

## STATE COURTS IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION LAW.

*Asadova Dilshoda,*

*Student of the Faculty of International law and comparative legislation,  
Tashkent state university of law, Uzbekistan*

### **Annotation.**

International arbitration has become a popular method for resolving commercial disputes between parties from different countries. However, the effectiveness of international arbitration depends on the ability of the parties to enforce the awards in the relevant jurisdictions. State courts play a crucial role in the enforcement of international arbitration awards. This article provides a comparative analysis of the state courts' approach to international arbitration law in various jurisdictions, including the USA, the UK, France, and Germany. The article examines the materials and methods used to evaluate the state courts' approach to international arbitration law, including case law, legislation, and scholarly literature. The discussion highlights the differences and similarities between the state courts' approach to international arbitration law, including jurisdictional issues, the validity of arbitration agreements, and the recognition and enforcement of awards. The conclusion offers key insights into the state courts' approach to international arbitration law and offers recommendations for policymakers, academics, and practitioners in the field.

### Introduction

International arbitration has emerged as a popular method for resolving commercial disputes between parties from different countries. One of the advantages of international arbitration is that it provides parties with a neutral forum for resolving disputes, and the parties can choose the law and procedures that will apply to their dispute. However, international arbitration is only effective if the awards are enforceable. In many cases, the state courts are responsible for enforcing international arbitration awards, and the state courts' approach to international arbitration law can have a significant impact on the effectiveness of international arbitration.

This article provides a comparative analysis of the state courts' approach to international arbitration law in various jurisdictions, including the USA, the UK, France, and Germany. The materials and methods used to evaluate the state courts' approach to international arbitration law include case law, legislation, and scholarly literature. The discussion highlights the differences and similarities between the state courts' approach to international arbitration law, including jurisdictional issues, the validity of arbitration agreements, and the recognition and enforcement of awards.

### Materials and Methods

The materials used to evaluate the state courts' approach to international arbitration law include case law, legislation, and scholarly literature. Case law is particularly important because it provides insights into how the state courts interpret and apply international arbitration law. Legislation is also important because it sets out the legal framework for international arbitration in the relevant jurisdiction. Scholarly literature is useful because it provides insights into the academic debates surrounding international arbitration law and can help to identify trends and developments in the field.

The methods used to evaluate the state courts' approach to international arbitration law include a comparative analysis of the relevant case law, legislation, and scholarly literature. The comparative analysis involves identifying the key issues in international arbitration law, such as jurisdictional issues, the validity of arbitration agreements, and the recognition and enforcement of awards. The analysis then examines how the state courts in each jurisdiction approach these issues, highlighting the similarities and differences between the jurisdictions.

### Discussion of Literature and Sources

#### Jurisdictional Issues

One of the key issues in international arbitration is determining which state court has jurisdiction to hear a dispute. The jurisdictional issues can arise at various stages of the arbitration process, including the validity of the arbitration agreement, the appointment of arbitrators, and challenges to the jurisdiction of the tribunal.

In the USA, the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) provides the legal framework for international arbitration. The FAA requires the state courts to enforce arbitration agreements, and the courts have generally been supportive of arbitration. However, there have been some cases where the state courts have refused to enforce arbitration agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is unconscionable or where there is a lack of mutuality. In addition, the state courts have been more willing to

intervene in the appointment of arbitrators and challenges to the jurisdiction of the tribunal than in other jurisdictions.

In the UK, the Arbitration Act 1996 provides the legal framework for international arbitration. The UK courts have generally been supportive of arbitration, and the courts have been reluctant to interfere in the appointment of arbitrators or challenges to the jurisdiction of the tribunal. However, there have been some cases where the courts have refused to enforce arbitration agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is illegal or where there is a lack of capacity.

In France, the Code of Civil Procedure provides the legal framework for international arbitration. The French courts have been supportive of arbitration, and the courts have been reluctant to intervene in the appointment of arbitrators or challenges to the jurisdiction of the tribunal. However, there have been some cases where the courts have refused to enforce arbitration agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is unconscionable or where there is a lack of capacity.

In Germany, the German Arbitration Act provides the legal framework for international arbitration. The German courts have generally been supportive of arbitration, and the courts have been reluctant to interfere in the appointment of arbitrators or challenges to the jurisdiction of the tribunal. However, there have been some cases where the courts have refused to enforce arbitration agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is illegal or where there is a lack of capacity.

### Validity of Arbitration Agreements

Another key issue in international arbitration is the validity of the arbitration agreement. The validity of the arbitration agreement can arise in cases where the agreement is challenged by one of the parties or where the agreement is alleged to be invalid.

In the USA, the state courts have generally been supportive of arbitration agreements, and the courts have been reluctant to find agreements to be invalid. However, there have been some cases where the courts have refused to enforce arbitration agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is unconscionable or where there is a lack of mutuality.

In the UK, the courts have generally been supportive of arbitration agreements, and the courts have been reluctant to find agreements to be invalid. However, there have been some cases where the courts have refused to enforce arbitration

agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is illegal or where there is a lack of capacity.

In France, the courts have generally been supportive of arbitration agreements, and the courts have been reluctant to find agreements to be invalid. However, there have been some cases where the courts have refused to enforce arbitration agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is unconscionable or where there is a lack of capacity.

In Germany, the courts have generally been supportive of arbitration agreements, and the courts have been reluctant to find agreements to be invalid. However, there have been some cases where the courts have refused to enforce arbitration agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is illegal or where there is a lack of capacity.

### Recognition and Enforcement of Awards

The recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards is another key issue in international arbitration. The effectiveness of international arbitration depends on the ability of the parties to enforce the awards in the relevant jurisdictions.

In the USA, the courts have generally been supportive of the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards. The FAA provides for the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards, and the courts have been reluctant to refuse enforcement except in limited circumstances, such as where the award is contrary to public policy.

In the UK, the courts have generally been supportive of the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards. The Arbitration Act 1996 provides for the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards, and the courts have been reluctant to refuse enforcement except in limited circumstances, such as where the award is contrary to public policy.

In France, the courts have generally been supportive of the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards. The Code of Civil Procedure provides for the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards, and the courts have been reluctant to refuse enforcement except in limited circumstances, such as where the award is contrary to public policy.

In Germany, the courts have generally been supportive of the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards. The German Arbitration Act provides for the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards, and

the courts have been reluctant to refuse enforcement except in limited circumstances, such as where the award is contrary to public policy.

### Conclusion

This article has provided a comparative analysis of the state courts' approach to international arbitration law in various jurisdictions, including the USA, the UK, France, and Germany. The analysis has highlighted the differences and similarities between the state courts' approach to international arbitration law, including jurisdictional issues, the validity of arbitration agreements, and the recognition and enforcement of awards.

The analysis has shown that while the state courts in each jurisdiction have generally been supportive of international arbitration, there are some differences in the approach taken by the courts. For example, the US courts have been more willing to intervene in the appointment of arbitrators and challenges to the jurisdiction of the tribunal than in other jurisdictions. In addition, there have been some differences in the way that the courts approach the validity of arbitration agreements, particularly in cases where the agreement is unconscionable or where there is a lack of capacity.

The analysis has also shown that the state courts in each jurisdiction have generally been supportive of the recognition and enforcement of international arbitration awards. However, there are some limited circumstances where the courts may refuse enforcement, such as where the award is contrary to public policy.

In conclusion, the state courts play a crucial role in the enforcement of international arbitration awards. The comparative analysis of the state courts' approach to international arbitration law has highlighted some key insights that can be useful for policymakers, academics, and practitioners in the field. The analysis can help to identify the best practices in international arbitration and can help to inform the development of international arbitration law in the future.

## Reference List

Arbitration Act 1996, c. 23 (UK).

Code of Civil Procedure, art. 1442 et seq. (Fr.).

Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. §§ 1-16 (USA).

German Arbitration Act, ZPO §§ 1025-1066 (Ger.).

Gary B. Born, *International Commercial Arbitration* (2d ed. 2014).

Emmanuel Gaillard & John Savage, *Fouchard Gaillard Goldman on International Commercial Arbitration* (1999).

Julian D.M. Lew, Loukas A. Mistelis & Stefan Kroll, *Comparative International Commercial Arbitration* (2003).

William W. Park, *Arbitration of International Business Disput*