

War Series: When Geopolitics Meets Arbitration in the UTI vs. Iran Case

August 1, 2024

In the arbitration case **United Technologies International, Inc. v. Islamic Republic of Iran**, the Tribunal faced a complex dispute arising from the Iranian Revolution and subsequent geopolitical upheavals. At the heart of the matter were **helicopter components** that Iran Helicopter Support and Renewal Company (IHSRC) had shipped to United Technologies International, Inc. (UTI) for repairs. The core issue was the proper return and payment for these components, with UTI seeking compensation for services rendered and storage costs, while IHSRC demanded the return of all components or their value.

UTI's Position and Claim

UTI, represented by its unincorporated division Sikorsky, argued that they fulfilled their contractual obligations by repairing and overhauling the components at their Connecticut facility. These repairs were conducted under terms specifying **delivery "F.o.b. Factory"**. However, post-revolution, IHSRC's request to alter the delivery terms to "C and F, Tehran" was declined by UTI, leading to a stalemate exacerbated by U.S. government orders that froze Iranian assets and prohibited the shipment of the components, classified under the **U.S. Munitions List**.

UTI thus found itself in possession of 22 fully repaired and 11 partially repaired components, for which payment was not received. They sought **\$183,886.05** for these services, plus

storage charges and interest. UTI asserted that due to the changing geopolitical landscape, including the U.S. embargo, they were rightfully retaining the components and sought Tribunal authorization to auction them or receive directions for continued storage and cost reimbursement.

IHSRC's Defense and Counterclaim

IHSRC countered with a multifaceted defense, asserting that UTI was obligated to return the components under IHSRC's terms, which specified "C and F Tehran, Iran". They disputed the claim, arguing that UTI failed to deliver the components as agreed and contended that UTI's non-performance couldn't be excused by U.S. government actions. IHSRC's counterclaim demanded either the return of all components sent for repair, valued at **\$5,500,000**, plus **\$15,000,000** in damages for non-delivery and **\$68,410,713** in incidental damages.

Request for Interim Measures

UTI's request for interim measures centered on auctioning the components or obtaining explicit instructions for their continued storage, highlighting the financial burden of storage costs and the risk of component obsolescence. They emphasized their **artisan's lien** under Connecticut law, securing payment for their repair and storage services. UTI argued that the interim measures were essential to prevent further economic loss and asset deterioration.

Tribunal's Analysis and Decision

The Tribunal's decision hinged on several critical points. Firstly, under Article 26 of the Tribunal Rules, interim measures can be granted to prevent **irreparable harm** to the parties' rights or property pending the final decision. This principle aligns with the International Court of Justice's practice of preserving the rights under dispute.

However, the Tribunal identified several obstacles:

1. **Ownership and Control:** Although IHSRC owned the components, they were stored in UTI's warehouses. The Tribunal noted that granting UTI's request could preempt a final decision on the restitution of these goods to IHSRC, thus complicating any future awards.
2. **Specificity and Jurisdiction:** There was ambiguity regarding the specific components held by UTI and those listed in IHSRC's counterclaim. Furthermore, the issue of storage costs beyond January 19, 1981, and whether these were within the Tribunal's jurisdiction, posed additional complications.
3. **Export Licensing:** UTI did not address the responsibility for obtaining export licenses, which was crucial given the components' classification under the U.S. Munitions List.

Given these factors, the Tribunal concluded that granting the interim measures would effectively constitute a provisional judgment on UTI's claims, which was inappropriate. Moreover, the Tribunal highlighted that the payment of storage costs, should it be warranted, was secured by the General Declaration's Security Account, thus negating the need for immediate interim relief.

Implications and Considerations

This decision underscores the delicate balance tribunals must maintain between providing interim relief and preserving the integrity of the final judgment. The ruling demonstrates the importance of clear contractual terms, especially in international transactions affected by geopolitical events. It also highlights the complexities of enforcing contractual rights amid governmental restrictions and the importance of addressing jurisdictional scope clearly in arbitration proceedings.

Key Takeaways

1. **Contractual Clarity:** Parties must ensure contracts are explicit about terms, especially regarding delivery and liability in the event of geopolitical changes.
2. **Interim Measures:** Tribunals have the authority to grant interim measures, but such requests must be compelling, clearly within jurisdiction, and not prejudicial to the final award.
3. **Geopolitical Impact:** Businesses operating internationally must consider the implications of political instability and government regulations on their contractual obligations.

This case serves as a poignant reminder of the intricacies involved in international arbitration and the critical role of clear legal frameworks and strategic foresight in managing cross-border disputes.

Author: Mahmoud Abuwasel

Title: Partner – Disputes

Email: mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com

Profile:

<https://waselandwasel.com/about/mahmoud-abuwasel/>

Lawyers and consultants.

Tier-1 services since 1799.

www.waselandwasel.com

business@waselandwasel.com