CORPORATE PREFERENCE FOR ARBITRATION OVER LITIGATION IN COMMERCIAL DISPUTES: A STRATEGIC LEGAL AND PRACTICAL ANALYSIS

Rishav Thakur, B.A. LL.B. (Hons.), ICFAI University Dehradun

ABSTRACT

In today's world commercial disputes are very common, especially due to globalization and the increased complexity of contracts. Although litigation remains a good option for resolving disputes, it may not be the most effective option for businesses especially when it comes to getting a quick resolution, maintaining confidentiality, and being sure about the outcome. As a result, many businesses are now opting for commercial arbitration as their preferred dispute resolution method. This paper gives a pragmatic and lawful explanation on why those in business tend to opt for arbitration processes as opposed to court litigation as a conflict resolution method in business disputes. The paper discusses the disadvantages of court litigation as a mechanism for resolution of dispute, advantage of arbitration to business entities and legal framework in India on which arbitration is being based for settlement of disputes. The commercial arbitrations in India, with their judicial outlooks and realities, would also be studied, including the reality of commercial arbitration in relation to the cost implications. However, despite the realities, corporates still favor arbitration as a tool of dispute resolution on account of its flexibility, autonomy, and enforceability. This article would finally culminate by providing recommendations to enhance institutionalized arbitration and further make India an arbitration leader.

INTRODUCTION

Disputes arising in the corporate world are almost inevitable in current corporate environment of complex contracts, mega-deal sizes and intertwined business relationships. Litigation has long been the dominant process to resolve commercial disputes. But litigation is slow as molasses, bureaucratic and expensive, inadequate for resolving commercial disputes. These concerns have forced companies to rethink the dispute resolution not as litigation alone, but a process. Arbitration has become the forum of choice for settling corporate disputes. Increasingly, contracts have clauses requiring the efficient, confidential, and predictable resolution of business disputes through arbitration. Essentially, arbitration allows the parties to controls the process, selecting the arbitral tribunals and having the requisite expertise, controlling the process, and selecting the law and forum. This is a good fit for business, as it aligns the process of resolving business disputes directly with business objectives and removes a lot of the uncertain factors.

The Indian legal system has also progressed to keep pace with the enforcement of arbitration as an efficient alternative to litigation. The Indian laws have also developed to facilitate arbitration as a rapid alternative to litigation. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 shows a clear legislature intention to facilitate arbitration and limit judicial intervention.[1]The juridical approach has clarified the horizon regarding arbitration agreements in the enforcement of their execution. The role of the court in arbitration is only in exceptional cases. This has further strengthened the confidence of the corporate world in arbitration as a reliable tool for the resolution of business disputes. The next article discusses why arbitration has gained popularity over litigation in the business world. This also raises questions regarding the detriments of litigation and analyses the business logic of arbitration. It also describes the framework of the law that favors arbitration and reveals the judicial mindset. It also tries to suggest changes for the future to further strengthen arbitration in India.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study employs a doctrinal and analytical approach to research. The research is founded on an analysis of legal regulations, court rulings, and additional resources like books, journal articles, and reports connected to commercial arbitration. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act

[1] Gary B. Born, International Commercial Arbitration (2d ed. 2014).

of 1996 serves as the main legislative structure for examination alongside pertinent amendments and judicial interpretations. The focus of the study is restricted to commercial arbitration in India, including brief mentions of international arbitration practices when needed to emphasize comparative benchmarks. The study examines the reasons corporate entities strategically choose arbitration instead of litigation and assesses the efficiency of arbitration as a mechanism for resolving disputes in a commercial environment

CONCEPT AND SCOPE OF ARBITRATION IN COMMERCIAL DISPUTES

Alternative Dispute Resolution refers to methodologies employed in resolving conflicts other than under the normal court structure. Of these, arbitration remains prominent as it is integral to commercial dispute resolution as it is binding and enforceable. It is done in a way that requires one or more arbitrators selected by the parties participating in the process, and their decision is binding.

Disputes that commonly arise in commercial matters pertain to contractual disagreements between business entities, and such matters include construction contracts, joint ventures, stock purchases, and supply chain arrangements. Such matters are often quite technical, and thus arbitration stands out as an appropriate method for resolving such matters. Furthermore, parties in commercial matters have the liberty to choose arbitrators who have the required expertise to make more informed decisions. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act of 1996 in India provides a total regulatory framework surrounding arbitration. One of the important aspects of this statute is that it lays great importance on the principle of party autonomy, which enables the parties involved in an arbitration to agree upon procedure, location, law, and language of the proceedings.

This flexibility makes it particularly useful for corporates that function in time-sensitive business environments. The Supreme Court has recognized that arbitration works efficiently as a tool in resolving commercial disputes and relieving the judicial system of its burden[2]. International commercial transactions have lately seen a rise in the use of arbitration as a tool in commercial dispute resolution due to the enforceability of such awards through the New York Convention of 1958. [3]Indian arbitral awards are enforceable in foreign countries, while

[2] Booz Allen & Hamilton Inc. v. SBI Home Finance Ltd., (2011) 5 SCC 532.
[3] Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 1958 (New York Convention).

foreign arbitral awards are also enforceable in India in few exceptional cases [4]This global enforceability makes arbitration a strategically indispensable tool for corporates engaged in cross-border commerce.

LITIGATION IN COMMERCIAL DISPUTES: PRACTICAL AND PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS

"Going to court has always been a constitutional sound way of settling a dispute, but in the case of companies caught up in commercial disputes, the process usually falls short of the mark in a number of ways. First of all, the largest sticking point is the matter of time in its many forms—court processes being complicated and postponements and overflows a persistent problem on the court's docket." The system itself is inflexible. Civil procedure follows formalized rules that do not leave much latitude to meet the technical and capital turns of commercial cases. Judges presiding over such cases may not be greatly informed in those areas of industry, so although the ruling is clearly correct, it can come across as commercially dim-witted. Costs are another problematic issue. What may seem initially cost-efficient can go through the roof with extended timelines, additional hearings, and possible appeals. And on top of that, not knowing when it will end complicates a company's ability to calculate risk and devise strategy. There is also the public component of litigation in the courts to consider. The reason is because court litigation results in the disclosure to all parties of trade secrets and terms that are injurious to business reputation, competitive position or other commercial interests. That is not the situation in arbitration because it's private and confidential.

Realizing the above weaknesses, the Indian courts have been increasingly emphasizing the promotion of arbitration as an efficient alternative to litigation. The corporates have therefore slowly shifted towards arbitration as it is more efficient, predictable, and business-friendly.

CORPORATE STRATEGY BEHIND CHOOSING ARBITRATION

"If we look at it from a business perspective, the choice of approaches for dispute resolution is not just ticking boxes but risk management and keeping costs in check to keep you on track." This is because companies weigh alternative dispute resolution procedures on the basis of predictability, speed and commercial truth. This explains why arbitration has increasingly been

[4] BALCO v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc., (2012) 9 SCC 552.

favored above court litigation to resolve disputes. One of the important advantages of arbitration as a strategy is party autonomy. This allows parties to customize the dispute resolution process according to the type of agreement. Parties have the freedom to choose the panel of arbitrators and other rules of procedure. This helps to ensure that the resolution of disputes is clear and is in line with commercial purposes. The Indian Courts have always held the principal of party autonomy in the context of arbitration in complex commercial transactions.[5]

Time efficiency and predictability are critical factors for which organizations prefer arbitration. With business transactions, any delay in resolving a dispute may hinder a project, strain the cash flow system, and even harm investor confidence. Since court backlogs and legal formalities tend to lead to lengthy court cases, arbitration, which is flexible in nature with fast track options and minimal adjournments, becomes more appealing. This factor results in organizations being able to accurately measure the nature of their legal risks. Another important strategic element in dispute resolution is confidentiality. Often, in the business community, disputes contain confidential information, such as pricing arrangements, business secrets, in-house technology, and processes.A dispute may reveal such information to the public, and thus confidentiality in arbitration has become very attractive to firms operating in competitively and innovation intense sectors. The expertise that arbitrators have is also an additional strategic advantage.The fact is that most trade disputes have technical, financial, and industry-specific intricacies that demand a deeper level of comprehension and familiarity. Arbitration, however, enables parties involved in a dispute to constitute arbitrators with such subject-specific technical know-how, such that awards become not only valid from a legal perspective, but also valid from a technical and practical standpoint as well. Cross-border deals, however, make arbitration even more important. Cross-border companies that engage in global business prefer arbitration over court litigation due to its impartial character and the global enforceability of arbitration awards that are governed by the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, also known as the New York Convention. Court decisions face problems concerning their enforceability across different jurisdictions.

The Supreme Court of India has acknowledged the significance of arbitration in facilitating international trade by limiting judicial intervention and respecting the choice of seat and

[5] Chloro Controls India (P) Ltd. v. Severn Trent Water Purification Inc., (2013) 1 SCC 641.

governing law[6]. Finally, arbitration contributes to the preservation of long-term commercial relationships. Litigation is inherently adversarial and often results in irreversible breakdown of business ties. Arbitration, whilst it is adversarial in result, uses a less confrontational approach to ensure that parties avoid serious relationship breakdown when resolving disputes. From an enterprise strategy perspective, preserving the business endgame and relationships typically trumps pursuing long term legal ones. Seen as a whole, arbitration offers corporates a means of resolving disputes which combines legal certainty with commercial common sense.[7] Despite the challenges that arbitration encounters in the areas of cost and enforceability, the advantages of arbitration-autonomy, efficiency, confidentiality, expertise, and enforceability-are still the factors that make arbitration the preferred choice over litigation.

ARBITRATION VS LITIGATION A PRACTICAL COMPARISON

An examination of the two alternatives: arbitration and litigation, and their practical applications. The two options are essentially intended for resolving disputes. However, when analyzed based on business goals of speed, predictability, privacy, and enforceability, the two options act differently. Speed is usually the deciding factor. Commercial cases are notorious in being protracted because of procedural hurdles, delays, and appeals, which may extend cases for several years. However, in arbitration, cases are under the control of the parties and help to minimize delays and even utilize rapid tracks. This helps to give businesses more predictable planning in their operations in terms of minimized exposure to legal risks. Expenses are the next area of contrast. Although the cost of litigious disbursements may seem lower at the start, there may be higher costs down the line because of the delays as well as appeals. There may be higher start-up costs for arbitration, perhaps particularly for ad-hoc arbitration, but there could be lower costs down the line as the delays in the procedure are reduced due to less appellate review. For the corporate world, lower total costs might matter more than lower start-up costs. One of the most defining factors is that of privacy. The trial is held in public, and commercial secrets are thereby likely to be exposed. An arbitration is conducted behind closed doors, and this is a definite advantage.

Moreover, arbitration has the benefits of expertise and flexibility. Arbitration enables the parties to choose arbitrators who have specific knowledge of the industry concerned, thus allowing for

[6] BALCO v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc., *supra note 4.*
[7] Gary B. Born, International Commercial Arbitration (2d ed. 2014).

more informed and practical decision-making. Judicial trials, on the other hand have a standardized procedure and may not necessarily involve expertise Enforcement of decisions is especially important in international commercial disputes. Awards in arbitration have the benefit of international enforceability under the New York Convention, while judicial decisions may be constrained by jurisdiction. In light of these considerations, the Indian judiciary has always preferred arbitration as a means of resolving commercial disputes[8].

LEGAL FRAMEWORK SUPPORTING COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION IN INDIA

The growing preference of corporate entities for arbitration is further strengthened by the legal framework governing arbitration in India. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 was enacted with the objective of promoting arbitration as an effective alternative to litigation and of aligning Indian arbitration law with internationally accepted standards[9]. The Act is founded on certain core principles, namely party autonomy, minimal judicial intervention, and the finality of arbitral awards, values which are essential for efficient commercial dispute resolution.

Section 5 of the Act expressly restricts judicial interference in arbitral proceedings providing that courts may intervene only in circumstances expressly permitted under the law. This article contains a provision establishing the intention of the legislature to maintain the autonomy of arbitral tribunals and to avoid any pointless procedural obstructions. Additionally, Sections 8 and 11 also require courts to refer the parties to arbitration in relation to a valid arbitration clause, thus steeling arbitral clauses in commercial contracts. Judicial interpretation has been critical in the development of pro arbitration regime in India. [10]The Supreme Court has consistently held that courts must limit their scrutiny to a prima facie examination of arbitration agreements at the pre-arbitration stage and avoid adjudicating the merits of disputes. [11]This approach has significantly enhanced corporate confidence in arbitration by reducing procedural uncertainty.

There were improvements in legislation in both 2015 and 2019 that consistently supported the growth of commercial arbitration in the Indian environment. This included setting time limits

[8] Vidya Drolia v. Durga Trading Corporation, supra note 1.
[9] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, §§ 5, 8, 34.
[10] N.N. Global Mercantile (P) Ltd. v. Indo Unique Flame Ltd., (2023) 7 SCC 1.
[11] Vidya Drolia v. Durga Trading Corporation, *supra note 1.*

for the completion of arbitrations, fast-track options, and more institutionalized arbitration. Emergency arbitration and limiting the role of courts helped make Indian arbitration more internationally standardized. The Act provides a robust mechanism to give effect to arbitral awards. The judicial treatment of domestic and foreign awards places them under Part II, except in a few instances set forth in the statute. This has significant importance in relation to companies involved in cross-border acquisitions, as it provides greater assurance in relation to dispute resolution in jurisdictions with uncertain dispute resolution regimes. Together, the legislative and judicial structure of India reflects the intent to make arbitration the preferred means of resolving disputes.

JUDICIAL APPROACH TOWARDS COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION

The judicial system exerts a significant influence on whether arbitration is an efficient method of dealing with a dispute or not. In recent years, there has been a move away from intense involvement in arbitration cases by courts in India. This is an effort by the Indian judiciary to encourage more cases of arbitration so that business confidence in arbitration is enhanced. In the past, some excessive interventions by the courts in critical phases of arbitration, such as arbitrator appointments, granting provisional relief, and contesting awards, impacted negatively on the swiftness and finality offered by arbitration. Although these problems existed, the courts have slowly fallen in with the aim to avoid excessive interventions in arbitration, as is the practice under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act of 1996. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that courts must restrict their examination at the pre-arbitration stage to a prima facie assessment of the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement, without delving into the merits of the dispute[12]. This ensures that arbitration continues uninterrupted without being slowed down or stuck in the judicial examination procedure. Moreover, the interference of Section 34 remains restricted as the courts have steadfastly held that the arbitral award should not fall merely because of factual or legal errors.

Judicial recognition of institutional arbitration and emergency arbitration further reflects an evolving and pragmatic understanding of modern commercial dispute resolution.[13] All these signs mark a shift in favor of worldwide arbitration standards by the Indian judiciary and also meet India's objective of having an arbitration-friendly regime in the country. It is appropriate

[12] Vidya Drolia v. Durga Trading Corporation, *supra note 1*.
[13] Amazon.com NV Investment Holdings LLC v. Future Retail Ltd., (2022) 1 SCC 209.

to mention that Indian courts in international commercial arbitrations have exhibited a mature approach in respecting the seat of arbitration, the governing law, and principles of procedural autonomy in international commercial arbitrations.

CHALLENGES IN COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION

Despite its growing acceptance, commercial arbitration is not free from challenges. One of the most frequently cited concerns is the high cost of arbitration, particularly in ad hoc proceedings. [14]Arbitration is not inexpensive. Arbitrators, administrative costs, and lawyers pile on quickly, making the process more and more financially burdensome. Large corporations may not even bat an eye, but when the costs escalate, arbitration just is not as good of an option for swift and readily available justice. In addition, procedural delays themselves are often yet another barrier, "simply reflecting the delay that has become typical of courts". The slowness is caused by time-wasting adjournments, poor case management or court intervention in preliminary steps that are not required. Moreover, these new statutory deadlines are not even consistently applied so timely results are by no means guaranteed. The enforcement of arbitral awards is also problematic for practical reasons. Arbitration is a mechanism that ensures enforceability of awards with limited grounds for challenge. However, in practice, parties often resist enforcement by raising pretextual objections and adopting dilatory tactics. Such conduct weakens the finality of arbitral awards and may lead corporate entities to question whether arbitration remains a reliable dispute resolution mechanism. Concerns relating to the neutrality and impartiality of arbitrators further add to the complexities of commercial arbitration, particularly in ad hoc proceedings[15]. Any perceived lack of objectivity or potential conflict of interest can significantly erode confidence in the arbitral process.

While institutional arbitration offers greater transparency and stronger procedural safeguards, its adoption has not yet become universal, largely due to limited awareness and inadequate supporting infrastructure. Addressing these challenges is essential to preserve arbitration as an effective and efficient method for resolving commercial disputes. Nevertheless, despite these limitations, arbitration continues to offer several strategic advantages over traditional court litigation.

[14] Law Commission of India, 246th Report on Amendments to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (2014)
[15] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, §§ 12–13.

WHY CORPORATES CONTINUE TO PREFER ARBITRATION DESPITE CHALLENGES

Even with all its challenges, businesses still lean toward commercial arbitration instead of going to court. Why? It just fits better with what they need. Arbitration gives them more predictability keeps things confidential, and lets them shape the process in ways that regular litigation rarely does.[16] When you're running a company, you want things to stay on track, even if a dispute pops up. Arbitration makes that possible it keeps uncertainty down and lets business keep moving. Smart companies spot potential disputes early, right when they're drafting contracts. With arbitration, they can actually plan for these issues, figure out where the risks are, and set the rules in advance. They get to decide how the process works, which helps them avoid those endless, expensive court cases that no one wants.There's another big plus: when a company wins an arbitration award, it's usually much easier to enforce it across borders. No need to fight through a maze of different legal systems — arbitration streamlines the whole thing.

Maybe most important of all arbitration helps protect business relationships. Going to court can turn partners into enemies, but arbitration is usually less combative. It doesn't guarantee there won't be hard feelings, but it often leaves the door open for future deals. In today's cutthroat, interconnected markets, keeping a good business relationship alive can matter a lot more than winning a drawn out legal battle.

SUGGESTIONS AND WAY FORWARD

It is necessary to implement reforms that focus on enhancing the arbitration framework, enabling arbitration to develop into a standard and favored method for resolving commercial conflicts. Initially it is essential to encourage the expansion and advancement of arbitration institutions. Enhanced institutional robustness, coupled with heightened consciousness among corporate organizations, can assist in tackling issues related to delays, expenses, and queries of neutrality. Secondly the arbitration framework needs to include cost-regulating measures that promote increased transparency and predictability in arbitration costs. This would aid in managing high costs and render the process easier to access. A quick comparative note can be made regarding arbitration-supportive regions like the United Kingdom and Singapore, which

[16] Booz Allen & Hamilton Inc. v. SBI Home Finance Ltd., *supra note 2.*

have effectively established themselves as prominent international arbitration centers. These regions feature robust institutional arbitration systems, steady judicial backing, and a well-defined approach of limited court involvement. Singapore, specifically, has shown how powerful legal support along with judicial restraint can greatly boost trust in arbitration. India can gain significant insights from these regions by enhancing institutional arbitration, ensuring improved predictability in expenses and schedules, and upholding a consistently pro-arbitration judicial stance

Third courts should persist in embracing a minimally interventionist stance in arbitration proceedings, as this would bolster trust in the arbitration process. Moreover companies need to show increased caution and foresight when formulating contracts especially arbitration agreements. Clearly outlining the terms of reference, location of arbitration, and procedural regulations from the beginning would lessen the potential for initial conflicts and avoidable legal battles. Together these initiatives would allow India's arbitration framework to develop and establish the nation as a robust and trustworthy location for commercial arbitration

CONCLUSION

The way companies handle conflicts is slowly evolving. This change primarily stems from companies reevaluating how legal frameworks match their overall business objectives. Although litigation is a conventional approach to resolving disputes, it doesn't always meet the practical needs of companies. Businesses are increasingly looking for dispute resolution methods that are reliable, effective, and able to maintain continuous operations. The aim of resolving commercial disputes is to offer solutions that fulfill these particular expectations.

Arbitration has become one of the most efficient ways to settle commercial disagreements. It is a procedure that closely matches business demands, especially the necessity for effective, private, and uniform resolution of disputes. Companies might choose commercial dispute resolution methods like arbitration as these procedures align more closely with their operational and strategic goals.This essay examines the factors that lead large companies to favor arbitration instead of litigation. Arbitration offers benefits such as flexibility in procedures, confidentiality, and participation from experts in the relevant field. Even though arbitration can sometimes lead to significant expenses and difficulties in enforcement, these issues do not surpass its overall advantages for large commercial organizations. With the ongoing growth of business activities in India, it is vital to enhance arbitration frameworks and ensure judicial

interference is kept to a minimum. Arbitration must be considered not just as a substitute for litigation, but as a strategic mechanism that enables efficient and business-focused dispute resolution.