



The Tribunal:

**Dr. José Miguel Júdece**

PLMJ - AM Pereira Sáragga Leal Oliveira Martins Júdece  
e Associados  
Edifício Eurolex  
Avenida da Liberdade 224  
Lisbon 1250-148  
Portugal

**Mr. Manuel Conthe**

Bird & Bird  
Jorge Juan, 8, 1º  
28001 Madrid  
España

**Dr. Raúl Emilio Vinuesa**

Vinuesa & Asociados  
Alsina 2360  
San Isidro (1642)  
Buenos Aires - Argentina

**By Electronic Mail**

2 January 2013

**PCA Case No. AA406: 1. GUARACACHI AMERICA, INC. (U.S.A.) 2. RURELEC PLC  
(UNITED KINGDOM) v. THE PLURINATIONAL STATE OF BOLIVIA**

Dear Members of the Tribunal,

Following the filing of the Claimants' Rejoinder on Jurisdiction on 20 December 2012, the jurisdictional decision in *Teinver S.A. et al v Argentine Republic* (known as the *Aerolíneas* case) was published.<sup>1</sup> The Claimants submit a copy of the decision as **Exhibit CL-151** in the belief

---

<sup>1</sup> *Teinver S.A., Transportes de Cercanías S.A. and Autobuses Urbanos del Sur S.A. v. The Argentine Republic* (ICSID Case No. ARB/09/1), Decision on Jurisdiction, 21 December 2012. This decision is submitted as **Exhibit CL-151**, and includes the separate opinion of Dr. Kamal Hussein (concurring in judgment).

WASHINGTON  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Suite 600  
Washington DC 20004-2692

T+ 1 202 777 4500

Direct T+ 1 202 777 4519

F+ 1 202 777 4555

Direct F+ 1 202 777 4555

E nigel.blackaby@freshfields.com

W freshfields.com

DOC ID US1494378

OUR REF NAB/CR

YOUR REF

CLIENT MATTER NO. 156366-0001

that it will assist the present Tribunal in its deliberations on several jurisdictional issues raised in this proceeding.

*First*, as the Tribunal is aware, Rurelec interprets the plain terms of the UK Treaty as protecting indirect investments, as have several investment treaty tribunals interpreting very similar treaty terms.<sup>2</sup> In *Aerolíneas*, the decision held that indirect investments were protected by the Spain–Argentina BIT, despite objections by Argentina that were similar to those made by Bolivia in this arbitration.<sup>3</sup> In *Aerolíneas*, Argentina argued that since the BIT’s definition of investment “[did] not explicitly refer to investments made ‘directly or indirectly,’ indirectly-held investments [were] not protected.”<sup>4</sup> The tribunal rejected this argument stating that there was “nothing in the broad language . . . of the Treaty”, which defined “investments” as “any kind of assets” and “property and rights of every kind”, that suggested that the BIT was only meant to cover direct investments.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the tribunal noted that its interpretation was in accord with the *jurisprudence constante* on this issue.<sup>6</sup> This same case law has been described at length in Rurelec’s pleadings.<sup>7</sup>

*Second*, the *Aerolíneas* decision held that the failure to comply with an amicable settlement provision in a treaty may be excused if such an exercise would prove futile.<sup>8</sup> The *Aerolíneas* tribunal also stated that where there are two disagreements between the parties, where one disagreement has been negotiated and the other has not, this previous negotiation is sufficient to comply with the amicable settlement provision of a treaty, so long as the disagreements’ subject matter are sufficiently related.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Counter-Memorial, Section III.B; Rejoinder, Section III.B.

<sup>3</sup> *Teinver S.A., Transportes de Cercanías S.A. and Autobuses Urbanos del Sur S.A. v. The Argentine Republic* (ICSID Case No. ARB/09/1), Decision on Jurisdiction, **Exhibit CL-151**, 21 December 2012, ¶ 235.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* at ¶ 229.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* at ¶ 230.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* at ¶¶ 231–32.

<sup>7</sup> *See, e.g.*, Claimants’ Rejoinder on Jurisdiction, ¶¶ 23–26.

<sup>8</sup> *Teinver S.A., Transportes de Cercanías S.A. and Autobuses Urbanos del Sur S.A. v. The Argentine Republic* (ICSID Case No. ARB/09/1), Decision on Jurisdiction, **Exhibit CL-151**, 21 December 2012, ¶¶ 126, 129. *See also* Claimants’ arguments in this regard in their Rejoinder at ¶¶ 49–52.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* at ¶¶ 122–125. *See also* Rejoinder Section V.B.

Claimants' enclose a copy of the *Aerolíneas* decision so that the members of the Tribunal may take it into account in considering Bolivia's jurisdictional objections.

Yours sincerely,

  
Nigel Blackaby

Encl(s)

Copy to: Hugo Raúl Montero Lara and  
Elizabeth Arismendi Chumacero

Office of the Attorney General of the  
Plurinational State of Bolivia

Eduardo Silva Romero  
José Manuel García Represa  
Alvaro Galindo  
Juan Felipe Merizalde

Dechert LLP

Martin Doe

Permanent Court of Arbitration