



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Principles of evidence in investor-state arbitration: burden, standards, presumptions & inferences

Duggal, K.A.N.

Citation

Duggal, K. A. N. (2019, February 28). *Principles of evidence in investor-state arbitration: burden, standards, presumptions & inferences*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/68700>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/68700>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/68700>

Author: Duggal, K.A.N.

Title: Principles of evidence in investor-state arbitration: burden, standards, presumptions & inferences

Issue Date: 2019-02-28



Universiteit
Leiden

PRINCIPLES OF EVIDENCE IN INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION

Burden, Standards, Presumptions, & Inferences

Kabir A.N. Duggal

PRINCIPLES OF EVIDENCE IN INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION:

Burden, Standards, Presumptions, & Inferences

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van

de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,

op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,

volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties

te verdedigen op donderdag 28 februari 2019

klokke 15.00 uur

door

Kabir Ashok Nina Duggal

geboren te Jubail, Saudi Arabia

in 1981

Promotor: Prof. dr. E.C.P.D.C. De Brabandere

Co-Promotor: Dr. M. Hébié

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. M.E. Koppenol-Laforce
Prof. dr. H.J. Snijders
Dr. H.E. Kjos (University of Amsterdam)
Prof. dr. C.J. Tams (University of Glasgow, U.K.)

Opdracht

To my parents who always wanted me to undertake research

and

To Dr. Joseph F. Moll who has encouraged me to do so

INHOUDSOPGAVE/TABLE OF CONTENTS

INHOUDSOPGAVE/TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	II
CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO EVIDENTIARY PRINCIPLES IN INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION	1
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. THE RESEARCH QUESTION.....	12
III. INTEREST OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION	20
IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	24
V. NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY.....	31
VI. STRUCTURE.....	32
VII. THE THESIS OF THIS RESEARCH.....	33
PART I EVIDENTIARY PRINCIPLES & THE PARTIES: BURDEN AND STANDARD OF PROOF.....	34
CHAPTER 2—BURDEN OF PROOF AS RECOGNIZED AND APPLIED BY INVESTOR- STATE ARBITRAL TRIBUNALS	37
I. INTRODUCTION AND POSITION IN INTERNATIONAL LAW—THE PARTY MAKING AN ASSERTION HAS THE BURDEN OF PROOF	37
II. APPLICABILITY AND PREVALENCE OF THE BASIC PRINCIPLE IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION	40
(A) The Basic Principle Applies to the Factual Allegations of the Party Making the Assertion— Whether Claimant or Respondent.....	42
(B) Investor-State Tribunals Have Refused To Relax The Basic Principle and have applied at all stages of the Arbitration Process.....	46

(C) Function of the Basic Principle: It Aids In Decision-Making From Firm Factual Presumptions.....	53
III. BURDEN OF PROOF AS RECOGNIZED AND APPLIED BY INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION AT THE JURISDICTION PHASE	57
(A) The Investor has the Burden of Proof in The Initial Establishment of Jurisdiction	58
(B) The Investor has the Burden of Proof in The Initial Establishment of a Cognizable Claim	61
(C) The Respondent has the Burden of Proof in Rebutting Factual Questions in the Establishment of Jurisdiction	67
(D) The Respondent bears the Burden of Proof for any Assertions that it makes at the Jurisdictional Stage	69
(E) Function of the Jurisdictional Burden of Proof—It Reconciles the Limited Nature of a Tribunal’s Jurisdiction with Concerns for Access to Justice	70
IV. BURDEN OF PROOF AS RECOGNIZED AND APPLIED BY INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION AT THE DAMAGES PHASE	75
(A) Determining The Appropriate Remedy—The Investor’s Burden.....	76
(B) Awarding Non-Speculative Damages—The Investor’s Burden	78
(C) Questioning The Appropriate Remedy—The Respondent’s Burden	80
(D) Challenges to the Investor’s Claim for Damages on Grounds that they are Speculative—The Respondent’s Burden.....	81
(E) Function of the Burden of Proof at the Damages Phase—It Prevents Under- or Over-Compensation	81
V. TIMEFRAME IN WHICH A BURDEN MUST BE DISCHARGED AS RECOGNIZED AND APPLIED BY INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION	83
(A) The Burden must be Discharged at the Time the Party Makes the Allegation	83
(B) Consequences of Timeliness—It Facilitates a Fair and Speedy Resolution of the Dispute	84
VI. CONSEQUENCE OF FAILURE TO DISCHARGE A BURDEN OF PROOF	84
(A) Consequences for the Parties—The Allegation will be Dismissed	85
(B) Consequences for an Award Issued in Derogation of Burdens of Proof—It can be the Basis for Annulment.....	86

VII. POTENTIAL PROBLEMS IN THE APPLICATION OF THE BASIC PRINCIPLE?	98
--	----

(A) Identification of the “Claimant” May Result in Problems?	98
(B) The Respondent’s Procedural Advantage?	101
(C) Other Problems on Simultaneous Pleadings?	102
VIII. CONCLUSION	102

CHAPTER 3—SHIFTING THE BURDEN OF EVIDENCE107

I. INTRODUCTION—WHEN A PARTY WITH THE INITIAL BURDEN PROVIDES EVIDENCE, THE BURDEN OF EVIDENCE SHIFTS TO THE OTHER PARTY	107
II. THE SHIFTING PRINCIPLE IN INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION.....	111
(A) Even though not Always Explicit, Investor-State Tribunals have Recognized and Applied the Shifting Principle.....	111
(B) At least Prima Facie Evidence needs to be Provided for the Burden of Evidence to Shift	113
III. THE SHIFTING PRINCIPLE AND PRESUMPTIONS: WHEN THE INITIAL BURDEN IS MET BY VIRTUE OF A PRESUMPTION, THE BURDEN OF EVIDENCE SHIFTS TO THE OTHER PARTY	116
IV. THE SHIFTING RULE PRINCIPLE AND THE JURISDICTIONAL PHASE OF THE CASE FOLLOWS THE SAME PRINCIPLES FOR BURDEN OF PROOF AT THE JURISDICTIONAL STAGE	119
V. CONSEQUENCES OF THE SHIFTING PRINCIPLE.....	120
(A) Consequences for the Parties: Failure to Respond to Evidence that Has Shifted can have Serious Consequences.....	120
(B) Failure of the Tribunal to Shift the Burden of Evidence May Result in Annulment	121
VI. PROBLEMS IN THE APPLICATION OF THE SHIFTING PRINCIPLE	123
VII. CONCLUSION	125

**CHAPTER 4—STANDARD OF PROOF AS RECOGNIZED AND APPLIED BY
INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRAL TRIBUNALS.....127**

I. INTRODUCTION	127
II. STANDARD OF PROOF AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH BURDEN OF PROOF.....	128
III. THERE IS A LACK OF CLARITY ON STANDARD OF PROOF.....	131
IV. A TYPOLOGY ON THE DIFFERENT STANDARDS OF PROOF IN INVESTOR- STATE ARBITRATION	139
(A) The “Prima Facie” Standard	139
(B) The Most Common Standard—Balance of Probabilities or Preponderance of Evidence as Recognized And Applied by Investor-State Arbitration	141
(C) Heightened Standard of Proof For “Serious” Issues As Recognized and Applied by Investor-State Arbitration	150
V. THE SPECIAL CASE OF WRONGDOINGS.....	157
(A) Introduction.....	157
(B) Additional Principles Clarified by Investor-State Tribunals: Mere Insinuations or Vague Allegations will not Suffice	159
(C) Circumstantial Evidence is Permissible When Direct Evidence is not Available for Allegations of Wrongdoings	167
(D) Evidentiary Techniques to Meet the Standard of Proof for Wrongdoings: “Connecting the Dots” and Red Flags	169
(E) The Heightened Standard of Proof Does Make it Difficult to Succeed in Allegations of Wrongdoings Even if Circumstantial Evidence is Permitted.....	171
(F) Problems Associated With The Heightened Standard of Proof	177
(G) Evidentiary Consequences Of Wrongdoings—It Can Give Rise to A Series of Challenges	178
VI. PROBLEMS AND CRITICISMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONCEPT OF “STANDARD OF PROOF”	184
VII. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILING TO APPLY THE APPROPRIATE STANDARD OF PROOF	187

VIII. THE USE OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE AS RECOGNIZED AND APPLIED BY INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION	189
IX. CONCLUSION	193

PART II EVIDENTIARY PRINCIPLES & THE TRIBUNAL: PRESUMPTIONS AND INFERENCES..... 196

CHAPTER 5—EVIDENTIARY PRESUMPTIONS AS APPLIED IN INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION..... 199

I. INTRODUCTION AND PRESUMPTIONS IN GENERAL.....	199
(A) Introduction and Types of Presumptions Commonly Recognized in International Law	201
(B) Function of Presumptions in General	204
II. ARBITRATION RULES AND THE APPLICATION OF PRESUMPTIONS IN GENERAL	205
(A) The Relationship Between Presumptions and Burdens of Proof	207
(B) The Relationship Between Presumptions and Inferences	208
III. LEGAL PRESUMPTIONS	210
(A) General International Law Presumptions in Investor-State Arbitration	210
(B) Municipal Law Presumptions in Investor-State Arbitration	211
(C) Rebuttal Nature of Legal Presumptions.....	212
(D) Illustrations for Legal Presumptions as Recognized and Applied by Investor-State Tribunals	214
IV. JUDICIAL PRESUMPTIONS.....	218
(A) The Constitutive Function of the Legal Presumption of Good Faith in Formulating Judicial Presumptions.....	218
(B) The Evidentiary Predicate for Judicial Presumptions	221
(C) Application of Judicial Presumptions to the Arbitration Record	222
(D) The Rebuttable Nature of Judicial Presumptions	223
V. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILING TO APPLY PRESUMPTIONS.....	224

VI. CONCLUSION	226
CHAPTER 6—INFERENCES FROM EVIDENCE OR ITS ABSENCE AS APPLIED IN INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION	229
I. INTRODUCTION: INFERENCES IN GENERAL	229
(A) Background to Inferences.....	231
(B) Inferences under Arbitration Rules	233
(C) Inferences and Indirect/Circumstantial Evidence.....	234
II. INFERENCES IN INVESTOR-STATE ARBITRATION & THE DOCTRINE OF PLAUSIBILITY	235
(A) Plausibility As Measure For The Drawing Of Inferences	237
III. DIFFICULTY OF PROOF THROUGH DIRECT EVIDENCE IN INVESTOR- STATE ARBITRATION	245
(A) The Relationship of the Inference to Direct Record Evidence	248
(B) The Quality and Quantity of Direct Evidence Supporting the Inference.....	251
IV. CIRCUMSTANCES SIGNIFICANT IN REBUTTING THE DRAWING OF RECORD INFERENCES	253
V. INFERENCES ARISING FROM THE MISCONDUCT OF THE PARTIES IN ADDUCING EVIDENCE (E.G., FAILURE TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS) IN ARBITRAL PROCEEDINGS.....	255
(A) Good Faith in Investor-State Arbitration	256
(B) Severity of Procedural Bad Faith and its Relationship to the Facts to be Proved	257
(C) The Importance of Procedural Clean Hands of the Party Seeking an Inference	260
(D) The Relationship of Inferences Arising from Party Misconduct and Inferences Arising from the Record	261
(E) The significance of such adverse interference	263
VI. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILING TO APPLY INFERENCES OR APPLYING AN INFERENCE INCORRECTLY	265

VII. CONCLUSION	266
SUMMARY	269
SAMENVATTING (DUTCH SUMMARY)	275
ANNEX A	281
ANNEX B	285
FIGURES IN THE THESIS	288
BIBLIOGRAPHY	289
CURRICULUM VITAE	305

