ADR IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS: REPAIRING TRUST BEYOND CONTRACTUAL REMEDIES

Anjali Agrawal, LL.M., National Law University Odisha

ABSTRACT

In the conventional commercial law, commercial disputes are often considered to be total violations of contracts that have to be settled in courts where one party is a winner, the other a loser. The reality of a legal battle is actually more expensive than the litigation expenses in the prevailing globalized economy. The trust, goodwill, and credibility that are built over years are the "Relational Capital" that suffers actual and occasionally irreversible harm. This article goes beyond the usual meaning of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) as a cost and time-effective alternative. It is being considered as a means of mending damaged business ties.

The article talks about how the contracts regulate not only on-and-off transactions but also business relations. The verdict of the litigation eliminates such co-operations by focusing merely on previous mistakes. On the other hand, ADR is future-oriented and does not just simply resolve conflicts amicably. The article is aimed at discussing various methods of regaining trust after a conflict, starting with negotiation, where parties find common values and choose to focus on effective communication without the interference of the third party. It proceeds to discuss mediation and conciliation as key methods of dispute resolution that are premised on the behavior of the disputing parties and the relationships between them and are supported by international documents such as the Singapore Convention and legal regulations such as the Mediation Act of 2023.

The article also mentions the hybrid arbitration model as a method of dispute resolution, which offers business relationships a combination of the freedom to settle and the assurance of a legally binding ruling. Long-term market health and sustainability require that ADRs have a capacity to repair and restore relationships and trust besides obeying the law. Rather than merely solving a case by case, the contemporary legal practice is now in the business of securing the network of business relationships so that the enemy of today becomes the friend of tomorrow.

Keywords: ADR, Relational Capital, Negotiation, Commercial Mediation, Mediation Act, 2023, Conciliation, Business Relationships, Settlement, Trust Restoration, Commercial Arbitration.

INTRODUCTION

Business in modern markets hardly occurs through isolated deals; it occurs through the long-term relationship networks, which fluctuate between the suppliers, distributors, investors, and strategic partners. Although the law of a contract describes rights, obligations, and remedial measures, their actual effectiveness depends on lesser objective aspects like trust, credibility, and reputation, which are all idea-based in such a way that they can be collectively inferred as '**relational capital**'. The conflicts that occur in such environments, hence, go beyond what can be considered as contract breaches, they extend to destabilize the underlying relationships that are the pillars of continued business collaboration.

Conventional dispute resolution mechanisms within the commercial law are mainly structured in a way to determine legal liability. Courts and arbitral tribunals conflict management involves the assessment of breaches of contract by courts and arbitral tribunals and remedies, which may include damages or specific performance. In spite of the fact that these processes embed enforceability and legal certainty, the presence of adversarial content causes the framing of disputes as a contesting assertion, and their outcome usually favors one group over the other. In business relationships that rely on further interaction, such adversarial resolution systems might undermine trust and damage the continuity of business relationships.

These restrictions have led to a growing preference towards Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in commercial and business affairs. ADR tools such as negotiation, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration were first introduced as effective alternatives to litigation process, which has the added advantage of saving financial means as well as time spent in formalities of the procedure. However, these mechanisms are not only relevant on the basis of efficiency. Most ADR procedures promote dialogue, confidentiality, and interest-based bargaining, therefore allowing parties to discuss the underlying commercial realities of the dispute rather than solely discussing the historical breaches of the contract between the parties. The fact that consensual dispute-resolution procedures can do what adjudicatory processes cannot do has long been recognized by scholars in situations arising out of ongoing relationships in which communication and understanding one another are essential to future cooperation.[1]

Recent legal trends demonstrate the institutional progress in such processes. The mediation law in India is reformed by the Mediation Act, 2023, which provides a statutory framework aimed

[1] Lon L. Fuller, *Mediation—Its Forms and Functions,* 44 S. Cal. L. Rev. 305 (1971).

at facilitating and governing mediation and mediation agreements.[2] Similarly, the **United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation**, also known as the **Singapore Convention on Mediation** at the international level, is aimed at facilitating the enactment of cross-border mediated settlements.[3] These developments have extended the traditional system of enforcing arbitral awards under the regime established by the New York Convention, which still forms the basis of international commercial arbitration.[4] Collectively, these tools represent an evolving dispute-resolution model where the consensual settlement process works with legally binding adjudication.

In commercial disputes, ADR is significant not just for efficiency but for its ability to address relational consequences and help resolve disputes while preserving trust and ongoing commercial relationships.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AND THE VALUE OF RELATIONAL CAPITAL

The applicability of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) to commercial disputes is more evident where the contract is interpreted not as a counting mechanism as provided by the law but rather as an aspect of ongoing economic relationships. Although the classic contract law describes contracts as risk delegation tools and enforceability, many business arrangements like long-term supply contracts, joint ventures, distribution, franchises, and so forth are based on long-term patterns of cooperation. In such cases, there is the provision of a formal legal norm by the contract, but the durability of the relationship is more a product of mutual trust and the awareness of the continuation of the future performance.

This social aspect is summarized within the aspect of relational capital, which refers to the trust and trustworthiness developed due to recurrent business relations. With time the parties will become known to be reliable and in good faith perform, thus minimizing the uncertainty of the transactions and enabling effective cooperation by escalating beyond the boundaries of binding contractual terms. This means that the commercial relationship is often developed in terms of the value of a potential prolonged collaboration rather than just the direct exchange.

[2] Mediation Act, 2023 (India).

[3]United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, opened for signature Aug. 7, 2019, enforced on Sept. 12, 2020 (Singapore Convention on Mediation).

[4] Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, June 10 , 1958, enforced on June 7, 1959, 330 U.N.T.S. 3 (New York Convention).

Tensions that arise in such relationships thus result in effects that are quite further than the immediate legal assertion. They can upset supply chains and long-term investment decisions, as well as destroy confidence between parties. In conventional adjudicatory processes, the disputes are resolved by determining the breach and providing remedies, hence being legally accountable. Nevertheless, courts so adversarial in their processes tend to drive the sides to the wrong and legal right instead of the right answers that maintain the underlying commercial relationship.

The Indian legal developments in judicial affairs have recognized the applicability of consensual dispute resolution. The Supreme Court in *Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Cherian Varkey Construction Co. (P) Ltd.,*[5] recognized the importance of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in facilitating the settlements where continued relationships or cooperative outcomes are desired by the parties. The court noted that ADR processes could offer adaptable avenues of solutions to disputes by usage of dialogue and compromise instead of totally adversarial determination.

The relevance of relational capital is enhanced in the global business dealings where cross-border deals often involve long-term commitments between the parties that are subjected to different legal systems. Conflict situations that emerge as a part of such arrangements may impact not only the contracting parties but the entire commercial nets comprising suppliers, investors, and financial institutions. Dispute resolution processes that help the parties to address the issue without necessarily rupturing the business relationship take up a significant economic significance in such a situation.

An in-depth knowledge of the relational feature of business deals provides a fundamental basis of application in examining the component of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). Adjudicatory mechanisms might seem to be adequate when the commercial disputes are seen merely as the issues of the breach of the contract. However, it is important to acknowledge that the concept of disputes as a violation of current relationships helps to accept the value of the processes that enhance and facilitate communication and negotiated settlement. Under this system of relations, such processes as negotiation and mediation are important so as to settle the disputes without damaging the credibility necessary for further commercial cooperation.

[5] *Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Cherian Varkey Construction Co. (P) Ltd.* (2010) 8 S.C.C. 24 (India).

NEGOTIATION AND MEDIATION AS MECHANISMS OF TRUST RESTORATION

The fact that many commercial contracts are relational in nature makes consensual modes of dispute resolution particularly relevant. Contrary to litigation or arbitration, which is the most dominant techniques to determine the existence of legal liability, negotiation, and mediation allow the parties to settle conflicts in a manner that is consistent with the economic reality of sustainable business partnerships. In commercial settings, conflicts do not readily occur in isolation but are frequently a part of an existing relationship, like a supply contract, joint venture bargain, distribution channel, etc., where the relationship is mutually beneficial. Such mechanisms in which parties can recalculate the outcomes of their contractual expectations while preserving the operational relations are especially significant in such environments.

Negotiation is the most practical and commercial-friendly, as well as the most immediate method of managing a dispute. Business participants usually provide clauses or provisions of negotiation in a contract and require senior representatives to make an effort to settle before formal proceedings commence. These clauses are indicative of a realization that business conflicts are mostly founded in operational misunderstandings, performance delays, or changes in the market conditions rather than a deliberate breach of the contract. Negotiation allows parties to deal directly with the problems and to come up with solutions that are compatible with commercial considerations like changing schedules of deliveries, changing pricing models, or even arranging the obligations of performance. Since it is a confidential process and creates less emphasis on party autonomy, negotiation also helps to eliminate reputational and commercial risks that are common with public adjudication.

The effectiveness of the negotiation process in commercial conflicts is strongly related to the interest-based bargaining principle. Parties are not only expected to present only legal claims, but they are also supposed to explore the commercial interests behind the dispute, such as the continuity of the market, stability in the supply, or even the availability of the distribution channels. Empirical studies of the negotiation process have stressed the advantages of such a perspective that enables finding mutually beneficial solutions that could never be identified under an adversarial channel of litigation.[6] In reality, negotiated resolutions often save business relationships by converting conflicts into opportunities for contractual adjustment rather than

[6] Roger Fisher & William Ury, *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In* (Penguin, 3d ed. 2011).

termination or dissolution.

Where direct negotiation is inadequate, the next alternative would be mediation, which provides a mechanism through which a formal process of restoring communication between parties that have failed is realized. The introduction of a neutral mediator means that commercial actors can facilitate a conversation or dialogue while still having autonomy over the outcome of the dispute. The mediator's role is not to render decisions but to facilitate parties in identifying underlying commercial interests as well as exploring possible settlement options. Mediation used in a business context frequently involves joint and confidential caucuses where the mediator discusses areas of compromise acceptable to both sides individually.

The legal framework of commercial mediation has become much stronger within recent years. In India, the Mediation Act 2023 formally recognizes mediation as a distinct category of dispute-resolution process and introduces mechanisms to enforce mediated settlement agreements.[7] The legislation also encourages pre-litigation mediation, reflecting the objective of resolving disputes at an early stage before adversarial proceedings escalate conflict. Enforceability of mediated settlements is especially important in commercial disputes, as the parties would be more willing to seek mediated solutions in cases where results are accompanied by the threat or promise of legal enforceability.

The cross-border transactions are also supported by international developments. The **United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting in Mediation** (the Singapore Convention on Mediation), is a constitution that provides a new framework of recognition and enforcement of mediated settlement in international business disputes.[8] The convention addresses a long-standing concern of enforceability of cross-border mediated agreements among the commercial actors. The Convention puts an increased reliance on mediation as a credible dispute-resolution mechanism in international commerce by allowing the settlement agreements from mediation to be directly enforceable in contracting states.

The significance of mediation in business conflicts is revealed by the ability of the process to save and maintain relationships which otherwise would be damaged by the adversarial system of litigation. The process of mediation makes the parties understand the importance of future

[7] Mediation Act, 2023 (India).
[8] United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, opened for signature Aug. 7, 2019, enforced on Sept. 12, 2020 (Singapore Convention on Mediation).

business collaboration and does not necessarily emphasize the previous violations of the contract. The confidential and non-adversarial nature of the process permits parties to discuss delicate business issues without damaging their reputation in the market or investor confidence. The qualities make mediation especially useful in conflict situations that touch on continuing commercial relationships in which preserving a relationship causes economic advantage to both parties.

However, the consensual strategies like negotiation and mediation depend on the willingness of parties to arrive at an agreement. In some commercial disputes, especially when the matter of dispute is significant monetary or even a basic disagreement of the interpretation of the contract, consensus might not be the adequate solution. In such dire situations, parties are usually in need of an enforceable and binding determination of the dispute.

HYBRID ADR MECHANISMS AND ARBITRATION IN COMMERCIAL DISPUTES

While both negotiation and mediation give the required impetus to save the commercial relations, the ultimate success depends on free will. The commercial actors in the complex markets need the mechanisms that would provide not only the settlement opportunities but also the assurance of the enforceable results. Arbitration can serve this purpose by serving as a neutral adjudicative system that possesses the capacity to render binding verdicts without the burdensome formalities of procedure such an occasion frequently requires.

The enforceability of arbitral awards made under the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, also known as the New York Convention, has led to the fact that arbitration has become the preferred choice in solving cases of transnational activities.[9] The convention requires the contracting states to recognize and enforce foreign arbitral awards subject to limited exceptions, which assures the parties of a predictable mechanism for resolving disputes across jurisdictions. This international enforcement regime has made arbitration a milestone in the international business dispute-resolution framework.

Despite its arbitral and adjudicatory character, arbitration is increasingly becoming a system aimed at promoting negotiated solutions during the dispute resolution process. The implementation of hybrid procedures (e.g., arbitration-mediation-arbitration (Arb-Med-Arb))

[9] Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, June 10, 1958, enforced on June 7, 1959) 330 U.N.T.S. 3 (New York Convention).

is one of the leading examples. Under this setup, parties enter into arbitration proceedings but then attempt to seek mediation during the course of arbitration. In case the mediation is successful, the settlement can be recorded along the lines of a consent award by the arbitral tribunal and, therefore, enforced within the system of arbitration, but if it fails, the tribunal resumes proceedings and issues a final award.

The hybrid procedural models attempt to combine the relational advantages of mediation with legal certainty of enforceability provided by arbitration. By creating structured opportunities for settlement within the arbitral process, such mechanisms persuade parties to reconsider negotiated solutions while reassuring them that any unresolved issues will eventually be solved by a binding process through arbitration. In commercial disputes where future cooperative interaction is of the essence, availability of mediation within the arbitration proceedings may facilitate settlement without abandoning the formal dispute resolution mechanisms.

Indian jurisprudence has increasingly approved arbitration as a reliable platform for solving complex commercial disputes. In *Amazon.com NV Investment Holdings LLC v. The Future Retail Ltd.*[10], the Supreme Court, confirmed the provisions of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which defines provisional arbitral awards as enforceable, and thus, interim arbitral determinations can be enforced in an Indian court. This decision can be considered an illustration of the trend among the judiciary to strengthen the arbitration system in India and increase the confidence of commercial parties working in the international business environment.

The hybrid ADR mechanisms can, therefore, be described as a turning point towards the course of commercial dispute resolution. Instead of viewing negotiation, mediation, and arbitration as mutually exclusive processes in the framework of a commercial conflict, the present-day business world tends to integrate these tools and engage them to respond to the complex nature of commercial disputes. The settlement-based procedures provide a chance to salvage business ties, and arbitration ensures that in case no consensus is reached, an agreement is legally binding to be maintained at the end of the day.

This integrative mode highlights the dramatic change taking place in commercial law in terms of dispute resolution. With the increased multifaceted interdependence of business affairs,

[10] *Amazon.com NV Investment Holdings LLC v. Future Retail Ltd.*, (2022) 1 S.C.C. 209 (India).

resolution systems need to treat not only the legal but, to a larger extent, the relational aspects of conflict. The ability of ADR tools to ensure trust and, at the same time, provide enforceable results has, therefore, become a relevant consideration in modern-day business regulation.

ADR AND THE GOVERNANCE OF SUSTAINABLE COMMERCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

The increasing institutionalization of ADR in the commercial dispute-resolution processes is an organizational change in the approach to commercial law in which the long-term conflicts of business are addressed. The majority of the wars encountered in the contemporary sphere of business are not of one-off business deals but of a long-term contractual framework like infrastructure concessions, joint ventures, technology licensing, and international supply contracts. The economic worth of a relationship is usually dwarfed by the value of the contending claim in such situations. A purely adversarial adjudication can thus have expenses that extend even beyond the immediate legal issue, including supply chain frustrations, reputational damages, and loss of business opportunities. ADR mechanisms approach this dilemma by thinking in terms of dispute-resolution systems that help parties to resolve disputes but not necessarily to bring negative effects to the commercial relationship.

One of the key legal instruments with the help of which ADR allows preserving relationships is the inclusion of multi-tier dispute resolution clauses in commercial contracts. These provisions are traditionally required to pass through preliminary phases, including negotiation or mediation before an arbitration or a lawsuit begins. Contractually, such clauses contain the contractual requirements to seek a consensual resolution to adjudication. In business, they serve a stabilizing role by providing procedural events to the parties in order to re-evaluate the commercial implications of the conflict. These clauses are becoming increasingly recognized by courts and arbitral tribunals as having legal validity, because they persuade that such terms are an indication of the willingness of the parties to maintain cooperative commercial terms whenever possible.[11]

The practical importance of such mechanisms is particularly evident in sectors characterized by a prolonged business partnership. For example, in major infrastructure and building projects, the conflicts frequently appear in the implementation of the projects and not when the project

[11] Gary B. Born, *International Commercial Arbitration* (Kluwer Law Int'l, 3d ed. 2021).

ends. Direct resort to lawsuits could foster risks to the completion of the project and also expose both sides to significant budgets. ADR procedures allow parties to resolve a dispute without interfering with the functioning of the project. Empirical analysis of international commercial arbitration suggests that the corporate players often tend to have settlement instead of adjudication procedures in such dispute matters where the ongoing business relations are involved because such measures enable the commercial activities to run parallel to the dispute resolution procedures.[12]

Legislative development in India reflects increasing recognition of these market realities. The Mediation Act, 2023, aims to facilitate an early-stage dispute management process based on a system of mediation, including the provisions that facilitate pre-litigation mediation and institutional mediation models.[13] The Act also acknowledges the enforceability of mediated settlement agreements, which curbs one of the biggest fears of commercial actors over the legality of negotiated results. The law enhances the position of consensual dispute resolution in the wider commercial dispute-resolution framework by giving the process of mediation statutory legitimacy.

At the international level, similar enforceability concerns led to the implementation of the Singapore Convention on Mediation, which puts in place the regime of recognition and enforcement of mediated settlement agreements in cross-border commercial disputes.[14] Before the Convention, even parties who settled their disputes using mediation inevitably had a challenge when it came to enforcing their settlements in a multi-jurisdictional setting. The Convention fills this gap by authorizing settlement agreements that are the product of mediation to be directly enforced in contracting states, which would significantly increase the degree of credibility of mediation as a practical tool of transnational commercial dispute resolution without disruption of commercial relations between parties.

Judicial practice indicates a growing support of ADR mechanisms, which reflects commercial stability. The courts recognized that some types of disputes, especially those that relate to commercial relationships, are best settled by consensual means since they allow parties to settle

[12] Queen Mary Univ. of London & White & Case LLP, *International Arbitration Survey: Adapting Arbitration to a Changing World* (2021).
[13] Mediation Act, 2023 (India).
[14] United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, opened for signature Aug. 7, 2019, enforced on Sept. 12, 2020 (Singapore Convention on Mediation).

differences without necessarily damaging their cooperation.

These tendencies indicate the increasing importance of ADR mechanisms in managing commercial relationships, instead of litigation. ADR helps parties understand the conflicts allowing sustaining long-term cooperation through promoting early negotiations and mediation at the first step of the disagreement escalation. It offers binding settlement systems and incorporates the consensual procedure into the arbitration, hence not only solving the dispute but also putting the business networks that rely on long-term trust with the partners on solid grounds.

CONCLUSION

The increased popularity of ADR within the sphere of business litigation suggests that dispute resolution within contemporary commerce is no longer purely a solution to the issue of contractual breach limited to a corrective effect. Instead, it is gradually becoming instrumentalized as a means of managing the implicit risks of continued business partnership. Conflicts do not become isolated or unique in markets that have complex supply-chain networks, international interventions, and strategic relationships on a long-term basis. The real legal issue, however, is not how disputes ought to be resolved but how they can be addressed without destruction of the commercial relations that bring about the economic value.

Based on this discussion, it is the philosophy represented by the ADR that is imported rather than the efficiency of the procedure. The operating models of negotiation, mediation, and structured hybrid processes direct the attention of settlement from a retrospective fault-finding process to a prospective problem-solving process. They establish institutional areas where parties can renegotiate the terms of commercial interests, redistribute the terms of the contract expectations, and find solutions that could not otherwise be found through the strictly adversarial scenario. In the case of commercial actors whose business models depend on long-term collaboration, such processes allow managing the conflicts without the emergence of irreparable disruption.

At the same time, growing legal acknowledgment of the mediation framework, hybrid procedures, and binding arbitration models proves that ADR is not just an informal settlement mechanism anymore but a part of the commercial legal regulation. The legislative reforms along with international conventions represent a conscious attempt at harmonizing the knowingly consensual allocation of dispute settlement with the tools that present legal assurance and binding nature. This institutionalization confirms that maintenance of such relationships does not require reliance on the expense of legal reliability, which is something that cannot be neglected in the commercial dealings.

Finally, the issue of ADR in business conflicts reflects a more general shift in the intersection of law and trade. As business relationships continue to become interdependent and sustainable, the dispute-resolution systems should be able to deal with not only law-based but also the relationship-based rights with which economic cooperation occurs. ADR offers exactly this kind of framework that enables an effective way of resolution of disputes and also protects the trust, credibility, and stability that form the foundation of a modern commercial activity.

In a way, ADR alters the perspective of dispute resolution not as the final point of contractual dispute but as the component part of the continued regulation of trade associations.