

Corporate Attacks: Financial Stability

Case Study: Too-Big-To-Fail

Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) grants corporations shocking powers to attack the laws we rely on for a clean environment, financial stability, affordable medicines, safe food and decent jobs. The cases are decided by tribunals composed of three private attorneys, some of whom rotate between serving as “judges” and bringing cases against governments. The tribunalists are paid by the hour and are unaccountable to any court system or electorate. Under U.S. trade and investment pacts alone, corporations have already won more than \$3.6 billion in taxpayer money, with \$34 billion still pending.

Saluka v. Czech Republic

Investor Win (awarded \$236 million)

Saluka Investments, a Netherlands investment company, [filed an investor-state claim in 2001 under the Netherlands-Czech Republic BIT](#) against the Czech government for not bailing out a private bank, in which the company had a stake, in the same way that the government bailed out banks in which the government had a major stake. The bailouts [came in response](#) to a widespread bank debt crisis. Investicni a Postovni Banka (IPB), the [first large bank to be fully privatized in the Czech Republic](#), along with three large banks in which the government retained significant ownership, had been suffering from [significant debt and borderline insolvency](#), threatening the Czech banking sector. Consequently, the government placed IPB into forced administration in 2000 and then [sold the bank for one crown](#) to another bank.

Saluka, a [minority shareholder in IPB](#), claimed the Czech government [violated the BIT’s “fair and equitable treatment” provisions](#) because the government did not give IPB the same degree of assistance as it gave to the banks in which the government possessed a large stake. The government argued that rectifying IPB’s debt problems was the responsibility of private shareholders, while the problems of the large banks in which the government had a major shareholding interest [were the government’s responsibility](#).

The [investor-state tribunal decided](#) that the Czech Republic had violated the BIT’s “fair and equitable” treatment obligation and acted discriminatorily by giving greater government aid to banks in which the government was a major stakeholder. The tribunal [ordered the government to pay Saluka \\$236 million](#).