

GAR KNOW HOW CHALLENGING AND ENFORCING ARBITRATION AWARDS

Hong Kong

Tony Dymond, Gareth Hughes, Cameron Sim
and Tiffany Wu

Debevoise & Plimpton

JUNE 2024



Form of awards

1. Must an award take any particular form?

Section 67 of the Hong Kong Arbitration Ordinance (Cap. 609) (HKAO), which gives effect to article 31 of the UNCITRAL Model Law, sets out the formal and substantive requirements for an award. It provides that an award must:

- be in writing;
- be signed by the arbitrator or arbitrators. A signature by a tribunal majority is sufficient in proceedings with more than one arbitrator, provided that the reason for any omitted signature is stated (eg, death, incapacity, permanent absence overseas with no means of contact, refusal to sign in the case of dissent);
- state the reasons on which it is based, unless the parties have agreed otherwise; and
- be dated and state the place of arbitration.

A signed copy of the award must be delivered to each party.

There is no default time limit for making an award (HKAO, section 72(1)). The Court of First Instance of the High Court of Hong Kong (the Court) has the power to extend any time limit to render an award, even if it has expired (HKAO, section 72(2)). An order to extend the time limit for making an award is not subject to appeal (HKAO, section 72(3)).

Procedural law for recourse against an award (other than applications for setting aside)

2. Are there provisions governing modification, clarification or correction of an award? Are there provisions governing retraction or revision of an award? Under what circumstances may an award be retracted or revised (for fraud or other reasons)? What are the time limits?

Section 69(1) of the HKAO, which gives effect to article 33 of the UNCITRAL Model Law, provides that within 30 days of receipt of the award (unless the parties have agreed on another time limit), a party, with notice to the other party, may request that the tribunal:

- correct any computational, clerical or typographical errors or similar errors in the award; and
- if so agreed by the parties, give an interpretation of a specific point or part of the award.

Within 30 days of receipt of the request, the tribunal must determine whether the request is justified and, if so, make the correction or give the interpretation. The interpretation will form part of the award (HKAO, section 69(1)(1)). The tribunal can also correct any computational, clerical or typographical errors or similar errors on its own initiative within 30 days of the date of the award (HKAO, section 69(1)(2)).

Unless the parties have agreed otherwise, a party may also, with notice to the other party and within 30 days of receipt of the award, request an additional award as to claims presented in the arbitral proceedings but omitted from the award. The tribunal has 60 days to make the additional award if it considers the request to be justified (HKAO, section 69(1)(3)). The tribunal may extend the time limit to make a correction, interpretation or additional award (HKAO, section 69(1)(4)).

A correction or interpretation of an award, or an additional award, must be made in accordance with the requirements of the HKAO (Section 69(1)(5)) as to form, content and delivery of awards generally. Section 69(2) of the HKAO further provides that the tribunal has the power to make other changes to an award that are necessary or consequential to the correction or interpretation of the award.

The tribunal may also review an award of costs within 30 days of rendering the award if, when making the award, the tribunal was not aware of certain information relating to costs that it should have taken into account. The tribunal can then confirm, vary or correct the award of costs (HKAO, section 69, paragraphs (3) and (4)).

Applications to set aside an award, based on fraud or otherwise, may be made pursuant to section 81 of the HKAO. The grounds for setting aside an award include incapacity of a party, invalidity of the arbitration agreement, inability to present a party's case, arbitrability and conflict with Hong Kong public policy. The Court will not consider the merits of the dispute or the correctness of the award.

An application to set aside an award must be made within three months of the date on which the party making the application received the award (HKAO, section 81, paragraph (1)(3)). If an application has been made for correction and interpretation of an award, an application to set it aside must be made within three months from the date on which the tribunal disposed of the request. (HKAO, section 81, paragraph (1)(3)).

3. May an award be appealed to or set aside by the courts? What are the differences between appeals and applications to set aside awards?

An award may ordinarily not be appealed. However, the parties may opt into section 5 of Schedule 2 of the HKAO pursuant to section 99(e) of the HKAO if they wish to have the right to appeal an award on a question of law. In those circumstances, the Court will have discretion in determining appeals and will have the power either to confirm, vary, remit, or set aside the award. Parties may also opt into section 4 of Schedule 2 of the HKAO pursuant to section 99(d) of the HKAO so that they can challenge an award on the ground of serious irregularity affecting the tribunal, the arbitral proceedings or the award.

In set-aside proceedings, the Court will not consider the substantive merits of the dispute or the correctness of the award, whether concerning errors of fact or law. The grounds for setting aside an arbitral award in Hong Kong are set out in section 81 of the HKAO, which incorporates article 34 of the UNCITRAL Model Law. The grounds for challenge include incapacity of a party, invalidity of the arbitration agreement, inability to present a party's case, arbitrability and conflict with Hong Kong public policy.

An award can also be set aside if there has been a successful challenge to an arbitrator who has participated in proceedings resulting in an award (HKAO, section 26(5)).

Setting aside of arbitral awards

4. Is there a time limit for applying for the setting-aside of an arbitral award?

An application to set aside the award under section 81 of the HKAO must be made within three months of the date of receipt of the award or, if a request for a correction or interpretation of an award or an additional award has been made under section 69 of the HKAO, from the date on which the request has been disposed of by the tribunal (HKAO, section 81(1)(3)). The three-month time limit is absolute and cannot be extended by the Court (*AW and Others v PY and Another* [2022] HKCFI 1397). However, when considering an application to set aside an order for enforcement, the Court has a discretionary power to extend the time limit specified in the order pursuant to Order 3, Rule 5 of the Rules of the High Court (*Canudilo International Company Limited v Wu Chi Keung and Others*.)

5. What kind of arbitral decision can be set aside in your jurisdiction? What are the criteria to distinguish between arbitral awards and procedural orders in your jurisdiction? Can courts set aside partial or interim awards?

The HKAO does not contain a definition as to what constitutes an arbitral award. Under Hong Kong law, only awards concerning decisions finally disposing of disputed substantive matters between the parties may be challenged. Orders concerning procedural matters cannot be challenged as they are not characterised as arbitral awards (See *Gingerbread Investments Ltd v Wing Hong Interior Contracting Ltd* [2008] 2 HKLRD 436, where the Court held that an 'Order for Directions' concerning discovery of documents is not an 'award').

Section 71 of the HKAO provides that 'an arbitral tribunal may make more than one award at different times on different aspects of the matters to be determined', meaning that partial or interim awards can be set aside.

6. Which court has jurisdiction over an application for the setting aside of an arbitral award? Is there a specific court or chamber in place with specific sets of rules applicable to international arbitral awards?

The competent court in Hong Kong for the setting aside of arbitral awards is the Court of First Instance of the High Court of Hong Kong. See section 2 of the HKAO (definition of Court) and section 81 of the HKAO (application for setting aside as exclusive recourse against arbitral award).

The Court of First Instance has a specialist arbitration list containing judges with extensive experience of arbitration-related cases and applications under the HKAO (RHC Commentary 72/2/13). Order 73 of the Rules of the High Court contains specific procedural rules for matters concerning arbitration-related proceedings and arbitral awards.

7. What documentation is required when applying for the setting aside of an arbitral award?

The application, request or appeal to the Court shall be made by originating summons under Order 73, Rule 1 of the Rules of the High Court (Cap. 4A) (RHC) (HKAO, section 107). The application and any order thereon may be served out of the jurisdiction by leave of the Court (RHC, Order 73, Rule 7(1)).

8. If the required documentation is drafted in a language other than the official language of your jurisdiction, is it necessary to submit a translation with the application for the setting aside of an arbitral award? If yes, in what form must the translation be?

The HKAO does not contain any provisions requiring the translation of an arbitral award in respect of which a set-aside application is made (whereas it does contain express provisions regarding the translation of awards in recognition and enforcement proceedings: see sections 85, 88, 94 and 98C of the HKAO). In accordance with section 27 of the Evidence Ordinance, if the final arbitral award is not in either or both of the official languages (namely, English and Chinese), the award should be translated into either official language, and certified by an official or sworn translator or by a diplomatic or consular agent.

9. What are the other practical requirements relating to the setting aside of an arbitral award? Are there any limitations on the language and length of the submissions and of the documentation filed by the parties?

The originating summons must set out the grounds of the set-aside application. Where the application is based on affidavit evidence, a copy of the supporting affidavit must also be served (RHC, Order 73, Rule 5(4)). Solicitors should refrain from providing affidavits on behalf of their clients when facts that are pertinent to the application have to be deposed to (KB v S [2016] 2 HKC 325, [26]). The originating summons must also be served on the arbitrators, who may participate in the proceedings, file evidence on matters that may assist the Court (but do not seek to explain the interpretation of the award), or take no action (RHC, Order 73, Rule 5(5)). There are no limitations on the length of submissions or documentation filed in support, which may be in either or both of the official languages (namely, English and Chinese).

10. What are the different steps of the proceedings?

Following the filing of the originating summons to set aside an award, the award debtor must file an acknowledgment of service. If the award debtor fails to do so, the award creditor is still required to proceed to have the matter heard. If the award debtor files an acknowledgment of service, the award creditor must support

the originating summons with an affidavit or affirmation of evidence. If the award debtor wishes to submit evidence, it must also file its own affidavit or affirmation. Subsequently, the application will be disposed of by way of an oral hearing.

The Court may also suspend the setting-aside proceedings to enable the arbitral tribunal to take steps to eliminate the grounds for setting aside (HKAO, section 81(1)). In *A v B* [2015] 5 HKC 509, the Court suspended the setting-aside proceedings to enable the sole arbitrator to include findings in the award in respect of a limitation defence advanced by the respondent.

11. May an arbitral award be recognised or enforced pending the setting-aside proceedings in your jurisdiction? Do setting-aside proceedings have suspensive effect?

The commencement of setting-aside proceedings does not give rise to an automatic suspension of enforcement proceedings. Pursuant to sections 86(4) and 89(5) of the HKAO, if a party applies to set aside an award while an application for recognition or enforcement is pending, the Court has the discretion to adjourn the recognition or enforcement proceedings. The Court may also order the party seeking an adjournment to provide security. In considering whether an adjournment or security is appropriate, the Court will consider, inter alia, the merits of the set-aside application, and whether enforcement will be rendered more difficult if it is delayed (*Dana Shipping and Trading SA v Sina Channel Asia Ltd* [2017] 1 HKC 281; *Weili Su v Shengkang Fei* [2019] 2 HKLRD 1214).

12. What are the grounds on which an arbitral award may be set aside?

The grounds for setting aside an arbitral award in Hong Kong are set out in section 81 of the HKAO, which incorporates article 34 of the UNCITRAL Model Law. The grounds for challenge include incapacity of a party, invalidity of the arbitration agreement, inability to present a party's case, arbitrability and conflict with Hong Kong public policy. Hong Kong public policy has been construed to mean 'contrary to the fundamental conceptions of morality and justice of Hong Kong', to be applied narrowly (e.g., if an award was procured by fraud, corruption or other unconscionable behaviour (*Hebei Import v Polytek Engineering* [1999] 2 HKC 205 at 233); see also *X Chartering v Y* [2014] HKEC 477 at [26]). In *Z v Y* [2018] HKCFI 2342, the Hong Kong High Court refused to enforce an award on public policy grounds because the tribunal had not provided adequate reasons for dismissing the respondent's case on illegality, and thus had not properly considered the illegality issues. In *X v. Jemmy Chien* [2020] HKCFI 286, the Hong Kong Court of First Instance granted leave to enforce an award notwithstanding that one party alleged the underlying agreement was a sham and tainted by illegality. The Court held that public policy interests would not justify allowing a party to rely on its own wrongdoing to avoid its contractual obligations in circumstances where the arbitral tribunal had considered and addressed the illegality claim.

In *BB v KO* [2023] HKCFI 2661, the Hong Kong Court of First instance refused to set aside an order for enforcement of an arbitral award. In addition to the application being out of time, the award debtor failed to prove that the award was the result of a champertous arrangement and that its enforcement would be contrary to public policy.

In *Z v R* [2021] HKCFI 2312, the Hong Kong Court of First Instance reinforced that (i) an applicant seeking to challenge an arbitral award under section 81 of the HKAO must furnish proof of the grounds of exclusive recourse set out in article 34(2) of the UNCITRAL Model Law, (ii) the burden of proving the existence of the grounds for setting aside is on the applicant, and (iii) even if the grounds are made out, the Court has a discretion to enforce the award nevertheless.

13. When assessing the grounds for setting aside, may the judge conduct a full review and reconsider factual or legal findings from the arbitral tribunal in the award? Is the judge bound by the tribunal's findings? If not, what degree of deference will the judge give to the tribunal's findings?

In assessing the grounds for setting aside an arbitral award, the Court will not consider the substantive merits of the dispute or the correctness of an award, whether concerning errors of fact or law (*Pacific China Holdings Ltd (In Liquidation) v Grand Pacific Holdings Ltd* [2012] 3 HKC 498 at [7]; *R v F* [2012] 5 HKLRD 278 at [31]; and *KB v S* [2016] 2 HKC 325 at [1], [47] and [49]). Hong Kong courts give a strong degree of deference to the tribunal's findings.

The HKAO contains a number of 'opt-in' provisions that parties may expressly adopt, extending the role of the Court. These include provisions enabling a challenge to an award on the grounds of serious irregularity, and permitting an appeal in respect of a question of law (HKAO, Schedule 2). In certain instances, these provisions apply automatically in domestic arbitrations (HKAO, sections 99 and 100).

14. Is it possible for an applicant in setting-aside proceedings to be considered to have waived its right to invoke a particular ground for setting aside? Under what conditions?

In certain instances, an applicant may be prevented from setting aside an arbitral award on the basis that it has waived its right to object (or is estopped from doing so) (see *China Nanhai Oil Joint Service Corp Shenzhen Branch v Gee Tai Holdings Co Ltd* [1995] 2 HKLR 215 at 226, in the context of the enforcement of an award.) A party is taken to have waived its right to object to non-compliance with a derogable provision of the HKAO or an arbitration agreement if it knew of the non-compliance but nevertheless proceeded with the arbitration without stating its objection to such non-compliance within the time limit provided for or otherwise without undue delay (HKAO, section 11; UNCITRAL Model Law, article 4).

The Court may, on its own motion, set aside an arbitral award on the grounds set out in section 81(1) of the HKAO (article 34(2)(b) of the UNCITRAL Model Law), and, therefore, arguments based on waiver and estoppel may not necessarily prevent the setting aside of an award.

15. What is the effect of the decision on the setting-aside application in your jurisdiction? What challenges or appeals are available?

The setting aside of an award has the effect of the award never having been made. If the Court sets aside an award on the basis that the arbitral tribunal lacked jurisdiction, it may declare the award to be a nullity and of no effect. The leave of the Court of First Instance is required for any appeal to the Court of Final Appeal against a decision to set aside an arbitral award (HKAO, section 81(4); *China International Fund Ltd v Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (HK) Ltd* [2016] 1 HKC 35).

16. Will courts take into consideration decisions rendered in relation to the same arbitral award in other jurisdictions or give effect to them?

The Court may take into consideration, but is not bound by, decisions rendered in other jurisdictions. The Court retains the discretion to enforce a foreign arbitral award even if it has been set aside by the courts of the seat of arbitration (*Dana Shipping and Trading SA v Sina Channel Asia Ltd* [2017] 1 HKC 281).

Procedural law for recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards

17. What is the applicable procedural law for recognition and enforcement of an arbitral award in your jurisdiction?

The HKAO is the applicable legislation in Hong Kong. It divides awards into four main categories for the purposes of enforcement:

- Convention awards (defined in section 2 of the HKAO as awards made in states or territories that are party to the New York Convention (the Convention), other than China), the enforcement of which is governed by Division 2 of Part 10 of the HKAO;
- Mainland awards (defined in section 2 of the HKAO as awards made in 'any part of China other than Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan'), the enforcement of which is governed by Division 3 of Part 10 of the HKAO;
- Macao awards (defined in section 2 of the HKAO as awards made in the Macao Special Administrative Region), the enforcement of which is governed by Division 4 of Part 10 of the HKAO; and
- awards made in Hong Kong and Taiwan and other arbitral awards that are not Convention awards, Mainland awards or Macao awards, the enforcement of which is governed by Division 1 of Part 10 of the HKAO.

As a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (PRC), Hong Kong is not itself a party to the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States – International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, Washington 1965 (the ICSID Convention). However, when China took over sovereignty of Hong Kong from the United Kingdom in 1997, it notified the United Nations and the World Bank that the ICSID Convention would apply to Hong Kong. On 26 August 2022, the PRC designated Hong Kong as a constituent subdivision pursuant to articles 25(1) and (3) of the ICSID Convention.

The Arrangement Concerning Mutual Enforcement of Arbitral Awards between the Mainland and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (the 1999 Arrangement) allows for the enforcement of arbitral awards as between mainland China and Hong Kong. The Supplemental Arrangement Concerning Mutual Enforcement of Arbitral Awards between the Mainland and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (2020) clarifies and modifies the 1999 Arrangement, such that all arbitral awards rendered pursuant to the HKAO can be enforced in mainland China, and, likewise, all arbitral awards rendered pursuant to the PRC Arbitration Law can be enforced in Hong Kong. Simultaneous enforcement applications may be made in the courts of mainland China and Hong Kong. On 19 May 2021, Part 2 of the Arbitration (Amendment) Ordinance 2021 came into force to fully implement the Supplemental Arrangement by effecting the necessary changes to the HKAO. This included the repeal of section 93 of the HKAO, which prohibited simultaneous enforcement applications. This change will assist in the enforcement of arbitral awards against award debtors with assets in both mainland China and Hong Kong.

The Arrangement Concerning Reciprocal Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards Between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region allows mutual recognition of arbitral awards between Hong Kong and Macao.

18. Is your jurisdiction a party to treaties facilitating recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards (eg, the ICSID Convention or bilateral treaties)? (In particular, is your state a party to the 1958 New York Convention? If yes, what is the date of entry into force of the Convention? Was there any reservation made under article 1(3) of the Convention?)

Similar to the position with respect to the ICSID Convention, Hong Kong itself is not a separate contracting state to the Convention. Nevertheless, China, where the Convention entered into force on 22 January 1987, extended the application of the Convention to Hong Kong in 1997.

China has made both reciprocity and commercial relationship reservations under article 1(3) of the Convention, which also bind Hong Kong. These mean that Hong Kong will apply the Convention (1) to recognise awards made in the territory of another contracting state (the reciprocity reservation) and (2) 'only to differences out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the State making such declaration' (the commercial reservation).

Recognition proceedings

19. Is there a time limit for applying for the recognition and enforcement of an arbitral award?

Ordinarily, a six-year time limit to enforce an award runs from the point at which the award debtor fails to comply with its obligations under the award (section 4(1)(c) of the Limitation Ordinance (Cap. 347); *CL v SCG* [2019] HKCFI 398). However, the applicable limitation period depends on whether the underlying contract giving rise to the dispute is a standard contract (for which a six-year time limit applies) or a contract executed under seal (for which a 12-year time limit applies) (*Wang Peiji v Wei Zhiyong* [2019] HKCFI 2593).

20. Which court has jurisdiction over an application for recognition and enforcement of an arbitral award? Is there a specific court or chamber in place with specific sets of rules applicable to international arbitral awards?

The competent court in Hong Kong for the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards is the Court of First Instance of the High Court of Hong Kong. See section 2 of the HKAO (definition of Court), sections 61 and 84 of the HKAO (granting leave to enforce an arbitral order, direction or award), and sections 87(1)(a), 92(1)(a), and 98A(1)(a) of the HKAO (enforcing a Convention, Mainland or Macao award).

The Court of First Instance has a specialist arbitration list containing judges with extensive experience of arbitration-related cases and applications under the HKAO (RHC Commentary 72/2/13). Order 73 of the Rules of the High Court contains specific procedural rules for matters concerning arbitration-related proceedings and arbitral awards.

21. What are the requirements for the court to have jurisdiction over an application for recognition and enforcement and for the application to be admissible?

Section 84 of the HKAO specifies that an award in arbitral proceedings by an arbitral tribunal, whether made in or outside Hong Kong, is enforceable in the same manner as a judgment of the Court that has the same effect, but only with leave of the Court, and otherwise subject to the provisions of the HKAO. Typically, if a party tries to enforce an arbitral award in Hong Kong, it is because there is some jurisdictional nexus with Hong Kong (eg, assets located in Hong Kong), although this is not a statutory requirement.

Under section 81 of the HKAO (which incorporates article 34 of the Model Law) the Court is empowered to review an arbitral tribunal's ruling on a challenge to its jurisdiction but not a ruling on the admissibility of a claim. Compliance with a pre-arbitration condition (eg, an escalation clause) is usually a matter of admissibility to be decided by the arbitral tribunal (*C v D* [2023] HKCFA 16), while the identity of the proper parties to an arbitration agreement is a matter of jurisdiction and within the Court's power to review (*R v A and Others* [2023] HKCFI 2034).

22. Are the recognition proceedings in your jurisdiction adversarial or ex parte? What are the different steps of the proceedings?

An application seeking leave to enforce an arbitral award under section 84 of the HKAO is governed by Order 73, Rule 10 of the RHC, as amended by section 13 of Schedule 4 of the HKAO. The application is made ex parte, supported by an affidavit. The Court may direct a summons to be issued if it considers it appropriate to give the other party an opportunity to be heard in an inter partes hearing. The recognition and enforcement proceedings themselves are adversarial in nature.

23. What documentation is required to obtain recognition?

Under section 85 of the HKAO, a party seeking recognition of an arbitral award must produce (i) the duly authenticated original award or a duly certified copy of it; (ii) the original arbitration agreement or a duly

certified copy of it; and (iii) if the award or agreement is not in either or both of the official languages (namely, English and Chinese), a translation of it in either official language certified by an official or sworn translator or by a diplomatic or consular agent.

Sections 88, 94 and 98C of the HKAO require similar documents for the recognition of a Convention award, a Mainland award and a Macao arbitral award, respectively.

24. If the required documentation is drafted in a language other than the official language of your jurisdiction, is it necessary to submit a translation with an application to obtain recognition? If yes, in what form must the translation be?

Yes. According to sections 85, 88, 94 and 98C of the HKAO, if the final arbitral award is not in either or both of the official languages (namely, English and Chinese), it is necessary for the award to be translated into either official language and certified by an official or sworn translator or by a diplomatic or consular agent.

25. What are the other practical requirements relating to recognition and enforcement? Are there any limitations on the language and length of the submissions and of the documentation filed by the parties?

Under Hong Kong law, the first step towards the recognition and enforcement of an arbitral award is obtaining the Court's grant of leave to enforce the award.

The procedure for seeking leave to enforce an award under section 84 is governed by Order 73, Rule 10 of the RHC. The application is usually made *ex parte*, and the applicant must make full and frank disclosure of all relevant information in support of the application, including the existence of any proceedings to set aside the award. Failure to do so could be fatal to the application if:

- the relevant information is of material importance;
- the failure was culpable; or
- the sanction would not be out of all proportion to the 'offence' (see *Grant Thornton International Ltd v JBPB & Co* [2013] HKEC 477).

The Court may direct a summons to be issued if it considers it appropriate to give the other party an opportunity to be heard in an *inter partes* hearing.

Once leave to enforce is granted, the Court's order must be drawn up by, or on behalf of, the applicant and personally served on the respondent, delivered to his or her last known or usual place of business or abode, or in such other manner as the Court may direct.

The award may be enforced 14 days after the date of service of the Court's order on the respondent or, under Order 73, Rule 10(6) of the RHC, the respondent may apply by way of summons and affidavit to set aside the order granting enforcement of the award within 14 days of being served. Note also that if an 'application for setting aside or suspending' an award has been made, then 'the court before which enforcement of the award is sought ... may, if it thinks fit, adjourn the proceedings for the enforcement of the award' (HKAO, sections 86(4)(a), 89(5)(a), 98D(5)(a)).

Notwithstanding the 14-day time limit to apply for leave to set aside the enforcement order, the Court has power to grant an extension of time under Order 3, Rule 5 of the RHC. In *Astro Nusantara International BV and Others v PT First Media TBK* [2018] HKCFA 12, the Court of Final Appeal granted an extension of time for the award debtor to challenge the enforcement orders notwithstanding a 14-month delay, taking into account that the award debtor had a strong case that the relevant awards had been made without jurisdiction over certain parties, and that the delay had not caused the award creditor any uncompensable prejudice.

26. Do courts recognise and enforce partial or interim awards?

Section 71 of the HKAO provides that ‘an arbitral tribunal may make more than one award at different times on different aspects of the matters to be determined’, meaning that partial or interim awards can be recognised and enforced.

27. What are the grounds on which an arbitral award may be refused recognition? Are the grounds applied by the courts different from the ones provided under article V of the New York Convention?

The major grounds for refusing recognition and enforcement of an arbitral award in Hong Kong are set out under sections 86(1), 89(2), 95(2) and 98D(2) of the HKAO, which substantially replicate the grounds set out in article V(1) of the Convention.

28. When assessing the grounds for refusing recognition, may the recognition judge conduct a full review and reconsider factual or legal findings from the arbitral tribunal in the award? Is the judge bound by the tribunal’s findings? If not, what degree of deference will the judge give to the tribunal’s findings?

In considering whether or not to refuse the recognition of an arbitral award, the Court does not examine the merits of the dispute (*Xiamen Xingjingdi Group Ltd v Eton Properties Ltd* [2009] 4 HKLRD 353, at [28]). The grounds for refusing recognition of an arbitral award in Hong Kong do not require the Court to conduct a full review of the factual or legal findings in the arbitral award. Recognition may be denied where one of the limited grounds for refusing recognition of an award is established.

29. Is it possible for a party to be considered to have waived its right to invoke a particular ground for refusing recognition of an arbitral award?

In some circumstances, a party may be deemed to have waived its right to invoke a particular ground for refusing recognition of an arbitral award (See *China Nanhai Oil Joint Service Corp Shenzhen Branch v Gee Tai Holdings Co Ltd* [1995] 2 HKLR 215 at 225.) This includes the scenario where the party resisting recognition kept silent about a procedural irregularity of which it was aware during the proceedings, and which might have been cured had the irregularity been promptly raised, but the party instead decided to not disclose the point until the recognition stage (*Arjowiggins HKK2 Ltd v X Co* [2016] HKEC 2472, at [32]; *G v X (Arbitration)* [2022] 3 HKLRD 297 at [22] and [23]).

A party is taken to have waived its right to object to non-compliance with a derogable provision of the HKAO or an arbitration agreement if it knew of the non-compliance but nevertheless proceeded with the arbitration without stating its objection to such non-compliance within the time limit provided for or otherwise without undue delay (HKAO, section 11; UNCITRAL Model Law, article 4).

30. What is the effect of a decision recognising an arbitral award in your jurisdiction?

The grant of leave to enforce by the Court is the first step towards recognition and enforcement of an award. The award is enforceable only after expiry of 14 days (or such other period that the Court may fix) from the date of service of the Court’s order granting leave on the award debtor (RHC, Order 73, Rule 10(6)). An award debtor on which such an order is served may, within 14 days of the date of service, seek to resist enforcement as a way of challenging the decision recognising an arbitral award.

Once an award becomes enforceable, it is enforced as though it were a local court judgment (HKAO, section 84). As is the case with a local court judgment, the Court may stay enforcement of the award under Order 47, Rule 1(1) of the RHC, which states that ‘there are special circumstances that render it inexpedient to enforce the judgment’.

31. What challenges are available against a decision refusing recognition in your jurisdiction?

If the Court has refused leave to enforce an award under section 84(1) of the HKAO, an appeal against that decision may be made with leave of the Court pursuant to section 84(3) of the HKAO.

32. What are the effects of annulment proceedings at the seat of the arbitration on recognition or enforcement proceedings in your jurisdiction?

It lies within the Court's discretion to determine whether it will adjourn an application to enforce an arbitral award if an action to remit or set aside the award is pending. The Court will consider factors, such as the merits and prospects of success of the setting-aside application (HKAO, sections 86(4)(a), 89(5)(a), 98D(5)(a)).

Note that section 84 of the HKAO is subject to section 26(2), which means that if an application for the enforcement of an arbitral award is made during the period in which a challenge to the appointment of an arbitrator is pending before the courts, and the arbitral tribunal that made the award includes the challenged arbitrator, the Court may refuse enforcement of the award. This usually applies if the award on which enforcement is sought is a partial or interim award, rather than the final award.

33. If the courts adjourn the recognition or enforcement proceedings pending annulment proceedings, will the defendant to the recognition or enforcement proceedings be ordered to post security?

Sections 86(4)(b), 89(5)(b) and 98D(5)(b) of the HKAO provide that the Court can order security to be posted if an application for setting aside or suspension of the award has been made by a party.

The chief factors likely to be considered by the Court when deciding whether or not to order security include (1) the strength of the grounds of challenge to the award and (2) the possible difficulty in enforcing the award if security is not ordered. (See *Soleh Boneh International Ltd v Government of the Republic of Uganda and National Housing Corp* [1993] 2 Lloyd's Rep 208 CA (Eng); *L v B* [2016] HKCU 1165 at [7].)

34. Is it possible to obtain the recognition and enforcement of an award that has been fully or partly set aside at the seat of the arbitration? If an arbitral award is set aside after the decision recognising the award has been issued, what challenges are available?

Under section 89(2)(f)(ii) of the HKAO, the court before which enforcement of the award is sought has discretionary powers to refuse enforcement if an award has been 'set aside or suspended by a competent authority of the country in which, or under the law of which, it was made'. If the award has been set aside at the seat of the arbitration, the enforcing court in Hong Kong could nevertheless decide to enforce the award or it could proceed to allow enforcement of the award before the set-aside application has been completed.

Service

35. What is the procedure for service of extrajudicial and judicial documents to a defendant in your jurisdiction?

The procedure for service with respect to applications to the court for leave to enforce arbitral awards is governed by Order 65 of the RHC (service of documents in connection with proceedings within Hong Kong).

Order 65 prescribes that service can be effected by personal service, by post or by placing the documents through the letterbox of the defendant at his or her usual or last known address, or in the case of a corporation, at its registered address. For service of a writ or an originating summons by registered post or insertion through the letterbox, the date of service is deemed to be the seventh day after the date on which the copy was sent to or inserted through the letterbox for the address in question, unless the contrary is shown (RHC, Order 10, Rules 1(3) and 5).

If it appears that it is impracticable to serve the documents in any of the aforementioned methods, the claimant can apply to the court for an order of substituted service (RHC, Order 65, Rule 4). Substituted service of a document is effected by taking such steps as the court may direct to bring the document to the notice of the defendant. Such an application is generally made by affidavit *ex parte*. The affidavit should clearly state the type of substituted service proposed, and it must show that the writ is likely to reach the defendant or come to his or her knowledge if the method of substituted service is allowed.

If the extrajudicial and judicial documents are drafted in a language other than English or Chinese, it is necessary to serve these documents with a translation (as per section 4 of the High Court Civil Procedure (Use of Language) Rules (Cap. 5C)). However, translations of judicial documents can be supplemented at a later stage (as set out in Practice Direction 10.2).

36. What is the procedure for service of extrajudicial and judicial documents to a defendant outside your jurisdiction? Is it necessary to serve these documents together with a translation in the language of this jurisdiction? Is your jurisdiction a party to the 1965 Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters (the Hague Service Convention)? Is your jurisdiction a party to other treaties on the same subject matter? When is a document considered to be served to the opposite party?

There are different procedures that apply to service out of the jurisdiction, depending on the type of extrajudicial and judicial document being served. For documents related to arbitration, the following rules apply.

Order 73, Rule 7 of the RHC applies to summonses or orders made under the HKAO or any orders made thereon other than those by which an application for leave to enforce an arbitral award is made.

Order 73, Rule 10(5) of the RHC applies to an order made further to an *ex parte* application seeking leave to enforce an arbitral award.

Pursuant to Order 73, Rule 7, summonses or orders made under the HKAO or any orders made thereon can be served out of the jurisdiction with leave of the Court, provided that:

- the summons or order relates to an arbitration governed by Hong Kong law save if the application is for leave to enforce an arbitral award;
- the arbitration has been, is being or is to be held within Hong Kong; or
- the originating summons is one by which an application is made under section 45(2) (interim measures) or section 60(1) (inspection, photographing, preservation, custody, detention, sale, sampling or experimenting of any relevant property) of the HKAO.

Before leave will be granted, it must be demonstrated to the Court that the case is proper for service out of jurisdiction under Rule 7(4) of the RHC.

Pursuant to Order 73, Rule 10(5), an order made *ex parte* granting leave to enforce an arbitral award can be served without leave. If, however, service needs to be effected outside the jurisdiction, pursuant to Order 11, Rule 1(1)(m), an originating summons by which an application is made to enforce an arbitral award or any orders made thereon can be served out of the jurisdiction with leave of the Court. Service in these circumstances is permissible with leave whether or not the arbitration is governed by Hong Kong law.

Any originating summons, summons or order that is to be served out of the jurisdiction under Order 73 need not be served personally, so long as it is served in accordance with the law of the country or place in which service is effected (RHC, Order 11, Rule 5(3), applied by virtue of Order 73, Rule 7(6)).

If the extrajudicial and judicial documents served on a defendant are drafted in a language other than English or Chinese, it is necessary to serve these documents with a translation (as per section 4 of the High Court Civil Procedure (Use of Language) Rules (Cap. 5C)). However, translations of judicial documents can be supplemented at a later stage (as set out in Practice Direction 10.2).

Hong Kong is a party to the 1965 Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters (the Hague Service Convention). On 1 July 1997, the Hague Convention ceased to apply to service of documents between Hong Kong and Mainland China, as such service was no longer international in nature (see RHC Commentary 69/4/1). There are arrangements in place for service

of documents between Hong Kong and Mainland China (the Arrangement for Mutual Service of Judicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Proceedings between the Mainland and Hong Kong Courts), and between Hong Kong and Macau (the Arrangement for Mutual Service of Judicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Cases between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macau Special Administrative Region).

Identification of assets

37. Are there any databases or publicly available registers allowing the identification of an award debtor's assets within your jurisdiction? Are there any databases or publicly available registers providing information on award debtors' interests in other companies?

Certain databases are publicly available in Hong Kong and can be used for the identification of assets. For example, land records with information about property assets are kept by the Land Registry, and information pertaining to companies is contained in the Companies Registry. Both of these registries are open to the public.

38. Are there any proceedings allowing for the disclosure of information about an award debtor within your jurisdiction?

Section 84 of the HKAO provides that, with leave of the Court, an arbitral award may be enforced in the same manner as a judgment of the Court, subject to the provisions of the HKAO, meaning that orders facilitating the enforcement of judgments, such as the ability to examine judgment debtors under Orders 48 and 49B of the RHC, are also available in relation to the enforcement of arbitral awards.

Pursuant to Order 48 of the RHC, on an ex parte application of the award creditor, the Court may order the award debtor to attend before the Registrar, or such officer as the Court may appoint, and be orally examined on whether (i) there are any debts owing to the award debtor by other persons, and (ii) the award debtor has any other property or financial resources that could be used for satisfying the award. If the award debtor is a limited company, the order can be made against a senior officer of the company.

Pursuant to Order 49B of the RHC, when the award is for the payment of a specified sum of money, on an ex parte application of the award creditor, the Court may order an examination of the award debtor regarding his or her assets, liabilities, income and expenditure and of the disposal of any assets or income. If it appears to the Court that there is reasonable cause to believe that an order to appear before the Court for examination may be ineffective to secure the award debtor's attendance, the Court may (1) order that the award debtor be arrested and brought before the Court on the day following the day of arrest (RHC, Order 49B, Rule 1(1)) and (2) make an order prohibiting the award debtor from leaving Hong Kong (RHC, Order 49B, Rule 1(2)).

Further, pursuant to Order 38, Rules 13 and 14 of the RHC, the judgment debtor may apply for an order to (1) require a non-party witness to attend any proceedings in the cause or matter and produce any document considered by the Court to be necessary, or (2) compel the attendance of a non-party witness to give evidence or to produce documents or other material evidence.

Order 38 does not apply to discovery applications against non-party banks, to which section 21 of the Evidence Ordinance applies. Section 21 provides: 'On the application of any party to any proceedings, the court or judge may order that such party be at liberty to inspect and take copies of any entries in a banker's record for any of the purposes of such proceedings.' The court in *Pacific King Shipping Holdings Pte Ltd v Huang Ziqiang* [2015] HKEC 76 noted that, although it could grant such an order in the appropriate circumstances, it 'would not lightly use its powers to order disclosure of full information touching the confidential relationship of banker and customer'.

Enforcement proceedings

39. What kinds of assets can be attached within your jurisdiction?

A wide variety of assets can be attached, including immovable, movable, intangible or other forms of property.

40. Are interim measures against assets available in your jurisdiction? Is it possible to apply for interim measures under an arbitral award before requesting recognition? Under what conditions?

Both arbitral tribunals and courts are empowered to issue interim measures in support of claims advanced in arbitral proceedings.

Pursuant to section 35 of the HKAO, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the arbitral tribunal may grant interim measures upon the request of any party. These measures may be granted to a party to:

- maintain or restore the status quo pending determination of the dispute;
- take any action that would prevent, or refrain from taking action that is likely to cause, current or imminent harm or prejudice to the arbitral process;
- preserve assets out of which a subsequent award may be satisfied; and
- preserve evidence that may be relevant or material to the resolution of the dispute.

Pursuant to section 45 of the HKAO, the Court also may grant interim measures in support of arbitration upon the application of any party. The power conferred by section 45 may be exercised by the Court irrespective of whether or not similar powers may be exercised by an arbitral tribunal under section 35 in relation to the same dispute, though the Court may decline to exercise this power if 'the interim measure sought is currently the subject of arbitral proceedings' or if it 'considers it more appropriate for the interim measure sought to be dealt with by the arbitral tribunal' (HKAO, section 45(4)).

Award creditors may apply to the Court for interim measures against assets in support of enforcement proceedings. Until 31 December 2023, the doctrine of absolute foreign immunity applied in Hong Kong. Awards against a foreign state could not be recognised or enforced in Hong Kong, unless the foreign state had waived its immunity. This position originated from the landmark decision in *Democratic Republic of the Congo v. FG Hemisphere Associates LLC* (2011) 14 HKCFAR 95.

On 1 January 2024, the PRC's Foreign State Immunity Law (FSIL) came into force. The Central People's Government has stated that Hong Kong and Macau should follow the rules and policies set out in the FSIL. The FSIL follows a doctrine of restrictive sovereign immunity, which extends to both immunity from jurisdiction and immunity from enforcement against a foreign state's assets. Awards that satisfy the exceptions to immunity set out in the FSIL may be recognised and enforced in PRC courts. In particular, where the underlying dispute arises out of commercial activities between a foreign state, and an organisation or individual of any other state (including the PRC), there is a "commercial activities" exception to immunity. Parties may enforce arbitral awards against foreign states' commercial assets within the Hong Kong courts' jurisdiction, provided that the award arises out of the foreign state's commercial activities.

Pursuant to article 4 of the Supplemental Arrangement Concerning Mutual Enforcement of Arbitral Awards between the Mainland and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (2020), Hong Kong courts are expressly empowered to issue interim measures either before or after accepting an application for enforcement of a Mainland arbitral award.

Pursuant to the Arrangement Concerning Mutual Assistance in Court-ordered Interim Measures in Aid of Arbitral Proceedings by the Courts of the Mainland and of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, parties to certain institutional arbitrations seated in Hong Kong are permitted to apply to mainland Chinese courts for interim measures in support of their arbitral claims.

41. What is the procedure for obtaining interim measures against assets in your jurisdiction?

Pursuant to section 35 of the HKAO, an award creditor can apply directly to an arbitral tribunal seated in Hong Kong for interim measures against assets. There is no requirement to obtain prior court authorisation to make such an application. Section 36 of the HKAO requires a party to show that (1) the interim measure is needed to avoid harm that could not be adequately compensated by damages, and (2) there is a reasonable possibility that the claim would succeed on the merits. Further, unless the parties have agreed otherwise, section 37 of the HKAO allows a party 'without notice to any other party, [to] make a request for an interim measure' (ie, a party can apply for an interim measure on an ex parte basis).

The Court can grant interim measures under section 45 of the HKAO, and this power can be exercised irrespective of whether similar powers may also be exercised by an arbitral tribunal under section 35 of the HKAO in relation to the same dispute. According to Order 29, Rule 1(2) of the RHC, through which the Court grants interim measures, where 'the applicant is the plaintiff and the case is one of urgency, such application may be made ex parte on affidavit'. Applicants seeking urgent aid from the courts must act with diligence and speed in serving the documents initiating the proceedings, as the court will assess any delay in light of the prejudice suffered (*VE Global UK Ltd v Charles Allard Jr* [2017] HKEC 2135 at [23] and [28]).

42. What is the procedure for implementing interim measures against assets in your jurisdiction?

With respect to an application for interim measures, Hong Kong law does not distinguish between immovable, movable, intangible or other forms of property. The general procedure for interim measures therefore applies to immovable property.

43. What is the procedure for requesting attachment against assets in your jurisdiction? Who are the stakeholders in the process?

The procedure to attach assets in Hong Kong is to apply to the Court for the relevant order. The two main orders by which assets may be attached are garnishee orders and charging orders.

Garnishee order

Pursuant to Order 49, Rule 1 of the RHC, in certain circumstances, award creditors, for the purpose of enforcing an award, may apply to the Court for a garnishee order. Order 49, Rule 2 of the RHC states that an application for a garnishee order must be made ex parte, supported by an affidavit or affirmation that:

- states the name and the last known address of the judgment debtor;
- identifies the judgment to be enforced and states the amount remaining unpaid under it at the time of the application for the garnishee order;
- states that to the best of the information available to, or belief of, the applicant, the garnishee is within the jurisdiction and is indebted to the judgment debtor, and includes the sources of the applicant's information or the grounds for his or her belief; and
- where the garnishee is a bank having more than one place of business, states the name and address of the branch at which the judgment debtor's account is believed to be held or, if it be the case, that this information is not known to the applicant.

The garnishee order initially will be an order nisi. The Court may grant the award creditor an order absolute on further consideration of the matter. The garnishee should pay the amount specified in the order to the award creditor, and any payment made by the garnishee in compliance with the order shall be a valid discharge of his or her liability towards the award debtor to the extent of the amount paid (RHC, Order 49, Rule 3).

The stakeholders in the process are the Court, the applicant, the judgment debtor and the garnishee. If, in garnishee proceedings, it is brought to the notice of the Court that some third party other than the judgment debtor is entitled to the debt sought to be attached or has a charge or lien upon it, the Court may order the

third party to attend before the Court and may summarily determine the questions at issue or make such other order as it thinks just (RHC, Order 49, Rule 6).

Charging order

To enforce an award, the Court may make a charging order, on any property of the award debtor, to secure the payment of any debt due or to become due under that award (RHC, Order 50, Rule 1). A charging order can be imposed on the following types of property: land or real estate, securities, and funds in court (High Court Ordinance, Section 20A(2)).

An application for a charging order may be made ex parte, supported by an affidavit or affirmation that:

- identifies the award to be enforced and states the amount remaining unpaid under it at the date of the application;
- states the name of the award debtor and of any creditor whom the applicant can identify;
- gives full particulars of the subject matter of the intended charge; and
- verifies that the interest to be charged is owned beneficially by the award debtor (RHC, Order 50, Rule 1(3)).

Unless the Court otherwise directs, the supporting affidavit or affirmation may contain statements of information or belief with the sources and grounds for that information or belief (RHC, Order 50, Rule 1(4)).

An order made by an ex parte application will be an order nisi. Upon further consideration of the matter, the Court may make the charging order absolute. The charging order, however, is not a direct mode of enforcement but is rather an indirect mode in the sense that it provides the award creditor with security, in whole or in part, over the property of the award debtor. To obtain the actual proceeds of the charge, the award creditor must then proceed to apply further for an order to sell the specified assets and satisfy his or her award (RHC, Order 50, Rule 3).

44. What is the procedure for implementing attachment orders against assets in your jurisdiction?

With respect to an application for attachment, Hong Kong law does not distinguish between immovable, movable, intangible or other forms of property. The procedure to attach all types of property in Hong Kong is to apply to the Court for such orders. The two main orders by which assets may be attached are through garnishee orders and charging orders.

45. Are there specific rules applicable to the attachments against sums in bank accounts or other assets deposited with banks?

Garnishee orders may be obtained in respect of bank accounts opened in a branch or subsidiary of a domestic or foreign bank located in Hong Kong but not in respect of bank accounts opened in a branch or subsidiary of a domestic or foreign bank located abroad.

Under Hong Kong law, an interim order may also be issued to restrain a party from diminishing their assets, including funds held in bank accounts located in Hong Kong or elsewhere. This is known as a Mareva injunction, for which an application may be made ex parte.

46. May a creditor of an award rendered against a private debtor attach assets held by another person on the grounds of piercing the corporate veil or alter ego? What are the criteria, and how may a party demonstrate that they are met?

Under Hong Kong law, the corporate veil of a company may only be pierced in a limited number of situations. For example, when there is some relevant impropriety or wrongdoing where the company is used for some illegitimate purpose, such as devices to perpetrate frauds or to evade legal obligations (*Sap Products Ltd v Xena Security Ltd & Anor* [2017] HKCU 12 at [11] to [13], adopting *Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd & Others* [2013] 2 AC 415).

There is a distinction between the 'evasion' of legal obligations and the 'avoidance' of the incurring of any legal obligation in the first place. Under Hong Kong law, the doctrine of lifting the corporate veil seeks to prevent the former (ie, using a company to evade the law or frustrate its enforcement) but not the latter. When a party is under an existing legal obligation or liability or subject to an existing legal restriction that it deliberately evades or whose enforcement it deliberately frustrates by interposing a company under its control, the Court may then pierce the corporate veil for the purpose of depriving the company or its controller of the advantage that they would otherwise have obtained by the company's personality (*Global Alliance Logistics (HK) Ltd v Premiere Logistics (HK) Ltd & Anor.* [2022] HKCU 1844 at [17], adopting *Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd & Others* [2013] 2 AC 415).

Recognition and enforcement against foreign states

47. Are there any rules in your jurisdiction that specifically govern recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards against foreign states?

Since the FSIL came into force on 1 January 2024, the doctrine of restrictive sovereign immunity applies under Hong Kong law. This extends to both immunity from jurisdiction and immunity from enforcement against a foreign state's assets. Awards that satisfy the exceptions to immunity set out in the FSIL, including the "commercial activities" exception, may be recognised and enforced. Parties may enforce arbitral awards against foreign states' commercial assets within the Hong Kong courts' jurisdiction, provided that the awards arise out of the foreign state's commercial activities.

Recognition and enforcement of non-ICSID investment awards can be sought pursuant to Part 10 of the HKAO. There is a distinction between awards issued by tribunals seated in contracting states to the New York Convention (to which section 87(1) of the HKAO applies), and tribunals seated elsewhere (to which section 84(1) of the HKAO applies). However, the process for recognition and enforcement is the same for either category of award, with the same defences under the New York Convention available. These defences constitute permissive grounds upon which Hong Kong courts may decline to recognise or enforce an award.

As a special administrative region of the PRC, Hong Kong is not a signatory to the ICSID Convention. Article 54 of the ICSID Convention stipulates that contracting states must recognise ICSID awards as binding. This requires domestic courts to take necessary steps under domestic law to give effect to them. Part 10 of the HKAO does not currently stipulate a framework for the recognition and enforcement of ICSID awards. It is likely that an application for the recognition and enforcement of an ICSID award would fall within the category of enforcement of an arbitral award under section 84(1) of the HKAO. The Hong Kong courts would likely apply both section 86 of the HKAO and the ICSID Convention in considering any defences raised against recognition or enforcement.

48. What is the procedure for service of extrajudicial and judicial documents to a foreign state?

The procedure for service of extrajudicial and judicial documents to a foreign state is governed by Order 11, Rule 7 of the RHC.

If the sovereign state is not able to claim immunity from recognition and enforcement of the particular award pursuant to provisions under the FSIL, after obtaining leave to serve under Order 11, Rule 1, a person who wishes to have the writ served on the state must lodge in the Registry:

- a request for service to be arranged by the Chief Secretary;
- a copy of the writ; and
- except where the official language of the state is English, or the official languages of that party include English, a translation of the writ in the official language or one of the official languages of that state.

Documents duly lodged will then be sent by the Registrar to the Chief Secretary for the writ to be served on the state,

49. May a foreign state invoke sovereign immunity (immunity from jurisdiction) to object to the recognition or enforcement of arbitral awards?

Since the FSIL came into force in the PRC on 1 January 2024, the doctrine of restrictive immunity applies under Hong Kong law. An arbitral award against a foreign state may be recognised and enforced in Hong Kong courts if it satisfies the exceptions under the FSIL. In particular, pursuant to the “commercial activities” exception, foreign states are not immune from suit in respect of arbitration-related court proceedings that arise out of commercial activities or investment disputes, including proceedings commenced pursuant to investment treaties. Award creditors will be able to enforce awards from commercial or investment arbitrations against foreign states’ commercial assets in Hong Kong by registering the awards as judgments.

It remains to be seen whether awards obtained prior to the FSIL coming into force will be deemed enforceable, or if awards must have been issued only after the FSIL came into force.

50. May award creditors apply interim measures against assets owned by a sovereign state?

The doctrine of restrictive immunity applies under Hong Kong law since the FSIL came into force in the PRC on 1 January 2024. An arbitral award against a foreign state may be recognised and enforced in Hong Kong if it satisfies the exceptions under the FSIL. Award creditors may apply to the court for interim measures against a foreign state’s assets in support of recognition and enforcement proceedings.

51. Are assets belonging to a foreign state immune from enforcement in your jurisdiction?

The doctrine of restrictive immunity applies under Hong Kong law since the FSIL came into force in the PRC on 1 January 2024. Under the FSIL, a foreign state’s assets are not immune from execution where they have been used in commercial activities. There are also certain categories of foreign state property that remain expressly protected. These include diplomatic property, military property, property of a foreign central bank and any other property that the PRC concludes does not have any commercial use. As Hong Kong is constitutionally bound to follow the PRC’s approach to foreign state immunity under the FSIL, it is expected that the same or similar exceptions to immunity from enforcement shall apply.

52. Is it possible for a foreign state to waive immunity from enforcement in your jurisdiction? What are the requirements of waiver?

It is possible for a foreign state to waive immunity from enforcement in Hong Kong. Until 31 December 2023, any waiver needed to be made ‘in the face of the Court’ (*Democratic Republic of the Congo v FG Hemisphere Associates* (2011) 14 HKCFAR 95). Since the FSIL came into force on 1 January 2024, a foreign state’s express waiver of immunity from suit and/or execution must be given effect, whether that waiver is given by contract or by international treaty. However, the FSIL stipulates that a waiver of immunity from suit does not automatically imply a waiver of immunity from execution.

53. Is it possible for a creditor of an award rendered against a foreign state to attach the assets held by an alter ego of the foreign state within your jurisdiction?

Under Hong Kong law, the corporate veil of a company may only be pierced in a limited number of situations. For example, when there is some relevant impropriety or wrongdoing where the company is used for some illegitimate purpose, such as devices to perpetrate frauds or to evade legal obligations (*Sap Products Ltd v Xena Security Ltd & Anor* [2017] HKCU 12 at [11] to [13], adopting *Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd & Others* [2013] 2 AC 415).

There is a distinction between the ‘evasion’ of legal obligations and the ‘avoidance’ of the incurring of any legal obligation in the first place. Under Hong Kong law, the doctrine of lifting the corporate veil seeks to prevent the former (ie, using a company to evade the law or frustrate its enforcement) but not the latter.

When a party is under an existing legal obligation or liability or subject to an existing legal restriction that it deliberately evades or whose enforcement it deliberately frustrates by interposing a company under its control, the Court may then pierce the corporate veil for the purpose of depriving the company or its controller of the advantage that they would otherwise have obtained by the company's personality (*Global Alliance Logistics (HK) Ltd v Premiere Logistics (HK) Ltd & Anor* [2022] HKCU 1844 at [17], adopting *Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd & Others* [2013] 2 AC 415).

54. May property belonging to persons subject to national or international sanctions be attached? Under what conditions? Is there a specific procedure?

Pursuant to the United Nations Sanctions Ordinance (Cap. 537) and the United Nations (Anti-Terrorism Measures) Ordinance (Cap. 575), sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council generally apply automatically in Hong Kong. The government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region does not have the legal power to take any legal action in respect of other sanctions imposed by states.

There is no specific procedure for enforcing an arbitral award against, or attaching the assets of, persons subject to sanctions. Property belonging to persons subject to sanctions may be attached depending on the terms of the sanctions. However, if the Secretary for Security specifies any property as terrorist property, then it may not be attached, as such property may not be used for the purposes of security (United Nations (Anti-Terrorism Measures) Ordinance (Cap. 575), section 6).



Tony Dymond
Debevoise & Plimpton

Tony Dymond is a partner in the firm's London and Hong Kong offices, and a member of the international dispute resolution group. He is co-chair of the firm's Asia arbitration practice. His practice focuses on complex, multijurisdictional disputes, in both litigation and arbitration.

Mr Dymond joined Debevoise in 2014. He has advised clients in a wide range of jurisdictions,

Having spent the last 25 years in London, Hong Kong and Seoul. He is widely acknowledged as a leading lawyer in high-value disputes arising from large-scale projects, particularly in the energy and infrastructure sectors. His practice includes investor-state disputes relating to investments in these sectors. He also regularly acts on shareholder and joint venture disputes and on corporate governance disputes. He has appeared in arbitrations under the principal arbitration rules and in the English and Hong Kong courts.

Mr Dymond is a regular speaker at disputes conferences and contributor to various related law journals.

Mr Dymond is consistently recognised by the legal directories as a leader in his field. He is included in *The Legal 500's* inaugural International Arbitration Powerlist, and in *The Legal 500 UK* (2024), where he is recommended for construction disputes and international arbitration. He is recommended by *The Legal 500 Asia Pacific – Greater China* (2024) for international arbitration and included in *The Legal 500 Arbitration Powerlist for Hong Kong* (2023). He is also named by *Who's Who Legal* (2024) amongst its Thought Leaders in construction and arbitration, and by *Expert Guides* as one of the UK's leading construction law practitioners.

Mr Dymond was called to the Bar of England & Wales in 1993, and was admitted as a solicitor in Hong Kong in 2000 and in England & Wales in 2004.



Gareth Hughes
Debevoise & Plimpton

Gareth Hughes is a partner in the firm's Hong Kong office and a member of the International Dispute Resolution Group. His practice focuses on major commercial litigation, international arbitration and white collar / regulatory defense matters.

Mr. Hughes joined Debevoise in 2018. Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Hughes was a partner at a leading international firm, where he oversaw the opening of the firm's dispute practice in Hong Kong and was head of the firm's Asia Disputes Group and its International Contentious Financial Services Disputes Group.

With over 25 years' experience in the region, Mr. Hughes advises major corporates, financial institutions and high net worth individuals in connection with complex commercial disputes, often with a cross-border component to them. His matters involve proceedings in the courts or before arbitral institutions, including arbitrations under the HKIAC, LCIA, SIAC, CIETAC, UNCITRAL and ICC rules.

He also frequently advises on internal and regulatory investigations, including in particular those involving the Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission, the Hong Kong Monetary Authority, the Hong Kong Stock Exchange and the Independent Commission Against Corruption. His work has encompassed financial services, corporate finance, private wealth, fraud, private equity, insurance, judicial review and shareholder related matters.

Mr. Hughes has become one of Asia's most respected and experienced litigators. *The Legal 500 Asia Pacific* lists him in its Hall of Fame and he is also recognized as a leading individual for dispute resolution in *PLC*, *Chambers Asia-Pacific* and *Chambers Global*. *Lawdragon* recognizes him as one of the 500 leading global litigators, and *Benchmark Litigation (Asia-Pacific)* names him a Dispute Resolution Star. He is recognized by *The Legal 500 Asia Pacific – Greater China* (2024) for his anti-corruption and compliance, litigation and international arbitration practices. *The Legal 500* also lists him in its Arbitration Powerlist for Hong Kong (2023). He is recommended by *Chambers Global*

(2024) for Litigation (International Firms) and by *Chambers Greater China* (2024) as a leading individual for Litigation and for Contentious Regulatory Financial Services-related matters. Mr. Hughes has been described in *The Legal 500 Asia Pacific* as a "tactically astute," "highly professional and skilled legal operator who inspires confidence and is an extremely safe pair of hands," and *Chambers Asia-Pacific* has noted that he "is an excellent lawyer with deep experience in Asia" who "always has his eye on the right outcome for the client." Clients say that "he knows the regulators very well and has a sophisticated and commercial approach to investigations which is quite unique." He has received further praise for his "considerable experience advising on regulatory matters and investigations," his "clear, unambiguous advice" and being "technically extremely sound but also highly pragmatic." According to clients, "he never fails to deliver as promised." Mr. Hughes is also recommended by *Who's Who Legal* (2024).

Mr. Hughes holds a law degree from Manchester University. He is admitted to practice as a solicitor in Hong Kong and England & Wales.



Cameron Sim
Debevoise & Plimpton

Cameron Sim is an international counsel in the firm's international dispute resolution group. His practice focuses on international arbitration and complex cross-border disputes, notably on Asia-related matters. He is admitted in Hong Kong, New York, England & Wales and Australia.

Mr Sim is recommended for international arbitration by *The Legal 500 Asia Pacific – Greater China* (2024) and *The Legal 500 Asia Pacific* (2022-2023). *The Legal 500* also includes him in its Arbitration Powerlist for Hong Kong (2023). He is also ranked by *Who's Who Legal* (2024) as a national leader for arbitration in Mainland China & Hong Kong and as a global future leader. In 2022, Mr Sim was also recognized as a 'Rising Star' by the *Euromoney Legal Media Group*, and by the IFLR Asia-Pacific Awards.

Mr Sim has represented corporates and sovereigns across a range of industries, including banking and finance, energy, insurance, pharmaceuticals, private equity, retail, and telecommunications. He has particular experience in commercial disputes concerning shareholder agreements, joint ventures, private equity funds, M&A issues, supply and distribution, fraud, and investment protections. He has advised on arbitrations under all leading arbitration rules in key arbitral seats, including Hong Kong, Singapore, New York, London, Paris, Geneva, Stockholm and The Hague. His arbitrations often involve parallel proceedings in courts, most frequently in the Caribbean.

Mr Sim was admitted as an Australian lawyer of the Supreme Court of Victoria and a solicitor and barrister of the High Court of Australia in 2010, as a solicitor of the Senior Courts of England & Wales in 2011, as an attorney and counsellor at law in the State of New York in 2016, and as a solicitor of the High Court of the Hong Kong SAR in 2020.



Tiffany Wu
Debevoise & Plimpton

Tiffany Wu is a litigation associate and a member of the firm's International Dispute Resolution Group.

Ms. Wu has acted on behalf of a wide range of clients including financial institutions, private equity funds and major international corporations on matters including contentious regulatory enforcements, white-collar crime investigations, anti-corruption and compliance, insurance disputes and commercial litigation.

Ms. Wu has also previously gained transactional experience in advising clients on a broad range of cross-border transactions, including mergers & acquisitions and divestitures, private equity transactions, and joint ventures.

Ms. Wu rejoined Debevoise in 2022. Prior to joining the Hong Kong office, Ms. Wu completed her training contract at a leading international law firm in Hong Kong.

She received an LL.M. from New York University on a full scholarship awarded by the HKSAR

government in 2017, and a PCLL and LL.B. with First Class Honors from The University of Hong Kong in 2016 and 2015, respectively, where she was the co-chief editor of the Hong Kong Journal of Legal Studies.

Ms. Wu is fluent in English, Mandarin and Cantonese.

Debevoise & Plimpton LLP

Debevoise & Plimpton LLP is a premier law firm with market-leading practices, a global perspective and strong New York roots. Our clients look to us to bring a distinctively high degree of quality, intensity and creativity to resolve legal challenges effectively and cost efficiently.

Deep partner commitment, industry experience and a strategic approach enable us to bring clear commercial judgment to every matter. We draw on the strength of our culture and structure to deliver the best of our firm to every client through true collaboration.

Approximately 700 lawyers work in nine offices across three continents, within integrated global practices, serving clients around the world. Our lawyers prioritize developing a deep understanding of the business of our clients. We then pursue each matter with both intensity and creativity to achieve optimal results.

We are committed to serving our clients through excellence in lawyering. We receive numerous accolades and awards recognizing this commitment and the firm's market prominence worldwide.

Debevoise is also recognized as one of the leading firms for diversity. We believe that a diverse workforce, where all of our colleagues feel respected, builds a stronger firm, and benefits clients and the wider community.

The firm's culture fosters a collaborative approach across disciplines and regions, and, as a result, clients benefit from the dedication, cohesiveness and superior quality that we bring to all of our work worldwide.

21/F AIA Central
1 Connaught Road Central
Hong Kong
Tel: +852 2160 9800
Fax: +852 2810 9828

www.debevoise.com

Tony Dymond
tdymond@debevoise.com

Gareth Hughes
ghughes@debevoise.com

Cameron Sim
csim@debevoise.com

Tiffany Wu
tlwu@debevoise.com