INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS LAW REVIEW
An International Open Access Double Blind Peer Reviewed, Referred Journal

Volume 4 | Issue 3 | 2025 Art. 61

A Critical Study of India's Arbitration Regime: Between Tradition, Transformation and Global Competitiveness

Basil Raju
LLM Student,
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Jyotirmoy Banerjee
Assistant Professor,
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Recommended Citation
Basil Raju and Jyotirmoy Banerjee, *A Critical Study of India's Arbitration Regime: Between Tradition, Transformation and Global Competitiveness*, 4 IJHRLR 868-880 (2025).
Available at www.humanrightlawreview.in/archives/.

A Critical Study of India's Arbitration Regime: Between Tradition, Transformation and Global Competitiveness

Basil Raju
LLM Student,
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Jyotirmoy Banerjee
Assistant Professor,
Amity Law School, Amity University, Bengaluru

Manuscript Received	Manuscript Accepted	Manuscript Published
01 June 2025	04 June 2025	07 June 2025

ABSTRACT

India's arbitration regime has undergone significant evolution, transitioning from a historically rigid legal framework to a more dynamic and globally competitive dispute resolution system. This transformation is driven by the need to attract foreign investment, reduce judicial backlog, and promote ease of doing business. However, the journey has been marked by challenges, including balancing the preservation of traditional dispute resolution mechanisms with the adoption of global best practices. This paper critically examines the evolution of India's arbitration framework, tracing its roots from the Arbitration Act of 1940 to the contemporary Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and subsequent amendments. It explores the influence of judicial interpretations, policy reforms, and legislative advancements that have shaped the current arbitration landscape. The study also highlights the challenges faced by India in achieving global competitiveness, including issues related to judicial intervention, enforcement of awards, procedural delays, and the need for a robust institutional arbitration ecosystem. Despite recent reforms aimed at enhancing procedural efficiency, reducing costs, and ensuring neutrality, India continues to grapple with concerns over arbitrator independence, transparency, and the unpredictability of judicial outcomes. Furthermore, the paper examines the impact of international conventions like the New York Convention and the Singapore Convention on India's arbitration regime, assessing their effectiveness in promoting cross-border dispute resolution. The analysis

also draws comparisons with leading arbitration jurisdictions, such as Singapore, the United Kingdom, and Hong Kong, to identify potential areas of improvement for India. This paper provides a comprehensive evaluation of India's arbitration regime, emphasizing the need for continued reforms to enhance its credibility, efficiency, and global competitiveness, while preserving its unique legal heritage.

KEYWORDS

Arbitration Reform, Dispute Resolution, Judicial Intervention, Global Competitiveness, Institutional Arbitration.

1. INTRODUCTION

Arbitration, as a mechanism for resolving commercial disputes, has become an essential part of the global business environment, offering a faster, more flexible, and cost-effective alternative to traditional court litigation. In India, the journey of arbitration has been both complex and transformative, reflecting the broader challenges and opportunities faced by the country's legal system in adapting to global standards. Historically, India's arbitration framework was rooted in the Arbitration Act of 1940, which, despite its initial promise, proved inadequate in addressing the complexities of modern commercial disputes. This led to the enactment of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, a comprehensive legislation aimed at aligning India's dispute resolution processes with international norms, particularly the UNCITRAL Model Law and the New York Convention[1].

However, despite this progressive legislation, India's arbitration regime has often been criticized for excessive judicial intervention, procedural delays, and a lack of institutional support, which have hindered its competitiveness on the global stage. The country's courts have sometimes adopted an interventionist approach, undermining the core principles of arbitration, such as party autonomy and finality of awards. This judicial oversight, while aimed at ensuring fairness and accountability, has occasionally resulted in prolonged dispute resolution processes, eroding confidence among foreign investors and businesses.

[1] *Arbitration: India's Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 | Legal Service India - Law Articles - Legal Resources*, http://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-15934-arbitration-india-s-arbitration-and-conciliation-act-1996.html (last visited May 13, 2025).

In recent years, India has taken significant steps to modernize its arbitration framework, introducing reforms aimed at reducing court interference, promoting institutional arbitration, and enhancing the speed and efficiency of arbitral proceedings. These changes, including the establishment of dedicated arbitration centres and amendments to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, reflect India's ambition to become a global arbitration hub. This paper critically examines these developments, exploring the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for India's arbitration regime in its quest for global competitiveness.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND TRADITIONAL ARBITRATION IN INDIA

Arbitration as a method of dispute resolution has deep roots in India, tracing back to ancient times when informal methods of settling conflicts were preferred over formal litigation. Historically, Indian society relied on community-based dispute resolution systems, including the Panchayat system, which provided a localized, quick, and cost-effective mechanism for resolving disputes. These early forms of arbitration were deeply embedded in the socio-cultural fabric of Indian villages, where community elders or respected leaders acted as neutral arbitrators, ensuring that justice was delivered based on mutual trust, local customs, and social norms. This approach emphasized consensus, community harmony, and the restoration of relationships, making it well-suited for resolving family, property, and commercial disputes.

With the advent of British colonial rule, India's traditional dispute resolution mechanisms were gradually overshadowed by a more formal and rigid legal system. The British introduced codified laws and established a centralized judiciary, which significantly reduced the role of traditional arbitration[2]. However, the need for a more flexible and efficient dispute resolution system led to the enactment of the Indian Arbitration Act, 1899, which was primarily applicable to the Presidency towns of Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. This Act, inspired by the English Arbitration Act of 1889, marked the first formal attempt to regulate arbitration in India[3].

[2] Aishwarya Kaushiq, *India's Arbitration Overhaul – A Dive Into Key Reforms And Challenges*, Bar and Bench - Indian Legal news (May 5, 2025), https://www.barandbench.com/law-firms/view-point/indias-arbitration-overhaul-a-dive-into-key-reforms-and-challenges.

[3] *Evolution Of Arbitration In India*, https://www.mondaq.com/india/arbitration-dispute-resolution/537190/evolution-of-arbitration-in-india (last visited May 13,

In 1940, the Indian Arbitration Act was enacted, consolidating the earlier legislation and providing a comprehensive framework for arbitration across the country. However, this Act had several limitations, including excessive judicial intervention, procedural delays, and a lack of effective enforcement mechanisms, which significantly hindered the growth of arbitration as a preferred method of dispute resolution[4]. These challenges paved the way for the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which aimed to modernize India's arbitration framework in line with international standards and promote India as a global hub for commercial arbitration.

3. THE ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION ACT, 1996: A TRANSFORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, marks a transformative shift in India's dispute resolution framework, replacing the outdated Arbitration Act of 1940 and aligning the country's arbitration laws with global standards. Drawing inspiration from the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration and the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, the 1996 Act was designed to promote efficiency, reduce judicial intervention, and enhance the enforceability of arbitral awards[5].

This Act include party autonomy, allowing parties to select arbitrators and determine procedural rules, thereby ensuring flexibility in dispute resolution. It also limits judicial interference to specific stages, such as the appointment of arbitrators, setting aside awards, and enforcement, supporting the principle of minimal court intervention. It further provides a robust framework for the recognition and enforcement of both domestic and foreign arbitral awards, incorporating the principles of the New York and Geneva Conventions, which has significantly improved India's attractiveness as an arbitration destination[6].

Additionally, it includes provisions for interim relief, enabling parties to seek urgent protective measures before or during arbitration. This focus on speed, cost efficiency, and

2025).

[4] *THE EVOLUTION OF ARBITRATION LAWS IN INDIA: FROM THE ARBITRATION ACT, OF 1940 TO THE PRESENT - Jus Corpus*, (Nov. 8, 2024), https://www.juscorpus.com/the-evolution-of-arbitration-laws-in-india-from-the-arbitration-act-of-1940-to-the-present/.

[5] *UNCITRAL Model Law | Legal Service India - Law Articles - Legal Resources*, http://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-8878-uncitral-model-law.html (last visited May 13, 2025).

[6] Aishwarya Agrawal, *Enforcement of Foreign Awards in India*, LawBhoomi (Dec. 11, 2023), https://lawbhoomi.com/enforcement-of-foreign-awards-in-india.

finality has helped establish a more reliable and predictable arbitration environment in India, encouraging foreign investment and reducing the burden on the conventional court system. Despite these advances, ongoing reforms and judicial interpretations remain essential for addressing procedural delays, enhancing transparency, and fostering a robust institutional arbitration ecosystem, ensuring India's continued growth as a globally competitive arbitration hub.

4. JUDICIAL TRENDS AND CHALLENGES IN INDIAN ARBITRATION

The Indian judiciary has played a pivotal role in shaping the country's arbitration landscape, balancing the principles of party autonomy and judicial oversight. While the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, was designed to minimize court intervention and promote speedy dispute resolution, the judiciary's approach has evolved significantly over the years, reflecting both progress and persistent challenges.

Indian courts were criticized for their interventionist approach, often setting aside arbitral awards on broad grounds such as "public policy" and "patent illegality." This trend, seen in landmark cases like ONGC v. Saw Pipes Ltd. (2003), expanded the scope for challenging arbitral awards, creating uncertainty for businesses and deterring foreign investors[7]. However, more recent decisions, such as the Supreme Court's ruling in BALCO v. Kaiser Aluminum (2012), marked a positive shift by reaffirming the principle of minimal judicial interference and limiting the applicability of Part I of the 1996 Act to domestic arbitrations. This judgment emphasized party autonomy and upheld the finality of arbitral awards, aligning India's arbitration regime more closely with international standards[8].

Despite these advancements, significant challenges remain. Indian courts continue to grapple with issues related to the enforcement of foreign awards, inconsistent judicial interpretations, and delays in arbitration-related proceedings. The lack of a unified approach across various high courts, coupled with frequent delays in enforcing awards, undermines the core

[7] Rebecca Furtado, *Public Policy And Setting Aside Of Arbitral Awards: A Never-Ending Challenge For Practitioners*, iPleaders (Oct. 25, 2016), https://blog.ipleaders.in/public-policy-setting-aside-arbitral-awards-never-ending-challenge-practitioners/.

[8] *Bharat Aluminium Company v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc., Supreme Court Of India, Judgment, Law, Casemine.Com*, https://www.casemine.com, https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/5790b44be561097e45a4e570 (last visited May 13, 2025).

principles of arbitration. Additionally, concerns about arbitrator independence, transparency, and high costs have raised questions about the effectiveness of India's arbitration framework.

To address these challenges, ongoing judicial reforms are essential. Clear guidelines on the interpretation of "public policy," streamlined enforcement procedures, and greater institutional support are critical for enhancing India's global competitiveness in arbitration. Without such reforms, India risks losing its potential as a leading arbitration hub in the Asia-Pacific region.

5. NOTABLE CASES

A. In the case of *ONGC v. Saw Pipes Ltd.*[9] is a landmark decision that significantly expanded the scope of "public policy" under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. In this case, the Supreme Court of India was asked to decide whether an arbitral award could be set aside on the grounds of public policy. The dispute arose when Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC) challenged an arbitral award favoring Saw Pipes Ltd., arguing that the award was patently illegal and contrary to the fundamental policy of Indian law. The court ruled in favor of ONGC, holding that an arbitral award could be set aside if it was found to be "patently illegal" or in conflict with the "public policy of India." The court broadened the definition of public policy to include not just violations of fundamental legal principles but also errors in the application of the law and the contravention of statutory provisions. This judgment significantly increased the scope for judicial intervention, creating concerns about the finality of arbitral awards and impacting India's attractiveness as an arbitration-friendly jurisdiction.

B. In the case of *Bhatia International v. Bulk Trading SA*[10] and *Venture Global v. Satyam Computer Services*[11] created significant confusion regarding the applicability of Part I of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act to international commercial arbitrations held outside India. In the Bhatia International case, the Supreme Court ruled that Part I of the Act, which contains provisions for interim relief, award enforcement, and challenge mechanisms, would apply to foreign-seated arbitrations unless expressly excluded by the

[9] ONGC v. Saw Pipes Ltd , AIR 2003 SUPREME COURT 2629
[10] Bhatia International v. Bulk Trading SA (2002), AIR 2002 SUPREME COURT 1432
[11] Venture Global v. Satyam Computer Services (2008), AIR 2008 SUPREME COURT 1061.

parties. This interpretation effectively allowed Indian courts to intervene in foreign arbitrations, contradicting the globally accepted principle of minimal judicial interference in international arbitration. This approach was further reinforced in *Venture Global v. Satyam Computer Services*, where the court extended this interpretation, allowing parties to seek interim relief in Indian courts even when the arbitration was seated abroad. These rulings created substantial uncertainty for businesses, as it exposed foreign arbitral proceedings to the risk of extensive judicial scrutiny in India, undermining the efficiency and finality of international arbitration.

C. In response to the confusion created by *Bhatia International and Venture Global*, the Supreme Court revisited the issue in *BALCO v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc.*[12]. This landmark judgment decisively overruled the Bhatia precedent, holding that Part I of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, does not apply to foreign-seated arbitrations, even if the parties have not expressly excluded its application. The court emphasized that the territorial principle, a cornerstone of the UNCITRAL Model Law, should guide the interpretation of the Act. The BALCO ruling restored clarity by confirming that Indian courts have no jurisdiction over foreign-seated arbitrations, thereby reducing judicial interference and aligning Indian arbitration law with international best practices. However, this decision was applied prospectively, meaning it only affected arbitration agreements entered into after the date of the judgment, leading to a temporary period of legal uncertainty for older contracts. Nevertheless, BALCO is widely regarded as a critical step in enhancing the credibility and attractiveness of India as a global arbitration hub, reaffirming the principle of party autonomy and reducing the scope for judicial intervention in international disputes.

6. MAJOR ARBITRATION REFORMS IN INDIA

6.1 The 2015 Amendment Act

The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015, marked a significant step in modernizing India's arbitration framework. It aimed to reduce judicial intervention, promote

[12] Ashish Chugh, *The Bharat Aluminium Case: The Indian Supreme Court Ushers In a New Era*, Kluwer Arbitration Blog (Sep. 26, 2012), https://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/2012/09/26/the-bharat-aluminium-case-the-indian-supreme-court-ushers-in-a-new-era/.

faster dispute resolution, and enhance transparency. Key changes included the introduction of strict time limits for completing arbitration (12 months, extendable by six months), the reduction of judicial oversight by restricting the grounds for challenging awards under Section 34, and the recognition of emergency arbitrators' interim orders. This amendment also streamlined the appointment process for arbitrators, mandated disclosure of potential conflicts of interest, and established clearer guidelines for arbitrator fees, thereby promoting cost efficiency and accountability in arbitration proceedings[13].

6.2 *The 2019 Amendment Act*

The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2019, focused on institutionalizing arbitration in India to improve the quality and credibility of arbitral proceedings. It introduced the Arbitration Council of India (ACI), a regulatory body tasked with grading arbitral institutions, accrediting arbitrators, and promoting institutional arbitration. The amendment also emphasized confidentiality in arbitral proceedings and provided clearer timelines for written submissions, enhancing the speed and predictability of dispute resolution. Additionally, it supported the growth of institutional arbitration by encouraging parties to use established arbitral institutions instead of relying solely on ad hoc arbitration[14].

6.3 The 2021 Amendment Act

The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2021, introduced critical refinements to India's arbitration framework, focusing on protecting the integrity of the arbitral process. It provided for an automatic stay on the enforcement of arbitral awards if they were found to have been obtained through fraud or corruption, safeguarding parties from unfair practices. This amendment also tightened the qualifications and eligibility criteria for arbitrators, ensuring that only competent and experienced individuals are appointed, thereby enhancing the quality and credibility of the arbitration process

[13] Rebecca Furtado, *Analysis and Interpretation of the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015*, iPleaders (Jul. 25, 2016), https://blog.ipleaders.in/analysis-interpretation-arbitration-conciliation-amendment-act-2015/.

[14] Diva Rai, *Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2019: Key Amendments and Critical Analysis*, iPleaders (Aug. 18, 2020), https://blog.ipleaders.in/arbitration-conciliation-amendment-act-2019-key-amendments-critical-analysis/.

in India[15].

7. INSTITUTIONAL ARBITRATION IN INDIA

Institutional arbitration in India has gained significant momentum in recent years as the country strives to establish itself as a global arbitration hub. Unlike ad hoc arbitration, where parties independently manage the arbitration process, institutional arbitration is conducted under the auspices of established arbitral institutions that provide standardized rules, administrative support, and experienced arbitrators. This structured approach reduces procedural delays, minimizes costs, and ensures a higher degree of transparency and professionalism in the dispute resolution process.

India's journey toward institutional arbitration has been supported by the establishment of several prominent arbitration institutions, including the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration (MCIA), the Indian Council of Arbitration (ICA), and the Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC). These institutions have developed comprehensive arbitration rules that align with global best practices, providing parties with the confidence to resolve their disputes efficiently[16]. The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2019, further boosted this trend by establishing the Arbitration Council of India (ACI), a regulatory body responsible for promoting and regulating institutional arbitration, accrediting arbitrators, and grading arbitral institutions.

Despite these positive developments, institutional arbitration in India faces several challenges. Many parties still prefer ad hoc arbitration due to perceived cost advantages and flexibility, leading to inconsistent outcomes and procedural inefficiencies. Additionally, the lack of awareness about the benefits of institutional arbitration and concerns about potential delays in appointing arbitrators have hindered its widespread adoption. However, as businesses increasingly seek faster and more predictable dispute resolution, institutional arbitration is expected to gain traction in India.

For India to become a truly global arbitration hub, it must continue to strengthen its institutional framework, improve

[15] *The Impact Of Arbitration And Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2021 » Lawful Legal*, (Oct. 6, 2024), https://lawfullegal.in/the-impact-of-arbitration-and-conciliation-amendment-act-2021-2/.

[16] arjunmehra0852, *INSTITUTIONAL ARBITRATION: THE EMERGING NEED FOR A ROBUST DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISM IN INDIA*, CDR Centre (Jan. 12, 2022), https://cdrcentre.com/institutional-arbitration-the-emerging-need-for-a-robust-dispute-resolution-mechanism-in-india/.

arbitrator training, and ensure that its arbitral institutions match the standards of leading international centres like the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) and the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA)[17].

8. INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

International arbitration is a widely accepted method for resolving cross-border commercial disputes, offering parties a neutral, flexible, and efficient alternative to traditional court litigation. It allows businesses from different legal and cultural backgrounds to resolve their conflicts in a mutually agreed-upon forum, without the complexities and biases that may arise in domestic courts. International arbitration is governed by a network of conventions, model laws, and institutional rules that provide a consistent and predictable legal framework, ensuring that parties can enforce their rights across jurisdictions.

The cornerstone of international arbitration is the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958), which has been adopted by over 170 countries[18]. This convention ensures that arbitral awards issued in one member country are recognized and enforceable in other member countries, significantly reducing the risk of non-compliance and enhancing the credibility of the arbitration process. In addition to the New York Convention, the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration (1985) provides a standardized legal framework for arbitration, addressing issues such as the formation of arbitral agreements, the composition of arbitral tribunals, and the enforcement of awards.

Leading arbitral institutions like the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC), and the Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC) play a critical role in facilitating international arbitration[19].

---

[17] Bhumika Indulia, *Making India a Hub of Arbitration: Bridging the Gap Between Myth and Reality*, SCC Times (Feb. 17, 2021), https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2021/02/17/making-india-a-hub-of-arbitration-bridging-the-gap-between-myth-and-reality/.

[18] Anubhav Pandey, *Overview of New York Convention of Arbitration*, iPleaders (Jun. 2, 2017), https://blog.ipleaders.in/new-york-convention/.

[19] *SIAC Rules 2025: Innovative Features and What to Expect for Indian Parties*, Kluwer Arbitration Blog (Apr. 1, 2025), https://arbitrationblog.kluwerarbitration.com/2025/04/01/siac-rules-2025-innovative-features-and-what-to-expect-for-indian-parties/.

These institutions provide comprehensive rules, expert panels of arbitrators, and administrative support, ensuring that disputes are resolved efficiently and fairly[20]. Despite its advantages, international arbitration also faces challenges, including high costs, lengthy proceedings, and concerns about arbitrator bias. However, ongoing reforms, including efforts to streamline procedures, enhance transparency, and promote diversity in arbitrator appointments, are helping to address these issues, reinforcing international arbitration as a vital tool for global commerce.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

To establish India as a globally competitive arbitration hub, it is essential to promote institutional arbitration by encouraging businesses to choose established institutions like the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration (MCIA) and building the credibility and capacity of domestic institutions. This can be achieved through financial incentives, government support, and awareness campaigns highlighting the advantages of institutional arbitration over ad hoc approaches. Judicial training and specialization are equally important, requiring the establishment of dedicated arbitration benches and continuous training programs to promote consistency in arbitration-related judgments, reducing the unpredictability often associated with judicial intervention.

To further enhance efficiency, the enforcement of arbitral awards must be streamlined by reducing procedural delays, simplifying execution processes, and discouraging frivolous litigation aimed at delaying enforcement. Additionally, maintaining high ethical standards for arbitrators and ensuring transparency in their appointment and conduct will build trust in the arbitration process, reducing concerns over impartiality and bias.

Finally, international collaboration is crucial for India's growth as an arbitration hub, requiring active engagement with global institutions, participation in international conferences, and the hosting of high-profile arbitration events to enhance India's reputation as a reliable venue for resolving cross-border disputes.

10. CONCLUSION

India's arbitration landscape has evolved significantly over the past few decades, reflecting the country's commitment to creating

[20] Jus Mundi, *Wiki Note: Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre (HKIAC)*, https://jusmundi.com/en/document/publication/en-hkiac (last visited May 13, 2025).

a robust, efficient, and globally competitive dispute resolution framework. The introduction of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, marked a transformative moment, aligning India's arbitration laws with international standards and reducing the procedural complexities that had previously hindered the effectiveness of the 1940 Act. Subsequent amendments in 2015, 2019, and 2021 have further strengthened this framework, addressing critical issues such as judicial intervention, time-bound proceedings, and the credibility of arbitral institutions.

Despite these positive developments, challenges remain. Indian courts have made considerable progress in reducing judicial interference, which restored the principle of minimal court intervention in foreign-seated arbitrations. However, the judiciary's interpretation of concepts like "public policy" continues to influence the finality and enforceability of arbitral awards, creating uncertainty for businesses and investors. Additionally, the lack of widespread adoption of institutional arbitration remains a significant obstacle, as many parties still prefer ad hoc arbitration, leading to inconsistent outcomes and procedural inefficiencies.

To fully realize the potential of arbitration in India, it is essential to promote institutional arbitration by supporting institutions like the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration (MCIA) and building the capacity of domestic arbitral bodies. Judicial specialization and continuous training for judges handling arbitration-related matters are also critical to ensuring consistency in judgments and reducing delays. Furthermore, strengthening enforcement mechanisms, promoting transparency and ethical standards, and engaging with global arbitration bodies will enhance India's credibility as a trusted arbitration destination.

As India seeks to establish itself as a leading international arbitration hub, ongoing reforms, strategic policy decisions, and effective institutional support will be essential. By addressing these challenges and building on recent legislative achievements, India can create a more predictable, transparent, and efficient arbitration ecosystem, attracting global businesses and reinforcing its position as a key player in the global dispute resolution market.