
DISPUTE RESOLUTION JOURNAL®

A Publication of the American Arbitration Association®-
International Centre for Dispute Resolution®

March-April 2026

Volume 79, Number 6

Editor's Note: The Courts and Arbitration

Victoria Prussen Spears

Neither the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act's Arbitration Exception Nor Its Waiver Exception Apply to Actions to Enforce Foreign Judgments, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit Rules

Jeffrey A. Rosenthal, Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr., Ari D. MacKinnon, Boaz S. Morag, Katie L. Gonzalez, Nowell D. Bamberger, Christopher P. Moore, and Rathna Ramamurthi

Chapter 2 of the Federal Arbitration Act Does Not Confer Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Vacatur of Foreign Arbitration Awards, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Rules

Jeffrey A. Rosenthal, Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr., Christopher P. Moore, Katie L. Gonzalez, Boaz S. Morag, and Shaniqua C. Shaw

Germany's Highest Court Upholds Validity of Arbitration Agreement That Excludes German T&C Law

Jan Henning Buschfeld and Marjorie Vieira

Consideration of Artificial Intelligence in Arbitration Terms of Reference and Procedural Orders

T. Michael Guiffre, Lily C. Geyer, John Laird, and Alicia Clausen

Artificial Intelligence in Arbitration: Is There Room for AI Arbitrators?—Part II

Farqaleet Khokhar

Jurisdictional Issues in Enforcement of International Arbitration Agreements in Pakistan: A Critical Analysis—Part II

Rana Rizwan Hussain

The Components That Affect the Validity of an International Commercial Agreement to Arbitrate

Zafira Hudani

The View from Europe: What's New in European Arbitration?

Stephan Wilske, Björn P. Ebert, Michelle Lindholm, and Charlotte Rosenkranz

Dispute Resolution Journal®

A Publication of the American Arbitration Association®-
International Centre for Dispute Resolution®

Volume 79, Number 6

March-April 2026

- 491 Editor's Note: The Courts and Arbitration**
Victoria Prussen Spears
- 495 Neither the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act's Arbitration Exception Nor Its Waiver Exception Apply to Actions to Enforce Foreign Judgments, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit Rules**
Jeffrey A. Rosenthal, Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr., Ari D. MacKinnon, Boaz S. Morag, Katie L. Gonzalez, Nowell D. Bamberger, Christopher P. Moore, and Rathna Ramamurthi
- 503 Chapter 2 of the Federal Arbitration Act Does Not Confer Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Vacatur of Foreign Arbitration Awards, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Rules**
Jeffrey A. Rosenthal, Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr., Christopher P. Moore, Katie L. Gonzalez, Boaz S. Morag, and Shaniqua C. Shaw
- 511 Germany's Highest Court Upholds Validity of Arbitration Agreement That Excludes German T&C Law**
Jan Henning Buschfeld and Marjorie Vieira
- 515 Consideration of Artificial Intelligence in Arbitration Terms of Reference and Procedural Orders**
T. Michael Guiffre, Lily C. Geyer, John Laird, and Alicia Clausen
- 523 Artificial Intelligence in Arbitration: Is There Room for AI Arbitrators?—Part II**
Farqaleet Khokhar

543 Jurisdictional Issues in Enforcement of International Arbitration Agreements in Pakistan: A Critical Analysis—Part II

Rana Rizwan Hussain

561 The Components That Affect the Validity of an International Commercial Agreement to Arbitrate

Zafira Hudani

571 The View from Europe: What's New in European Arbitration?

Stephan Wilske, Björn P. Ebert, Michelle Lindholm, and Charlotte Rosenkranz

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President

Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President

Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

STACY A. ALEXEJUN

Partner

Quarles & Brady LLP

ELIZABETH A. EDMONDSON

Partner

Jenner & Block LLP

JENNIFER L. BARNETT

Vice President and Senior Counsel

American Arbitration

*Association/International Centre
for Dispute Resolution*

THARA GOPALAN

Vice President

American Arbitration

*Association/International Centre
for Dispute Resolution*

ALBERT BATES JR.

Partner

*Troutman Pepper Hamilton
Sanders LLP*

DAVID E. HARRELL JR.

Partner

Locke Lord LLP

JOHN D. BRANSON

Partner

Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP

B. TED HOWES

Independent Arbitrator

Howes Arbitration

THEO CHENG

Arbitrator and Mediator

ADR Office of Theo Cheng LLC

PATRICK R. KINGSLEY

Partner

*Stradley Ronon Stevens &
Young LLP*

WADE CORIELL

Partner

King & Spalding LLP

TIMOTHY K. LEWIS

Senior Counsel

Blank Rome LLP

SASHE D. DIMITROFF

Partner

Baker & Hostetler LLP

GREGORY R. MEEDER

Partner

Holland & Knight LLP

KEVIN O'GORMAN

Partner

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP

NATHAN D. O'MALLEY

Partner

Musick Peeler

DHARSHINI PRASAD

Partner

Willkie Farr & Gallagher (UK) LLP

L ANDREW S. RICCIO

Partner

Baker & McKenzie LLP

LISA M. RICHMAN

Partner

McDermott Will & Emery LLP

PETER RUNDLE

Arbitrator

Rundle Law Corporation

CHIRAAG SHAH

Partner

Morrison & Foerster LLP

LAURA K. VEITH

Partner

K&L Gates LLP

DANA WELCH

Arbitrator

Welch ADR

FREDA L. WOLFSON

Partner

Lowenstein Sandler LLP

LOUISE WOODS

Partner

Vinson & Elkins RLLP

DISPUTE RESOLUTION JOURNAL®

The Journal of the American Arbitration Association®-International Centre for Dispute Resolution® (AAA®-ICDR®)

ISSN 1074-8105 (print) and 25733-606X (digital).

© American Arbitration Association-International Centre for Dispute Resolution. All rights reserved under the U.S. Copyright Act. No part of this publication may be reproduced, reprinted, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including but not limited to digital, electronic, mechanical, recording, or photocopying, without prior written permission.

The Dispute Resolution Journal is © 2026 American Arbitration Association, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of the Dispute Resolution Journal may be reproduced, transmitted or otherwise distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical without written permission from the American Arbitration Association, Inc. Any reproduction, transmission or distribution of the material herein is prohibited and is in violation of US and international law. American Arbitration Association, Inc., expressly disclaims any liability in connection with the articles contained in the Dispute Resolution Journal or its contents by any third party. The views expressed by authors in these articles are not necessarily those of the American Arbitration Association, Inc. The American Arbitration Association, Inc., assumes no responsibility for the content and materials contained in these articles. The information provided in these articles do not, and is not intended to, constitute legal advice; instead, all information, content, and materials are for general informational and educational purposes only. Information in these articles may not constitute the most up-to-date legal or other information. Use of, and access to, these articles or any resources contained within the articles do not create an attorney-client relationship between the readers, authors, contributors, contributing law firms, or the American Arbitration Association, Inc. Do not consider these articles to be a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your state.

Article Submissions

Direct editorial inquiries and send materials for publication to:
Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications
Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005,
smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541.

Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to arbitrators and mediators, attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, corporate officers, government agencies and their counsel, senior business executives, and anyone interested in dispute resolution.

This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering dispute resolution, legal, accounting, or other professional services or advice in this publication. If dispute resolution, legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

Subscriptions

Digital and print subscriptions to the Dispute Resolution Journal are available for purchase through the AAA-ICDR's online store, <https://aaaeducation.org/bookstore>.

Reprint Permissions

Please send requests to reproduce Dispute Resolution Journal articles to the AAA-ICDR's Publications Department Elizabeth Bain, Director of Publications, at baine@adr.org.

ISSN 1074-8105 (print) and 25733-606X (digital).

The cover of this journal features the painting *Close Hauled*, a drawing by Rockwell Kent, 1930, electrotype on paper.

Publishing Staff

Director of Publications: Elizabeth Bain

Production Editor: Sharon D. Ray

Cover Design: Sharon D. Ray

Cite this publication as:

Dispute Resolution Journal® (The Journal of the American Arbitration Association®-International Centre for Dispute Resolution® (AAA®-ICDR®))

Editorial Office

American Arbitration Association

120 Broadway, Floor 21

New York, NY 10271

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to American Arbitration Association-International Centre for Dispute Resolution, 120 Broadway, 21st Floor, New York, NY 10271

To reach Customer Service:

Elizabeth Bain

Available 8:00 AM-5:00 PM Eastern Time

(401) 431-4837

baine@adr.org

Neither the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act's Arbitration Exception Nor Its Waiver Exception Apply to Actions to Enforce Foreign Judgments, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit Rules

Jeffrey A. Rosenthal, Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr.,
Ari D. MacKinnon, Boaz S. Morag, Katie L. Gonzalez,
Nowell D. Bamberger, Christopher P. Moore, and
Rathna Ramamurthi¹

In this article, the authors review a federal circuit court decision holding that the arbitration exception and the waiver exception to the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act do not apply to actions to enforce foreign judgments, even where the foreign judgment itself recognized or enforced an arbitration award.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (D.C. Circuit) has ruled that the arbitration exception and the waiver exception to the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) do not apply to actions to enforce foreign judgments,

¹ The authors, attorneys with Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP, may be contacted at jrosenthal@cgsh.com, cboccuzzi@cgsh.com, amackinnon@cgsh.com, bmorag@cgsh.com, kgonzalez@cgsh.com, nbamberger@cgsh.com, cmoore@cgsh.com, and rramamurthi@cgsh.com, respectively.

even where the foreign judgment itself recognized or enforced an arbitration award.

In *Amaplat Mauritius Ltd. and Amari Nickel Holdings Zimbabwe Ltd. v. Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation, et al.*,² the D.C. Circuit reinforced the distinction between actions to recognize and enforce foreign arbitration awards under the 1958 Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (the New York Convention) and actions to recognize and enforce foreign court money judgments. The circuit court determined that the arbitration exception, by its plain terms, did not contemplate an action to recognize and enforce a foreign court judgment. For similar reasons, the circuit court found that a foreign state's signing of the New York Convention and subsequent agreement by it or its instrumentalities to arbitrate a dispute did not constitute an implied agreement to submit to jurisdiction for actions to recognize and enforce foreign judgments, and therefore did not satisfy the waiver exception.

In reaching this conclusion, the circuit court expressly declined to follow a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit determining that the waiver exception applied to an action recognizing a foreign court judgment confirming an arbitration award.

Background

Under the FSIA, foreign sovereigns are presumptively immune from suit in U.S. courts unless one of the exceptions to immunity enumerated in the FSIA applies.³ U.S. courts lack subject matter jurisdiction over actions against foreign sovereigns unless one of the FSIA's exceptions to sovereign immunity applies.⁴

² *Amaplat Mauritius Ltd. and Amari Nickel Holdings Zimbabwe Ltd. v. Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation, et al.*, ____ F.4th ____, No. 24-7030, 2025 WL 1934050 (D.C. Cir. July 15, 2025).

³ See 28 U.S.C. § 1605.

⁴ See, e.g., *Argentine Republic v. Amerada Hess Shipping Corp.*, 488 U.S. 428, 443 (1989).

Under the waiver exception, sovereign immunity is lost where the foreign state either expressly or impliedly waives immunity.⁵ The arbitration exception provides that a foreign state is not immune to jurisdiction in the United States where a private party sues under a contract containing an agreement to arbitrate or seeks recognition and enforcement of an arbitration award rendered under the arbitration agreement, when, *inter alia*, the agreement to arbitrate is or may be governed by an international agreement to which the United States is party that calls for the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards, such as the New York Convention.⁶

Procedural History

In the early 2000s, two Mauritian mining companies, Amaplat Mauritius Ltd. and Amari Nickel Holdings Zimbabwe Ltd. formed a joint venture with Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation (ZMDC), majority-owned by the Republic of Zimbabwe, to engage in mining activities in Zimbabwe.⁷ The joint venture was formed pursuant to two Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that included a provision requiring any dispute to be resolved by arbitration administered by the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC).⁸

ZMDC eventually sought to cancel the MOUs, and Amaplat and Amari initiated an ICC arbitration seated in Zambia against ZMDC and the Commissioner of Zimbabwe's Ministry of Mines (the Commissioner).⁹ In 2014, the tribunal issued a final award finding that ZMDC breached the MOUs and ordering ZMDC to pay approximately \$50 million to Amaplat and Amari, excluding

⁵ 28 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(1).

⁶ 28 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(6).

⁷ Amaplat Mauritius Ltd. and Amari Nickel Holdings Zimbabwe Ltd. v. Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation, et al., 663 F. Supp. 3d 11, 16 (D.D.C. 2023).

⁸ *Id.* at 16-17.

⁹ *Id.* at 17.

interest.¹⁰ ZMDC did not pay the arbitration award, and in 2019 Amaplat and Amari obtained a judgment from the High Court of Zambia recognizing the award pursuant to the New York Convention.¹¹

In 2022, Amaplat and Amari (Plaintiffs) initiated an action in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia against ZMDC, the Commissioner, and the Republic of Zimbabwe (Defendants). By that time, an action to seek recognition and enforcement of the arbitral award in a U.S. court was time-barred under the Federal Arbitration Act.¹² Accordingly, Plaintiffs sought instead to recognize and enforce the High Court of Zambia judgment under the District of Columbia Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (the D.C. Foreign Judgments Recognition Act).¹³ Defendants moved to dismiss arguing, *inter alia*, lack of subject matter jurisdiction.¹⁴

The district court granted in part and denied in part Defendants' motion to dismiss. After dismissing the claims against Zimbabwe and ZMDC,¹⁵ the district court considered whether the arbitration or waiver exceptions applied to the Commissioner. The district court concluded that the arbitration exception did not apply, because Plaintiffs' action did not seek to "enforce the MOUs or to confirm the Zambian arbitral award" through the New York Convention, but was an action under the D.C. Foreign Judgments Recognition Act.¹⁶ Acknowledging that this "may seem like a fine distinction," the district court relied on precedent "recogniz[ing] the conceptual difference between arbitral awards

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² See 9 U.S.C. § 207.

¹³ Amaplat and Amari, 663 F. Supp. 3d at 17.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 18.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 20-26 (finding that the Republic of Zimbabwe was not the alter ego of ZMDC, and there was no personal jurisdiction over ZMDC).

¹⁶ *Id.* at 31-32.

and foreign court judgments on arbitral awards” to find that the arbitration exception did not apply.¹⁷

The district court found, however, that the waiver exception did apply, because the Commissioner impliedly waived sovereign immunity “by being a New York Convention signatory and agreeing to arbitrate in the territory of another signatory.”¹⁸ In so finding, the district court relied on the Second Circuit’s decision in *Seetransport*, which held that a foreign sovereign impliedly waived its immunity from “a claim to confirm an arbitral award *and* from a claim to recognize a foreign court judgment confirming the arbitral award.”¹⁹ Defendants appealed.

The D.C. Circuit’s Decision

The D.C. Circuit reversed the district court’s decision, finding that an application of either the arbitration exception or the waiver exception “would require us to conflate two distinct concepts—arbitral awards and foreign court judgments.”²⁰ Because “neither exception applies,” the circuit court concluded that it “lack[ed] subject matter jurisdiction over this action.”²¹

Beginning with the arbitration exception, the D.C. Circuit “agreed with the district court that the arbitration exception is inapplicable,” because “there is a basic distinction between actions to confirm foreign arbitral *awards* and actions to domesticate foreign judicial *judgments*.”²² The court found that the “plain terms” of the arbitration exception required that the action be brought to “enforce an agreement . . . to submit to arbitration”

¹⁷ Id. at 32-33 (quoting *Commissions Import Export S.A. v. Republic of the Congo* (Comimpex), 757 F.3d 321, 330 (D.C. Cir. 2014)).

¹⁸ Id. at 36.

¹⁹ *Amaplat and Amari*, 2025 WL 1934050, at *3 (emphasis in original). See also *Amaplat and Amari*, 663 F. Supp. 3d 11 at 33-36 (citing *Seetransport Wiking Trader Schiffahrtsgesellschaft MBH & Co., Kommanditgesellschaft v. Navimpex Centrala Navala*, 989 F.2d 572 (2d Cir. 1993)).

²⁰ *Amaplat and Amari*, 2025 WL 1934050, at *1.

²¹ Id.

²² Id. at *4 (emphases in original).

or “to confirm an award made pursuant to such an agreement to arbitrate.”²³ Because the arbitration exception “[n]owhere . . . mentions foreign court judgments,” the court declined to “collaps[e] two concepts that we consistently have understood to be distinct.”²⁴ As a result, the court found that the arbitration exception did not apply to an action brought under the D.C. Foreign Judgments Recognition Act to recognize and enforce a foreign court judgment.²⁵

Turning next to the waiver exception, the court determined “[f]or similar reasons” that “the implied waiver exception also does not apply here.”²⁶ Noting that the waiver exception must be construed “narrowly” and may apply only if there is “strong evidence of the sovereign’s intent to waive immunity,” the court found that the New York Convention, which governs the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards and not foreign judgments, was “insufficient to show Defendants’ intent to waive immunity from judgment recognition actions.”²⁷

In reaching this conclusion, the D.C. Circuit expressly declined to follow the Second Circuit’s 1993 decision in the *Seetransport* case.²⁸ There, the Second Circuit reasoned that the foreign sovereign, having agreed to and in fact having arbitrated a dispute subject to the New York Convention, “logically . . . had to have contemplated the involvement of the courts of any of the Contracting States in an action to enforce the award,” including by enforcing judgments that enforce the award.²⁹ The D.C. Circuit rejected the Second Circuit’s reasoning on the basis that the New York Convention and the Federal Arbitration Act implementing it into U.S. law “say[] nothing about recognizing foreign court judgments after having sought recognition and enforcement of

²³ *Id.* (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(6)).

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ *Id.* at *5.

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Seetransport*, 989 F.2d at 578-79.

the award.”³⁰ The D.C. Circuit accordingly held that a sovereign’s assent to the New York Convention and subsequent agreement to arbitrate did not sufficiently demonstrate an intent to waive immunity from judgment recognition actions.³¹ The D.C. Circuit rejected Plaintiffs’ contention that two prior D.C. Circuit cases referencing the *Seetransport* decision—*Creighton Ltd. v. Government of the State of Qatar* and *Tatneft v. Ukraine*—should change this outcome.³² Distinguishing these authorities as “both deal[ing] with [enforcement of] arbitral awards” and not foreign court judgments, the Court further observed that it had never before “formally adopted *Seetransport*’s conclusion that signing the New York Convention and agreeing to arbitrate is even sufficient to waive immunity from award actions.”³³ The court instead decided to “once again leave that question for another day,” but “resolve[d] that such conduct is insufficient to establish the requisite intent to waive immunity from foreign judgment actions that are not governed by the [New York] Convention.”³⁴

As a result, the court held that neither the arbitration exception nor the waiver exception applies to the action under the D.C. Foreign Judgments Act, and therefore remanded to the district court to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.³⁵

Takeaways

As the default venue for actions against foreign sovereigns,³⁶ the D.C. Circuit’s decision will significantly limit parties’ ability to bring actions against foreign sovereigns to enforce foreign judgments that have recognized or enforced arbitration awards

³⁰ Amaplat and Amari, 2025 WL at *5.

³¹ *Id.* at *6.

³² *Id.* (citing *Creighton Ltd. v. Gov’t of the State of Qatar*, 181 F.3d 118, 123 (D.C. Cir. 1999); *Tatneft v. Ukraine*, 771 F. App’x 9, 10 (D.C. Cir. 2019)).

³³ *Id.* at *7 (internal citation and quotation omitted) (citing cases).

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ See 28 U.S.C. § 1391(f)(4).

under the New York Convention. As a result, foreign award creditors may need to consider whether they should incur the expense of bringing protective actions to seek recognition of their arbitral awards in the United States within the three-year limitations period to do so, even when they do not have prospects of collecting in the United States, to protect against the possibility that recoverable assets might come into the United States within the much longer period available to enforce a domestic court judgment.

In addition, the D.C. Circuit expressly left open the question of whether “signing the New York Convention and agreeing to arbitrate is even sufficient to waive immunity from award actions,”³⁷ notwithstanding its prior decisions in *Creighton Ltd. v. Government of the State of Qatar* and *Tatneft v. Ukraine* and the decisions of other Circuit courts, including specifically *Seetransport*.³⁸ Without a sharp and mature circuit split on this issue, however, the U.S. Supreme Court may be disinclined to review it in the near future, having previously denied certiorari in the *Tatneft v. Ukraine* case.³⁹

The D.C. Circuit’s decision does create a clear rift with the Second Circuit with respect to actions to enforce foreign judgments. As the two most significant circuits for enforcement of international awards, particularly concerning sovereigns, this is notable. In the face of relatively little case law on the subject, however, it remains to be seen whether the clarity of the split on this issue alone will suffice to attract the Supreme Court’s attention.

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ See also, e.g., *S & Davis Int’l, Inc. v. Republic of Yemen*, 218 F.3d 1292, 1301 (11th Cir. 2000).

³⁹ See *Ukraine v. Tatneft*, 140 S. Ct. 901 (2020). The D.C. Circuit had previously unanimously denied rehearing en banc of the *Tatneft* decision applying the waiver exception. *Tatneft v. Ukraine*, 771 F. App’x 9 (D.C. Cir. 2019), reh’rg en banc denied (D.C. Cir. Sept. 16, 2019).