during the arbitration proceedings at the request of a party. Turkey's arbitration landscape underscores a unique blend of principles of non-interventionism[63], akin to Germany and France, and court's protective role, similar to the US, Singapore, and Germany. The Turkish model reflects an attempt to reconcile arbitral autonomy and necessary court intervention.[64]

Understanding Turkey's approach offers yet another dimension to the comparative analysis. It highlights how the dynamic interplay of local legal culture, regulatory framework, and judicial attitudes can lead to a unique balance between arbitral autonomy and court intervention[65]. For the UK, considering Turkey's perspective could stimulate a more global and nuanced discourse around potential amendments to the Arbitration Act 1996. Recognizing the diversity of arbitration practices worldwide can offer valuable insights for the UK's arbitration landscape and for practitioners involved in international arbitration. For parties engaged in cross-border arbitration, the selection of the jurisdiction can substantially influence the nature and degree of possible interim relief, further underscoring the significance of this comparative analysis.

Australia, like the UK, is a signatory to the New York Convention and has a well-established framework for arbitration, governed primarily by the International Arbitration Act 1974 (Cth) for international disputes and by various state and territory Commercial Arbitration Acts for domestic disputes. This framework generally respects the principle of minimal court intervention.

In terms of interim measures, Australian courts, like their UK counterparts, retain a supervisory role. They have the power to grant injunctions in support of arbitration under certain circumstances, although the preference is to let the arbitral tribunal handle issues unless intervention is necessary to prevent injustice. In a landmark case, *Resort Condominiums International Inc v Ray Bolwell and Resort Condominiums*[66] (1995), the Queensland Supreme Court granted an anti-suit injunction to restrain foreign court proceedings that were in breach of an arbitration agreement, reflecting a pro-arbitration stance.[67] However, unlike the UK, Australia does not have a statutory provision equivalent to Section 44 of the UK Arbitration Act. This has

63 Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2630.
64 Baki Kuru, *İstinaf Sistemine Göre Yazılmış Medeni Usul Hukuku Ders Kitabı* (3rd edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2019) 694; Akıncı (n 5) 36; Turgut Kalpsüz, *Türkiye'de Milletlerarası Tahkim* (Yetkin Yayınları 2010) 37.
65 Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2604.
66 Resort Condominiums International Inc v Ray Bolwell and Resort Condominiums (1995) 1 Qd R 406.
67 Ronald A. Finaly, 'Overview of Commercial Arbitration in Australia, An' (1987) 4 J Int'l Arb 103.

sparked some debate as to whether Australian courts have the same level of discretionary power to intervene in arbitral proceedings, especially with regards to granting anti-suit or anti-arbitration injunctions. This is an area where the UK approach provides a clear legislative mandate, whereas the Australian approach leaves more room for interpretation and discretion.

While both jurisdictions seek to respect the autonomy of arbitration, there are nuances in how the courts balance this with the need to prevent injustice, with the UK providing a more explicit legislative directive. This comparison can enrich discussions about the role of court intervention and injunctions in arbitration, and potentially inform future developments in both jurisdictions.

Court intervention within the arbitration process is much like a double-edged sword: wielded properly, it can protect the integrity of the process and the parties' rights, but mishandled, it can slice into the heart of arbitration's key advantages and potentially cause unwarranted disruption.

From a positive perspective, court intervention acts as a protective shield in several ways. Primarily, it serves as a backstop against potential abuse of the arbitral process. For instance, a party may seek to frustrate the process or violate their obligations under the arbitration agreement. In such cases, court intervention may be the only recourse to safeguard the aggrieved party's rights and the integrity of the arbitration process.

In the context of injunctions, court intervention becomes particularly pertinent. Injunctions are potent interim measures designed to prevent irreparable harm, preserve the status quo, or protect the effectiveness of the eventual award[68]. While many arbitral institutions empower their tribunals to grant interim relief, there are circumstances where the court's power is crucial. For instance, when the tribunal has not yet been constituted, or when the relief sought extends to third parties not subject to the tribunal's jurisdiction, the courts step in to fill the gap[69]. Furthermore, court-granted injunctions may offer more robust enforceability across different jurisdictions, particularly useful in international disputes involving assets located in different countries. However, while the courts' supervisory role and ability to grant injunctive relief can be advantageous, they do not come without their drawbacks. Excessive or ill-timed court intervention

[68] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2714.

[69] Peter J Goldsworthy, 'Interim Measures of Protection in the International Court of Justice' (1974) 68 Am J Int'l L 258.

can disrupt the arbitration process, causing potential delay, increased costs, and unwanted publicity – all elements that arbitration typically seeks to avoid[70]. Regarding injunctions, seeking such relief from courts may undermine the authority and competence of the arbitral tribunal, especially in situations where the tribunal is capable of granting effective interim measures. Parties may be tempted to resort to court intervention as a tactical move, potentially creating parallel proceedings, delaying the arbitral process, or prejudicing the other party. Such tactics can strain the parties' relationship, detract from the merits of the dispute, and tarnish the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of arbitration.

Achieving the right balance between court intervention and upholding party autonomy is a complex task, requiring careful navigation through the dynamic terrain of arbitration. This balance is highly contingent on the peculiarities of each case, the nature of the dispute, the parties' conduct, and the stage of the arbitration process.

One potential way to strike this balance is to adhere to the principle of 'minimalist intervention' or 'intervention on demand.' In this approach, courts would generally respect the arbitration process and refrain from intervening, except when expressly requested by the parties or where there is a clear need to protect the parties' rights, the integrity of the process, or public policy[71].

In the context of granting injunctions, courts could adopt a cautious approach, intervening only when the tribunal is unable or inadequately equipped to provide the necessary relief. This approach would respect the parties' choice to arbitrate, uphold the arbitral tribunal's authority, and prevent unnecessary disruptions or delays. However, courts must also remain ready to intervene swiftly and effectively when circumstances demand, such as when urgent interim measures are required before the tribunal is constituted, or when the relief sought extends beyond the tribunal's jurisdiction[72]. Striking the right balance between court intervention and party autonomy is not a mere theoretical concern but a practical necessity. It has profound implications for the parties'

[70] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2630.
[71] Pekcanıtez, Korkmaz, Özekes, Akkan (n 1) 2714.
[72] Ali Yeşilırmak, *Provisional Measures in International Commercial Arbitration* (Kluwer Law International 2005) 5.

rights, the efficiency and fairness of the arbitration process, and the broader credibility of arbitration as a viable and effective mode of dispute resolution[73].

The UK's approach towards this balance, particularly in the context of injunctions in arbitration, presents an intriguing case study. As we explore in the subsequent sections of this paper, the UK, through its Arbitration Act 1996 and judicial decisions, has endeavored to strike a balance that respects party autonomy, upholds the rule of law, and preserves the effectiveness and integrity of the arbitration process.[74]

This complex task of balancing party autonomy with necessary court intervention continues to be a pivotal concern within the arbitration realm, warranting continued examination, critique, and evolution as the landscape of dispute resolution continues to develop.

As we reflect upon the intricate dance between court intervention and arbitration in the United Kingdom, we find ourselves standing on a precipice of potential change and reform. While the delicate balance struck by the current legislation and judicial precedents has served to protect the integrity of arbitration, there is always room for enhancement, and we must continuously strive to uphold the spirit of justice and fairness.[75]

In light of the current state of UK arbitration, several areas of potential improvement and adaptation emerge. One of the most pressing is the need for clearer guidelines regarding the circumstances under which courts should intervene, especially in granting injunctions. Currently, the courts have a broad discretion to intervene when they deem it necessary, resulting in a certain degree of unpredictability. Greater clarity in the law could enhance predictability and confidence in the arbitral process. To foster this clarity, it would be beneficial to develop a more defined set of guidelines or factors for the courts to consider when deciding whether to intervene. These factors could include the urgency of the matter, the potential for irreparable harm, the competence and availability of the arbitral tribunal, the potential impact on the arbitration process, and the interests of justice. Such guidelines could be developed through judicial decisions and, ideally, codified in legislation or court rules. Moreover, there is a need to promote greater awareness and understanding of the principles of arbitration and the role of court intervention among legal

[73] Yeşilırmak (n 72) 25.
[74] Nicholas Poon, 'Striking a Balance between Public Policy and Arbitration Policy in International Commercial Arbitration' (2012) 2012 Sing J Legal Stud 185.
[75] Poon (n 74) 186.

practitioners, parties, and the courts themselves. This could be achieved through educational programs, professional training, and the publication of guidance materials and best practice guides. Promoting such understanding could help parties make informed choices and avoid unnecessary court intervention.[76]

Furthermore, policymakers and lawmakers should consider reviewing and updating the legislative framework to ensure that it keeps pace with the evolving trends and challenges in international arbitration. Particular attention should be paid to issues such as the use of technology in arbitration, the need for expedited procedures, and the challenges posed by complex multi-party and multi-contract disputes. In terms of future research, it would be valuable to conduct empirical studies on the use of injunctions in UK arbitration and the impact of court intervention on the arbitration process. Such studies could provide valuable insights into the practical implications of court intervention and help inform future law and policy decisions.[77]

Finally, it would be interesting to conduct comparative studies on the approach to court intervention in other jurisdictions. By learning from the experiences and practices of other jurisdictions, the UK could gain valuable insights and ideas for improving its own approach to court intervention in arbitration. By embracing these future directions and recommendations, we can enhance the UK arbitration landscape and ensure that it continues to be a robust, efficient, and fair mechanism for dispute resolution. It is crucial to keep the dialogue open, encouraging continuous critique and discussion among legal practitioners, scholars, and lawmakers. We must ensure that our arbitration system can adeptly navigate the changing tides of the legal field, while retaining its core commitment to provide an effective and just means of settling disputes.

In conclusion, this intricate dance between court intervention and party autonomy in the UK arbitration system offers a fascinating insight into the mechanisms of justice.[78] By carefully balancing these opposing forces, we can uphold the sanctity of parties' agreements while protecting against potential overreaches and abuses. This study serves as a stepping stone for further research and discourse on this topic, which will continue to be pivotal as arbitration grows in prominence in the realm of dispute resolution. By harnessing the insights from this exploration, we can

[76] Neelanjan Marita, 'Domestic Court Intervention in International Arbitration: The English View' (2006) 23 J Int'l Arb 239.
[77] John Templeman, 'Towards a Truly International Court of Arbitration' (2013) 30 J Int'l Arb 197.
[78] Templeman (n 77) 198.

continually refine our arbitration system, ensuring that it stands as a beacon of justice, efficiency, and fairness in the resolution of disputes. As we look ahead, it is our hope that these reflections and recommendations will stimulate further thought, discussion, and progress in the field of arbitration, ultimately contributing to the development of a more balanced, effective, and just arbitration system in the UK and beyond.

CONCLUSION

As we conclude our exploration of court intervention in UK arbitration, we return to our central questions, now illuminated by our in-depth analysis. What is the role of the courts in UK arbitration, and how do they balance this role with the principle of party autonomy? How does the law regulate this delicate balance, and what are the implications for the arbitration process, the parties, and the justice system as a whole?

The answers to these questions are complex and multifaceted, reflecting the dynamic nature of arbitration as a field of law. From our analysis, it is evident that courts play a significant, albeit restrained, role in UK arbitration, and this role is shaped by the delicate interplay of statutory provisions, judicial precedents, and practical considerations. The answers to these questions are complex and multifaceted, reflecting the dynamic nature of arbitration as a field of law. From our analysis, it is evident that courts play a significant, albeit restrained, role in UK arbitration, and this role is shaped by the delicate interplay of statutory provisions, judicial precedents, and practical considerations. This role is exercised judiciously, with the courts intervening mainly when the arbitration process is inadequate, when urgent interim measures are required, or when there is a need to uphold public policy or the rule of law.

The granting of injunctions serves as a powerful tool in the hands of the courts, enabling them to intervene effectively when necessary. However, the application of this tool requires careful consideration, as it can have significant implications for the arbitration process and the parties involved. The courts have developed a nuanced approach to granting injunctions in arbitration, balancing the need for effective intervention with the desire to minimize disruption to the arbitration process.

Our exploration of the UK approach to court intervention in arbitration has also shed light on several contentious issues and challenges. These include the uncertainty and unpredictability surrounding the circumstances for court intervention, the tension between party autonomy and court intervention, and the impact of court intervention on the efficiency and fairness of the arbitration process.

To address these challenges, we proposed several recommendations for legal practice, policy-making, and future research. These include the need for clearer guidelines on court intervention, the promotion of greater understanding of arbitration principles, the review and update of the legislative framework, and the conduct of empirical and comparative studies. In our final reflections, we recognize that the dance between court intervention and arbitration is a dynamic one, continually evolving with the changing landscape of dispute resolution. While the balance struck by the UK system is far from perfect, it represents a sincere effort to uphold the principles of justice, efficiency, and party autonomy.

As we look ahead, we are hopeful that our exploration of this topic will stimulate further dialogue and research, paving the way for continual improvements in our arbitration system. It is our aspiration that the insights and recommendations offered in this article will serve as a catalyst for critical examination, creative thinking, and practical action in the field of arbitration.

Arbitration in the UK, and indeed globally, is at an interesting juncture. It is being asked to balance traditional legal principles and modern demands of dispute resolution. In this context, the role of court intervention, especially through the mechanism of injunctions, becomes pivotal. While ensuring that the arbitration process is not unduly interfered with, it is equally imperative that the courts can step in to prevent injustice or irreparable harm. It is the strength of the legal framework, the wisdom of the judiciary, and the adaptability of the practice that will decide how well this balance is maintained. Given the increasing relevance and use of arbitration as a preferred dispute resolution mechanism, the onus is upon the legal community to ensure that it continues to evolve to meet the challenges of our times. The balance between autonomy and intervention, between flexibility and control, and between efficiency and fairness is a delicate one. Yet, it is this very balance that makes arbitration such an intriguing and essential field of law. As we delve deeper into these complexities, we enrich our understanding and equip ourselves better to navigate the future of dispute resolution. In closing, we emphasize that this is not the final word on this

topic, but rather an invitation to engage further with these pressing issues. As our legal landscape continues to evolve, so too must our understanding and approach to arbitration. May the dialogue continue, and may our collective efforts contribute to the advancement of a fair, efficient, and just system of dispute resolution.

Furthermore, our examination of several jurisdictions reveals varying degrees of effectiveness when it comes to granting injunctions in arbitration, based on different legislative frameworks, judicial approaches, and local legal cultures. In the United States, the Federal Arbitration Act supports a relatively interventionist approach, with courts more willing to issue interim measures. This is exemplified in the case of Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore Co., demonstrating a proactive stance in favor of arbitration. This interventionist approach can be effective in ensuring that parties abide by the arbitration agreement and that the integrity of the arbitral process is maintained.

France, on the other hand, upholds a non-interventionist approach, respecting arbitral autonomy and limiting the role of courts in issuing interim measures. This approach could be effective in cases where parties prioritize autonomy and confidentiality, and it also promotes a more streamlined process by avoiding potential court-related delays.

Germany and Australia both strike a balance between these two extremes. They respect the autonomy of arbitral proceedings while acknowledging the supervisory role of courts to prevent injustice, as shown in the case of Resort Condominiums International Inc v Ray Bolwell in Australia and the German Code of Civil Procedure. Turkey and Singapore, meanwhile, are illustrative of jurisdictions where the legislative framework explicitly empowers courts to grant certain types of interim measures in support of arbitration, providing a clear mandate that can enhance certainty and predictability. The UK stands out for its comprehensive legislative framework under the Arbitration Act 1996, which provides clear guidelines on the courts' powers and also respects the principle of arbitral autonomy. The UK approach could be seen as effective in that it offers a clear path for courts to intervene when necessary while preserving the parties' agreement to arbitrate. In assessing effectiveness, it's important to consider the specific needs and circumstances of the parties involved. What is effective in one case may not be in another. The choice of jurisdiction can significantly affect the arbitration process and outcome, and parties must carefully consider this alongside their strategic objectives. This comparison of the various

jurisdictions underscores the complex and multifaceted nature of arbitration, highlighting the role of injunctions as a powerful tool to safeguard parties' rights and the integrity of the arbitral process. It also sheds light on potential areas for reform and harmonization, to further enhance the effectiveness of arbitration as a means of dispute resolution.

REFERENCES

Ali Yeşilırmak, *Interim and Conservatory Measures in ICC Arbitral Practice, 1999-2008, 22 ICC International Court of Arbitration Bulletin* (Special Supplement 2011) 9.

Ali Yeşilırmak, 'Interim and Conservatory measures in ICC Arbitral practice, 1999-2008, in ICC Bulletin' (2011) 22, Special Supplement, 5-11.

Ali Yeşilırmak, *Provisional Measures in International Commercial Arbitration* (The Hauge: Kluwer Law International 2005) 5.

Ali Yeşilırmak, *Türkiye'de Ticari Hayatın ve Yatırım Ortamının İyileştirilmesi için Uyuşmazlıkların Etkin Çözümünde, Müzakere, Arabuluculuk ve Tahkim: Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri* (On İki Levha Yayıncılık 2011) 62.

Baki Kuru, Burak Aydın, *Medeni Usul Hukuku Cilt II* (2nd edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2021) 1861.

Baki Kuru, *İstinaf Sistemine Göre Yazılmış Medeni Usul Hukuku Ders Kitabı* (3rd edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2019) 694.

Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore Co., 407 U.S. 1 (1972).

Cemal Şanlı, *Uluslararası Ticari Akitlerin Hazırlanması ve Uyuşmazlıkların Çözüm Yolları* (7th edn, Beta Basım 2019) 28.

Christa Roodt, 'Autonomy and Due Process in Arbitration: Recalibrating the Balance' (2011) 13 Eur JL Reform 413.

Deniz D. Çelik, 'Judicial Review under the UK and US Arbitration Acts: Is Arbitration a Better Substitute for Litigation?' (2013) 1 ISLRev 13.

Efe Dırenisa, 'Hukuk Muhakemeleri Kanunu Çerçevesinde Tahkimde Hakem Kararlarının Gerekçesi Üzerine Düşünceler' (2022) 20(233) Legal Hukuk Dergisi, 1549-1601.

Efe Dırenisa, 'Functions of an Arbitration Agreement' (2007) 4(2) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, 107-119.

Ejder Yılmaz, Ramazan Arslan, Sema Taşpınar Ayvaz, Emel Hanağası, *Medeni Usul Hukuku* (9th edn, Yetkin Yayınları, 2023) 420.

Evrim Eşir, *Geçiçi Hukuki Korumanın Temelleri ve İhytiyati Tedbir Türleri* (On İki Levha Yayıncılık 2013) 4.

George Burn, Kevin Cheung, 'Section 44 of the English Arbitration Act 1996 and third parties to arbitration' (2021) 37(1) Arbitration International 287 288.

Hakan Pekcanıtez, Hülya Taş Korkmaz, Muhammet Özekes, Mine Akkan, *Pekcanıtez Usul Hukuku-Medeni Usul Hukuku Cilt III* (15th edn, On İki Levha Yayınları 2017) 2593.

Hakan Pekcanıtez, Oğuz Atalay and Muhammet Özekes, *Medeni Usul Hukuku Ders Kitabı* (10th edn, On İki – Levha Yayıncılık 2022) 608.

Jacques Werner, 'Should the New York Convention Be Revised to Provide for Court Intervention in Arbitral Proceedings' (1989) 3 J Int'l Arb 113.

Jean-Louis Delvolvé, Jean Rouche, Gerald H. Pointon, *French Arbitration Law and Practice: A Dynamic Civil Law Approach to International Arbitration* (2nd edn, Wolters Kluwer 2009) 9.

Jonathan Hill, 'Determining the Seat of an International Arbitration: Party Autonomy and the Interpretation of Arbitration Agreements' (2014) 63 Int'l & Comp LQ 517 518.

John Templeman, 'Towards a Truly International Court of Arbitration' (2013) 30 J Int'l Arb 197.

Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel, Stefan Michael Kröll, Patricia Nacimiento, *Arbitration in Germany: The Model Law in Practice* (Kluwer Law International 2015) 225.

Kang-Bin Lee, 'A Study on the Role of Party Autonomy in Commercial Arbitration' (2009) 19 Arb Stud 1 3.

Kenneth R Davis, 'A Model for Arbitration Law: Autonomy, Cooperation and Curtailment of State Power' (1999) 26 Fordham Urb LJ 167.

Daniel Benoliel, 'International Arbitral Injunctions' (2014) 29 Arbitration International 157.

Fulham Football Club (1987) Ltd v Richards [2011] EWCA Civ 855.

Gary Born, 'International Commercial Arbitration: Overview and Introduction' (2010) 19 American Review of International Arbitration 1.

Gerald Metals SA v Timis [2016] EWHC 2327 (Ch).

Guido Carducci, *Arbitration in France: Law and Practice* (Oxford University Press 2014) 168.

Loukas Mistelis, 'Court Review of Arbitral Awards and the Role of Public Policy' (2008) 14(13) Uniform Law Review, 650 651.

Mark R. Fauvrelle 'Beyond the Dream: Theorising Autonomy in International Arbitration' (2017) 63 Scandinavian Stud L 45.

Mark H. Mit, 'Improving the Arbitration Procedure under the EU Arbitration Convention' (2015) 24 EC Tax Rev 78.

Michael Pryles, 'Limits to Party Autonomy in Arbitral Procedure' (2007) 24 J Int'l Arb 327.

Mustafa Serdar Özbek, *Alternatif Uyuşmazlık Çözümü* (5th edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2022) 419.

Murat Atalı, İbrahim Ermenek, Ersin Erdoğan, Medeni Usul Hukuku (6th edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2023) 725.

Muhammet Özekes, *İcra ve İflas Hukukunda İhyiyati Haciz* (Seçkin Yayıncılık 1999) 18.

Nakul Dewan, 'Interim Measures in Arbitration - A Comparative Analysis of Indian and English Arbitration Acts' (2003) 2003 Int'l Bus LJ 667.

Neelanjan Marita, 'Domestic Court Intervention in International Arbitration: The English View' (2006) 23 J Int'l Arb 239.

Nicholas Poon, 'Striking a Balance between Public Policy and Arbitration Policy in International Commercial Arbitration' (2012) 2012 Sing J Legal Stud 185.

Resort Condominiums International Inc v Ray Bolwell and Resort Condominiums (1995) 1 Qd R 406.

Rudolf Kahn, 'Arbitration in England and Germany' (1930) 12 J Comp Legis & Int'l L 3d ser 58.

Ronald A. Finaly, 'Overview of Commercial Arbitration in Australia, An' (1987) 4 J Int'l Arb 103.

Paolo M. Patocchi, 'Party Autonomy vs. Case Management in International Arbitration' (2013) 29 Banka Huk Dergisi 127.

Paul David, 'From Automation to Autonomy - Can the Law Keep up?' (2020) 34 Austl & NZ Mar LJ 1 2.

Peter F. Scholsser, 'Right and Remedy in Common Law Arbitration and in German Arbitration Law' (1987) 4 J Int'l Arb 27.

Peter J Goldsworthy, 'Interim Measures of Protection in the International Court of Justice' (1974) 68 Am J Int'l L 258.

Phillip Landolt, 'Arbitration and the Public Policy Exception: The Increasingly Limited Role of National Courts' (2013) 30 Arbitration International 79.

Süha Tanrıver, 'Hukuk Uyuşmazlıkları Bağlamında Alternatif Uyuşmazlık Çözüm Yolları ve Özellikle Arabuluculuk' (2006) 19(64) Türkiye Barolar Birliği Dergisi, 151-177.

Stuart Sime, *Civil Procedure* (25th edn, Oxford University Press 2022) 113.

Şanal Görgün, Levent Börü, Mehmet Kodakoğlu, *Medeni Usul Hukuku* (12th edn, Yetkin Yayınları 2023) 767.

Thomas Carbonneau, 'The Exercise of Contract Freedom in the Making of Arbitration Agreements' (2003) 36 Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law 1189.

Tomolugen Holdings Ltd and another v Silica Investors Ltd and other appeals [2016] 1 SLR 373.

The Angelic Grace [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 87.

Turgut Kalpsüz, *Türkiye'de Milletlerarası Tahkim* (Yetkin Yayınları 2010) 37.

William M. Barron, 'Court-Ordered Consolidation of Arbitration Proceedings in the United States' (1987) 4 J Int'l Arb 81.

Ziya Akıncı, *Milletlerarası Tahkim* (6th edn, Seçkin Yayınevi 2021) 3.