International Arbitration Practice
Chambers Global named King & Spalding one of the top international arbitration practices globally, quoting clients who say “Their understanding of the law ... is unparalleled.”
King & Spalding’s international arbitration practice is consistently recognized as one of the leading practices in the world in both commercial and investment arbitration—a reputation we have earned through creative strategic thinking, meticulous preparation, effective advocacy and demonstrated results.

Independent legal directories that rank law firms based on client feedback, including Chambers, The Legal 500 and Global Arbitration Review, regularly report on our technical know-how, client responsiveness and results-oriented practice.

In the international commercial arbitration arena, we have represented clients in scores of corporate and contractual matters. In the investor-state arbitration arena, we have handled more than 100 investment arbitrations involving a wide spectrum of legal issues and facts.

In addition to acting in arbitration proceedings, we represent clients in courts around the world in arbitration-related litigation, such as motions to compel arbitration, anti-suit injunctions and enforcement actions.

**Band 1 for International Arbitration**
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**International Arbitration Practice Group of the Year**

LAW360: 2017, 2018, 2019

**Most Impressive International Arbitration Practice Worldwide**

GLOBAL ARBITRATION REVIEW: 2019
In-Depth Arbitration Knowledge

King & Spalding’s international arbitration practice is one of the most experienced and extensive in the world. We have a consistent track record of securing favorable results in complex, high-profile cases.

Our lawyers have successfully represented clients in commercial and investor-state disputes arising under contractual agreements and investment treaties across the Americas, Asia, Africa, Europe and the Middle East. The team has deep experience handling disputes in the energy, mining, construction, financial services, hospitality, manufacturing, media, intellectual property, pharmaceutical, transport and technology sectors.

Many of King & Spalding’s arbitration lawyers are members of the world’s leading arbitration institutions and are active within the various international organizations that work to promote knowledge and understanding of international arbitration, including the International Bar Association, the International Council for Commercial Arbitration, the Institute for Transnational Arbitration, the International Chamber of Commerce, the London Court of International Arbitration and the International Law Association.

King & Spalding lawyers regularly serve as arbitrators in both commercial and investment arbitration proceedings, and have published books and scholarly articles on topics related to international arbitration.

WHAT OUR CLIENTS SAY ABOUT OUR ARBITRATION LAWYERS:
“truly extraordinary”
“one of the top arbitration lawyers in the world”
“hugely respected and extremely well regarded”
“appears to effortlessly out-lawyer his opposition”
“unparalleled experience in investor-State arbitration”
“incisive, imaginative and prepared to be tough”
“thought leader of the future”

EXCERPTED FROM CHAMBERS, THE LEGAL 500 AND WHO’S WHO LEGAL
“The firm’s rise up the rankings speaks volumes of the power of a winning record.”

GLOBAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

“An esteemed practice with a reputation for representing high-profile clients.”

CHAMBERS LATIN AMERICA

Ranked top two globally (2019)
King & Spalding stands out among the world’s leading law firms as having a truly international arbitration practice with an established global footprint. With international arbitration lawyers in New York, Washington, D.C., Houston, Austin, Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, London, Paris, Frankfurt, Geneva, Moscow, Abu Dhabi, Dubai, Riyadh, Singapore and Tokyo, our international arbitration practice has acted in proceedings involving projects or parties in some 140 countries across six continents.
Representative Experience

INVESTMENT TREATY CASES

Representing Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Company in a US$9.5 billion UNCITRAL arbitration brought under the U.S.-Ecuador bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns the scope of environmental release agreements and due process violations by an Ecuadorian court in an environmental contamination trial brought by Ecuadorian plaintiffs.

Representing claimant in Salini Impregilo S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic, an ICSID arbitration brought under the Italy-Argentina bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns the construction and maintenance of a toll highway.


Representing claimant in Veolia Proprete v. Arab Republic of Egypt, an ICSID arbitration brought under the France-Egypt bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns waste management services.

Representing Bear Creek Mining Corporation v. Republic of Peru, an ICSID arbitration brought under the Canada-Peru Free Trade Agreement. The dispute concerns a mining project.

Representing claimant in CEAC Holdings Limited v. Montenegro, an ICSID arbitration brought under the Cyprus-Serbia and Montenegro bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns an aluminum production enterprise.

Representing claimant in Garanti Koza LLP v. Turkmenistan, an ICSID arbitration brought under the U.K.-Turkmenistan bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns the construction of highway bridges.

Representing claimant in Murphy Exploration and Production Company International v. Republic of Ecuador, an UNCITRAL arbitration brought under the U.S.-Ecuador bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns a concession agreement for the exploration and exploitation of hydrocarbons.

Representing claimants in Teinver S.A. Transportes de Cercanías S.A. and Autobuses Urbanos del Sur S.A. v. Argentine Republic, an ICSID arbitration brought under the Spain-Argentina bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns the nationalization of two airlines.

Representing claimant in 9REN Holding S. a. r. l. v. Kingdom of Spain, an ICSID arbitration brought under the Energy Charter Treaty. The dispute concerns a renewable energy-generation enterprise.

Representing claimant in Union Fenosa Gas, S.A. v. Arab Republic of Egypt, an ICSID arbitration brought under the Spain-Egypt bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns the supply of natural gas.

Representing claimants in an UNCITRAL arbitration brought under the Netherlands-Vietnam bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns the expropriation of real estate.

Representing South American Silver Limited in an UNCITRAL arbitration brought under the U.K.-Bolivia bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerns a mining project.

Representing claimants in Ioan Micula et al. v. Romania, an ICSID arbitration brought under the Sweden-Romania bilateral investment treaty. The dispute concerned a food products enterprise.

Representing claimants in Anatolie Stati, Gabriel Stati, Ascom Group S.A. and Terra Raf Trans Trading Ltd. v. Republic of Kazakhstan, an SCC arbitration brought under the Energy Charter Treaty. The dispute concerned the termination of our clients’ contracts and the seizure of their interests in the Borankol and Tolkyn oil fields in Kazakhstan.

Representing claimant in Fraport AG v. The Republic of the Philippines, an ICSID annulment proceeding, brought in respect of an award rendered in a dispute concerning the construction of an airport terminal. The arbitration had been brought under the Germany-Philippines bilateral investment treaty.
COMMERCIAL CASES

Representing a dry bulk transportation company in two related ad hoc arbitrations brought by a financial services company and a maritime company. The dispute concerns the purchase of vessels.

Representing an international voice and data communications company in an UNCITRAL arbitration against a telecommunications company. The dispute concerns breach of contract.

Representing a hydrocarbons refining company in an ICC arbitration against an EPC contractor. The dispute concerns costs and delays in connection with the construction of a refinery in Latin America.

Representing a private equity sponsor in an LCIA arbitration against a European apparel manufacturer. The dispute concerns the purchase of a line of clothing.

Representing North American and Dutch oil majors in an ICC arbitration against a South East Asian State. The dispute concerns the allocation of petroleum revenues.

Representing a large energy company in an ICC arbitration brought by an independent owner and operator of LNG carriers. The dispute concerns alleged damage to a vessel docked at an LNG facility.

Representing a major U.S. corporation in a SIAC arbitration against a French company and French national. The dispute concerned intellectual property rights relating to the design of restaurants.

Representing a group of 14 European insurance companies in an ad hoc arbitration brought by a European telecommunications company. The dispute concerned the determination of the purchase price for real estate under a call option exercised by the telecommunications company.

Representing a major international aircraft manufacturer in an ICC dispute against a vendor. The dispute concerned claims of delay, disruption and the incurrence of substantial costs relating to the design and implementation of various subsystems for corporate and private jet aircraft.

Representing a mobile software and services company in an UNCITRAL arbitration against a hardware and software systems company. The dispute concerned a software cross-licensing agreement and IP infringement.

Representing an East Asian company in a SIAC arbitration against an East Asian trading company. The dispute concerned a consortium agreement relating to a metro rail system.

Representing independent oil companies as claimants in an UNCITRAL arbitration against a State-owned oil company. The dispute concerned the alleged breach of stabilization provisions in a production-sharing contract and the collection of windfall profits tax.

Representing U.S. bondholders in a VIAC arbitration against a Czech export bank. The dispute concerned bond claims.

Representing an Indian conglomerate in an ICC arbitration against a European hotel group. The dispute concerned a joint venture agreement for the development of hotels.

Representing a European auto parts supplier in an ICC arbitration against an auto manufacturer. The dispute involved breach-of-warranty claims under the CISG.

Representing a U.S. chemical company in a AAA arbitration against another U.S. chemical company. The dispute concerned a breach of a long-term supply agreement.

Representing the Government of Canada in LCIA arbitrations initiated by the United States under the 2006 Softwood Lumber Agreement.

Representing claimant in an IACAC arbitration. The dispute concerned the delivery of feedstock to a petrochemical plant in Mexico.

Representing a Korean company in an ICC arbitration against a U.S. pharmaceutical company. The dispute concerned a licensing agreement.
Representative Clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Canada</th>
<th>InterGlobe Enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascom Group S.A.</td>
<td>Kosmos Energy Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>KS Invest GmbH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek Mining Corporation</td>
<td>Mahindra &amp; Mahindra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTAŞ Pipeline Corporation</td>
<td>Marriott International Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Resources Inc.</td>
<td>Murphy Oil Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalam SGPS S.A.</td>
<td>Noble Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron Corporation</td>
<td>Northrop Grumman Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clorox Spain</td>
<td>Phillips 66 Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coca-Cola Company</td>
<td>Refineria de Cartagena S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConocoPhilips Company</td>
<td>Reliance Industries Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cube Infrastructure Fund SICAV</td>
<td>Republic of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daewoo International</td>
<td>Rockhopper Exploration plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dow Chemical Company</td>
<td>Royal Dutch Shell plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Corporation</td>
<td>Russian Machines OJSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emirates Investment Company</td>
<td>Sabre Oil and Gas Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN+ Group Limited</td>
<td>Salini Impregilo S.p.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enron Creditors Recovery Corporation</td>
<td>Samsung C&amp;T Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPF Beteiligungs GmbH</td>
<td>Sempra Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euromar Commodities GmbH</td>
<td>SN Aboitiz Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Foods S.A.</td>
<td>South American Silver Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterran Corporation</td>
<td>SPI Group S.a.r.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exxon Mobil Corporation</td>
<td>Teinver S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraport AG</td>
<td>Tullow Oil plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garanti Koza LLP</td>
<td>Union Fenosa Gas S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General Electric Company</td>
<td>United Company Rusal PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Oil LP</td>
<td>Veolia Propreté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliburton Company</td>
<td>VTB Bank (Austria) AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess Corporation</td>
<td>Western Zagros Resources Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some jurisdictions, this may be considered “Attorney Advertising.”
King & Spalding consists of King & Spalding LLP, a Georgia, U.S., limited liability entity, and affiliated limited liability entities in the U.S., England and Singapore.
“King & Spalding has built its name on results.”
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