Vol. 2, 2013- JUNE 2014

Journal of CONTEMPORARY LAW

Table of Contents

Interests of Developing Countries and the Consensus Principle of the WTO
~ Jacob Abiodun Osuntogun

Challenges of Section 20 of the Nigerian Admiralty Jurisdiction Act to International Arbitration Agreements
~ Lukman A. Abdulrauf & Abdulrazaq A. Daibu

Issues and Challenges in the Enforcement of Environmental Laws and Standards in Nigeria
~ S. Gozie Ogbodo & Helen Uchenna Agu

Climate Change in Nigeria and the Quest for Autochthonous Solutions: A Legal Appraisal
~ Roseline Omoye Ehiemua

Privacy of Divorce Proceedings as a Universal Practice in Nigeria: Why Not?
~ V.E Onuoha & Michael Attah

Proof of Public Documents in Nigerian Courts - An Appraisal
~ Christine O. Ike

The Evidence Act, 2011: Closing the Window for the Application Of Common Law Rules Of Evidence
~ Gabriel O. Arishe & Desmond O. Oriakhogba

Gas Flaring and Environmental Rights: The Nigerian Context
~ Irekpitan Okukpon - Adesanya

A publication of the Department of Commercial and Property Law, Faculty of Law, University of Nigeria.

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Prof. John Blum, Director, Postgraduate Studies, Institute for Health Law, Loyola University, Chicago School of Law, 25 East Pearson Street, Chicago I'll 606 II. 2.

Prof. Chris Nwachukwu Okeke, Golden Gate University School of Law, San Francisco, US.

Prof. E.E. Essien, Faculty of Law, University of Uyo.

Prof. U.S.F. Nnabue, Faculty of Law, Imo State University , Owerri.

Prof. Ifeoma P. Enemo, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Enugu Campus, University of Nigeria.

Prof. George C. Nnona, Faculty of Law, University of Nigeria.

Prof. Chukwunonso Okafo, Faculty of Law, University of Nigeria.

Hon. Justice Peter Affen, Judge, High Court, Federal Capital Territory, Abuja.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Prof. George O.S. Amadi,
Editor-in-Chief.

Prof. Felicia Monye,
Deputy Editor-in-Chief

Dr. M.C. Anozie
Associate Editor and Head, Department of Commercial and Property Law, Faculty of Law, University of Nigeria.

John Funsho Olounfemi
Managing Editor

Dr. Edith Nwosu
Secretary, Editorial Board

Herbert Umezuruike
Case Note Editor

Festus Ukwueze
Features Editor

Dr. Obi Nnamuchi
Features Editor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

~~~~~

Interests of Developing Countries and the Consensus Principle of the WTO ~ **Jacob Abiodun Osuntogun** 1 - 32

Challenges of Section 20 of the Nigerian Admiralty Jurisdiction Act to International Arbitration Agreements **Lukman A. Abdulrauf & Abdulrazaq A. Daibu** 33 - 50

Issues and Challenges in the Enforcement of Environmental Laws and Standards in Nigeria ~ **S. Gozie Ogbodo & Helen Uchenna Agu** 51 - 86

Climate Change in Nigeria and the Quest for Autochthonous Solutions: A Legal Appraisal ~ **Roseline Omoye Ehiemua** 87-108

Privacy of Divorce Proceedings as a Universal Practice in Nigeria: Why Not?~**V.E Onuoha & Michael Attah** 109-132

Proof of Public Documents in Nigerian Courts - An Appraisal ~ **Christine O. Ike** 133-150

The Evidence Act, 2011: Closing the Window for the Application of Common Law Rules of Evidence ~ **Gabriel O. Arishe & Desmond O. Oriakhogba** 151-166

Gas Flaring and Environmental Rights: The Nigerian Context ~ **Irekpitan Okukpon-Adesanya** 167-189
~~~~~

CHALLENGES OF SECTION 20 OF THE NIGERIAN ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION ACT TO INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS

LukmanAdebisiAbdulrauf[*] &AbdulrazaqAdelodunDaibu[**]

Abstract

Section 20 of the Nigerian Admiralty Jurisdiction Act (AJA) purports to render null and void agreements of parties that oust the jurisdiction of the court by limiting the jurisdiction of admiralty disputes to forum outside Nigeria. This article argues that an arbitration agreement does not ordinarily oust the jurisdiction but merely stipulates a procedure in which parties prefer to settle their differences and that this choice of forum for dispute resolution is outside the contemplation of section 20 AJA contrary to some erroneous relevant judicial decisions in Nigeria.

1. Introduction

Arbitration is an alternative method of dispute resolution in which a neutral third party (arbitrator) hands down a decision after a hearing, of which both parties have an opportunity to be heard.[1] It is a fair resolution of disputes or differences between not less than two parties for determination in a judicial manner by person(s)

[*] LL.B (Zaria), LL.M. (Ilorin) BL ; Lecturer, Department of Public Law, Faculty of Law, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria Email: lukmanrauf@gmail.com.

[**] LL.B, LL.M, (Ilorin) BL; Lecturer, Department of Private and Property Law, Faculty of Law, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.email: abdulrazaqdaibu@yahoo.com.

[1] A. A. Daibu "Application of the Rules of Natural Justice in Arbitral Proceedings in Nigeria" *Ife Juris Review,* Vol. 1 (2013), p. 56; M. M. Akanbi*Domestic Commercial Arbitration in Nigeria: Problems and Challenges"* (Lambert Academic Publishing Germany., 2012), p. 47; T. A. Adewuyi "The Effect of Section 20 of the Admiralty Jurisdiction Act No 59 0f 1991 on International Arbitration Clauses" *University of Ilorin law Journal 2006,* Vol. 1 p. 1; R. Bernstein *et al., Handbook of Arbitration Practice* (3rd edition, Sweet & Maxwell, London 1998), p.13; *Black's Law Dictionary* 6th ed. (Centennial Edition) (US: West Group Publishing Co., 1990), p. 105.

other than a court. [2] The basis for arbitration as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism is hinged on the desire of the parties to have a less cumbersome, less expensive and informal way of settling their dispute without technicality andrigidity associated with litigation in a shorter time.[3]

Based on the principles of *pactasuntservanda,*[4] parties are generally free to enter into a contract and such a contract is enforceable by law provided such agreement is lawful and not contrary to public policy.[5] Thus it is usual for parties in the course of their commercial transactions to insert arbitral clause in the agreement in case of any dispute arising there from. This means that parties could agree that disputes in the course of their contract be submitted to an arbitrator whether national or foreign.Maritime arbitration mostly arises in contracts for the use of ship(s) (charter parties), carriage of cargo (bills of lading), for ship building and or sales and less commonly for insurance or repair of ships and it is a standard practice that maritime or shipping contracts will have an arbitral clause.[6]The Nigerian Arbitration and Conciliation Act hereinafter referred to as ACA[7] provides for a unified legal framework for the fair and efficient settlement of commercial

[2] J. F. Olorunfemi"The Effect of Arbitration Agreement on The Jurisdiction of The Court in Nigeria" *Nigeria Journal of Public Law*, Vol. 2 No 1 (2009), p. 310; *Halsbury's Laws of England* (vol. 2,3rdedn., London: Butterworths.,1964), p.256 para. 501; F. Ajogwu*Commercial Arbitration in Nigeria: Law and Practice* (Lagos: Mbeyi& Associates Nig. Ltd., 2009), p. 5.

[3] J.O. Orojo and M.A. Ajomo, *Law and Practice of Arbitration and Conciliation in Nigeria* (Lagos: Mbeyi& Associates Nig. Ltd., 1999, pp. 42 – 46; Ajogwu, above note 2, p. 5. See also the case of *Ebokan v. Ekwenibe& Sons Trading Co.* (2001) 2 NWLR (Pt.696) 32 at 43.

[4] Freedom of contract: It means that agreements of a party to a contract which are not fraudulent are to be observed. See *AG Nasarawa State v.A G Plateau State* (2012) 10 NWLR (Pt. 1309) 419 at 450.

[5] See *Northern Assurance Co. Ltd v. Wuraola* (1969) NSCC 22; *United Bank of Nig. Ltd v. Ozigi* (1991) 12 NWLR (Pt.176) 677; *Nika Fishing Co. Ltd. v. Lavina Cooperation* (2008) 16 NWLR (Pt.1114) 509 at P.542 E; *Dragetanos Const. (Nig.) Ltd. v. Fab Madis Ventures Ltd.* (2011) 16 NWLR (Pt.1273) 308 at P. 353 D-F; *AG Nasarawa State v. A G Plateau State* above note 4.

[6] Adewuyi above note 1, pp.1-2.

[7] Cap. A18 *Laws of the Federation of Nigeria(LFN), 2004, hereafter ACA.*

disputes by arbitration and conciliation in Nigeria.[8] The Act empowers a court to stay proceedings in an action arising from a contract with arbitral clause pending the reference of the dispute to arbitration in accordance with their agreement or arbitral clause in the contract.[9]

Arbitration agreements like other contracts are generally binding and enforceable in Nigerian courts.[10]However, there are some difficulties with regard to enforcement of arbitration clauses contained in maritime agreements. Section 20 of the Admiralty Jurisdiction Act[11] renders null and void any agreement by any person or party to any cause, matter or action which seeks to oust the jurisdiction of the court in respect of any admiralty matter where any of the eight circumstances listed under the Act exist. The import of this provision is that courts will not stay proceedings for parties to resort to arbitration based on the provision of their maritime agreement as that will be interpreted to mean ousting the jurisdiction of the court. This provision was originally thought to apply only to foreign jurisdiction clause, that is, clauses in agreements requiring disputes to be settled in any foreign court other than Nigerian courts.[12] However, recent decisions of the

[8] B.A Bukar, "Mandatory and Other forms of Arbitration under Some Selected Oil, Gas and Investment Legislation in Nigeria" *OGEL*, (2010) available at http://www.ogel.org (accessed June 28, 2013); D. Okorie, "Does the Regime of Statutory Arbitration of Investment Disputes in Nigeria Negate the Sanctity of Party Autonomy in relation to the Agreement of Parties to Arbitrate? Available on line at http://www.dundee.ac.uk/cepmlp/gateway/?news=31248 (accessed June 28, 2013); M. M. Akanbi "Challenge of Arbitration Practices under the Nigerian Arbitration and Conciliation Act of 1988: Some Practical Considerations" *Arbitration*, Vol. 78 No. 4 (2012) p.325. See also the long title of ACA available at http://www.nigeria-law.org/ArbitrationAndConciliatioAct.htm (accessed June 29, 2013).

[9] Sections 4 and 5, ACA.

[10] See *Commerce Assurance Limited v. Alli* (1992) 3 NWLR (Pt. 232) 710, *Kano State Urban Development Board v. Fanz Construction Co. Ltd* (1986) 5 NWLR (Pt. 39) 74.

[11] Admiralty Jurisdiction Act Cap. A5, *LFN 2004*, hereafter, AJA; the law was promulgated as Decree, No. 59 of 1991 under the military regime and is deemed to be an Act of the National Assembly by virtue of s.315 1999 Constitution of Federal Republic, hereafter, the 1999 Constitution.

[12] F.Egede, "Foreign Maritime Arbitration Clauses: Applicability and enforcement in Nigeria" http://www.businessdayonline.com/ARCHIVE/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5611:foreign-maritime-arbitration-clauses-applicability-and-enforcement-in-nigeria-&catid=133:legal-indignity&Itemid=557 (accessed March 21, 2012).

Nigerian courts have shown that it also applies to any admiralty or maritime matter which seeks to oust the jurisdiction of the Nigeria courts[13] in certain well defined circumstances elaborately provided by the AJA.The courts in guise of guarding their jurisdiction tenuously and jealously assumes jurisdiction albeit erroneously to the detriment of parties' arbitral clauses thereby defeating the essence of arbitration.[14] This development may have negative effect on maritime business andinternational commercial arbitration in Nigeria.

This articleunlike similar effort in this area[15]examines the effect of section20 of the AJA on arbitration agreement particularly, international maritime arbitration agreements. It argues analytically, using case laws thatsection 20 of the AJA should not be interpreted as construing arbitration agreement as anouster of the jurisdiction of Nigerian courts. As such, parties are free to insert in their agreement arbitration clauses for resolution of their admiralty disputes by an arbitral tribunal within or outside Nigeria.This article therefore considers certain paramount issues such as evaluation of admiralty jurisdiction as it relates to arbitration agreements, an examination of section20 of the AJA and the effects of the section on arbitration agreements.Little literature exists in this area as efforts are still being made to understand the exact scope of section 20 of the AJA. Adewuyi[16]wrote on the effects of section 20 of the AJA on arbitration agreements. He contends that maritime arbitration is mostly an international commercial transaction as parties are rarely of the same nationality.[17]He examined the position of English

[13] Particularly the Federal High Court (FHC) because based on the provision of s.251 1999 Constitution and also s1 of the AJA, the Federal High Court(FHC)has exclusive jurisdiction to the exclusion of any other court on Admiralty matters. There is however a controversy as to whether the exclusive jurisdiction of the FHC excludes every other court or tribunal including an arbitral tribunal however, these arguments are not the subject of this as they have already been extensively dealt with elsewhere. See M.M. Akanbi, "Examining the concept of Arbitrability under Nigerian Domestic Arbitration Laws" *Nigerian Bar Journal*, Vol. 3 No. 1 (January 2005)

[14]Olorunfemi, above note2,p. 311.

[15]Adewuyi, above note 1

[16]*Ibid.*

[17]Adewuyi above note 2, p.2.

courts on the enforcement of judgments and arbitral awards from United Kingdom and European Union[18] and argued thatsection 20 of AJA should not be taken as a derogation of the general principles of arbitration. However, his analysis did not consider the provision of section 10 of AJA and he did not discuss the effects of the decisions of court which has brought about more clarity into interpretation of the said section. This paper has taken the research in this area a step further by discussing in detail the decisions of the Nigerian courts supporting our argumentsthat arbitration agreement is not an ouster but an avenue that affords parties the opportunity to explore arbitral process to resolve their disputes pursuant to their contract. This paper also argues that the courts are duty bound to interpret contracts in such a way that will give effect to the wishes of the parties.Hence, this work is an updated literature on the controversy surrounding section 20 of the AJA.

2. An Overview of Admiralty Jurisdiction Act asit relates to Arbitration Agreements

The *Black's Law Dictionary*defines "admiralty" as the system of jurisprudence that has grown out of the practice of admiralty courts.[19] This definition may not be helpful having regard to the complex nature of Nigerian admiralty practice as it fails to give us a clear glimpse of what admiralty is all about, nevertheless the definition has hinted us of the fact that admiralty is a system of law. The definition has also stated the court that administers admiralty matters in the United Kingdom which is the admiralty courts. For a clearer definition therefore, recourse will be made to judicial authorities. In the case of *I.T.P.P. v. UBN PLC.*[20], admiralty was referred toas "the law of marine commerce and marine navigation. It entails the transport at sea of persons and property and marine affairs in general."[21] This definition in succinct termsexplains that admiralty involves issues of marine commerce and marine affairs in general.[22] At common law,

[18]*Id* at pp. 5-7

[19]*Black's Law Dictionary*, above note 1, p. 50.

[20] (2006) 12 NWLR (Pt. 995) 483

[21]Per Niki Tobi JSC in *ITPP v. UBN*, above note 15, p. 507 para E-F.

[22] This makes one wonder why AJA still went ahead to provide for aviation matters particularly in section 4 of the Act as regards aviation claims.

admiralty covers only maritime claims and maritime at common law involves matters connected with or related to the sea, sea navigation or commerce and sometimes extended to all sorts of navigable waters.[23]

The principal law regulating admiralty matters in Nigeria is the AJA which vests the exclusive jurisdiction of admiralty matters in theFederal High Court. However the provisions of the AJA as it relates tothe jurisdiction of the Federal High Court must be read in conjunction withsection215 (1) (g) of the 1999 Constitution. The main objective of the AJA as stated in its preamble is "to provide for the extent of the jurisdiction of the Federal High Court in admiralty matters and other matters connected therewith". The provisions of AJA has extended admiralty in Nigeria beyond what is obtainable at common law[24] for example, items such as claims for oil pollution damage, aviation matters, banking or letter of credit transaction involving the importation or exportation of goods not withstanding that the transaction is between a bank and its customers not considered and envisaged at common law are all deemed admiralty matters under the AJA.[25]

Arbitration agreements are agreements between twoor more parties to resort to an arbitral tribunal to resolve their dispute where the situation arises.[26] To uphold the sanctity of arbitration, section2 of the ACA provides that an arbitration agreement shall be irrevocable except by the parties or the court. Section4 of the same law also provides that a court before which an arbitration agreement is brought shall if any of the parties so request order a stay of proceeding and refer the case to arbitration while section5 gives the court discretion to act in that regards. The above sections

[23] *Black's Law Dictionary*, above note 1, pp. 50 and 987- 988; D.I Efewevwerhan, *Principles of Civil Procedure in Nigeria* (Enugu: Chenglo Ltd., 2007) pp. 42-43.

[24] Efewevwerhan, above note 17, pp. 42

[25] See s. 1 and 4 AJA

[26] Akanbi. *Domestic Commercial Arbitration in Nigeria: Problems and Challenges"* above note 1 at p. 47; Ajogwu, above note 2, p. 5; Adewuyi, above note1, pp. 1-2; Ronald Bernstein *et al.*,above note 1, p.13; *Halsbury's Laws of England* above note 2, p.256 para. 501;

show that arbitration agreements are enforceable by law in the Nigerian Courts. Hence, the fundamental question is theenforceability of maritime arbitration in the face of the express provision of section20 of the AJA.

3. Section 20 of The Admiralty Jurisdiction Act: A Critique

Section20 of AJA provides that:

> any agreement by any person or party to any cause, matter or action which seeks to oust the jurisdiction of the court shall be null and void, if it relates to any admiralty matter falling under this Act and if;
>
> (a) the place of performance, execution, delivery, act or default is or takes place in Nigeria; or (b) any of the parties resides or has resided in Nigeria; or
>
> (c) the payment under the agreement (implied or express) is made or is to be made in Nigeria; or (d) in any admiralty action or in the case of a maritime lien, the plaintiff submits to the jurisdiction of the Court and makes a declaration to that effect or the rem is within Nigerian jurisdiction; or
>
> (e) it is a case in which the Federal Government or the Government of a State of the Federation is involved and the Federal Government or Government of the State submits to the jurisdiction of the Court; or
>
> (f) there is a financial consideration accruing in, derived from, brought into or received in Nigeria in respect of any matter under the admiralty jurisdiction of the Court; or
>
> (g) under any convention, for the time being in force to which Nigeria is a party, the national court of a contracting State is either mandated or has a discretion to assume jurisdiction; or
>
> (h) in the opinion of the Court, the cause, matter or action should be adjudicated upon in Nigeria.[27]

Arbitration agreements have been argued to be an ouster of the jurisdiction of courts because of the provision of the above section which has been said to alter the existing position in Admiralty matters thereby modifying sections 2 and 4 of the ACA and

[27] Section 20 AJA.

limiting enforceable arbitration agreements to those having Nigeria as their forum.[28]

The above provision effectively means any agreement by parties contained in their maritime or admiralty contract that cases of disputes arising therefore will be resolved by arbitration and not by recourse to the courts is an ouster clause and such agreement is null and void and has no legal effect. This provision effectively contradicts the well-established principle of Nigerian arbitration practice and the practice of arbitration generally that courts will stay proceedings if parties decide that they want to resort to arbitration based on the provisions of their arbitration agreement.[29]

4. Effects of Section 20 of Admiralty Jurisdiction Act on Arbitration Agreements

A proper approach to analyzing the effects of section 20 of the AJA on arbitration agreements is best done in the light of attitudes of the Nigeria court in decided cases. The interpretation of section20 of the AJA seems to bea battle between national and foreign jurisdiction on admiralty jurisdiction. The courts in Nigeria are always willing to guard jealously their jurisdiction and thus are most likely going to strike out an application seeking to stay proceedings in a Nigerian court for the purpose of resolution of the dispute in a foreign arbitration tribunal i.e. arbitration tribunal outside Nigeria. The courts usually interpret such category of agreements as an attempt to ouster their jurisdiction and this has serious effect on the arbitration agreement as the courts will declare such arbitration agreement null and void. The above proposition can be discerned in the case of *LignesAeriennes Congolese v. Air Atlantic Nigeria Ltd*[30]where the Court of Appeal in Nigeria considered the effects of section 20 of the AJA on the enforceability of arbitration agreements in a foreign forum.

[28]*M.V. Panormos Bay &Ors v. Olam Nigeria Plc*(2004) 5 NWLR (Pt. 865) 1 see also Ajogwu, above note 2, p. 104.
[29]Section 4 ACA.
[30](2005) 11 CLRN 55.

Ordinarily, exclusive jurisdiction in admiralty matters is vested in the Federal High Court.[31] The brief facts of the case is that the appellant, LignesAeriennes Congolese (LAC) a commercial airline and national carrier of the Democratic Republic of Congo with its head office in Kinshasa entered into an Aircraft lease agreement with the respondent, Air Atlantic Nigeria Ltd (AAN) a Nigerian company with its head office in Lagos. By virtue of article 7 of the agreement the parties agreed that the procedure for dispute settlement is arbitration and the applicable law to be Congolese Law. Article 7 of the agreement provides thus:

> The present agreement shall be governed by Congolese positive law. Any dispute relating to the execution, the interpretation and/or the termination of the present agreement shall be settled in a friendly way between the parties. If they fail to do so, the dispute shall be referred to arbitration by both Presidents of Kinshasa and Lagos Bars.

A dispute arose between the parties. AAN filed an action at the Federal High Court Lagos. AAN's claim before the Federal High Court was for the sum of $169,794 being consideration for the lease of Cargo Aircrafts to LAC. AAN filed a motion against LAC's Boeing 737 seeking to prevent it from leaving jurisdiction as security for the sum. LAC filed a preliminary objection to the claim by the AAN on the basis that by the lease agreement the party had chosen the Congolese law to apply to their relationship and therefore the lower court lacked jurisdiction to entertain the suit. The learned trial judge disagreed with the defendant/appellant and held that it had jurisdiction to entertain the suit despite the provisions for arbitration and governing law contained in the agreement.LAC appealed the lower court's decision. LAC contended before the Court of Appeal that the trial court ought to have given effect to the agreement of the parties for arbitration.

The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The court agreed that the lower court has and possesses the requisite statutory jurisdiction to entertain the respondent's suit. The court found that the real and combined effect of articles 7 and 8 of the Aircraft Lease Agreement entered into by the parties was and remains to

[31]Section 251 (1) (g) of the 1999 Constitution. See also s.1 and 2 of AJA.

oust the jurisdiction of the lower court in respect of disputes arising from the said agreement. The court found that the agreement of the parties was within the contemplation of the provisions of section 20 of the AJA and was thereby rendered null and void.

Commenting on the above decision, Adedoyin Rhodes – Vivour[32] said the basis of the decision of the Court of Appeal was the provisions of section20 of AJA. The Court of Appeal in accepting that the parties agreements fall under the purview of section20 recognized that the suit relates to an admiralty matter placing reliance on section1 of the AJA which provides that the admiralty jurisdiction of the court includes jurisdiction to hear and determine any question relating to a proprietary interest in a ship or aircraft or any maritime claim as specified in section 2 of the Act. Section 2 categorizes maritime claims into those of a proprietary or general nature.

In *M.V. Panormos Bay &Ors v. Olam Nigeria Plc*[33]section 20 of Admiralty Jurisdiction Decree(now AJA) fell for consideration and it highlighted the clear difficulty its application will have on arbitration agreements. In the case, the respondent commenced an action against the appellant jointly and severally for the sum of $100,000 or its Naira equivalent being special and general damages for the loss of 4535 bags of rice covered by 3 bills of lading. Upon being served with the respondent's claim, the appellant applied for a stay of proceedings pending referenceto arbitration based on clause 7 of the bill of lading which provides that "Any dispute arising under the bill of lading shall be referred to arbitration in London. The unamendedcentrococon arbitration clause will apply"

In opposing the application, respondent relied on section 20 ofAJA. The trial court found that there was a provision for reference to arbitration but nevertheless refused the application. The appellants appealed to the Court of Appeal. One of the issues for determination was whether the provision of section20 of the

[32]A. Rhodes –Vivour., "Maritime Jurisdiction In Nigeria: *LignesAeriennesCongolaises v. Air Atlantic Nig Ltd" Journal of Maritime and Transport Law*,Vol. 14 No.1(May 2007) p. 2.
[33] Above note 23

AJAapplies to the contract of carriage between the parties as to affect/modify the provisions of the arbitration clause. The Court of Appeal held that since the object of an arbitration clause in the bill of lading is to oust the jurisdiction of the court to exercise its admiralty jurisdiction over the case, it is null and void. Galadima, J.C.A[34]held as follows:

> Prior to coming into force of the Admiralty Jurisdiction Decree, 1991, sections 2 and 4 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act applied in all contracts having arbitration clause, without any limitation, whatsoever. However, section 20 of the Admiralty Jurisdiction Decree has altered the hitherto existing position in admiralty matters thereby modifying sections 2 and 4 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, and limiting enforceable arbitration agreements to those having Nigeria as its forum.[35]

The justice further stated that:

> Indeed, the intention of the lawmakers as regards section 20 of the Admiralty Jurisdiction Decree is to derogate from the hitherto existing position found in section 4 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act. In the instant case, since the object of the arbitration clause in the bill of lading is to oust the jurisdiction of the Nigerian court to exercise its admiralty jurisdiction over the case, the said clause is null and void.[36]

With due respect to the justice of the Court of Appeal, it is our humble opinion that he erred in law as he failed to give effect to section 10 of the AJA, which empowers the court to order a stay of proceedings pending arbitration in appropriate cases, whether in Nigeria or elsewhere. Section 10 of the AJA provides that:

> (1) Without prejudice to any other power of the Court- (a) where it appears to the Court in which a proceeding commenced under this Act is pending that the proceeding should be stayed or dismissed on the ground that the claim concerned should be determined by arbitration (whether in Nigeria or elsewhere) or

[34] As he then was, at pp. 12 to 13
[35]*Ibid.*
[36]*Ibid.*

by a court of a foreign country;...the court may order that the proceeding be stayed...[37]

Though the use of the word "may" in the above provision implies that the court has discretion[38] as to whether or not to grant the stay, it is only logical that the court in the interpretation of the provisions of a document should give express voice to the intention of the parties. In this instance, the express intention of the parties can be gathered from the provision of their bill of lading which stipulates in clause 7 that "any dispute arising under the bill of lading shall be referred to arbitration." The learned justice attention was also not drawn to the supreme court's decision in *The Owners of The MV Lupex v. Nigeria Overseas Chartering and Shipping Limited*[39]where it was held that where parties have chosen to determine for themselves that they would refer any of their disputes to arbitration instead of resorting to regular courts, a *prima facie* duty is cast upon the courts to act upon their agreement.[40] Though this particular supreme courtdecision did not consider the provisions of sections 10 and 20 of the AJA, it is relevant in this situation because it highlights the importance of freedom of the parties to choose the mode of determination of their dispute based on the principle of freedom of contract which is applicable in every civilized society. Secondly, the fact of the case shows that the matter is maritime and admiralty related which is within the purview of the Act.[41]

Quite unfortunately, the decision in *Parnamos Bay*[42]has become a convenient authority for mischievous parties to avoid foreign arbitration agreements, otherwise, voluntarilyentered into by parties[43]. For example, in *MT Amor &Anor v. Bronwen Energy*

[37] S.10 of the AJA
[38] *Kano v. CBN* (1996) 4 NWLR (Pt. 444) 587. Though in the case of *Ude v. Nwara* (1993) 2 SCNJ 47, Nnaemeka-Agu said "May" should be construed as mandatory i.e. meaning 'shall' or 'must'.
[39] (2003) 15 NWLR (Pt. 842) at p .469.
[40] Particularly at p. 469
[41] Sections 1 and 2 of the AJA
[42] Above note 23
[43] Egede, above note 11

TradingLimited,[44]the trial judge dismissed the appellants application for stay of proceedings pending reference to arbitration on the grounds that an arbitration clause in the agreement amounted to an ouster of the jurisdiction and therefore null and void. In several other cases, too numerous to mention here, attempts to hold the plaintiffs to their agreement to arbitrate were refused based on the application of the principle in *Parnomos Bay v. Olam*.[45]

It is contended that arbitral agreement does not in any way oust jurisdiction of courts in Nigeria,[46] it merely provide an avenue and procedure for parties to such agreement to explore amicable means of settling their disputes through arbitration before resorting to litigation.[47] Therefore section 20 of AJA cannot be reasonably held to generate the heat of ouster of jurisdiction of the court[48]

It is submitted that the court while construing documents in dispute is duty bound to carefully construe the content of a document or contract by discovering the intention and contemplation of the parties and not to import into a contract extraneous ideasthat is not only envisaged by parties but also not potent on the face of the document.[49] Thus the main duty of acourt is to interpret a contract by giving effect to the wishes of the parties. In the case of*Nika Fishing Co. Ltd. v. Lavina Cooperation*,[50]the Supreme Court Per Niki Tobi JSC noted that the refusal of stay of proceedings by the two lower courts cannot be supported by evidence on record and held as follows in granting the application for stay of proceedings albeit on jurisdictional clause contained in the agreement of the parties:

[44] FHC/L/CS/974/2007
[45] Egede, above note 11
[46] Olorunfemi, above note 2, p.317
[47] *Ibid*
[48] Id at p. 320. See also Per Uwaifor JCA and Achike JCA (as they then were) in *The Owners of the M. V. Lupex v. Nigerian Overseas Chartering &Shiping Ltd.* (1993-1995) N.S.C. 182 at pp. 374 386 respectively
[49] *Amadi v. Thomas Apline and Co. Ltd.* (1972) 7 NSCC 262; *Nika Fishing Co. Ltd. v. Lavina Cooperation* (2008) 16 NWLR (Pt.1114) 509 at p.542
[50] (2008) 16 NWLR (Pt.1114) 509 at p.543- 544 B-A

> It is the law that parties to an agreement retain the commercial freedom to determine their own terms. Not other person. Not even the court, can determine the terms of contract between parties thereto. The duty of the court is to strictly interpret the terms of the agreement on its clear wordings....What the two courts did was clearly not borne out from the record, it is clear to me from what the two courts said in refusing the application for stay of proceedings that they allowed themselves to be governed by sentiments; and sentiments cannot be legal basis for refusing application for stay.... It is a matter of legal principles and not one of sentiment or patriotism that the matter should be tried in Nigeria and not in Argentina.

Therefore, where a contract specifically provides for arbitration or venue of arbitration, courts are bound to give effect to the contract by construing it without ado or any form of sentiment.

Interestingly, in *Onward Enterprises Limited v. M.V. Matrix &Ors*[51], the defendant/applicant, having secured the plaintiffs claim at the trial court, brought a motion under section 5 of the ACA for an order to stay further proceedings and referring the dispute to arbitration in London as agreed by the parties. The plaintiff contended, relying on *Sonnar v.Nodwind*[52] that a stay wouldpermanently deny him (the plaintiff)of any redress as the dispute was already time barred in London. Abdullahi Mustapha, C.J (as he then was) demonstrated a commendable knowledge of admiralty law.[53].He held that:

> To my mind the question of denying the plaintiff permanently of remedy in the instant case does not arise. As pointed out, this case is not a foreign jurisdiction case but an arbitration clause one. The defendants have conceded to the jurisdiction of this court and are not trying to oust it. If this case is stayed on the

[51](2010) 2 NWLR (Pt. 1179) p. 530 at 551

[52] (1987) Vol 3 Nigeria Shipping Cases p.175 in "Admiralty Jurisdiction, Beneficial Ownership of Vessels, Arrest of Vessels" contribution by Matrix solicitors in Legal Newsletter Overview (August 2003)http://matrixsolicitors.com/publicationslist.asp?pubid=6 (accessed on 20 March 2012).

[53]Egede, above note 11.

> condition that the security posted by the defendants be retained to abide by any order that the arbitrator may make, the plaintiff cannot be said to be permanently deprived of remedy.

Aggrieved, the appellant submitted the matter to the Court of Appeal for further consideration in *Onward Enterprises Limited v. M.V. Matrix &Ors*[54]and the sole issue before the Court of Appeal was whether the trial judge was right when he ordered a stay of proceedings at the trial court pending reference to arbitration in London. Happily, the respondent's counsel referred the court to section 20 of the AJA[55] . In resolving the issue, AdziraGanaMshella, JCA who delivered the lead judgment of the Court of Appeal held after evaluating the decision in *M.V. Panormos*state expressly that the attention of the Court of Appeal was not called to the case of *M. V. Lupex v. N. O. C & S Ltd* where the Supreme court upheld the right of parties for the enforcement of express agreement contained in their agreement to refer their dispute to arbitration and as such , *"it behoves the court to lean towards ordering a stay of proceedings"* for parties to resort to arbitration.[56]

By this decision, it is clear that stay of proceedings could be granted pending reference to arbitration in a foreign country in deserving cases. Once an arbitration clause is retained in a contract which is valid and the dispute is within the contemplation of the clause, the court should give regard to the contract by enforcing the arbitration clause.

The Court in the above case[57] further observed that, quite rightly, section20 of the AJA was not discussed in the *Lupex* case and acknowledged that, ordinarily, the Court of Appeal is bound by its earlier decision or is at best free to pick and choose between two conflicting decisions, the one that appears to it to be correct.[58] However, where a decision of the Court of Appeal, although, not expressly overruled, cannot stand with a decision of the Supreme

[54]Above note 43

[55] Now Admiralty Jurisdiction Act Cap A5, LFN 2004.

[56]*Onward Enterprises Limited v. M.V. Matrix & Ors* above note 43.

[57]*Ibid.*

[58]*N. E. P. A. v. Onah*(1997) 1 NWLR (Pt. 484) 680 at 689

Court (as in this case) the lower court or a court of coordinate jurisdiction is entitled to refuse to follow it.[59]

It is therefore expected that stakeholders in the field of admiralty and maritime arbitration will welcome the decision in the *M.v.Matrix* as timely and legal rebranding of our law relating to maritime transactions and agreements, which in their nature are mostly transnational.[60]

5. Conclusion

The article examines the effect of section 20 of the AJA on arbitration agreements showing how Nigerian courts have held maritime arbitration agreements nulland void merely because it contains arbitral clauses which according to them, tend to usurp their powers.The cases considered illustrates the dichotomy between the application of the principle of *pactasuntservanda* and the application by state courts of legislation and principles pertaining to the enforcement of foreign arbitration clauses.[61]This in our opinion highlights the ultimate conflict between the jurisdictional and contractual perspective of arbitration. This article notes thatthere is an inadvertent effort to subject maritime arbitration totally to the control of the state based on the provision of section 20 AJA against the will of the parties and contrary to the principle of freedom of contract.

Maritime arbitration is no doubt international and transnational in nature and they must therefore be recognized and given proper effect to in our courts since parties are bound by the conditions and terms in a contract they freely entered into.[62]Contractual agreements which have neither been fraudulently or illegally

[59]*Disu v. Ajilowura* (2001) 4 NWLR (Pt.702) Pp. 72 and 91; *CamptelInteâlspa v. Devson Ltd* (1996) 7 NWLR(Pt. 459) 170 at 184

[60]Egede , above note 11.

[61]Rhodes –Vivour, above note 26, p. 5.

[62]F. Oditan, "Emerging Trends In The Enforcement Of Maritime Arbitration Awards And ADR Settlements" A paper presented at the IMASA/MA, Aseminar on Promoting Maritime Administration and Alternative Dispute Resolution in the West and Central African Sub-Region held at the Federal Palace Hotel, Victoria Island, Lagos on 28 April 2010. p.13.

entered into by parties must in all respects be observed and enforced by the courts.[63]The general tendency is for our courts to "guard jealously" their jurisdiction and to refuse to accede to requests for stay of Nigerian proceedings in favour of foreign proceedings merely because foreign law or fora are chosen as the proper law of the arbitration agreement. This should not be so, where there is a contract regulating any arrangement between the parties, the main duty of the court is to interpret that contract and give effect to the wishes of the parties to the contract.[64]

Proper judicial interpretation is essential to ensure that the growth and sustainability of maritime arbitration is secured in Nigeria. Sections 2 and 4 of the ACA give parties the right to enter arbitrationagreement and sections 4 and 5 of the same Act give them a right to apply to stay proceedings where there is dispute pending reference to arbitration. Section 20 of the AJA however nullifies any agreement by any person or party to any cause, matter or action which seeks to oust the jurisdiction of the Federal High Court if it relates to any admiralty matter falling under the Act including matters falling under any convention to which Nigeria is a party. The provision of section 20 of AJA in our humble opinion negates the principle of freedom of contract. Parties to an agreement retain the freedom to determine their own terms. No other person or court can determine the terms of contract between or among the parties thereto. Therefore, section 20 of AJA must be read in conjunction with section 10 of the Act to have a clear intention of the legislature more so when the law is that contents of a statute must be read and interpreted together by courts in the course of its interpretation.

[63]*Nika Fishing Co. Ltd. v. Lavina Cooperation* (2008) 16 NWLR (Pt.1114) 509 at P.542 E; *Dragetanos Const. (Nig.) Ltd. v. Fab Madis Ventures Ltd.* (2011) 16 NWLR (Pt.1273) 308 at P. 353 D-F; *AG Nasarawa State v. A G Plateau State*, above note 4.

[64]*Oduye v. Airway Ltd.* (1987)2 NWLR (Pt.55)126; *AG Nasarawa State v. A G Plateau State*, above note 4.

The duty of the court is to strictly interpret the terms of the agreement in clear wordings.[65] It is submitted most humbly that it is not the function of the court of law or that of the state statute under whatever guise to make agreements for the parties or change the agreements as made by them.[66]

Obviously, dispute resolution and maritime arbitration raisesimportant questions forpolicy development inthemaritime sector. Though there are no universal answers,international best practicesin maritime law is preferredandrecommended againstdogmatic municipal policy, which is not based on considerations reasonably reflected in contractual international norms and expectations of parties.

The Federal High Court and the Court of Appeal's decisions in the case of *Onward Enterprises Limited v. M.V. Matrix &4 Ors.* are commendable and a welcome development in the sphere of maritime arbitration jurisprudence in Nigeria because it reflects the essence and binding nature of arbitral agreements between parties and the need for national courts to give effect to same in order to promote commercial transactions between parties to foreign or international arbitral agreements in Nigeria.

[65] *Nimanteks Associates v. Marco Construction Company Limited* (1991) 2 NWLR (Pt.174)411. See also *Dragetanos Const. (Nig.) Ltd. v. Fab Madis Ventures Ltd.*, above note 55, p. 354 para d- e.

[66] *African Reinsurance Corporation v. Fanteye* (1986) 1 NWLR (Pt.14) 133.