

Volume 36, No. 2, 2018

ASA Bulletin

Founder: Prof. Pierre Lalive
Editor in Chief: Matthias Scherer



Association Suisse de l'Arbitrage
Schweiz. Vereinigung für Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit
Associazione Svizzera per l'Arbitrato
Swiss Arbitration Association

ASA BULLETIN

Founder: Professor Pierre LALIVE

Editor in Chief: Matthias SCHERER

Published by:

Kluwer Law International

PO Box 316

2400 AH Alphen aan den Rijn

The Netherlands

e-mail: lr-sales@wolterskluwer.com

Aims & Scope

Switzerland is generally regarded as one of the World's leading place for arbitration proceedings. The membership of the Swiss Arbitration Association (ASA) is graced by many of the world's best-known arbitration practitioners. The Statistical Report of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) has repeatedly ranked Switzerland first for place of arbitration, origin of arbitrators and applicable law.

The ASA Bulletin is the official quarterly journal of this prestigious association. Since its inception in 1983 the Bulletin has carved a unique niche with its focus on arbitration case law and practice worldwide as well as its judicious selection of scholarly and practical writing in the field. Its regular contents include:

- Articles
- Leading cases of the Swiss Federal Supreme Court
- Leading cases of other Swiss Courts
- Selected landmark cases from foreign jurisdictions worldwide
- Arbitral awards and orders under various auspices including ICC, ICSID and the Swiss Chambers of Commerce ("Swiss Rules")
- Notices of publications and reviews

Each case and article is usually published in its original language with a comprehensive head note in English, French and German.

Books and journals for Review

Books related to the topics discussed in the Bulletin may be sent for review to the Editor (Matthias Scherer, LALIVE, P.O. Box 6569, 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland).

ASA Board

Association Suisse de l'Arbitrage/Schweizerische Vereinigung für Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit/Associazione Svizzera per l'Arbitrato/Swiss Arbitration Association

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Elliott GEISINGER, President, Geneva
Dr Bernhard BERGER, Vice President, Bern
Dr Bernhard F. MEYER, Vice President, Zurich
Felix DASSER, Member, Zurich
Christoph MÜLLER, Member, Neuchâtel

MEMBERS OF THE ASA BOARD

Sébastien BESSON, Geneva – Harold FREY, Zurich –
Isabelle HAUTOT, Paris – Michael HWANG, Singapore –
Nadja JAISLI KULL, Zurich – François KAISER, Lausanne –
Pierre MAYER, Paris – Andrea MEIER, Zurich –
Andrea MENAKER, New York – Gabrielle NATER-BASS, Zurich –
Christian OETIKER, Basel – Yoshimi OHARA, Tokyo –
Paolo Michele PATOCCHI, Geneva – Henry PETER, Lugano –
Wolfgang PETER, Geneva – Franz T. SCHWARZ, London –
Anke SESSLER, Frankfurt – Frank SPOORENBERG, Geneva –
Nathalie VOSER, Zurich

HONORARY PRESIDENTS

Dr Marc BLESSING, Zurich – Dr Pierre A. KARRER, Zurich –
Prof. Dr Gabrielle KAUFMANN-KOHLER, Geneva –
Michael E. SCHNEIDER, Geneva – Dr Markus WIRTH, Zurich

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENT

Prof. François KNOEPFLER, Cortaillod

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Alexander MCLIN, Geneva

ASA Secretariat

4, Boulevard du Théâtre, P.O.Box 5429, CH-1204 Geneva,
Tel.: ++41 22 310 74 30, Fax: ++41 22 310 37 31;
info@arbitration-ch.org, www.arbitration-ch.org

FOUNDER OF THE ASA BULLETIN

Prof. Pierre LALIVE

ADVISORY BOARD

Prof. Piero BERNARDINI – Dr Matthieu DE BOISSESON –
Prof. Dr Franz KELLERHALS – Prof. François KNOEPFLER –
Prof. François PERRET – Prof. Pierre TERCIER – V.V. VEEDER QC. –
Dr Werner WENGER

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor in Chief

Matthias SCHERER

Editors

Dr Philipp HABEGGER – Dr Cesare JERMINI –
Dr Bernhard BERGER – Catherine A. KUNZ –
Dr Johannes LANDBRECHT

EDITORIAL COORDINATOR

Angelika KOLB-FICHTLER

CORRESPONDENCE

ASA Bulletin

Matthias SCHERER

Rue de la Mairie 35, CP 6569, CH-1211 Genève 6

Tel: +41 22 319 87 00 – Fax: +41 22 319 87 60

mscherer@lalive.ch

(For address changes please contact
info@arbitration-ch.org/tel +41 22 310 74 30)

Published by Kluwer Law International
P.O. Box 316
2400 AH Alphen aan den Rijn
The Netherlands

Sold and distributed in North, Central
and South America by Aspen
Publishers, Inc.
7201 McKinney Circle
Frederick, MD 21704
United States of America

Sold and distributed in all other countries
by Air Business Subscriptions
Rockwood House
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 3DH
United Kingdom
Email: international-customerservice@wolterskluwer.com

ISSN 1010-9153

© 2018, Association Suisse de l'Arbitrage
(in co-operation with Kluwer Law International, The Netherlands)

This journal should be cited as ASA Bull. 2/2018

The ASA Bulletin is published four times per year.
Subscription prices for 2018 [Volume 36, Numbers 1 through 4] including postage
and handling: 2018 Print Subscription Price Starting at EUR 353/ USD 468/ GBP 259.

This journal is also available online at www.kluwerlawonline.com.
Sample copies and other information are available at Irus.wolterskluwer.com

For further information please contact our sales department
at +31 (0) 172 641562 or at international-sales@wolterskluwer.com.

For Marketing Opportunities please contact international-marketing@wolterskluwer.com

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval
system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying,
recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright owner.
More information can be found at:
Irus.wolterskluwer.com/policies/permissions-reprints-and-licensing.

Printed on acid-free paper

Swiss Federal Supreme Court Confirms Independence of CAS

Note on Decision 4A_260/2017¹ of 20 February 2018

CAROLINE DOS SANTOS²

Introduction

In recent years, the validity of Third Party Ownership agreements (“TPO”) has been a hot topic in the football community. Under such agreements, a club transfers, totally or partially, a player’s economic rights to a third-party in return for a financial counterpart to the club. This entails the dissociation of players’ federative rights (which consist in the possibility of having the player participate in competitions) and its economic rights (which are the rights to obtain proceeds from their transfer). Such practices have been tracked by the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (“FIFA”) in order to limit the influence of actors outside the football world and prevent third-parties from acquiring ownership of players’ economic rights. In this context, Articles 18 *bis* and 18 *ter* of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (“RSTP”) were adopted, enabling FIFA to sanction the conclusion of such contracts – which have been on the rise in recent times.

In its decision 4A_260/2017 of 20 February 2018, the Swiss Supreme Court examined two important issues. The first, concerns the independence of the Court of Arbitration for Sports (the “CAS”). The *Lazutina* decision,³ in 2003, had already ruled on this issue. This new case strengthens the Supreme Court’s previous finding. The second concerns the recently adopted – and controversial – FIFA regulations banning TPO agreements.

Factual background

This case relates to a sports arbitration between RFC Seraing, a Belgian third division football club, (the “Club”) and FIFA with regards to a TPO agreement. In July 2015, the Club was accused of having concluded

¹ ASA Bull. 2/2018, p. 406.

² Lawyer, Lalive.

³ Supreme Court Decision 4P.267/2002 (129 III 445), ASA Bull. 3/2003, p. 601.

TPO-type agreements regarding several players in violation of FIFA's RSTP. After initiating a disciplinary procedure, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee sanctioned the Club, banning it from registering players at a national and international level for the next four transfer periods and imposing a fine of CHF 150'000, in accordance with Articles 18 *bis* and *ter* of the RSTP. The FIFA Appeal Committee confirmed this decision in 2016, which led the Club to file an appeal with the CAS. The CAS upheld this decision, in March 2017, reducing the ban from four to three months but confirming the rest of the decision.⁴

Ultimately, a challenge was brought by the Club to the Supreme Court seeking the annulment of the award which, as examined below, was finally rejected.

Decision of the Supreme Court

Pursuant to Article 75 of the Swiss Civil Code ("CC") any member of an association who has not consented to a resolution which infringes the law or the articles of association is legally entitled to challenge such resolution before an independent tribunal. According to case law, such tribunal may be an arbitral tribunal – such as the CAS – as long as it acts as a judicial authority. The Supreme Court first considered whether the challenge was inadmissible on grounds of estoppel (*venire contra factum proprium*) as the Club had lodged an appeal with the CAS while at the same time denying that the CAS was a proper arbitral tribunal; finally, the Supreme Court accepted to hear the case.

The first argument raised by the Club related to the independence of the CAS. The Club argued that the award was not rendered by a proper tribunal ("*un véritable tribunal*") and therefore should be annulled on the ground of Article 190 al. 2 lit. a of the Swiss Private International Law Act ("PILA"). According to the Club, the *Lazutina* case only concerned the relationship between the CAS and the International Olympic Committee ("IOC") and therefore the relationship between the CAS and FIFA – described by the Club as a *mafia* ("*une organisation mafieuse*") – had never been examined. Essentially, the Club argued that FIFA is the CAS's "biggest client" in terms of "business volume" which would make the CAS a dependent institution. Additionally, it was the Club's contention that the CAS's funding method (i.e. financial contributions made by the sports

⁴ CAS 2016/A/4490.

federations to fund the CAS's budget) would only reinforce its dependence from FIFA given the latter's large contributions. Against this background, the CAS would be in no position to be independent in cases involving FIFA. Furthermore, arbitrators – unlike national judges – would suffer direct financial consequences from a reduction in the caseload guaranteed by FIFA, inducing them to favour this federation in disputes involving it.

The Supreme Court confirmed its previous decisions as to this issue, by following its own precedent, in the leading case *Lazutina*. Essentially, the Supreme Court found there was no reason to revisit its jurisprudence, observing that FIFA's contribution to the CAS was less than 10% of the total budget, thus dismissing the Club's argument. The Supreme Court further rejected the Club's argument that arbitrators would be influenced by financial concerns when dealing with cases involving FIFA.

The Club then made the complaint that his right to be heard was violated during the hearing that had taken place on 17 October 2016. This grievance was dismissed by the Supreme Court which emphasized once again that any alleged violation of the right to be heard must be raised immediately and that failure to do so will cure the violation and render the award unchallengeable, on this ground, before the Supreme Court. That said, the Supreme Court went on to add that, with regards to the alleged violation, the Chairman only directed the proceedings just as he was supposed to.

Last but not least, the Club formulated a grievance based on Article 190 al. 2 lit. e PILA, arguing that the award was against public policy as it went against competition law. After recalling its restrictive jurisprudence in the matter, the Supreme Court, citing the *Tensacciai* case,⁵ pointed out that competition law was not part of Swiss public policy.

Basing its argument on a prior case where a TPO agreement had been considered as lawful under Swiss law by the Supreme Court,⁶ the Club further submitted that the present decision would violate public policy by putting “out of business” (“*hors commerce*”) a perfectly lawful activity. The Supreme Court found that decision 4A_116/2016 had been rendered in a very different context from the one in this case. First, the player's interest and the investor's interests were identical, which was not the circumstance in the present case. Second, decision 4A_116/2016 had been rendered when FIFA's

⁵ Supreme Court Decision 4P.278/2005 (132 III 389), ASA Bull. 3/2006, p. 521. See also Philipp LANDOLT, *Commentaire sur: Ière Cour civile, arrêt du 8 mars 2006, 4P.278/2005*, ASA Bull. 3/2006, p. 535.

⁶ Supreme Court Decision 4A_116/2016.

regulation banning TPO agreement was not in force yet. Third, the Supreme Court had not focused on judging the TPO system, *per se*. For these reasons, the two cases were not comparable and therefore the Supreme Court rejected the argument.

Furthermore, the Club argued that clubs, as their indirect members, were in a contractual relationship with federations. By virtue of this contractual relationship and in accordance with FIFA's regulation, clubs were being prohibited from concluding TPO agreements. By prohibiting the recourse to TPO agreements *via* its regulation, FIFA was restricting the clubs' freedom in violation of Article 27 (2) CC, and as such was violating public policy. The Supreme Court considered the grievance unfounded, emphasizing that not every violation of Article 27 CC would be tantamount to a violation of public policy.

In its last argument, the Club asserted that the sanction was disproportionate and therefore contrary to public policy; in particular, the Club argued that the sanction jeopardized its right to economic development and therefore its very existence and that such a sanction should have been considered unlawful and the decision annulled. The Supreme Court determined that the grievance was unfounded, indicating it was not for the court to revisit the sanction itself or to review the findings of fact.

In view of the above, the Supreme Court rejected the annulment request, reaffirming once again the independence of the CAS.

Conclusion

Although this decision has remained slightly in the shadows, it represents an important victory not only for the CAS but for FIFA as well.

Although the independence of the CAS as an institution has already been established in the *Lazutina* case, this case is noteworthy as it is the first to examine the relationship between the CAS and FIFA. The Supreme Court upholds the CAS as a structurally independent institution, confirming it is independent from international federations, including FIFA. More importantly, the Supreme Court confirms that the CAS is financially independent, therefore validating its funding scheme. By doing so, the Supreme Court emphasizes that CAS's funding method does not necessarily lead to a dependent relationship with its funders. In any case, as pointed out by the Supreme Court, another financial method would be hardly conceivable. Requesting the athletes to contribute would bar them from

reaching the CAS thus preventing them an access to justice and harming them. This decision, alongside the *Gundel*⁷ decision, the *Lazutina* decision, and the *Pechstein*⁸ decision issued by the German *Bundesgerichtshof*, contributes to shape a consistent *corpus* of case law in the field.

This decision is also an important win for FIFA which, in the midst of a controversial *saga* around the ban of TPO agreements, sees its regulation upheld both by the CAS and the Swiss Supreme Court, thus strengthening its application in the future. Whereas pending procedures involving TPO contracts are taking place in different jurisdictions in Europe, a decision rendered by the Swiss Supreme Court certainly holds a certain weight. Moreover, this decision confirms the Supreme Court's interpretation of Article 27 CC with relation to TPO agreements. While it admits that FIFA's regulation restricts the clubs' economic freedom, it concludes that such agreements do not suppress it, thus not resulting in a violation of the Swiss public policy.

It is however important to mention that the validity of Article 18 *ter* of the RSTP under EU competition law is being reviewed by the Belgian Courts. Such decision, should it consider the ban of TPO contracts to be against EU competition law, could well have an impact on the CAS' and the Supreme Court's future decisions on TPO agreements.

⁷ *Gundel v. Fédération Equestre Internationale*, Supreme Court Decision 119 II 271, ASA Bull. 3/1993, p. 398.

⁸ *Bundesgerichtshof, Az. KZR 6/15, Pechstein v. International Skating Union (ISU)*, 7 June 2016.

Submission of Manuscripts

Manuscripts and related correspondence should be sent to the Editor. At the time the manuscript is submitted, written assurance must be given that the article has not been published, submitted, or accepted elsewhere. The author will be notified of acceptance, rejection or need for revision within eight to twelve weeks. Manuscripts may be drafted in German, French, Italian or English. They should be submitted by e-mail to the Editor (**mscherer@lalive.ch**) and may range from 3,000 to 8,000 words, together with a summary of the contents in English language (max. ½ page). The author should submit biographical data, including his or her current affiliation.

Aims & Scope

Switzerland is generally regarded as one of the World's leading place for arbitration proceedings. The membership of the Swiss Arbitration Association (ASA) is graced by many of the world's best-known arbitration practitioners. The Statistical Report of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) has repeatedly ranked Switzerland first for place of arbitration, origin of arbitrators and applicable law.

The ASA Bulletin is the official quarterly journal of this prestigious association. Since its inception in 1983 the Bulletin has carved a unique niche with its focus on arbitration case law and practice worldwide as well as its judicious selection of scholarly and practical writing in the field. Its regular contents include:

- Articles
- Leading cases of the Swiss Federal Supreme Court
- Leading cases of other Swiss Courts
- Selected landmark cases from foreign jurisdictions worldwide
- Arbitral awards and orders under various auspices including the ICC and the Swiss Chambers of Commerce ("Swiss Rules")
- Notices of publications and reviews

Each case and article is usually published in its original language with a comprehensive head note in English, French and German.

Books and Journals for Review

Books related to the topics discussed in the Bulletin may be sent for review to the Editor in Chief (**Matthias SCHERER, LALIVE, P.O.Box 6569, 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland**).