1. **Phillip Morris v. Uruguay**

* Please read the following paragraphs of the Award – **paras. 272-307, 388-420.**

The following questions will be discussed:

1. What was the investment in the case?
2. What standards of protection under the BIT were breached according to Claimant? What were the main substantive issues the tribunal had to deal with?
3. Based on the arbitral award, can you define what is the police powers concept? How did the Tribunal use the police powers concept?
4. What interests were protected by the state through the manifestation of police powers doctrine?
5. Did the Tribunal decide that the measure was a legitimate exercise of the state’s police powers? If so, why?
6. Do you think that the fact that a state concludes a BIT deprives it of its ability to regulate in public interest?
7. **Dan Cake v. Hungary, paras 145-157**,
8. What was the investment in the case?
9. What standards of protection under the BIT were breached according to Claimant?
10. What were the main substantive issues the tribunal had to deal with?
11. Do you see any controversial issue in this case?
12. **Solar and Michael Göde v. Czech Republic, para 360.**
13. Please explain what the tribunal says in para 360.

Thank you and see you soon.