

Abstract

Methanex and Saluka:

Towards a Re-definition of Indirect Expropriation in International Investment Arbitration?

August Reinisch

According to the NAFTA Chapter 11 tribunal in *Methanex Corporation v. United States of America*, 2005, “[...] as a matter of general international law, a non-discriminatory regulation for a public purpose, which is enacted in accordance with due process and, which affects, inter alios, a foreign investor or investment is not deemed expropriatory and compensable unless [...] .” In a similar way, an UNCITRAL investment tribunal in *Saluka Investments BV (The Netherlands) v. The Czech Republic*, 2006, held that “the principle that a State does not commit an expropriation and is thus not liable to pay compensation to a dispossessed alien investor when it adopts general regulations that are “commonly accepted as within the police power of States” forms part of customary international law today.”

These two arbitral holdings have raised questions as to the present day content of the international law on indirect expropriation, in particular as to whether the traditional approach focusing on the intensity of interference with investor rights may have been replaced by a broad police powers doctrine immunizing state action against claims of *de facto* expropriation.