

A cláusula do "Tratamento Justo e Equitativo" na Jurisprudência do ICSID

Autor: Vitor Silveira Vieira

Orientador: Prof. Dr. Fábio Morosini

PERGUNTA

Qual é o entendimento dado pela Jurisprudência do ICSID à cláusula do "Tratamento Justo e Equitativo"?

MÉTODO

Método empírico:
Análise quantitativa e qualitativa das sentenças arbitrais proferidas sob os auspícios do ICSID

HIPÓTESE

Nos casos em que a interpretação do seu significado se torna relevante, o fator determinante para a adoção de um posicionamento ou outro é a corrente jurisprudencial e doutrinária vigente no momento em que o caso é decidido

JUSTIFICATIVAS

- O ICSID é a mais relevante Câmara de Arbitragem em matéria de Investimento Estrangeiro Direto
- A cláusula do "Tratamento Justo e Equitativo" serve de embasamento para grande parte das controvérsias e seu entendimento é muito controverso



BIBLIOGRAFIA BÁSICA

- ALVAREZ, José. The Public International Law Regime Governing International Investment. Brill Academic Pub. 2010
BARBOSA, Flávio spaçoquere e MONEBHURRUN, Nitish. O Tratamento do Investimento Estrangeiro. Revista Brasileira de Arbitragem. Ed. Esp. 2011, pp.107-145.
BISHOP, R. Doak, CRAWFORD James, et al. Foreign Investment Disputes: Cases, Materials and Commentary, Kluwer Law International 2005.
DIEHL, Alexandra. The Core Standard of International Investment Protection, International Arbitration Law Library, Volume 26 Kluwer Law International 2012.
DOLZER, Rudolf e SCREUER, Cristoph. Principles of International Investment Law. Oxford University Press. 2008.
EVANS Malcom D., International Law. Oxford University Press. 3rd ed, 1993
HORN, Norbert and KRÖLL, Stefan Michael. Arbitrating Foreign Investment Disputes, Kluwer Law International, 2004
JENIS, Mark W. Little, Brown and Company. Second edition. 1993
NEWCOMBE, Andrew and PARADELL, Luis. Law and Practice of Investment Treaties. Kluwer Law International. 2009
ROTHKOPF, Robert. The Rompetrol Group NV v Romania – treaty protections triggered by maltreatment of company officers. Disponível em: [\[http://kluwerarbitrationblog.com/2013/05/24/the-rompetrol-group-nv-v-romania-treaty-protections-triggered-by-maltreatment-of-company-officers/\]](http://kluwerarbitrationblog.com/2013/05/24/the-rompetrol-group-nv-v-romania-treaty-protections-triggered-by-maltreatment-of-company-officers/)
SASSON, Monique, Substantive Law in Investment Treaty Arbitration: The Unsettled Relationship between International Law and Municipal Law, Kluwer Law International 2010
SCHREUER, Cristoph. Fair and Equitable Treatment in Arbitral Practice. Offprints of the Journal of World Investment & Trade, Vol. 6, No.3. June 2005
UNCTAD. Fair And Equitable Treatment, a Sequel. United Nations Conference On Trade And Development. Series on Issues in International Investment Agreements II. New York and Geneva, 2012
VANDELVE, Kenneth J. A Unified Theory of Fair and Equitable Treatment. International Law and Politics. Vol. 43, pp. 43-106, 2010

CONCLUSÕES

- O Primeiro caso foi o *Azinian v. Mexico*, que fixou um entendimento que foi reproduzido na maioria dos primeiros casos.
- No período de 1999 a 2002, 62,5% os casos seguiram a doutrina de que a cláusula do "tratamento justo e equitativo" não seria uma apólice de seguro para os investimentos, tendo como principais referências os casos *Azinian v. Mexico* e *Maffezini v. España*.
- No período de 2003 a 2013, 69% os casos seguiram a doutrina das expectativas legítimas, tendo como principais referências os casos *Metalclad v. USA* e *Tecmed v. Mexico*.
- Em um caso deste ano (8 de Abril de 2013), o *Arif v. Moldavia*, criticou-se a doutrina das expectativas legítimas, o que talvez seja o indício de um novo entendimento para os próximos anos

CASOS SELECIONADOS

1. Robert Azinian, Kenneth Davitian, & Ellen Baca v. The United Mexican States, ICSID Case No. ARB (AF)/97/2. 1 November 1999
2. Metalclad Corporation v. The United Mexican States, ICSID Case No. ARB/AF/97/1. 30 August 2000
3. Emilio Agustín Maffezini v. The Kingdom of Spain, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/1. 13 November 2000.
4. Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal S.A. v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/97/3. 21 November 2000
5. Alex Genin, Eastern Credit Limited, Inc. and A.S. Baltoli, V. The Republic of Estonia Case No. ARB/99/2. 25 June 2001
6. Eudoro Armando Olguín v. Republic of Paraguay, ICSID Case No. ARB/99/5. 26 July 2001.
7. Mondeval International Ltd. V. The United States of America, Case No. ARB/AF/99/2. 11 October 2002
8. Marvin Feldman v. Mexico. CASE NO. ARB/AF/99/1. 16 December 2002
9. ADF GROUP Inc. V. The United States of America Case No. ARB/AF/00/1. 9 January 2003
10. Tecnicas Medioambientales Tecmed S.A. v. Estados Unidos Mexicanos CASO No. ARB (AF)/00/2. 29 May 2003
11. The Loewen Group, Inc. and Raymond L. Loewen v. The United States of America. Case No. ARB(AF)/98/3. 26 June 2003
12. Consortium rfc v. Royaume du Maroc, Aff. No ARB/00/6. 22 December 2003.
13. Waste Management, Inc. v. United Mexican States, Case N° ARB/AF/00/3. 30 April 2004
14. CMS Gas Transmission Company v. The Argentine Republic, CASE NO. ARB/01/8 12 May 2005
15. Noble Ventures, Inc. v. Romania. ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12 12 October 2005
16. AZURIX CORP. v. The Argentine Republic. ICSID CASE NO. ARB/01/12. 14 July 2006
17. ADC Affiliate Limited and ADC & ADMC Management Limited v. The Republic of Hungary ICSID Case No. ARB/03/16. 2 October 2006
18. PSEG GLOBAL INC. AND KONYA ILGIN ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM VE TİCARET LİMİTED S'RKETİ v. Republic of Turkey. ICSID Case No. ARB/02/5. 19 Jan 2007
19. MTD Equity Sdn. Bhd. and MTD Chile S.A. v. Republic of Chile Case No. ARB/01/7. 21 March 2007
20. LG&E ENERGY CORP., LG&E CAPITAL CORP. and LG&E INTERNATIONAL INC. v. ARGENTINE REPUBLIC. ICSID Case No. ARB/02/1. 25 July 2007
21. M.C.I. POWER GROUP L.C. and NEW TURBINE, INC. v. Republic of Ecuador ICSID Case No. ARB/03/6. 31 July 2007
22. COMPAÑÍA DE AGUAS DEL ACONQUIJA S.A. and VIVENDI UNIVERSAL S.A. v. ARGENTINE REPUBLIC. Case No. ARB/97/3. 20 August 2007
23. PARKERINGS-COMPAGNIE AS v. Republic of Lithuania. ICSID Arbitration Case No. ARB/08/1. 11 September 2007
24. OKO PANKKI OY (formerly called: OKO Osuuspankkien Keskuspankki OY), VTB BANK (DEUTSCHLAND) AG (formerly called: Ost-West Handelsbank AG); and SAMPO BANK PLC v. The Republic of Estonia. 19 November 2007
25. SEMPRO INTERNATIONAL v. Argentine Republic. CASE NO. ARB/02/16. 28 September 2007
26. Desert Line Projects LLC v. The Republic of Yemen. ICSID Case No. ARB/05/17. 6 February 2008
27. HELIAN INTERNATIONAL HOTELS A/S v. THE ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT. ICSID CASE NO. 05/19. 3 June 2008
28. METALPAR S.A. Y BUEN AIRE S.A. v. REPÚBLICA ARGENTINA CASO CIADI NO. ARB/03/5. 6 June 2008
29. BIWATER GAUFF (TANZANIA) LTD. v. UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA ICSID CASE NO. ARB/02/22. 24 July 2008
30. RUMELİ TELEKOM A.S. v. TELSIM MOBİL TELESKOMAŞ HİZMETLERİ A.S. ICSID Case No. ARB/05/16. 29 July 2008
31. DUKE ENERGY ELECTROQUEIL PARTNERS & ELECTROQUEIL S.A. v. REPUBLIC OF ECUADOR. ICSID Case No. ARB/04/19. 18 August 2008
32. Jan de Nul N.V. and Dredging International N.V. v. Arab Republic of Egypt. ICSID Case No. ARB/04/13. 23 November 2008
33. L.E.S.I. S.p.A. et ASTALDI S.p.A. c/ République algérienne démocratique et populaire CIRDI NO. ARB/05/3. 12 November 2008
34. PANTECHNIK S.A. CONTRACTORS & ENGINEERS v. THE REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA. ICSID Case No. ARB/07/21. 30 July 2009
35. BAYINDIR INSAAT TURIZM TİCARET VE SANAYİ A.S. v. Islamic Republic of Pakistan. ICSID Case No. ARB/03/29. 27 August 2009
36. EDI SERVICES) LIMITED v. Romania. ICSID CASE NO. ARB/05/13. 8 October 2009
37. IOANNIS KARDASSOPOULOS and RON FUCHS v. THE REPUBLIC OF GERMANY. ICSID Case Nos. ARB/05/18 and ARB/07/15. 3 March 2010
38. GEMPLUS S.A. SLP S.A. GEMPLUS INDUSTRIAL S.A. de C.V. and Talsuis v. THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES
39. Gustav F W Hamster GmbH & Co KG v. Ghana ICSID Case No. ARB/07/24. 18 June 2010.
40. AES SUMMIT GENERATION LIMITED and AES-TISZA ERÖMŰ KFT v. The Republic of Hungary. ICSID Case No. ARB/07/22. 23 September 2010.
41. ALPHA PROJEKTHOLDING GMBH v. Ukraine. ICSID Case No. ARB/07/16. 8 November 2010.
42. Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic. ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1. 27 December 2010.
43. JOSEPH CHARLES LEMIRE v. Ukraine. ICSID CASE NO. ARB/06/18. 28 March 2011
44. GEAGROUP AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT v. Ukraine. ICSID CASE NO. ARB/08/16. 31 March 2011
45. Impregilo S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic. ICSID Case No. ARB/07/17. 21 June 2011
46. EL PASO ENERGY INTERNATIONAL COMPANY v. The Argentine Republic. ICSID Case No. ARB/03/15. 31 October 2011
47. TOTO COSTRUZIONI GENERALI S.P.A. v. REPUBLIC OF LEBANON. ICSID Case No. ARB/07/12. 7 June 2012
48. SWISSLIUN DOO SKOPJE v. THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA. ICSID CASE NO. ARB/09/16. 6 July 2012.
49. ANTOINE GOETZ & CONSORTS ET S.A. AFFINAGE DES METAUX v. REPUBLIQUE DU BURUNDI. Affaire CIRDI NO. ARB/01/2. 21 July 2012
50. OCCIDENTAL PETROLEUM CORPORATION OCCIDENTAL EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION COMPANY v. THE REPUBLIC OF ECUADOR. ICSID Case No. ARB/06/11. 5 October 2012.
51. BOSH INTERNATIONAL, INC and B&P LTD FOREIGN INVESTMENTS ENTERPRISE v. UKRAINE. ICSID Case No ARB/08/1. 25 October 2012
52. VANNESSA VENTURES LTD. V. THE BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA. ICSID CASE NO. ARB/AF/04/6. 16 Jan 2013
53. MR. FRANCK CHARLES ARIF v. REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA. ICSID Case No. ARB/11/23. 8 April 2013
54. THE ROMPETROL GROUP N.V. v. ROMANIA. ICSID Case No. ARB/06/3. 6 May 2013