INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY

Arbitration Under The Malapsian Arbitration Act 1952 -A General Assessment bis-a-bis Shari'a - A General Assessment.

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC
UMIVERSIT. LIBRARY

ORDER NO: GPT LOCATION:
DATE RECEIVED: 6/9/93 M.

ACC. NO: 128839

Ashgar Ali bin Ali Mohamed
CALL NO: G911017

Masters In Comparative Law International Islamic University Petaling Jaya Selangor

Dated the 10th Day of June 1992



الجامعة السلامية العالمية ماليريا INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA وُنِنْ رَسِنْ تِينَ السِّلِاعُ انْتَارَا نِجْنِيَا مِلْسُنِينَا

Contents

	Page
List of Abbreviation	(iv -v)
Table of Cases .	(vi-xvi)
<u>Chapter I</u>	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Arbitration	2
1.3 Arbitrator Defined and Distinguished	4
1.4° Arbitration in Shariah	6
1.4 (1) Concept of Arbitration in Shari'a	6
1.4 (2) Arbitration in Family Matters	8
1.5 Arbitration Agreement	9
1.6 Arbitration Agreement Under Shari'a Treaties	14
1.7 Scope of Arbitration Agreement	15
1.8 Ouster of Court's Jurisdiction	16
1.9 Stay of Court's Proceedings	18
	•
<u>Chapter II</u>	
2.1 Introduction	29
2.2 Appointment Of A Single Arbitrator	31
(i) Agreement between the parties	31
(ii) Appointment by a third party	32
(iii) Agreement is silent as to the constitutio	n ,
of the tribunal.	33
(iv) Appointment by court, Default of Agreemen	t 34
(v) Appointment by court to fill a vacancy	39

			(ii)
	(vi) (Appointment in Default of the Appointment	
٠.	,	of Second Arbitrator	41
2.3	Refere	ence to Two Arbitrators	43
	(i)	Appointment by a party to fill a vacancy	44
	(ii)	Appointment by the court to fill a vacancy	46
	(iii)	The two appointed Arbitrators, Appointing	
		An Umpire.	47
2.4	A tri	ounal of three Arbitrators.	49
2.5	Remova	al of An Arbitrator or Umpire.	54
	(i)	Removal for misconduct	56
	- 1	Misconduct himself or proceedings	56
	(ii)	Disqualification and Unfitness	66
	(iii)	Excess or refusal of jurisdiction by	
		arbitrator	67
	(iv)	Charge of fraud	69
	(v)	Exceptional cases.	70
		Chapter III	
		Natural Justice	
3.1	Intro	duction	72
3.2	Heari	ng	74
3.3	Proces	eding	77
3.4	Rules	of Evidence	78
3.5	Impar	tiality and Bias.	82

	(iii)
<u>Chapter IV</u>	
4.1 Award	95
4.2 Effect Of Award	99
4.3 Reasons for award	101
4.4 Time for making award	105
4.5 Remitting an award	107
4.6 Setting aside an award .	110
4.7 Enforcement of an award	115
4.8 Conclusion	120
Appendix A	124
Bibliography	125

<u>List of Abbreviations</u>

AC Appeal Cases

AIR All Indian Report

AIR (S.C) All Indian Report (Supreme Court)

AIR (All.) All Indian Report (Allahabad)

AIR (Cal.) All Indian Report (Calcutta)

ALR American Law Report

Aust. L.R Australian Law Report

Beavan Beavan

CLJ Curren Law Journal

Ch. App. Chancery Appeal

Ch. D Chancery Division

E.R English Report

HLC House of Lords Cases

ILR Indian Law Report

Ind. App. Indian Appeal

KB Kings Bench

Ky Kyshe's Report

Ll. Rep Lloyds Report

LRC (comm) Law Report of Commonwealth

(commercial)

MLJ Malayan Law Journal

NSWR New South Wales Report

NZLR New Zealand Law Report

QB Queens Bench

QBD Queens Bench Division

SCR Supreme Court Report

Sol. Jo Solicitors Journal

VR Victorian Report

WAR Western Australia Reports

WLR Weekly Law Reports

	TABLE OF CASES	Pages
Adams v Great North of	Scotland Railway Co.	(1871)
AC 31		57
A.G v Davidson 148 E.R	366	78
Agarwal Engineering Co	v Techoimpex H.M Ind	ustries
(1977) AIR (SC) 2122		
Alagappa Chettiar v Pal	ani Velpillai & Ors	(1967)
1 MLJ 208		11
Allison v General Counc	il of Medical Educat	ion
(1894) 1 QB 750		84
Alpines Shipping Co v V	'inbee (Manchester) L	td.
(1980) 1 Ll. Rep. 400		63, 75
An Arbitration between	Comilla Eitzen ; Re.	
(1896) 40 Sol. Jo. 438		62, 81
Arbn Jupiter General In	surance Co Ltd v Cor	p.
of Calcutta (1956) AIR	470	48
Askew and Fields Case (1985) LRC (comm.) 43	2 101
Atlantic Lines and Navi	gation Co Inc. v Hal	morre
S.P.A. (1985) 1 Ll. Re	р. 597	64, 76, 108
Badger ; Re 106 E.R 517		62, 81
Baring Bros. v Doulton	& Co (1892) 61 LJQB	704 83
Baron v Sunderland Corp	n. (1966) 2 QB 56	
Bedell v Moore 75 E.R 1	016	
B. Fernandez & Hnos s e	n c v Rickers Rice M	ills
136 ALR 351		

Bremer Handelsgesellschaft v Westzucker (1981) 2 Ll.
Rep 130 103
Bright v River Plate Construction Co (1900) 2 Ch. 83584
Burkett Sharp & Co v Eastcheap Dried Fruit Co. and
Perera (1962) 1 Ll. Rep. 267 (CA)
Canterbury Pipeline Ltd v AG (1961) NZLR 785 66, 83
Carlishe ; Re; Clegg v Clegg (1890) 44 Ch. D 200 22
Carus & Wilson - Greene ; Re (1886) 56 LJQB 530 5
Cataline v Norma (1938) 61 Ll. Rep 360 90
Champsey Bhara & Co v Jivraj Balloo (1923)
AIR (PC) 66
Chandris v Isbrandten Moller Co Inc. (1951) 1 KB
240 ; (1950) All. E.R 618
Cheng Keng Hoong v Government Of the Federation Of
Malaya (1967) 2 MLJ 1
Chowdhri Murtaza Hossein v Mussumat Bibi -
Bechunnissa (1876) 3 Ind. App. 209
Chung and Wong v CM Lee (1934) MLJ 153 63, 75, 101
Collins v Collins 26 Bear. 306; 28 LJ Ch. 184 3
Comilla Cotton v Granadex (1976) 2 Ll. Rep 10 70
Compagnie Europeene de Jereals SA v Tradax
Export SA (1986) 2 Ll. Rep 301
Construction Engineers and Builders Ltd v Sugar
Dev. Corp (1985) LRC (comm) 596
Continental Grain Co. v Bremer Handelsqessellschaft
MbH (No.2) (1984) 2 Ll. Rep 121

Contishipping v Victor Shipping and Trading Ltd.
(1984) 2 Ll. Rep 477 108
Czarnikhow v Roth Schmidt & Co. (1922) 2 KB 478 111
Davies Middleton & Davies Ltd v Cardiff Corpn. (The
Times 16th January (1964)
D & C Finance Bhd. v The Overseas Assurance Corpn.
Ltd (1989) 2 CLJ 598
Dewan Singh v Champat Singh (1970) 2 SCR 903;
(1970) AIR (SC) 967
Dr. Ng Ah Kow & Anor v Dr. Low Shik Aun (1970) 2
MLJ 257 117
Drew v Drew & Lebrun (1855) 3 Masq. 1
Drouth v The Ship "Paul Donmer" (1934) MLJ 72 123
ELF Petroleum S.E Asia Pte Ltd. v Winelf
Petroleum Sdn. Bhd. (1986) 1 MLJ 277
Eleftheria Niki Compania Naviera S.A v Eastern
Mediterranean Marine Ltd (1980) 2 Ll. Rep 252 109
Enoch and Zaretzky Bock & Co.'s ; Re (1910) 1 KB 327 77,80
Excomm. Ltd v Ahmad Abdul - Qawi Bamaadah (1985) 1
L1. Rep 403
Eyre v The Corporation of Leicester (1892) 1 08 136 37,47
Fima Palmbuck Services Sdn. Bhd. v Suruhanjaya
Pelabuhan Pulau Pinang & Anor (1988) 1 MLJ 269 12
Finney Lock Seeds Ltd v George Mitchell
(Chesterhall) Ltd. (1979) 2 Ll. Rep. 301

Franklin v Minister of Town & Country Planning
(1948) AC 87
Ganda Edible Oils Sdn. Bhd. v Transgrain BV (1988)
1 MLJ 428
Gartside v Outram (1857) 26 (NS) Ch. D. 113 77
Glacomo Costa Fu Andrea v British Italian Trading
Co. (1962) 2 All. E.R 53 97
Gold Coast City Council v Canterbury Pipe Lines
(Aust.) Pte Ltd. (1968) CLR 58
Government of Ceylon v Chandris (1963) 1 Ll. Rep 214 77
Haddad v Norman Mir Pty. Ltd. (1967) 2 NSWR 676 62, 77
Haigh v Haigh (1861) 31 LJ Ch. 420 77
Hannam v Bradford Corp. (1970) 1 WLR 937 86,87,88
Harrison v Creswick (1853) 13 CB 399 98
Hayn Roman & Co. SA v Cominter (UK) Ltd. (1983)
1 Ll. Rep 521
Hee Cheng v Krishnan (1955) MLJ 103 116
Henderson v Williams 93 E.R 420 98
Heyman v Darwins Ltd (1942) AC 356
Hodgkinson v Fernie & Anor 140 E.R 712 110
Hopper; Re (1867) 2 LR QB 367
Hunslow & B.C v Twickenham Garden Dev. Ltd (1971)
Ch. 233 77
Indian Oil Corp. v Indian Carbon Ltd. (1989) LRC
(comm) 541 104
Inland Revenue Comissioners v Hunter (1914) 3 KB 42854,100

international Airport Authority of India v Ball &
Another (1988) LRC (comm) 583 90
Johnston v Cheape 3 E.R 1318
Kasturi Palm Products v Palmex Industries Sdn. Bhd.
(1986) 2 MLJ 310 119
Keighley, Maxsted & Co. and Bryan Durant & Co;
Re (1893) 1 0.8 405
Kerajaan Negeri Selangor v Maraputra Sdn. Bhd.
(1992) 1 CLJ 441
Kiril Mischeff Ltd. v Constant Smith & Co. (1950)
2 KB 616 107
K.S.M Insurance Bhd v Ong Ah Bah & Anor (1986)
1 MLJ 237
Lau You Timber Co. v United General Insurance Co.
Ltd. (1968) 1 MLJ 181
Lee Brothers Construction Co v Teh Teng Seng Realty
Sdn. Bhd. (1988) 1 MLJ 459
Lim Su Sang v Teck Guan Construction & Development
Co. Ltd. (1966) 2 MLJ 29
Lock v Vulliamy 110 E.R 912
London Export Corporation Ltd v Jubilee Coffee
Roasting Co. Ltd. (1958) 1 WLR 661 58,59,62,74,80
London & North Western Railway v Billington
(1899) AC 79 21,22
Maeda Construction Co Ltd v Building Design
Team & 2 Ors (1991) 2 CLR 1554 54,100

Malayan Insurance Co Incorporated v Chek Brothers
Const. Co (1973) 1 MLJ 185 98
Manchester Carriage and Tramways Co Ltd v Swinton and
Pendlebury UDC (1906) AC 277 97
Marqulies Brothers Ltd v Defnis Thomaides & Co. Ltd
(1958) 1 WLR 398; (1958) 1 All. E.R 777 108,109
Martin v Boulanger (1883) 8 App. cas. 296 100
Melbourne Harbour Trust Commissioners v Hancock
(1927) 39 CLR 571 57
Metropolitan Properties v Lannon (1969) 1 QB 577 84
Meyer v Goldenbury (1890) 4 Ky. 596
Modern Engineering v Miskin (1981) 1 Ll. Rep 135 89
Mohamed Abdullah Tpe Abdul Majid v Habib
Mohamed (1986) 1 MLJ 526 111,115
Mohamed Halim Ismail's case (High Court Civil Suit
No C 655 Of 1984 (unreported))
Mohamed Ibrahim & Koshi Mohamed ; Re (1963) MLJ 32 95
Montgomery Jones & Co. v Liebenthal & Co. (1898)
78 LT 406 ; Digest 456
Moran v Lloyds (1983) QB 542; (1983) 2 WLR 672 65,108
Municipal Corporation of Delhi v Jagan Nath Ashok
Kumar & Anor (1988) LRC (comm.) 577 104
Mutual Shipping Corp v Bayshore Shipping Co. Ltd.
(1985) 1 WLR 625 108
MV Myron v Tradex Export S.A 1970 1 QB 527 77.78

Naamloose Vennootschap Hondels - En Transport
Maatschapipij 'vulcaan' v A.S.J Lubwig Nowinckles
Rederi (1938) 2 All. E.R 152 77
New India Assurance Co. Ltd. v Lewis (1967)
1 MLJ 156
Nicoban Shipping Co. v Alam Maritime Ltd (1980)
2 L1. Rep. 107
Official Assignee v Chartered Industries of Singapore
Ltd. (1978) 2 MLJ 99 64,97
Ong Guan Teck & Ors v Hijjas (1982) 1 MLJ 105 109,110
Oppenheim & Co v Majomed Janeef (1922) 1 AC 482 116
Oriental Fire & General Insurance Co. v Muslidhar
(1985) AIR (Cal.) 101
Overseas Fortune Shipping Pte Ltd v Great Eastern
Shipping Co Ltd (1987) 1 Ll. Rep 270 108
Pegang Prospecting Co Ltd v Chan Phooi Hoong & Anor
(1975) 23 MLJ 231
Perbadanan Kemajuan Negeri Perak v Asean Security
Paper Mill Sdn. Bhd. (1991) CLJ 1584 1,18,22
Prasun Roy v Calcutta Metropolitan Development
(1988) LRC (comm) 567
R v Barnsley Licensing Justices (1960) 2 0B 167 86
R v Camborne Justice Ex Parte Pearce (1955)
1 QB 41 84,85,86
R v Huggins (1895) 1 QB 563
R v Liverpool City Justice (1983) 1 MLR 119

R v Nailsworth Licensing Justice Ex Parte Bird
(1953) 2 All. E.R 652
R v Sunderland Justice (1901) 2 KB 357
R v Sussex Justice Ex Parte Mc Carthy (1924)
1 KB 256 72
R v Watson (1976) 9 Aust. LR 551
Rahcaci Shipping Co SA v Blue Star Line Ltd (1967)
All E.R 301 30
Ram Datt Ram Kissendess v E.D Sasson & Co. (1929)
56 LR Ind. App. 138 77
Ramsden & Co. Ltd v Jacobs (1922) 1 KB 640 63,75
Randell v Thompson (1876) 1 QBD 748 107
Regina v Mulvihill (1990) 1 WLR 438
Rocco Giuseppe & Figli v Tradax Export S.A (1984)
1 WLR 121 99
Rotheray & Sons Ltd v Carlo Bedaride & Co (1961)
1 L1. Rep 220 59,63,76
Rowe Brothers and Co Ltd v Crossley Brothers Ltd
(1912) 108 LT 11
Russell v Russell (1880) 14 Ch. D. 471
Sabah Shipyard Sdn. Bhd. v Jackson Marine (Malaysia)
Sdn. Bhd. (1991) 2 CLJ 1020 50
Schofield v Allen (1904) Sol. J 176
Scott v Avery & Ors (1843 - 1860) All E.R 1 17
Sharikat Pemborong Pertanian & Perumahan v Federal
Land Development Authority (1971) 2 MLJ 210 64,113,114

	{xi·	v }
	Shayler v Woolf (1946) Ch. 320	2
	Siemens Engineering and Manufacturing Co of India	
	Ltd v Union of India (1976) Suppl. SCR 489 ; AIR	
	(1976) SC 1785 10	02
	Sinnadurai v New Zealand Insurance Co Ltd. (1968)	
	2 MLJ 70	2
	Spurrier v La Cloche (1902) AC 446	7
	Stannard and Another v Sperway Constructions Pty Ltd.	
	(1990) V.R 6736	4
	Steel Authority of India Ltd. v Hind Mentals Inc.	
	(1984) 1 L1. Rep. 405	08
	Syed Awal bin Omar Shatrie v Syed Ali bin Omar Al	
٠	Junied & Ors (1878) 1 Ky. 438	01
	Taylor (David) & Sons Ltd v Barnett Trading Co. (1953)	
	1 WLR 562	,76
	Tew v Harris (1847) 11 QB 7 ; 17 LJQB 1 4	4
	The Fuji Hoshi Maru, United Asian Bank Bhd v M/V Fuji	
	Hoshi Maru Owners & Ors Interested (1981) 2 MLJ 333 1	1
	Tidswell; Re 33 Beav. 213; 55 E.R 349 96,	99
	Timber Shipping Co. S.A v London & Overseas Freighters	
	Ltd (1972) AC 1 9	9
	Tipping v Smith 93 E.R 1010 99	7
	T.O.R Line A.B v All Trans. Group of Canada Ltd (1982)	
	1 Ll. Rep 617 36	,41
	Tracomin v Gibbs (1985) 1 11. Ren 586	.88

Turner (East Asia) Pte Ltd v Builders Federal
(Hong Kong) Ltd. & Anor (No.2) (1988) 2 MLJ 502 88
Union of India v ML Dalmiya & Co Ltd (1977) AIR
(Cal.) 286 101
Union of India v MS Chamanlal Loona & Co (1957) AIR
(SC) 452
Union Nationale Des Co-operatives Agricoles Des Céreales
v Robert Catterall & Co Ltd (1959) 1 All. E.R 721 115,116
Universal Petroleum Co Ltd v Handels and Transport
GMbH (1987) 1 WLR 1178 103
Van Dongen v Cooper (1967) WAR (Aust) 143 59
Varitas Shipping Corp v Anglo Canadian Cement Ltd
(1966) 1 Ll. Rep 76
Walshaw v Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the
Borough of Brighouse 1899 2 QB 286
Welfare Insurance Co Ltd v Maiden bin Minap (1969)
1 MLJ 166 105,107
Whitley and Roberts Arbitration ; Re (1891) 1 Ch. 558 111
Willesford v Watson (1873) 8 Ch. App 473 18,22,123
Williams v Wallis & Cox (1914) 2 KB 478 57
Wilson v Glover (1969) NZLR 365
Wilson & Son and Eastern Countries Navigation and
Transport Co. Re; (1892) 1 08 81
Woh Hup (Pte) Ltd v Property Development Ltd (1991)
2 CLJ 1260 13
Yeoh Him v Yeoh Cheno Kano (1887) 4 Kv. 204

	(xvi)
Zambia Steel & Building Supplies Ltd v James Clark &	
Eaton Ltd (1986) 2 Ll. Rep 225	11

CHAPTER 1

1.1	Introduction
1.2	Arbitration
1.3	Arbitrator Defined and Distinguished
1.4	Arbitration in Shari'a
	1.4.1 Concept of Arbitration in Shari'a
	1.4.2 Arbitration in Family Matters
1.5	Arbitration Agreement
1.6	Arbitration Agreement Under Shari'a Treaties
1.7	Scope of Arbitration Agreement
1.8	Ouster of Court's Jurisdiction
1.9	Stay of Court's Proceedings

1. Introduction

All lawyers are potently aware of the time-worn cliche 'justice delayed is justice denied' but the economic consequence of this is a reality to consumers and business people alike when dispute arises. Any delay invariably has financial implications for the commercial community. Frustration by the delays, costs and unsatisfactory conclusions of the formal legal process, many people began to seek alternative solution to their problems and disputes. One of the most enduring and widely accepted alternative to the formal legal process is arbitration, particularly in the area of commercial.

The law of arbitration is based upon the principle of withdrawing the disputes from the ordinary courts and enabling the parties to substitute a domestic tribunal. The greater use of alternatives to the traditional court's system would be to unburden the judiciary of part of its workload, streamline the judicial process and ultimately preserve the quality of the judicial system. According to Peh Swee Chin J. in the Perbadanan Kemajuan Negeri Perak v. Asean Security Paper Mill Sdn. Bhd. 1,

"Arbitration Act....the very laudable purpose of resolving commercial disputes, bearing in mind at the same time that courts have always more work than they can ever handle..."

^{1 1991} CLJ 1584 at p.1585

Thus, to pragmatic business people the use of such methods can be seen as more commercially responsive to their often highly specialised and lengthy dispute with resultant saving in costs, delay and the preservation of commercial goodwill.

2. Arbitration

Arbitration is a means by which parties to a dispute get the same settled through the intervention of a third person but without having recourse to a court of law.

When two persons agree to have their differences settled through arbitration, what they really mean is that the actual decision of the dispute will rest with a third person called an arbitrator, though court may have to intervene to regulate arbitration proceedings or to give the award² of the arbitration sanction of law.

In Wharton's Law Lexicon, the word 'arbitration' has been defined as "the determination of a matter in dispute by the judgment of one or more persons, called arbitrators, who in case of difference, usually call in an umpire to decide between them" and according to Mozley and Whiteley, "arbitration is where two or more parties

The decision of an arbitrator or umpire is called the award.

submit all matters in dispute to the judgment of arbitrators who are to decide the controversy 3.

The word 'arbitration' has not been defined in the Arbitration Act or in the English Act. In Collins v. Collins ⁴, Sir John Romilly M.R said;

"An arbitration is a reference to the decision of one or more persons either with or without umpire, of some matter or matters in difference between the parties. It is very true that in one sense it must be implied that although there is no existing difference, still that difference may arise between the parties; yet I think the distinction between an existing difference and the one which may arise is a material one, and one which has been properly relied upon is the one, and one which has been properly relied upon in the case...."

Reference to arbitration is of two main kinds;

- 1. Conventional, the parties agree to refer their present or future disputes to a tribunal of their own choosing instead of to a Court, and
- 2. Statutory, such reference is imposed on them by the terms of a particular statute.

Mozley and Whiteley's Concise Law Dictionary

^{4 26} Bear. 306; 28 LJ Ch.184

Our concern however is only with the first kind of arbitration, and particularly with the validity and scope of arbitration agreement, the enforcement of such agreements by the courts, power to stay an action brought in breach thereof, the appointment and removal of arbitrators, the conduct of the reference, the rules of fair trial, award and the enforcement. These matters are of the most part regulated by statute ⁵.

Arbitrator Defined and Distinguished

An arbitrator is a person to whose attention the matters in dispute are submitted by the parties, a judge of the parties own choosing whose functions are judicial and where duties are not those of a mere partisan agent, but of an impartial judge, to dispense equal justice to all parties, and to decide the law and facts involved in the matters submitted with a view to determine and finally end the controversy.

To quote Russell on Arbitration 8,

".. An arbitrator is neither more nor less than a private judge of a private court (called an arbitral tribunal) who gives a private judgment (called an award). He is a judge in that a dispute is submitted to him; he is not a mere investigator but a person before whom material is placed by the parties, being either or both of evidence and submissions; he gives a decision in accordance with

⁵ Arbitration Act 1952 (Act 93)

e 20th.Edition, at p.104

some recognised system of law and the rules of natural justice. He is private in so far as;

- 1. he is chosen and paid by the disputants,
- 2. he does not sit in public,
- 3. he acts in accordance with privately chosen procedure so far as that is not repugnant to public policy,
- 4. so far as the law allows he is set up to the exclusion of the state courts,
- 5. his authority and power are only whatsoever he is given by the disputant's agreement,
- 6. the effectiveness of his powers derives wholly from the private law of contract and accordingly the nature and exercise of these powers must not be contrary to the proper law of the contract or the public policy of England, bearing in mind that the paramount public policy is that freedom of contract is not lightly to be interfered with..."

As Lord Esher said in Re Carus & Wilson-Greene,

".. If it appears from the terms of the agreement by which a matter is submitted to any person, that what he is to do, is to be in the nature of a judicial enquiry, and that the object is that he should hear the parties and decide the matter upon evidence to be led before him, there the person is an arbitrator. "

An arbitrator differs from mediator, referee, commissioner etc. The importance of the distinction lies in this, that, if the agreement between the parties amounts to a reference to an arbitrator, the provision of the Arbitration Act would apply, whereas in any other case the agreement may, if at all, be binding only as an ordinary contract but not subject to the law of arbitration.

⁷ [1886] 56 LJQB 530; 18 QBD 7

Arbitration in Shari'a

Arbitration is described in Shari'a texts as the spontaneous and more or less improvised move by two or more parties in dispute to submit their case to a third party called 'hakam' or 'muhakkam' (arbitrator). The arbitrator is an ordinary man, but is required to possess all the qualifications of a Qadhi (Judge). The dispute is to be determined according to Shari'a both in procedure and in substance, whether or not the dispute is extra-judicial or already pending before the Court. The whole procedure is called Tahkim.

i. The Concept of Arbitration in Shari'a

The validity of arbitration has been recognised by the Holy Quran itself.

[&]quot; Allah doth command you, to render back your trusts to those to whom they are due, and when ye judge between man and man, that ye judge with justice. Verily how excellent is the teaching which He giveth ye! For Allah is He who heareth and seeth all things..."

⁸ Surah An-Nisa : 58 (translation by Yusof Ali)