

BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SETTLEMENT OF  
INVESTMENT DISPUTES

ICSID Case No. ARB/19/6

-----x  
 In the Matter of Arbitration Between: :  
 :  
 ANGEL SAMUEL SEDA AND OTHERS, :  
 :  
                   Claimants, :  
 :  
           and :  
 :  
 REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA, :  
 :  
                   Respondent. :  
 -----x

Volume 1

HEARING ON NEW EVIDENCE AND ORAL CLOSING SUBMISSIONS

Monday, October 3, 2022

Hotel Le Royal Monceau  
Hearing Room: Louis Duhayon,  
          Andre Junot & Pierre Bermond  
37 Avenue Hoche  
Paris, France

The Hearing in the above-entitled matter  
came on at 9:30 a.m. before:

PROF. DR. KLAUS SACHS  
President of the Tribunal

PROF. HUGO PEREZCANO DÍAZ  
Co-Arbitrator

DR. CHARLES PONCET  
Co-Arbitrator

ALSO PRESENT:

MS. SARA MARZAL YETANO  
Secretary to the Tribunal

Realtime Stenographers:

MR. DAVID A. KASDAN  
Registered Merit Reporter (RMR)  
Certified Realtime Reporter (CRR)  
B&B Reporting/Worldwide Reporting, LLP  
529 14th Street, S.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20003  
United States of America

MR. LEANDRO IEZZI  
MR. DIONISIO RINALDI  
D.R. Esteno  
Colombres 566  
Buenos Aires 1218ABE  
Argentina

Interpreters:

MS. ANNA SOPHIA CHAPMAN  
MS. AMALIA THALER - de KLEMM  
MS. ROXANA DAZIN

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Claimants:

MR. RAHIM MOLOO  
MS. ANNE CHAMPION  
MS. MARRYUM KAHLOON  
MR. BEN HARRIS  
MS. NIKA MADYOON  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, LLP  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10166-0193  
United States of America

MR. PEDRO G. SOTO  
MS. ANKITA RITWIK  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, LLP  
1050 Connecticut Ave N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
United States of America

MR. ALEJANDRO MEJÍA  
MR. JUAN PABLO PANTOJA RUIZ  
Cáez Muñoz Mejía Abogados  
Cra. 17 ##89-31  
Bogotá, Colombia

Party Representatives:

MR. ANGEL SEDA  
MR. JUSTIN ENBODY  
MR. STEPHEN BOBECK  
MR. JUSTIN CARUSO  
MR. MONTE ADCOCK  
MR. PIERRE AMARIGLIO

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

On behalf of Respondent:

MS. MARTHA LUCÍA ZAMORA  
MS. ANA MARÍA ORDÓÑEZ PUENTES  
MR. GIOVANNY VEGA-BARBOSA  
MS. ELIZABETH PRADO LÓPEZ  
MS. YADIRA CASTILLO MENESES  
MR. ANDRES FELIPE REINA ARANGO  
MS. MARCELA MARÍA SILVA ZAMBRANO  
Agencia Nacional de Defensa  
Jurídica del Estado  
Carrera 7 No. 75-66 - 2do y 3er piso  
Bogotá  
Colombia

MR. CARLOS SABOYÁ  
Director de Asuntos Jurídicos, Fiscalía  
General de la Nación

MS. SANDRA MARTÍNEZ  
Asesora de la Dirección de Asuntos  
Jurídicos, Fiscalía General de la Nación

MS. SANDRA MONTEZUMA  
Asesora en el Despacho del Vicefiscal,  
Fiscalía General de la Nación

MR. ALBERTO ACEVEDO QUINTERO  
Director del Cuerpo Técnico de  
Investigaciones de la Fiscalía General de  
la Nación

MS. TATIANA GARCÍA  
Directora de Asuntos Internacionales,  
Fiscalía General de la Nación

MR. ANDRES FELIPE TINOCO  
Asesor en el Despacho del Vicefiscal,  
Fiscalía General de la Nación

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

DR. YAS BANIFATEMI  
MS. YAEL RIBCO BORMAN  
MS. PILAR ALVAREZ  
MS. CAROLINA BARROS  
MR. YOUSSEF DAOUD

Gaillard Banifatemi Shelbaya Disputes  
22 rue de Londres, 75009 Paris  
France

MS. XIMENA HERRERA BERNAL  
Gaillard Banifatemi Shelbaya Disputes  
165 Fleet Street  
London EC4A 2AE  
United Kingdom

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

On behalf of the United States of America:

MS. LISA J. GROSH  
Assistant Legal Adviser  
MR. ALVARO PERALTA  
MR. JOHN DALEY  
MS. NICOLE C. THORNTON  
MS. JULIA BROWER  
MR. MATTHEW HACKELL  
MS. MICHELLE KER  
Office of the Legal Adviser  
United States Department of State  
Washington, D.C. 20520  
United States of America

MS. CATHERINE (KATE) GIBSON  
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative  
600 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
United States of America

MR. EMMETT WEISS  
U.S. Department of Treasury  
Washington, D.C.  
United States of America

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
PRELIMINARY MATTERS.....	8
CLOSING ARGUMENTS	
ON BEHALF OF THE CLAIMANTS:	
By Mr. Moloo.....	21
By Ms. Champion.....	83
By Mr. Moloo.....	131
By Ms. Kahloon.....	189
By Mr. Moloo.....	197
ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT:	
By Ms. Ordóñez.....	201
By Ms. Banifatemi.....	207
By Ms. Herrera.....	284
By Ms. Ribco Borman.....	355
By Ms. Banifatemi.....	371

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

P R O C E E D I N G S

PRESIDENT SACHS: Welcome to this Closing Argument Hearing.

We should first see whether the list of participants corresponds to the persons being present here or connected. I will start with the Claimant. Could you please confirm that all counsel and Party representatives included in the List of Participants are indeed present or connected?

MR. MOLOO: Yes, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SACHS: Thank you.

And the same for the Respondent?

MS. BANIFATEMI: Yes, Mr. President. I'm happy to introduce the members of our team if the Panel would like to know who is who. I'm in your hands. Everybody is president.

PRESIDENT SACHS: Why not, yes. We have the pressure to see, I think, most of you if not all at the previous hearing.

MS. BANIFATEMI: Thank you. To my right you have already met with Ms. Ana María Ordoñez, who's the Director of Agencia Nacional de Defensa Jurídica del

1 Estado. From the same body you have MR. Giovanni  
2 Vega-Barbosa.

3 And maybe people can raise their hand as I  
4 give their name.

5 We also have from the--well, we have the  
6 Director del Cuerpo Técnico de Investigaciones de la  
7 Fiscalía General de la Nación, Dr. Alberto Quintero.

8 And we have Ms. Sandra Montezuma, who is the  
9 Asesora de la Dirección de Asuntos Jurídicos, Fiscalía  
10 General de la Nación, so this is the Prosecutor's  
11 team. And also Mr. Andrés Felipe Tinoco, also from  
12 the same body.

13 And we have not in the room Ms. Martha Lucía  
14 Zamora, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

19 On the counsel team you have myself from  
20 Gaillard Banifatemi Shelbaya Disputes. You have  
21 Ms. Ximena Herrera.

22 You can raise your hand.

1           You know her.

2           Ms. Pilar Alvarez, Yael Ribco Borman, and  
3 Ms. Carolina Barros, and we have also Jad Markbaoui,  
4 and Cesar Rodriguez.

5           Thank you very much.

6           PRESIDENT SACHS: Thank you very much.

7           Now I turn again to the Claimant to present  
8 your team, please.

9           MR. MOLOO: Thank you, Mr. President.

10           Representing the Claimants we have the  
11 principal Claimant, Mr. Seda, who you are all familiar  
12 with. We may have other Claimants join us at various  
13 points in time today, but given the time difference, I  
14 don't think they're on quite yet. I think it's  
15 3:00 a.m. where most of them are.

16           To my right we have Ms. Annie Champion;  
17 myself, Rahim Moloo; Ms. Marryum Kahloon; Ms. Ankita  
18 Ritwik; and Mr. Pierre Amarilglio from Tenor Capital.  
19 And I do have two of any colleagues in New York,  
20 despite the hour in New York, joining us: Ms. Nika  
21 Madyoon and Mr. Ben Harris.

22           PRESIDENT SACHS: As you said, this might be

1 the hour, indeed.

2 SECRETARY MARZAL: Excuse me, Mr. President.

3 Here, the Secretary. Can I confirm that Codian

4 MSE--because there is somebody waiting in the Zoom

5 waiting room--are your associates?

6 MR. MOLOO: That's our conference room in

7 New York.

8 SECRETARY MARZAL: Perfect, thank you.

9 PRESIDENT SACHS: Sara, could you check with  
10 the Non-Disputing Party, whether they are connected?

11 SECRETARY MARZAL: Yes, we have one  
12 Non-Disputing Party connected already, Mr. Alvaro  
13 Posada; I believe I'm correct.

14 Alvaro Peralta, sorry. Correction.

15 PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay. Very good.

16 Housekeeping. Claimant, any housekeeping  
17 matters from your side?

18 MR. MOLOO: No, Mr. President.

19 PRESIDENT SACHS: Thank you.

20 Respondent?

21 MS. BANIFATEMI: We do, Mr. President.

22 With permission from the Tribunal, we would

1 like to address the issue of the rebuttal evidence  
2 that was excluded from the record. We understand, and  
3 you have, of course, at email of 26 September where we  
4 mentioned that we were proceeding with this Hearing  
5 under protest and with/reserve provisional rights. It  
6 is a very important and serious matter for the State  
7 of Colombia; therefore, Ms. Ordoñez will give you a  
8 statement on behalf of Colombia in this regard and put  
9 forward our position in this regard, if you allow us.

10 PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay.

11 MS. BANIFATEMI: Thank you.

12 MR. MOLOO: Sorry, Mr. President. I wasn't  
13 under the impression that we would be dealing with  
14 this Application first thing this morning. I had  
15 thought that we would deliver our Closing Submissions  
16 and then address the Tribunal on the issue of the  
17 evidence, but we're in the Tribunal's hands.

18 PRESIDENT SACHS: No, let's proceed in that  
19 order.

20 And please, so the floor is yours.

21 MS. ORDÓÑEZ: Thank you, Mr. President.

22 Dear Mr. President and Members of the

1 Tribunal, as the Director of the International  
2 Litigation at the National Agency for the Legal  
3 Defense of Colombia, it is my duty to highlight before  
4 this Tribunal some crucial considerations regarding  
5 the evidence that has been excluded from the file. As  
6 a sovereign State's representative, I will address you  
7 in Spanish.

8 (Pause.)

9 MS. ORDÓÑEZ: After nearly four years since  
10 the Arbitration was started, there have been--

11 THE INTERPRETER: Sorry, interruption. Is  
12 there a problem? The English channel is working?

13 (Pause.)

14 MS. ORDÓÑEZ: Okay. It's been nearly four  
15 years since the receipt of this Request for  
16 Arbitration, and there have been several rounds of  
17 written submissions and a one-week hearing in  
18 Washington, D.C. After that, we had the expectation  
19 of submitting to you our Closing Arguments with the  
20 whole information that the State of Colombia has made  
21 the effort to collect so that all of you, Members of  
22 this Tribunal, should have all the evidence necessary

1 to adopt a fair decision, taking into consideration  
2 all the evidence that we have made available to you.

3 Tribunal, if something will prove the  
4 99 percent success rate of the Colombian State as  
5 Defendant in international investment disputes, it is  
6 that Colombia is a State that respects the rights of  
7 foreign investors and of investment arbitration as an  
8 alternative mechanism, which is exceptional and  
9 specialized for the resolution of disputes. It is  
10 precisely for this reason that, in compliance with  
11 definite Procedural Orders issued by this Tribunal, ■

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

15 Arbitrators, you have a very big  
16 responsibility [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

21 In times of crisis within the settlement  
22 system for investor-State disputes, the evidence that



1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

10

In order to refute the statement of Fanny

11

Giraldo. Procedural Order 11 recalls that the

12

admission of Mrs. Giraldo's statement was permitted

13

since Colombia would have the possibility to rebut it

14

and should have the last word on merit. And,

15

therefore, we spared no effort to collect evidence

16

that would allow us, in view of this Hearing, to rebut

17

her allegations by Fanny Giraldo. [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

1           Procedural Order No. 11 explains, and is the  
2 *raison d'être*, and I must say the unprecedented  
3 sacrifice made by the Colombian State in making  
4 available to the Tribunal and the Applicants  
5 information and documentation that compromises its  
6 highest interest, including safety and integrity of  
7 all members of the delegation of Colombia and also  
8 lawyers.

9           [REDACTED]

21           As an additional show of good faith and in  
22 view of the consultation for the Parties for the

1 possible reconsideration of Decisions of 22 and  
2 26 September, we are also accompanied today by  
3 Mr. Alberto Acevedo, Director of the Technical  
4 Investigation Courts of the Attorney General's Office.  
5 Mr. Acevedo has suspended his work in relation to the  
6 most important criminal investigations within the  
7 State of Colombia with the purpose of resolving any  
8 doubts that the Tribunal might have or the counsel of  
9 the other Party in relation to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
13 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

17 Thank you very much.

18 PRESIDENT SACHS: Thank you very much. Any  
19 comments at this stage from the Claimant?

20 MR. MOLOO: At this stage, Mr. President,  
21 perhaps I can just make one offer, which is, if this  
22 is really all about C-450, which is Ms. Giraldo's

1 letter, claimants offer to retract that from the  
2 record, if that would deal with all of their concerns.

3 PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay. That is noted. Do  
4 you want immediately to react, or later?

5 MS. BANIFATEMI: Of course. This is not  
6 acceptable because it has been on record, it has been  
7 viewed by the Tribunal. The Tribunal has already seen  
8 that evidence, to the contrary of our rebuttal  
9 evidence which the Tribunal had not seen, so it's very  
10 easy now, if they're troubled by that evidence, which  
11 actually is really very interesting for us, it's their  
12 option, but we cannot accept that our due-process  
13 rights which have been breached be resolved by the  
14 withdrawal of a belated evidence they put and which  
15 triggered all of this and all of this effort that  
16 Colombia has gone through, as Ms. Ordoñez has just  
17 explained.

18 PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay. So, your positions  
19 are noted. You said this is the comment that--the  
20 first comment that you have, but you will be given the  
21 floor, of course, to comment in more detail at the  
22 appropriate point of time either today or tomorrow.

1 And the Tribunal will, in any event, get back to the  
2 issue in the course of this Hearing.

3 So, we now give the floor to the Claimant.

4 MR. MOLOO: Thank you, Mr. President. If  
5 you'll just give us a moment, we'll pass out the hard  
6 copies.

7 (Pause.)

8 MR. MOLOO: We could mail it to you  
9 afterwards.

10 (Comments often microphone.)

11 MR. MOLOO: No, understood. Totally  
12 understood.

13 (Pause.)

14 MS. BANIFATEMI: Before we start, if I may,  
15 Mr. President, I just see there are almost 300 slides.  
16 In three hours, I don't know if my friend and  
17 colleague will go through this, but if this is--I hope  
18 this is not a new submission because we really made  
19 the effort following the Tribunal's instruction to  
20 hold to the three hours, and to summarize and wrap up  
21 our case, and we hope that all of these slides will be  
22 addressed by Claimant.

1           PRESIDENT SACHS: We will see, having seen  
2 and heard counsel from Claimant in action, I would  
3 think that they will make it for the three hours.

4           MR. MOLOO: I hope that's not a comment on  
5 how quickly we speak, but we do hope to do get through  
6 these slides. I think we now have the screen up. The  
7 Tribunal has what they need in front of them? Okay.

8           CLOSING ARGUMENT BY COUNSEL FOR CLAIMANTS

9           MR. MOLOO: Thank you very much, Members of  
10 the Tribunal, for your time here today.

11           It's been over two years since we started  
12 this Arbitration, and we're here before today to tell  
13 you many of the things that you've heard from us  
14 before. And the reason why I say that is because our  
15 case really hasn't changed since we filed this  
16 Arbitration, and so many of the things you'll hear  
17 from Ms. Champion and myself today are things that you  
18 heard at the Opening in May. And that's because  
19 everything that happened in the Hearing confirms the  
20 narrative that Claimants have put before you because  
21 it's the truth. Because what has happened here is  
22 quite clearly a breach of the TPA, and our purpose

1 here today is to show you, to walk you through some of  
2 that evidence we heard back in May and show how that  
3 confirms the case theory that we've advanced right  
4 from the outset.

5           In contrast, I have to admit I'm not really  
6 sure what we're going to hear from Respondents this  
7 afternoon because we have seen shifting sands over the  
8 last couple of years. Initially--and I think still  
9 today--their position has been that none of this is  
10 about the wrongdoing of Claimants; you'll see  
11 statements in the record to that effect. And then, we  
12 had a belated Essential Security objection. And even  
13 now in the letters that are being exchanged  
14 subsequently, you see mentions of illegality. I don't  
15 know if there's going to be a new illegality defense  
16 this afternoon, I actually am not sure. In preparing  
17 for this submission, I asked myself always, well, what  
18 are the main arguments so I can help this Tribunal  
19 deal with the issues that are before them, and I'm not  
20 sure what we're going to hear this afternoon.

21           It's a rare situation where I'm usually  
22 surprised but one thing I have not been surprised



1 way this case has evolved.

2           But in preparing for this Closing  
3 Submission, I went back to where we started when we  
4 were first looking at this case, and when one--as  
5 anybody does, and that's the Treaty, and I started  
6 from Page 1 of the Treaty. And it struck me--and I  
7 know we've seen some of this language, but it really  
8 did strike me, when you look at the second, third, and  
9 fourth preambulatory clauses and what they say because  
10 it's a unique treaty in that sense. The U.S. and  
11 Colombia came together to promote broad-based economic  
12 development in order to reduce poverty and generate  
13 opportunities for sustainable economic alternatives to  
14 drug-crop production. Nobody is denying the history  
15 of Colombia, but what they wanted to do is they wanted  
16 to transition away from that history into a different  
17 future that promoted economic development, to reduce  
18 poverty, to generate legitimate business opportunities  
19 for people of Colombia. They wanted to create new  
20 employment opportunities and improve labor conditions  
21 and living standards and establish clear and mutually  
22 advantageous rules governing their trade.

1           And that is precisely what the investors  
2 here came into Colombia to do. They came in and this  
3 is a situation where they had a successful investment.  
4 They built a hotel that was one of the most successful  
5 hotels in Medellín. It created jobs, it brought  
6 tourism to Medellín, and they were expanding that  
7 property development business to different areas of  
8 the country creating jobs, creating job opportunities,  
9 and achieving these objectives that Colombia and the  
10 U.S. sought to accomplish.

11           And you guys have all seen--everybody in  
12 this room, Members of the Tribunal, you've seen the  
13 pictures of the Charlee hotel. I hope that one day,  
14 you'll have the opportunity to visit because it is a  
15 beautiful hotel, and it is one of the few luxury  
16 hotels in Medellín. It has an amazing roof deck that  
17 oversees all of Medellín, it, you know, has a gorgeous  
18 restaurant on the main floor and on the rooftop, and  
19 it is by all measures, and the experts on Colombia's  
20 side agree, a resounding success.

21           And its recognition has gone well beyond  
22 Medellín. Worldwide acclaim.

1           If we go to the next slide.

2           2012, Condé Nast, Hot List; 2015, Spotlight  
3 in the New York Times: If you're spending 36 hours in  
4 Medellín, what do you do? Well, one of the few things  
5 they talked about is this hotel, The Charlee Hotel.  
6 In Vogue Travel, 21 reasons the cool kids of Colombia  
7 flock to Medellín. I'm not a cool kid and I even  
8 stayed at The Charlee Hotel for obvious reasons, but I  
9 can tell you, that's where the cool kids do hang out.

10           It is by all measures a wildly successful  
11 investment in the country.

12           And Mr. Seda and the Royal Property Group  
13 expanded on the success, and what you see here on  
14 Slide 7 are not renderings. These are actual pictures  
15 of the Luxé by Charlee, which is about an  
16 hour-and-a-half away from Medellín, where they built  
17 several properties, and there was going to be a hotel  
18 that was the sort of pivotal project or property in  
19 the middle of this Luxé by Charlee development. And  
20 that was the next project that they sold out just as  
21 quickly, and people live in some of these houses. The  
22 problem is, the hotel is in complete disrepair. It's

1 75 percent done, but at the time of these Measures,  
2 that's when it came to an end, and I'll come on to  
3 that and I'll explain that.

4           And then, next, was obviously the Meritage;  
5 and, in 2012, Mr. Seda identified 56 hectares property  
6 between the airport and Medellín, and for a variety of  
7 reasons, saw that this was going to be a really  
8 interesting investment opportunity. It's a perfectly  
9 placed land just off the highway, a number of  
10 investments are being made in this area, the Avianca  
11 headquarters--you may know Avianca, one of the leading  
12 airlines in Latin America. Thousands of new employees  
13 were coming not too far away from where the Meritage  
14 Property is. They were going to need housing. It was  
15 going to be a hub--56 hectares. That's like a  
16 subdivision of a city. That's what was being  
17 developed at the Meritage. That's--and these are  
18 renderings here, but that's what it would have looked  
19 like if it was going to have been done.

20           And it was the best-selling project in the  
21 Province of Antioquia, and this is not contested. In  
22 Mr. Seda's Witness Statement, he talks about the fact

1 that in August 2016, they had pre sold--they had  
2 already sold Phase 1, 152 units sold, \$34.2 million at  
3 the time. They expected to start construction on  
4 Phases 2 and 3 at the end of August 2016, and at the  
5 time that these Measures were adopted, there were 700  
6 people that were benefiting from this investment.

7           If we go back to the Preamble--you don't  
8 need to change slides--but just to remind you, one of  
9 the key objectives was to promote broad-based economic  
10 development, to create new employment opportunities.  
11 There were 700 people working on the site at the time  
12 that these Measures were taken.

13           I feel bad for the Claimants. I  
14 legitimately do for obvious reasons, but I feel bad  
15 for the people of Colombia, these people who were  
16 working on sight, who lost their job as a result of  
17 these Measures. The development that this Treaty  
18 sought to engender, to foster, it didn't come to be  
19 because of these Measures, and that's why this is such  
20 a sad story.

21           And when we think about what was the reason  
22 for this Measure, how did this all come to be? Well,

1 it all came to be because of the decision of one  
2 Prosecutor. One Prosecutor pushed that first domino  
3 that had all--that has us all here before you. And  
4 you heard from that Prosecutor, Ms. Ardila Polo, and  
5 in her cross-examination, she accepted that it all was  
6 her. Ms. Champion asked her: "So, the decisions you  
7 made in your cases were your own?"

8 "My own. My own." She said it twice.

9 "Just to wrap up the Precautionary Measures,  
10 the decision to impose those were entirely yours, to  
11 invoke those Precautionary Measures?"

12 And she said: "Correct. Just mine."

13 Didn't go before a court. There was no--this was an  
14 administrative decision by one Prosecutor.

15 And Ms. Champion said: "Just to reiterate  
16 that last question, the decision to impose the  
17 Precautionary Measures was entirely up to you;  
18 correct?"

19 And she says: "And that is correct."

20 One rogue Prosecutor pushed that first  
21 domino and all of the following dominoes that we will  
22 talk about today then fell.

1           And Mr. López Montoya, who you didn't hear  
2 from in May, but I do think it's important to remind  
3 you of his testimony. He talks about what happened on  
4 August 3rd, 2016, because he was the Representative of  
5 Royal Realty, he was the VP of construction, who was  
6 on-site when Ms. Ardila Polo showed up on that site.  
7 And if you read his testimony, it is--it reminds you  
8 of a classic expropriation. All of the cases that we  
9 learn about, you know, back in the Sixties and even  
10 earlier, about expropriation, he says the person  
11 informed me that several police trucks from the  
12 technical investigation team of the Office of the  
13 Fiscalía had arrived at the Meritage Lot. That's what  
14 you think about; right? The police trucks role in.  
15 He told me something to the effect of the Prosecutors  
16 will arrive soon, and you should talk to them and see  
17 if you could resolve the situation. Of course, there  
18 was no resolving the situation immediately that day,  
19 as we now look back in hindsight we see, but  
20 Ms. Ardila Polo showed up, and she introduced herself,  
21 and she put the padlock on the door. And from that  
22 day forward, everyone went home, and that was it.

1 August 3rd, 2016.

2           We didn't know it at the time, but that then  
3 crystallized into a breach, we say, in January 2017,  
4 when she issued the Determination of Claim. But she  
5 put the padlock on the door for the first time on  
6 August 3rd, 2016, and then said it's final as of  
7 January 2017.

8           And, unfortunately, you saw the renderings,  
9 but this is what the property looks like about three  
10 years ago. These pictures are about three years old  
11 now, and unfortunately now the conditions are even  
12 worse, but you can see the degradation that happens to  
13 a site when you just it leave it in disrepair. But  
14 you can see there were substantial construction works  
15 going on. There were several buildings that were  
16 mid-construction when that padlock was put on the  
17 door. I've been here. I've seen--and in fact, I  
18 think Ms. Champion took these pictures. 700 people  
19 working on-site.

20           And now, when you drive from Medellín's  
21 airport to Medellín, everybody drives by this. You  
22 can't escape this eyesore, and this sad story is for

1 everybody who visits Medellín. All the citizens of  
2 Medellín see it on a regular basis. They have a  
3 visual reminder because this is what they see.

4           And immediately thereafter, after  
5 August 3rd, you can see on August 4th, August 6th, the  
6 leading newspapers, these are the headlines: "Seizure  
7 of land plots where an exclusive project is being  
8 built in Medellín." The narco property in Antioquia  
9 that entangles a model complaint uncovered problems at  
10 the Meritage Plot. That's the headlines. "Widely  
11 reported, closely watched project." Given its  
12 enormous size, it's not surprising, but when these are  
13 the headlines, what do you expect is going to happen  
14 if you're a property developer? You think everybody  
15 is going to run to you and say, "oh, when's your next  
16 project happening?" Obviously not. What happens is:  
17 That project is dead. The Contractors have to be sent  
18 home, the banks come calling--and you can see on the  
19 next slide, we have Mr. Seda and Mr. López Montoya's  
20 testimony, the banks accelerated the debt. They  
21 pulled the additional financing, not just from this  
22 project but from other projects. The Unit Buyers come

1 knocking and saying, hey, we've put deposits, give us  
2 back our money.

3           They sue Newport, and Newport and Royal  
4 Property is entangled in this litigation, in  
5 litigation and arbitrations in-country for the next 74  
6 months up until to this day. That's what happens.  
7 That's what happens when someone goes and puts the  
8 padlock on the door and says--and there is a sign,  
9 nobody--do not buy here. That's the sign. They  
10 actually--it's not metaphorical. They put that sign  
11 on the property. And at this time--and I showed you a  
12 bit of this excerpt, but I think there was some sound  
13 difficulties, so we'll try it without sound this time.  
14 And instead of hearing nice music, you'll have to hear  
15 my voice. I apologize for that.

16           But at the time, they had promotional videos  
17 of Luxé going because it was nearly done. These are  
18 actual--again, not rendering, this is actually Luxé.  
19 Those are actual houses on the Luxé property  
20 overlooking the lake in Guatapé. They were four  
21 months away from the hotel being complete. They had  
22 hired staff, they were already booking events, there's

1 a restaurant on the lake. Again, I've, you know,  
2 visited it, but it's--you can see, that's the  
3 restaurant right there.

4           And it oversees--it looks at this, the  
5 Piedra del Peñol. Sorry, I'm--I apologize to all the  
6 Colombians in the room. But they all know that it is  
7 a very prominent tourist attraction, that I've been  
8 to, in Colombia, and that's the view in Guatapé from  
9 the Luxé property. They had hired staff, and it was a  
10 truly--going to be a magnificent resort location, but  
11 the hotel--and the hotel was 75 percent done. It was  
12 four months away from being completed. But what  
13 happened was, unfortunately, the financing was pulled  
14 because the bank said we can't do business with you.  
15 We're scared to do business with you.

16           Several other projects in the works: Tierra  
17 Bomba, 450 Heights, Santa Fe. In Santa Fe, for  
18 example, they had bought the land, they had the City  
19 Planning Director's endorsement in writing. There was  
20 a--there were dozens of people working at the Royal  
21 Property Group on all of these projects. That was  
22 what the Royal Property Group did. They had all of

1 these property development projects. You can't view  
2 this as just the Meritage. It was a stream of  
3 projects that they had in their portfolio that were at  
4 various different stages of development. Luxé being  
5 nearly completed, Meritage as we know, you know,  
6 Contractors on-site, pre-sales of Phase 1 done, and  
7 all of these different projects were at different  
8 stages of development.

9           But this was a property development company  
10 that had several projects in their pipeline that all  
11 dried up because you need financing. And as you've  
12 heard from Colombia, if there's--if you're tainted,  
13 someone--apparently, you're supposed to Google them  
14 and you're supposed to find as much information as you  
15 can. If this is what people are hearing about why  
16 Meritage was pulled, can you imagine any bank, anybody  
17 wanting to do business with the Royal Property Group  
18 when those are the headlines? Of course not.

19           And ultimately, it resulted in the taking of  
20 a \$255 million business that we are here today in  
21 front of you. The Claim--I can tell you: The  
22 Claimants would much rather have preferred to be doing

1 what they do in their daily lives--building  
2 projects--but they can't do that anymore, and that's  
3 why we're here in front of you asking for  
4 compensation.

5           And so, what are the breaches of the Treaty?  
6 On 19, 20, and 21, you have provisions that I'm sure  
7 you've all looked at: 10.7, expropriation; 10.3,  
8 national treatment; and 10.5, talking about the  
9 minimum standard of treatment, in particular, the fair  
10 and equitable treatment and protection--and full  
11 protection and security. Those are there for your  
12 reference, and we'll obviously go through each one in  
13 more detail.

14           The first one I want to start with is  
15 expropriation because whatever this is under Colombian  
16 law, and I'm on Slide 24 for your reference, whatever  
17 this is under Colombian law, I keep coming back to--as  
18 a matter of international law, this is actually a  
19 simple expropriation case. This is a taking. They  
20 came in to the property and they took the Project.  
21 It's as simple as that. It's an outright taking of  
22 the Project. And, of course, this Treaty covers both

1 indirect and direct expropriations, but in my mind,  
2 this is clearly a taking as a matter of international  
3 law.

4           The question becomes: Are there any  
5 exceptions from the obligation to pay compensation for  
6 a taking as a matter of international law? And I  
7 would suggest that there are very limited exceptions  
8 under international law, and that if it was done in  
9 the exercise of the police power, so there's a police  
10 power--limited "police power" exception. But any  
11 public purpose is not a police power, and I'll come on  
12 to that.

13           But I think it's hard to contest the fact  
14 that there was a taking and what was taken. Well,  
15 there's two main things that were taken in our  
16 submissions: The first is the indirect interest that  
17 Newport had in the contract rights to develop and  
18 profit from the Meritage Project; and the second is  
19 the indirect interest that Royal Realty, who is the  
20 management company, had in the Contract--in its  
21 management contracts. Those were the two things that  
22 were taken from the Meritage Claimants.

1                   And what was the thing that took them?

2 Well, there's two things that we say effectuated that  
3 taking. It began with the Certificate of Real  
4 Property Seizure, which was July 22nd, 2016. Now,  
5 you'll remember this was signed on July 22nd, 2016.  
6 Ms. Ardila Polo did not show up to the property until  
7 August 3rd. Ms. Champion's going to talk to you about  
8 the interesting things that happened between July 22nd  
9 and August 3rd. Some of the Tribunal members may  
10 remember that, but that Certificate of Real Property  
11 Seizure was actually signed on July 22nd, 2016.  
12 Ms. Ardila Polo shows up to the property on  
13 August 3rd, puts the padlock on the door, and then  
14 says, yes, indeed, we are moving forward with this  
15 Asset Forfeiture Proceeding on January 25th, 2017.  
16 You can see that date on the Resolution for  
17 Determination of the Claims. And that's the date on  
18 which this crystalizes. It's--at that point, it's  
19 stuck in the court system, and you can't get out.

20                   Before that, there was a chance that the  
21 Claimants could have gotten back their property and  
22 they tried, they really wanted to. They took all the

1 diligence they did and they wanted to get this  
2 property back but that was the point of no return, in  
3 our submission.

4           And how--we've heard this question of: How  
5 long is long enough to be in expropriation? And  
6 there's case law on this, and we took you to some of  
7 this in the Opening, but I've given you two examples  
8 here: Wena Hotels, one year was enough, it just can't  
9 be an ephemeral taking. And in the Azurix Case, they  
10 talk about, in Middle East Cement, how there was a  
11 suspension for four months. In S.D. Myers, there was  
12 a measure that lasted three months but in each of  
13 those cases, the question was: Is this long enough  
14 where basically you can't go back and do your project?  
15 You've lost your project. And 74 months later, here  
16 we sit, still no access to the property.

17           And by the way, the property is on an early  
18 sale list. It's currently for sale, that is a taking.

19           You can't go back and build this project.  
20 Nobody can go back and build this project today. The  
21 financing's not going to be there. The buildings are  
22 in disrepair. A taking had been effectuated,

1 certainly here if there was an expropriation in Wena  
2 Hotels and all of those cases represent--reflected in  
3 Azurix, certainly 74 months is long enough.

4           We've shown you the pictures but I think  
5 it's important to note the land was previously  
6 authorized for early disposal on 4th December 2018.  
7 It was removed on 2nd July 2019, but as of July 1st,  
8 2021, the land is back on the authorized for early  
9 disposal list, and that's, for the record, C-435,  
10 reflects that it's on the early sale list, so they're  
11 selling the property. So, in our submission, there  
12 has been a taking.

13           And in our submission, it's an unlawful  
14 taking and, therefore, a breach of the TPA because it  
15 was done in a discriminatory manner, or in an  
16 arbitrary way, without due process, and no  
17 compensation was paid, and it was not done to protect  
18 a legitimate public-welfare objective. We're going to  
19 talk about all of those when we talk about the FET  
20 breaches, but for purposes of establishing that it was  
21 an unlawful expropriation, all I need to confirm for  
22 you three gentlemen is that there was no compensation

1 paid and there's no dispute about that. And on the  
2 next slide, you can see ConocoPhillips versus  
3 Venezuela, they confirmed that if there is no  
4 compensation paid, that is sufficient for it to be an  
5 unlawful expropriation.

6 And in Colombia's Rejoinder, they say no  
7 compensation was or is due to the Claimants, so they  
8 don't dispute--nobody disputes that compensation has  
9 not been paid for this taking; and, for that reason,  
10 we say it's an unlawful expropriation.

11 So, what, under international law, is the  
12 potential excuse that one can give to escape this  
13 compensation obligation? Well, the TPA gives us a  
14 clue at Annex 10-B. It says: "Except in rare  
15 circumstances, non-discriminatory regulatory actions  
16 by a party that are designed and applied to protect  
17 legitimate public-welfare objectives, such as public  
18 health, safety, and environment, do not constitute  
19 indirect expropriations."

20 Now, what does this cover? We've seen  
21 contexts in which these types of provisions have been  
22 discussed. Generally speaking, they apply obviously

1 to a non-discriminatory measure, but when is it  
2 non-discriminatory? It's generally a regulation  
3 that's adopted for a general regulation, a general  
4 application. So, for example, the Methanex versus  
5 U.S. Case, where--which I'm sure you will all be  
6 familiar with, where it's the banning of a toxic  
7 substance, for example, to prevent environmental  
8 damage or, you know, a cancer-causing agent, for  
9 example, a general application, let's ban the  
10 substance. That's the kind of police power that is  
11 protected and usually then exempts you from the  
12 compensation obligation.

13           This is not a general application regulatory  
14 measure. This is a targeted measure at one particular  
15 investment, and for reasons we'll come on to, it's not  
16 non-discriminatory; it is discriminatory, in fact.  
17 There's some guidance in the case law on what is a  
18 police power. So, for example, in the Magyar versus  
19 Hungary Case, a case which Respondent also adopts in  
20 defining the police powers, they talk about two  
21 different narrow sets of circumstances. The first is  
22 Measures of police powers that are aimed at enforcing

1 existing regulations against an Investor's own  
2 wrongdoing, where the Investor is committing some  
3 illegal act or something like that; or the second  
4 group, which is abating risks, again, to the public  
5 health, environment or public order.

6           And they concede, Colombia does--and I  
7 mentioned this earlier--that it's not the first prong.  
8 There is no wrongdoing of the Investor at issue here.  
9 They say that in the Rejoinder. They say: "While it  
10 is true that the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings were not  
11 initiated in connection with any 'wrongdoing' of which  
12 Mr. Seda was personally accused and not against any of  
13 the Claimants." They accept it. They're saying there  
14 is no wrongdoing of Mr. Seda or any of the Claimants.  
15 They talk about several irregularities in the chain of  
16 title. They're saying no wrongdoing on behalf of  
17 Mr. Seda. We're not accusing Mr. Seda of anything.  
18 Now, that's changed, as we know, but in the Rejoinder,  
19 as recently as the Rejoinder, they said no wrongdoing  
20 of any of the Claimants here.

21

■

[REDACTED]

15           But, to exercise your police powers, as a  
16 matter of international law, the Measures you take  
17 must be proportionate to the public--the threat to the  
18 public order and must be taken with due process. That  
19 is, as a matter of international law, in the Bahgat  
20 versus Egypt Case, that's just one example of cases  
21 where they've said it has to be proportionate. If  
22 there is a threat to public order, the action you take

1 to deal with that threat has to be proportionate.

2           We would submit that coming in and just  
3 seizing the property before even assessing good faith,  
4 that is not a proportionate measure to deal with--even  
5 assuming that there is a legitimate public order  
6 threat here.

7           What would have been the proportionate  
8 measure here? It would have been, let's go after the  
9 assets of the people who we say have done something  
10 wrong. Let's go after Iván López's assets. That  
11 would have been--if you want to protect the society  
12 against the illicit activity of Iván López, go after  
13 his assets. You don't need to go and prematurely  
14 seize this property.

15           And I thought this was telling. They said,  
16 Day 1 of the Transcript, at 269; counsel for Colombia  
17 said: "The Colombian courts are seized of the matter,  
18 so let the Courts decide. And at the end of the day,  
19 it may well be that Newport will be recognized as a  
20 bona fide without fault third party, in which case the  
21 precautionary measures will be lifted. Newport will  
22 be entitled to dispose of the land at that point in

1 time." What they're saying is you may get the  
2 property back, but is that a proportionate measure to  
3 the threat that they've identified, shoot first, ask  
4 questions later? No. We say that is not  
5 proportionate and, therefore, they don't come within  
6 the exception to the compensation obligation as a  
7 matter of international law.

8           And when you see what Dr. Wilson Martínez  
9 has said, for example, in his Second Report, he says  
10 what would have made sense, what would have been the  
11 proportionate thing to do, the proportionate thing to  
12 do as a matter of even Colombian law would have been  
13 to go after those who were laundering money, those who  
14 you know were engaged in criminal activity. That  
15 would have been much less infringing on the investor's  
16 rights. That would have been, perhaps, a  
17 proportionate conduct. But to prematurely go and  
18 seize the Meritage Project was not proportionate.

19           Moving to the second argument:

20 Discrimination.

21           The standard for discriminatory conduct,  
22 whether it's a breach of national treatment, fair and

1 equitable treatment or as a matter of expropriation,  
2 you know, not being something that was discriminatory,  
3 the standards are largely the same in all of those  
4 cases. And Claimants and Colombia generally agree on  
5 what that standard is, and that is, when you have  
6 similar cases that are treated differently without  
7 reasonable justification, you can see that's the  
8 standard that both Parties agreed to in their  
9 submissions.

10           And you have to think about the comparators  
11 in a fact-specific and context-specific assessment.  
12 There is no rigid test or anything like that. You  
13 need to look at the facts of the case, and all that  
14 this next slide does is tell you that.

15           And, in Colombia's opening submission, they  
16 tell you what that like circumstances are; what are  
17 those similar cases. And in their Opening  
18 Submissions--this is from one of their slides--they  
19 said at Slide 192, it's assets affected by comparable  
20 wrongful conduct. So you're looking at the asset and  
21 you're saying, let me look at other cases in which  
22 similar wrongful conduct is infecting those assets.



1 That's the wrongful conduct that they're saying  
2 affected this asset and let's see what are the other  
3 similar cases that have been affected by that same  
4 alleged wrongful conduct.

5 I do want to make one point--it's on this  
6 next slide-- [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED] That's in their Opening  
8 Submissions. [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
10 [REDACTED] They were started  
11 because Iván López.

12 And when we talk about Essential Security  
13 we'll come back to this because now all of a sudden  
14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]  
16 [REDACTED] And Colombia in its Opening Submissions  
17 admits that. [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]  
19 [REDACTED]

20 So, who are the relevant comparator groups  
21 that have been affected by the same sort of alleged  
22 wrongful conduct taking them at their word?

1           We would submit there are three: The Sister  
2 Property which we've talked a lot about, other López  
3 Vanegas properties, and other persons with a prior  
4 interest in the Meritage Property, and I will go  
5 through each of these briefly.

6           We've all become very familiar with this  
7 diagram. It's only twice in this deck, I promise you,  
8 I'm pretty sure. Here is the first time. And I think  
9 it's important to start with this point: At the very  
10 outset here, in 1994, that first gray hexagon, that is  
11 a property that is co-owned--co-owned--by Iván  
12 López--by what they say is a front-buyer for Iván  
13 López, Sierralta López. Iván López, importantly, was  
14 never on title, by the way. Iván López's name was  
15 never directly on title. That's an important point.  
16 But they're saying Sierralta López is a front-buyer  
17 for Iván López. That's their case.

18           And Entrelagos Orozco is the front-buyer for  
19 Jaime Orozco, who is his half-brother. But that  
20 property, it's not like it's subdivided into  
21 three-fourths and one-fourth. It's co-owned, jointly  
22 owned by both of them, and then it gets split into Lot

1 A and Lot B. Lot A and Lot B are each--you can see  
2 there's a 75 percent and 25 percent. They're both  
3 still co-owned. Lot A is co-owned by the front-buyer  
4 for Iván López allegedly. And Lot B is 75 percent  
5 co-owned by Iván López. So the entire property is  
6 allegedly infected by this wrongdoing that they're  
7 saying; right?

8           And everything that goes forward is then a  
9 reconsolidation of, and a division of, that property  
10 that was co-owned, the entire property, including the  
11 Sister Property, which is Lot A2, you can see it on  
12 the bottom in the blue, Lot A2 was at one point owned  
13 75 percent by Iván López. It was then owned by the  
14 Fruit Seller. It was then owned by the Engineer. All  
15 of those things that they talk about in the  
16 Provisional Measures application, in the  
17 Requerimiento, in the Determination of Claim, they all  
18 equally affected both the Meritage Property and Lot  
19 A2.

20           And when asking Ms. Ardila Polo about how  
21 does she come to this? What investigation did she do  
22 when she was looking at the Meritage Property? And

1 she said she had two title studies. And she refers to  
2 those two title studies. She said she had one title  
3 study from Otero & Palacio. That title study is on  
4 the Meritage Property, okay?

5           And this is important: And they had a title  
6 study from Gúzman Monroy. Now, where did they get  
7 that title study from? Gúzman Monroy is actually a  
8 title study on the Sister Property. Gúzman Monroy  
9 must have been given to her by Iván López because our  
10 folks didn't have the title study by Gúzman and  
11 Monroy, but she has two title studies that she had  
12 looked at when reviewing the Meritage and the Sister  
13 Property.

14           And since then we've been able to get a copy  
15 of the Gúzman and Monroy title study, and it is at  
16 C-30bis. And the Gúzman and Monroy title study on the  
17 Sister Property gives a favorable opinion, so she's  
18 got one title study on the Sister Property that says  
19 favorable opinion, and she has the Otero & Palacio  
20 title study. And guess what that--on the Meritage  
21 Property--and guess what that gives? A favorable  
22 opinion.

1           Two title studies, one for the Sister  
2 Property, one for the Meritage, both favorable  
3 opinions, and she goes after the Meritage Property and  
4 leaves the Sister Property, so she assumed that oh  
5 well, this favorable property, this favorable opinion,  
6 means they must be good-faith buyers. And whatever  
7 conclusion she came to, the Meritage was entitled to  
8 that same conclusion, if that's what she based her  
9 assessment on.

10           And they've confirmed at the Hearing, if  
11 there was any doubt, that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

18           When I asked Mr. Caro on cross-examination  
19 about the Sister Property, he said: "With respect to  
20 that property, no Asset Forfeiture Proceeding has been  
21 initiated in respect of that lot." To this day,  
22 whatever--if they're still doing investigations,



1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

18           That's the testimony you heard, no evidence,  
19 not even minimum evidence that there's any basis to  
20 act against that 25 percent and I want to go back to  
21 46. I told you it was only there twice but--

22           ARBITRATOR PONCET: Sorry, sorry to

1 interrupt for a second. You're not questioning as  
2 such the fact that a prosecutor may do this in this  
3 case and that in that case. The point you're making  
4 is that by joining this difference of treatment in  
5 your view with regard to the two plots or the two  
6 divisions, then it becomes discriminatory under the  
7 Treaty, but you're not asking us to review what the  
8 Prosecutor did; right? I mean, I'm slightly leading  
9 but--

10 (Overlapping speakers.)

11 ARBITRATOR PONCET: I just wanted to make  
12 sure that I understood your question.

13 MR. MOLOO: I'm just saying--

14 ARBITRATOR PONCET: Up to a point my  
15 question is a leading one. But I just want to make  
16 sure that I understood the point you're making.  
17 You're not asking this Tribunal to review or to assess  
18 the actions of the Prosecutor as such, but only to the  
19 extent that joining them together leads you to the  
20 conclusion which we will share or not that this  
21 constitutes discriminatory treatment under the Treaty;  
22 right?

1           MR. MOLOO: For purposes of assessing the  
2 discriminatory conduct, that's absolutely right. You  
3 do not need to review whether or not they made the  
4 right decision. All you need to come to the  
5 conclusion of is, were there similarly situated cases  
6 that were treated differently, and was there a  
7 reasonable justification for that. And we say there  
8 were similar situated cases, for the reasons that I've  
9 explained, that were treated differently: One, asset  
10 forfeiture was commenced. The other one has been left  
11 as is and has not been taken to this date. And there  
12 is no rational justification for that differential  
13 treatment. That's correct. We're not asking you to  
14 say should they have acted against the other property  
15 or not? That you do not need to come to a conclusion  
16 about to assess whether or not there has been  
17 discriminatory treatment.

18           But one important fact here, if you look at  
19 the reconsolidation with the Engineer, at that point  
20 it is in the hands of José Ignacio  
21 Cardona--right?--who is said to be Perra Loca or the  
22 front-buyer, sorry, for Perra Loca. It then gets

1 divided and is repurchased by Entrelagos Orozco. You  
2 can see on the blue, the green square there. So, he  
3 rebuys this property from José Ignacio Cardona. So,  
4 he acquired A2 from the Engineer. And if anybody  
5 knows about this history of title, it's the guy who is  
6 the half-brother of the alleged narco-trafficker;  
7 right? So, how can you possibly say that we have no  
8 evidence that his 25 percent was not infected? He  
9 repurchased it from the Engineer who they said was the  
10 front-buyer for Perra Loca.

11           So, I just don't understand that  
12 explanation.

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED]

21           Slide 53 was in the Determination of Claim,  
22 January 25th, 2017. That's the document that we say

1 crystallizes this breach; right? And in the sworn  
2 declaration of José Ignacio Cardona, who is the  
3 Engineer, they get a testimony from him. And he says:  
4 "Following that meeting from Mr. Jaime Orozco, he  
5 contacted me to make a proposal by which he wanted to  
6 undertake parceling of the lot. He told me they  
7 wanted to avoid being involved in those proceedings.  
8 And so he says that I should reconsolidate and all the  
9 rest and then I deliver to Ms. Tatiana Gil, under  
10 orders from Mr. Jaime Orozco, the 83.9 percent."

11           That's his testimony, that actually the  
12 person orchestrating all of this is Mr. Jaime Orozco.  
13 Ms. Ardila Polo knew this at the time of the  
14 Determination of Claim, that's actually in the  
15 Determination of Claim. She has this testimony. How  
16 can she possibly have testified to you what she  
17 testified in May? I have no evidence that Mr. Jaime  
18 Orozco had done anything wrong, that he was involved  
19 in any illicit activity. She was told by the  
20 Engineer. She wrote it down. She drafted the  
21 Determination of Claim, that Mr. Jaime Orozco was the  
22 one who was organizing all of this.

1           And now, I'll go back to 52, Ms. Champion  
2 asked her about this: "All of that activity is  
3 directed by Jaime Orozco; correct?"

4           And she said, yeah, "based on the  
5 information given by the Engineer, José Luis Cardona  
6 Rodríguez, yes, that is the information he offered."

7           It seems like she's giving him a presumption  
8 of good faith, that well beyond a presumption of good  
9 faith that was certainly not granted to my clients.  
10 If there was one of these properties that you should  
11 have gone after, it was the Sister Property, not the  
12 Meritage.

13           What other reason did we get for why they  
14 haven't gone after the Meritage? Well, if we go to  
15 54, this question was put to counsel for Colombia.  
16 Lot A2, which is the Sister Lot--54--oh sorry, for  
17 some reason it's in the hard copies but not on the  
18 screen.

19           It says--this is a quote from Colombia's  
20 opening: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

15

[REDACTED]

16

When should you--when do you assess a breach? The

17

time, it's too late--even if they do take it tomorrow,

18

it's too late to say oh, well, we didn't treat them

19

discriminatorily. Because you have to assess that

20

question of was there a breach when the breach

21

crystallized. And you have some sources there.

22

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

[REDACTED]

On the next page, we have the Quartier  
apartments which was under development, because one of  
the things they said was well, this one was under  
development so that's what made it unique. The  
Quartier Property Iván López purchased in the Eighties  
and then he transferred it in 1994 to none other than  
Promotora Sierra Alta, which presumably is also a  
front-buyer for Iván López. And then Promotora Sierra  
Alta sold it in 1997.

There was property being built on the  
Quartier developments. Did you go after that one?

No, they didn't go after that one.

[REDACTED]



1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

[REDACTED] various

5

other banks and fiduciaries did business in that

6

particular property. Personally owned by Iván López

7

in 2007. In early 2009, Scotiabank Colpatría, one of

8

the largest banks acquires a mortgage on that

9

property. They would have done some diligence.

10

Another fiduciary sold property owned by

11

Mr. López, August 2019. During the pendency of this

12

proceeding, banks, Banco de Bogotá, one of the largest

13

banks in Colombia, is doing business on properties in

14

which Iván López has previously been an owner.

15

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

22

[REDACTED] That's the  
third comparator group because Dr. Wilson Martínez and

1 others say the right thing to do is to actually go  
2 back and trace the history back and figure out who was  
3 not a good-faith buyer? That's the person whose  
4 assets I'm going to go after, but they haven't gone  
5 after anybody else in the chain of title.

6           And just on the next slide there you have a  
7 couple of cases, discriminatory intent is not  
8 necessary. We don't need to show why there is a  
9 discriminatory conduct. That intention is irrelevant  
10 to assessing discriminatory conduct. We have some  
11 explanations to offer you in a bit, but it's  
12 unnecessary for your finding.

13           And so Colombia, we submit, has  
14 discriminated against the Meritage Claimants as  
15 compared to the three comparator groups by applying a  
16 different standard for what constitutes an alleged  
17 illicit origin, and by failing to consider the  
18 Meritage Claimants' good faith prior to seizing the  
19 Meritage Property, which appears to be what they are  
20 doing with respect to the other comparative groups.

21 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED] But they're  
2 assessing perhaps good faith, but we were entitled to  
3 that same treatment. And that's a breach of the  
4 national treatment protection, that's a breach of the  
5 FET protection, and that makes the expropriation  
6 unlawful for yet another reason.

7           So, they say, well, how can this be  
8 justified; right? Is one question that this Tribunal  
9 might ask. Is there a reasonable justification? And  
10 we would submit that there is not, but the two  
11 explanations you have been given are we have to  
12 prioritize because there is limited resources, and in  
13 this case there is some urgency because this is a  
14 development in progress. But neither one of those  
15 hold any water.

16           Why? Because no Additional Resources were  
17 needed to investigate the Sister Property. They've  
18 effectively already done that research because they  
19 shared a history of title, so there was no additional  
20 investigation that was needed. There was no  
21 additional resources. It doesn't explain why no  
22 action has been taken since then. It doesn't explain

1 why they did not consider Newport's status as a  
2 good-faith buyer before they took any action. ■

■ [REDACTED]  
■ [REDACTED]

13           So, quite frankly, those excuses don't hold  
14 any water. And we've showed you--by the way, it  
15 doesn't explain why they haven't gone after other  
16 properties that are in development that share the same  
17 alleged wrongful conduct.

18           That differential treatment, that's enough  
19 for you to say there's been a breach here, you can  
20 find that there's an expropriation and no  
21 compensation, and we can all go home. You can find  
22 there's been discrimination, we can all go home.

1 Well, not all go home, we still need to deal with the  
2 issue of damages. But you don't need to deal with any  
3 of the other breaches. But there are several other  
4 breaches and so, I would be remiss not to go through  
5 at least a couple of them.

6 We submit that Colombia has initiated these  
7 Asset Forfeiture Proceedings without due process.  
8 You've seen many of these provisions--and I've got  
9 them here for your reference--but there are a few  
10 provisions that the Assess Forfeiture Law that are  
11 really important to assess this due-process standard,  
12 a breach of the due-process standard. Good faith is  
13 presumed in all legal action or transactions. There  
14 is a presumption of good faith.

15 And when does this good-faith assessment  
16 need to be done? Well, Article 118 says that it needs  
17 to be done at this initial stage--right?--before a  
18 Determination of Claim. One of the purposes of the  
19 initial stage you can see on 118 is: "5, search for  
20 and collect the proof which makes it possible to  
21 reasonably conclude that there is no good faith  
22 without fault." That's the first thing you do during

1 the initial stage, according to the Asset Forfeiture  
2 Law.

3           The provision on Precautionary Measures,  
4 Article 87. The purpose of Precautionary Measures,  
5 the very purpose, that last sentence says: "In any  
6 case," if you're taking Precautionary Measures, "in  
7 any case, the rights of third parties acting in good  
8 faith without fault must be safeguarded." When you're  
9 taking Precautionary Measures, you must safeguard  
10 Parties acting in good faith.

11           And by the way, if you do take Precautionary  
12 Measures, how long can they last before you issue a  
13 Determination of Claim? Six months. So, that initial  
14 phase has to be done by that point, at which point you  
15 must certainly have assessed good faith.

16           152. Whose burden of proof is it? Who does  
17 this investigation? Is it the courts? No, it's not  
18 the courts. It's the Office of the Attorney General  
19 of Colombia has the burden to identify, locate, gather  
20 and file the elements of proof which show the  
21 existence of some grounds set forth in the law for the  
22 Declaration of Forfeiture and that the affected person

1 is not a bona fide owner of rights without fault.  
2 That is an obligation on the Attorney General to do,  
3 according to the Asset Forfeiture Law.

4           And Mr. Medellín and Mr. Wilson Martínez  
5 confirmed--Doctors, sorry--I'm glad they're not in the  
6 room; otherwise they would have corrected  
7 me--Dr. Medellín and Dr. Wilson Martínez confirm what  
8 I just told you; that before you take Precautionary  
9 Measures, you must assess good faith so you don't harm  
10 their rights. You didn't hear from Dr. Medellín,  
11 unfortunately, but he was a former Minister of  
12 Justice. He was the father of the Asset Forfeiture  
13 Law, former Ambassador of the UK for Colombia. Highly  
14 regarded. He was the legal advisor to the Attorney  
15 General, in fact, on issues related to Asset  
16 Forfeiture when they were implementing and enforcing  
17 the 2014 Asset Forfeiture Law. So, one of the leading  
18 expert and, unfortunately, you didn't have the  
19 opportunity to hear from him.

20           (Phone rings.)

21           MR. MOLOO: No problem.

22           And even when you hear from--this was a

1 little bit misleading, so I just do want to correct  
2 this. In Colombia's Post-Hearing Brief, they did say,  
3 they said what do you see in Paragraph 175? The  
4 Fiscalía was not under an obligation to confirm the  
5 existence of bona fide third parties upon the adoption  
6 and imposition of the Precautionary Measures. That  
7 was their position in the Post-Hearing Brief, despite  
8 what I just showed you. And they say: "As  
9 acknowledged by the Claimant's Expert during the  
10 Hearing, Asset Forfeiture Proceedings are initiated by  
11 a finding that the origin of the asset is tainted by  
12 illegality." And that 282 footnote, you can see  
13 refers to this excerpt of the Transcript. And so, I  
14 just wanted to show you that excerpt of the Transcript  
15 where Dr. Martínez said: "Indeed, when carrying out  
16 asset forfeiture investigation, the first thing we run  
17 into are assets. The first thing that's investigated  
18 is the origin, and the destination of those assets to  
19 determine whether they are tainted by illegality. If  
20 that is the case, they can move on with the  
21 investigation; but, if not, that asset forfeiture  
22 action has come to an end."

1           But if you look what he went on to say at  
2 Line 12, he made clear: "When the investigator, the  
3 operator, finds that the tainted asset is in the hands  
4 of a third party, a good-faith third party, clearly,  
5 they cannot go after that asset."

6           And so I asked Dr. Caro: "Did you assess  
7 Newport's good faith? Did you at any relevant point  
8 in time?" Because, in the Requerimiento that he  
9 authored, nowhere in there is there a discussion about  
10 Newport's good faith? And I asked him, show me where  
11 it is, and he couldn't show me anything.

12           I said: "But you cannot point me to  
13 anywhere in this Decision--right?--that specifically  
14 discusses independently Newport's good-faith status."

15           And he said: "That's right, because Newport  
16 was tied to Corficolombiana." So, he's saying we  
17 assessed Corficolombiana's good faith, not Newport's  
18 because we didn't need to assess Newport's because  
19 Corfi and Newport are tied together.

20           And I said: "But it's not the same standard  
21 for everybody. You put yourself in the position of  
22 the person who's actually conducting the diligence."

1           And he said: "Of course, the standards are  
2 different." And of course, Corfi and Newport are  
3 different so he should have assessed Newport  
4 independently. But irrespective of that, the standard  
5 of a fiduciary and of Newport were different.

6           So, even tying them together, even if you  
7 could tie them together, it wouldn't make sense. They  
8 just did not assess Newport's good faith at all before  
9 they seized the property.

10           And, in fact, then it went to the Asset  
11 Forfeiture Court. The Asset Forfeiture Court said  
12 initially: "No recognition of the impacted Party is  
13 conferred upon Newport." That's what they initially  
14 found in August 2017.

15           And it was not until April 22nd, 2022, just  
16 before the hearing that the Superior Court of Bogota  
17 said that it concluded: "Newport is entitled to  
18 participate in the case, given that it has a pecuniary  
19 right with respect to the affected properties." And  
20 so, they effectively found--and they refer to  
21 Article 30 here--and Article 30 talks about Affected  
22 Persons, and their rights must be assessed. Their

1 good faith status must be assessed.

2           And that's why Colombia has to say the  
3 following, and this is the quote, and I come back to  
4 it in their Opening. Now, what they say is they  
5 accept. Okay, well, the courts have found that  
6 they're affected parties, now let the courts do their  
7 thing. The Colombian courts are seized of the matter.  
8 And our friends on the other side are not claiming the  
9 judicial process in Colombia is wrong. And in fact,  
10 they're very happy of the Decision in April, two weeks  
11 ago, and let the courts decide. Let the courts take  
12 this normal course of what an asset forfeiture  
13 proceeding should be and at the end of the day, it may  
14 well be that Newport is recognized as a bona fide  
15 without-fault third party. The Precautionary Measures  
16 will be lifted, and they'll get their asset back.  
17 That's what they're saying.

18           Now--but it's too late, it's too late to  
19 give it back. And by the way, from a due process  
20 perspective, it's the wrong Order. You don't shoot  
21 and ask questions later. You have to assess someone's  
22 standing, and their rights, and assess whether or not

1 they acted in good faith beforehand, and that's  
2 exactly what the case law says. In *Siag v. Egypt*,  
3 they said: "It is important to note"--they're talking  
4 about an Egyptian Court Decision--it ruled that "the  
5 Decision to issue Resolution No. 83 before the  
6 specific date was without any legal basis in all  
7 respects. The Tribunal finds that Claimants  
8 accordingly suffered a denial of substantive due  
9 process." They assessed this context of even court  
10 conduct as being potentially a breach of due-process  
11 rights.

12           And when something is not carried out in  
13 accordance with the domestic law, it is a breach of  
14 the due-process rights, and that's what *Quiborax v.*  
15 *Bolivia* said. But even more importantly, when you  
16 look at *ADC v. Hungary*, what they say is "an actual  
17 and substantive legal procedure for a foreign investor  
18 to raise its claims against the depriving actions  
19 already taken or about to be taken against it, must  
20 come first." You need reasonable advanced notice, a  
21 fair hearing, and an unbiased and impartial  
22 adjudicator to hear your case as to whether or not you

1 are a good-faith purchaser in this case. That must  
2 come first before the Measure. That's what ADC v.  
3 Hungary found when it was assessing due process.

4 Similarly in Rumeli v. Kazakhstan. They  
5 said in that case, the decision at hand, the Measure  
6 that was taken, was made without giving Claimants a  
7 real possibility to present their position. They have  
8 to be given an opportunity to be heard before the  
9 depriving measure takes place. That's due process.

10 You don't get surprised by someone showing up on your  
11 lot and putting the padlock on the door. You should  
12 have the opportunity to present your case. I'm a  
13 good-faith Party, not 74 months after it's been taken  
14 but before the measure is taken. That's what  
15 international law requires.

16 In Deutsche Bank v. Sri Lanka, again,  
17 Paragraph 487, CL-87, Deutsche Bank was not informed  
18 of the case against it before the Monetary Board  
19 issued its stop payment order, and it was not offered  
20 the possibility to respond to the investigation  
21 report. Again, another case where the Measure was  
22 taken before--and before the Claimant had any

1 opportunity to be heard at all. That is not due  
2 process as a matter of international law.

3           And all of those cases confirm that the  
4 timing matters. The depriving measure cannot take  
5 place before you have an opportunity to be heard, and  
6 the Claimants are only now going to be given an  
7 opportunity to be heard. They're saying, well,  
8 they're going to be given an opportunity to be heard,  
9 but it's the order of things. You can't be given an  
10 opportunity once you've already been deprived of your  
11 rights. And so, that breaches the due-process rights  
12 of the Claimants.

13           The last due-process violation that I'm  
14 going to address you with, and then perhaps we can  
15 take a break, if the Tribunal would see it appropriate  
16 to do so, is with respect to conduct that's happened  
17 during the course of actually these proceedings as  
18 well.

19 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] That is not due

process. And also a breach of the FET provision.

Members of the Tribunal, before we go to the next breaches, which my partner Ms. Champion will address, perhaps now is an appropriate time for a break.

PRESIDENT SACHS: Yes. We will resume at 25.

(Recess.)

PRESIDENT SACHS: So, here we go, Ms. Champion. The floor is yours.

MS. CHAMPION: Thank you. Can you hear me?

REALTIME STENOGRAPHER: Yes.

MS. CHAMPION: All right. So I will pick up

1 where Mr. Moloo left off, just finishing up due  
2 process.

3           Including the grounds laid out by Mr. Moloo,  
4 Colombia's--one of the issues here is Colombia's  
5 shifting positions on the basis for the Asset  
6 Forfeiture Proceedings. Colombian authorities did not  
7 seem to take Mr. López's kidnapping complaint filed in  
8 2014 very seriously.

9           Can you go to the slides?

10           (Comment off microphone.)

11           MS. CHAMPION: Oh, okay.

12           It sat on the shelf for two years until it  
13 was suddenly revived and used as a basis to seize the  
14 Meritage Project.

15           As you will see when Slide 96 is pulled up,  
16 Colombia tries to claim here that the Asset Forfeiture  
17 Proceedings were never--"never"--that's the word they  
18 used--based on the kidnapping story. That's what they  
19 say in their Counter-Memorial, their Post-Hearing  
20 Brief, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED]

1

██████████

2

Could we go to Slide 97.

3

In the Precautionary Measures Resolution,

4

Ms. Ardila writes: "The reasonable grounds are

5

supported by the evidence included in the file and

6

would show that the assets identified with the

7

particular lot numbers were acquired through

8

punishable conduct such as kidnapping, threats, and

9

personal misrepresentations, among others."

10

It further refers to the statements of

11

Mr. López and determining whether they are true or

12

not.

13

The court decisions also talk about the

14

kidnapping, if we go to the next slide--or no, you're

15

right, 98.

16

The Asset Forfeiture Court and the Appellate

17

Decision on Corficolombiana's control of legality

18

petition also talk about the kidnapping and

19

Mr. López's statements. So, to say that the

20

kidnapping story was not a basis for the Asset

21

Forfeiture Proceedings is just not supported by the

22

record.

1           The problem is that Colombia knows that  
2 story is false. In their own Opening, they noted  
3 that: "Per the information provided by the FBI,  
4 Ms. Ardila was already aware of the divergent  
5 narratives behind Sebastian López's alleged  
6 kidnapping."

7           A prominent Colombian Prosecutor, Claudia  
8 Carasquia (phonetic), the former Director of the  
9 Organized Crime Unit in the Attorney General's Office,  
10 stated on television that "the kidnapping story was a  
11 fraud."

12 [REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

[REDACTED]

5

[REDACTED]

6

[REDACTED]

7

But that's not what happened here. As

8

Mr. Moloo has already explained, Claimant's Expert,

9

Dr. Martínez, sets forth what the State can do when

10

the assets it seeks to move against are in the hands

11

of third parties acting in good faith. It can move

12

down the chain of title and attach the assets or

13

equivalent assets or proceeds of the alleged

14

wrongdoers.

15

Colombia sent us this demonstrative

16

yesterday that shows people they allege are the

17

wrongdoers here, [REDACTED]. You know, we're going

18

to hear a lot about [REDACTED] this afternoon, I

19

imagine. But that's not whose assets Colombia went

20

after. They went after those of the Claimants here,

21

not the assets of the alleged wrongdoers.

22

Because Colombia acted arbitrarily by

1 promising the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings on a known  
2 lie and disproportionately by not pursuing the stated  
3 public purpose of these measures, they violated the  
4 fair-and-equitable-treatment provisions provided in  
5 Article 10.5 of the TPA.

6           The Tribunal in EDF v. Romania sets forth  
7 factors to consider in determining what is arbitrary.  
8 These come from a noted expert on this, Professor  
9 Christoph Schreuer, who has identified these factors  
10 as: "A measure that inflicts damage on the Investor  
11 without serving any apparent legitimate purpose."  
12 That's what happened here. Again, the damage was  
13 inflicted on the Claimants, on the Investors. It  
14 served no purpose to inflict the damage on them. They  
15 were not the alleged wrongdoers.

16           "A measure that is not based on legal  
17 standards but on discretion, prejudice, or personal  
18 preference." Again here, as Mr. Moloo covered,  
19 Ms. Ardila's discretion appeared to govern the  
20 imposition of the Precautionary Measures entirely.  
21 She said it was entirely her decision.

22           "A measure taken for reasons that are

1 different from those put forward by the  
2 decision-maker." We'll get to that. I think there's  
3 a strong argument here that this was actually  
4 motivated by a corrupt scheme that Ms. Ardila became a  
5 part of.

6           And finally, "a measure taken in willful  
7 disregard of due process and proper procedure."

8 Mr. Moloo has already identified some of the issues  
9 relevant to that.

10           On this slide, you just see some cases that,  
11 you know, that talk about the principle of  
12 proportionality. What is proportionality? It looks  
13 at the State's goal versus the Claimants' interest and  
14 the nature of the conduct being censored.

15           Again, Colombia alleges that it's going  
16 after illicit assets, assets derived from criminal  
17 activity. But that's not what it's actually done  
18 here. It could have traced back in the chain of  
19 title, gone after the wrongdoer's assets, the payment  
20 rights. They haven't done that. Instead, they've  
21 gone after the Claimants' investment.

22           And the final due process ground that we

1 have is that the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings were  
2 initiated as part of a corrupt scheme.

3           Notably, Colombia does not dispute, they do  
4 not deny that Mr. Seda was extorted. They just say  
5 they don't know if it was a negotiation or a  
6 shakedown. Well, you don't negotiate to purchase  
7 something that you already bought, but that is, in  
8 fact, what Mr. Seda was forced to do when he was  
9 approached as part of a corrupt scheme.

10           I'm going to revisit the timeline. This  
11 will look familiar. We used a similar slide in our  
12 Opening. We've added a few things that emerged during  
13 the Hearing in this case, but the Tribunal will recall  
14 that López filed his kidnapping complaint in 2014 with  
15 the Organized Crime Unit, and at that time, he is  
16 threatening Mr. Seda just with bad publicity; right?  
17 He says, If you don't pay me, don't make a pay-off,  
18 I'm going to tell everybody that I actually own the  
19 land, and that--you know--they shouldn't buy in your  
20 project.

21           The Organized Crime Unit refers the  
22 complaint to the Asset Forfeiture Unit. It's assigned

1 to Prosecutor Number 37; that's Ms. Tovar. Ms. Tovar  
2 appears to have requested that the Judicial Police do  
3 some investigation, but the case remained dormant for  
4 nearly two years. That changes all of a sudden in  
5 April of 2016.

6 We submit it's not a coincidence that on the  
7 7th of April, Mr. López represented by a new lawyer,  
8 Mr. Mosquera, contacts Mr. Seda, claiming that he's  
9 the rightful owner, that Mr. López is the rightful  
10 owner of the Meritage Property, and demanding a  
11 meeting in D.C., of all places, to explore an  
12 alternative resolution.

13 Colombia would have you believe it's a  
14 coincidence that the very next day, Ms. Malagón, the  
15 Head of the Asset Forfeiture Unit, opens a new case  
16 based on Mr. López's complaint and assigns it to  
17 Prosecutor Number 44, Ms. Ardila.

18 Nowhere in the Resolution opening this new  
19 investigation does Malagón acknowledge the  
20 pre-existing investigation. It's simply ignored.  
21 Even though from the day this investigation is opened  
22 and assigned to Ms. Ardila, she has in her hands a

1 memo that Ms. Tovar had requested as part of her prior  
2 investigation. [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

9           That's the chart that I extensively  
10 cross-examined Ms. Ardila about; and, as you will  
11 recall, and as Mr. Moloo did mention, she tied herself  
12 in knots trying to explain why she went after the  
13 Meritage and not any of the properties in that chart,  
14 and every rationale she offered simply did not hold  
15 water, whether it was the time period, whether it was  
16 the fact that the Lots had undergone consolidation and  
17 re-subdivision; whether it was the fact that Lot  
18 Numbers became extinct as a result of that process,  
19 that's all true for the Meritage Lot as well. None of  
20 the explanations she tried to give for why she focused  
21 immediately on the Meritage held any water at all.

22           During the same time period that Ms. Ardila

1 receives this memo, Mr. Mosquera is stepping up his  
2 extortion demands. He's asking Mr. Seda to confirm a  
3 meeting so that they can reach a "brokered solution,"  
4 and he starts to threaten legal proceedings.

5 Mr. Seda is concerned about this threat of  
6 legal proceedings. He responds. He offers to meet in  
7 Colombia. Mr. Mosquera declines and says, We're  
8 proceeding with our defense. That defense turns out  
9 to be the tutela that Mr. López filed.

10 And interestingly, in the tutela, Mr. López  
11 seeks the same relief that Ms. Ardila ultimately gave  
12 him when she imposed Precautionary Measures. He seeks  
13 to enjoin construction and sales of the Meritage  
14 Project. Well, the Asset Forfeiture Court dismissed  
15 the tutela but, as noted, Ms. Ardila later gave him  
16 the relief that he wanted.

17 The other concerning thing that happens in  
18 this time period is that Mr. Seda is approached by  
19 someone claiming to be from the Attorney General's  
20 Office.

21 If we go to the next slide.

22 In mid-June. This is before Mr. Seda has

1 any clue what's going on inside the Fiscalía, and he's  
2 approached by a man outside The Charlee Hotel asking  
3 him to pay a COP 500 million bribe because the  
4 Fiscalía is trying to help him.

5           During the same time period, Mr. Seda meets  
6 with Mr. Valderrama, another representative of Mr.  
7 López and Mr. Mosquera and Mr. López himself. After  
8 Mr. Valderrama shows him pictures of his children in  
9 an obviously threatening gesture, Mr. Seda flees the  
10 meeting. During these meetings, Mr. López--or, excuse  
11 me, Mr. Mosquera brags that he has influence over the  
12 Attorney General's Office and specifically the Asset  
13 Forfeiture Unit and Ms. Malagón and Ms. Ardila in  
14 particular.

15           Again, this is while Mr. Seda has no idea  
16 what's going on in the Asset Forfeiture Unit, but  
17 Mr. Mosquera is saying, I can influence them, and if  
18 you don't pay us about USD 20 million, that's what I'm  
19 going to do, and I'll get the Project seized.

20           Mr. Seda flees that meeting. He tells them  
21 he's going to report them. Mr. Valderrama immediately  
22 sends him conciliatory text messages: I'm so sorry.

1 Let's restart the exchange.

2 All of this is in the record. It's all  
3 corroborated by those text messages.

4 He doesn't hear from them for a while, but  
5 then all of a sudden, six weeks later in late July,  
6 Mr. Valderrama again texts Mr. Seda. He tells him we  
7 need to speak urgently. Mr. Seda replies that he's  
8 not interested and tells Mr. Valderrama that if he  
9 contacts him again, he's going to call the  
10 Authorities.

11 Mr. Valderrama says, I understand. The  
12 negotiation Chapter is closed. Unknown to Mr. Seda,  
13 but apparently not to Mr. Valderrama, just the prior  
14 business day, three days before, the prior business  
15 day, Ms. Ardila has signed the Precautionary Measures  
16 Resolution, and she also testified at this Hearing  
17 that Ms. Malagón was well-aware of that Resolution,  
18 too, that it would have been reviewed as part of a  
19 regular Committee that they have.

20 So, Ms. Malagón knows about it, Ms. Ardila  
21 knows about it, and it seems that Mr. Mosquera,  
22 Mr. López and Mr. Valderrama know that it's coming,

1 too.

2           As Mr. Moloo has already covered in detail,  
3 Ms. Ardila shows up at the Lot on August 3rd. She  
4 imposes the Precautionary Measures.

5           At this point, Mr. Seda is obviously  
6 desperate to save his project. He decides to seek  
7 help from the U.S. Embassy; and, as part of that, he  
8 wants to obtain the extortion at monetary demand in  
9 writing. So, he meets with Mr. Mosquera and Mr. López  
10 Vanegas again, in Miami this time. Mr. Mosquera  
11 reiterates his demand for around 20--USD 18 million,  
12 COP 56 billion, and, you know, he even suggests that  
13 Mr. Seda can pay that into a fiduciary offshore  
14 account and only release it once the Precautionary  
15 Measures are lifted and the Asset Forfeiture  
16 Proceeding against the Meritage is dismissed with the  
17 finding that Newport is a good-faith buyer.

18 Mr. Mosquera apparently feels comfortable that he has  
19 the power to make that happen. Again, he brags about  
20 his contacts and his influence over Ms. Malagón and  
21 Ms. Ardila, and that's the deal he tries to strike  
22 with Mr. Seda. That is not a deal that makes sense if

1 he's bluffing. Mr. Seda then does obtain the monetary  
2 demand in writing and he, again, cuts off contact with  
3 these extortionists, and report--ultimately, he does  
4 report this to the Colombian Authorities, and the  
5 Tribunal heard from Mr. Hernández, who was one of the  
6 Prosecutors in charge of the ensuing investigation.

7           Importantly, the asset forfeiture code  
8 provides Ms. Ardila with exactly the power that  
9 Mr. Mosquera claims she had. In other words, she  
10 could have dismissed the Asset Forfeiture Proceeding  
11 at any time upon a determination that the assets in  
12 question are in the name of third parties acting in  
13 good faith without fault. Ms. Ardila could have made  
14 that determination at any time, and she admitted that  
15 on cross-examination. Perhaps that's the reason she  
16 didn't address Newport's good faith. She was waiting  
17 to do so until Mr. Seda paid the extortion demand.  
18 She could have done so any time before January 25th,  
19 and she did--but she didn't because Mr. Seda did not  
20 pay.

21

■

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

[REDACTED]

5

[REDACTED]

6

[REDACTED]

7

[REDACTED]

8

[REDACTED]

9

[REDACTED]

10

[REDACTED]

11

[REDACTED]

12

[REDACTED] And as

13

Mr. Hernández testified--again, this isn't just

14

speculation--"all of this is taken from what was

15

mentioned in the investigation, be it through

16

wiretapping, statements, interviews, as part of this

17

investigation." Right? They collected all this

18

evidence, and his team prepared this chart to show the

19

scheme that they were investigating and regarding

20

which they had collected significant evidence.

21

Mr. Hernández also affirmed the accuracy of

22

two explosive reports that appeared in the Colombian

1 newspaper, El Espectador, in October of 2020. As set  
2 forth in those Articles, which are C-365 and C-366:  
3 "Since December 2016, suspicions on the existence of  
4 an alleged cartel made up of the corrupt officials  
5 within the Asset Forfeiture Unit of the Prosecutor's  
6 Office have been gathering steam."

7           It goes on to describe what this  
8 investigation has uncovered thus far, including,  
9 again, extortion taking place in asset forfeiture  
10 cases involving Ms. Malagón and Ms. Ardila, the Gran  
11 Estación case is mentioned as is the Supercundi case.

12 [REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

5

Colombia's counsel vociferously objected to me

6

questioning her any further about the document, which

7

they said was confidential; she'd never read it. I

8

can't question her on this document.

9

Mr. Caro backed that up. He said she

10

couldn't have seen this. [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

1

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Ms. Ardila

Polo writes him back: "Good morning respected Dr. Mosquera," and explains why she's not going to recognize Mr. López as an affected party, a courtesy that Newport never got.

In sum, Colombia acted arbitrarily and disproportionately when it initiated the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings in furtherance of a corrupt scheme in breach of the Fair and Equitable Treatment protection in Article 10.5 of the TPA. Again, I think it's important to take a step back. Why did all of this happen? Ms. Ardila claims--Colombia claims that

1 her investigation was into the assets of Iván López;  
2 that that's what differentiated it from the prior  
3 investigation, which was based, they say, on the  
4 kidnapping complaint. As we've seen, the Colombian  
5 courts and Prosecutors rely on the kidnapping  
6 complaint in this Asset Forfeiture Proceeding, too,  
7 but that's Colombia's story.

8           So, why is an asset forfeiture investigation  
9 that's focused on Iván López's assets? She received a  
10 list of 47 of them. Why did she zero in on the  
11 Meritage? Why? Why is--why not look at those assets?  
12 The assets that actually pertain to Mr. López  
13 personally, which the Meritage Lot never did.

14           I would submit that corruption is the most  
15 credible explanation that we have. Colombia itself  
16 has endorsed what's called the red flags approach.  
17 Followed by the Tribunal in Spentex, the Tribunal  
18 should adopt a methodology of starting from red flags,  
19 individual indicia of corruption and connecting the  
20 dots to obtain a larger picture. As Colombia argued  
21 there, it's practically impossible to prove  
22 corruption, so tribunals should use this time-honored

1 methodology. That's the Glencore v. Colombia Case.

2 Well, there are a lot of red flags here.

3 Some of them are listed on this slide. Certainly the  
4 timing and the speed of the Asset Forfeiture  
5 Proceedings against the Meritage that are opened in  
6 2016 closely tracks the extortionate demands made on  
7 Mr. Seda.

8 Colombia did not even cross Mr. Seda on the  
9 fact that he was approached on two occasions by people  
10 claiming to be from the Attorney General's Office and  
11 telling him to make a payoff and that would make  
12 everything go away. They didn't even cross him on  
13 that. There is no dispute that Mr. Seda was the  
14 attempted victim of an extortion scheme.

15 Mr. Mosquera also made claims--how could he  
16 have made these claims? He said I can influence  
17 Ms. Malagón, I talk to her every week. She'll do what  
18 I ask her to do. He specifically claimed to be able  
19 to influence the people in charge of the investigation  
20 and Asset Forfeiture Proceeding that resulted in the  
21 imposition of Precautionary Measures on the Meritage.  
22 He made an offer that could not have worked at all if

1 he was lying. He said put the money, \$20 million, in  
2 an offshore account, and you can only release it once  
3 I get the Asset Forfeiture Proceeding lifted. Again,  
4 this offer makes no sense if he were simply bluffing.

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]

16 And Ms. Ardila and Colombia cannot explain  
17 the discriminatory treatment of the Meritage Project.  
18 All of the explanations that they have offered simply  
19 do not hold water. Corruption is actually the most  
20 likely explanation.

21 I will now cover how the initiation of the  
22 Asset Forfeiture Proceedings was unconnected to any

1 rational policy purpose because of Colombia's failure  
2 to target illicit proceeds. I think this has been  
3 covered, really, by the content of slides that we've  
4 already covered, so I will just quickly go through it.

5           Again, Colombia claims the purpose of these  
6 proceedings is to investigate and sanction members of  
7 the Oficina de Envigado, which they alleged is a  
8 narcotics trafficking cartel. They say that the Asset  
9 Forfeiture Laws are used for the pursuit of assets  
10 acquired through illicit enrichment.

11 [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] They could have gone after the alleged wrong  
13 doers. They could have gone after Iván López and his  
14 assets. The Asset Forfeiture Law even allows you to  
15 seize equivalent assets. If you find that an asset  
16 has been gained illicitly but it's now in the hands of  
17 a good-faith party, you can go after equivalent assets  
18 that belong to the person that was alleged to have  
19 engaged in the wrongdoing. That's not what they did  
20 here. They went after the Meritage.

21           Again, this did not meet Colombia's stated  
22 policy objectives.

1

█

█

█

█

█

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

[REDACTED]

If you look at these decisions, tribunals will look at, you know, at factors that Tribunals will consider to determine if a State action is arbitrary, and Tribunals have said that Measures are arbitrary if they're not reasonably related to a rational policy purpose. Again, it's hard to see what rational policy purpose was served by any of this. It's certainly not the one that Colombia identifies.

Another way in which Colombia breached the TPA was by failing to assess Newport's good faith.

What is the good-faith standard under Colombian law? Well, we have a Constitutional Court Judgment from August 2020, and this Constitutional Court Judgment talks about how, "when someone intends to acquire an asset, it is up to that person to ascertain the legal status of such asset." The asset.

1 It focuses on the asset. "In order to establish the  
2 history and chain of title and tradition, but not to  
3 inquire into the history or personal details of the  
4 Party that transfers the respective assets to him."  
5 So, again, the diligence is into the asset. Is the  
6 asset free of encumbrances, liens or claims that  
7 someone could make against the asset; right? The  
8 statute of limitations for those claims in Colombia is  
9 10 years. So, that's why, when people are acquiring  
10 property in Colombia, they will do a title study that  
11 looks at the asset for the last 10 years.

12 Dr. Carlos Medellín, again former Minister  
13 of Justice and an Expert for Claimants in this  
14 proceeding, has further explained that what good faith  
15 requires is objective and diligent actions aimed at  
16 verifying the conditions and possible defects of the  
17 asset; right? Objective and diligent actions--not  
18 perfection--that's not the standard--or as Colombia  
19 seems to require a completely backwards-looking thing  
20 that says, well, we found a mistake in your diligence,  
21 we think you should have detected this or that,  
22 therefore the diligence wasn't sufficient. That seems

1 to be the standard Colombian is applying. It's not  
2 the standard. Perfection is not the standard. It  
3 requires objective and diligent actions, not  
4 perfection.

5           If we look further at that Constitutional  
6 Court judgment, the Court explains why the standard  
7 cannot be that you have to exhaustively investigate  
8 not just the seller of the asset but everybody  
9 backwards in the chain of title, all the other sellers  
10 of this asset ever. I mean, as the Court explains,  
11 this would make legal trade difficult or impossible.  
12 The Court explains here that, in a scenario such as  
13 this, people in legal commerce would be obliged not  
14 only to study the title to assets but also to perform  
15 meticulous investigations into the legal past of the  
16 sellers, into any legal disputes they may be involved  
17 in different jurisdictions, into the investigations  
18 and inquiries carried out by the Prosecutor's Office  
19 in which they could be involved, and even into  
20 opinions about said sellers in their communicates and  
21 on social media. Again, the Court says this is not  
22 required. This is not what is required, and it's

1 commercially impractical, impractical and impossible.

2           I'm going to be very brief on these slides  
3 because I think the Tribunal is fully familiar with  
4 the steps that were taken here, the steps of diligence  
5 that were taken here. Again, Newport hired one of  
6 Colombia's largest and most trusted fiduciaries,  
7 Corficolombiana. Corficolombiana asked that the  
8 purchasers at Newport carry out a title search,  
9 recommended a respective law firm to do that title  
10 search. That was done. The title search came back  
11 with a favorable opinion. No encumbrances, no reason  
12 that you cannot purchase this property. The title  
13 search also included a search of the OFAC and UN lists  
14 for mention of the individuals and legal persons  
15 appearing on Certificates of Encumbrance and Transfer  
16 History, came up with nothing.

17           One of the lawyers who did that study, Anna  
18 Palacio, explains the reason why they do a 10-year  
19 search. As I already said, it's because it's tied to  
20 the statute of limitations for claims against title.  
21 It's 10 years in Colombia. That's why 10 years is the  
22 industry standard.

1           They went further than that, though.  
2       Despite what this Colombian Constitutional Court  
3       Decision says, they did do KYC on the seller; right?  
4       They did a company study of La Palma Argentina, came  
5       back favorable.

6           Corficolombiana, as a regulated financial  
7       institution, subject to Colombia's SARLAFT procedures,  
8       that's a risk management system for money-laundering  
9       and terrorism financing; right? So, Corficolombiana  
10      has to have a SARLAFT procedure, it has to be approved  
11      by the Government. Colombia followed that procedure  
12      here. The testimony of their representative, she  
13      explains what was done here.

14           SARLAFT was run on, not just on Newport, but  
15      La Palma, the Investors. It all came back clean, no  
16      reason not to proceed with the Project.

17           Now, Mr. Caro, on cross, expressed basically  
18      complete ignorance of Corficolombiana's SARLAFT  
19      procedures and just didn't seem to think they were  
20      relevant to his inquiry about whether their diligence  
21      had been adequate. But in fact, Claimant's Expert,  
22      Dr. Martínez, again one of the drafters of the law,

1 explained that when an entity satisfies the minimum  
2 requirements on prudence that the law demands, in this  
3 case Corficolombiana complied with the requirements  
4 applicable to it, as provided by Article 102 of the  
5 EOSF, which details the SARLAFT due-diligence  
6 requirements, by undertaking that due-diligence in  
7 accordance to the legal system, it can be stated that  
8 it has acted in a prudent manner without fault.

9 Colombia satisfied--Corficolombiana satisfied its  
10 diligence duties, but it went above and beyond.

11 By the way, that's Paragraph 73 of his First  
12 Report.

13 Corficolombiana went even further, though.  
14 Their outside counsel, Francisco Sintura, who was,  
15 himself, was a former Vice Fiscal, wrote to the  
16 Attorney General's Office, wrote to the Asset  
17 Forfeiture and Money Laundering Unit, which at that  
18 time were a single unit, and he submitted a list of  
19 over--you know, this is a 60-page submission--a list  
20 of all the names of the owners of the property and the  
21 legal representatives of the entities in the chain of  
22 title that then appeared in the records plus La Palma

1 plus the property, submitted that list, told the  
2 Attorney General's Office why they were submitting the  
3 list because they were going to make an investment,  
4 because they were going to acquire this property,  
5 asked whether there were any active investigations  
6 involving any of these persons or entities. The  
7 response came back there's nothing. Again, this went  
8 above and beyond.

9           Again, let's look at what Colombia's  
10 criticisms are of the diligence that was done here.  
11 In their Opening Statement, they criticized the title  
12 study for going back only 10 years, not 20. They  
13 claimed that had Otero & Palacio conducted a full  
14 investigation, they will see, as we have seen before  
15 and contrary to what the Claimants say, that, indeed,  
16 there was Iván López Vanegas appearing as a  
17 representative of Sierralta, and was, indeed, if they  
18 had just done a Google search, they would have seen  
19 that he's a drug dealer. Well, again, this is exactly  
20 what the Constitutional Court has said you do not need  
21 to do.

22           But it is also completely backwards-looking.

1 Colombia doesn't point to any written rules that say  
2 your title study has to be 20 years instead of 10.  
3 Nothing; right? It's all just based on--again, we  
4 think we found a mistake here, since you made this  
5 mistake, your diligence must not have been adequate.  
6 That's exactly what the Constitutional Court said was  
7 commercially unworkable.

8           Indeed, Colombia took the position that, in  
9 order for diligence to be adequate, it would have to  
10 go all the way back to the origin of the asset.  
11 That's what they said. Again, there's no written  
12 rule. That's just what they say would have been  
13 needed.

14           Now, the question that has arisen in these  
15 proceedings as well is, when did this diligence  
16 attach; right? When did Newport become someone who  
17 would have been an affected party with property rights  
18 in the asset that was seized? The Decision of the  
19 Superior Court of Bogotá that recognized Newport as an  
20 affected party, relied on the Sales-Purchase  
21 Agreement, which was executed in November of 2012.  
22 Now, that is a--effectively, an option Contract. It

1 gives Royal Realty, later assigned to Newport, the  
2 option to buy the property. One of the requirements  
3 is that title come back clean. La Palma has to--you  
4 know, title has to come back clean. So, of course,  
5 they did as we've already discussed. They did go out  
6 and do their title checks, they did all their  
7 diligence and then create the rest of the structures  
8 that eventually are set up to carry out the  
9 development of the Meritage Project. So, when did the  
10 good faith attach? When was this diligence done?  
11 What is the date? The clearest statement in the  
12 record comes from, again, Dr. Medellín, and he says:  
13 "The date of the signing of the commercial trust  
14 agreement entered into between Newport and  
15 Corficolombiana in the Year 2013 is determinant. As  
16 of that time, the Parties to said agreement already  
17 had a patrimonial interest over the Real Property  
18 asset." Again, it's not about title. It's about  
19 having a patrimonial, a pecuniary interest in the  
20 asset. It's not about having title to the asset.  
21 Therefore it cannot be demanded of them that they  
22 continue engaging in acts due diligence regarding a

1 transaction that had already taken place.

2 Dr. Wilson Martínez agrees that the relevant  
3 time is October 2013. That's when the trusts are set  
4 up. That includes the pre-sales trust and the payment  
5 trust. And again, this is done in October 2013.

6 After those trusts are created, they start pre-sales,  
7 they start promoting the Project, they start selling  
8 units. Now, there is no duty to revisit diligence. I  
9 think an exchange between the President of the  
10 Tribunal and Colombian's witness make this is very  
11 clear. If we just skip ahead to Slide 153.

12 The President of the Tribunal asked  
13 Mr. Reyes: "Assume I buy a property in Colombia and  
14 there is no problem, nothing turns out, I do a due  
15 diligence that you would consider sufficient, and 10  
16 years later I learned that a relative of Escobar was  
17 involved in the initial--at the origin of the  
18 property. Now, does that affect my property rights?"

19 Mr. Reyes's answer is unequivocal:

20 "Absolutely not."

21 The President goes on: "Okay, if I want to  
22 resell the property in the year thereafter, so the new

1 circumstance has arisen, and I want to sell my  
2 property, and now it is known that there was at the  
3 origin an illicit circumstance, would I be able to  
4 sell the property to somebody else? Would that  
5 somebody else be a good faith purchaser because he  
6 would know, wouldn't he, probably he would know, of  
7 the illicit origin."

8           Again, the answer is unequivocal: "Yes, you  
9 can sell it."

10           Part of being a good faith buyer is being  
11 able to alienate the property; right? You don't  
12 have--if you can't sell the property, that's not much  
13 of a property right. The two are connected and  
14 inherent. There is no duty to revisit diligence, redo  
15 it.

16           But Newport and Corficolombiana nonetheless  
17 did revisit the diligence when Mr. López first  
18 approached Mr. Seda in 2013.

19           As Mr. Seda stated on cross: They  
20 rereviewed all the diligence that had been done; he  
21 reported the approach to La Palma Argentina, the  
22 seller; he reported it to Corficolombiana; he went on

1 a nationally syndicated radio program to talk about  
2 the extortion demand, so that the Unit buyers would  
3 know about it and they found nothing. There was no  
4 evidence that Mr. López owned the property, that he  
5 had any ownership right to the property.

6 Corficolombiana also revisited the  
7 diligence, and the testimony of Ms. Betancourt in  
8 Slide 151, she sets forth exactly what they did, we  
9 verified once again how the business deal had taken  
10 place, we verified the title studies, we verified the  
11 searches, we looked into La Palma again. We confirmed  
12 that there were no issues, none at all. Again, this  
13 wasn't required, but it was done anyway.

14 I apologize, I just want to correct the  
15 record. I misstated the date when Mr. López  
16 approached Mr. Seda. It was 2014, not 2013.

17 Slide 152.

18 Ms. Betancourt explained that all of the  
19 Contracts remained in place. There was no grounds to  
20 terminate them. After revisiting the diligence, there  
21 was no reason to terminate them, and they proceeded  
22 with the Project.



1           By initiating these Asset Forfeiture  
2 Proceedings against the Meritage, arbitrarily and  
3 without any rational policy purpose, Colombia breached  
4 the Fair and Equitable Treatment protection provided  
5 in Article 10.5 of the TPA. We've already talked  
6 about the certificate. I'm just going to briefly  
7 cover these slides.

8           You know, it created a legitimate  
9 investment-backed expectation; right? Mr. Sintura  
10 told the Fiscalía exactly why he was requesting this  
11 information. Because we're going to conduct a  
12 transaction in this property, because we want to avoid  
13 acquiring any assets that may be involved in active  
14 investigations; right? He told them, this is why  
15 we're asking you for this information. The Head of  
16 the Unit responded that there were no issues.

17           Mr. Seda testified about the reliance on  
18 that certification from the Fiscalía as part of the  
19 broader package of diligence that was done.

20           And as--again, a question from the President  
21 of the Tribunal to Colombia's witness, Mr. Caro. The  
22 President asked: "That's the part of the document

1 which deals with good-faith, and I would like to start  
2 with the individuals that are named on Page 139,"  
3 these are individuals identified in Corficolombiana's  
4 petition, "when I look at them, Mr. Arboleda--that's  
5 the mango vendor--Mr. Cardona Rodríguez--that's the  
6 engineer--Ms. Muñoz and Ms. Rendón--the model, these  
7 individuals were named in the list that was part of  
8 the petition to the Attorney General's Office of  
9 August 2013. When you received this petition and you  
10 responded to it, those individuals were commented as  
11 not listed in the information system. So, in other  
12 words, I conclude from this that, at the time, you  
13 were not aware that, for example, Mr. Arboleda who  
14 was, according to Respondent's position, a front man  
15 and a former mango vendor. Do I understand that  
16 correctly, you were not in possession of such  
17 information in 2013?"

18 Well, Mr. Caro says, I'm not the one to give  
19 the answer, but he says the Chief of the Unit at that  
20 time is that person, and that's exactly who provided  
21 it.

22 Again, Colombia's own Prosecutors confirmed

1 to Mr. Seda that they had a legitimate expectation  
2 based on this certification. That expectation was  
3 backed up by investment; and, by frustrating that  
4 legitimate expectation, Colombia breached its  
5 obligations to provide fair and equitable treatment  
6 under Article 10.5 of the TPA.

7           These cases explain that the touchstone of  
8 fair and equitable treatment is the frustration of  
9 legitimate expectations, expectations backed by  
10 investment. That's exactly what happened here.

11           I'll just briefly cover another breach,  
12 which is the fact that Colombia's Measures, the  
13 Measures taken here, put Claimants' entire portfolio  
14 in the line of fire. Colombia knew or should have  
15 known this, should have known that all of Royal  
16 Realty's business would be put directly in the line of  
17 fire.

18           An Asset Forfeiture Proceeding and unfounded  
19 criminal investigation taint the reputation of the  
20 affected party. It really goes without saying. It  
21 signals that the Party is involved in illegal activity  
22 or that the Party did not conduct adequate diligence

1 or both. In either scenario, banks, investors and  
2 customers will avoid working with that person.

3 [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

10 Colombia submits that we have put in no  
11 evidence of this. That's simply not true. There's  
12 the publicity. There are multiple letters, text  
13 messages, agreements in the record. Testimony that  
14 show that one-by-one these projects came to a halt,  
15 and they came to a halt because of the proceedings  
16 against the Meritage. We have Mr. López Montoya's  
17 testimony, Mr. Seda's testimony. We have emails from  
18 investors who said we can't--we can't go forward.

19 And there's more in the appendix. We cannot  
20 go forward until the Meritage issue is resolved.

21 The Purchase Agreement for the land for the  
22 Tierra Bomba project was revoked, and it specifically

1 states: "Given the difficulties and the scandal  
2 related to Meritage Project, we're revoking this."

3 The management contract that Royal Realty  
4 was going to enter into with a hotel in Tierra Bomba,  
5 also revoked because of the Meritage Project.

6 Mr. Seda sets forth in his Witness Statement  
7 how the Meritage seizure affected his other projects.  
8 People wouldn't go into business with Royal Realty,  
9 they would not buy land with them, they would not  
10 enter into deals with them, they could no longer  
11 attract investment, all of these projects at various  
12 states of development died. They were put into the  
13 line of fire by Colombia's actions.

14 Again, Colombia criticizes this evidence,  
15 they say, it's based on testimony. It's not just  
16 based on testimony. You saw some of the documents  
17 there, there's more in the appendix, but again,  
18 Colombia had the opportunity to cross-examine these  
19 witnesses.

20 Colombia's conduct arbitrarily and  
21 unreasonably placed Claimants' investments in the line  
22 of fire in breach of the FET protection in

1 Article 10.5 of the TPA. Colombia also failed to  
2 protect Claimants' investments from the arbitrary and  
3 irrational conduct of officials within the Attorney  
4 General's Office in breach of its obligation to  
5 exercise vigilant pursuant to the TPA's protection,  
6 also provided in Article 10.5 of the TPA.

7           As set forth in this Case, *Rompetrol v.*  
8 *Romania*: "In the Tribunal's considered view, it is  
9 part of the legitimate expectations of a protected  
10 investor--without in any way trenching upon the  
11 sovereign right of the host State to prescribe and  
12 enforce its criminal law--that, if its interest find  
13 themselves caught up in the criminal process either  
14 directly or indirectly, means will be sought by the  
15 authorities of the host State to avoid any  
16 unnecessarily adverse effect on those interests or at  
17 least to minimize or mitigate those adverse effects."  
18 Colombia simply did not do that here. In fact, its  
19 officials took the path that would cause the most  
20 damage to Claimants' investment.

21           As the Tribunal explained in *AMT v. Zaire*:  
22 "The obligation on the State is one of vigilance";

1 right? The State must be vigilant. The obligation  
2 incumbent upon Zaire is an obligation of vigilance, in  
3 the sense that Zaire is the receiving State of  
4 investments made by AMT, an American company, shall  
5 take all measures necessary to ensure the full  
6 enjoyment and protection and security of its  
7 investment and should not be permitted to invoke its  
8 own legislation to detract from any such obligation."

9 Colombia cannot simply rely on the fact it has an  
10 Asset Forfeiture Code, that--it's purportedly  
11 following that code, it has to be vigilant. It has to  
12 ensure that the measures it's taking are not  
13 unnecessarily inflicting damage. They did not do that  
14 here.

15           Finally, and briefly, Colombia has engaged  
16 in a sustained and increasingly hostile campaign to  
17 tarnish Mr. Seda's reputation. A completely  
18 unnecessary campaign. The Asset Forfeiture Proceeding  
19 itself did enough damage but they have not stopped  
20 there. Although stating in their pleadings before  
21 this Tribunal, that Mr. Seda was not personally  
22 accused of any wrongdoing, Colombia has pivoted 180

1 and they've launched a retaliatory campaign. [REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

19

But Mr. Seda and the rest of the Claimants

20

have never been charged with a crime, either in

21

Colombia or the U.S., even though Mr. Seda has been

22

subject to invasive investigations, never been charged

1 with a crime, never been put on the OFAC List, the UN  
2 list, et cetera. There is simply nothing to back up  
3 all of this innuendo.

4 This campaign to tarnish Mr. Seda's  
5 reputation amounts to a failure to protect Mr. Seda  
6 and his investments from--excuse me--in breach of  
7 Colombia's obligation to exercise vigilance pursuant  
8 to the full protection and security protections  
9 provided by Article 10.5 of the TPA.

10 I will turn it back over to my colleague,  
11 Mr. Moloo, who will address damages.

12 MR. MOLOO: Thank you, Ms. Champion.

13 Just what you gentlemen want before lunch,  
14 the most technical part of my presentation. So, for  
15 the next 30 minutes if you'll bear with me, we will go  
16 through why we think Colombia's conduct has caused  
17 damage to Claimants and the amount of damage that  
18 Claimants have suffered.

19 The first thing I want to talk about is  
20 causation, and the TPA itself in 10.16 deals with  
21 causation. It says that what can be claimed here is  
22 loss or damage that, by reason of or arising out of

1 the breach, can be claimed. By reason of or arising  
2 out of. And we would submit that all of the damages  
3 that I'm going to talk about are by reason of or  
4 arising out of, and in particular there's a question  
5 about the non-Meritage Projects, and I think we've  
6 given you enough evidence as to why all of those  
7 projects--it doesn't make any sense why the Luxé  
8 wouldn't have been finished. It's a 75 percent-done  
9 hotel, financing is in place. Construction contracts  
10 are all in place. Why that gets stopped? It gets  
11 stopped because the bank pulls the financing. They  
12 shut off the tap that they've already approved. There  
13 is no other reason why these projects dry up, but for  
14 the Measures that are at issue here.

15           And as Joseph Charles Lemire v. Ukraine  
16 says, If it can be proven that in the normal cause of  
17 events, a certain cause will produce a certain effect,  
18 it can be safely assumed that a rebuttable presumption  
19 of causality between both events exists and that the  
20 first is the proximate cause of the other.

21           Ms. Champion took you through a lot of this.  
22 But here on this slide is some of the evidence that's

1 in the record, as to, obviously the Meritage project  
2 was halted, but why the banks pulled the financing.  
3 That's covered by the Witness Statements, but also  
4 Documents. Other investors withdraw from the Luxé,  
5 one of them Paladin, one of the private equity  
6 financiers refused to invest any longer in Luxé and in  
7 some of the Development Projects where they basically  
8 just said we're not investing with you anymore because  
9 we're worried obviously that the same thing is going  
10 to happen to your other projects that happened to the  
11 Meritage.

12           One of the things that Colombia says, is  
13 yeah, but nothing happened to The Charlee. The  
14 Charlee is still operating, but The Charlee is  
15 obviously in a very different situation because it  
16 doesn't need third-party financing anymore; right?  
17 There is no third-party financing. It's  
18 self-sustaining; right? There's no other business  
19 partnerships or anything needed. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

15

Now, Dr. Hern says--that's the Respondent's Expert--they say, Claimants should have no issues pursuing these other opportunities because they can just sell the Projects, they can just sell them or they can pursue other projects. But he fundamentally misunderstands the case that Colombia itself is putting forward: He can't sell them. He can't sell these other projects because now he's associated with

22

1 this illegality, so people are hesitant to buy from  
2 him.

3           It's national news; right? So, on  
4 Colombia's case in this proceeding, selling is going  
5 to be difficult.

6           But in any event, I asked him in  
7 cross-examination, well, you're saying this--you're  
8 saying--you know, he can still develop these other  
9 projects, what's stopping him, and, you know, he can  
10 still sell them. But have you seen any of the  
11 evidence? And he said, and I asked him, You haven't  
12 seen the evidence; right? I referred to the Paladin  
13 statements, these private equity investors. And he  
14 says, I haven't. I haven't looked at the evidence  
15 behind those. And I said, For example, C-186, we can  
16 pull it up. Do you recall seeing this Agreement? It  
17 was an Agreement where they had to terminate one of  
18 the Contracts because of the Meritage. And he said, I  
19 can't recall, honestly, whether I have seen that  
20 particular agreement.

21           And then I took him to the statements by the  
22 government officials where they're saying, yeah, of

1 course, you're going to be affected by these things.  
2 And he said again, Can you take me to the statement?  
3 And I took him to one of the statements and he said, I  
4 have not seen this document. And I took him through a  
5 number of these documents that you've seen today and  
6 he hadn't seen any of them. And then I asked him, And  
7 if he was prevented--Mr. Seda and Newport and Royal  
8 Property Group--from being able to transact and to  
9 sell these projects and do the business that you're  
10 saying they could have done, then what would have been  
11 your conclusion? And he said, Yes, logically if he is  
12 impacted and he can't develop them and he can't also  
13 sell them, then I would take a different view that  
14 economically those projects must have been impacted  
15 then.

16 That's what their expert ultimately said  
17 after I took him to all of these documents, and he  
18 said, Well, if I would have--if that was--if he  
19 couldn't sell and he couldn't develop these projects  
20 anymore, then I would have taken a different view.

21 So, what is that compensation? Well, we  
22 start with what is the legal standard, and we all know

1 it's Fair Market Value. No dispute there. Colombia  
2 agrees, Fair Market Value captures the full reparation  
3 owed to Claimants. And Dr. Hern, their expert, says  
4 it's the price that a willing buyer would pay a  
5 willing seller in the market, in a liquid market, the  
6 hypothetical price. He agrees that that's the  
7 approach.

8           And then we talk about well, what is the  
9 Fair Market Value? How do you assess Fair Market  
10 Value? And there is three ways, I'm sure the Tribunal  
11 is familiar with them: Income-based approach,  
12 market-based approach, and an asset-based approach.  
13 And the starting point, and I think it's well accepted  
14 now, is the income-based approach. And why is that  
15 the starting point? It's because it properly captures  
16 the value of that investment to the owner. And the  
17 owner or controller of the entity is likely to have  
18 the detailed information needed to give a realistic  
19 assessment of those future cash flows. So, that's why  
20 you start with an investment-based approach. And  
21 that's where all economists in the real world, and I  
22 think more so now in investor-State arbitration,

1 generally start.

2           But especially in the context of real estate  
3 development because there aren't a lot of real estate  
4 development cases in the investor-State context. So I  
5 think it's important to think about in the real estate  
6 development context in particular, what do experts do?  
7 And so, we went to CBRE, who's again, that's  
8 Colombia's expert, CBRE, well-known industry expert,  
9 real estate expert, and we found an expert assessment  
10 they themselves had done of an undeveloped, completely  
11 undeveloped, piece of land. You may recall there was  
12 some confusion about whether this piece of land was in  
13 California or in Mexico. It's in Mexico.

14           But this piece of land was a valuation,  
15 there was a valuation done in March 20--of 2018 by the  
16 expert that CBRE put up in this particular  
17 arbitration. And their completely undeveloped piece  
18 of land, that they used a Discounted Cash Flow  
19 approach to assess the value of the land. They said  
20 what's the highest and best use? Well, the highest  
21 and best use is you're going to develop this land,  
22 you're going to subdivide it, and you're going to

1 build a bunch of units and you're going to sell that  
2 finished product. Let's do a Discounted Cash Flow of  
3 this land based on that highest and best use of that  
4 property.

5           And Ms. Ritwik asked Mr. Maugeri on  
6 cross-examination, Have you ever done a DCF for an  
7 undeveloped project, completely undeveloped." And he  
8 confirmed, Yes, I have.

9           And when I took Dr. Hern to this because  
10 he's not an industry expert, I would submit, I talked  
11 to him and I asked him, Are you familiar with the  
12 subdivision development approach that CBRE had taken  
13 in this valuation report? And he ultimately said he  
14 looked at it, he read through it. And he goes, The  
15 value of the underlying land is then estimated. I'm  
16 asking him, Estimated through a Discounted Cash Flow  
17 analysis with revenues based on the achievable sale  
18 price of the finished product. And I asked him, Have  
19 you ever used this approach to value other assets,  
20 undeveloped assets? Have you used this Discounted  
21 Cash Flow Approach to do this for a piece of land.  
22 And he said, Yes. So, apparently Dr. Hern has done

1 so, too.

2           And I asked him, Do you disagree with an  
3 approach of valuing an undeveloped real estate  
4 project, completely undeveloped, nothing on the land  
5 whatsoever? Are you okay with basically using a DCF  
6 Approach? Do you have any issue with that? And he  
7 said, Not as a matter of principle. As a matter of  
8 principle would I disagree with the use of a DCF for  
9 undeveloped projects? Not necessarily because I think  
10 there are some circumstances where one could get quite  
11 comfortable with, you know, how that project become  
12 evolve.

13           So, both CBRE and Dr. Hern are comfortable  
14 with using the DCF Approach for completely undeveloped  
15 land. Now, the Meritage and Luxé are obviously not  
16 undeveloped pieces of land. We will get to that. But  
17 even for a completely undeveloped piece of land,  
18 they're okay with using the DCF Approach. They  
19 confirmed that at the Hearing.

20           And why are sunk costs not okay? Why does  
21 that not make sense, especially, I would say, in the  
22 real estate development context? Well, first of all,

1 because it doesn't value the know-how, the brand  
2 value, the track record, the experience of the folks  
3 who are coming to build that property, so you don't  
4 just, you know, what I paid for that piece of land is  
5 not necessarily what it's worth tomorrow. There's  
6 appreciation, obviously, but if I'm bringing some  
7 added value, some knowledge, some expertise, I get  
8 permitting done, et cetera, that all has value that  
9 you have to give--that you have to account for, and  
10 that's the problem with the sunk-costs approach. It  
11 doesn't give any value to these intangibles, the  
12 market knowledge, the consumer insight, the vendor  
13 relationships, the hotel management experience. All  
14 of the things that the Royal Property Group had, not  
15 anybody can come in and do this. This requires some  
16 sophistication, some knowledge, some knowledge that,  
17 by the way, obviously the Royal Property Group had  
18 because they had done this before.

19           But Dr. Hern, despite accepting that the DCF  
20 Approach would be okay for a completely undeveloped  
21 piece of property, he basically confirms that the  
22 approach he took was a sunk costs updated at Risk-Free

1 Rate. I asked, Is that what you've done, you've  
2 basically sunk costs updated at a Risk-Free Rate?

3 He said, Essentially.

4 He was resisting the sunk costs terminology  
5 and said, You could think of it as a replacement, an  
6 estimate of the replacement costs. But he confirmed,  
7 It's sunk costs, Risk-Free Rate updated. That's not  
8 Fair Market Value. Sunk costs, anybody who owns a  
9 house knows what I paid for the house 10 years ago is  
10 not what it's worth today. Hopefully it could go up  
11 or down, but it's not what I paid. That's not the  
12 Fair Market Value, even just for a piece of property.

13 Some more on confirming that that's the  
14 approach he's taken, just basically a sunk-costs  
15 approach or replacement cost.

16 And the reason why he justified this  
17 Replacement Cost Approach, what was the reason? I was  
18 trying to figure out how could he justify this as an  
19 economist? And he said, Well, in a perfectly  
20 competitive environment, where it is perfectly  
21 competitive--that's an economic term of art--then it  
22 makes sense, your sunk costs updated at a Risk-Free

1 Rate is going to be what the thing is worth. Because  
2 it's a perfectly competitive environment. I can go  
3 and buy that replacement. If I buy a widget from one  
4 person, I can go and buy a widget from someone else  
5 for the same price. And I asked him, But that's your  
6 assumption, but nothing is perfectly competitive;  
7 right? And he said, Right, right. That's right.

8           But that's his assumption. That's the only  
9 way you get to replacement cost theory for Fair Market  
10 Value. Is that you're assuming a perfectly  
11 competitive environment. But he accepts that nothing  
12 is perfectly competitive.

13           And I would suggest especially the real  
14 estate development market in Medellín where one of the  
15 main reasons why Mr. Seda went there in the first  
16 place was because he saw opportunity. He saw that  
17 there wasn't a widget on every corner that you could  
18 buy. There wasn't a luxury hotel, there was  
19 opportunity, and that's exactly what investors do.  
20 They find those opportunities and they invest in them.  
21 This is not a perfectly competitive environment with  
22 no barriers to entry.

1           So, then the next question is, when using a  
2 DCF is, can I say with a sufficient degree of  
3 certainty that there would have been some profit  
4 obtained here? And real estate is different than like  
5 a big mining investment, for example, which I know we  
6 see a lot more, for example; right? Where you can  
7 sink a bunch of money, and you could lose it if  
8 there's no gold in the ground; right? That's not the  
9 case with property; right? Property has inherent  
10 value. So, to be profitable, that threshold to reach  
11 that sufficient certainty that there was going to be  
12 profitability in a property development context, is  
13 much easier to meet than, for example, mining or  
14 something else, and so that's important to appreciate,  
15 that that threshold for a sufficient degree of  
16 certainty that there would have been profitability is  
17 much easier to meet in the property development  
18 context, and it was certainly met, I would say, here  
19 especially looking at the track record of these  
20 investors.

21           And Colombia appears to accept that a DCF  
22 valuation is reliable with the correct assumptions and

1 that's in their Rejoinder. Colombia's Rejoinder said,  
2 It is possible to correct some of the assumptions made  
3 by BRG to reach a more reasonable DCF value which can  
4 be verified by appropriate crosschecks as demonstrated  
5 by Dr. Hern.

6           So, they confirmed that with the right  
7 assumptions, DCF is the right approach.

8           The question, of course, then is who's got  
9 the assumptions; right?

10           But by the way, before I get to those  
11 assumptions, one important point is The Charlee Hotel,  
12 no dispute that, wildly successful and profitable, I  
13 think that was confirmed by the Respondent's Experts  
14 as well.

15           With respect to the Meritage, DCF is  
16 warranted, it was significantly advanced. This is a  
17 situation where you pre-sell; right? So the owners  
18 have already committed contractually to buy the  
19 property. Sold out in record time, 152 units, I'm  
20 going to build them, I already know who the buyers  
21 are. I have contracts with them. They have to buy  
22 them. They've put down deposits. My costs are known

1 because I've entered into contracts with my  
2 construction contracts. There is--You've reached the  
3 point of equilibrium. The banks are giving you money  
4 because they know at this point that it's secure.  
5 Right? You've reached that point where you know,  
6 you've sold the units, everything with the hotel, et  
7 cetera, is basically you've mapped it out, you know  
8 your costs, et cetera, very far advanced.

9           And Colombia, by the way, did not contest  
10 any of that evidence. They didn't challenge  
11 Mr. Seda's testimony on any of this at the Hearing.

12           Luxé. The cabanas were already built. Now,  
13 what's the income stream that comes from that? Well,  
14 someone has to manage them; right? People--the owners  
15 have bought these cabanas, and they've contracted with  
16 the Royal Property Group to manage these cabanas.

17           Hotel. Financing is in place. The  
18 hotels--they're already booking events. It's  
19 72.5 percent complete, is what the C-338--the  
20 construction folks will tell you that it's  
21 72.5 percent complete when there is an audit done on  
22 this project.

1           It was meant to commence operations in  
2 January 2017, mere months. This was Meritage August  
3 2016, January 2017, the hotel was meant to open. They  
4 had already hired staff to work at the front desk.  
5 Again, none of this is contested because they didn't  
6 challenge Mr. Seda's testimony at the Hearing on any  
7 of this.

8           So, let's go to the inputs. What are those  
9 inputs? Well, there's three different categories that  
10 I'm going to take you through. One is the real estate  
11 business. That's basically the part of these projects  
12 was that there were houses and apartment units that  
13 are being bought and sold. And so you have the  
14 revenue side of that and the cost side of that. Then  
15 you've got the hospitality business, the hotels.  
16 Right? How much does it cost to operate and what are  
17 the costs and fees that you're going to earn.

18           And then we'll talk about the risk  
19 adjustments. And there's two risk adjustments we'll  
20 talk about. We'll talk about the Discount Rate, and  
21 then the properties that are in development, 350  
22 Heights, et cetera, Santa Fe, BRG, has taken a further

1 discount on the probability of survival.

2           So, let's start with the real estate  
3 business. The formula is fairly straightforward.  
4 What are your revenues. Let's start with the revenue  
5 side of the equation. It's how much do I get to sell,  
6 how many square meters am I selling, and what's the  
7 sale price per square meter, and I multiply the two.  
8 Right? Here's my average sellable area, and here's  
9 how much I get per square meter. I multiply those two  
10 and that gives me an output of how much I'm going to  
11 sell a particular house for, for example. Right? So,  
12 if I say my house is--we use square feet in the United  
13 States--so \$1,000 per square foot, you figure out how  
14 many square feet you have, and you multiply the two,  
15 and that's what your price is. That's a proxy that  
16 many folks use for sellable--for revenues on the real  
17 estate side of things.

18           And here, you have two numbers here. The  
19 blue column on this chart is based on the business  
20 planning documents, so these are Luxé's projections.  
21 Their contemporaneous Business Plans are projecting  
22 the sale price per square meter in that blue bar.

1           And then JLL, who I'm sure this Tribunal  
2 knows, is probably the world's leading expert on  
3 property as an industry expert, they've corroborated  
4 that by market data in Colombia, in other places  
5 they're saying. If I look at similar units, how much  
6 do they sell for per square meter? If I compare that  
7 to the Meritage, for example, they're saying well,  
8 actually in that area you can get COP 4.5 million per  
9 square meter. So, what you see is BRG's assessment in  
10 all of those cases except for Santa Fe, are actually  
11 more conservative than JLL's market data in terms of  
12 price per square meter. And the equation is as simple  
13 as that on the revenue side of things for the real  
14 estate business. It's price per square meter times  
15 how much land do I get to sell, or how much property,  
16 developed property do I sell.

17           So, then you look at the other side of the  
18 equation, costs. How much does it cost me to build  
19 this thing? And you have construction costs  
20 essentially, and then you've got soft costs like  
21 marketing and pre-development expenses. And again,  
22 you've got the business planning documents and then

1 you've got market data in terms of costs.

2 I'm sure Tribunal Members love hearing this,  
3 when they hear that costs, the cost side of the  
4 equation here, is actually not in debate, and that's  
5 confirmed by CBRE. They say, According to the  
6 Claimants' model, construction costs are pretty much  
7 aligned with our professional opinion. So, Colombia's  
8 experts accept that the costs side of the equation  
9 here on the real estate business is reasonable. And  
10 Dr. Hern, when I asked him in cross-examination, you  
11 agree that the construction costs in the BRG model are  
12 reasonable; correct?

13 And he said, General speaking that's the  
14 question. I said, Yes. He said, Because there are  
15 obviously many, many thousands of construction costs  
16 assumptions. I mean, based on the evidence that I've  
17 seen from CBRE, I have no reason to think that they  
18 are excessively different from what one would expect,  
19 but there's still, I think, a lot of subjectivity to  
20 those numbers but I see no real reason to dispute  
21 them. That's right.

22 That's just a typical expert example, but

1 basically what he's saying is, I agree--that he agrees  
2 that construction costs are reasonable.

3           So, to get your damages on the real estate  
4 side of things, what do you do? And this is exactly  
5 what BRG has done, they take the revenues, they  
6 subtract the costs and that's your damages on the real  
7 estate side of things. Obviously, then they update  
8 that as appropriate.

9           Now, to verify that damage, Dr. Hern looks  
10 at EBITDA margins to compare, you know, is this a  
11 reasonable margin that they're getting. And he says,  
12 No, they're not reasonable margins. But the examples  
13 that he gives, you can see the red part of these  
14 graphs, are social housing examples.

15           Now, the margins you get in social housing  
16 projects are completely different than the kinds of  
17 luxury projects that we're selling here; right? And  
18 that's because the social housing business is a volume  
19 business. You get--families get subsidies basically  
20 to buy these social housing units and so you have  
21 razor thin margins and basically the business is a  
22 volume business, that's what JLL tells us. So, when

1 he's looking at EBITDA margins, you can't compare  
2 social housing projects to the luxury apartments and  
3 cabanas that you saw pictures of at the outset. Those  
4 aren't the same types of margins.

5           And then if you look at Profit Margin  
6 comparisons, what did CBRE do? CBRE went and they  
7 interviewed people. They did a survey. Their own  
8 survey. We don't know what the methodology was, but  
9 they went and just asked people. They didn't tell us  
10 who they asked, it was just random people--maybe not  
11 random respondents, but they didn't identify the  
12 Respondents. We can't assess whether or not they're  
13 comparable or not.

14           And they just asked them, What are roughly  
15 your profit margins? And they were asked on  
16 cross-examination, Did you ask for the underlying  
17 data, or did you take their word for it? And CBRE  
18 said, We took their word for it.

19           And you don't list who these people are in  
20 your Report, do you?

21           And he said, No, not explicitly.

22           So, quite frankly, I don't think you can

1 rely on any of the survey data that you got. They  
2 didn't identify the Respondents. It's impossible to  
3 verify whether the projects are comparable to the  
4 Claimants, and it's really just survey data that was,  
5 I mean, very--you know--I mean, you saw the  
6 cross-examination and you may recall it's not very  
7 reliable.

8           One of the other questions you asked is, How  
9 quickly can you sell these things? Because the  
10 quicker you sell them, the faster you get money;  
11 right? So, you have a higher NPV, Net Present Value,  
12 because you get money sooner in the bank account.

13           CBRE acknowledges that the Meritage Project  
14 had record sales--this is in their direct  
15 presentation, by the way, CBRE, that's their  
16 presentation, Colombia's presentation--they say we know  
17 that the Meritage at Phase 1 had record sales; we were  
18 able to verify this.

19           So, they're confirming, record sales. The  
20 Meritage Project.

21           But then what they did was they looked at  
22 velocity of sales figures from their survey data.

1 Now, their survey data, it was really interesting, and  
2 I went back and looked at this, and I was really  
3 surprised. But even if you look at their survey data,  
4 they did it for different reasons. So, they  
5 interviewed four different projects from Medellín, for  
6 example. Right? And they said, What's your velocity  
7 of sales per month? And one Respondent said, Two to  
8 three units per month. One said, Three to five.

9           Now, we don't know who these people are so,  
10 we don't know if they're selling apartments or houses  
11 or where in Medellín, but someone said two to three,  
12 and someone said three to five, someone else said four  
13 to 15, someone else said five to 15, and then someone  
14 else said 1.4 to 2. And guess what number CBRE picked  
15 for sales velocity for Medellín? 1.4. The lowest of  
16 all of the numbers. They didn't take an average, they  
17 didn't do anything like that. They just said, Oh,  
18 sales velocity in Medellín should be about 1.4 per  
19 month. And you can see that in the cross-examination.

20           And that's not what the numbers we're seeing  
21 here, so it can't be right, but they ignored their own  
22 survey data.

1           For Cartagena, same thing happened. They  
2 looked at a couple of different developers, two--so  
3 again, these are not very reliable results. But one  
4 of them said, Oh, our sales absorption is 15 to 20 per  
5 month. And another one said, Two per month. And  
6 guess what number they picked to put in their Report?  
7 Two. So, they're just taking the numbers that are the  
8 most convenient.

9           And they had to say on cross-examination.  
10 As I said, this was challenging in connection with the  
11 sample we were able to collect. That's the only  
12 non-highlighted part on the right side there. So,  
13 they just said, It was challenging, and we had to pick  
14 something. And they just happened to pick the lowest  
15 number in all of the datasets. So, it's just not  
16 reliable.

17           In terms of the hospitality business. So,  
18 we've talked about real estate, you know, they built  
19 these projects and they sell them, those are just  
20 sales of houses basically; right? And apartment  
21 units. But then there's the hospitality side of  
22 things.

1           On the hospitality side of things, there are  
2 again revenues and costs, and how do you assess  
3 revenues? Well, revenues are their available rooms,  
4 and what's called RevPar, it's a term that's used in  
5 the hospitality industry. And basically what RevPar  
6 is, is the average daily rate times the occupancy  
7 rate. So, you take, let's say for a hotel I get \$500  
8 a night, and let's say on average a hotel room is  
9 occupied 200 nights a year, so I multiply \$500 a night  
10 times 200 nights a year of occupancy and I get my  
11 RevPar. And if I've got 100 rooms, I multiply all of  
12 those and that gives me my revenues on the hospitality  
13 side of the business.

14           And the revenue for available room for each  
15 of the Projects, BRG calculates them here in this  
16 slide. This is part of their direct presentation at  
17 Slide 32. And you can see for the Meritage hotel, for  
18 the Luxé, for Cartagena, for 450 Heights, for Santa  
19 Fe, this was what was projected. And you can see as a  
20 benchmark, The Charlee Hotel, the revenue per  
21 available room was about COP 509,000 per night.

22           Other fees that they got, they got a

1 developer fee, there were certain contractual fees  
2 that the Meritage Claimants, the Royal Realty as the  
3 Manager and the developer, gets. Those are just  
4 contractual development fees that they get. And  
5 that's just purely a question of what rights do they  
6 have in their contract? And that's reflected in the  
7 RR Meritage company agreement at 3.08, and you've got  
8 the provision there. They get a developer fee, they  
9 get the percentage of gross sales, and they get  
10 certain additional fees that are paid.

11           And when I asked Dr. Hern about this, he  
12 said, Oh well, I'm not a lawyer, I can't interpret  
13 this.

14           But it's all right there, and BRG has  
15 assessed how much of these fees would then have  
16 accrued to Royal Realty.

17           So, on the hospitality side of things, then  
18 we go to the other side of the equation, what's the  
19 cost? Well, to build and operate a hotel, there are a  
20 number of costs. There's: Operating Revenues,  
21 Operating Costs, there's some management brand fees,  
22 and there's Profit Sharing Agreement. And that is all

1 information that BRG has calculated and verified by  
2 comparing it to what the market data is, and JLL has  
3 assessed what that market data is, and they derived a  
4 value per key. So, in the hotel industry, that's a  
5 metric that's often used, value per key.

6           And you can see the blue line on Slide 215,  
7 that's the value, the average value per key, for the  
8 Claimants' hotels. And you can see where that ranks  
9 in terms of the comparable hotels, sample of hotels  
10 that JLL used. So, the overall average is  
11 USD \$414,000, and for Claimants' hotels the average is  
12 USD \$388,000. So, when they're doing this market  
13 check, it's a check against the DCF model. They're  
14 saying, Yeah, it checks out because they're coming in  
15 under the--against what we think are comparable  
16 hotels--they're coming in under that overall average.

17           So, it's a reasonability check in terms of  
18 the DCF model for revenue--for the value per key from  
19 a hospitality industry perspective.

20           So, when Dr. Hern looks at these  
21 comparables, what does he do? Well, the way he  
22 assesses whether or not these are actually comparable,

1 he goes to Booking.com, the website that we all--many  
2 of us may have gone to, and he just picks a random  
3 night of the year. And he goes, Let me see how much  
4 each of these hotels cost on that random night that I  
5 pick. So, he picked October 28, 2020, which, by the  
6 way, is at the height of the pandemic. And he said,  
7 Let me check the price for that night and then I can  
8 make an assessment as to whether or not they're  
9 comparable to the Meritage and all of these other  
10 hotels. And I asked him, So, you did this on  
11 October 28, you went to Booking.com; is that right?  
12 He said, Yes. And I said, I also use that website.  
13 And you forecast out, you put in the date June 16th.  
14 Why did you pick June 16, out of curiosity? Did you  
15 try other dates, or did you just--you just thought  
16 June 16th, it's a nice date, let's pick that date?

17 And his answer is, Pretty much. That's why  
18 he picked the date. Not a very scientific approach to  
19 picking comparables and deciding or criticizing, I  
20 would say, JLL, one of the world's leading hotel  
21 experts as to what is a comparable hotel.

22 I'm not sure that I actually need to do much

1 more on why his approach was flawed. But quite  
2 frankly, what he was saying were comparables, were  
3 just, I mean, you heard it. Were just not comparable  
4 options. I mean, you heard from JLL basically saying  
5 this demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of  
6 the industry.

7 But I do want to spend a bit of time on  
8 those Discount Rate, which is at Slide 220.

9 And some of the questions were, well, what's  
10 captured by the Discount Rate in this particular case?  
11 Does it capture the, you know, likelihood that this  
12 project might fail? And he said--and he was asked,  
13 But I'm talking about the Project completely failing.  
14 Is that impossible?

15 And when they're talking about the Meritage,  
16 he says--and the Luxé, he says, That is--is it taken  
17 into account by the Discount Rate? Mr. Dellepiane was  
18 asked about that, and he said, A hundred percent.  
19 That's exactly what it is. It's assessing that for a  
20 project that is reasonably likely to succeed, and you  
21 know--for the Meritage and Luxé, he's saying that is  
22 what the Discount Rate assesses. It's assessing the

1 risk of the project failing. That's one of the things  
2 that's captured by that.

3           And I know the President of the Tribunal  
4 asked that same--a similar question: How do you  
5 capture a risk such as delay in construction and  
6 things like that?

7           And that was answered, again by the experts,  
8 they said, In two ways. One is when you project cash  
9 flows because you're taking into account those kinds  
10 of risks, delays. That's accounted for in when you're  
11 projecting when am I likely to get cash flows.

12           But the second is in the Discount Rate  
13 because the beta parameter for the real estate  
14 industry, that's one of the things that's incorporated  
15 into the Discount Rate. So things like delays of  
16 construction work, that is all captured by the  
17 Discount Rate.

18           If we go to 223, Dr. Hern's Discount Rate  
19 and his assumptions are just not reasonable, in our  
20 view, and why is that? Well, the Discount Rate, as  
21 this Tribunal will know is driven partly by the Cost  
22 of Debt and the Cost of Equity, so the overall

1 Weighted Cost of Capital. And the Cost of Debt that  
2 he uses for his Discount Rate is the cost of  
3 construction loans. But when you're operating a  
4 hotel, that's not the right Discount Rate to use.  
5 Because the cost of construction, the loans for  
6 construction, is just a different metric than when  
7 you're actually operating a hotel because at that  
8 point, you're getting--you have cash flows; right?  
9 So, the rate at which you can borrow for an operating  
10 hotel or for management of houses or apartasuites is  
11 totally different that the Cost of Debt for just  
12 construction loans. So his Cost of Debt is not a  
13 reasonable proxy for what should be used for an  
14 investment like this. And he overestimates the Market  
15 Risk Premium by calculating the arithmetic rather than  
16 the industry preferred geometric average; and BRG has  
17 talked about that, and Damodaran, who I've never  
18 actually met but have said his names more times than I  
19 can count, prefers the industry preferred geometric  
20 averages. And if there's one thing I've learned in  
21 arguing damages is when Damodaran says it, it's  
22 something you should look at closely, and we would

1 urge the Tribunal to do that in this particular  
2 instance. Of course, you have to apply it  
3 appropriately, but in this particular instance, the  
4 industry preferred geometric average, we would say, is  
5 preferred.

6           And in assessing country risk, he uses the  
7 Colombia peso-dominated issuances which are thinly  
8 traded and just not reliable, because they are thinly  
9 traded to assess country risk. When something is not  
10 traded robustly, you shouldn't use that as a proxy for  
11 assessing country risk. Whereas, BRG uses the EMBI  
12 calculated by JPMorgan, which is based on U.S.  
13 dollar-denominated issuances, which are much more  
14 widely traded to assess country risk.

15           And then, as I said for these early-stage  
16 projects what they do, based on input from JLL on the  
17 probability of survival--JLL, what they did was they  
18 said, When projects are started, what is the  
19 probability at these early stages, that they fail? So  
20 let's add an additional, taking a conservative  
21 approach, what is the probability of success for  
22 projects that aren't as advanced as a Luxé or a

1 Meritage where you've already sold units. You know,  
2 it's--the Construction Contracts you de-risked it all  
3 the way.

4           And there they've applied a multiplier of  
5 77 percent for the Development Projects and 61 percent  
6 for the expansion projects. To give you, sort of  
7 taking into account that additional risk.

8           Now, Members of the Tribunal, it is 1:00.  
9 Maybe let me say one more thing and then I think I  
10 have about 15 minutes left, but I'm sure I'll be  
11 corrected if I'm wrong, but I can do that last bit  
12 after the break, if that makes sense.

13           But let me end on this Slide 227 before I  
14 suggest we take a break, which is, based on all of  
15 those parameters that I've just discussed, you put  
16 that into the Model, and ultimately what BRG comes up  
17 with is damages that align with this table. So,  
18 \$64 million for the Meritage, \$44 million for Luxé,  
19 for a total of \$108 million for those two projects.  
20 And then the Projects in development, an additional  
21 \$80.5 million. With Pre-Award Interest, that's how  
22 you get the \$255 million.

1           Actually, I lied, one more thing I do want  
2 to say which is on Pre-Award Interest.

3           I think at the very least, something that  
4 needs to be or should be considered generally by  
5 tribunals in general and I hope this Tribunal in  
6 particular, it is a disincentive for Respondents to  
7 pay when you use a Pre-Award Interest Rate that is  
8 lower than their own Cost of Capital. So, when a  
9 State can borrow, whatever they borrow money  
10 at--right?--and here you have on Slide 229, their Cost  
11 of Debt. When you use an interest rate that is lower  
12 than that, then they have a disincentive to pay us  
13 because this is the cheapest money that they can  
14 get--right?--not paying us is cheaper than borrowing  
15 money from someone else. So, what we suggest is using  
16 a Cost of Debt, the Claimants' Cost of Debt as an  
17 appropriate proxy for Pre-Award Interest because  
18 that's how much we have to borrow at, which is about  
19 5 percent, and that number is above Colombia's Cost of  
20 Debt, which I think incentivizes things appropriately.  
21 It doesn't disincentivize them from paying this  
22 particular Award.

1           The last thing that I would spend my last  
2 10-15 minutes on is the Essential Security Defense.  
3 We will not likely cover the jurisdiction slides  
4 today. We may come back to them tomorrow in rebuttal,  
5 but Members of the Tribunal, it makes sense to take a  
6 brief--our lunch break before I come back after lunch  
7 to address you on Essential Security.

8           MS. BANIFATEMI: Thank you, Mr. President.

9           It's interesting that we hear that the  
10 jurisdiction slide will not be addressed but maybe  
11 addressed tomorrow in rebuttal. I do have a  
12 due-process issue with this because there is a great  
13 number of slides that were just passed over that we  
14 didn't hear about. This is not the way that we've  
15 done things. It's a full new submission, and I do  
16 have an issue with Mr. Moloo just going through or not  
17 going through them and just saying, I'm going to come  
18 back to it tomorrow in rebuttal. If he has not  
19 addressed it, so either he does or he doesn't, and I  
20 have a problem with essentially putting all of these  
21 slides as a submission and not address them and just  
22 keep them in a safe place for tomorrow as a rebuttal.

1 That is an issue in terms of due process, I'm afraid.

2 PRESIDENT SACHS: Yes, Mr. Moloo?

3 MR. MOLOO: Mr. President, we were expecting  
4 not just to have these slides but possibly other  
5 slides, if we may burden the Tribunal with additional  
6 slides. But for rebuttal, I don't think there was  
7 anything in the Procedural Order not allowing us to  
8 rely on slides. Obviously when you talk about  
9 jurisdictional issues, those are Objections on  
10 Jurisdiction that have been raised by the Respondent,  
11 so I think some of those may be more appropriately  
12 dealt in rebuttal. You know, we're in the Tribunal's  
13 hands, but I don't think we should be prevented from  
14 using slides in rebuttal tomorrow.

15 MS. BANIFATEMI: Just to be clear, the  
16 rebuttal is expected to address what we will have  
17 argued. So, if they're keeping under their sleeve  
18 slides that they will address tomorrow, which may or  
19 may not be in response to our briefing today, that is  
20 inappropriate. Either it's in rebuttal precisely if  
21 what Moloo said, or it's not and then they cannot do  
22 that. The question is not about having slides or not

1 having slides. By the way, we are at a disadvantage  
2 here because they will have all of evening to prepare  
3 for their rebuttal. We will have very short time  
4 after the rebuttal, so there is an imbalance there, so  
5 this is even further aggravated by the fact that they  
6 are keeping slides just in case, and they may address  
7 more than what we will have said as a rebuttal.

8 So, rebuttal is rebuttal.

9 MR. MOLOO: Yes, we agree. We will not--if  
10 they don't address jurisdiction, for example, at all,  
11 we would not address jurisdiction, either. So, I'm  
12 not suggesting that we would address arguments that  
13 are not in response to arguments that they raise  
14 tomorrow--this afternoon, rather. And I'm not sure I  
15 understand the disadvantage because we've now given  
16 our full openings, and they have more time than we do  
17 to respond. I'm not sure I understand that argument.  
18 But I can assure the Tribunal Members that we will not  
19 deal with anything tomorrow that has not been raised  
20 this afternoon.

21 MS. BANIFATEMI: To be very clear, this is a  
22 submission which has not been put fully before the

1 Tribunal, so I do take issue with all of the slides  
2 that we have not seen and are there that the Tribunal  
3 may or may not look at in its own time. But it's an  
4 imbalance in the sense that we have tried really to  
5 address it. We asked for more than three hours. We  
6 were given only three hours. In those three hours, we  
7 will address a number of things, but there is so much  
8 in this submission that they have not even gone  
9 through that the Tribunal will now have in front of it  
10 for deliberation purposes, and it will not have our  
11 view on those slides because it's way more than what  
12 you would expect for three hours. That's Point 1.

13 Point 2, the imbalance that I discussed  
14 about rebuttal is that they will have all evening, all  
15 afternoon and all evening to prepare for the rebuttal  
16 of what they will hear this afternoon from our side.  
17 Whereas, from our rebuttal of 30 minutes tomorrow, we  
18 will have, for now, about 15 minutes to listen to what  
19 they say and come back and discuss and argue rebuttal.  
20 So, the imbalance is between what's going to happen  
21 tonight and the 15 minutes we will have tomorrow for  
22 that.

1           The other imbalance that I'm talking about  
2 is the fact that this is a full submission with a lot  
3 of slides that have not been explained and the  
4 Tribunal has before it, which is much more than what  
5 we will have the opportunity to explain to the  
6 Tribunal because there's a lot here that you heard,  
7 and we are only in a position in the little that we  
8 have, which is three hours, where we are trying to  
9 address things, but we cannot address everything, and  
10 so this is the issue of the imbalance on the slides,  
11 which is a different issue of the rebuttal. I hope  
12 this clarifies.

13           PRESIDENT SACHS: Let's go step by step.  
14 You said you need 15 more minutes to deal with the  
15 Essential Security exception?

16           MR. MOLOO: Yes, by our calculation, that's  
17 about what we have, I may be wrong, but that's about  
18 how long I think I'll be.

19           PRESIDENT SACHS: How much more time do you  
20 have?

21           MR. MOLOO: About 15 minutes. Sara will  
22 correct me--Ms. Marzal will correct me.

1           SECRETARY MARZAL: I have seven-and-a-half,  
2 but--

3           MR. MOLOO: We're in the Tribunal's hands.  
4 I think I have about 15 minutes more of submissions,  
5 if that is--

6           PRESIDENT SACHS: On the security issue?

7           MR. MOLOO: Correct.

8           PRESIDENT SACHS: Not on jurisdiction?

9           MR. MOLOO: Not on jurisdiction. And we  
10 made the decision at the break that if we were pushed  
11 for time, which I'm in a bit of between a rock and a  
12 hard place, which is I want to, obviously, be  
13 respectful for the time limit, which is three hours,  
14 and I think what makes most sense is for me to address  
15 you on Essential Security. And if there was one thing  
16 that we would submit that we will just deal with, if  
17 it's raised by--to the extent it's raised this  
18 afternoon on rebuttal, is the jurisdictional issues.

19           PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay. I think we would  
20 prefer to give you some more minutes also to deal with  
21 jurisdiction, so that we cover all what is in the file  
22 here. Of course, you would be granted some more time

1 as well. And possibly also consider that--I mean,  
2 this program was set up by you, so but when I look at  
3 it, the break--the break is a bit too short, indeed,  
4 in the morning, next morning, so we could consider  
5 prolonging it to at least half an hour or to 11:00.  
6 And then we start with the Respondent's rebuttal at  
7 11:00 o'clock. That would lead us to 11:30, then we  
8 will have a short break, and then we have the  
9 questions and answer. I think this--this was your  
10 program, but looking at it, I think the Respondent has  
11 a point here.

12 MR. MOLOO: We're fine with giving them a  
13 longer break, Mr. President. That's fine with us.

14 PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay. So, this afternoon  
15 you will deal both with the Essential Security  
16 exception and jurisdiction, very shortly?

17 MR. MOLOO: Yes. I think if we're in that  
18 position--so, I think maybe we get instead of 15  
19 minutes, we do 30 minutes and we can deal with--

20 PRESIDENT SACHS: Obviously, you will get  
21 the same 15 minutes more.

22 MS. BANIFATEMI: Well, there is a

1 discrepancy between the understanding from the  
2 Claimant about how much they have, which is 15, and  
3 ICSID's calculation, which I think is what binds  
4 everyone, to seven-and-a-half. So, if they have  
5 seven-and-a-half plus the rest, then we should have  
6 the equivalent.

7 PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay, okay.

8 MR. MOLOO: We're fine.

9 MS. BANIFATEMI: But it would be helpful to  
10 a count when we come back so that we know how much  
11 more time we have.

12 PRESIDENT SACHS: I think that's already  
13 said.

14 MS. BANIFATEMI: Seven-and-a-half, if they  
15 have 30 minutes, then we have the rest, 30 minus  
16 seven-and-a-half. Thank you.

17 PRESIDENT SACHS: Very good. So, we will  
18 have a break and resume at 2;15. Is that all right?

19 (Whereupon, at 1:13 p.m., the Hearing was  
20 adjourned until 2:15 p.m., the same day.)

21 AFTERNOON SESSION

22 PRESIDENT SACHS: All right. Mr. Moloo,

1 you're invited to proceed.

2 MR. MOLOO: Thank you, Mr. President.

3 Oh, sorry, we'll just need a moment.

4 (Pause.)

5 MR. MOLOO: Thank you, Mr. President, and I  
6 hope you all enjoyed the lunch as much as I did. I  
7 have to say, I don't know if it's a function of being  
8 in Paris or this particular hotel, probably a bit of  
9 both, but I'm not used to having those types of  
10 lunches during my breaks but welcome it, so thank you  
11 perhaps to Respondent's counsel for picking the menu.

12 Let me turn to the Essential Security  
13 Defense, and before I do, there's one point that I do  
14 want to make, which is, you know, that this is a new  
15 submission. I do want to make the point--I do take  
16 issue with that for one important reason, which is all  
17 of this is in the record. Right? Our submissions are  
18 what you hear from Ms. Champion and I, but none of  
19 this is new, and I think that's important point, and I  
20 said at the outset, it is an important theme for us  
21 because none of this has changed. These are the  
22 arguments--I hope you're not tired--you may be tired

1 of hearing them from us, but they are the same  
2 arguments that you will have heard supplemented by  
3 additional evidence, but none of this is new  
4 submissions.

5           And likewise, with the Essential Security  
6 Submission that I will make, these are all arguments  
7 that you will have heard before.

8           And I think it's actually a fairly  
9 straightforward argument in the first instance when  
10 we're talking about the Essential Security Defense  
11 that was first raised in the Rejoinder.

12           And I take you to Article 22.2, which is the  
13 Essential Security Provision, and it says: "Nothing  
14 in this Agreement shall be construed to preclude a  
15 party from applying measures that it considers  
16 necessary for the fulfillment of its obligations with  
17 respect to the maintenance or restoration of  
18 international peace or security, or the protection of  
19 its own Essential Security Interests."

20           Nothing precludes a party from applying  
21 measures that it considers necessary to do that. And  
22 the reason why this is important, this language, is

1 the language, the ordinary meaning of it, makes it  
2 clear that they must adopt the Measures for the  
3 purposes of achieving that Essential Security  
4 Interest, which means they must know the Essential  
5 Security Interest at the time they're applying the  
6 Measures. That's the language in 22.2. They're not  
7 precluded from applying measures that they consider  
8 necessary to protect their Essential Security  
9 Interest, but you can't apply measures, not know what  
10 that Essential Security Interest is come six years  
11 later and say, Oh, I now have an Essential Security  
12 Interest for which I can justify measures that I  
13 applied six years ago. That's not the way it works.  
14 You must know at the time that you're applying the  
15 Measures what the Essential Security Interest is.

16           And what's exactly what the International  
17 Court of Justice said in the Nicaragua versus USA  
18 case, where the Treaty there was dealing with  
19 non-precluded measures clause: "The present treaty  
20 shall not preclude the application of measures." In  
21 that case, if you look at the "necessary to fulfill  
22 the obligations of a party for the maintenance,

1 restoration of the international peace and security or  
2 necessary to protect its Essential Security  
3 Interests," whether this is self-judging or not is  
4 totally irrelevant, by the way, to the question--this  
5 temporal question that I'm--or issue that I'm raising,  
6 which is at what point in time must the Essential  
7 Security be identified or known.

8           And the Court there said--they specifically  
9 said was to bear in mind the chronological sequence of  
10 events. They must have been at the time they were  
11 taken Measures necessary to protect its Essential  
12 Security Interest, and the same is, of course, true  
13 here.

14 [REDACTED]



1

[REDACTED]

22

You can end the analysis right there, but if

1 you feel the need to go on, Members of the Tribunal,  
2 there is another important point, which is this is not  
3 a jurisdictional clause, and you've heard the change  
4 in--you know, in order to introduce this late, they  
5 raise it as a jurisdictional defense, and then you  
6 start to hear the vocabulary change to,  
7 justiciability, which is different from jurisdiction?  
8 Right? So this is not a jurisdictional defense? It's  
9 an affirmative defense to, we would say, a remedy.

10           It specifically says that nothing in this  
11 Agreement shall be construed to preclude a party from  
12 applying measures. That's what it is. It says--it  
13 allows them to apply measures. It does not exempt  
14 them from the obligation to comply with the treaty or  
15 to pay compensation for a breach of the treaty.  
16 They're just entitle to keep their Measures in place  
17 assuming it was done in a timely way, et cetera. And  
18 that's exactly what "prevent" means, the ordinary  
19 meaning, to prevent from taking place.

20           And that makes sense in the context of  
21 International Investment Treaty Law and International  
22 Trade Law, and this is important because the exception

1 applies equally to the "Investment" chapter as well as  
2 the "Trade" chapter. It applies equally to Chapter 10  
3 and 21. And it's important to note in that context  
4 why--you know, when I say it just goes to the remedy,  
5 why is that relevant? Why is that important? Because  
6 in the trade context, the primary remedy is the  
7 removal of a non-conforming measure. Right? If  
8 someone is--they apply a quantitative restriction or  
9 something like that, in the trade context, the primary  
10 remedy under international law is you have to remove  
11 that quantitative restriction, and they're saying,  
12 well, you're not--you don't have to remove the Measure  
13 if it's done to protect your Essential Security  
14 Interest.

15           And likewise in the investment-treaty  
16 context, 10.26 specifically contemplates the  
17 possibility of restitution of property. But here this  
18 provision says you can keep the Measure in place if  
19 it's to protect your Essential Security Interest, but  
20 it does not exclude the possibility of monetary  
21 damages, and that's exactly the issue that was before  
22 the Eco Oro versus Colombia tribunal under the

1 Canada-Colombia BIT. And again, this has nothing to  
2 do with whether it's self-judging or not. It's a  
3 question of what is the remedy? What does this get  
4 you? Whether--if it is properly invoked, whether  
5 self-judging or not, what does it get you?

6 And the Eco Oro versus Colombia case dealt  
7 exactly with this question. When they were  
8 interpreting language that was similar, nothing in  
9 this agreement shall be construed to prevent a party  
10 from adopting or enforcing measures necessary to do  
11 various things.

12 And they said Colombia also provided no  
13 justification as to why it was necessary for  
14 protection of the environment, in that case, not to  
15 offer compensation to an investor for any loss  
16 suffered as a result of the Measures taken by Colombia  
17 to protect the environment, nor explained how such  
18 construction would support the protection of  
19 investment in addition to the protection of the  
20 environment.

21 And they said--and Canada came in with  
22 Colombia there, and they said it can't--the Tribunal

1 there did not accept Canada's Non-disputing Party  
2 submission, that in such circumstances, payment of  
3 compensation is not required.

4           So very similar to here. They said it just  
5 says you could adopt the Measure, not that you're  
6 precluded from the compensation obligation, so Eco Oro  
7 is very much on point, we would say; and there again  
8 was a situation where you had Canada and Colombia both  
9 coming in, making submissions to that effect, and the  
10 Tribunal said, no, that's not what it says. That's  
11 not the ordinary meaning. It doesn't comport with the  
12 purpose of this Treaty, either. And it doesn't  
13 comport with the purpose of the Treaty in this case  
14 either. I've already taken you to the Preamble, but  
15 it also needs to be interpreted in a way that is the  
16 consistent with the purpose and object of this Treaty  
17 which includes, you know, promoting broad-based  
18 economic development in order to reduce poverty and  
19 generate opportunities for sustainable economic  
20 alternatives to drug-crop production, to promote new  
21 employment opportunities and increase the living  
22 standards. That's the kind of things that this

1 investment was doing.

2           They've relied on travaux, and they put in  
3 hundreds of pages of travaux. But if the ordinary  
4 meaning is clear and unambiguous, then one needs not  
5 go to the travaux. And we would submit, and Colombia  
6 has even said, that the Article 22.b is unambiguous,  
7 so there is no need to go to the travaux. But if you  
8 do go to the travaux, the travaux is not very clear on  
9 this, and this is why travaux--you have to look at  
10 very carefully because one of the things we would  
11 submit the travaux makes absolutely clear is that this  
12 obligation of compensation for a breach of the Treaty  
13 was of critical importance in particular for the  
14 United States. They said the other point is that this  
15 chapter establishes that it is possible to expropriate  
16 for social interest. You can expropriate for social  
17 interest, but you still have to pay compensation.

18           The U.S. also said, But we feel it is  
19 legally necessary that investors have the opportunity  
20 to receive compensation for damages caused to them.  
21 We seek to give you that in a way that does not  
22 fundamentally harm the Investors. They wanted to give

1 them what they were looking for, what Colombia was  
2 looking for while not harming, fundamentally,  
3 investors and their right to receive compensation.

4           At one point in the negotiations, they're  
5 saying we continue with the underlying problem, we  
6 want it to be compensated immediately after the  
7 Measures invoked. That is fundamental. Immediate  
8 compensation was fundamental. So, at various points  
9 in the negotiating rounds, the U.S. was saying you can  
10 expropriate for social interest, but you're not going  
11 to exempt the compensation obligation. In their  
12 words, that obligation was fundamental.

13           There is some talk about subsequent  
14 agreement, and I think this is important. In *Infito*  
15 *Gold*, what the Tribunal there said was that even if  
16 you have non-Parties submissions in the middle of an  
17 Arbitration, that cannot be used to form a subsequent  
18 agreement. Why is that? The Tribunal said: Even if  
19 the Tribunal confer an agreement from the Contracting  
20 State's submissions during the proceedings, *quad non*,  
21 this agreement would post-date the commencement of  
22 this Arbitration, and the Tribunal could not take into

1 consideration in favor of one litigant to the  
2 detriment of the other without incurring the risk of  
3 breaching the latter's due-process rights.

4           So, you can't take into account a subsequent  
5 agreement during the course of the proceedings and use  
6 it against one of the litigating Parties. That's what  
7 the *Infinito Gold v. Costa Rica Award* found.

8           And in any event, even if there was a  
9 subsequent agreement here between the Parties, it  
10 cannot be used to modify the treaty obligations. You  
11 can't use a subsequent agreement to modify treaty  
12 rights, and the *Sempra Tribunal* says, more or less,  
13 the same thing.

14           I will briefly touch upon the last couple of  
15 arguments with respect to Essential Security. You  
16 have our submission that we think it's late. The  
17 Tribunal in Procedural Order No. 9 only allowed the  
18 submission insofar as it was--for purposes--it was a  
19 jurisdictional objection. I don't think it is a valid  
20 jurisdictional objection. We've explained to you why.

21           Arbitrator Perezcano asked the question of  
22 counsel for Respondent during the Hearing, noting

1 that, in the footnote, it says the Tribunal or panel  
2 hearing the matter shall find, suggesting that the  
3 Tribunal has the authority to make a finding, and we  
4 would say that that confirms in our submission, at  
5 least, that there is jurisdiction, it's not a  
6 jurisdictional question, in our view. It's a merits  
7 defense. It's an affirmative defense. And as a  
8 merits defense, it is out of time. According to  
9 Procedural Order No. 1, they were only allowed to  
10 raise defenses that were in response--were responsive  
11 in the Reply and the Rejoinder submissions. That's in  
12 Procedural Order No. 1. And in Rule 26 of the ICSID  
13 Arbitration Rules, it says any step taken after  
14 expiration of the applicable time limit shall be  
15 disregarded unless there are special circumstances,  
16 and there are no special circumstances here, in our  
17 submission, because there can be no new facts because  
18 otherwise it's out of time for different reasons. The  
19 fact must have been known at the time the Measure was  
20 taken in order to come within the protection of the  
21 provision.

22           There is also a good-faith defense. We

1 don't think this is a defense that's raised in good  
2 faith for two reasons: One, it's simply a recasting  
3 of arguments they made in the Counter-Memorial and the  
4 Rejoinder. You can see that at Slide 255. It's more  
5 or less the same reasons, it's to fight organized  
6 crime, but they just recast that as all of a sudden an  
7 Essential Security Interest in the Rejoinder.

8           But more than that, as I think is accepted  
9 by both Parties, one of the questions when you're  
10 assessing good faith is whether or not the Measure is  
11 plausibly connected to the Essential Security Interest  
12 that's been identified. And for the reasons  
13 Ms. Champion has already mentioned and I've discussed  
14 earlier, there is no connection here between the  
15 Measure and whether you call it a "police purpose," a  
16 "public purpose" or an "Essential Security Interest,"  
17 there is no rational connection between the Measure  
18 adopted here and that Essential Security Interest.

19           Colombia accepts that the Claimants'  
20 wrongdoing is not the subject of the Measures, and if  
21 they were actually concerned with the Essential  
22 Security Interest of fighting organized crime, they

1 would have gone after the assets of those individuals  
2 who--whose actions are actually, they say, criminal,  
3 and they haven't done that.

4           And, lastly we rely--as certainly we don't  
5 think you need to get this far down this chain, but  
6 the most-favored-nation treatment standard is one that  
7 we think applies if the Tribunal were to find that  
8 this were to preclude us from bringing our claims  
9 because there are other treaties that don't preclude  
10 investors from those States from bringing claims in  
11 similar circumstances. And just one example is the  
12 Colombia-Swiss BIT.

13           I will turn it over to my colleague,  
14 Ms. Kahloon, to deal with the jurisdictional issues.

15           MS. KAHLOON: Good afternoon Mr. President  
16 and Members of the Tribunal. Thank you for the  
17 opportunity to address you again on behalf of the  
18 Claimants.

19           I will be providing the Tribunal with a  
20 summation of the jurisdictional issues in dispute  
21 between the Parties.

22           As a threshold matter, since the Parties

1 Opening Submission at the May Hearing, the only  
2 movement in jurisdictional objections between the  
3 Parties has been the addition of overwhelming evidence  
4 to the record through the testimony of Mr. Seda and  
5 Claimant's Experts that reaffirms Claimants' status as  
6 protected investors who have made a protected  
7 investment in Colombia and who have standing to  
8 adjudicate Colombia's unlawful conduct before this  
9 Tribunal.

10           Turning first to Claimants' status as  
11 protected investors under the TPA. It's agreed  
12 between the Parties that in order for an ICSID  
13 tribunal to exercise jurisdiction over a claimant, the  
14 *ratione personae* requirements in both the ICSID  
15 Convention and the TPA, extracted on this slide, must  
16 be met. It's uncontested between the Parties that  
17 each of the seven individual Claimants and JTE  
18 International Investments qualify as protected  
19 investors under the TPA and the ICSID Convention.

20           It is also uncontested that Boston  
21 Enterprises Trust is a protected investor under the  
22 TPA. The only remaining issue in dispute between the

1 Parties is whether Boston Enterprises Trust qualifies  
2 as a protected investor under the ICSID Convention.

3 In the TPA, the Contracting Parties expressly agreed  
4 that a trust is a type of enterprise that has legal  
5 personality and standing to initiate international  
6 arbitration. The ICSID Convention in turn extends  
7 standing to any juridical entity. This is not a  
8 limited class and it extends to any juridical entity.

9           Moreover, to the extent that there is any  
10 ambiguity in the ordinary meaning of this phrase, the  
11 travaux préparatoires, Colombia's favorite tool of  
12 treaty interpretation, confirm that the drafters  
13 wanted to keep the definition as neutral as possible  
14 in order to take into account differing national law.  
15 Colombia, after having agreed to include trusts as a  
16 type of enterprise within the TPA, cannot  
17 retroactively seek to add conditions of corporate  
18 liability when the clear terms of the Treaty  
19 contemplated in corporation of trust within the  
20 concept of an investor who could initiate ICSID  
21 Arbitration. Accordingly the Boston Enterprises Trust  
22 should be held to be a covered investor with standing

1 to act as a claimant.

2           Turning next to Claimants' ownerships of a  
3 protected investment under the TPA. Article 10.28 of  
4 the TPA incorporates a very broad definition of what  
5 constitutes an investment, to include every asset that  
6 an investor owns or controls which has the  
7 characteristics of an "investment." The TPA,  
8 thereafter, sets non-cumulative and non-exhaustive  
9 examples of what such characteristics could include.

10           As highlighted in Claimants' Opening, there  
11 are a number of decisions that support adopting a  
12 broad interpretation of Article 10.28 of the TPA.  
13 Now, Claimants' investment in Colombia are comprised  
14 of a bundle of rights, including shares earned by each  
15 of the investors in Newport, Luxé and/or Royal Realty,  
16 management contracts that were in place between Royal  
17 Realty and Newport as well as Royal Realty and Luxé,  
18 as well as equity in enterprises through investment  
19 vehicles that were set up for Development Projects,  
20 such as RDP Interpalmas, RDP Cartagena, and  
21 Revmarketing.

22           Accordingly, it's clear that the Claimants

1 are in a broad range of investments in Colombia. Each  
2 of which display the characteristics of an  
3 "investment." However, the Parties disagree on  
4 whether the ICSID Convention creates a separate  
5 jurisdictional hurdle that investors must discharge in  
6 order to gain access to ICSID Arbitration. The ICSID  
7 Convention does not include a definition for the term  
8 "investment" or the so-called "cumulative criteria"  
9 that Colombia is attempting to read into the  
10 Convention. And a number of tribunals, including  
11 those on the slide, have rejected a so-called "double  
12 keyhole test." However, in any event, and has only  
13 been reinforced since the Hearing, Claimants meet each  
14 of the criteria advanced by Colombia.

15           First, Claimants have made a commitment of  
16 capital or other resources as protected investments.  
17 Thusly, there is no minimum contribution that needs to  
18 be made in order for an investment to qualify as  
19 protected, and Colombia itself has conceded on  
20 numerous occasions that Claimants have made a  
21 contribution. However, they disagree as to whether  
22 this contribution was allegedly large enough. But it

1 became apparent at the Hearing that Colombia had  
2 ignored evidence of contributions that were put on to  
3 the record by Claimants of contributions in both Luxé  
4 and Newport. That be found in Exhibits C-358 and  
5 C-359.

6           Moreover, as this Tribunal has now heard  
7 straight from the source himself, Mr. Seda contributed  
8 significantly know-now and brand value to create a  
9 highly successful portfolio of projects that had great  
10 potential within the Colombian tourism market.

11           Second, Claimants have assumed significant  
12 investment risk through their Investments. Claimants  
13 assumed the risk that they would lose their invested  
14 capital, and concomitantly they held an expectation of  
15 gain or profit. Accordingly, even applying Colombia's  
16 test, there is no question that the Claimants made an  
17 investment in the State.

18           Moving to the next objection. Now, as  
19 Mr. Moloo and Ms. Champion have already covered  
20 extensively, the claims advanced in this Arbitration  
21 by Claimants are directly related to the Measures in  
22 dispute and are not limited to the Meritage Project.

1 As Claimants have established in their submissions to  
2 date, all that is required at the jurisdictional stage  
3 with respect to this objection is a relationship of  
4 apparent proximity between the challenged measure and  
5 the Claimant or its investment. Any further analysis  
6 is more suitably reserved for a consideration on the  
7 merits of the Claim. Now, Mr. Moloo and Ms. Champion  
8 have gone far beyond establishing a relationship of  
9 apparent proximity between the Measures and the impact  
10 that these Measures have had on Luxé, as well as the  
11 development projects and Royal Realty's--

12 REALTIME STENOGRAPHER: Just a moment. I  
13 need you to slow down. It is making it very difficult  
14 for the interpretation as well.

15 MS. KAHLOON: My apologies.

16 REALTIME STENOGRAPHER: Start with that  
17 sentence again.

18 MS. KAHLOON: As Mr. Moloo and Ms. Champion  
19 have already covered extensively in their submissions,  
20 the Measures at issue in this Arbitration severely  
21 affected not only the Meritage Project, but also Luxé  
22 and Royal Realty's pipeline of Development Projects.

1 The impact on these Measures, which was widely  
2 publicized, should have been foreseeable to Colombia  
3 before it wrongfully initiated Asset Forfeiture  
4 Proceedings against the Meritage Project.

5 Moving to the final objection. Both Boston  
6 Enterprises Trust and Brian Hass have standing in this  
7 Arbitration.

8 First, addressing Boston Enterprises Trust,  
9 the settlor Trustee and beneficiary of Boston  
10 Enterprises Trust is a U.S. national that has  
11 maintained continuous ownership of an investment in  
12 Newport since 30 March 2016, and in Luxé since  
13 14 February 2012. The change in ownership structure  
14 through affiliated entities of the same nationality  
15 was purely to maintain anonymity as established in  
16 Claimants' Opening Submissions, as opposed to an  
17 effort to gain access to ICSID Arbitration. It is not  
18 appropriate to draw parallels between this corporate  
19 restructuring and a situation where there has been an  
20 abuse of process, because at all points Boston  
21 Enterprises Trust would have been entitled to have  
22 recourse to ICSID Arbitration, and tribunals have

1 recognized that internal corporate organizations of  
2 this kind are committed.

3           With respect to Mr. Hass, Colombia contends  
4 that Mr. Hass does not have standing in this  
5 Arbitration because he's drafted his investment in  
6 Luxé through a Family Trust. However, the record  
7 shows that Mr. Hass made his investment through  
8 Haystack Holdings, which in turn was controlled by a  
9 family trust, which Mr. Hass and his wife are the  
10 settlers and sole beneficiaries. As can be seen in  
11 C-222. As Mr. Hass is the ultimate beneficial owner  
12 of the Shares, he has standing to claim relief before  
13 this Tribunal, pursuant to the principle in  
14 international law that grants standing and relief to  
15 the owner of the beneficial interest.

16           Mr. Moloo will now conclude Claimants'  
17 Opening Statement.

18           MR. MOLOO: I asked Ms. Kahloom to leave me  
19 with three minutes, so I apologize if she was rushing.  
20 It was because I had asked you to leave me three  
21 minutes, which I think I do have.

22           What we want to end is with our request for

1 relief. You can see on Slide 278, and again, this is  
2 the same request we've asked from the outset that the  
3 Tribunal declare that there have been breaches that  
4 the Claimants be awarded \$255.8 million plus interest,  
5 and we're also claiming moral damages. And I want to  
6 say one note on moral damages.

7           This is the first case in which I have ever  
8 claimed moral damages, so we didn't take the Decision  
9 lightly to make a claim for moral damages, and I know  
10 we've covered a lot of uncomfortable topics over the  
11 last several years, including the alleged extortion  
12 scheme and corruption issues, and we don't think you  
13 need to find any of that in order to find that  
14 Claimants have prevailed in this case, and for that  
15 reason we thought is this something--we want to go  
16 there because they are uncomfortable topics. But we  
17 thought we had to because these--this is an important  
18 part of what happened in this case, and we had to tell  
19 that story to show how egregious the conduct was.

20           Mr. Seda has been subject to, and his  
21 investments and the Investors in this case, have been  
22 subject to rather egregious conduct, and we think it

1 is a case where moral damages would be appropriate to  
2 show that this is not acceptable. It's important to  
3 show that to other investors, and it's important to  
4 show that to the Treaty Parties.

5           And I want to end where Mr. Seda ended in  
6 his testimony, and it's up on the screen. I asked  
7 him, why did you go back to Colombia? You went back  
8 to Colombia. With all of this happening, why did you  
9 go back to Colombia, and why are you pursuing all of  
10 this? There's the threat of potential investigations  
11 and all of this is coming out because you're pursuing  
12 this claim. Wouldn't you just want to put this all to  
13 an end?

14           And he said because I'm defending my name,  
15 and because this is going to follow me no matter where  
16 I go. It's true. It's going to. It has for the last  
17 several months, and it's going to continue to follow  
18 him. And he wants it to come to an end, and he wants  
19 to put an end to this. And putting an end to this is  
20 hopefully this Tribunal saying that the type of  
21 conduct that happened in this case is not acceptable.  
22 It's not what Colombia and the U.S. wanted when they

1 signed this Treaty. It's not meant--if this type of  
2 conduct is not what this Treaty is meant to protect  
3 then I don't know what is. It's not what the  
4 Claimants deserved. It's not what the people of  
5 Colombia deserved. But in order to put an end to  
6 this, the Claimants must be compensated for the  
7 wrongful conduct that happened in this case.

8 Those are our submissions.

9 PRESIDENT SACHS: Thank you very much,  
10 Mr. Moloo.

11 We will have a short break, a few minutes?

12 MS. BANIFATEMI: Just a few, yes.

13 PRESIDENT SACHS: Do you want to stay in the  
14 room or do you leave?

15 MS. BANIFATEMI: We are in your hands. We  
16 can leave, come back.

17 PRESIDENT SACHS: No, no, no. How long does  
18 it take you to get prepared?

19 MS. BANIFATEMI: To switch computers and do  
20 some switching of the team here, so, five minutes  
21 should be fine. 10, if the Tribunal wishes to have  
22 more. We're in your hands.

1 PRESIDENT SACHS: I'd say 10 minutes, yeah.

2 MS. BANIFATEMI: 10 minutes?

3 (Comment off microphone.)

4 MS. BANIFATEMI: Yes, it will be sent right  
5 away.

6 (Recess.)

7 PRESIDENT SACHS: I think everyone is ready  
8 to resume, and the floor goes to Ms. Banifatemi.

9 MS. BANIFATEMI: Thank you, Mr. President.  
10 Ms. Ordoñez will start for Colombia, with your  
11 permission.

12 PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay.

13 Yes, please.

14 MS. ORDÓÑEZ: I will be addressing you in  
15 Spanish as well.

16 CLOSING ARGUMENT BY COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT

17 MS. ORDÓÑEZ: Mr. President and  
18 co-Arbitrators, before I give the floor to our  
19 colleagues from GBS Disputes, I would, first of all,  
20 like to make a few observations related to major  
21 issues.

22 First of all, I'd like to refer to the

1 expectations that explain and inform our consent to  
2 investor-State arbitration. These include the  
3 exceptional nature of both this mechanism and the  
4 foreign investor's powers and rights under Section 10  
5 of the Treaty with the United States of America.

6 Then, secondly, I will refer to some of the  
7 basic content of the Law on Asset Forfeiture, which,  
8 almost after four years of litigation before you,  
9 should now be clear to everyone.

10 Further, I must, first of all, refer to  
11 these basic points because, as we've heard this  
12 morning, it seems the Claimants are suggesting that  
13 those points are either unclear or are being  
14 misrepresented.

15 Regarding Colombia's consent to  
16 investor-State arbitration, I would like to refer to  
17 the three main premises that we in Colombia feel are  
18 important. On the one hand, the International Foreign  
19 Investment Law that we understand is a law of minimum  
20 protections which does not seek to put the foreign  
21 investor in a more favorable position than that of a  
22 domestic investor. This is how we understand the

1 rights of foreign investors and their investments in  
2 relation to the minimum standard of treatment, but  
3 also in relation to the standards of expropriation,  
4 national treatment, and full protection and security.

5           We find it also important to recall this  
6 understanding, because we can't help but to identify  
7 in the position of our colleagues from the  
8 counterparty questionings that, far from being  
9 supported by a strict understanding of International  
10 Foreign Investment Law, they would seem to reject  
11 certain types of situations, which, although not  
12 comfortable, are typical of asset forfeiture actions  
13 in Colombia and are equally borne by all domestic and  
14 foreign investors in our country who invest in illicit  
15 property.

16           -Further, we understand that investor-state  
17 dispute settlement is an exceptional mechanism, where  
18 the investor exclusively has the rights that the State  
19 Parties have provided. Despite the sophistication of  
20 investor-state arbitration and the agreement to  
21 litigate in equal conditions, the rights of the  
22 investor in this kind of proceedings arise from the

1 consent provided by the States. That's why the State  
2 of Colombia--

3 PRESIDENT SACHS: Can you slow down a little  
4 bit, the translators.

5 MS. ORDÓÑEZ: Thirdly, we understand that  
6 the jurisdiction of the tribunals is subject to the  
7 implicit condition of legality, and this is why the  
8 Colombian State, has the burden, and the Tribunal the  
9 obligation, to, as far as it possibly can and with all  
10 diligences, make sure that the investment does not go  
11 against any of the legal systems of the State. This  
12 is why this allegation of illegality or unlawfulness  
13 is so severe that it can have an effect on  
14 transnational public order.

15 I'd finally like to conclude by clarifying  
16 some specific aspects of asset forfeiture that should,  
17 as I say, be clear to everyone now after almost four  
18 years of consideration but don't seem clear on  
19 Claimants' side, this apparent misunderstanding, which  
20 we have described as a convenient misrepresentation,  
21 explains how part--or to a great extent their claims  
22 are unfounded.

1           Firstly, the asset forfeiture procedure  
2 comprises two stages. One which is completely  
3 reserved, including for those who may be affected.  
4 So, after almost four years, it should be clear to  
5 everyone that these publicity claims are not  
6 admissible in relation to the activities that take  
7 place during this first phase, and that includes the  
8 introduction of Precautionary Measures. This is why  
9 it is not correct to say that the imposition of  
10 Precautionary Measures should have been preceded by  
11 consultation with the affected Party in order to  
12 understand whether they were third Parties in good  
13 faith and free of fault.

14           For the same reason, it's absurd to say that  
15 the response to a right of Request for Information is  
16 just a mechanism, even the moderately diligent  
17 mechanism to understand if a piece of land or a group  
18 of people are subject to this asset forfeiture  
19 proceeding. Even if they were, and if the proceeding  
20 were in its initial stage, response to the right of  
21 petition could never have given an account of those  
22 proceedings.

1           Secondly, the Asset Forfeiture Procedure is  
2 a progressive one aimed at establishing the origin of  
3 the grounds for asset forfeiture and the existence of  
4 any third party in good faith without fault, the  
5 latter being the only instance accepted by Colombian  
6 law in order to generate property rights over assets  
7 of illicit origin.

8           This progressive character implies that the  
9 establishment of these above situations goes to a  
10 first stage, initial phase, led by the Prosecutor's  
11 Office, but then it goes on to a following phase, and  
12 it has to go before the Asset Forfeiture Court, and  
13 it's up to the Prosecutor's Office to take such  
14 measures such as Precautionary Measures or to file an  
15 asset forfeiture suit that would have to be defended  
16 before a court. This defense includes the existence  
17 of the causes of action and the existence or not of  
18 third parties in good faith without fault.

19           This simple description, which should be  
20 familiar to all, completely rules out any argument  
21 suggesting that if a certain piece of information was  
22 not known and was invoked during the initial phase it

1 can no longer be the subject of analysis and debate in  
2 the trial stage. The same Asset Forfeiture Procedure  
3 allows for supervening evidence to be invoked, and  
4 that evidence can be passed from one proceeding to  
5 another, if it's necessary in the context of the  
6 forfeiture.

7 This is--this now brings me, having given  
8 these clarifications, to the end of the State's  
9 opening allegations. Thank you.

10 PRESIDENT SACHS: Thank you very much.

11 MS. BANIFATEMI: Mr. President, Members of  
12 the Tribunal, thank you very much. And following from  
13 Ms. Ordoñez's comments, I will now address a number of  
14 points.

15 You will see on Slide 2, which is my Table  
16 of Contents, we will address the Essential Security  
17 exception, issues of jurisdiction, and the premature  
18 and abusive nature of this proceeding. I will address  
19 all three first points. Following that, Ms. Herrera  
20 will address issues of liability and the fact that the  
21 Respondent has not breached its international  
22 obligations under the TPA.

1           And, finally, Ms. Ribco Borman will address  
2 the issue of damages or the fact that the Claimants  
3 are not entitled to damages in this case.

4           Before I start, Mr. President and Members of  
5 the Tribunal, I would like to make a few opening  
6 comments for which I do not have slides but which I  
7 would like to address based on what I heard this  
8 morning, and these are important points.

9           The first point I would like to make is, as  
10 you know, it's always important for Tribunal Members  
11 to go back to the record and to double-check the  
12 record and to not make a decision or deliberate based  
13 on misrepresentations by parties and out-of-context  
14 quotes.

15           We saw a lot of out-of-context quotes this  
16 morning in the presentation by the Claimants. I would  
17 urge the Tribunal to go back to the record and truly  
18 to double-check everything in the context in which  
19 questions were posed and answered, and the actual  
20 arguments that were made.

21           It is in that context also that I make the  
22 previous comment that had we had the same notion as

1 our friends on the other side, we could put a lot of  
2 slides and not argue them, but the point that I was  
3 making is that in some arbitrations I've been where  
4 simply slides not argued have been excluded from the  
5 record because these are submissions that are not put  
6 before the Tribunal, so we were not asking for that.  
7 I just ask for the Tribunal to be indulgent in the way  
8 that it will, indeed, look at the Parties'  
9 submissions. And we have been selective because we  
10 were trying to accommodate the Tribunal's directions  
11 of arguing in three hours. And by definition, we will  
12 not have time to address everything, so we will refer  
13 the Tribunal back to our submissions with respect, and  
14 we will do our best to address the rest today.

15           The second point I would like to make is,  
16 again, going to your experience as arbitrators, you  
17 have sat in many, many, many arbitrations and you know  
18 that by definition there's always ships in the night.  
19 You have one story narrative and you have another  
20 story narrative, and the two almost never reach each  
21 other.

22           In this case, it feels like this is also the

1 same. You hear one narrative on the other side, which  
2 is an investor mistreated by Colombia, a good-faith  
3 investor having done everything he can to invest in  
4 Colombia has been mistreated at every point in time,  
5 at every turn, and Colombia has been this horrible  
6 State and taking action against him, being retaliating  
7 against every single action, and moral damages and so  
8 on and so forth. A lot of theatrics. You will have  
9 heard that.

10 We will not engage in theatrics because  
11 that's not what this is about, but we will address the  
12 gravity of the situation. This is a very serious  
13 case. We heard a lot of personal comments by  
14 Mr. Moloo and his colleague about going to Colombia  
15 and taking pictures and having seen how The Charlee is  
16 wonderful. The only comment I will make is that, in  
17 my over 25 years of practice, I have never been in a  
18 situation--representing Claimants and investors or  
19 representing States--I have never been in a situation  
20 with this level of gravity, and I'm not saying this  
21 lightly.

22 We are in a case, and this is what you

1 really have to realize, and I will address it in the  
2 few moments to come--we are in a case where Colombia  
3 is trying to put some order in its country in relation  
4 to narco-trafficking, which is a very extremely  
5 serious situation not only for Colombia but for the  
6 world, because these are violent, organised groups,  
7 and they have a--and as you will have seen from--and  
8 you will see from also the U.S.' perspective, they  
9 have--they go much beyond Colombia in what they do in  
10 their actions.

11           So, this is what you have in front of you.  
12 This is Colombia taking action through Asset  
13 Forfeiture Proceedings, and you will have heard a lot  
14 of misrepresentation about what these are. An Asset  
15 Forfeiture Proceeding is, by definition, as its name  
16 says, relating to an asset. The asset is the Meritage  
17 Lot. It's not about Mr. Seda as such, so it's not  
18 that Colombia has discriminated Mr. Seda or looked at  
19 Mr. Seda. It has looked at Meritage. And if Mr. Seda  
20 is taken and captured in those Measures, it's his own  
21 doing. It was his own obligation to go through due  
22 diligence. When you allegedly invest in Colombia and

1 to ensure that he was investing in a framework that he  
2 knows, because this is Medellín, we are talking about-

3 [REDACTED]  
4 [REDACTED]  
5 [REDACTED] so he had a duty of due diligence, and  
6 anything that might happen including asset forfeiture  
7 procedures, it's his own doing.

8 Now, we heard from Mr. Moloo that they have  
9 not shifted. We have shifted constantly. No, they  
10 have frozen their case at one particular point in time  
11 which is when the Measure of Asset Forfeiture  
12 Proceeding was taken at the beginning. We're not  
13 shifting position. By nature, Asset Forfeiture  
14 Proceeding, as Ms. Ordoñez just explained, is that  
15 it's evolutive. It is an ongoing proceeding. It  
16 starts, and it continues. There is proceedings before  
17 the courts. That's why we say it's premature. You  
18 still have a process that will continue going on. So,  
19 this is, by nature evolutive. So, by definition, the  
20 facts will evolve. The other reason--and so we're not  
21 shifting at all, so this is the nature of Asset  
22 Forfeiture Proceedings.

1           The other point I want to make is that there  
2 is a tension from Mr. Moloo to say that, oh, their  
3 case is shifting all the time, but when it comes to  
4 Essential Security, they say, oh, it's all a recast of  
5 what they said at the beginning. It's either a recast  
6 and we've said all along, and it's the same thing and  
7 we're recasting or it's not the same thing, so you  
8 cannot have it both ways.

9           The reality is that the case has evolved (1)  
10 because Asset Forfeiture Proceedings evolve, and (2)  
11 because in relation to legality questions, we have  
12 come, we, Colombia, and you will have heard  
13 Ms. Ordoñez this morning about the prosecution of  
14 Colombia, having gone through the very taxing,  
15 burdensome exercise of looking at the investigations  
16 in relation to the Meritage and responding, and this  
17 is the Claimants' own doing. They asked for this.  
18 They asked for Document Production. It all started  
19 because Colombia went through that process to produce,  
20 follow the Tribunal's Order, investigation  
21 proceedings, and that is when all of these  
22 illegalities started to come out, and that's when

1 Colombia started to connect the dots between what it  
2 was seeing in the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings, in  
3 relation to the Meritage, and it was seeing in this  
4 Arbitration, in relation to Mr. Seda, Mr. López  
5 Vanegas, [REDACTED], who has come out because  
6 of this evolving situation.

7           Likewise, the fact the rebuttal evidence  
8 that was not admitted, this was rebuttal evidence to  
9 Ms. Giraldo's statement that was belatedly put by the  
10 Respondent, and I'm not going to rehash our letters.

11 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] So, if there's any evolution, it's one  
16 because of the nature of the Asset Forfeiture  
17 Proceedings and simply because everything that has  
18 been uncovered, it's because we were responding to  
19 requests in Document Production by the Claimants or  
20 rebutting to statements made by Ms. Giraldo--I will  
21 come back to that. So, that again is extremely  
22 serious and you have to take that into account. Our

1 case is not shifting, our case is addressing very  
2 precisely what this Tribunal is confronted with.

3           And, finally, maybe one point on Mr. Moloo's  
4 comment at the end about moral damages, and I will  
5 finish here with where you started. This is not a  
6 case of an investor being treated poorly, a good-faith  
7 investor, this is a case about Colombia being dragged  
8 unfairly, abusively into an arbitration through an  
9 instrumentalization of arbitration when Colombia is  
10 trying to address wrongdoing by the Oficina de  
11 Envigado, this is what we're talking about. And now,  
12 I'm going to address that more precisely.

13           Starting with the Essential Security  
14 because--and you've heard that I will try to--of  
15 course, I'm not going to rehash what you heard in the  
16 Opening, but I will address some of the important  
17 points that you have in front of you.

18           I'm at Slide 4 now with the first point,  
19 which is that, given that Colombia's invoking that  
20 exception under Article 22.2(b) of the TPA, any  
21 determination by you would seriously undermine  
22 Colombia's Essential Security Interests.



1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

11

[REDACTED] so,

12

these were just factual circumstances and the context

13

for you to understand why Essential Security is such

14

an important matter here for Colombia. Dealing with

15

the Treaty itself. Before I do that, I would like to

16

address two points that were made by Mr. Moloo about

17

the timing issue. So, he says that you should just

18

look at the period of time when the Measures were

19

taken so--and then, you don't want to look at the rest

20

of the period, and he--I think he refers to the

21

Nicaragua Case. Well, our response to that is

22

that--and, of course, we made this point in the

1 Opening but it is as if we had not said anything, so  
2 they rehashed the same thing, but, again, we need to  
3 respond that. The Treaties are not the same thing.  
4 The Treaty here does not have the same elements as the  
5 one that was in the case of Russia trafficking  
6 transit, where the Treaty addressed Measures taken  
7 during a certain period of time. It's not the case  
8 here in the TPA.

9           The second point is that the evidence at the  
10 beginning was based on the Oficina being the previous  
11 owner of the Meritage Lot, and Mr. López Vanegas is  
12 also related to Oficina. But as you know, the  
13 Arbitration revealed that the Asset Forfeiture  
14 Proceedings are protective of something much more  
15 serious [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

19           So, again, you have to take into account the  
20 evolution of the facts, the Measures are taking into  
21 account that evolution, but importantly  
22 Article 22.2(b) doesn't make any--it doesn't bring any

1 limitation as to the timing of the Measures. And  
2 here, the Measures complained of having a continuous  
3 nature, and you have to take into account the fact  
4 that they have because the Asset Forfeiture  
5 Proceedings are ongoing and also because of this  
6 Arbitration simply. Because of this Arbitration, we  
7 came to connect the dots between this case and [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED]  
9 So, it's neither here nor there. The  
10 Nicaragua Case cannot be raised because, simply, the  
11 Treaties are different--written differently, and the  
12 language has nothing to do with this case.

13 On the MFN, I will say just one word. MFN  
14 Clause cannot apply because you have the language of  
15 the TPA, which says nothing in this Treaty and  
16 excludes pretty much everything, so it goes to the  
17 fundamental--and Ms. Ordoñez talked about it--is the  
18 fundamental consent of Colombia to accept arbitration  
19 under certain circumstances. So, it's not enough that  
20 we--you have--so, what they say is that, oh, forget  
21 Article 22.2(b), just go to a treaty that doesn't have  
22 that exclusion. But that exclusion is fundamental to

1 U.S. and to Colombia, and you could just not forget  
2 that because that's the very substance of the consent  
3 of Colombia to this case.

4           Now, if I may go to Article 22.2(b), at  
5 Slide 10, you see that well, the language is pretty  
6 clear; right? So, you have the nature of the  
7 Essential Security itself, which is the Colombian  
8 sovereign power to take measures against the worst  
9 type of organized crime that has historically been  
10 known in Colombia. That's what I just mentioned, and  
11 the language shows that the implication of the  
12 Essential Security Exception renders the matter  
13 non-justiciable. Non-justiciable means what? It  
14 means that it cannot be reviewed by a court, simply.

15           So, this what you have in the text. It says  
16 "nothing in this Agreement", so this is essentially an  
17 entire exclusion, "nothing in this Agreement shall be  
18 construed to preclude a party from applying measures".  
19 This means that a party can apply measures,  
20 notwithstanding anything that is in the Treaty and,  
21 therefore, that can be done without any legal  
22 assessment.

1           I will come back later to the footnote  
2 because our friends on the other side would like to  
3 forget the footnote, but it's very much there. But  
4 non-justiciability--and I will come back to the  
5 Parties' joint interpretation of the Treaty in that  
6 regard--this is what this means.

7           A party can take measures, can apply  
8 measures, protecting its own Essential Security  
9 Interests without--notwithstanding anything in this  
10 Treaty, including the investor-State dispute  
11 resolution. Now, if you look at my next slide, this  
12 is not new. We said it in our Rejoinder at Slide 11,  
13 we had said it in our Rejoinder of 16 February 2022,  
14 so now, they say, ah, it's all new, because the U.S.  
15 said it, you said it now. We said it from our  
16 Rejoinder 16 February 2022, not surprisingly because  
17 this was actually discussed between Colombia and the  
18 U.S. during the travaux préparatoires and you see that  
19 the U.S. on the 3 May Hearing, actually said and I  
20 quote from the U.S., "once a State Party to the TPA  
21 raises the exception, its invocation is not  
22 justiciable, and the Chapter 10 Tribunal must find

1 that the exception only applies to the dispute before  
2 it." And you--on the left side, you see that we had  
3 said that the dispute is not justiciable under grounds  
4 of Article 22.2 of the U.S.-Colombia TPA. So, it's  
5 not new, we said it at the outset as soon as we  
6 invoked the exception.

7           On my next slide, they argued, the Claimant  
8 argued that this is belated, and in any event, it's  
9 meritless. And you see on the left side, we put an  
10 excerpt of the Rebuttal. They say that it's  
11 time-barred, and they said during the Hearing, they  
12 change position--I just addressed that. And they say  
13 that under ICSID Article 41(2), the Tribunal has  
14 discretion to consider jurisdiction or competence at  
15 any stage of the proceeding, but cannot do that for  
16 matters of justiciability. With respect, this is  
17 wrong, for the five following reasons:

18           First of all, ICSID's Procedural Rules  
19 cannot trump the mandatory language of the Treaty.  
20 It's not only the mandatory language of the Treaty,  
21 but I will come back to that. It's also the authentic  
22 interpretation of the Treaty, which is binding on this

1 Tribunal. That's the first point.

2           The second point is that Article 41(2)  
3 essentially--and the Claimants' interpretation of that  
4 is incorrect because the Tribunal has the power and  
5 duty to satisfy itself at the time it has  
6 jurisdiction. What does that mean? That means that  
7 you have the power, at any point in time, to raise ex  
8 officio, your jurisdiction, because it's your duty to  
9 ensure that you cannot proceed without having  
10 jurisdiction. So, it's because that is--can be done  
11 at any point in time, a fortiori, it also is something  
12 you can and should do in terms of justiciability,  
13 which is even beyond jurisdiction because it means  
14 that you do not have the power to exercise  
15 jurisdiction.

16           They say, also, that this is belated . With  
17 respect, we have raised the exception based on newly  
18 discovered facts that reveal the seriousness of the  
19 circumstances of this case. I explained earlier this  
20 is because of everything that was uncovered after the  
21 document production, and the investigations that we  
22 had to submit following and complying with the

1 Tribunal's Order.

2           And following that, the Claimants had ample  
3 opportunity to address the point and to present their  
4 case in that regard, so they cannot blame--complain  
5 about any due-process issue.

6           In the alternative, what we say is that, if  
7 you look and seek to ensure, even if you're not with  
8 us on justiciability, which we say you should be  
9 because, essentially, as soon as we say it applies, it  
10 applies, and Colombia is entitled to take measures  
11 without any assessment by a court--you still have--you  
12 still lack jurisdiction, and that's my point C, to  
13 decide the dispute.

14           On my Slide 14, we have put the chart of  
15 essentially how you should look at this from the point  
16 of view of international general law as codified under  
17 the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. I will  
18 address each of them with more or less detail and  
19 rebutting--you don't have everything on slide because  
20 I had not planned on saying it, but, again, having  
21 heard my colleagues, I have to respond to some of  
22 these points.

1           First of all, of course, you have to look at  
2 ordinary meaning of Article 22.2(b). I will come back  
3 to this and I won't talk about it now.

4           Context of the Article 22.2(b), I had not  
5 planned on discussing it, but I will rebut briefly the  
6 context. We discussed this during the Opening. You  
7 have to take into account that it's at the end of the  
8 Treaty, and you know that it says "nothing in this  
9 Agreement", so the fact it is at the end of the Treaty  
10 shows that it encapsulates the entirety of the Treaty,  
11 including investor-State arbitration and including  
12 compensation.

13           There was a point made by Mr. Moloo about  
14 the U.S. actually having had a very strong desire to  
15 allow compensation for investors. With respect, this  
16 is wrong. You just need to go back to what the U.S.  
17 actually said during the Hearing of May, and if I may  
18 refer you to Page 390 of the Hearing of May. That's  
19 3 May 2022, Lines 9 to 21, which I will read for the  
20 record. So Page 390, Lines 9 to 21.

21           I quote from the U.S. Government: "I would  
22 like it address an argument we heard from Claimants

1 yesterday that Article 22.2(b) merely allows the State  
2 to apply or continue to apply Measures that it  
3 considers necessary for the protection of its own  
4 Essential Security Interest but that Article 22.2(b)  
5 does not address the question of liability of  
6 compensation. The United States disagrees. Once the  
7 Essential Security Interest exception is invoked, a  
8 Tribunal may not, thereafter, find the relevant  
9 Measure in breach of the Chapter 10 obligation and may  
10 not consequently order the payment of any compensation  
11 in connection with that Measure."

12           It's very clear what the U.S. says, and  
13 here, again, there is an agreement between the U.S.  
14 and Colombia, which dates back to the travaux  
15 préparatoires, and I will come back to this. So, if  
16 you look at the context, the fact that it's at the end  
17 and the language together mean that everything is  
18 excluded, including investor-State arbitration and  
19 compensation as the U.S. has clarified in its  
20 submission.

21           Object and purpose of the TPA, you saw there  
22 was a slide, I don't have it with me, but there was

1 this very interesting slide about the preamble of the  
2 Treaty, which is essentially about allowing,  
3 promoting, broad-based economic development in order  
4 to reduce poverty. My friends forget some other--and  
5 with permission, I don't have it in my Slide, so I  
6 will respectfully refer you back to the actual  
7 Hearing. Yes, so they have quoted from the three--no,  
8 WHEREASES 2, 3, and 4 in their Slide 4. So, promote  
9 broad-based economic development in order to reduce  
10 poverty and generate opportunities for sustainable  
11 economic alternatives to drug-crop production. So, we  
12 see that drugs is, indeed, very much in the State's  
13 mind when they entered into this Treaty.

14           But look also at what they do not  
15 address--or if you look at the Preamble, in your time  
16 because I don't have it handy, four WHEREASES before  
17 the end, I quote: "Promote transparency and prevent  
18 and combat corruption, including bribery and  
19 international trade and investment."

20           And the last whereas--no, sorry. It's not  
21 whereas--it's on the first page, so it's first page,  
22 fourth before last, and the last on the first page of

1 the Preamble, I quote: "Preserved their ability to  
2 safeguard the public welfare."

3           So, these are important object and purpose  
4 of the Treaty, but they do not mention on the other  
5 side of the table but, of course, fighting against  
6 corruption, including bribery, international  
7 trade/investment, that is also part of what the  
8 Treaty--the States had in mind.

9           On effet utile, going back to my chart, I  
10 will respectfully refer you back to our submissions,  
11 that this has to be a purposeful provision.  
12 Otherwise, if you don't give effect to it, you're  
13 simply not giving effect to a very important provision  
14 in the Treaty. And now I'll come to the rest, which  
15 is authentic interpretation and travaux, but saying  
16 one word about the ordinary meaning at Slide 15.

17           So, you have, of course, on the left side,  
18 the actual text. "Nothing in this Agreement"--and  
19 that, of course, again, exclude ISDS and exclude  
20 compensation, shall be construed to preclude a Party  
21 from applying measure, that it considers necessary for  
22 the protection of its own Essential Security. What

1 you see is that it says, it considers necessary,  
2 "measures it considers necessary." This means that  
3 it's a subjective determination by the State who  
4 invokes the exception. It's not an objective  
5 criterion; it's a subjective one.

6           This has been consistently interpreted--you  
7 have that--the references on the right side--by every  
8 court or tribunal that has had to deal with similar  
9 language on the self-judging nature of this sort of  
10 language, meaning it considers necessary. They have  
11 always interpreted this as a carve-out of  
12 jurisdiction.

13           And if you look at the footnote, which is  
14 not discussed by the other side, you see that it says  
15 "for greater certainty". So, it's just for the  
16 evidence of doubt. It doesn't mean the text is not  
17 clear, the text is very clear, but to even clarify  
18 more, they say for greater certainty. If a party  
19 invokes the provision, the Tribunal or panel hearing  
20 the matter shall find that the exception applies.

21           And I'll come back to this, the U.S. and  
22 Colombia took a position on this in the travaux

1 préparatoires and in otherwise.

2           I want to say here one word here about Eco  
3 Oro because our friends have said--had said a number  
4 of things in that relation. I just want to make sure  
5 that you go back to actually what Eco Oro says. The  
6 provision under Eco Oro, which was Article 2201(3) of  
7 the Canada-Colombia FTA, is a general exception  
8 related to environmental matters, not Essential  
9 Security, so not the same thing we're talking about.  
10 And that provision is fundamentally different from the  
11 provision you have in front of you because it does not  
12 have the self-judging elements that are expressly  
13 provided in this provision. So, these are two main  
14 reasons why Eco Oro cannot apply.

15           And you have to look at the chapeau of Eco  
16 Oro, which is--which essentially talks about measures  
17 adopted by the State that are not applied in a manner  
18 that would constitute a means of arbitral  
19 unjustifiable discrimination, that's what they refer  
20 to. That is not found in Article 22.2(b), so, again,  
21 the provisions are completely different.

22           And the Eco Oro also applies to provisions

1 contained in Chapter 8, which is the "Investment"  
2 chapter of that FTA whereas Article 22.2(b) applies to  
3 the entirety of the Treaty because it says "nothing in  
4 this Agreement".

5 And, of course, as we discussed, that means  
6 that it includes investor-State arbitration and  
7 compensation, so for these reasons Eco Oro simply is  
8 neither here nor there, and it cannot apply, and it's  
9 not binding on this Tribunal for one, but in any  
10 event, it is a completely different finding.

11 Now, if you're not with us at all on that,  
12 we--and I'll come back to this, the exception has been  
13 fully invoked by Colombia in good faith, and I will  
14 show that. But before I do that, on my next Slide 16,  
15 I want to discuss the interpretation by the Parties.

16 So, you see here on the left side,  
17 Colombia's positions, on the right side, the U.S.  
18 submission. On the left side, you have Colombia's  
19 Rejoinder of 16 February, and you see that  
20 Colombia--and you see what the arrows and the boxes,  
21 red boxes--you see that we have referenced what was  
22 exactly the same wording used by both States. So, in

1 Colombia's Rejoinder, we argued and submitted that  
2 this renders the case non-justiciable. The U.S. in  
3 the Hearing of 3 May said exactly the same thing.  
4 They said it's not justiciable.

5 We argued also the self-judging nature of  
6 the provision, and you see on the right side, that the  
7 U.S. also has said the same thing. The fact that both  
8 States are saying the same thing about the  
9 interpretation means that there is an authentic  
10 interpretation of the Treaty by both Contracting  
11 Parties that binds this Tribunal. You cannot escape  
12 the fact that both States are saying the same thing.  
13 And the U.S., who are present today, are listening to  
14 this, the U.S. have--probably, when they come and  
15 argue interpretation, they have at heart the correct  
16 interpretation of the Treaty and ensuring that the  
17 Tribunal understands what the U.S. had in mind when it  
18 entered into this Treaty, just as Colombia had the  
19 same thing in mind at the time.

20 And you see that, during our oral  
21 submission, which happened the day before the U.S.,  
22 and for that matter, we had no clue what the U.S.

1 would say. So, on the 2nd of May, we argued the  
2 subsequent agreement under the Vienna Convention on  
3 the Law of Treaties, the fact that the same things  
4 would be found in the submissions of the U.S. and  
5 Colombia. That makes it, under Article 31(3)(a) of  
6 the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a  
7 subsequent agreement between the Parties, that makes  
8 it an authentic interpretation.

9           And you see that the next day, the U.S.,  
10 relying on the same provision, said that is the  
11 Parties', the TPA Parties' common understanding. So,  
12 that, if anything, confirms that the Parties, the two  
13 Parties have the same interpretation, they viewed this  
14 as non-justiciable, meaning that the States cannot  
15 assess--the Tribunal--I'm sorry, cannot assess any or  
16 determine the actions of Colombia, as soon as Colombia  
17 addresses--invokes the exception, and that it is  
18 self-judging in the sense that it's a subjective  
19 determination by Colombia, and that it is a joint  
20 interpretation by the two States.

21           ARBITRATOR PONCET: I'm sorry to interrupt  
22 you, Professor Banifatemi. I was just asking the

1 Chairman if I should ask the question tomorrow when we  
2 have time for the questions and I've been told to ask  
3 it right away.

4           Just assume for the sake of argument, assume  
5 the United States is invoking the Treaty, and it's  
6 invoking it in bad faith, does the Arbitral Tribunal,  
7 in front of which the United States would invoke the  
8 Treaty, have to step back and say this is it, or does  
9 the Arbitral Tribunal have any power to assess whether  
10 or not the implication is made in good faith? I am  
11 not saying by this, let me emphasize that, in our  
12 case, there is any issue about that. I'm just asking  
13 for my understanding of the provisions, so I'm taking  
14 the other example, for ease of reference, assuming a  
15 Colombian investor in the United States, let's say  
16 it's the Trump administration and it's invoked in a  
17 totally crazy manner, does the Arbitral Tribunal  
18 sitting under the Treaty have the power to adjudicate  
19 that?

20           MS. BANIFATEMI: I will start with the end,  
21 which is that, as you will have understood from our  
22 submission, we have a series of alternatives: One,

1 it's not justiciable; two, you do not have  
2 jurisdiction. In the event that you decide against us  
3 that you do have jurisdiction, we are--we have invoked  
4 this in good faith and I will address that later on.  
5 So, I--just to give the Tribunal comfort that, even if  
6 you were to go there, which we say is wrong because  
7 this is not the sense of the Treaty, you should feel  
8 comfort in the fact that this is an extremely  
9 important, serious matter for which Colombia has  
10 raised the exception in good faith.

11           Going to the first question, I am not  
12 authorized by the U.S. to speak for the U.S., so I  
13 cannot say anything for the U.S. The U.S. are hearing  
14 us, if they have anything to say, they probably will.  
15 All I can say is that, based on the interpretation  
16 that you have seen from both States, from Colombia and  
17 from the U.S.--and I'll come now to the travaux  
18 préparatoires, but from what you've heard at the  
19 Hearing, self-judging means self-judging. When the  
20 U.S. says it's not justiciable, meaning that it cannot  
21 be submitted to a determination by a court or  
22 tribunal, that's what it means.

1           So, it's that--in other words, it's  
2 intrinsic to the concept of Essential Security. If a  
3 State says, the Measures that I've taken go to my  
4 Essential Security, nobody other than that State can  
5 determine what that Essential Security is, and that's  
6 enough. That's what self-judging means, and that's  
7 what the subjective determination means.

8           And it's only for--and that's when I say  
9 it's a purposeful meaning. You have to give effect--  
10 effet utile, you have to give effect to this,  
11 otherwise you just are overlooking an essential  
12 provision in the Treaty. There's a reason why the  
13 State--the two States put that text in the Treaty.  
14 Colombia, by the way, if I recall correctly, there are  
15 17 BITs and TPAs in which Colombia has this in its  
16 Treaties. And again, there's a reason why, because  
17 Colombia is engaged in one of the worst efforts  
18 worldwide in relation to narco trafficking and armed  
19 and bloody crime. These are some of the worst  
20 organizations worldwide, now having relationship with  
21 the Hezbollah. I mean, we're talking about extremely  
22 serious wrongdoing around the world.

1           So, if Colombia says this is my Essential  
2 Security, that should be enough.

3           Now, if you would like to look at  
4 jurisdiction, you have to say, okay, I look at  
5 jurisdiction, I look at--it's not justiciability, but  
6 it's jurisdictional. So, you need to look at that and  
7 determine that Colombia is right when it says "nothing  
8 in the Agreement can be construed". It's still  
9 self-judging, and you say, I do not have jurisdiction  
10 because Colombia is saying that it's Essential  
11 Security. So, you can either say I do not have the  
12 power to decide and assess, or you say I do not have  
13 the jurisdiction. And, as far as I'm concerned, there  
14 is a level, its power comes before jurisdiction but  
15 the end result would be the same. I, as the Tribunal  
16 cannot make a determination based on law in relation  
17 to this point.

18           ARBITRATOR PONCET: And the Measure under  
19 Article 22 is the overall fight against a particularly  
20 dangerous form of organized crime--

21           MS. BANIFATEMI: Yes.

22           ARBITRATOR PONCET: --that is active in the

1 drug trade?

2 MS. BANIFATEMI: Yes. And the Meritage was  
3 targeted--Ms. Herrera will come back to this because  
4 there was a huge number of misrepresentations about  
5 Asset Forfeiture Proceedings and she will explain what  
6 exactly this is. It follows the assets, so Colombia  
7 looks at the Meritage in the first instance.  
8 Meritage, at the time, we saw that there was in the  
9 tracing of the asset, there was--

10 ARBITRATOR PONCET: Yeah, I got that.

11 MS. BANIFATEMI: Okay. So--but then, as the  
12 facts uncover and as the facts keep growing, and  
13 that's when we invoked Essential Security, we saw more  
14 and more--

15 ARBITRATOR PONCET: I got your point.

16 MS. BANIFATEMI: Okay. So--

17 ARBITRATOR PONCET: I got your point, but  
18 what you're saying is that measure is, not contrary to  
19 what we heard this morning, something specifically  
20 adopted, for instance, it would be a determination of  
21 some kind in an international environment where  
22 Colombia would have said, well, we--rightly we regard

1 the fight against organized crime as an Essential  
2 Interest of our State due to the vast experiences  
3 we've had, et cetera, et cetera. It's not that. It's  
4 the simple existence of this undoubtedly extremely  
5 important and extremely difficult crime against--the  
6 fight against form of organized crime, in which so  
7 many people have lost their lives.

8 MS. BANIFATEMI: Yes.

9 ARBITRATOR PONCET: It's just the fact that  
10 it exists, is what you're saying?

11 MS. BANIFATEMI: The continuum--

12 ARBITRATOR PONCET: That's the Measure?

13 MS. BANIFATEMI: The continuum of all of the  
14 Measures that--and, indeed, the existence of the Asset  
15 Forfeiture Proceedings in relation to the Meritage,  
16 because this is the subject of the case that's before  
17 you. What's the case before you is not the entirety  
18 of the fight against narco trafficking. What's before  
19 you is Colombia's fight against narco trafficking.

20 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I will

1 address that very briefly, but the Measures taken in  
2 relation to Meritage, all of the Measures--the  
3 continuum of those Measures and how they're unfolding  
4 because, as we go more and more, the Asset Forfeiture  
5 Proceedings are developing and more and more facts are  
6 being uncovered, all of those Measures, in relation to  
7 the Meritage, given the fight against narco  
8 trafficking and money-laundering.

9 ARBITRATOR PONCET: Thank you. Sorry for  
10 the interruption.

11 MS. BANIFATEMI: Not at all, Mr. Arbitrator.  
12 Thank you.

13 [REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED] So, nothing new, both

4

Contracting Parties to the Treaty have maintained

5

consistently the same view of how this should be

6

interpreted, and it's a very specific determination.

7

And as you see, consistent.

8

Now, if I may--

9

SECRETARY MARZAL: Excuse me, Ms.

10

Banifatemi, the Interpreters are asking if you could

11

please slow down a little bit.

12

ARBITRATOR PONCET: And she keeps being

13

interrupted. I'm sorry.

14

SECRETARY MARZAL: Sorry.

15

MS. BANIFATEMI: I will try to slow down for

16

sure. Apologies.

17

So, I'm coming to the further alternative,

18

which is that in any event, this has been raised by

19

Colombia in good faith. And the Measures complained

20

of are designed to protect Colombia's Essential

21

Security Interest and, therefore, there is no universe

22

in which the Tribunal could find that Colombia has

1 breached its obligations under the TPA.

2           On my Slide 19 you see that there is--so you  
3 have again the provision itself, and there's three  
4 requirements that we have highlighted. The first that  
5 there has to be measures that were adopted. That's  
6 not contested by the other side. That's--those  
7 Measures are considered to be necessary for the State  
8 who invokes that exception, and that's not contested.  
9 The only requirement that's challenged by the  
10 Claimants, as you see on my slide, is the protection  
11 of the own security interests, and the criterion which  
12 is not contested is that the Measures must plausibly  
13 be expected to protect the State's Essential Security  
14 Interest.

15           Now, my next slide, I will try to, in my  
16 next slides, plural, I will try to explain what we are  
17 now really confronted with.

18 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]





1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]





1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]



1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]



1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

21

One final word, and that's my Point 2, at

22

Slides 33 and 34, that's the consequences of that

1 implication is that the Tribunal cannot find liability  
2 and/or compensation, there is also three reasons for  
3 that, so first of all, as you know, the Essential  
4 Security Exception is a derogation to the entirety of  
5 the TPA--I've explained that--so no breaches and no  
6 compensation.

7           Importantly, this is my second bullet, in  
8 order to award compensation to the Claimant, the  
9 Tribunal would be taking a premature measure because  
10 the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings are still ongoing.  
11 They're evolving. The Meritage Lot has not yet been  
12 forfeited. And there has been no determination by the  
13 Colombian court as to whether or not Newport is a bona  
14 fide without-fault third party. So, this is ongoing,  
15 so therefore it's completely premature for this  
16 Tribunal to decide that there has been any breach of  
17 the Treaty because the Colombian Courts have not made  
18 any determination in that regard.

19           And finally, any determination by the  
20 Tribunal of Colombia's actions in the circumstances  
21 poses the risk of interfering with Colombia's  
22 Essential Security Interest and would be essentially

1 allowing the instrumentalization of international  
2 arbitration by Mr. Seda and his acolytes to the  
3 benefit of criminal organization, and would be  
4 contrary to international public policy and we said  
5 that the Tribunal should be extremely cautious before  
6 doing that.

7 I will say a few words about jurisdiction,  
8 if I may. And I'm in your hands as to when you wish  
9 to have a break.

10 The first point is that the Claimants have  
11 not made a protected investment under the TPA and the  
12 ICSID Convention. The Claimants have first--so, on  
13 Slide 37, you see that the Claimants have failed to  
14 show that they provided any significant contribution  
15 of capital or other resources into the Project. As  
16 you now know, pursuant to the Financial Statements of  
17 Newport, less than \$2 million were paid by the  
18 Shareholders, including Newport. This is anything but  
19 substantial.

20 Interestingly, it's through the Unit Buyers  
21 that the Meritage Project has been financed mostly,  
22 and as *Vestey v. Venezuela* said, any capital resources

1 committed by the Claimants are incapable because of  
2 their insignificance of contributing any meaningful  
3 way to the objective of the, in that case, or in this  
4 case, the U.S.-Colombia TPA.

5           Because there is no significant contribution  
6 and no real contribution in fact, there cannot be any  
7 risk and Mr. Seda cannot complain of being mistreated  
8 or legitimate expectation. And one word here about  
9 that and the risk. If anything, when he allegedly  
10 invested in the Medellín Region and dealing with  
11 cartel individuals, he should have had the expectation  
12 that the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings might be  
13 initiated against the asset that was the subject of  
14 his alleged investment, and that in that sense there  
15 cannot be any legitimate expectation, there is only a  
16 real risk in that sense. But in any event, we say  
17 that, as the definition, he didn't really take a risk  
18 as such because the contribution was nowhere.

19           However, we said that there is an  
20 expectation of gain and profit, which is not  
21 sufficient to establish a protected investment was  
22 made. And on profit, I just want for you to remember

1 the very interesting--when did they talk about  
2 proportionality but look at they invested even less  
3 than 2 million. It's actually the Unit Buyers who  
4 invested, but against that 2 million, they're asking  
5 for 255 million. This is better than the casino.  
6 They win at every step. So, if you please look at the  
7 cross-examination of Mr. Seda during the Hearing of  
8 3 May, and, for example, Page 444, Lines 15 to 22, I  
9 asked him that he had identified land in previously  
10 dangerous regions and the perception of danger causes  
11 prices to be fixed at the bargain, and he said yes.

12           And likewise, at Page 447, I asked him  
13 again, "this is what I call being a good businessman.  
14 You buy pieces of land in regions that are either  
15 perceived as previously dangerous or are still  
16 dangerous and you expect to make a very high profit  
17 out of it--right?--and you talk about profit of  
18 1000 percent," and he accepts, he agrees. And he says  
19 later on at Page 448 on Lines 17 and 18, "my job is to  
20 give returns to my Investor. That's the way I can do  
21 what I love." So, what is interesting for Mr. Seda is  
22 that he barely makes any investment, and he expects a

1 1000 percent profit, and even more, \$255 million in  
2 this case. Again, it's better than the casino.

3 On my next slide, I will be very fast

4 [REDACTED]

14 Now, on illegality, that's Point B, you have  
15 under Rule 41(2) of ICSID Rules, again, this is a  
16 question of jurisdiction. So, at any point in time  
17 you have to raise matters of jurisdiction, and that  
18 includes the legality of the Investment that was made,  
19 which goes to jurisdiction. And you have the example  
20 here of Infinito versus Costa Rica: "The Tribunal had  
21 the duty to assess ex officio in accordance with ICSID  
22 Rule 41(2). As a result, the Tribunal cannot merely

1 rely on the Parties' assessment and must engage in its  
2 own inquiry on the basis of the evidence on the  
3 record. This is particularly true when there are  
4 allegations of corruption, which is a matter of  
5 international public policy."

6           So, you do have the duty when you're  
7 confronted with illegality of the scale that we're  
8 talking about, even if we had not raised the  
9 illegality of the investment, it would be your duty to  
10 raise that and to address that.

11           And you have case law in that regard on my  
12 next slide, it's Phoenix, Oxus, Mamidoil. And you  
13 look at Phoenix, for example, illegal investments  
14 according to national law and the host-State cannot be  
15 protected through an ICSID arbitral process, you're  
16 familiar with the case law.

17           And going to doctrine, of course, I wanted  
18 to pay tribute to Professor Gaillard, late Professor  
19 Gaillard's writings on corruption matter, in that the  
20 investment has to be made in conditions of legality  
21 but don't take only Professor Gaillard's words for it,  
22 take Mr. Moloo's word for it. This is an article

1 written in 2010, at Slide 43, where he says that, I  
2 quote: "The consent of a host-State to resolve  
3 disputes with investors is governed by certain  
4 overarching principles, including transnational public  
5 policy." And further down he says that the applicable  
6 law includes transnational public policy against fraud  
7 and corruption.

8           And again, he says, I quote: "Breaches of  
9 transnational public policy may also prevent the  
10 admissibility of any claim that relates to an  
11 investment that involved fraud and corruption by the  
12 Investor." So, in 2010 when he's not representing  
13 Mr. Seda, he agrees with me.

14           Next Slide 44, just to wrap up, that the  
15 Claimants' alleged investment are tainted by  
16 illegality and money-laundering. First as regards  
17 Meritage, illicit origin, it has been in the  
18 possession and control of members of the Oficina, as  
19 we've shown. It has experienced several  
20 transformations and has been the subject of fake sales  
21 via front men currently investigated for  
22 money-laundering. And it's currently owned by La

1 Palma Argentina, [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED]

3           These facts alone should be the end of this  
4 matter. You should say "we cannot judge this. This  
5 is, indeed, good-faith invocation by Colombia." If  
6 you were on the merits only and not on the principle,  
7 which is that you should not assess at all. If you  
8 decided to assess the good-faith invocation by  
9 Colombia, these facts should show you enough that, and  
10 given the circumstances we've shown, that this has  
11 been, indeed, invoked by Colombia in utter good faith.

12           And also in regards to Luxé, [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]

17 So, this also shows that again this is not the  
18 representation of the alleged investment as Mr. Seda  
19 would have it.

20 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] Two-thirds of the Claimants' claim concerned

17

projects unrelated to the Meritage Project, actually

18

Mr. Moloo showed this to you. It's only 31 percent of

19

the Claims of 64 million that relates to the Meritage

20

that is part of the quantum that they are asking.

21

If I may, I can finish before we have--

22

SECRETARY MARZAL: The Court Reporters are

1 asking for a break.

2 MS. BANIFATEMI: Okay, I'll stop.

3 PRESIDENT SACHS: Thank you for your  
4 endurance both Court Reporters, that was quite  
5 something.

6 Let's see, it's 4:25. Let's say 4:40.

7 (Recess.)

8 PRESIDENT SACHS: Mr. Moloo, can we resume?  
9 There are still members of your team missing but in  
10 the interest of time?

11 MR. MOLOO: Yes, we can resume.

12 PRESIDENT SACHS: Very good. Please.

13 MR. MOLOO: May I point out one correction,  
14 if I may, Mr. President.

15 PRESIDENT SACHS: If it's short, yes.

16 [REDACTED]



1 indirectly holds shares in Luxé through his Family  
2 Trust which is a discretionary trust. If you look at  
3 the excerpt, you see that the Trust is at the  
4 discretion--I'm in the second box--to completely  
5 withhold distributions from any one beneficiary and  
6 you also see that they have the power to exclude the  
7 beneficiaries. So, to the extent that this is a  
8 discretionary trust, the true Claimant should have  
9 been the Trustee, who is the owner and not Mr. Hass,  
10 who, therefore, cannot have standing to be here before  
11 you.

12 [REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

Just as a reminder, in any event, on my next

5

slide, you see that they focused on the TPA and say

6

that the TPA allows trust as being investors, but

7

since you're an ICSID Tribunal, the cumulative

8

conditions must be met. So, for the purpose of the

9

ICSID Convention, that's Article 25, which requires

10

that there be a national of another Contracting State,

11

which means legal personality, and this is reference

12

to the commentary by Professor Schreuer, and the Trust

13

not having a legal personality, again, cannot have

14

standing before this Tribunal, and the Tribunal does

15

not have jurisdiction over it.

16

This completes my second part on the lack of

17

jurisdiction over the Claimants and their claim.

18

I would like to say one word which I forgot

19

in my introductory remarks, and I think it is the

20

appropriate time to say it. And it's important. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

You heard Mr. Moloo say earlier that he was

5

scared that Mr. Seda somehow is scared about

6

initiating anything because there will be some type of

7

retaliation. We take serious issue with that. There

8

has been nothing done by Colombia that was

9

retaliation. [REDACTED]

10

[REDACTED], so

11

this is something that she has done, and that's her

12

own decision in relation to the slander that she

13

considers she has been the subject of.

14

[REDACTED]

15

[REDACTED]

16

[REDACTED] So, it's not

17

retaliation by Colombia. It's what Mr. Seda is doing

18

and the reaction that he should expect as a result.

19

[REDACTED]

20

[REDACTED]

21

[REDACTED]

22

[REDACTED]



1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

[REDACTED]

5

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

6

[REDACTED]

7

[REDACTED]

8

[REDACTED]

9

So, Colombia, in its traditional--and you

10

remember that that's part of the--also the

11

judicial--and that same letter refers to the U.N.

12

Convention Against Elicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs

13

and Psychotropic Substances. That's part of that

14

cooperation between the FBI and the Colombian

15

Authorities.

16

PRESIDENT SACHS: Forgive me, but we

17

discussed all this in May, didn't we?

18

MS. BANIFATEMI: We did, but it's--I'm

19

answering Mr. Moloo when he says that he's scared and

20

if there's a retaliation against Mr. Seda, explaining

21

that there's no retaliation. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

20

And finally I want to refer you back to the

21

cross-examination Day 3 of Mr. Seda, Pages 639 to 653,

22

which is the entire discussion between me and Mr. Seda

1 of these exact actions and, of course, on the other  
2 side we didn't hear anything about that.

3 So, if anything, Mr. Seda is not scared. ■

■ [REDACTED]  
■ [REDACTED]. If anybody is scared, it would be  
6 the prosecutors who with courage in Colombia are  
7 actually going after these drug lords, and even my  
8 colleague sitting here and I do recall that we have  
9 the equivalent of the Head of the FBI in Colombia, the  
10 Head of the CTI, sitting with us. If the Tribunal has  
11 any questions on this issue, he's here to answer.

12 So, I finish with the third part which is  
13 the premature and abusive nature of this arbitration.

14 Point A, Slide 55 is simply that the asset  
15 forfeitures are still before the Colombian courts.  
16 You have a timeline. I will not go through it. You  
17 remember that in May there was a discussion about  
18 whether Newport is afectado or it's not afectado.  
19 You will recall that the prosecutors treated Newport  
20 as afectado, so it had access to the file. Then, in  
21 2017, there was the Requerimiento, and that was  
22 appealed. As a result of the appeal, the process was

1 suspended until in 22 April 2022, the Appeal Court  
2 reinstated Newport as an afectado for the trial stage,  
3 which will now start, and this is all ongoing. So,  
4 and, of course, Newport will have access to the full  
5 case and the trial stage.

6 So, as a result of that, there is no final  
7 determination as to whether or not Newport is a bona  
8 fide third party without fault and the merits of the  
9 Attorney General's asset forfeiture petition.

10 Further, the court decision is further  
11 subject to appeal as a matter of Colombian law. And  
12 finally, as you remember from the U.S. submission in  
13 May, the responsibility of a State cannot be invoked  
14 until a final judicial act has been decided and, in  
15 this case, there is no final judicial act because this  
16 is all ongoing and Newport has to make its claim to  
17 the Colombian courts who will decide whether or not  
18 Newport is a bona fide third party without fault.

19 Point B, the remedies and mechanisms allowed  
20 under Colombian law. It's a reminder. You heard this  
21 in May. Article 34 of the Colombian Constitution,  
22 which says that there is a right to a judicial

1 decision for the forfeiture assets acquired by means  
2 of illicit enrichment.

3 Article 90 of the Colombian Constitution  
4 also provides that there shall be financial liability  
5 of States for unlawful damages attributable to it. In  
6 the event that Mr. Seda has any issue with damages,  
7 the appropriate measure should be taken to the  
8 Colombian courts and, therefore, you see that  
9 Colombian law allows for full remedies under Colombian  
10 law for any damages caused for the wrongful or alleged  
11 wrongful conduct attributable to the State.

12 And the reality, and that's my last point  
13 under C, not only these are premature claims but  
14 they're also abusive because what Mr. Seda and his  
15 acolytes are trying to do is to be compensated  
16 multiple times, with my Slide 59.

17 Mr. Seda and his acolytes are effectively  
18 trying to have four bites at the Apple, so it's to  
19 have the cake and eat it four times.

20 First, they want compensation from this  
21 Tribunal--\$255 million. It's again better than a  
22 casino.

1           Then they want to be able to seek  
2 compensation from the Colombian court, which is still  
3 open to them during the process and throughout and at  
4 the end of the process.

5           There is a legal action by Newport against  
6 La Palma Argentina. We know that but we don't have  
7 much information about it, so we don't know, but we  
8 know that it exists.

9           And, finally and importantly—this is  
10 something you need to bear in mind—Mr. Seda is feeding  
11 domestic proceedings brought by the Unit buyers  
12 against the State of Colombia by feeding them—and this  
13 is uncontested—by feeding them the process and reports  
14 from this Arbitration, and these are reports by  
15 Mr. Martínez, reports by Mr. Medellín, the –  
16 confidential report prepared by investigator Paula  
17 Espinosa and addressed to Ms. Noguera, and finally the  
18 Transcripts of Mr. Seda's improper recordings.

19           This has been feeding the proceedings in  
20 Colombia, the Unit buyers, and rather than be  
21 responsive to the potential actions that may be  
22 brought by Unit Buyers against Newport, Mr. Seda is

1 trying to avoid responsibility by saying, "hey, go  
2 against Colombia, don't come after me." And so he's  
3 feeding them this.

4 So, Colombia is, as a result, exposed more  
5 than one time. It's exposed to in the country by the  
6 actions of Mr. Seda, by the actions of Unit buyers,  
7 and also in this Tribunal for \$255 million.

8 This is abusive. It's nothing short of  
9 abusive, and this should not be allowed by this  
10 Tribunal, who we say should be safeguarding the  
11 integrity of international arbitration as a mechanism  
12 and the integrity of this process, and, frankly the  
13 integrity of treaty protection of international law.

14 With this, and with my thanks to the  
15 Tribunal for its patience and the interpreters, I pass  
16 on to Ms. Herrera.

17 PRESIDENT SACHS: Thank you very much.

18 Ms. Herrera.

19 MS. HERRERA: Thank you very much,  
20 Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal.

21 I will address now the allegations on the  
22 merits, both in fact and, later on, on law.

1 I will echo Ms. Banifatemi's point made  
2 about the series of misrepresentations made that we  
3 heard from our friends on the other side earlier this  
4 morning regarding the law, the testimonies and, in  
5 fact--and the facts. So, again, I'm not sure that we  
6 will be able to respond to all of them and correct all  
7 of them, and again, ask the Tribunal to please refer  
8 back to the documents and don't take the word of the  
9 Claimants as the real text or the real facts.

10 Anyway, one point that it's quite important  
11 here, and I'm sorry, I know we walked you through  
12 this, the Asset Forfeiture Law in May but, again, I  
13 think that it's important to remember one thing, and  
14 that is: What is the purpose? And the purpose is to  
15 forfeit an asset. The imperative word is the "asset."  
16 And that's important here because, as you have heard,  
17 the case of the Claimants is: Mr. Seda was target?  
18 No, Mr. Seda wasn't target. It was the Meritage Lot.  
19 And in fact, the Meritage Lot is not even owned by  
20 Mr. Seda.

21 So, that's the first point. Very quickly, I  
22 just want to remind the Tribunal, again, that there

1 are two phases in the Asset Forfeiture Procedure: The  
2 Initial Phase before the Prosecutors and the Trial  
3 Stage before the Court. Again, why is this important?  
4 And I know that that seems pretty basic because the  
5 Claimants through all the presentations, what they  
6 have done is apply the level of proof, the level of  
7 evidence, the level of determination that is to be  
8 applied and determined by the Judge, at the final  
9 stage, and bring it back to the beginning and say, no,  
10 no, no, it's the Prosecutors who should have done  
11 basically what the Judge has to determine, and I will  
12 again refer to this.

13           The two quick last points to recall. The  
14 Asset Forfeiture Proceedings are not criminal in  
15 nature, and finally, to recall again, they're not  
16 subject to statute of limitations, and this is  
17 important, again, regarding the so-called "due  
18 diligence" performed by Newport.

19           As you will see in Page 64, we're trying to  
20 address the main allegations regarding--the Claimants  
21 have made regarding the asset forfeiture--and why they  
22 say that they were wrong, in fact, they are not wrong.

1           And the first one--and we heard again about  
2 this, this morning, is that the Attorney General's  
3 Office has initiated the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings  
4 and imposed Precautionary Measures based solely on a  
5 false kidnapping story. They refer again--we went  
6 through this in May. They refer again to the fact  
7 that it seems that there was no--or there was no  
8 kidnapping story, at least there was no kidnapping as  
9 such when Sebastian López was coerced to transfer the  
10 property. He was coerced, whether there was  
11 kidnapping or not, that doesn't matter. That's the  
12 way that the Oficina de Envigado functions: They  
13 coerce payments of any debt.

14           But this is just wrong. This is wrong.  
15 It's not based on the false kidnapping. And I'm going  
16 to go through this, and this is important, again,  
17 because the--the Claimants have said--you have to have  
18 perfect certainty of everything at the beginning, the  
19 Prosecutor have had perfect certainty all the evidence  
20 of everything covered at the initiation of the  
21 proceedings. This is not true. And again, here we  
22 have the Claimants wrongly attempting to apply to the

1 initiation of the proceedings and imposition of the  
2 Precautionary Measures, the standard of proof that  
3 applies at later stages of proceedings.

4 Ms. Banifatemi referred how the Asset  
5 Forfeiture Proceedings are a continuum, are ongoing,  
6 and, in fact, is almost a crescendo, as is normal in  
7 any procedure that becomes a contentious proceeding,  
8 where more evidence is being brought into the forum.

9 So, first thing, what is--what does the  
10 Prosecutors, what do they have to do at the initiation  
11 of the proceedings? What's the standard? They can  
12 initiate proceedings if there are serious and  
13 reasonable basis to infer the probable existence of  
14 assets that could be subject to Asset Forfeiture. As  
15 you see, that's not a certainty, it's a reasonable  
16 basis to infer.

17 Now, as I have said, this continues, so it  
18 escalates, and then for the Determination of Claim,  
19 that is when the Prosecutor asks the Court, please do  
20 forfeit or if--or not forfeit, but please do forfeit,  
21 in regards on indication that there are grounds, so  
22 again, there are grounds for forfeiture. And you see

1 this very clearly in Mr. Caro's---Prosecutor Caro's  
2 Requerimiento or Determination of Claim.

3           And again, at the stage of the Asset  
4 Forfeiture before the Courts at the Trial Stage,  
5 that's a completely different standard. Its  
6 demonstration--yes, there has to be a certainty at  
7 demonstration. So, you cannot just--because it's  
8 convenient, I take the standard at the end that the  
9 Judge--in which the Judge will make the recommendation  
10 and I bring it back at the initiation of the  
11 proceeding. It just doesn't work that way.

12           Now, we hear about--we hear our friends of  
13 opposing counsel saying Ms. Ardila, again, it were  
14 just under study, it was just on a--the word of a  
15 convicted drug trafficker that she seized Meritage, it  
16 was based on a lie. And, in fact, in their PHB, they  
17 say the following. They misrepresent what Prosecutor  
18 Ardila said, and I read. That's from the PHB of the  
19 Claimants. They say: "At the Hearing, Ms. Ardila  
20 testified that she relied, almost entirely, on the  
21 word of a convicted drug trafficker to seize the  
22 Meritage property."

1           And then, you have what Ms. Ardila really  
2 said at the Hearing, and that goes--again, it's  
3 important to read the actual documents and the actual  
4 transcripts, and it's--she says "when the case was  
5 admitted and opened before the Asset Forfeiture Unit,  
6 it was based on a detailed report of the real estate  
7 recordation documents in connection with those pieces  
8 of property in particular. When it was submitted to  
9 me, it was accompanied by a very detailed study.

10 Amongst the evidence--amongst the evidence--was the  
11 tutela action submitted by Iván López together with  
12 other documents. Among those documents, so the ones  
13 accompanying the tutela, were other title studies.

14 And let's look at what Ms. Ardila had at the moment  
15 that she initiated Asset Forfeiture Proceedings and  
16 Precautionary Measures.

17           So, she knew--and we know that--that Iván  
18 López had been extradited on counts of drug  
19 trafficking, that he had connections with the Oficina,  
20 that he had owned the Meritage, that was shown in the  
21 title deeds for the property, despite what our  
22 friends on the other side have said, and I will go

1 back to that, although we went extensively on that in  
2 May.

3           Two, that there were several irregularities  
4 in the deeds, which included suspicions of forgery,  
5 and this was based on a study of the Superintendency  
6 of notaries which had gone and done 55 types of deeds  
7 in the chain of transfer.

8           There was also an interview of Mr. Arboleda,  
9 where, it has demonstrated that he didn't have the  
10 financial capacity, et cetera, and, there was evidence  
11 that the Meritage Lot had been the object of several  
12 transformations, physical and legal, in a  
13 relatively--excuse me, relatively short period of  
14 time. As we know now, we are all always saying  
15 Mr. Arboleda was the mango seller. Anyway, these are  
16 all clear hallmarks of money-laundering.

17           One point that I want to clarify here is, we  
18 heard this morning that, in fact, Ms. Ardila, when she  
19 started, she had very little, and, curiously, she  
20 started on the basis of a Report that didn't mention  
21 the Meritage. There are two different moments in  
22 terms of the collection of evidence that was carried

1 out in this process. I mean, there are several, but  
2 in that initial phase.

3           So, when the procedure--when the case is  
4 opened, this case is opened by the Asset Forfeiture  
5 Unit--sorry, I'm going to give the whole timeline  
6 because I think it's important. So, we have Mr. López  
7 Vanegas going in 2004 before--excuse me, 2014, before  
8 the Unit, the Criminal Unit, not the Asset Forfeiture  
9 Unit, in Medellín, the Prosecutor is Ms. Correa, and  
10 that's--she specialized in the Oficina de Envigado.  
11 What happened? She looks at that and she says, I'm  
12 going to send it to money-laundering and also to the  
13 different places where there are investigations of  
14 Oficina de Envigado.

15           Then, after going through money-laundering,  
16 there is another case--you know how they send copies,  
17 we referred several times about the "compulsa de  
18 copias" (in Spanish)--in May, they said the  
19 money-laundering, well, there must be here also. It  
20 seems that this is the case where Asset Forfeiture  
21 should be investigated.

22           At that point, and before it's opened, by

1 Ms. Ardila, before it's assigned to her, really, and  
2 she opens the case, the Superintendency of Notaries  
3 had this study that it had conducted, so there was a  
4 lot already.

5           It's given to Ms. Ardila. Ms. Ardila will  
6 start the Precautionary Measures, but it's important  
7 to say she requires, then, another study. And that's  
8 the other study--I mean, she receives this  
9 information, she looks at López Vanegas, and she says,  
10 I'm going to ask for another study on the other  
11 properties of Mr. Vanegas, and that's the second study  
12 that the Claimants have referred to, saying 47  
13 properties--and I will go back to that when we talk  
14 about discrimination, but 47 properties and the  
15 Meritage was not there. Well, the Meritage was not  
16 there because there had been already a previous study  
17 before the case started on the Meritage, so surprise,  
18 it wasn't there. It was just supplemental and looking  
19 into López Vanegas. So, that was one first point that  
20 I wanted to make clear.

21           Then, a second contention of the Claimants  
22 is that there was insufficient evidence of the illicit

1 origin and change of transfer of the Meritage Lot, and  
2 that's not true. Again, the collection of evidence  
3 continued, and it keeps corroborating the illicit  
4 origin and involvement of the Oficina de Envigado with  
5 the Meritage Lot. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

10

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

12

The Claimants say the Attorney General's

13

Office failed to evaluate Newport's good faith

14

before imposing the Precautionary Measures. And here,

15

again, what are they doing, the Claimants? So, they

16

conflate, or as the Director was saying this morning,

17

well, maybe she--they don't understand, but I doubt

18

it--what's the standard of proof in--that is required

19

in the application--sorry, what's the standard proof

20

but also what is the level of scrutiny that the

21

prosecution has to have on the good faith, or lack of

22

good faith, of the possible affected Parties at the

1 initiation of the proceedings and what is the one that  
2 is applied by the Judges?

3           And again, here we know--and this is  
4 Article 117 and 89 of the Asset Forfeiture Law--when  
5 you're dealing with anticipated Provisional Measures,  
6 which is an exception but it applies when there's a  
7 necessity, when there's urgency, as it was the case  
8 here, where there were being sales and everything was  
9 going to be dissipated and third bona fide party  
10 buyers will be affected, there's not really a  
11 necessity. The law doesn't provide exactly you have  
12 to conduct an analysis existing of bona fide third  
13 parties as required by law. You have to include them  
14 and notify them of the Measure when imposed as  
15 affected. And Prosecutor Ardila did so. Now, when--

16           PRESIDENT SACHS: Excuse me, just to help  
17 us.

18           MS. HERRERA: Yes.

19           PRESIDENT SACHS: Just to help us, the  
20 Claimant referred to an article and I don't find--

21           MS. HERRERA: 117?

22           PRESIDENT SACHS: Yes, which applies in the

1 initial phase, which states in my recollection that  
2 also during this initial phase, it has to be  
3 ascertained whether the buyer has purchased the  
4 property in good faith.

5 MS. HERRERA: In the initial phase, and  
6 that's Article 152--no, the initial phase. Sorry.  
7 So, we have--and that's Article 118, and that's in the  
8 Requerimiento phase, and the standard is "search and  
9 collect for evidence that allows to reasonably infer  
10 the absence of good faith." So, that's the standard  
11 at this stage of the Requerimiento. That's the formal  
12 forfeiture petition, not the Precautionary Measure.  
13 So, you're right, yes, there is the standard, they  
14 have to look, but the standard is really low, I mean,  
15 the standard is low, and it's "infer the absence".

16 Now, at the trial stage, both Parties, and  
17 that's provided in Article 145, will present proof,  
18 and there has to be a determination, really, who is in  
19 the better position to prove? And that's provided in  
20 the law, it's usually the--in this case the Claimants  
21 or the ones that are having--the affected parties that  
22 have the assets being forfeited, but, of course, the

1 Prosecutor has the obligation to present proof to try  
2 to rebut, e t cetera.

3 Now, I move to--

4 PRESIDENT SACHS: I have another question,  
5 I'm sorry.

6 MS. HERRERA: No, no.

7 PRESIDENT SACHS: Would you go back to  
8 Slide 66.

9 MS. HERRERA: Um-hmm. 66.

10 Yes.

11 PRESIDENT SACHS: Did you say that at this  
12 moment in time, Ms. Ardila already had in hand the  
13 legal opinions as to the title research?

14 MS. HERRERA: At the time of the  
15 Precautionary Measures?

16 PRESIDENT SACHS: Uh-huh.

17 MS. HERRERA: No.

18 PRESIDENT SACHS: Okay. Thank you.

19 MS. HERRERA: Had internal studies of the  
20 register but not the opinions of the Experts.

21 Sorry, one problem.

22 So, okay. Now, moving--I continue on the

1 point of the bona fide under stages, and the Claimants  
2 will say, look, you have to look at Article 87 of the  
3 Asset Forfeiture Law, and, that's a word they say,  
4 "there is an affirmative obligation to safeguard the  
5 good-faith third Parties who might be affected by the  
6 actions\_". Yes, but look at the language of  
7 Article 87--it refers--this Article 87 refers to the  
8 normal Precautionary Measures, that is when there is  
9 not that much urgency, which is not the case here, and  
10 so there is a different level.

11 In any event, because for the exceptional  
12 you will see Article 89 does not make reference to  
13 this--it's not really affirmative to this obligation.  
14 It only says you impose them as long as this--the  
15 reason why you're imposing it is for any of the  
16 purposes provided in 87. That's the reference.

17 Now, in any event, I'm not saying that you  
18 don't have to protect, but they are protected, the  
19 possible affected parties, they are protected because  
20 they're notified, obviously there is no point of  
21 notifying before you cannot put exceptional  
22 Precautionary Measures because that defeats the

1 purpose, but they are notified as they were here. I  
2 mean, we heard through--I mean, we have heard in May  
3 and the Claimants were quite surprised that actually  
4 they were included as afectados, and even with that  
5 designation in the initial phase of this proceedings.

6 And they were given the possibility to file  
7 documentation, including not the opinions obviously of  
8 Medellín and Martínez, but opinions and briefs both  
9 Newport and La Palma .

10 But anyway, further, their imposition of  
11 Precautionary Measures here were studied twice by the  
12 courts in the control of legality, and they were  
13 approved. And what is interesting, further  
14 interesting, is--I mean, the Claimants take issue and  
15 say, oh, well, you know, but how come, oh, they  
16 violated--they said before the courts--they say  
17 violated the level of scrutiny they had had because  
18 they had to go further. And you see at the end of  
19 Slide 74, it says what is the scope of the legality of  
20 the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings? Because what  
21 happened was that the Claimants were making their  
22 argument you have--before you applied the

1 Precautionary Measures, you have to find that actually  
2 we're bona fide third-party Buyers. And the Courts  
3 and the Appellate Courts says no, this is  
4 clearly--there is no showing the lack of minimally  
5 sufficient evidence based on Precautionary Measures.  
6 Instead, what the appellant is seeking is a premature  
7 lifting of the restriction, recognition of a status,  
8 that's the *bona fide* third party which is only for the  
9 courts' final determination, has no basis.

10 Now, the Claimants also rely on Article 152  
11 of the Asset Forfeiture Law to argue that the Attorney  
12 General's Office did not bother to identify, locate,  
13 gather and file elements of proof regarding Newport's  
14 good-faith status. And this is wrong because  
15 Article 152 does not refer to the initial phase. This  
16 referred to the trial stage of the Asset Forfeiture  
17 Proceedings. And, of course, we know for a fact that  
18 the Prosecutors are--have gathered and are presenting--  
19 proof of that.

20 One of the other arguments that we hear from  
21 the Claimants is, oh, well, but, in fact,  
22 Mr. Caro--and Mr. Moloo cross-examined Mr. Caro and is

1 actually like you're conflating the due diligence that  
2 was made by--between Corficolombiana and Newport, and  
3 you didn't analyze the good faith of Newport.

4 This is interesting. This is interesting because you  
5 may recall that Newport always relies--and we will go  
6 back to that for purpose of how stringent its due  
7 diligence was in Corficolombiana, but leave that  
8 alone. The truth is that if you look at Mr. Caro's  
9 provisional--in the Requerimiento, you will see at  
10 Pages 732 that, in fact, he did look at what was the  
11 due diligence that has been conducted by Newport. So,  
12 did he not analyze? I don't think so.

13           And further, and that's one of the things  
14 that is important to recall, who is the one that is  
15 the spokesperson for the property at this stage? It  
16 is Corficolombiana. And Corficolombiana, the good  
17 faith or not, and the due diligence of  
18 Corficolombiana, was also examined quite thoroughly by  
19 the Prosecutor Caro in its Requerimiento.

20           Finally, and it has been confirmed by the  
21 courts, and Prosecutor Caro also made it very clear,  
22 again, it is for the Judge in the trial phase to

1 determine whether Newport is a *bona fide* third party  
2 without fault or not. And I have these two quotes,  
3 one from the Decision in which the Judge, the first  
4 instance judge, accepts the request for commencing  
5 Asset Forfeiture Proceedings, and then we have an  
6 answer to Arbitrator Poncet of Mr. Caro explaining  
7 this point. So again, you cannot apply the standard  
8 of the end to the beginning, in procedures that are  
9 supposed to be evolving and with their level of  
10 evidence that's mounting.

11           Other of the arguments that the Claimants  
12 made is the Attorney General's Office should not have  
13 imposed Precautionary Measures since they're not  
14 reasonable nor proportional, and they do not target  
15 illicit proceeds. Okay. Again, this is a complete  
16 misconception and it's an *ex post facto* created  
17 position of the Experts and I will come back to this,  
18 but let's see.

19           First of all, the Precautionary Measures  
20 were legitimately adopted by the Attorney General's  
21 Office, considering the urgency of the situation. So,  
22 what was Prosecutor Ardila saying? And I said

1 already, López Vanegas, the Oficina in the chain of  
2 transfer, the irregularities in the deeds including  
3 possible forgery of documents, participation of front  
4 men, physical and legal transformations. So, if you  
5 told me that there were no basis and they were being  
6 sold.

7           And Precautionary Measures are always  
8 imposed. And the question is do you impose it earlier  
9 on, the exceptional anticipated or a bit later, but  
10 they're imposed because that's the only way to make  
11 sure that the assets are not dissipated  
12 when--through--before there is a determination by the  
13 courts.

14           Again, just to recall, the legality of the  
15 Measures was twice confirmed, and what is more, not  
16 only was the legality of the Measures confirmed twice  
17 by the Colombian courts, but because the way that the  
18 Asset Forfeiture Law is construed and the logic that  
19 enforcement--there is participation not only of the  
20 courts but also of the Minister of Justice, of the  
21 Inspector General's Office, the one that looks that  
22 the State--the administrative entities and the State

1 are complying with their functions. And you have the  
2 legality of Precautionary Measures was confirmed by  
3 the Prosecutor, by the specialized judge of first  
4 instance, by three superior judges of the Superior  
5 Court of Bogotá, the Minister of Justice and the  
6 Inspector General. Seven public officials of  
7 different branches of the State.

8           So, unlike what Mr. Moloo had represented  
9 this morning, it wasn't Ms. Ardila going and saying,  
10 oh, I put the padlock and I finished this and because  
11 I feel like. Or because theoretically I have an  
12 interest, a further interest--and I will go back to--I  
13 will address that later on--in paralyzing this  
14 project. What she did was fully in accordance with  
15 the law.

16           Now, we have now an ex post facto argument  
17 that, you know, what the Attorney General's Office  
18 should have done was target illicit proceedings  
19 instead of the Meritage Lot. Well, I mean, the asset  
20 is the Meritage Lot. You cannot target illicit  
21 proceedings or credits that are of a personal nature.  
22 You have to go for the asset. But also what the

1 Claimants had done is again, misrepresent how this  
2 works. Under the Asset Forfeiture Law, you have 16  
3 different grounds for Asset Forfeiture. The first  
4 nine of them, with some variations, concerned illicit  
5 assets for--given their origin or destination.

6 And the ones, the remaining ones, which are  
7 the 10 and 11 of Article 16 of the Asset Forfeiture  
8 Law, are equivalent, and that's--and they may refer to  
9 the Decision of the Constitutional Court--I will go  
10 back to that in a moment. But this is a different  
11 reason, this is a different ground. You don't go and  
12 simply because there is an illicit--I'm pursuing an  
13 illicit asset and then I change to the other ground,  
14 and what I go is to the proceedings of the--doesn't  
15 work that way. If what you're saying is, the origin  
16 of this asset is illicit--I go to that asset.

17 And this situation, what they're referring,  
18 are conflating, the Article 16.10 and 16.11 is another  
19 scenario. That's when what happens if as a prosecutor  
20 or asset of the Court, I go and I cannot forfeit an  
21 asset. Well, that it's illicit in its origin. I go  
22 and forfeit an asset that is of licit nature, but it's

1 in the hands of the same person that committed the  
2 illicit act. I will go back to that. So, it doesn't  
3 work that way. You just cannot--

4           And interestingly, there was something that  
5 Mr. Martínez had not referred to at all in the First  
6 Opinion that he gave to Corficolombiana, you may  
7 recall that Mr. Martínez appeared, gave an opinion  
8 before the--to Corficolombiana and then what happened  
9 is he comes here, he's actually supposedly an  
10 independent expert, and he himself, had to say, I have  
11 it somewhere during the Hearing saying, well, no,  
12 actually, yes, in a way I cannot be completely  
13 impartial.

14           Other of the arguments. Had the Attorney  
15 General's Office evaluated Newport's due diligence,  
16 then they would have found that it was bona fide  
17 without fault. Again, we're going through the same  
18 kind of thinking. And, this is important, because  
19 let's look at what's a required standard of due  
20 diligence applicable under the Asset Forfeiture Law.

21           So, what is the standard for--that the  
22 Constitutional Court has said to find whether there

1 is-if--a person claiming to be a bona fide without  
2 fault Party, has to fulfill. And it says the  
3 Constitutional Court basically states that in order to  
4 qualify as a *bona fide* without fault, the Party--that  
5 Party needs to establish that it would have been  
6 impossible, impossible, that's for any prudent and  
7 diligent person to discover the process of error of an  
8 apparent right of situation. So, that's what the  
9 Constitution--that's the level, and that has not  
10 changed actually with the Decision of 2020. And  
11 again, I will address that later.

12 In fact, as you can see that this was  
13 prompted by a question Mr. Martínez, Arbitrator  
14 Perezcano asked him about this standard. And he had  
15 to agree, he had to say yes, I have to agree you're  
16 right, that's the standard.

17 Furthermore, what happens, and this is  
18 important, as Ms. Banifatemi was saying before, when  
19 you're investing in an area affected by violence and  
20 civil unrest, and recall we know that for years  
21 Medellín had the reputation as being a bad-ass town,  
22 violence reigned, civil society had been destroyed.

1 No one seems to know how to put Medellín back  
2 together. And we see, and I'm going to Page 85, what  
3 the land restitution Civil Division of the High Court  
4 of Antioquia district said in a decision of 2014. It  
5 says, when you're dealing--title studies do not  
6 suffice to infer good faith without fault to acquire  
7 premises, and that there should be extremely diligent  
8 inquiries regarding social and political context and  
9 the effects caused by the internal armed conflict. It  
10 cannot be clearer.

11           And why? Because this situation has impacts  
12 in both the grounds of the Asset Forfeiture or, in  
13 fact, it can be and that doesn't concern us here but  
14 the victims of land restitution. It concerns us to  
15 the extent that we know that the drug-dealing through  
16 the paramilitary and the paramilitaries displace a lot  
17 of the population. In fact, I think at one point,  
18 Colombia was the third country with having the higher  
19 number of refugees and it was its own internal  
20 displacement.

21           And let's see what happened. So  
22 Ms. Banifatemi asked--reads from the brochure of

1 Mr. Seda in which he is advertising his model of  
2 business. We heard before saying you find these nice  
3 regions, previously dangerous, you get a bargain and  
4 that's it, and Mr. Seda said yeah, that's my strategy.  
5 So, Mr. Seda knows where he's investing, that's the  
6 strategy, yet he doesn't want to have the--comply with  
7 the level of due diligence that he should.

8           So, as we said, but we heard, and we heard a  
9 lot of that during the cross-examination and had been  
10 repeated, I would say, ad nauseam, that Newport has  
11 transacted in good faith. It had an extensive due  
12 diligence that had been done on the property. It  
13 included four types of title studies, a certification  
14 of the fiscal year. Again, we have said that that  
15 certification is just an answer to ratification.

16           But let's look during the cross-examination  
17 of Mr. Seda. Four titles. So Mr. Seda said the four  
18 titles, the first one is Otero & Palacio of 7 March  
19 2013 commissioned by Royal Property. Then we have one  
20 that's the title of Osorio & Moreno 17 May 2016, which  
21 was commissioned by Colpatria to give a loan for the  
22 project. And then he said, this is not the title

1 study, and we hired Corficolombiana, and according to  
2 Mr. Seda the mere hiring of federally regulated  
3 financial institutions which had impacted--financial  
4 institutions would have impacted guidelines and  
5 regulations.

6 But we heard today, I don't remember  
7 opposing counsel saying SARLAFT, the SARLAFT has been  
8 approved of Corficolombiana had been approved by the  
9 Government. That's not true. The Government  
10 established some guidelines, and then it's up to the  
11 institution, the financial institutions to follow, but  
12 they had the liberty of structuring it, so it's not it  
13 had been approved.

14 PRESIDENT SACHS: Forgive me, the Court  
15 Reporter asked for a short break.

16 (Brief recess.)

17 PRESIDENT SACHS: Ms. Herrera. Back to due  
18 diligence. And you were on Slide 88?

19 MS. HERRERA: Oh, yeah. Thank you. 88.  
20 Thank you, Mr. President.

21 So, let's talk about the studies, the title  
22 studies. These are civil title studies, and these

1 are patently insufficient under Colombian law to assess  
2 the risk of asset forfeiture given their limited  
3 material scope and the temporal too, and I will go to  
4 that.

5           And this was clearly put by Dr. Reyes, civil  
6 title studies are patently insufficient and he says  
7 the main objectives of these studies is to verify  
8 there are no problems civil nature in the chain of the  
9 tradition of property, to the purpose of the studies  
10 are temporarily limited to ten years, and we heard  
11 again today of opposing counsel saying they were clean  
12 title studies and interestingly the way they were  
13 described were again there were not liens, they were  
14 not encumbrances--yeah, that's what you do when  
15 selling a property, but that has nothing to do with  
16 due diligence that is required to show that you have  
17 bona fide without-fault party, and moreover in an area  
18 where Mr. Seda and Claimants were investing.

19           So, this is limited. This is not the  
20 purpose for what they created, Parties held everything  
21 and, in fact, we see in the words of Ms. Ana María  
22 Palacio of Otero Palacio, which is the firm that

1 performed the civil title study for Royal Property.  
2 It says when she's asked if--and this is taken from  
3 Pinturas Prime arbitration that involved claims also  
4 regarding to the Asset Forfeiture Procedure regarding  
5 Meritage, obviously, it says, well, when she's asked  
6 about the investigation, so I'm not sure that for my  
7 title studies which does not include an analysis of  
8 the people who appear there as such, or who would have  
9 affect my study, because I'm issuing an opinion of  
10 legal civil matters of the possible defects that the  
11 property may have; or that it has any affectation or  
12 it has liens but nothing in matters of investigation  
13 because that's not my scope. So, we go to the  
14 material scope.

15           And then again, you see when Corficolombiana  
16 listed among the due-diligence procedures that have  
17 been carried, says study of the company La Palma  
18 Argentina company carried out by Otero & Palacio  
19 determine legal viability from a commercial point of  
20 view. So, it's clear this is patently insufficient.

21           Then moving to 89, let's look again at the  
22 Osorio & Moreno, and again this is interesting--and

1 again, I'm sorry, we went through this, but it seems  
2 Claimants keep hammering on that, so I'm obliged to  
3 address it again. So, we looked at the Osorio &  
4 Moreno title, which is the second one that Mr. Seda  
5 said of the four title studies. Osorio & Moreno was  
6 the one commissioned by Scotiabank Colpatria for a  
7 loan for the Project. And you see, again, what's  
8 the--what they say, they said the real estate subject  
9 of study is free from all liens or limitations upon  
10 ownership rights of asset forfeiture..

11           And it says also a disclaimer that says  
12 we're not liable for information that may appear  
13 thereafter, that up to this day is not known by the  
14 lawyer's office, such as information regarding Asset  
15 Forfeiture Processes where such change has not been  
16 recorded within the registration pages reviewed. Of  
17 course. If that is unentered--that there has been a  
18 measure and that it's in the registration of the Asset  
19 Forfeiture Proceeding, that's a different thing, but  
20 as explained before, if there are Asset Forfeiture  
21 Proceedings that are ongoing, there is the initiation  
22 of the investigation, well, they're not going to find

1 it. Definitely you're not going to find it in a civil  
2 law-civil-title study.

3 And then again there is another aspect, and  
4 as I recall earlier on, the Asset Forfeiture action is  
5 not subject to statute of limitations, and that's why  
6 also a title study of 10 years is clearly  
7 insufficient.

8 And we saw this before. We saw that the  
9 title study of Otero & Palacio was 10 years, and they  
10 say-and when they ask again in the same arbitration to  
11 Ms. Palacio, is, oh, why did you do a title study for  
12 10 years? She said, "that was just a proposal, if the  
13 client says no I want you to do the entire change of  
14 recordation of titles, it can be done so it covers the  
15 entire change."

16 And during the cross-examination, Mr. Seda  
17 acknowledged Newport's failure to diligently  
18 commission the title study, and Ms. Banifatemi asked  
19 him, so what this shows is the title study can carry  
20 shorter or longer terms, depending on what the client  
21 asks. That's what it says. Yes, to be clear on the  
22 title study and every title study we have ever

1 performed, we have never, ever directed, suggested or  
2 made reference to a firm to perform a title study in  
3 one way or another. I mean, if I'm investing, and the  
4 quantities that supposedly I'm investing in this  
5 project, I will make sure that this is carried out in  
6 a proper manner.

7           But moreover, you may recall that also the  
8 Osorio & Moreno title study extended to 20 years; and,  
9 here during cross-examination, so Mr. Seda says, so  
10 when we talked to Osorio & Moreno--I think that's her  
11 name--I only talked to her once. She said, well, the  
12 thing is because I asked the same question, meaning  
13 the duration. She says the thing is we're only  
14 required to do 10 years' title search, but banks are  
15 particular about reputational damage. And she says  
16 you know we go about 20 years because the banks ask us  
17 to go back 20 years because they don't want to suffer  
18 any reputational damage.

19           And President Sachs asked, when you learned  
20 this, basically, this didn't give you the idea to go  
21 back to your lawyer and to ask them, well, the bank  
22 said it would be more prudent to go back 20 years,

1 could you do that for me also?

2 And Mr. Seda said, plainly: "Well, no."

3 Also, during the cross-examination, Mr. Seda  
4 had to admit that, if they had done a more prudent  
5 test starting of 20 years, they will probably as, in  
6 fact, Osorio & Moreno would had, find the deed where  
7 Sierralta López & Company (in Spanish) represented by  
8 Iván López and in the case of (in Spanish), I don't  
9 know how you say the "Managing Shareholder," is the  
10 legal representative, and obviously a shareholder,  
11 appear.

12 PRESIDENT SACHS: May I interject a  
13 question?

14 MS. HERRERA: Yes.

15 PRESIDENT SACHS: At this point in time, if  
16 I understood correctly, Mr. López was not on the OFAC  
17 List?

18 MS. HERRERA: No.

19 PRESIDENT SACHS: So, had she detected this  
20 indication, what is your position should have been  
21 made further? I mean, I presume the lawyer would have  
22 checked with the OFAC List, López was not on the OFAC

1 List, undisputedly, so what would the shortcoming then  
2 be?

3 MS. HERRERA: Open searches, Google. In  
4 fact, that's the case that Mr. Seda recognizes it. "In  
5 fact, when in 2014, Mr. López appears and says well  
6 the Meritage lot is mine I asked my lawyer Mr. Lopera  
7 to conduct a search . And Lopera, my lawyer, found  
8 indeed López Vanegas is a convicted drug-trafficker."

9 Thank you.

10 Quick two points: We were told today that  
11 the due diligence conducted by Osorio & Moreno went 60  
12 years back, but, in fact, there are a couple of  
13 things. It didn't go 60 years back. They took the 10  
14 years, what was there; and, in the scope of these 10  
15 years, they listed the persons, and particularly with  
16 regard--regarding the legal representatives, they only  
17 listed the legal representatives at the date of that  
18 search.

19 So, of course, that's limited, and, in fact, Moreno  
20 Osorio, or Osorio Moreno--sorry--didn't find Ivan  
21 López Vanegas, so you were told, oh yeah,--but you  
22 know, many banks find Ozorio Vanegas and Ivan Lopez

1 and nothing happens Nothing happened? Nothing  
2 happened, but there are different--you didn't know  
3 what kind of transactions--different due diligence are  
4 made. It's different if I'm buying this for investing  
5 this; that if I'm giving a loan in which I basically  
6 have a much more restricted due diligence, et cetera.  
7 So, you cannot meet those sweeping affirmations.

8           Moving again to Page 92, then the Claimants  
9 rely in what they call and again the certification  
10 title, again, that doesn't exist under Colombian law.  
11 There is just rights of petition.

12           And importantly, they say--with--Mr. Reyes'  
13 idea is actually if you really know how Asset  
14 Forfeiture works and we will expect that the lawyers  
15 at least of the Claimant, or the Claimant will know  
16 given the magnitude, supposed magnitude, of this  
17 investment, then you don't ask. I mean, you cannot  
18 rely on solely the Fiscalía, oh, can you tell me?  
19 Please tell me if anybody is here and that's it. That  
20 is a certification. The Fiscalía gave you information  
21 that's public that's not confidential that it can  
22 provide at that point, but that's it.

1           And also, what did they respond? They  
2 respond on the basis of the list that is presented to  
3 them. If you present the list and that's incomplete,  
4 also the response of the Fiscalía is going to be  
5 incomplete. The Fiscalía is not charged for doing the  
6 due diligence that the Claimants should have done.

7           And again, in the Osorio & Moreno title  
8 study in the disclaimer, you see this disclaimer, same  
9 type of disclaimer.

10           Just a quick note, you may recall that I  
11 refer, and I asked Mr. Martínez during the  
12 cross-examination about whether really asking a  
13 certification from the Fiscalía is a proof of good  
14 faith, and I put to him an example of something that  
15 happened in the Nineties where these so-called  
16 "certifications" were used to evade the law and to  
17 make mockery of the law, and he says I don't remember,  
18 but yeah, that happened. And at that time, the  
19 Attorney General was Mr. Sintura, the same person, and  
20 he was the one who had this problem. The same person  
21 that is making this petition.

22           So, it doesn't matter how you title it. You

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

[REDACTED]

5

[REDACTED]

6

bring me third parties that are going to appear as the

7

owners so that they can appear as if having good

8

faith. This is a ruse that had been--

9

PRESIDENT SACHS: Is this part of the new

10

evidence?

11

MS. HERRERA: No. It's in the record.

12

That's in the record. It's R-121.

13

Okay. Moving to 93--and we go here to the

14

particular, to not use another term, view of the

15

Decision of the Constitutional Court of Colombia,

16

C-327. The first thing that I have to recall

17

again--and I had referred to this--what was the

18

decision of constitutionality? The Claimants at one

19

point said this is not the case. No, it's a case on

20

the decision of the constitutionality of a norm. What

21

is the norm? Article 16 of the Asset Forfeiture Law.

22

What is being analyzed? The two last paragraphs,

1 meaning 10 and 11.

2           And why, whatever the quote says, doesn't  
3 apply to the rest? Because the Court, the  
4 Constitutional Court, has already decided on the  
5 constitutionality of all the previous articles and  
6 it's constitutional res judicata, and that's  
7 important. If they want to go back, they have to do  
8 so under Colombian Law on a specific decision  
9 reversing a decision. This is not the case. And it's  
10 crystal-clear that the Decision refers to assets of  
11 legal courts.

12           So, of course, the Claimants take this and  
13 say, oh, and you see, no, the levels of due diligence  
14 is only the assets. But they're talking--the Court is  
15 talking here to the assets of legal origin.

16           And I want to call your attention to one  
17 thing, and it is when the Constitutional Court decides  
18 on these two Articles 10 and 11, decide they are  
19 conditionally constitutionally--constitutional. And  
20 what does the Court says in terms of how do you have  
21 to read this conditionality?

22           One minute.

1           Yes. So, in the C-27 of 2020, it's Exhibit  
2 CMB-014 at Paragraph 7.5, when the Court says how are  
3 you to understand these two provisions for purposes of  
4 applying them and them being constitutional? It says  
5 the Court will condition the constitutionality of  
6 Paragraphs 10 and 11 of Article 16--that again is not  
7 the cases, the scenario that we are analyzing here,  
8 which is an asset of illicit origin.

9           Paragraphs 10 and 11, Article 16 of  
10 Law 1708/2004, to specify on the one hand that, in  
11 this hypothesis, the Asset Forfeiture shall operate  
12 only when the holder of the right is the same person  
13 who has carried out the underlying illegal activity,  
14 the holder of the right of some licit assets who have  
15 collected legal activities but the Prosecutors cannot  
16 forfeiture assets, legal assets, and they have to go  
17 for the equivalent of licit origin.

18           It says carry out the legal activities that  
19 support the prosecutor powers of the state. And on  
20 the other hand to point out that the aforementioned  
21 restriction is applicable without prejudice of the  
22 rights of third parties acting in good faith without

1 fault, in whose favor in rem titles have been  
2 constituted over the legal property subject to asset  
3 forfeiture.

4           And that's the case for instance, what  
5 happens if there is a mortgage? The property is in  
6 the hands of the person that committed the illegal  
7 act, but whose licit assets are being forfeited in  
8 lieu of the illicit ones, and they have a mortgage.  
9 So, a third party could have a mortgage. You have to  
10 make sure there is protection, but that's a complete  
11 different scenario.

12           So, it doesn't matter the legal contortions  
13 that you saw Mr. Martínez doing, and the Claimants  
14 doing, to apply this. That just simply does not  
15 follow. Whatever the Court said does not apply on  
16 the level of due diligence which we saw is quite high,  
17 doesn't apply to this scenario of illegal assets.  
18 Illegal assets is stringent. You have to look at the  
19 assets; you have to look at the change of title.

20           Now, moving to--why don't I have the number  
21 of the page here?

22           Four. This is particular--I really find

1 this interesting the way that the Claimants have tried  
2 to say they conducted a due diligence because it's  
3 completely circular. You have Newport and  
4 Corficolombiana trying to attempt to discharge the due  
5 diligence by allocating the responsibilities to each  
6 other, and making really mock of why are their anti  
7 money-laundering and the "know your client"  
8 obligations, et cetera, so you say during the  
9 cross-examination, Mr. Seda was adamant that, for him,  
10 having hired a federally regulated financial  
11 institution, i.e. CORFI, which had guidelines and  
12 regulations was kind of the summum of the due  
13 diligence, was evidence of the seriousness of  
14 Newport's due diligence.

15           And he put it here. He says--during the  
16 Hearing, he says, "Mr. Seda, so I think we know, we  
17 didn't--we were under Contract to purchase property,  
18 but the acquirer of the property is Corficolombiana,  
19 so they are doing the due diligence that's required by  
20 them and I'm relying on them doing that due diligence,  
21 so I have reliance on that they are going to do that  
22 work right. They're going to acquire the property;

1 that property's going to be deposited in a trust, so  
2 they have to do it. They have to do it."

3           And then it's quite interesting because--we  
4 saw this in May, but Mr. Seda writes a letter to  
5 Corficolombiana at one point saying can you please  
6 send me the communication of the approvals of the  
7 structuring of this business, and Corficolombiana  
8 says, yeah, remember, it's important to note that it  
9 is not the fiduciary but the Trustor, Newport, which  
10 directly negotiated the acquisition of the Project's  
11 plot with the Company La Palma, and they basically  
12 said it's up to you to do the due diligence.

13           And moving forward to the following page,  
14 when we address this with Mr. Martínez, this was quite  
15 interesting because Mr. Martínez said during the  
16 Hearing says--so Mr. Martínez at the Hearing,  
17 basically what he's saying Corficolombiana didn't have  
18 to do an enhanced due diligence regarding third  
19 parties from which it didn't hold contractual  
20 relationships as clients or counterparts. In view of  
21 the Claimants' own experts, Corficolombiana was not  
22 responsible for the due diligence in the chain of

1 transfer of Meritage. Who was responsible then?

2 He says, Mr. Martínez, my position after  
3 looking at the documents in the case, is that the only  
4 obligated party I have found in this case was the  
5 fiduciary, Corficolombiana, but he says in the end,  
6 in my opinion Corficolombiana did not have to do an  
7 enhanced due diligence regarding third parties with  
8 whom it did not hold a contractual relationship as  
9 client or counterparts. Who are the clients of the  
10 counterparts? Newport? La Palma? That's it; it  
11 stops.

12 I have already said about the connection of  
13 Mr. Martínez and Mr. Sintura, the lawyer of  
14 Corficolombiana, and the impartiality of Mr. Martínez,  
15 to put it that way, the questions.

16 Now, because you're in the discussions--and  
17 this is quite important--a lot of the time was spent  
18 during the evidentiary hearing in May regarding what's  
19 the relevant time to conduct due diligence, and this  
20 generated a lot of questions. And so, the first thing  
21 is, as acknowledged by the Claimants' own expert, the  
22 relevant time to conduct due diligence--and that

1 expert is Mr. Martínez--is when, with transfer of  
2 property, and Arbitrator Perezcano says, you said that  
3 good faith is evaluated based on information available  
4 at the moment of entry into the transaction. And you,  
5 my question to you, what is the Transaction, what is  
6 the relevant transaction, when does this arise. And he  
7 says the moment the act by which the properly  
8 transfer is perfected. And then the Claimants said the  
9 Sale Promise Agreement did not provide for transfer of  
10 title. That's undisputed. President Sachs asked this  
11 question again regarding the "promesa de compraventa"  
12 (in Spanish), and Mr. Moloo confirmed: "Correct.  
13 That did not provide transfer of title."

14           And then we got to why there is an ongoing  
15 obligation, and this all arises because even if you  
16 say, okay, it was extremely difficult, it was  
17 impossible because we have seen it was impossible,  
18 extremely difficult for the Claimants to find Mr. Iván  
19 López when I have a drug dealer coming and saying  
20 "that's mine," that raises a question, and there is no  
21 contention that that happened in early 2014. So, we  
22 talk about the continuous obligation to refresh its

1 due diligence.

2           And what Mr. Reyes clearly explains is,  
3 look, it's a very different proposition if you're  
4 talking of a one-off -transaction that is perfected  
5 just with the sale; that when you're looking at the  
6 whole complex project, that involves several phases.  
7 And that the question of Arbitrator Poncet, rightly  
8 so, what does it mean? I have to be doing the  
9 exercise of due diligence all the time and given the  
10 Claimants also asked what does it mean ad infinitum?  
11 Mr. Reyes says no. It is if you receive information  
12 that changes the perception regarding good faith,  
13 then you're under the obligation to review your  
14 opinion regarding good faith.

15           Now, we have heard today the Claimants  
16 saying, oh, no, no, no, no, no, but the moment of the  
17 transfer, and they cite Mr. Medellín, was when the  
18 transfer of the property was made to the trust, and  
19 that Trust is the Meritage-La Palma Trust referred as  
20 the "Parqueo". Curiously enough, "Parqueo" means  
21 parking because that's going to move, the whole  
22 structure. And whose bona fide are we analyzing?

1 We're analyzing Newport. Newport is not there.

2           Anyway, in this--under this complex project,  
3 there is an ongoing obligation, if you hear something  
4 new that changes that, to do something. During the  
5 Hearing, cross-examination, again I said this before,  
6 it was clear that Mr. Seda had done or his lawyer had  
7 done a Google search and had found that Mr. Iván López  
8 was extradited and--had been extradited and was a  
9 recognized drug-trafficker, and you have the reference  
10 here, and this was before they started the  
11 construction of the project, they say, my God they  
12 stopped all the project, that many people working,  
13 this is going, whatever we had managed to construct is  
14 going to ruin. Well, you assumed the risk.

15           In cross-examination, Mr. Seda recognized  
16 Newport refused to do the due diligence after learning  
17 of Mr. Lopez' claim. Ms. Banifatemi asked

18           "Ms. Banifatemi: You did not deem necessary  
19 given the situation and that you have a claim by  
20 someone who says I'm the rightful owner to restart  
21 maybe a due diligence, not a Google one, to have an  
22 attorney maybe look at the chain of title to go as far

1 as possible? You did not do that; right?"

2 Mr. Seda said: "We did not redo the  
3 diligence."

4 Again, it was a conscious choice. I would  
5 say that's reckless behavior, reckless choice, but you  
6 assumed the risk.

7 And the question from Mr. Poncet--actually,  
8 Dr. Reyes gave an even more clear answer saying--well,  
9 Arbitrator Poncet was asking, saying--how many times  
10 do you have to renew the due diligence, with what  
11 frequency, and Dr. Reyes says "every time a drug  
12 dealer tells you that a criminal office has  
13 dispossessed you of an illicit asset, and that this  
14 fact will be informed to the Office of the Attorney  
15 General." There is no mention of the Claimants going  
16 to the Attorney General's Office.

17 Now, the issues with the pages.

18 Now, because of this discussion, the  
19 submission was like, oh, you know, and we hear it  
20 again, yeah, but you know, after we knew that Iván  
21 López was claiming property, we responded to his  
22 interview on the radio; we spoke to the Unit Buyers,

1 well you spoke to the unit buyers, you tried to assure  
2 that everything is fine ,they will continue buying.  
3 Okay. And then, they submit, the Claimants wrongfully  
4 claim, they say that Corficolombiana thoroughly  
5 refreshed its due diligence, so that's the contention  
6 in the Post-Hearing Brief.

7           Now, if you look just make a perfunctory  
8 analysis of the statement of the Legal Director of  
9 Corficolombiana, Ms. Guzman, who we referred to today  
10 and this was in another procedure that has been  
11 encountered here, what is it that Ms. Betancourt says  
12 that she did? She said -well, that actually she did  
13 not refresh. It says I verify once again how the  
14 business deals with La Palma had taken place, we  
15 verified the title studies, the ones that had been  
16 conducted and we know they were insufficient. We  
17 verified the searches that Mr. Sintura--we already  
18 talked about the searches and the petition and the  
19 limitations on the searches and the list and the  
20 petition--had performed, and once again the tool we  
21 have is to search for the list of people whose name  
22 appear in the title of transfer property, what really

1 showed that was incomplete. And those that appear,  
2 particularly for La Palma, that were generated.

3           So, clearly, rechecking patently  
4 insufficient titles, verifying incomplete lists, and  
5 particularly doing enquiries about La Palma, it's just  
6 looking at all the information. I don't see any  
7 refreshing as they want, and conspicuously absent from  
8 the alleged refreshed due diligence are searches  
9 regarding López Vanegas and they know, Corficolombiana  
10 knows, because Mr. Seda said I told Corficolombiana  
11 about the call.

12           We move now to the Claims of the--Claimants'  
13 allegations regarding violation of due process. So,  
14 the Claimants had submitted they were denied the  
15 opportunity properly to participate in the proceedings  
16 that led to the seizure of the Meritage Project.  
17 That's not true.

18           We have shown--and again to the surprise,  
19 apparently, of the Claimants--that both Prosecutor  
20 Ardila and Prosecutor Caro, and you have the evidence  
21 here, even in the Requerimiento Mr. Caro says,  
22 "identificacion y lugar de los afectados" , and is

1 listed the lawyer of Newport, and you see how before  
2 that Prosecutor Ardila had also included Newport in  
3 the afectados. So, I don't know what this idea that  
4 they were not included comes from.

5 In cross-examination, and you know Mr. Seda  
6 admitted, Ms. Banifatemi asked:

7 "Ms. Banifatemi: My question is simple.  
8 Not getting to legalese. Are you aware that in  
9 April 2017 the Prosecutor recommended that Newport be  
10 admitted as an affected party?

11 Mr. Seda: No, no one told me that. That  
12 the Fiscalía recommended us to be an affected party,  
13 never."

14 I submit, starting an investment arbitration  
15 and claiming that--they had been deprived of--there  
16 had been a violation of due process when the facts  
17 demonstrate the opposite, is to say the least  
18 questionable. Anyway.

19 Now, at the trial stage, we have the  
20 decision of the second judge of the section of Asset  
21 Forfeitures, and we know that the Second Judge of the  
22 Circuit of Medellin said no I don't consider Newport

1 as an afectado. Why ? Because in my reading of the  
2 law, it only will be afectado if it has in rem rights,  
3 which it doesn't. And this is not contested. We have  
4 seen already that Mr. Moloo answering to President  
5 Sachs that there had been transfer of title.

6 And you will see also that, during the  
7 cross-examination, when I asked Mr. Martínez, I said

8 "So, that is, the Judge's explanation that  
9 there need to be Real Property rights that they  
10 would be--for it to be--basically you need Real  
11 Property, it's upper cap, and that's not correct.  
12 We're not referring to Real Property, the  
13 Company. There need to be Real Property rights  
14 and they would be the affected parties. That is  
15 feasible, at least it coincides with your own  
16 view in the First Opinion" and then in the  
17 cross-examination

18 he said

19 "The general rule is that the affected  
20 parties are the holders of Real Property rights,  
21 rights in rem. That's the general rule."

22 So, at least, this was reasonable. And in

1 any event, this was revoked by the Court of Appeals,  
2 and we know that part of the guarantees that the  
3 Claimants have and we know now that Claimants are  
4 fully participating, or we expect so, in the trial  
5 phase. We have again the--you have again here the  
6 chart, and another.

7           And another point I wanted to make very  
8 quickly is, in fact, because the procedures were--with  
9 the appeal of the Decision of not being considered  
10 affected parties in the trial phase, there has been no  
11 movements in terms of--The procedure was actually  
12 suspended, so it's not that there had been a violation  
13 of the due process of the Claimants, who now can  
14 present all evidence.

15           PRESIDENT SACHS: May I ask, what is the  
16 time perspective of the proceedings that now start to  
17 deal with the good-faith issue, if I understand it  
18 correctly?

19           MS. HERRERA: I had been told that one year.  
20 Whether that's really feasible, I don't know. I want  
21 to refer now and address that point in the following  
22 slide of why it takes so long and also another point,

1 which is, you know, of course, they take the issue  
2 with the--Claimants take the issue with, yeah,  
3 according to Caro's testimony, it's one year; but the  
4 Claimants take issue with the duration of the  
5 proceedings.

6 But there are--Considering the aggregate  
7 circumstances, there are reasons that explain why this  
8 had happened and what's reasonable. First of all, as  
9 acknowledged by Mr. Seda in the cross-examination, the  
10 file is thousands and thousands and thousands and  
11 thousands of documents. Yes, indeed. Just the part  
12 that had been submitted is 8,500 pages.

13 The appeal was filed by Newport against the  
14 Decision of the Second Judge which, of course, delayed  
15 things. As explained by Prosecutor Caro, Prosecutors  
16 and the judges specialized in asset forfeiture are  
17 each in charge of around 120 cases, and there is only  
18 one Court of Appeals specialized in Asset Forfeiture.  
19 The activity of the Colombian Judicial Branch was  
20 suspended during the COVID pandemic.

21 And this is interesting, because in an  
22 exchange between Mr. Mosquera and Mr. Seda on

1 September 11, 2016, Mr. Seda says, "and if we don't  
2 pay and we have the land taken, well, we lose a lot  
3 less considering that in any case it will be  
4 impossible to continue with the other phases. This  
5 means that the necessary proof to take away this land  
6 is almost impossible. The process could take years, of  
7 course, it could be."

8           So, this is interesting because this is  
9 September 2016, so shortly after the Requerimiento,  
10 and Mr. Seda is well aware of the long duration of  
11 the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings. There is no  
12 mistake, they're now saying in this Arbitration, oh it  
13 was awful. They knew the duration.

14 [REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

█

[REDACTED]

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

One quick point on that, and there was on Ms. Ardila again, the Claimants had Ms. Ardila for hours, I think, and that's the issue of—they're saying she lied. I'm going to address first the point of whether she knew or not. That we don't know. I cannot testify for her. Again, I just want to point out that the Claimants had the documents; they could have confronted it with her complaint against Mr. Seda. They chose not to do so and put it to Mr. Caro.

In any event, and the second point on this is on the credibility of Ms. Ardila. It is not true that she lied when she said that she had no personal relationship or professional relationship with Mr. Mosquera. I mean, if you look at the Spanish, it's very clear. When you say personal or professional relations that you're working with or you have the personal, but they write to you as he did requesting that you include Mr. López Vanegas, and in

1 fact she said I'm not going to include López Vanegas  
2 as afectado--that's a different thing--but look at the  
3 Spanish because it's a misrepresentation. She did not  
4 lie.

5           Going now to discrimination, several  
6 important things here. The Claimants have gone and  
7 said, oh, it's discrimination, they target Mr. Seda  
8 because he was a foreigner. Well, no, the lot is an  
9 asset, and for that, who are the ones who are really  
10 the owners of this asset? We knew that it was La  
11 Palma. And, in fact, La Palma is the trustor, and La  
12 Palma is the beneficiary, has the beneficiary rights  
13 under the Trust. La Palma is what nationality? It's  
14 incorporated in Colombia. All the Shareholders are  
15 Colombian--or as far as we know. Again, there are  
16 always surprises behind, so as far as we know they're  
17 just Colombians.

18           In any event, that's what the similar  
19 situation, so Colombia has, indeed, conducted and  
20 proceeded with forfeitures of other properties  
21 belonging to nationals, Colombian nationals, which  
22 have comparable connections to criminal activities.

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

[REDACTED]

5

[REDACTED]

6

[REDACTED]

7

[REDACTED]

8

And again, this is the "like circumstances".

9

And you heard the Claimants this morning "there are 47

10

properties, of Ivan Lopez, that have not been

11

targeted." Again, you have to look for these 47

12

properties, what had happened. A lot of them were

13

acquired in '85-'86, so before there is any

14

presumption that he was involved in drug-dealing.

15

And also they referred to one project "oh,

16

but the Quartier Project. The Quartier Project was in

17

a similar situation, you know, because López Vanegas

18

was the owner and yet there was no Asset Forfeiture,

19

then they completed that development, and they're

20

selling their units." Again, this was acquired by

21

López Vanegas in '86. So, you cannot just make swift

22

generalizations; you have to look at what happened

1 with each of them. And some of these properties had,  
2 as I said, they had been--the Registration Number  
3 disappeared or whatever; it requires a lot of work.  
4 And I remind you that what Colombia has done is, okay,  
5 if I miss anything, if I miss anything, we're looking  
6 again.

7 We're looking again--sorry.

8 Let's talk briefly about the--not so  
9 briefly, about the so-called "Sister Property", and  
10 the Claimants are unhappy with any of the answers that  
11 were given of what was the process of thinking of  
12 Ms. Ardila. They say it is the Meritage that was  
13 target, and it was Ms. Ardila who only herself decided  
14 to do it.

15 The first thing, that assertion that,  
16 Ms. Ardila, in the record, saying "I took the decision  
17 myself" was in the context that she was pressed to  
18 say, "oh but Ms. Malagón did it, and nobody told you  
19 to do something that goes to corruption." You should  
20 say "no, I--that was my own decision. Nobody forced  
21 me to do it. I studied the thing and decided to  
22 request Asset Forfeiture."

1           In any event, why the Sister Property is not  
2 in identical circumstances? Because the defects are  
3 not the same. First, if you look from 2006 onwards,  
4 the Meritage Lot, the so-called "Sister Property," had  
5 a different change of transfer, and a lot of transfers  
6 and connections with the Oficina that were only  
7 present in the Meritage Lot, including the one of  
8 Gurú, the Model, [REDACTED] but  
9 anyway there is much more elements in that property  
10 pointing out to money-laundering.

11           Also--and this is what Ms. Ardila  
12 explained--is the Attorney General's Office considered  
13 it lacked sufficient evidence as to the illicit origin  
14 of the Sister Property, and remember this goes back to  
15 in August 1994, Jaime Orozco and Iván López buy a  
16 property from La Granja divided in two lots but each  
17 one has--jointly a certain percentage. Orozco,  
18 25 percent--and that's the surface- 25 percent on one  
19 lot and 25 percent on the other lot, and the other one  
20 75 percent and 75 percent. And the surface of the 25  
21 percent is 188,558 square meter. They are  
22 consolidated afterwards, but then, in 2016, again they

1 are divided and what Orozco Vanegas keeps is exactly  
2 the 25 percent that you have before.

3           So, I can understand—and this information  
4 about the percentages was from the beginning, it  
5 appeared and Ms. Ardila had it, since the beginning—I  
6 mean, you can look at her provisional determination  
7 that will appear there, how she knew there was 25, 75,  
8 et cetera. So, I can understand she looked and said  
9 25 percent. I don't know if there is any illicit  
10 activity of Orozco, I see at the end he goes with  
11 25 percent. Can I proceed to impose measures and here  
12 there is not being sale, there is no units being  
13 sold? Well, Probably, no. I have to look further.

14           And what does she do? Precisely that. She  
15 imposed Precautionary Measures on the Meritage, and  
16 the others she doesn't have the urgency and say but  
17 I'm opening another investigation on the Sister  
18 Property and other properties.

19           Now, we had been told that it was because  
20 Ms. Ardila was corrupt, was in collusion with Iván  
21 López, that she targeted the Meritage. But she  
22 targeted the Meritage, but she opens--how is it this

1 go? Opens investigations into the so-called "Sister  
2 Property," and it's not her who then decides in that  
3 second investigation that actually let's prioritize  
4 other assets [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] We have shown--and I refer you to

10 what was 114, our timeline, showing why the so-called

11 "coincidences" are not coincidences. And, in

12 particular, as we said in the Post-Hearing Brief, in

13 fact, the reason that you see that--the Claimants rely

14 on the alleged "suspicious coincidence in time" and

15 the speed of the Asset Forfeiture proceedings to

16 support the corruption theory. But, what they omit to

17 say is during this period López Vanegas filed a number

18 of petitions before the Attorney General to reactivate

19 the proceedings.

20 And, in fact, the Asset Forfeiture

21 Proceedings had started by the time that López Vanegas

22 said "please commence Asset Forfeiture." Why would I



1

[REDACTED]

2

Now, finally, I will say that on this,

3

again, that the Claimants made a lot of accusations,

4

bring a lot of papers on press on the supposed

5

corruption, Mr. Hernández, Mr. Hernández who came

6

here, despite all the cases he had, whose father was

7

killed, being another officer of the Fiscalía, they

8

didn't ask him. And we had to produce thousands of

9

files just to rebut press, which is innuendo. Anyway,

10

nothing of that. They were--neither Ms. Ardila or

11

Mr. Hernández were confronted.

12

[REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
2           You know--I don't have time. You know very  
3 well all the parameters and the requirements under  
4 each of the standards of protection in the TPA. Very  
5 quickly, you have an expropriatory--you have permanent  
6 impact--this is no permanent impact here. This is a  
7 measure that is ongoing. There had been no  
8 determination--we will see if there is an impact or  
9 not, and I said again that's redress if that's the  
10 case. Interference with reasonable backed  
11 expectations, the Claimants accepted framework of the  
12 Colombian Asset Forfeiture Law, and would say that--  
13 what I hear this morning is that the Claimants find  
14 the Asset Forfeiture Law, the Colombian, odious. They  
15 could find it that way. They even say, oh okay, it  
16 doesn't follow international law--Well, the Asset  
17 Forfeiture Law had been followed by other countries.  
18 In any event, that's irrelevant. The point is that's  
19 part of the framework when Mr. Seda and Claimants  
20 decided to invest.

21           The character of the government actions, the  
22 government action is not final, there are still no

1 final decisions, it is based on the existing  
2 framework. Legitimate expectations, again, we don't  
3 believe that, we say legitimate public welfare. We  
4 hear that there was no legitimate public welfare I  
5 have to tell you, fighting against criminal or  
6 organized crime, [REDACTED], I'm sure  
7 that everybody that is here from Colombia will agree  
8 with me it's quite a legitimate one. I don't think  
9 there is a single Colombian family that had not lost a  
10 person due precisely to the Oficina and the violence  
11 created by the drug-dealing, so that's combating  
12 organized crime.

13 Compliance with due process of law, I show  
14 you how it has been interpreted in the law and no  
15 discrimination here, and this is bona fide application  
16 of the Asset Forfeiture Law.

17 We move quickly to national treatment. We  
18 see that one of the elements is that the measure has  
19 to be applied to the foreign investment. Again, this  
20 is a measure applied to the asset. It's not applied  
21 to Mr. Seda. And again, the asset is owned by  
22 Colombian nationals.

1           There has been less favorable treatment.  
2 That's not the case, and that's evaluated in like  
3 circumstances , I already touched on this. There is  
4 no reasonable justification. Even if there was a  
5 different treatment with Meritage Lot, that treatment  
6 and the imposition of the Precautionary Measures was  
7 urgent for the reasons I already explained.

8           On fair and equitable treatment, where the  
9 standard is not arbitrary and reasonable, I have  
10 touched upon this already. [REDACTED]  
11 [REDACTED] , the illicit  
12 origin of the asset. It was in accordance with  
13 procedural protection, I talk about the protections,  
14 the possibility to intervene, legality control, again  
15 it was not discriminatory. And also, to recall, the  
16 standard under the TPA doesn't include legitimate  
17 expectation, but even if there were, again the  
18 Claimants could not have legitimate expectations that  
19 Asset Forfeiture Law would not apply when they have  
20 not complied with--would have to do in due diligence  
21 or at least appear so far.

22           And, finally, with the other projects, and

1 there is no evidence of sufficient causal nexus  
2 between the Measures and the damages claimed on the  
3 other projects.

4 As to full protection and security, remember  
5 here, and the same in regards to minimum standard of  
6 treatment, the protection is predicated of the  
7 Investment and not of the investor, and we have seen  
8 the Measures of, very quickly, that were taken to  
9 protect not only the Claimants' investment, I mean  
10 investment whatever it is—it's not, the investment has  
11 not been--the Measure has been not against  
12 investment, but also Mr. Seda as investor himself.

13 Thank you.

14 So, my colleague, Ms. Ribco, will address  
15 damages now.

16 PRESIDENT SACHS: Damages.

17 How much time is left?

18 SECRETARY MARZAL: 23 minutes.

19 MS. RIBCO: Thank you very much.

20 Good afternoon, and I know everyone wants to  
21 go home, and indeed Mr. Moloo mentioned this morning  
22 that we should not get to damages and we should go

1 home, and we should, indeed, because as shown in this  
2 roadmap that you have there, we have shown already  
3 that the Measures were adopted in the protection of  
4 Essential Security of Colombia. We have shown that  
5 this Tribunal does not have jurisdiction. We have  
6 shown that the claims are premature and abusive. And  
7 we have shown that Colombia has not breached its  
8 international obligations under the TPA.

9           But still I need to address damages, in case  
10 you reach to it, and because there has been a lot of  
11 misrepresentations and things to correct this  
12 afternoon already from our friends on the other side.

13           We had originally prepared more slides but  
14 we had to reduce them to fit them into the  
15 three-and-a-bit more hours. I will need to rush  
16 through anyway the few slides that were left, so I  
17 respectfully request the Tribunal to refer back to the  
18 PHB where all the damages cases are very clearly  
19 explained.

20           So, it is undisputed that only the damages  
21 incurred by reason of or arising out of the State's  
22 unlawful conduct are compensable, and this has been

1 confirmed this morning by Mr. Moloo.

2           Now, only one-third of the damages claimed  
3 by the Claimants concern the Meritage Project. This  
4 is undisputed, as is also undisputed that the Asset  
5 Forfeiture Proceedings also targeted the Meritage Lot,  
6 not even the Meritage Project because, as we said,  
7 it's an action that targets only assets and not the  
8 Investors, as such. So, only 31 percent, if any, of  
9 the claims should be claimed before this Tribunal.

10           We see in the following slide that there is  
11 also no legal connection between the Meritage Project  
12 and any of the Claimants' other projects. Indeed, if  
13 you see all the Claims--and we have seen already at  
14 the Opening, but if you see again all the Claimants  
15 that are in yellow have absolutely no connection to  
16 the Meritage. But even the ones--and also the  
17 projects that you see--Luxé, the 450 Heights and Santa  
18 Fe and Tierra Bomba--are developed by SPVs that are  
19 totally unconnected to Newport.

20           So, there is no legal connection at all  
21 between this and the Meritage Project, assuming that  
22 the Meritage was the target of the Measures which

1 again it was not.

2 So, now if we look, for example, at the Luxé Project,  
3 for which the Claimants claim 44 million, which is  
4 22 percent of the full damages claim. This morning the  
5 Claimants made the allegation that the banks  
6 accelerated debt and that, therefore, the Luxé, at  
7 least the construction of the hotel, had to stop  
8 because financing dried up.

9           We searched really carefully the record, and  
10 there is absolutely no evidence, first, that Colpatria  
11 agreed to provide this financing; second, that  
12 Colpatria ever decided to withdraw the financing due  
13 to the Asset Forfeiture Proceedings.

14           And in fact, if you compare Exhibit C-168,  
15 which is the letter that refers to the Decision of  
16 Banco de Bogotá, which was the bank that was financing  
17 construction of the Meritage. in that letter, for  
18 example, the Banco de Bogotá really informed that it  
19 was accelerating payment--the credit due to the Asset  
20 Forfeiture Proceedings or actually to the Preliminary  
21 Measures that had been adopted by them, and it  
22 referred to provision of the Promissory Note which

1 allowed acceleration of those payments.

2           Then no such provision, if you look at  
3 C-135, which is the loan approval letter for  
4 Colpatria, no such provision is included, so there is  
5 nothing that will allow, for example, Colpatria to  
6 accelerate the payment in case of Asset Forfeiture  
7 Proceedings against Luxé, let alone against a totally  
8 unrelated project, which is Newport.

9           Now, as I said, the loan was granted to Luxé  
10 by The Charlee, so it was not granted to Newport.  
11 Newport does not appear anywhere in that loan  
12 approval. And that, as I said, there is no ground.

13           Now, assuming that Colpatria did decide to  
14 withdraw financing, there's absolutely no documentary  
15 evidence that the Claimants ever claimed that  
16 Colpatria--to give that financing back because they  
17 did not have any grounds to accelerate payment.  
18 That's what a diligent businessman would have done.

19           Now, they also--and a lot was said this  
20 morning that the hotel was 70 percent completed.  
21 There's, however, no evidence that construction was  
22 halted because Colpatria allegedly decided to withdraw

1 financing.

2           Actually, they said it was only four months  
3 away from being completed, so it's quite incredible  
4 that they did not have by then financing, especially  
5 when they say they are investors and there is  
6 absolutely no evidence that they ever even attempted  
7 to provide old funds to complete this almost completed  
8 hotel that they claim as well would have been very  
9 profitable.

10           So, all this looks very unreasonable, and  
11 there's absolutely no evidence to show any of these  
12 steps that I'm going through.

13           They also say, for example, that they tried  
14 to sell the Project to alternative investors but that  
15 they couldn't because of the Measures. However, if  
16 you look at Exhibit C-381, it shows that actually by  
17 November 2016, that's three months after the  
18 Preliminary Measures were imposed, Royal Paladin were  
19 still interested in negotiating the potential  
20 investment in Luxé, and we don't know if that ever  
21 went forward or not because we don't know who is at  
22 the moment operating the Luxé Cabanas, which are

1 operating as the Claimant stated this morning.

2           Now, if we look what the evidence shows, and  
3 we saw this in the Opening Statement, it shows that,  
4 by the time the Precautionary Measures were adopted,  
5 the Luxé Project was already significantly delayed.  
6 It had experienced severe cost overruns and financing  
7 had dried up.

8           Now, even assuming that there is a causal  
9 link, the loss is suffered in connection with the Luxé  
10 Project, is still highly exaggerated, as we will see  
11 later, and the maximum compensation should be  
12 3.7 million and not 44 million as claimed by the  
13 Claimants.

14           A similar situation is with the other  
15 project. I will move a bit faster in the interest of  
16 time. So, with Tierra Bomba, we saw already the  
17 evidence in the record. What does it show? That  
18 there's absolutely no causation because the Claimants  
19 did not own the land where they intended hopefully to  
20 develop the Tierra Bomba project. They did not have  
21 any approval by the indigenous population that was  
22 required to develop those projects.

1           And indeed, what they had were promises to  
2 purchase three lots but, as these were made with  
3 prospective sellers that did not have legal title over  
4 that land, those contracts were terminated some years  
5 later, and what the termination contract says that  
6 they were terminated by mutual consent of permitted  
7 seller and buyers.

8           What there is no evidence of is that the  
9 projects were viable or that, for example, the  
10 Claimants tried to find other lots in Tierra Bomba,  
11 which would have been the reasonable thing to do again  
12 if the Project was so profitable as they claim they  
13 were.

14           Now, there is a developing project which is  
15 interesting because, in fact, this is little more than  
16 ideas and brochures. Still, they claim \$54.5 million  
17 in connection with this. This is their 450 Heights  
18 and Santa Fe de Antioquia project. And there's again  
19 no evidence that these were viable, that they had  
20 financing or that the projects were halted due to the  
21 Asset Forfeiture Proceedings.  
22 What the evidence shows is that investors that were

1 seeking to divest from Mr. Seda's other projects  
2 actually accepted interest in the Santa Fe de  
3 Antioquia project.

4           Even more interesting is the Claim for  
5 15 million in connection with what we called the  
6 "future hypothetical projects," that 7 percent of the  
7 claim in connection with projects that were not even  
8 ideas, so we said the developing projects were little  
9 more than ideas. These were not even ideas. Still,  
10 the Claimants are claiming 15 million in connection to  
11 this.

12           There is no evidence against that they were  
13 viable, that there was financing, that they were  
14 impossible to develop due to the Asset Forfeiture  
15 Proceedings. What the evidence shows is that Mr. Seda  
16 was still operating The Charlee Hotel, and that he  
17 kept receiving offers to operate other projects.

18           Moving to the next issue, and it's assuming  
19 that you find that there's causation and you actually  
20 need to assess damages, there is a dispute between the  
21 Parties as to which method to apply.

22           It is undisputed that the criteria for

1 Rusoro applies to determine whether DCF method is  
2 appropriate in case of not-going concerns. We saw a  
3 very similar slide during the Opening, and all we did  
4 at the Hearing was to confirm. For example, one of  
5 the criteria is that there should be an established  
6 historical record of financial performance.

7           The Claimants' only operating hotel which is  
8 The Charlee Hotel is very different in nature from the  
9 other hotels that they would have developed. None of  
10 them were developed.

11           So, just to recall, The Charlee Hotel had 42  
12 rooms. It was in central Medellín and, as Mr. Seda  
13 confirmed during his cross-examination, it was known  
14 for its relation to "prepagos," which is "prostitutes"  
15 in Spanish. All other projects were more family  
16 oriented.

17           Also, they referred constantly to the  
18 Meritage that was sold. Actually, phase one of the  
19 Meritage Project is the only phase of the project that  
20 had reached the equilibrium point, and as demonstrated  
21 by Dr. Hern, it was sold at a loss. So, really the  
22 track record of the Claimants speaks for itself.

1           The second issue, for example, reliable  
2           protections of future cash flow. It's undisputed that  
3           the business planning on which BRG relied had not been  
4           verified by third Parties and, as confirmed by  
5           Mr. Seda, they're highly unreliable because he said,  
6           when faced with one that it was not possible to  
7           determine whether it was the last version of the  
8           document or just some undated draft of a brochure of  
9           one of the projects.

10           Now, just in the interest of time, Dr. Hern  
11           does, and we--our position is that a Cost Approach  
12           should be followed, but even if the Tribunal decides  
13           to go for a DCF, Dr. Hern explained that, because the  
14           Claimants had invested in a competitive market, that  
15           result of going for the Cost Approach or for a  
16           reasonable DCF Approach or a DCF Approach based on  
17           reasonable assumptions is very much consistent.

18           Now, the Claimants seem to question that the  
19           hospitality and real estate market is a competitive  
20           market. It has been shown that there is no barriers  
21           in principle to entry, so it is, in principle--a  
22           competitive market. If there is any barrier that

1 applies in the particular region where the Claimants  
2 have invested is that most of the land in Antioquia,  
3 where Medellín is, is largely in the hands of narcos,  
4 and, and their blessing, to put it in a way, is needed  
5 in order to do business there. So, if there is any  
6 barrier to entry the market, that is the one.  
7 Otherwise, it's fully, and not perfectly because there  
8 is no perfectly competitive market as explained by  
9 Dr. Hern, but it is competitive.

10 An important point on this is that the  
11 Claimants have, other than contesting the Cost  
12 Approach, they did not contest the cost valuation made  
13 by Dr. Hern. So, if the Tribunal decides to adopt a  
14 Cost Approach, then Dr. Hern's cost valuation is  
15 uncontested.

16 But let's see because for the sake of  
17 exercise and completeness, Dr. Hern also performed a  
18 DCF valuation on the basis of reasonable or supported  
19 assumptions. And for the hotel which are 80 percent  
20 of the damages claims, despite the fact that they  
21 mentioned that there's no operating hotel other than  
22 The Charlee, the Claimants are claiming \$77 million,

1 only 25.5 concerned the Meritage, and that's on the  
2 basis of what we call "the exaggerated assumptions."

3 Now, if we go to the adjusted assumptions,  
4 let's see, for example, the EBITDA margin, the  
5 Claimants--or BRG has applied a 38 to 56 percent  
6 margin without any support.

7 Now, if we see, for example, if--Dr. Hern  
8 adopted a 19 to 22 percent margin, which is in line  
9 with The Charlee Hotel that the Claimants operate and  
10 that they claim is a very successful hotel, and the  
11 impact on the valuation is huge. It's between 51 and  
12 61 percent, which equals 66 to 79 percent.

13 Now, just in--each one of these key drivers  
14 has such a significant impact. So, if you just follow  
15 Dr. Hern's approach on EBITDA margins, then the  
16 valuation needs to be reduced by between 66 and  
17 79 percent. If we go to the Discount Rate, BRG  
18 applied a rate of 7.9 Discount Rate, which, as  
19 explained by Dr. Hern, is highly unrealistic because  
20 the Claimants themselves have offered investment as an  
21 internal rate of return of between 25 and 28 percent.  
22 Again, if only adjusting this driver, it has an impact

1 on the valuation of between 72 and 105 percent.

2 Failure rate. Again, this was highly--or  
3 properly discussed because BRG decided to apply a  
4 zero percent failure risk for Meritage and Luxé only  
5 at 23 percent for projects that are little more than  
6 ideas, as we mentioned, and for which they didn't have  
7 the land or permits. So this is fully developed in  
8 the PHB and, in the interest of time, I respectfully  
9 refer you to the PHB.

10 Similar impact applies to the real estate  
11 operations, and I will only--the real estate claims  
12 amount to 20 percent, 21 million. Only if I may  
13 correct only or comment on the speed of sales, BRG  
14 applied speed of sale of up to 14.4 units per month  
15 for the 450 Heights. This is up to more than three  
16 times fast--I mean, selling, that they assumed that  
17 the 450 Heights Project would have sold up to three  
18 times faster than the Meritage Phase 1 sold. The  
19 Meritage Phase 1 sold at four units per month during  
20 the first month in which it was in the market.

21 Again, it was sold at a loss, so it's not  
22 such a great comparator, but even taking it as a

1 comparator, the ones that BRG--on which BRG relied,  
2 14.4 is highly, highly unreliable. And if we adjust  
3 that, then the difference is around 3 percent which is  
4 15--around 3 million, sorry, which is 15 percent.

5           Similarly unsubstantiated and exaggerated is  
6 the Claimants' claim for lost fees, which amounts to  
7 85.9 million, only 28.2 million concerned the Meritage  
8 Project. There is no evidence that the Claimants  
9 would have operated the yet-to-be-built hotels. As I  
10 mentioned before, there is also not evidence, for  
11 example, that they operated the Luxé Cabanas. There's  
12 no evidence that Royal Realty lost the opportunity to  
13 generate these fees because they could have provided  
14 management and operating services to other third  
15 parties. They are, indeed, still operating The  
16 Charlee Hotel and their know-how that was mentioned by  
17 the Claimants today, Claimants still have it, so they  
18 could put it to use, instead of claiming in this  
19 Arbitration. The claims are so exaggerated because  
20 they're highly based on the exaggerated assumptions  
21 that we mentioned before.

22           Then there is also a claim of 15.6 million

1 for future hypothetical projects. This is absolutely  
2 and entirely speculative because there is no evidence  
3 at all of any such future hypothetical project that it  
4 would exist, that it would succeed, and even if, then  
5 the valuation is exaggerated because again it's based  
6 on the exaggerated assumptions that were considered  
7 for the Claimants' valuation and real estate business.

8           Now, just to conclude, the DCF valuation in  
9 this is a very helpful table because it compares  
10 Dr. Hern's Cost Approach, and his correct DCF Approach  
11 that you will see is largely consistent, as expected  
12 because, as we said, this is a competitive margin and  
13 it's ridiculously lower than BRG's exaggerated DCF  
14 valuation.

15           Just to finish, the Claimants are also  
16 claiming moral damages. It has been demonstrated at  
17 the Opening, and it's also explained in the PHB, that  
18 moral damages are only applicable or may only be  
19 granted on exceptional circumstances such as physical  
20 threat, illegal detention, kidnapping, forced  
21 disappearance. None of this has happened here.  
22 So--not even close to it.

1           And we saw also, if I may refer to a table  
2 that we had in our Opening, comparing the amounts  
3 granted in other cases where human rights had been  
4 breached, including, as I said, forced disappearance  
5 and assassination, and the amounts granted were far,  
6 far lower than the amount claimed by the Claimants or  
7 by Mr. Seda in this case.

8           I don't know if we have any time left.

9           SECRETARY MARZAL: One minute.

10           MS. BANIFATEMI: Thank you. Again I'll just  
11 finish by the reverse order of what Ms. Ribco said,  
12 that, as you will have seen, that there is no case on  
13 damages. It's all inflated, and again it's Mr. Seda  
14 playing the casino.

15           As Ms. Herrera has explained, there is  
16 simply no breach of the Treaty. The only legitimate  
17 expectation, obviously, Mr. Seda and his acolytes  
18 should have been that by allegedly investing in  
19 Colombia, they are investing in one of the worst  
20 regions and the most dangerous regions, and then the  
21 due diligence was on their burden and they didn't do  
22 that, and I'm not going to reargue what Ms. Herrera

1 explained.

2           But, really, what you should decide is that  
3 this case is a case where you do not have  
4 jurisdiction, and as you know, you do not have the  
5 power to decide the invocation by Colombia of its  
6 Essential Security Interest exception in relation to  
7 an extremely grave and serious set of circumstances  
8 and [REDACTED].

9           We thank you, the Tribunal, for its  
10 patience, and if there is any questions to be  
11 addressed tomorrow, we're happy to take those; if not,  
12 then we'll just proceed with rebuttal.

13           PRESIDENT SACHS: No, as agreed we will ask  
14 our questions tomorrow. So this is the end of today's  
15 pleadings. We will then start tomorrow with the  
16 rebuttal, and then with the rejoinder rebuttal.

17           And we wish you a good evening. Marcus and  
18 I will have a drink because today is a German national  
19 holiday, and we are celebrating our reunification, and  
20 so you can see how serious we take your case that we  
21 sit tomorrow on a national holiday. So, thank you.  
22 Good evening.

1                   MR. MOLOO: Thank you. Thank you, David.

2 And the Interpreters.

3                   (Whereupon, at 7:09 p.m., the Hearing was  
4 adjourned until 9:30 a.m. the following day.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, David A. Kasdan, RDR-CRR, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were stenographically recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewritten form by computer-assisted transcription under my direction and supervision; and that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in this proceeding, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this litigation.



---

DAVID A. KASDAN