

## Stephen Houseman KC – Anti-Suit & Arbitration Injunctions

Stephen has unrivalled expertise in seeking and defending jurisdictional injunctions, especially anti-suit relief concerning potential, pending or concluded arbitrations. He is described in *Chambers Bar UK 2025* as the “go-to man for anti-suit injunctions” / “second-to-none on legally heavy work such as anti-suit injunctions”. “For anti-suit injunctions and jurisdictional issues, there’s no one better at the bar”, according to another market commentator.

Stephen’s experience in this specialist field dates back to *Society of Lloyd’s v. White* in 1999-2000. He has since acted and advised in over 30 such matters with several live instructions at any given point in time.

A number of these anti-suit cases (‘ASI’ for short) are considered to be leading authorities in specific areas, for example: arbitrability of foreign insolvency claims (*Nori Holdings / RiverRock Securities*); vexatious collusion between participants in foreign litigation (*Russian Machines / BNP Paribas*) (see [note](#) entitled “Arbitration Agreements & Collusive Litigation” published in March 2020); exclusive curial/challenge jurisdiction arising from choice of English seat (*C v. D*); and, more recently, the tests for non-contractual coercive remedies (*Magomedov*) and post-judgment anti-enforcement injunctions (*Google*).

These cases often involve ancillary issues, such as service of upon foreign defendants, the position of non-arbitrating or non-contracting parties, ascertaining the governing law of an arbitration agreement, expedition and urgency. Remedial variants include anti-anti-suit (AASI), anti-anti-anti-suit (AAASI), anti-arbitration (AAI) and pre- or post-judgment/award anti-enforcement (AEI) injunctions on a threatened or pending basis. Most cases involve foreign law elements, including aspects of the procedural or remedial law and practice of a foreign court system. Stephen was described over 15 years ago as having “a profound understanding of not only the law of this country but also that of many others” (**Chambers & Partners, UK Bar 2009**).

Stephen represented the claimant in *UniCredit Bank v. RusChemAlliance* which is the leading ‘foreign seat’ case heard and decided by the Supreme Court in April 2024 with judgment following [2024] 3 WLR 659 and since named ‘**Most Important Decision of the Year**’ at the GAR Awards in Paris in March 2025: see [note](#) entitled “Anti-suit relief & foreign-seat arbitration” published in September 2023. This and other recent cases (e.g. *Magomedov* & *Google*) involve the assertion of exclusive jurisdiction and grant of coercive remedies by the Russian courts in response to international sanctions regimes, pursuant to powers contained in Articles 248.1 & 248.2 of the Arbitrazh Procedural Code (APC). Stephen was asked to moderate a panel on such disputes at Linklaters during LIDW in June 2025.

Cases involving choice of arbitration fall into the three broad categories, with some non-arbitration cases comprised within [2] below for convenience. Details are anonymized where appropriate.

## [1] Post-Award Injunctions

*Noble Assurance Co & another v. Gerling-Konzern* [2008] Lloyd's Rep IR 1; [2007] 1 CLC 85 (Toulson LJ) – Acted for Shell and its captive insurer, Noble. Proceedings commenced by reinsurers in Vermont seeking to set aside an award in London arbitration (Bermuda Form). Declaratory relief as to the meaning and effect of award granted in favour of both claimants, i.e. the arbitrating party (Noble) and also its parent company (Shell); ASI relief refused on discretionary grounds, including international comity. Instructed by **Fulbright & Jaworski International** (now Norton Rose Fulbright).

*C v. D* [2008] 1 All ER (Comm) 1001; [2008] 1 Lloyd's Rep 239 (CA) – Acted for major pharmaceutical company (insured). Proceedings in New York threatened by insurers by way of attack upon finality of arbitral award made in London (Bermuda Form). Together with the subsequent Court of Appeal decision in *Sulamérica* (see under [2] below), and as discussed by the Supreme Court in *Enka v. Chubb* in 2020, *C v. D* was one of the leading authorities on ascertaining the proper law of an English seat arbitration agreement. Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

## [2] Pre-Arbitration or Pre-Award Injunctions

*Sulamérica Cia Nacional v. Enesa Engenharia SA* [2013] 1 WLR 102; [2012] 2 All ER (Comm) 795; [2012] 1 Lloyd's Rep 671 (CA) – Acted for local insurers in reinsurance-led all risks programme covering construction of hydroelectric facility in Brazil. ASI relief granted to restrain proceedings (including for interim anti-arbitration relief) in Brazilian courts. CA decision became the leading authority on ascertainment of the proper law of an (English seat) arbitration agreement contained within a substantive contract with an express choice of foreign law. (First instance decision of Cooke J is reported at [2012] 1 Lloyd's Rep 275.) The decision in *Sulamérica* has been the subject of published academic and practitioner analysis, and featured heavily in the analysis of the Court of Appeal and Supreme Court in *Enka v. Chubb* during 2020. Instructed by **Clyde & Co**.

*Joint Stock Asset Management Co Ingosstrakh-Investments v. BNP Paribas SA* [2012] 1 Lloyd's Rep 649; [2012] 2 CLC 312 (CA) – Acted for major bank seeking ASI (different forms, mandatory & negative, including 'anti-avoidance' injunctions) against six associated corporate defendants on both contractual and non-contractual grounds, including vexatious collusion/conspiracy. Underlying Russian proceedings reached cassation appeal. Jurisdiction and service-related issues, including service by alternative method upon foreign defendants. (First instance decision known as *Russian Machines* is reported at [2012] 1 Lloyd's Rep 61; [2011] 2 CLC 942; [2011] Arb LR 49; plus decision on deemed retrospective service [2012] EWHC 1023 (Comm).) Instructed by **Clifford Chance**.

*Financing Dispute / Ukrainian Proceedings (Anonymous) (2012-2013)* – Acted on behalf of claimants obtaining urgent parallel ASI relief, i.e. from both LCIA tribunal and Commercial Court on the same day, to restrain pursuit of proceedings brought unlawfully by defendant in

the Ukrainian Courts. Underlying dispute concerned escrow regime for retention monies following an asset sale and purchase. Simon J (as he then was) granted an interim order pursuant to s.44(3) of the 1996 Act / s.37 SCA 1981 against both the contracting (arbitrating) party and non-contracting (non-arbitrating) party, involving shareholder / subsidiary context. Instructed by **Baker & McKenzie**.

*International Finance Corporation & another v. Quantum Oil Terminals Ltd (2017-2018)* – Acted for injunction claimants, subsidiaries of the World Bank and OPEC, in ASI proceedings against a foreign defendant in respect of Ghanaian proceedings commenced after termination of development loans. ASI relief granted by Andrew Baker J (March 2017) and Robin Knowles J (December 2017) including in the face of AASI and AAI relief threatened/obtained by defendant. Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*Nori Holdings Ltd & others v. Bank Otkritie Financial Corp* [2018] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 80, [2018] 2 All ER (Comm) 1009 – Acted for Russian bank (injunction defendant) resisting ASI relief sought by claimant companies in respect of Cypriot proceedings and Russian proceedings, respectively. Males J (as he then was) granted ASI relief in respect of Russian proceedings on the basis that insolvency-related claims were arbitrable; but refused ASI relief in respect of Cypriot proceedings on the basis of *West Tankers* decision of CJEU. Instructed by **Stephoe & Johnson**.

*Perkins Engines Co Ltd v. Ghaddar* [2018] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 197, [2019] 1 All ER (Comm) 371 – Acted for injunction defendants resisting ASI relief in respect of Lebanese proceedings commenced by them against a machinery supplier (Perkins) after termination of distribution agreement. Bryan J granted ASI relief, based on the proper meaning and effect of the conditional arbitration agreement in the parties' contract and reciprocal enforcement procedures in UK and Lebanon. Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*Aqaba Container Terminal Co v. Soletanche Bachy France SAS* [2019] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 431 – Acted for injunction claimant (ACT) seeking ASI relief against counterparty who commenced proceedings in The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan seeking nullification of the parties' construction contract on constitutional grounds. ASI granted without notice by Jacobs J (August 2018), continued at contested return date by Moulder J (September 2018) and upheld at trial before Robin Knowles J in December 2018 (judgment handed down in March 2019). Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*Design Copyright Dispute / Ukrainian Proceedings (Anonymous) (2019)* – Acted for injunction claimant (German manufacturer) seeking and obtaining ASI relief against two defendants in respect of proceedings commenced by one of them in the Economic Court in Kyiv asserting copyright in certain designs relating to parts being supplied to the counterparty for installation into a drilling rig in Ukraine. Teare J upheld mandatory and negative ASI relief against both defendants at the return date (May 2019) including on the basis of vexatious collusion between them. Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*Financing Dispute / Russian Proceedings (Anonymous) (2020)* – Acted for potential injunction claimant (UK based securities broker-dealer) in respect of proceedings commenced against it in Moscow Arbitrazh Court by its contractual counterparty (an insolvent Russian bank) and another entity seeking invalidation of accounting reconciliations and arrangements to close out positions under a series of stock-lending, repo-financing and associated securities agreements governed by English law. Analysis involved inference of collusion between defendants who commenced foreign court proceedings to circumvent London arbitration by analogy to *Russian Machines* (see above). Instructed by **Signature Law**.

*RiverRock Securities v. International Bank of St. Petersburg* [2020] EWHC 2483 (Comm); [2020] 2 All E.R. (Comm) 1121; [2020] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 591 – Acted for claimant seeking and obtaining ASI relief against an insolvent Russian bank, acting through its official receiver (DIA), in respect of proceedings before St. Petersburg Arbitrazh Court claiming invalidation of contracts for sale and purchase of credit-linked notes. Contested interim injunction hearing (September 2019) before Foxton J leading to a detailed written judgment examining arbitrability of insolvency claims and role of public policy as a matter of English law, following and applying *Nori Holdings* (above). Final mandatory ASI and AEI relief granted together with indemnity costs by Sir Michael Burton GBE: [2020] EWHC 3324 (Comm). Instructed by **Jones Day**.

*Africa Finance Corporation & others v. Aiteo Eastern C & P Co Ltd* [2022] EWHC 768 (Comm); [2022] 1 CLC 877 – Acted for defendant in ASI proceedings before the Commercial Court in context of counter-injunctive relief granted by Nigerian courts and allegations of contempt of court in both jurisdictions. Issues relating to delay, comity, unclean hands, waiver and submission; plus jurisdiction challenge based on *forum non conveniens* rolled into final relief hearing. Underlying dispute concerns US\$2 billion financing, one involving an optional/asymmetrical arbitration agreement governed by English law and another governed by Nigerian law. ICC arbitration proceedings on foot in parallel. Three day trial in Commercial Court in March 2022 resulting in judgment of Sir Nigel Teare in April 2022. Limited permission to appeal granted by Males LJ in May 2022. Appeal resolved after a related s.67 challenge was dismissed: see judgment of Foxton J [2022] EWHC 2912 (Comm). Instructed by **Stewarts Law & Omnia Strategy**.

*Louis Dreyfus Company Suisse SA v. International Bank of St. Petersburg* [2021] EWHC 1039 (Comm); [2021] Costs L.R. 441 – Acted for claimant who obtained ASI relief in respect of a discrete head of claim introduced into contractual invalidation proceedings by the Russian State Official Receiver (DIA) in the same bankruptcy proceedings in St. Petersburg Arbitrazh Court as considered in *RiverRock* (above). Final relief and indemnity costs granted by Calver J in April 2021. Instructed by **Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe**.

*Zambian Electricity Supply Dispute (Anonymous) / UNCITRAL Arbitrations (2021-2022)* – Acted for arbitral claimants seeking AAI in respect of fresh arbitral proceedings commenced by respondent seeking alternative relief in relation to the same contractual arrangements

covered by pending arbitration. Issues as to abuse of process, implied obligations as to abusive or circumventive or unconscionable conduct on the part of arbitrating parties as a matter of English law. Separate claim for interim payment order pursuant to UNCITRAL Rules. Award issued in January 2022 subject to unsuccessful challenge in Commercial Court (see below). Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*Mining Dispute / Malian Proceedings (Anonymous) (2022)* – Acting for claimant seeking ASI in respect of civil proceedings commenced in late 2021 in the Bamako Commercial Court, Republic of Mali. Fuel Supply Agreement contains an arbitration agreement governed by English law and stipulating Paris seat arbitration under ICC Rules. A separate provision confers non-exclusive jurisdiction on the English Courts. Interim negative ASI granted by Calver J in March 2022. Final relief granted in May 2022. Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*EGF v. HVF & others* [2022] EWHC 2470 (Comm) – Acted on behalf of primary defendants (arbitral claimants / award creditors) in a set of curial challenges by arbitral respondent / award debtor under ss.24, 67 & 68 of the 1996 Act. Allegations of apparent bias and procedural misconduct on the part of the tribunal. Separate challenge to award granting interim payment order pursuant to Article 26 of UNCITRAL Rules. Related to *Zambian AAI* matter described above. Judgment of Andrew Baker J in September 2022 dismissed challenges. Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*Russian Corporate Conspiracy Dispute / BVI Proceedings (Anonymous) (2022-2023)* – Acted for arbitral respondent resisting claim for ASI relief by arbitral claimant in respect of substantive conspiracy proceedings commenced in BVI Court. ASI dismissed on grounds of delay by arbitral tribunal in London in October 2022. Instructed by **Seladore Legal**.

*Insurance Dispute / Ecuadorian Proceedings (Anonymous) (2023)* – Acting for reinsurers in connection with a coverage dispute concerning a damaged pipeline in Ecuador. The jurisdictional perspective arises from the fact that the local policyholder engaged the administrative jurisdiction of the national insurance superintendent and threatened to pursue a claim in the local civil courts under the policy. Instructed by **DAC Beachcroft**.

*UniCredit Bank v. RusChemAlliance* [2024] UKSC 30; [2024] 3 WLR 659 – Acted for the claimant bank seeking final ASI+AEI relief against a Russian entity part-owned by Gazprom. Proceedings were commenced in St. Petersburg Arbitrazh Court pursuant to Art.248.1 APC seeking payment of €450m+ under seven bonds relating to two major construction projects. Robin Knowles J granted interim relief without notice in August 2023. Sir Nigel Teare dismissed the ASI claim for lack of jurisdiction five weeks later: [2023] EWHC 2302 (Comm). The Court of Appeal allowed an expedited appeal in January 2024 and granted final mandatory ASI+AEI relief: [2024] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 350. The Supreme Court heard and dismissed RCA's jurisdictional appeal on an expedited basis in April 2024 and issued its judgment in September 2024. Instructed by **Latham & Watkins**.

*Magomedov & others v. PJSC Transneft & others* [2024] 4 WLR 48 – Acted for claimants seeking temporary AASI and subsequently AEI relief against a defendant state-owned entity (Transneft) which commenced ASI proceedings in Moscow pursuant to Art.248.1 APC whilst also challenging the English Court’s jurisdiction. Foxton J granted temporary or so-called ‘interim interim’ AASI relief on a without notice basis in February 2024 pending the determination of the jurisdiction challenge in the English Court. Bright J heard the substantive return date in May 2024, upholding such interim relief and granting AEI relief in respect of judgments obtained in Moscow in the meantime. This judgment contains a review of authorities relating to non-contractual AASI relief and whether ‘natural forum’ need be shown. Instructed by **Seladore Legal**.

*Infrastructure Dispute / Zanzibari Proceedings (Anonymous) (2024)* – Acted for the defendant in ASI proceedings commenced in February 2024 by a contractual counterparty to infrastructure joint ventures in Tanzania. Interim negative ASI relief granted by Andrew Baker J in February 2024. Substantive return date to be fixed. Issues concerning non-contracting parties and whether appropriate to have proceeded without notice. Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*Financing Dispute / Potential Luxembourg Proceedings (Anonymous) (2024)* – Advised finance parties as to potential pre-emptive coercive options in the context of multi-jurisdictional security arrangements concerning ultimate ownership of a major European football club close to redemption dates under various secured debt issuances and facilities. Instructed by **Quinn Emmanuel**.

*Financing Dispute / Potential Russian Proceedings (Anonymous) (2024)* – Advised a major international bank as to potential pre-emptive coercive options in the context of complex financing and security arrangements with a Russian-domiciled counterparty. This involves potential invocation of Arts.248.1 & 248.2 APC, as considered in *UniCredit* and *Magomedov* (see above) and *Google* (see below). Instructed by **Clifford Chance**.

*Investcom Global Ltd v. PLC Investments Ltd & others* [2024] EWHC 2505 (Comm); [2024] Bus.L.R. 1764 – Acted for claimant in ASI+AEI proceedings in respect of different sets of proceedings brought by associated defendants in Liberia during March-June 2024. Shareholder dispute relating to telecoms and mobile payment services business. ICC arbitration on foot with seat determined by the ICC Court pursuant to Article 18 of the ICC Rules. Interim relief granted by Foxton J on a without notice basis in mid-July, including by reference to vexatious ‘outflanking’ of arbitration agreements in the absence of direct privity between parties. Henshaw J dealt with jurisdiction challenge in September 2024, including effect of designation of foreign seat by ICC Court in the meantime. Instructed by **Skaddens**.

*Share Valuation Dispute / Russian Proceedings (Anonymous) (2024)* – Advised a major professional services business in July 2024 as to potential coercive (including AEI) options in the context of Russian court judgments adverse to their interests arising out of a share valuation

provided during an earlier corporate divestment. Instructed by **Clifford Chance**.

*Google LLC & another v. NAO Tsargrad Media & others* [2025] EWHC 94 (Comm) – Acted for claimants seeking post-judgment AEI+AASI relief against three Russian-domiciled defendants in the context of civil judgments obtained in Moscow which the relevant judgment-creditors seek to enforce against potential group corporate assets in several foreign jurisdictions. Judgment debts stated to be trillions times larger than combined global economic output. Interim relief granted by HHJ Pelling KC in August 2024. An expedited final hearing, including any jurisdiction challenge and set aside application, was heard in November 2024 leading to judgment in early 2025. This judgment contains an extensive review of authorities concerning grant of post-judgment AEI relief and the approach to alleged delay in seeking such relief. It also considers the meaning and effect of Art.248.1 APC in light of the choice of English court jurisdiction contained in YouTube Terms of Service. Henshaw J granted final injunction relief covering steps to enforce judgments against affiliates in foreign jurisdictions. Instructed by **King & Spalding**.

*Contractual Dispute / Potential Israeli Proceedings (Anonymous) (2024)* – Advising parties against whom collateral court proceedings have been threatened by a corporate counterparty in the context of a pending arbitration. Instructed by **Skaddens**.

*Atlas Holdings LLC v. Aviator LLC (2024)* – Acting for the defendant in non-contractual post-judgment AEI proceedings related to a trial judgment of the court in Tblisi, Georgia concerning IP rights over online gaming business. Pending ICC arbitral proceedings between claimant and other parties. Allegations of vexatious collusion by analogy to cases such as *Russian Machines* summarised above. Instructed by **A&O Shearman**.

*UniCredit Bank v. RusChemAlliance* [2025] EWCA Civ 99; [2025] 1 WLR 2321 – Acted for claimant seeking revocation of final ASI+AEI relief granted by Court of Appeal a year earlier in light of mandatory AASI relief obtained by the defendant in St. Petersburg pursuant to Art.248.2 APC. Revocation was ordered pursuant to CPR 3.7 in exceptional circumstances. The judgment considers potential public policy implications of this approach. Instructed by **Latham & Watkins**.

*Shareholder/Settlement Dispute (Anonymous) (Gibraltar Court of Appeal) (2025)* – Acting for claimant seeking ASI relief in respect of a derivative action commenced in the English High Court. Instructed by **TSN Limited (Gibraltar)**.

*Finance/Insolvency Dispute (Anonymous)* – Acting for potential claimant for ASI relief in connection with a financing dispute. Instructed by **A&O Shearman**.

### **[3] Substantive Injunctions**

*Law Debenture Trust Corp v. Elektrim Finance* [2005] 2 All ER 476; [2005] 2 Lloyd's Rep 755

(Mann J) – Acted for major bondholders in pre-emptive proceedings designed to protect proposed arbitration. Decision concerns the interplay of ss.9 & 72 of the 1996 Act, as well as proper construction of a combined jurisdiction and arbitration clause giving one party a unilateral option to select arbitration. Underlying dispute related to default / acceleration under €510m Elektrim bond issue (related HL decision in *Concord Trust v. Law Debenture Trust Corp* [2005] 1 WLR 1591). Instructed by **Bingham McCutcheon**.

*Digicel v. West Indies Cricket Board* (2008) – Acted for Caribbean telecoms company which was exclusive sponsor of West Indies Cricket Team, seeking interim injunction from Commercial Court under s.44(3) of the 1996 Act in order to hold the ring pending expedited arbitration for final relief. Underlying dispute related to the ‘*Stanford ‘20/20 for \$20 million’*’ cricket match held in Antigua on 1 November 2008 (which the England Cricket Team lost...) Instructed by **Jones Day**.

*Telenor East v. Altimio Holdings* [2011] EWHC 735 (Comm); [2011] Arb LR 9 (Gloster J) – Acted for defendant shareholder (Altimio) resisting mandatory interim injunction under s.44(3) of the 1996 Act designed to prevent a proposed strategic merger in the mobile telecoms sector, involving VimpelCom. The merger subsequently completed in April 2011, creating the world’s sixth largest mobile telecoms provider by subscriber numbers at the time. Instructed by **Skaddens**.

*Ouais Group Engineering & Contracting v. Saipem* [2013] EWHC 990 (Comm) (Popplewell J) – Acted for claimant seeking interim prohibitory and mandatory injunctive relief under s.44(3) of the 1996 Act to prevent payment out under a series of on demand guarantees / performance bonds issued by Lebanese banks, against backdrop of pending arbitration in London. Underlying dispute concerned termination of contracts for onshore gas field installation. Instructed by **Addleshaw Goddard**.

*LLP Expulsion / Financial Services Dispute (Anonymous) (2015-2016)* – Acted for LLP members resisting injunctive and other relief sought by an expelled member. LCIA arbitration award, including emergency arbitrator appointment and interim relief. Issues as to good faith and due process in expulsion regime. Instructed by **Addleshaw Goddard**.

*Rafael Advanced Defense Systems v. Mectron Engenharia* [2017] EWHC 597 (Comm) – Acted for intervening party resisting grant of injunctive relief relating to alleged misuse of confidential information in the defence procurement context (Brazilian Air Force). Teare J dismissed the interim injunction. Instructed by **Clifford Chance**.

*Consilient Health Ltd v. Gedeon Richter PLC* [2022] EWHC 1744 (Ch) & [2022] EWHC 1956 (Ch) – Acting on behalf of claimant / award creditor seeking enforcement of a final award issued in The Netherlands, which requires transfer of registered trade marks, marketing



authorisations and associated registration & manufacturing information in respect of long-term pharmaceutical collaboration agreement. Seeking final mandatory injunctive relief and order pursuant to s.39 SCA 1981 for a court officer to sign relevant transfer instrumentation in the event of default by the defendant / award debtor. Recognition and enforcement adjourned pursuant to s.103(5) of the 1996 Act by Miles J in June 2022. Instructed by **Allen & Overy**.

*LLP Expulsion / Financial Services Dispute (Anonymous) (2022-2023)* – Acted for claimant in a dispute about threatened expulsion from LLP. Interim injunction granted by Robin Knowles J in October 2022 pursuant to s.44(3) of the 1996 Act to preserve assets pending potential mediation and arbitration process. Tiered dispute resolution regime. Set aside challenge listed for January 2023 in Commercial Court. Instructed by **White & Case**.

*Energy Assets Sale / Letter of Credit Drawdown Dispute (Anonymous) (2025)* – Acted for arbitral respondent resisting an injunction to prevent drawdown on a letter of credit in respect of post-termination sum following non-completion of a billion dollar energy-related asset sale. An interim injunction was refused by an emergency arbitrator following an urgent hearing held in March 2025. Instructed by **Skaddens**.

*Updated June 2025*