

WATSON FARLEY
&
WILLIAMS

ALEXIS MARTINEZ
CV



ALEXIS MARTINEZ

Partner
London

T: +44 20 7155 2751
AlexisMartinez@wfw.com

Summary

Alexis is a Partner in the Dispute Resolution group.

Multilingual and dual-qualified, Alexis Martinez excels in large-scale multi-jurisdictional disputes.

Alexis is qualified in both England and France and has unparalleled experience working on investment treaty and energy arbitrations in English, Spanish and French.

Alexis's recent energy arbitration successes involve the payment of hundreds of millions of US dollars to clients in several pricing disputes under long-term natural gas and LNG contracts. His commercial arbitration practice encompasses complex energy, construction, mining, and financial disputes.

Highlights of Alexis' investment treaty arbitration experience involve the successful representation in multiple cases of Slovakia, Ecuador, the Czech Republic, Turkey, Uzbekistan and other states. He has also acted for claimants against states in 11 cases in Latin America, Africa, Asia and the Caribbean, all of which resulted in favourable multimillion awards or settlements.

Alexis has extensive experience advising sovereigns and international companies on public international law issues, such as the extent and international impact of sovereign rights, international sanctions, and the application of international treaties.

Alexis also regularly acts as arbitrator.

Alexis has been recommended as a leader in his field for many years. He has been recognised every year since 2017 as a Future Leader by Who's Who Legal: Arbitration. Alexis has also been recommended for international arbitration by The Legal 500 every year since 2016.

In the 2023 edition of The Legal 500, Alexis is noted as being "appreciated for his open-minded and client-based approach, as well as his high-level coordination of all communication to the tribunal and opposing party throughout the arbitration process." He is also described as "very easy to work with and absolutely committed to his clients. He is very thoughtful in sharing articles and legal updates, and has broad geographic experience and connections. His depth of knowledge about recent and relevant arbitration decisions is also very impressive."

Experience as arbitrator

- Sole arbitrator (LCIA Case No. 235869): EUR 1.276 million dispute arising between a state-controlled natural gas company and a contractor.
- Sole arbitrator (LCIA Case No. 215250): *ad hoc* arbitration governed by the UK Arbitration Act and arising under a telecommunications services agreement.
- Sole arbitrator (LCIA Case No. 184017): dispute arising under a loan agreement.
- Sole arbitrator (LCIA Case No. 184043): dispute arising under long-term loan agreements.

- Sole arbitrator (LCIA Case No. 184044): dispute arising under long-term loan agreements.
- Co-Arbitrator (LCIA Case No. 163438): dispute under three commercial contracts for the sale of goods.

Investment treaty arbitration counsel

- **Ecuador** in *Worley International Services Inc. (USA) v. The Republic of Ecuador*, the UNCITRAL arbitration under the Ecuador-United States BIT concerning the alleged expropriation and unfair and inequitable treatment of inspection and management contracts in oil company related assets and an oil refinery. Claims are for USD hundreds of millions.
- **The Slovak Republic** in *Spółdzielnia Pracy Muszynianka v. Slovak Republic*, PCA Case N° AA629, a treaty arbitration governed by the UNCITRAL Rules and the Poland – Slovak Republic BIT in connection to alleged rights to water natural resources.
- **The Slovak Republic** in *EuroGas Inc. and Belmont Resources Inc. v. Slovak Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/14/14, an ICSID dispute under the US Slovak Republic and Canada – Slovak Republic BITs in connection with the withdrawal of a mining license, valued over USD 1 billion, leading to a complete victory for the Slovak Republic.
- **The Slovak Republic** in *Achmea B.V. v. The Slovak Republic (Number 2)*, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Netherlands – Slovakia BIT concerning the alleged plan to establish a unitary public health insurance system in Slovakia run by the State. Claims exceeded USD 93 million.
- **Gabon** in *BCH Group v. Gabon*, ICC Case No. 20691, an arbitration involving claims exceeding US\$ 6 million over rights in a special economic zone, resulting in a complete victory for the client.
- **The investors** in *Millicom International Operations B.V. et al. v. Republic of Senegal*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/20, an ICSID dispute under the Netherlands – Senegal BIT, which settled on innovative terms very favourable to the investor.
- **The investor** in *British Caribbean Bank Limited v. The Government of Belize*, PCA Case No. 2010-18, a dispute governed by the UNCITRAL Rules and the Belize – United Kingdom BIT, leading to a USD 25.1 million award in favour of the investor.
- **The investor** in *Deutsche Bank v. Sri Lanka*, ICSID Case No. ARB/09/2, a dispute arising from the termination of a derivatives contracting, resulting in the award of USD 68 million and interest.
- **14 investors** in *The PV Investors v. Spain*, PCA Case No. 2012-14, a dispute under the Energy Charter Treaty and governed by the UNCITRAL Rules arising from changes to renewable energy legislation, leading to an award for EUR 91.1 million and interest in favour of the clients.
- **Uzbekistan** in *Romak S.A. v. The Republic of Uzbekistan*, PCA Case No. AA280, a dispute governed by the UNCITRAL Rules and the Switzerland Uzbekistan BIT, resulting in complete victory.
- **The investors** in *Gemplus S.A., SLP S.A., Gemplus Industrial S.A. deC.V. v. United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/04/3, and *Talsud S.A. v. United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/04/4, a dispute governed by the ICSID Additional Facility Rules, and the France – Mexico and the Argentina – Mexico BITs, resulting in a USD 15.5 million award, compound interest and USD5.3 million in costs.

- **The Republic of Turkey**, in Poslka Energetyka Holding SA v. Turkey, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Poland-Turkey BIT concerning the alleged shareholding in an energy company. Claims were for multiple USD 1 billion.
- **The Republic of Turkey** in Cementownia "Nova Huta" S.A. v. Turkey, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Poland-Turkey BIT concerning the alleged expropriation of shareholding in a cement factory. Claims were for multiple USD 1 billion.
- **The Czech Republic**, in Antaris Solar GmbH and Dr. Michael Göde v. Czech Republic, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Czech Republic-Germany BIT and the Energy Charter Treaty concerning the alleged expropriation of an investment in solar energy. Claims were for USD 14.4 million.
- **The Czech Republic** in I.C.W. Europe Investments Limited v. Czech Republic, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Czech Republic-United Kingdom BIT and the Energy Charter Treaty concerning the alleged expropriation of an investment in solar energy. Claims were for USD 1.7 million.
- **The Czech Republic** in WA Investments Europa Nova Ltd. v. Czech Republic, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Czech Republic-Cyprus BIT and the Energy Charter Treaty concerning the alleged expropriation of an investment in solar energy. Claims were for USD 3.3 million.
- **The Czech Republic** in Voltaic Network GmbH v. Czech Republic, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Czech Republic-Germany BIT and the Energy Charter Treaty concerning the alleged expropriation of an investment in solar energy. Claims were for USD 8.6 million.
- **The Czech Republic** in Photovoltaic Knopf Betriebs GMBH v. Czech Republic, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Czech Republic-Germany BIT and the Energy Charter Treaty concerning the alleged expropriation of an investment in solar energy. Claims were for USD 1.7 million.
- **The Czech Republic** in Jürgen Wirtgen, Stefan Wirtgen, Gisela Wirtgen and JSW Solar (zwei) GmbH & Co. KG v. Czech Republic, a UNCITRAL arbitration under the Czech Republic-Germany BIT concerning the alleged expropriation of an investment in solar energy. Claims were for USD 22.9 million.
- **The Czech Republic**, in Natland Group Limited, Natland Investment Group NV, and Radiance Energy Holding S.A.R.L. v. Czech Republic, the UNCITRAL arbitration under the Czech Republic-Netherlands BIT, the Czech Republic-Cyprus BIT, the Czech Republic-Benelux BIT, and the Energy Charter treaty concerning the alleged expropriation of an investment in solar energy. Claims were for USD 90 million.
- **The investors** in Siemens v. Argentina (ICSID Case No. ARB/02/8), Telefónica v. Argentina (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/20), Azurix v. Argentina (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/12), CMS v. Argentina (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/8), Enron v. Argentina (ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3), and Camuzzi v. Argentina (ICSID Case No. ARB/03/7), resulting in USD multimillion awards in favour of the clients.

Energy arbitration counsel

- A **European LNG buyer** in an ICC arbitration arising from a long-term multibillion-dollar LNG supply contract, which led to the successful settlement of a USD 200 million claim.
- An **Asian LNG buyer** on the development of an arbitration strategy, leading to the successful renegotiation of price and non-price term on a multibillion-dollar long-term LNG supply contract, leading to over USD 1 billion in savings for the client.

- A **European gas buyer** in an emergency arbitration, followed by “baseball” gas price arbitration in Southern Europe under the ICC Rules relating to a long-term LNG supply contract.
- A **European gas buyer** in a gas price arbitration in six different European markets under the ICC Rules relating to a long-term LNG supply contract with a sum in dispute in excess of USD1 billion.
- A **Central Asian State** in a multiple billion USD dispute with an Asian State-Owned Company over the price of natural gas to be delivered during the COVID crisis and the invocation of force majeure by the buyer under three mid-term gas contracts, which was successfully resolved.
- A **European gas buyer** in a gas price arbitration in Southern Europe under the ICC Rules relating to a long-term pipeline gas contract with a disputed amount in excess of USD 1.3 billion, which led to a favourable settlement.
- A **European gas buyer** in a gas price arbitration in Southern Europe under the ICC Rules relating to a long-term pipeline gas contract with a sum in dispute in excess of USD 2 billion, which led to a favourable settlement.
- A **European gas buyer** in a gas price arbitration in Southern Europe under the ICC Rules relating to a long-term LNG supply contract with a disputed sum in excess of USD 800 million, which led to a favourable settlement.
- A **large Chinese state-owned mining company** defending a claim arising from a natural resources transaction.
- A **Russian state-controlled oil and gas company** in the mediation of a significant dispute concerning the construction of a petroleum refinery.
- **Reliance Industries Limited and BG Exploration and Production India Limited**, in Reliance Industries Limited and BG Exploration and Production India Limited v. The Union of India the UNCITRAL arbitration concerning sums due under two Production Sharing Contracts for oil and gas assets. Claims were for multiple USD billions.
- A **Russian state-controlled oil and gas company** in a mediation over claims exceeding USD 120 million with a US company concerning the construction of a petroleum refinery.

Construction arbitration counsel

- A JV of **three global engineering, procurement and construction companies** in a construction and scheduling arbitration involving the construction of an LNG terminal and liquefaction plant with sums in dispute exceeding USD 4.5 billion.
- The **contractor** in NGE Contracting SAS, Guintoli SAS, and Bauer BG Ltd Skopje v. Ministry of Finance of Macedonia, ICC Case No. 26835, an arbitration for multiple USD millions, involving the construction dispute of a water collector project in North Macedonia.
- The **contractor** in ICC Case No. 16595, an arbitration arising from claims totalling over USD 180 million brought by a sub-contractor in relation to the construction of a university hospital in the Middle East.
- A **French renewables energy company** in a dispute with an Ethiopian state-owned entity arising from the construction of a windfarm.
- Advised a **large private jet manufacturer** in LCIA Case No. 6798 in relation to a claim exceeding USD 2 million.

ATHENS BANGKOK DUBAI DUSSELDORF FRANKFURT HAMBURG HANOI HONG KONG LONDON
MADRID MILAN MUNICH NEW YORK PARIS ROME SEOUL SINGAPORE SYDNEY

All references to 'Watson Farley & Williams', 'WFW' and 'the firm' in this document mean Watson Farley & Williams LLP and/or its Affiliated Entities. Any reference to a 'partner' means a member of Watson Farley & Williams LLP, or a member or partner in an Affiliated Entity, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualification. The transactions and matters referred to in this document represent the experience of our lawyers. This publication is produced by Watson Farley & Williams. It provides a summary of the legal issues, but is not intended to give specific legal advice. The situation described may not apply to your circumstances. If you require advice or have questions or comments on its subject, please speak to your usual contact at Watson Farley & Williams.
This publication constitutes attorney advertising.

Publication code number: Europe\73636859v1 © Watson Farley & Williams LLP 2023

[wfw.com](https://www.wfw.com)

