

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.



Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

THE NEED FOR BALANCING INVESTOR RIGHTS AND PUBLIC INTEREST: LEGAL DIMENSIONS OF INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS

AUTHORED BY: MS. RITIKA SUHAG,
LLM, Corporate law, IILM University, Greater Noida

CO-AUTHOR - MS. GARIMA MOHAN PRASAD,
Asst. Prof. IILM University, Greater Noida

ABSTRACT

The growth of international investment agreements (IIAs) has led to the proliferation of investor protections, particularly through mechanisms such as the Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS). While these mechanisms promote foreign direct investment (FDI) by safeguarding investor interests, they have also raised significant concerns over their impact on public policy, regulatory autonomy, and state sovereignty. This paper explores the legal and theoretical dimensions of balancing investor rights with the public interest. It examines key legal principles, such as Fair and Equitable Treatment (FET), National Treatment, and expropriation, alongside critiques of ISDS. The paper concludes by discussing reform proposals to realign IIAs with sustainable development and sovereign regulatory space.

Keywords: investment treaties; bilateral investment treaties; investor protection; right to regulate; regulatory autonomy; policy space; regulatory chill; investment treaty policy; investor-state dispute settlement; ISDS; international arbitration; settlement; international economic law; balancing of interests.

INTRODUCTION

In the past few decades, International Investment Agreements (IIAs)—particularly Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) and investment chapters in Free Trade Agreements (FTAs)—have become vital instruments for promoting and protecting foreign direct investment (FDI). These treaties typically provide broad protections for foreign investors, including guarantees of Fair and Equitable Treatment (FET), protection from expropriation, and access to Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanisms.

While these provisions have been instrumental in encouraging investment and reducing political risk for foreign investors, they have also sparked growing concern over their impact on public interest, particularly when investor claims challenge a state's right to regulate in areas such as public health, environmental protection, labor rights, and indigenous sovereignty. Cases like *Philip Morris v. Uruguay* and *Vattenfall v. Germany* highlight the potential for ISDS claims to conflict with legitimate regulatory measures enacted in the public interest.

This tension between investor rights and sovereign regulatory space raises critical legal and policy questions: How far should investment protections extend? What limits, if any, should exist on investor access to ISDS? And how can the international investment regime evolve to accommodate both economic objectives and societal values?

This paper explores the legal dimensions of this balance, analyzing the theoretical foundations, treaty standards, case law, and reform efforts aimed at recalibrating the system. Ultimately, it argues for a more equitable investment framework that ensures foreign investors are protected—without compromising the democratic authority and policy space of host states.

Theoretical Foundations

Legal Pluralism and Global Governance

Legal pluralism, in the context of global governance, recognizes that multiple legal systems coexist and interact in the international arena, rather than relying solely on a single, state-centric legal framework. It acknowledges the influence of various actors, including states, international organizations, and non-state actors, in shaping global legal norms and practices. IIAs create a semi-autonomous legal order governed by private arbitration panels, often disconnected from national courts. This fragmentation has implications for coherence, transparency, and accountability in global governance, particularly when ISDS decisions override national public interest laws.

Sovereignty vs. Globalization in Investment Law

The expansion of global trade and investment has increasingly constrained national policy space. IIAs often limit the sovereign discretion of states by subjecting domestic policies to international legal scrutiny. Tensions arise when regulatory actions—especially in health, environment, or labor—conflict with investment protections, such as the guarantee of "legitimate expectations" under FET clauses. This challenges traditional notions of sovereignty in favor of market-driven legal globalization.

Core Legal Concepts

Fair and Equitable Treatment (FET)

FET is a cornerstone of investment protection and includes rights to transparency, due process, and legitimate expectations. However, tribunals have inconsistently interpreted FET, sometimes equating it with a “right to a stable regulatory environment,” which can restrict policy reforms. The lack of a clear legal standard has led to unpredictability and concerns that FET undermines legitimate public interest regulations.

Expropriation and Regulatory Autonomy

IAs protect investors from both direct and indirect expropriation. While direct expropriation (e.g., nationalization) is relatively straightforward, indirect expropriation—where state regulation significantly affects investment value—has been contentious. Regulatory actions (e.g., environmental bans) may be construed as indirect expropriation, even when enacted in good faith. Tribunals must balance investor protection with a state's right to regulate for public welfare.

National Treatment and Non-Discrimination

These principles ensure that foreign investors are not treated less favorably than domestic ones. However, national treatment provisions may restrict a state's ability to provide targeted support for local industries or adopt affirmative policies. The challenge lies in distinguishing legitimate regulatory distinctions from discriminatory treatment.

The Role and Critique of Investor-State Dispute Settlement Mechanisms

Purpose of ISDS Mechanisms

The **Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS)** mechanism is a legal framework that allows **foreign investors** to bring claims directly against a **host state** for alleged violations of investment protection standards enshrined in **international investment agreements (IIAs)**—such as Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) or Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Its central purpose is to **depoliticize disputes**, provide **neutral and independent resolution**, and **enhance the protection of foreign investments**.

1. Protecting Foreign Investors from Unfair Treatment

ISDS allows investors to challenge state conduct that violates their rights under a treaty,

including:

- **Unlawful expropriation** of investments without compensation
- **Denial of fair and equitable treatment (FET)**
- **Discrimination** against foreign investors (violating National Treatment or Most-Favored-Nation clauses)

By providing a remedy outside domestic courts, ISDS is intended to offer **legal security** and **stability**, particularly in states with **unreliable, politicized, or underdeveloped** judicial systems.

2. Depoliticizing Investment Disputes

Before ISDS, investment disputes were resolved through **diplomatic protection**, where home states intervened on behalf of their investors. This could lead to **international tensions** and was often influenced by political considerations.

ISDS **removes the need for diplomatic intermediation** by allowing investors to assert their claims directly against the host state through international arbitration, thus reducing political friction between states.

3. Enhancing Investor Confidence and Promoting FDI

By ensuring that foreign investors have access to an **independent and impartial forum** for dispute resolution, ISDS enhances confidence in the investment environment.

This:

- **Encourages Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)**, especially in emerging or high-risk markets
- Provides investors with **recourse** in case their rights are violated
- Makes host states more accountable for their treatment of foreign investments

4. Enforcing International Legal Standards

ISDS is designed to **enforce compliance** with the legal obligations that host states undertake in IIAs. It gives investors a means to:

- **Hold states accountable** for breaching treaty provisions
- Ensure that international law is **not merely aspirational** but **enforceable**

This contributes to the **rule of law** in international economic relations.

5. Providing an Alternative to Domestic Courts

In many jurisdictions, domestic courts may be:

- Biased against foreign investors
- Inefficient or corrupt
- Lacking in capacity to handle complex investment disputes

ISDS offers a **neutral alternative**, with tribunals composed of international legal experts, applying international standards rather than domestic law.

6. Establishing Binding and Enforceable Decisions

Arbitral awards issued through ISDS are typically **final and binding** and can be enforced under international treaties such as the **New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958)**.

This ensures that investors can not only obtain a judgment but can also **enforce it internationally**, even if the host state refuses to comply voluntarily.

Criticism of ISDS

- **Erosion of Sovereignty:** ISDS permits foreign investors to bypass domestic courts and challenge public interest laws before private arbitration panels.
- **Lack of Transparency:** Many ISDS cases are conducted in secret, with limited public access to documents and hearings.
- **Regulatory Chill:** The threat of expensive ISDS claims may deter governments from enacting social or environmental reforms.
- **Inconsistency and Arbitrator Bias:** Differing interpretations of similar treaty provisions, and potential conflicts of interest among arbitrators, raise questions about fairness and coherence.

Landmark Case laws

1. Philip Morris v. Uruguay (2016)

Issue: Public health regulation vs. investor expectations

Facts: Philip Morris challenged Uruguay's anti-smoking regulations, including graphic warnings on cigarette packages and restrictions on branding, claiming these measures:

- Violated its intellectual property rights
- Constituted indirect expropriation
- Breached the Fair and Equitable Treatment (FET) standard

Outcome:

The tribunal ruled in favor of Uruguay, emphasizing the state's right to regulate for public health and found that the measures were legitimate, non-discriminatory, and proportionate.

2. Vattenfall v. Germany (2012 – ongoing)

Issue: Environmental policy and energy transition

Facts: Following the Fukushima nuclear disaster, Germany accelerated its nuclear phase-out, affecting Swedish energy company Vattenfall's investments in German nuclear plants.

Vattenfall claimed the decision violated:

- Legitimate expectations
- Investment protections under the Energy Charter Treaty

Outcome:

The case is ongoing, with Germany having already paid settlements in earlier Vattenfall claims related to environmental permitting.

3. Metalclad v. Mexico (2000)

Issue: Local governance vs. investment expectations

Facts: A U.S. company, Metalclad, was denied a construction permit for a hazardous waste facility by a Mexican local government, despite federal approvals. The investor claimed this was an indirect expropriation.

Outcome:

The tribunal sided with Metalclad and awarded damages, holding that the denial of the permit interfered with the company's legitimate expectations.

4. Tecmed v. Mexico (2003)

Issue: Environmental regulation vs. FET

Facts: Mexico refused to renew the license for Tecmed's hazardous waste landfill due to environmental concerns. Tecmed claimed it was unfair treatment and indirect expropriation.

Outcome:

The tribunal ruled in Tecmed's favor, finding that Mexico violated the FET standard by not providing a transparent and consistent regulatory framework.

5. South American Silver v. Bolivia (2018)

Issue: Indigenous rights vs. investor interests

Facts: Bolivia revoked a mining concession after indigenous communities protested its environmental and social impacts. The investor claimed this amounted to unlawful expropriation.

Outcome:

The tribunal found that Bolivia's actions were not arbitrary and were based on legitimate public concerns, although partial damages were awarded.

6. Yukos v. Russia (2014)

Issue: Expropriation and political motivations

Facts: Former shareholders of Yukos Oil claimed that the Russian government expropriated their investment through tax penalties and asset seizures motivated by political retribution.

Outcome:

The tribunal awarded \$50 billion in damages, the largest ISDS award to date. It found that Russia's actions were tantamount to expropriation.

The importance of balancing investor rights and public interest

Balancing investor rights and public interest is critical to the legitimacy, stability, and sustainability of the international investment regime. While protecting investors fosters economic development and encourages foreign direct investment (FDI), unbalanced protections—especially when enforced through mechanisms like Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS)—can undermine democratic governance, limit regulatory autonomy, and impede the pursuit of public welfare goals.

Below are key reasons why striking this balance is essential:

1. Safeguarding Regulatory Autonomy

Governments must retain the ability to regulate in areas such as:

- **Public health (e.g., tobacco control, pandemic measures)**
- **Environmental protection (e.g., emissions regulations, mining bans)**
- **Labor standards and human rights**

Without a balanced approach, states may be deterred from enacting necessary regulations due to fear of **ISDS claims** and high compensation awards. This phenomenon—known as **regulatory chill**—threatens the public interest, particularly in urgent areas like climate change and social justice.

2. Enhancing the Legitimacy of International Investment Law

If IIAs are perceived as prioritizing corporate rights over public welfare, they **lose political legitimacy**. Public backlash, civil society opposition, and rising skepticism from both developed and developing countries have pushed for reforms. Ensuring a fair balance helps restore trust and **strengthens the legal and moral foundation** of the investment regime.

3. Promoting Sustainable Development

The **UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)** emphasize inclusive, equitable, and environmentally sound growth. Investment law must evolve to:

- Encourage responsible investing
- Prevent abusive litigation
- Support host states in meeting their development and environmental commitments

Balanced IIAs can incentivize investment while ensuring that states can **prioritize development over profit** where necessary.

4. Preventing Inequality and Power Imbalances

Large multinational corporations can afford international arbitration, while smaller states often cannot bear the **financial and administrative burdens**. This can create **asymmetries** where wealthy investors dominate legal battles, reinforcing **global economic inequality**. Balancing rights ensures that **all stakeholders—states, investors, and the public—have a fair role**.

5. Encouraging Predictability and Consistency

Balanced agreements that:

- Clearly define standards like **Fair and Equitable Treatment (FET)** and **indirect expropriation**
- Include **public interest exceptions**
- Promote **transparent ISDS processes**

help reduce legal uncertainty. This fosters a **more stable investment environment**, which is beneficial for both investors and host countries.

6. Ensuring Democratic Accountability

Public policy decisions are ideally shaped through **democratic processes**, not by international arbitration panels. Overreach by ISDS tribunals can **erode democratic control** over national laws and priorities. Balancing interests ensures that **foreign investors do not override the will**

of citizens through private dispute mechanisms.

Issues faced in Balancing Investor rights and public interest

1. Broad and Vague Treaty Standards

Many IIAs contain **open-ended provisions** such as:

- **Fair and Equitable Treatment (FET)**
- **Indirect expropriation**
- **Legitimate expectations**

These clauses are often interpreted broadly by arbitral tribunals, creating **legal uncertainty** and allowing investors to challenge a wide range of public interest regulations, including health, environmental, and human rights policies.

2. Regulatory Chill

The threat of costly ISDS claims can deter states—especially developing ones—from introducing new regulations, even when they serve essential public goals. This “**regulatory chill**” undermines state sovereignty and democratic policymaking.

3. Lack of Transparency and Accountability in ISDS

ISDS proceedings are often:

- **Conducted in private**
- **Lack consistent legal reasoning**
- **Subject to potential arbitrator conflicts of interest**

This raises concerns about **legitimacy**, especially when public policies are at stake but the public has no access to the process.

4. Inconsistency in Arbitral Decisions

Tribunals have issued **conflicting rulings** on similar legal issues (e.g., defining FET or indirect expropriation), leading to unpredictability and erosion of trust in the dispute settlement system.

5. Unequal Access to Justice

Foreign investors can sue states through ISDS, but **states and affected communities** (e.g., indigenous groups) generally have no **reciprocal rights** to hold investors accountable for environmental or social harm. This creates a **power imbalance**.

6. Erosion of Sovereign Policy Space

Many investment treaties limit the state's ability to regulate in areas like:

- **Public health (e.g., tobacco, COVID-19)**
- **Environmental protection (e.g., mining bans, emissions control)**
- **Social welfare**

Such constraints threaten **constitutional and democratic governance** frameworks.

7. High Costs of Arbitration

ISDS proceedings are extremely expensive—costing **millions of dollars** in legal and tribunal fees. This places a **financial burden on developing countries**, even if they win the case.

8. Absence of Public Interest Carve-outs

Many treaties lack **explicit exceptions** for public interest measures (e.g., environmental or human rights safeguards). This omission gives more weight to investor protections than public welfare.

9. Inadequate Mechanisms for Appeal or Review

Unlike domestic courts, ISDS lacks a **standing appellate mechanism**, making it hard to correct legal errors or ensure consistency in decision-making.

10. Limited Reform Implementation

Although reform discussions (e.g., at UNCITRAL and ICSID) are underway, progress has been **slow and fragmented**, with states divided over how to balance protection with reform.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of international investment agreements has significantly enhanced protections for foreign investors, contributing to global economic integration and capital mobility. However, the rise of Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) claims against state regulations—particularly in areas such as public health, environmental protection, and social policy—has exposed the fragility of the balance between investor rights and public interest.

The legal mechanisms that once served to encourage investment are now increasingly questioned for undermining state sovereignty, chilling legitimate regulation, and prioritizing private profit over collective welfare. Landmark cases demonstrate that when treaty provisions

are interpreted expansively, they may conflict with the ability of states to address pressing domestic and global challenges, such as climate change or public health crises.

Rebalancing this relationship requires clearer treaty drafting, greater transparency and accountability in ISDS, and a shift toward recognizing the right to regulate as an integral part of sustainable investment governance. Reforms such as the establishment of standing investment courts, mandatory public interest exceptions, and more narrowly defined substantive protections are essential to preserving the legitimacy and fairness of the investment regime.

Ultimately, a more balanced investment framework should not be viewed as a constraint on investment, but as a necessary step toward ensuring that foreign investment supports—not undermines—sovereign governance and the public good.

SOURCES

<https://journal.kilaw.edu.kw/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/117-136-Dr.-Abubaker-Dr.-alhabeeb>

<https://www.oecd.org/>

<https://www.cambridgescholars.com/>

<https://cjl.uchicago.edu/>

<https://jusmundi.com/>