ARB 16 8 ew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidential Revised	11 Decembe Vienna, A
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES ICSID Case No ARB/16/8 between ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT AND OTHERS Claimants -V- REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA Respondent The Arbitral Tribunal The Hon L Yves Fortier CC, OQ, QC - Arbitrator Professor Dr Rolf Knieper - Arbitrator Professor Philippe Sands - President HEARING VIENNA, AUSTRIA Monday, 11 December 2017	On behalf of Claimants: TODD ALLEN WELLS THEODORE GLEASON COREN HINKLE ANDREW ASTUNO LUCIA CRACILINEANU GIEDRE STASIUNAITE GLEASON WELLS The Colorado Building 1615 California Street, Suite 616 Denver, CO 80202 United States of America todd wells@gleasonwells.com ted.gleason@gleasonwells.com Also present from the parties: ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT, Claimant WITNESSES: ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT VALERIU BERIL EXPERTS: ROGER GLADEI, Gladei & Assoc DAN NICOARA, Gladei & Assoc MIHALL RURAC, Agricultural expert ANDREI GUMOV/SCHI, Agricultural of LARS WIECHEN, Deloitte	expert
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS The Tribunal: The President: PROFESSOR PHILIPPE SANDS Matrix Chambers Gray's Inn London WC1R 5LN United Kingdom philippesands@matrixlaw.co.uk philippesands@matrixlaw	2 LIST OF PART On behalf of Respondent: LEON KOPECKY CHRISTOPH LINDINGER VICTORIA PERNT ANISSA ACHAIBOU FELX SCHNEIDER SCHÖNHERR RECHTSANWÄLTE O Schötnerning 19 10 Vienna Republic of Austria I.kopecky@schoenherr.eu c.kindinger@schoenherr.eu c.kindinger@schoenherr.eu v.pernt@schoenherr.eu ANNA CUSNIR (remotely) ANNA CUSNIR (remotely) ANNA CUSNIR (remotely) ANNA CUSNIR (remotely) ANNA CUSNIR (remotely) ADRIAN GUZUN SCHÖNHERR MOLDOVA Alexandru cel Bun 51 Chisinau 2012 Republic of Moldova a.cusnir@schoenherr.eu a.guzun@schoenherr.eu BXPERTS: PROFESSOR VIOREL RUSU, Legal MICHAEL PEER, KPMG	SMBH

	et al v Republic of Moldova	Revi		Vienna	
Opening Subi Opening Subi ZBIGNIEW P Examination Cross-examin Re-examinat Further cross Questions by Re-examinat Questions by VALERIU BE Examination Cross-examin	INDEX mission by Claimant mission by Respondent OTR GROT by Claimants thation by Respondent con by Claimants the Arbitral Tribunal the Arbitral Tribunal the Arbitral Tribunal the Arbitral Tribunal by Claimants by Claimants by Claimants	5 37 153 186 188 202 236 244 245 261 265 267 268			a, Au 7 09:32
2 THE P	londay, December 11, 2017) RESIDENT: Good morning. Weld ovely to be in this fine city. It	6 come to	1 2 3	to be here today before this prestigious Tribunal, and I would also like to give the Claimants' thanks to ICSID, in particular, and Ms Nitschke. It has	8 09:34
4 is 9.30. We have5 the next three	ave a tight schedule ahead of u days, so we propose to procee t fairly, fully respecting the		4 5 6	been an impressive team really, all the work they have put in it is amazing. Also before I introduce our team I would like to send a very sincere thank	
 quality of arm Weld here on time. 	s between the parties at all tin come all of you. Thank you fo My name is Philippe Sands. nd honour to chair these proces	r being I have	7 8 9 10	you to Schönherr, in particular, for opening their doors and having us here in Vienna. Let me just introduce very briefly the Claimants' legal team. My name is Todd Wells. I am	
 11 I am sitting wi 12 Fortier, and to 13 to my left, our 14 prepared thes 15 We among the site of the sit	th, to my right, the Honourable my left, Professor Rolf Kniepe secretary, Frauke Nitschke, w e proceedings magnificently are deeply grateful for having	e Yves er, and ho has this	11 12 13 14 15	the lead counsel on the team. Next to me is my law partner, the better half of Gleason Wells, Mr Ted Gleason. Next to him is Mr Coren Hinkle, also one of our law partners, and then going down the line we have Mr Andrew Astuno, then Ms Giedre Stasiunaite,	
 available. We a 	ce. Thank you for making this are at your service for the nex ed fairly and expeditiously and	t three	16 17 18 19	and then lastly we have Ms Lucia Craciuneanu Last but not least, of course, is our client, Mr Grot. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Excellent. Just so that	
• •	ith the timetable that we work	ed out,	20 21	we know who is in the room, could you introduce – $${\rm MR\ WELLS:}$$ The two other gentlemen are the	
22 would like to b23 parties and to	y, with the input of both sides egin by expressing our thanks t their counsel for the very and collegial way in which we b	to both	22 23 24	Moldovan legal experts. First is Mr Roger Gladei, and then his colleague, Mr Dan Nicoara. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Respondent?	

SID ARB 16 8 signiew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confident Revised	
igniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova 1 Claimants' appreciation of the ICSID service, and are equally happy to all have you here in our office. 4 To introduce our team, my name is 5 Leon Kopecky. To my right is Victoria Pernt. The 6 Anissa Achabou, Felix Schneider, our Moldova 7 colleague, Andrian Guzun, then our legal exper 8 Professor Viorel Rusu and our quantum expert 9 Mr Michael Peer with his assistant Martin Kozak. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Could you go a little model slowly, because you had yours in order so we could go down our list. This order is slightly different is so our brains are adjusting. Maybe go down the table that you have. 15 MR KOPECKY: We made the mistake putting them in alphabetical order. First, 16 putting them in alphabetical order. First, 17 Leon Kopecky, Victoria Pernt, Anissa Achaibou. 18 Felix Schneider, Andrian Guzun, Professor Vio 19 Rusu, Michael Peer, Martin Kozak. 20 THE PRESIDENT: Ms Anna Cusnir, one of issues on my list, is not with us for the best of reasons but is joining us telephonically? Is that still the case or not? 21 MR KOPECKY: Indeed. Ms Anna Cusni on. I do not know if she can say anything but,	9 we 09:36 1 2 3 4 hen 5 n 6 rt 7 8 9 ore 10 uld 11 12 he 13 14 e of 15 16 1, 17 rel 18 19 the 20 the 20 the 21 t 22 3	11 have done, reserving your position no doubt, but you 09:39 understand that that is the decision we have taken. So we will start after the openings with Mr Grot and then we will move to Mr Beril? Is that understood, Claimant? MR WELLS: Yes, understood. MR KOPECKY: Respondent understood and agreed. THE PRESIDENT: I would also like to introduce at the far left hand corner, my assistant, Ms Lea Main-Klingst, who is attending as an observer in the absence of Mr Kraven, who is slightly in advance of Ms Cusnir in having had a baby last week and I have dispensed him from the need to attend and I hope you will understand that. Also welcoming, of course, our interpreters and our court reporters, to whom we extend our appreciation. If I could move on to a number of issues surrounding supporting documentation and legal authorities, which is an outstanding issue, we have received Claimants' documents, as Respondent will know, on December 6, including ten authorities, and those ten authorities have been admitted into the record pursuant to paragraph 7 of Procedural Order
 Anna, could you confirm that you are on? THE PRESIDENT: We hear something. MR KOPECKY: Yes. Ms Cusnir is on. THE PRESIDENT: You are very welcome v us. I have a number of issues which we have 	5	There are two documents, CL-91, and CL-100, which the Claimants themselves have agreed not to reference, so these are struck from the record. We are left with CL-81, which has made an appearance, we have noted, in the hyperlinked index
7 discussed in advance. We just want to go throu	iah 7	for the first time. In light of paragraph 7 of
 8 those. Can I just confirm that Claimant and 9 Respondent are obviously happy with having Ms Cu 10 on by telephone? We have discussed that before 11 MR WELLS: Claimants are satisfied with the second issue is 13 THE PRESIDENT: The second issue is 	8 snir 9 ore. 10 vith 11 12 the 13	In light of paragraph 7 of Procedural Order No 6, which provides that, "any authorities submitted after the December 7 deadline shall not be admitted", we would like to invite Respondent to state whether it agrees to the late introduction of CL-81, and what your position is, Mr Kopecky, on the presence of CL-81 in the
 8 those. Can I just confirm that Claimant and 9 Respondent are obviously happy with having Ms Cu 10 on by telephone? We have discussed that before 11 MR WELLS: Claimants are satisfied v 12 that, yes. 13 THE PRESIDENT: The second issue is 	8 snir 9 ore. 10 vith 11 12 the 13 the 14 vve 15 uld 16 we 17 low 18 and 19 Ve 20	In light of paragraph 7 of Procedural Order No 6, which provides that, "any authorities submitted after the December 7 deadline shall not be admitted", we would like to invite Respondent to state whether it agrees to the late introduction of CL-81, and what your position is, Mr Kopecky, on the presence of CL-81 in the hyperlinked index. MR KOPECKY: If you just give me 30 seconds to look at the exhibit. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is Professor Dolzer. To help you, we are not sure at the end of the day how much will turn on it, but it

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		al 11 Decembe Vienna, A	
-		13	4	1	15
1	in.	09:42	1	issues which may arise out of REX-3. I think we 09:	:46
2	The next issue, missing originals, which			want to be very strict about how that 20 minutes is	
3	as you know we had decided to reserve what to do		3	used. It is your entitlement to use it, but if you	
1	about these. Pursuant to our letter of November 21		4	could identify when you turn to this matter during	
5	and the Respondent's request at paragraph 3 of your		5	the openings so that Ms Nitschke can make sure that	
3	Rejoinder that the Tribunal declare inadmissible the		6	those 20 minutes are allocated to that issue and not	
7	English translations which are currently on the		7	to any other. We trust you on it, but we want to be	
3	record, as I have it, as C-071, C-076, C-083 and		8	correct and fair in all the circumstances. When	
9	C-89, the Tribunal had reserved its view on the		9	that issue comes up in the opening you might want to	
0	admissibility of these documents.		10	use the words, or some variation, "we are now	
1	With regard to C-89a, we note that the		11	turning to REX-3" and Ms Nitschke will then know to	
2	Claimants have filed this on December 6, so late		12	allocate time for that separately.	
3	last week. Could we invite the Respondent to		13	MR WELLS: When you refer to the opening,	
4	express a view on C-89a, but in the absence of any		14	are you referring to when Mr Grot testifies?	
5	objection we would admit that document into the		15	THE PRESIDENT: No, the opening this	
6	record? If I could just hear from the Respondent on		16	morning. We have given you 20 extra minutes to deal	
7	C-89?		17	with that, and you are free to use that. Query	
8	MR KOPECKY: No objection.		18	whether you instead want to use it during	
9	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. That		19	examination of Mr Grot. It is not how we understood	
0	leaves C-71, C-76 and C-83. We have an English		20	it, but it may be that that is how	
1	translation on file, but the originals appear to be		21	MR WELLS: I misunderstood. I was	
2	missing. Our view we discussed this yesterday		22	thinking of his testimony. I was thinking of his	
2 3			23		
	is to remain seized of the matter, that there will			testimony. I thought it was an additional five	
4 5	be no reference to those documents, but Claimants may seek leave to file the originals if they have		24 25	minutes that was provided. THE PRESIDENT: That is in addition to the	
		14		1	16
1	them, and that we will remain seized of the matter		1	20 minutes you have for your opening 09:	16 : 47
2	during the course of the hearing, so that if they		2	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that,	
2	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but		2 3	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes.	
2 3 4	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we		2 3 4	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us?	
2 3 4	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any		2 3	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes.	
2 3 4 5	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response?		2 3 4 5 6	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of	
2 3 4 5	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76,		2 3 4 5	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the	
234557	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of		2 3 4 5 6	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of	
2 3 4 5 7 3	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76,		2 3 4 5 6 7	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very	
2 3 5 5 7 3 9 0	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2 3	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the	
2345739012345	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having	
234567390123456	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is	
2345673901234567	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will address it in some way. We would like to hear from		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is a reference to possibly other, one or more other	
23456739012345678	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will address it in some way. We would like to hear from you on that.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is a reference to possibly other, one or more other third party funders, because there is a reference to	
234567390123456789	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will address it in some way. We would like to hear from you on that. MR KOPECKY: I think that is what the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is a reference to possibly other, one or more other third party funders, because there is a reference to "funders" in the plural. I am going to invite both parties to	
2345673901234567890	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will address it in some way. We would like to hear from you on that. MR KOPECKY: I think that is what the Tribunal did, to keep this issue open, and we agree with that.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	20 minutes you have for your opening MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is a reference to possibly other, one or more other third party funders, because there is a reference to "funders" in the plural. I am going to invite both parties to address this matter very briefly, but I thought it	
23456739012345678901	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will address it in some way. We would like to hear from you on that. MR KOPECKY: I think that is what the Tribunal did, to keep this issue open, and we agree with that. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, both sides.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is a reference to possibly other, one or more other third party funders, because there is a reference to "funders" in the plural. I am going to invite both parties to address this matter very briefly, but I thought it may be helpful. We have discussed it. We have to	
234567890123456789012	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will address it in some way. We would like to hear from you on that. MR KOPECKY: I think that is what the Tribunal did, to keep this issue open, and we agree with that. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, both sides. The sixth point, a point of clarification		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is a reference to possibly other, one or more other third party funders, because there is a reference to "funders" in the plural. I am going to invite both parties to address this matter very briefly, but I thought it may be helpful. We have discussed it. We have to say that, having regard to the totality of this	
2345678901234567890123	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will address it in some way. We would like to hear from you on that. MR KOPECKY: I think that is what the Tribunal did, to keep this issue open, and we agree with that. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, both sides. The sixth point, a point of clarification in relation to additional time to address REX-3.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is a reference to possibly other, one or more other third party funders, because there is a reference to "funders" in the plural. I am going to invite both parties to address this matter very briefly, but I thought it may be helpful. We have discussed it. We have to say that, having regard to the totality of this case, the issues raised, the amounts in issue, the	
234567390123456789012	during the course of the hearing, so that if they come up we can then deal with it at that moment, but our inclination is that, absent the originals, we would not be inclined to admit them. Claimant, any response? MR WELLS: Yes. In regards to 71 and 76, no comment on those two. However, for 83a, one of the things we would like to do is perhaps the Tribunal could reserve its judgment on that until Mr Grot testifies later today. We would like to try to authenticate the document through his testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent, you have heard what has been said. They would like to reserve a position on 83a. It may be that Mr Grot will address it in some way. We would like to hear from you on that. MR KOPECKY: I think that is what the Tribunal did, to keep this issue open, and we agree with that. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, both sides. The sixth point, a point of clarification		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	20 minutes you have for your opening 09: MR WELLS: I was just checking on that, yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you will tell us? MR WELLS: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: I turn now to the issue of outstanding requests. There is a request from the Respondent in relation to the disclosure of third party funding arrangements. We have taken very careful note of the request of December 8, 2017 which limited Respondent's November 29 request to only relate to third party funding. We note that there has been a response from that and the identification of one third party funder but, having carefully read it, we have noted there is a reference to possibly other, one or more other third party funders, because there is a reference to "funders" in the plural. I am going to invite both parties to address this matter very briefly, but I thought it may be helpful. We have discussed it. We have to say that, having regard to the totality of this	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi			nber 201 a, Austri
	· ·	17	1	the totality of the circumstances of this case	19
1 2	great deal to be gained by a long and lengthy	09:48	1 2	the totality of the circumstances of this case	09:51
2	discussion about third party funding, so our inclination is not to make a whole lot of this		∠ 3	I included the fact that in our thinking, since Moldova has not contributed to the costs, it is	
4	beyond what we have, but we would like to hear from		4	perhaps not unreasonable for the Claimant to have	
5	the parties on it and perhaps the Respondent could		5	looked elsewhere to top up funds. I wonder whether	
6	go first on this issue.		6	we can close this with your submissions on this	
7	MR KOPECKY: Thank you, Mr President		7	issue?	
8	Regarding that request, Respondent stands		8	MR KOPECKY: We can, Mr President. We	
9	by its observations on record. Third party funding		9	consider this explanation, just the previous one,	
10	is a serious issue and Respondent's concerns are		10	given in good faith and therefore we withdraw the	
11	with the transparency and integrity of these		11	request.	
12	proceedings. The Respondent believes that this can		12	THE PRESIDENT: Heard with much	
13	be guaranteed only if the Tribunal is given evidence		13	appreciation.	
14	of the so far unclear nature and form of third party		14	We have on our issue of outstanding	
15	funding. However, as we have just heard, if the		15	matters the Respondent, the possibility for the	
16	Tribunal is satisfied with what is on record and		16	Respondent to get additional time to address the	
17	sees no issue, then Respondent is ready to withdraw		17	Claimants' amended request for relief. We note that	
18	its request.		18	on 8 December the Respondent reserved its rights to	
19	' THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I was		19	address various issues, including Respondent's	
20	very careful, I did not say we don't see an issue,		20	request that Claimants' claims including its now	
21	but we are expressing a query as to whether, given		21	modified be dismissed in their entirety with costs,	
22	the amounts in issue in this case and the totality		22	issues relating to allocation of damages on which	
23	of this case, there is much to be gained by		23	you have reserved right during the course of this	
~ .	expending a lot of time on the issue. We are not		24	hearing Claimants' modified requests for costs on	
24	a second a subject and the manufactor of the second s		25	which you have also reserved rights, and the fact	
24 25	expressing a view on the merits of your application:				
	expressing a view on the ments of your application:	18	_		20
25	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it	18 09:50	1	that there are now two Claimants who failed to	20 09:52
25 1 2	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is		1 2	submit a request for relief on which you have also	
25 1 2 3	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate.		1 2 3	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights.	
25 1 2 3 4	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to		1 2 3 4	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little	
25 1 2 3 4 5	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on		1 2 3 4 5	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of		1 2 3 4 5 6	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant?	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days.	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue,	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact,	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this.	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact, currently there is an outstanding payment due which	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this. THE PRESIDENT: Claimant?	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact, currently there is an outstanding payment due which Claimants are expecting to pay, hopefully within the	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this. THE PRESIDENT: Claimant? MR WELLS: That is an acceptable proposal	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact, currently there is an outstanding payment due which Claimants are expecting to pay, hopefully within the week actually, so I do want to provide additional	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this. THE PRESIDENT: Claimant? MR WELLS: That is an acceptable proposal for the Claimant.	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact, currently there is an outstanding payment due which Claimants are expecting to pay, hopefully within the week actually, so I do want to provide additional clarification on that as well. We have disclosed	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this. THE PRESIDENT: Claimant? MR WELLS: That is an acceptable proposal for the Claimant. THE PRESIDENT: Very fine. Let us then	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact, currently there is an outstanding payment due which Claimants are expecting to pay, hopefully within the week actually, so I do want to provide additional clarification on that as well. We have disclosed the existing third party funder; there are no others	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this. THE PRESIDENT: Claimant? MR WELLS: That is an acceptable proposal for the Claimant. THE PRESIDENT: Very fine. Let us then decide, subject to the views of my colleagues, that	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact, currently there is an outstanding payment due which Claimants are expecting to pay, hopefully within the week actually, so I do want to provide additional clarification on that as well. We have disclosed the existing third party funder; there are no others at this time, and to the extent that it is necessary	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this. THE PRESIDENT: Claimant? MR WELLS: That is an acceptable proposal for the Claimant. THE PRESIDENT: Very fine. Let us then decide, subject to the views of my colleagues, that you will have an extra five to ten minutes in the	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact, currently there is an outstanding payment due which Claimants are expecting to pay, hopefully within the week actually, so I do want to provide additional clarification on that as well. We have disclosed the existing third party funder; there are no others at this time, and to the extent that it is necessary to continue paying the cost of the Respondent, it	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this. THE PRESIDENT: Claimant? MR WELLS: That is an acceptable proposal for the Claimant. THE PRESIDENT: Very fine. Let us then decide, subject to the views of my colleagues, that you will have an extra five to ten minutes in the course of the closing to address those matters	09:52
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We are wanting to hold it in abeyance unless it becomes a material issue at some point. That is really what I am inelegantly trying to communicate. MR KOPECKY: In that case we propose to hear from the Claimants on this issue and, based on our explanations which did away with two-thirds of our previous request, we may be able to withdraw without further reference. THE PRESIDENT: Very good. Claimant? MR WELLS: As noted in the response from the Claimants on the third party funding issue, third party funding was not contemplated when this case began. It was purely in response to the nonpayment issue with the Respondent. In fact, currently there is an outstanding payment due which Claimants are expecting to pay, hopefully within the week actually, so I do want to provide additional clarification on that as well. We have disclosed the existing third party funder; there are no others at this time, and to the extent that it is necessary to continue paying the cost of the Respondent, it may be necessary to obtain other funding.	09:50	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	submit a request for relief on which you have also reserved rights. Our inclination is to allow you a little extra time to address those matters during the opening statements, if you wish to use it. We wonder whether you want additional time to address those matters, also with experts as and when they come up over the next two or three days. MR KOPECKY: Indeed, Mr President. We do not intend to address this in the opening because we do not yet know what is forthcoming, but we would like some additional time for our expert and maybe five or ten minutes in closing for this. THE PRESIDENT: Claimant? MR WELLS: That is an acceptable proposal for the Claimant. THE PRESIDENT: Very fine. Let us then decide, subject to the views of my colleagues, that you will have an extra five to ten minutes in the course of the closing to address those matters Excellent. We are bang on time. We are	09:52

CSID ARB 16 8 bigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidentia Revised		nber 20 a, Austi
issues which they want to address before we proceed? MR KOPECKY: We do, Mr President. Mr President, before the hearing, counsel for Claimant approached us with the request to provide additional support for the KPMG report, and we have produced this. In the course of the production we noticed there were two mistakes in the KPMG report with regard to the exchange rate and depreciation. KPMG therefore prepared an errata sheet which we would like to circulate and introduce to the record. It is ten pages, but it is only ten pages because that one number concerned figures in most of the tables. We highlighted in red wherever that figure influenced other numbers and in fact it is all about two numbers. We would like to seek Claimants' view on that and whether we can introduce this. THE PRESIDENT: Has Claimant had a copy of this? MR KOPECKY: We just got it so we would like to give it to Claimant first before we give it to the Tribunal, if this is acceptable. THE PRESIDENT: Is this going to be addressed in the openings at all? MR KOPECKY: No.	21 19:53 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>vients modifications, we would have perhaps additional time to address them. MR KOPECKY: That is absolutely agreed. THE PRESIDENT: What we would be therefore inclined to do is to say to the extent that you do not address that in your opening you will have additional time. No doubt you will be able to flag the issue in your opening, you will have additional time to address it once you have hadan opportunity. We are not going to deal with this in terms of any of the experts today, we will get into that tomorrow and the day after, so we will make sure you have additional time, if necessary, to address any change which is made, including in your questioning of the relevant expert and, if necessary, in your closings. Is that satisfactory? MR ASTUNO: That is amenable. We were just thinking that perhaps we would have additional time for closing, if indeed that is the case. THE PRESIDENT: I did say that. MR ASTUNO: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Are you comfortable with that, Respondent? MR KOPECKY: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Any other issues fro </pre>	23 09:55
1 THE PRESIDENT: Was it going to be addressed in your opening, because you need a moment 3 obviously to have a look at it. 4 MR ASTUNO: Was depreciation an additional 5 change? What was the second modification? 6 MR KOPECKY: To be honest, I would like to 7 refer to Michael Peer to answer this, as he would be 8 better placed. 9 MR ASTUNO: I heard there was an exchange 10 rate change and depreciation 11 MR KOPECKY: Depreciation Capex to use in 12 the calculation, correct. 13 MR ASTUNO: Just those two issues? 14 MR ASTUNO: Just those two issues and we are 15 happy to give the report to you right now for your 16 review. 17 MR ASTUNO: I think it is perhaps a bit 18 untimely to review an expert report before opening 19 statements begin. I will say that those two issues 20 are part of the substance of my opening remarks. In 21 good faith, if we accept those are indeed the only 22 modifications in this report, I am willing to 23 overl	22 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Respondent? MR KOPECKY: That is fine. THE PRESIDENT: And from Claimant? MR ASTUNO: Mr President, it is related somewhat. Our local agricultural experts are prepared to produce revised tables that were part of their original reports. Rather, they are supplemental tables, and we think that based on this current request we would ask Respondent to allow Claimants to produce these updated tables in the form of exhibits as part of these expert testimonies tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: Does the supplemental area go beyond the change that we have just been alerted to, or is it simply related to these two numerical changes? MR ASTUNO: It is in response to the issue that were addressed in Procedural Order No 6. The untimeliness of Respondent's expert quantum report has created an issue for Claimants to then go out and respond properly. These two tables are in direct response to the essence of Mr Peer's report. The timeliness that we had to deal with in that sense, we think this request is proper. THE PRESIDENT: Respondent?	

	RB 16 8 w Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confident Revised	
1 2 d 3 a 4 n 5 a 6 b 7 to 6 b 7 to 8 e 9 n 15 n 12 p 14 u 15 n 16 to 17 b 20 w 20 w 22 c 23 c 23 c 24 ti ti ti	MR KOPECKY: I think this issue has been dispensed with and we do not object to the additional time already given to address the alleged new issues in Michael Peer's report. However, anything that goes beyond a mathematical error would be a new additional submission and we would object to that, because what we just circulated is an erratum on a calculation. It is a typo in mathematical terms, whereas those sound like new assues and that is not the same thing in Respondent's view. THE PRESIDENT: We have heard both parties. Can I suggest that the way we proceed, unless you have anything more you want to address, my inclination, subject to my colleagues, would be to say we will discuss this in the first coffee preak as to the best way to deal with this, and we will assume we are not going to deal with this before the first break, so it gives us a chance to, without delaying. Have we got all the information we need from you? MR ASTUNO: One final point of darification. It is, of course, in light of the imeliness of the submission of the expert report, it is not necessarily a new issue – in fact, it is	25 09:58 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	have a conversation amongst ourselves and we will 10:00 come back to try to find and share wisdom and you will bear with us. Thank you very much. If I could ask one question. Mr Fortier has alerted us to one possibility. Just to be clear for us as we reflect in the coffee break, do the two proposed possible potential supplemental reports address an errata that was addressed in the errata document that has now been submitted, or is it something beyond that? MR ASTUNO: Mr President, would you mind if we took a minute to confer? I am noticing, in looking at this report, that it appears at first glance that there is new information that is not just the depreciation issue and the change in exchange rate that was earlier discussed. I am seeing reference to updated yield figures, revenue assessments, substantive changes that go beyond what my understanding of the originally described changes. MR KOPECKY: Yes, I had said this was on request of Claimants who asked for further clarifications, so we provided those. THE PRESIDENT: Again, I have not had a
2 to 3 a 4 5 F 6 tf 7 s 8 ir 9 a 10 9 11 q 12 a 14 q 15 T 16 tf 17 c 18 a 19 tf 20 n 21 n 22 tf 23 tf	not a new issue at all it is in direct response to the issues that Claimants now had to respond to as of three weeks ago. THE PRESIDENT: I do recall that in Procedural Order No 6 we reserved the possibility that you would have an opportunity to make further submissions or introduce possibly further materials in relation to that timeliness issue, but we did not actually take a decision on it. MR KOPECKY: If I recall, it related to quantum and not to agriculture. MR ASTUNO: It is all interrelated. The agricultural expert's report is the basis for the quantum valuation because the Claimant is a farmer. The PRESIDENT: Your submission is this sould be characterised both as a matter on agricultural issues which goes to quantum and herefore is a quantum issue. MR ASTUNO: Mr President, it is by all neans a quantum issue. MR KOPECKY: Respondent is confused at his stage. Maybe we defer to the Tribunal's wisdom on this. THE PRESIDENT: Let us during the break	26 09:59 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	tables to tables that already existed in the agricultural expert's report. THE PRESIDENT: And they are intended to deal with the views of Mr Peer? MR ASTUNO: That is right, in direct response to the views that he expressed in his report, which we are preparing to respond to in our opening today, and not to a new revised report that was just handed to us potentially minutes before we deliver those remarks. THE PRESIDENT: Let's proceed to the openings. We have taken note of everything. You will not get to this issue, if I have understood correctly, before the coffee break. We will have a

) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi		al 11 Decemb Vienna,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	briefly return to this in due course. Is that a satisfactory way to proceed? Claimant? MR ASTUNO: Yes. I think at this point we will proceed with our opening remarks as planned in direct response to the original report, and then during the break we can assess the contents of this supplemental report, if that is okay? THE PRESIDENT: That is fine with the Tribunal. Respondent? MR KOPECKY: No problem with that. We, however, would ask that if this is submitted in the record we get a copy today so that our experts can prepare for their Wednesday testimony. THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. One thing I hope both sides realise is that each party is strongly committed to equality of arms and both parties having a full and fair opportunity to address the issues they want to address in the course of these hearings. That will be the guidance for both parties as to how we proceed. If you feel you need to have the opportunity to address something we want to hear from you on that. You should at no point feel you have not been given an adequate opportunity to address existing material or, if it is admitted, new material. That is	29 10:03	$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array}$	anyone on your side who speaks Spanish and who can 10 have a quick look at the totality, and perhaps in conference with the other side over the lunch break to see if there are any problems with translation of the relevant passage? My experience with these case, both formally as counsel and now sitting as Arbitrator, is invariably you end up focusing on a single line of an arbitral award on which it would be extraordinary if a huge amount turned. In those circumstances could you, over the lunch break perhaps, see whether you can reach agreement on the translation, whether it is accurate to your satisfaction and proceed on that basis? MR GLEASON: Yes. I speak some Spanish. The only problem is I not call myself fluent in legal Spanish, which is the problem. I will confer with the other side over the coffee or lunch break and see if we can resolve the issue. We just did want the Tribunal to hold the Respondent to the same standard that they have been holding us to throughout these proceedings concerning the entirety of our evidentiary and legal submission. There have been various complaints raised throughout concerning translations and other issues and we do want to raise this issue as it does seem, especially	31 0:06
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	something we are strongly attached to. Very good. MR WELLS: One last item in housekeeping. Claimants do have one objection to a legal authority that was submitted with the Rejoinder, RL-21, and it is Cervin v Costa Rica, and the objection is that it was submitted in Spanish only. THE PRESIDENT: Duly noted. Which case is that? MR WELLS: RL-21, Cervin v Costa Rica. THE PRESIDENT: Is that because it only exists in Spanish, if I could ask the Respondent? MR KOPECKY: It does only exist in Spanish. We translated in the footnote the relevant part, so it is on record, but we did not provide the entire award which is 186 pages in English, because that would be prohibitive. THE PRESIDENT: Could you remind me, Claimants or Respondent, under which arbitral proceedings that award came down? MR KOPECKY: ICSID. THE PRESIDENT: As an ICSID Tribunal, it is a little difficult for one ICSID Tribunal to say we are not going to have regard to another one. Could we proceed like this: Do you have		14	considering the timing, to be somewhat relevant to 10 us from our perspective. THE PRESIDENT : Heard and understood. Ms Nitschke reminds me that, under PO1, for translation purposes it is sufficient to translate relevant parts or extracts rather than the whole. We are not going to put it to you to translate the whole thing obviously, but equally the Claimant is entitled, given language differences and assuring the need for equality on these kinds of issues, to have an opportunity to review that. MR GLEASON : My response to that would be that this is a case and cases need to be interpreted in context. A simple translation of one line or a few sentences from a case does not give us a full understanding of what the case stands for, especially when the case is trying to be compared to the case in front of the Tribunal today. That is why we find it to be problematic. THE PRESIDENT : That is a fair point, but if we can proceed on this good faith approach and you have a look at it. If the entirety of this case turns on a single line or paragraph of an earlier award, then we have a bigger issue to address. Ido not want to pre-empt that issue, but I would be	32

.bign) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 201 a, Austri
1		33	1	Claimants' timeline? And Respondent will no doubt	35
2	proceed on that basis.	10:08	2	in due course tell us why that timeline is	10:11
2	MR WELLS: As we are about to begin the		2	terrifically correct or hopelessly wrong.	
4	opening statement, we have a number of printouts		4	CH-3, statement of Rosietici village	
5	here. We just need to distribute them prior to the		5	cadastral.	
6	opening.		6	MR GLEASON: That would be our entire	
7	THE PRESIDENT: We are eager for your		7	opening presentation for your benefit. Yes.	
8	distribution.		8	THE PRESIDENT: That is your slides.	
9	While those are being distributed, you		9	CH-3, Claimants' opening and slides. Excellent.	
10	will be aware, and I think that should now be clear,		10	CH-4?	
11	that we have read everything. As I said during the		11	MR GLEASON: Then we have given you two	
12	pre-hearing telephone conference what we would find		12	demonstratives which we have marked as 1 and 2	
13	especially helpful from both sides is really homing		13	THE PRESIDENT: CH-4 and 5?	
14	in on the areas you believe us to be troubled by or		14	MR GLEASON: One of those is a chart which	
15	wanting elaboration on.		15	corroborates the statements of witnesses who have	
16	I come from a legal tradition in which it		16	not been designated to give testimony in this	
17	is the role of the Tribunal to indicate to a party		17	proceeding.	
18	when it has heard sufficient on a particular point.		18	THE PRESIDENT: We have called that CH-4.	
19	We recognise the need for you to make your case as		19	MR GLEASON: The last exhibit would be	
20	you want your case, but certainly in days when		20	"Statistical calculations concerning leases which	
21	I used to be counsel in ICSID proceedings I am no		20	are allegedly unsigned" and there will be some	
22	more but also in domestic proceedings I as		22	explanation about this one during the opening	
23	counsel found it very helpful to get an indication		22	statement.	
23 24	from the Tribunal that we understood the point and		23 24	THE PRESIDENT: We are going to invert	
25	it was time to move on to your next point. We are			your order. CH-4, Claimants' signed leases	
1	very conscious that we want to stick to your	34 10:10	1	demonstrative. CH-5 corroboration of witnesses, not	36 10:13
2	timetabling and we will, if necessary, indicate to		2	designated. You should have five documents.	
3	you that we have understood a particular point.		3	With that, can we move to opening?	
4	Please move on to the next one. It does not mean		4	MR GLEASON: Yes.	
5	that we are against you on that particular point, it		5	THE PRESIDENT: The PowerPoint is CH-3.	
6	does not mean we are with you on that particular		6	MR KOPECKY: If I may address a request to	
7	point, but we have understood the issue and you		7	Claimants. We have Anna Cusnir joining remotely.	
8	should feel able to move on, but we have read		8	She obviously cannot be given this in paper.	
9	everything.		9	I understand that we agreed it will be uploaded on	
10	We have read everything. We have read the		10	the Box today afternoon. However , can you send it	
11	pleadings, we have read the exhibits, we have read		11	to her by email so that she can also follow this	
12	the reports, we have read the witness statements.		12	presentation on her screen?	
			13	MR GLEASON: Of course we have it in	
13	We are generally familiar with the authorities, and		15		
13 14	We are generally familiar with the authorities, and you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the		14	electronic form. We are happy to give it to her	
				electronic form. We are happy to give it to her THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues	
14	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the		14		
14 15	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will		14 15	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues	
14 15 16	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will find extremely helpful. Now what are you giving out to us? MR GLEASON: What we are giving you here		14 15 16	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues email it to her now? Then Ms Cusnir will be able to	
14 15 16 17	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will find extremely helpful. Now what are you giving out to us?		14 15 16 17	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues email it to her now? Then Ms Cusnir will be able to see what we are seeing on her computer.	
14 15 16 17 18	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will find extremely helpful. Now what are you giving out to us? MR GLEASON: What we are giving you here is a succinct summary of the Claimants' views on the issues, a two-page document.		14 15 16 17 18	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues email it to her now? Then Ms Cusnir will be able to see what we are seeing on her computer. MR GLEASON: Okay. One moment please.	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will find extremely helpful. Now what are you giving out to us? MR GLEASON: What we are giving you here is a succinct summary of the Claimants' views on the		14 15 16 17 18 19	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues email it to her now? Then Ms Cusnir will be able to see what we are seeing on her computer. MR GLEASON: Okay. One moment please. THE PRESIDENT: While we are you waiting	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will find extremely helpful. Now what are you giving out to us? MR GLEASON: What we are giving you here is a succinct summary of the Claimants' views on the issues, a two-page document.		14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues email it to her now? Then Ms Cusnir will be able to see what we are seeing on her computer. MR GLEASON: Okay. One moment please. THE PRESIDENT: While we are you waiting to start, we appreciate that PO6, and possibly also	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will find extremely helpful. Now what are you giving out to us? MR GLEASON: What we are giving you here is a succinct summary of the Claimants' views on the issues, a two-page document. THE PRESIDENT: That is CH-1, Succinct		14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues email it to her now? Then Ms Cusnir will be able to see what we are seeing on her computer. MR GLEASON: Okay. One moment please. THE PRESIDENT: While we are you waiting to start, we appreciate that PO6, and possibly also PO1, indicates the questions from the Tribunal in	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will find extremely helpful. Now what are you giving out to us? MR GLEASON: What we are giving you here is a succinct summary of the Claimants' views on the issues, a two-page document. THE PRESIDENT: That is CH-1, Succinct summary.		14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues email it to her now? Then Ms Cusnir will be able to see what we are seeing on her computer. MR GLEASON: Okay. One moment please. THE PRESIDENT: While we are you waiting to start, we appreciate that PO6, and possibly also PO1, indicates the questions from the Tribunal in general will come only at the end, but I hope you	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you can proceed on that basis. Homing in on the points of difference between the parties we will find extremely helpful. Now what are you giving out to us? MR GLEASON: What we are giving you here is a succinct summary of the Claimants' views on the issues, a two-page document. THE PRESIDENT: That is CH-1, Succinct summary. MR GLEASON: We have also given you the		14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE PRESIDENT: Can one of your colleagues email it to her now? Then Ms Cusnir will be able to see what we are seeing on her computer. MR GLEASON: Okay. One moment please. THE PRESIDENT: While we are you waiting to start, we appreciate that PO6, and possibly also PO1, indicates the questions from the Tribunal in general will come only at the end, but I hope you will bear with us, it won't be taken out of your	

www.dianaburden.com

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			a, Austi
_		37			39
1		10:16	1		10:19
2	question rather than delay it for two or three days		2	4 September 2013 in a criminal investigation that	
3	or at the end of the hearing, I hope you will be		3	was suddenly closed for no reason whatsoever.	
4	comfortable with us doing that. It may be that my		4	"As a specialist cadastral engineer with	
5	colleagues may want to come in at a particular		5	13 years' of experience, it is my professional	
6	moment, that will not be deducted from your times in		6	opinion that this criminal and fraudulent scheme has	
7	opening. You are comfortable with that?		7	been conceived with a sole purpose for taking	
8	MR WELLS: Yes, Mr President.		8	possession of landowners' plots of lands by	
9	MR KOPECKY: Yes, of course.		9	Bio-Alianta SRL and bankrupting the previous lessee,	
10	MR GLEASON: Could we make one last		10	Laguardia. The final aim was to take over the plots	
11	request concerning timing? We are going to be		11	of land". That is one of the Respondent's own	
12	passing the chord back and forth between different		12	public officials.	
13	parts of the opening. Can we ask, because technical		13	This hearing is the conclusion of seven	
4	issues can be a little funny, that that time not be		14	years of battles by Laguardia and Mr Grot to recoup	
5	deducted from our presentation time?		15	farming investment. Claimants' opening is split	
6	THE PRESIDENT: I think you can assume		16	into three parts:	
7	that the Tribunal will have a degree of flexibility.		17	First, Mr Gleason will focus the	
8	Subject to that, we will stick to timing, and just		18	Tribunal's attention on many of the key facts in	
9	in the terms of the totality of your opening that is		19	this case, what really happened here. Second,	
0	about to begin, you have been allocated a particular		20	Mr Hinkle will focus the Tribunal's attention on	
1	amount of time. I am pretty brutal, as you have		20	relevant Moldovan law, and third, Mr Astuno will	
2			22	focus the Tribunal's attention on the damages. With	
	heard, about timings. I do not allow slippage, but			C C	
3	I hear you on that particular point.		23	that, I will hand the baton to Mr Gleason.	
4	Opening Submission by Claimant.		24	MR GLEASON: Thank you, Mr Wells.	
25	MR WELLS: Thank you. This is a story of		25	I am going to discuss the key disputed	
		20			40
1	a man born on a farm, who built a successful farm in	38 10:17	1	points in this matter. Unfortunately there are	40 10:20
	a man born on a farm, who built a successful farm in Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a	38 10:17		points in this matter. Unfortunately there are many, so I will take significant time to go through	
2	-	38 10:17			
2 3	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a	38 10:17	2	many, so I will take significant time to go through	
2 3 4	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of	38 10:17	2 3	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we	
2 3 4 5	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado	38 10:17	2 3 4	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up	
2 3 4 5	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to	38 10:17	2 3 4 5	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the	
2 3 4 5 7	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested	38 10:17	2 3 4 5 6	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations	
2 3 4 5 7 8	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of	38 10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda.	38 10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti	10:17	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found	
2345673901234	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages.	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time	
23456739012345	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning	
234567890123456	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings.	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally,	
2345678901234567	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings. Despite initially welcoming Laguardia to	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally, time permitting, we will discuss the situation in	
23456789012345678	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings. Despite initially welcoming Laguardia to Floresti and helping Laguardia set up its farming	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally, time permitting, we will discuss the situation in Rosietici.	
234567890123456789	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings. Despite initially welcoming Laguardia to Floresti and helping Laguardia set up its farming investment, the actions and omissions of some of	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally, time permitting, we will discuss the situation in Rosietici. If I may begin, I will begin by discussing	
2345678901234567890	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings. Despite initially welcoming Laguardia to Floresti and helping Laguardia set up its farming investment, the actions and omissions of some of those same Moldovan public officials alone, but also	10:17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally, time permitting, we will discuss the situation in Rosietici. If I may begin, I will begin by discussing the Claimants' efforts to set up the investment.	
23456739012345678901	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings. Despite initially welcoming Laguardia to Floresti and helping Laguardia set up its farming investment, the actions and omissions of some of those same Moldovan public officials alone, but also in conjunction with and at the behest of a violent	10:17	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally, time permitting, we will discuss the situation in Rosietici. If I may begin, I will begin by discussing the Claimants' efforts to set up the investment. Mr Grot is a farmer with years of	
234567890123456789012	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings. Despite initially welcoming Laguardia to Floresti and helping Laguardia set up its farming investment, the actions and omissions of some of those same Moldovan public officials alone, but also in conjunction with and at the behest of a violent local competitor, Bio-Alianta, destroyed that	10:17	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally, time permitting, we will discuss the situation in Rosietici. If I may begin, I will begin by discussing the Claimants' efforts to set up the investment. Mr Grot is a farmer with years of experience and successful high-yield modern forge	
2345678901234567890123	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings. Despite initially welcoming Laguardia to Floresti and helping Laguardia set up its farming investment, the actions and omissions of some of those same Moldovan public officials alone, but also in conjunction with and at the behest of a violent local competitor, Bio-Alianta, destroyed that farming investment.	10:17	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 1\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally, time permitting, we will discuss the situation in Rosietici. If I may begin, I will begin by discussing the Claimants' efforts to set up the investment. Mr Grot is a farmer with years of experience and successful high-yield modern forge projects. As the record clearly demonstrates, and	
1234567890123456789012345	Poland. Our client, Mr Zbigniew Piotr Grot, a farmer, a man we affectionately call Ziggy, but of course Mr Grot in those proceedings. A Colorado resident, Mr Grot took his love of farming to Moldova, where his company Laguardia first invested in a challenging environment in the southern part of Moldova, Stefan Voda. After obtaining profitable yields in some fields that had been unused for as many as ten years, he took that initial investment and moved on to the northern part of Moldova, the Floresti district, deepening the farming investment by obtaining over 1,500 leases across three villages. We will hear a lot about those villages in these proceedings. Despite initially welcoming Laguardia to Floresti and helping Laguardia set up its farming investment, the actions and omissions of some of those same Moldovan public officials alone, but also in conjunction with and at the behest of a violent local competitor, Bio-Alianta, destroyed that	10:17	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	many, so I will take significant time to go through 24. I will walk you through the outline and then we will jump into how Mr Grot and the Claimants set up the investment. We will first talk about how the investment was set up, the legitimate expectations which were created in Floresti and Moldova more generally, how the investment was properly established in Floresti, we will spend some significant time discussing the attributable acts and omissions in this case of the Respondent State, we will talk about how these attributable acts and omissions do breach international obligations found under the BIT, we will also have to spend some time addressing Respondent's argument concerning Claimants' efforts to seek correction, and finally, time permitting, we will discuss the situation in Rosietici. If I may begin, I will begin by discussing the Claimants' efforts to set up the investment. Mr Grot is a farmer with years of experience and successful high-yield modern forge	

y) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi		al 11 December 2 Vienna, Aus
1	I am not going to stop and go to each one, however	41	1	43 Additionally, in expanding the investment 10:24
2	if the Tribunal has a question on any of those,	10.22	2	to Floresti, Mr Grot properly engaged with the
3	please do not hesitate, but in this particular case		3	relevant parties, the landowners and local officials
4	we see that Mr Grot had successfully farmed in		4	concerning expanding the investment to Floresti, and
5	Poland. We see that through the letters of		5	this was expanding to a larger farming operation, a
6	recommendation from local officials in Poland, the		6	2830 ha farm. He consulted with landowners. He
7	statements of accountants in Poland showing that he		7	consulted with the Floresti district president,
8	made at the time over 500,000 USD per year in Poland		8	Ruslan Zelenenco, the Vice-President, Sergiu Rusu,
9	if we do the conversion. We also see that in the		9	the local mayors, the local cadastral agents. He
10	witness statements.		10	followed the advice of local agricultural experts,
11	Mr Grot decided to attack a new		11	some of whom like Mr Ion Tugui, were recommended to
12	opportunity, in this case in Moldova. In going into		12	him by local officials like Mr Rusu, and Mr Grot
13	Moldova, he did engage in proper and adequate due		13	used the government-approved lease template to enter
14	diligence in setting up the investment. Despite		14	into these contracts with the landowners. Through
15	Respondent's allegations, Mr Grot did consult with		15	this process legitimate expectations were created,
16	relevant professionals, including an attorney who		16	which leads me to my second point.
17	had over 20 years' experience in advising commercial		17	MR FORTIER: How long was this setting up
18	parties and foreign investors. Mr Grot also		18	of the investment? Can you give us some references
19	purchased an already established company, ICS		19	to dates? Just the setting up of the investment
20	Laguardia SRL, to be the operating company and the		20	before you come to the legitimate expectations?
21	investment vehicle in this case.		21	MR GLEASON: Absolutely. Are you
22	In expanding the investment to Floresti		22	referring to the general setting up of the
23	after the first successful year in Stefan Voda on		23	investment or the expansion to Floresti?
24	250 ha with good results, Mr Grot engaged in		24	MR FORTIER: I suppose it includes the
25	additional due diligence. Now, on this particular		25	expansion, but I would like to have bookends here,
		42		44
1	point I would like to stop for a moment and address Respondent's request for an adverse inference	10:23	1	because you say this is item 1 of 3, setting up the 10:25
3			2	investment, right?
1	concerning Claimants' alleged inability the		∠ 3	
4	concerning Claimants' alleged inability the Claimant did not unfortunately produce the			investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand.
4 5			3	investment, right?
	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the		3 4	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there
5	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this		3 4 5	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to
5 6	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the		3 4 5 6	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address.
5 6 7	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference		3 4 5 6 7	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am
5 6 7 8	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations		3 4 5 6 7 8	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants		3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records.		3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the
5 6 7 8 9 10	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants		3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed.		3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There are significant accounting and financial records		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question, absolutely.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There are significant accounting and financial records submitted in this case, exhibits 1 and 2 attached to		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question, absolutely. MR FORTIER: I want some dates.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There are significant accounting and financial records submitted in this case, exhibits 1 and 2 attached to the Deloitte report, CEX-1, which demonstrate the		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question, absolutely. MR FORTIER: I want some dates. MR GLEASON: Sure. It was in the mid
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There are significant accounting and financial records submitted in this case, exhibits 1 and 2 attached to the Deloitte report, CEX-1, which demonstrate the level of activity in Stefan Voda in 2009 and 2010.		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question, absolutely. MR FORTIER: I want some dates. MR GLEASON: Sure. It was in the mid 2000s when Mr Grot was first introduced to the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There are significant accounting and financial records submitted in this case, exhibits 1 and 2 attached to the Deloitte report, CEX-1, which demonstrate the level of activity in Stefan Voda in 2009 and 2010. This point was in fact verified by Respondent's		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question, absolutely. MR FORTIER: I want some dates. MR GLEASON: Sure. It was in the mid 2000s when Mr Grot was first introduced to the opportunities in Moldova, and I would have to look
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There are significant accounting and financial records submitted in this case, exhibits 1 and 2 attached to the Deloitte report, CEX-1, which demonstrate the level of activity in Stefan Voda in 2009 and 2010. This point was in fact verified by Respondent's quantum expert, Michael Peer at REX-3. Table 2 in		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question, absolutely. MR FORTIER: I want some dates. MR GLEASON: Sure. It was in the mid 2000s when Mr Grot was first introduced to the opportunities in Moldova, and I would have to look at the witness statement of Mr Grot to figure out
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There are significant accounting and financial records submitted in this case, exhibits 1 and 2 attached to the Deloitte report, CEX-1, which demonstrate the level of activity in Stefan Voda in 2009 and 2010. This point was in fact verified by Respondent's quantum expert, Michael Peer at REX-3. Table 2 in that report actually calculates a profit for Mr Grot		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question, absolutely. MR FORTIER: I want some dates. MR GLEASON: Sure. It was in the mid 2000s when Mr Grot was first introduced to the opportunities in Moldova, and I would have to look at the witness statement of Mr Grot to figure out which year that was exactly, but it was in the mid
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Claimant did not unfortunately produce the Stefan Voda contract which was requested in this case, that is clear from the record but the argument that there should be an adverse inference concerning Claimants' Stefan Voda operations and in essence there is no proof on the record concerning his operations or the success of his operations should be rejected. First and foremost, Claimants did diligently search for these records. Unfortunately they could not be located as a lot of time has passed. But perhaps more importantly Respondent on this point does ignore the factual record. There are significant accounting and financial records submitted in this case, exhibits 1 and 2 attached to the Deloitte report, CEX-1, which demonstrate the level of activity in Stefan Voda in 2009 and 2010. This point was in fact verified by Respondent's quantum expert, Michael Peer at REX-3. Table 2 in		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	investment, right? MR GLEASON: 1 of 3? I do not understand. MR FORTIER: At the outset you said there were three principal issues that you were going to address. MR GLEASON: I said more than three, I am sorry. MR FORTIER: Then I misunderstood you. I thought you said that there were three principal issues and you were dealing, first, with setting up the investment, you would come late to the legitimate expectations, and then to the investments properly established in Floresti. MR GLEASON: That was the first line of my outline. But yes, I understand your question, absolutely. MR FORTIER: I want some dates. MR GLEASON: Sure. It was in the mid 2000s when Mr Grot was first introduced to the opportunities in Moldova, and I would have to look at the witness statement of Mr Grot to figure out

-) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 20 [.] a, Austi
-	ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova company, ICS Laguardia SRL. After that point it went into 2009 and he slowly entered into the Moldovan market by engaging in the first year of operations on a smaller farm in the Stefan Voda district, which is in southern Moldova. After having a successful year in Stefan Voda, opportunities were a bit limited in that district and he was looking to expand the investment to the Floresti district which began in about spring/summer of 2010 when he began looking at those opportunities. It was in the summer of 2010 that he was invited by the Vice-President of Floresti district, Sergiu Rusu, who he had met through a business contact. Sergiu Rusu is a person who is Vice-President. His role in part was to attract foreign investment to Floresti. Mr Rusu invites Mr Grot to Floresti in the summer of 2010, many meetings are held in the various village halls of the three villages at issue in this case, and the parties all agree that they want to move forward on	45 10:26			
22 23 24 25	this project. The lease registration process takes a few months, over the late summer and early fall, expanding into the late fall of 2010. Does that help?		22 23 24 25	MR FORTIER: We are strictly in the Floresti district? MR GLEASON: Yes. We are now in 2010. MR FORTIER: Vice-President Rusu is the	
1 2 3	MR FORTIER: Yes. It does. Carry on. MR GLEASON: Thank you very much. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: A little bit more	46 10:28	1 2 3	district Vice-President. MR GLEASON: That is right. MR FORTIER: So we are very much at the	48 10:30
4 5 7 8 9 10	precise. The meetings were in September. Is that correct? MR GLEASON: The meetings, I believe, were at the very earliest late August, but yes, the majority were in September, if my memory serves me correctly on the record. MR FORTIER: Of 2010?		4 5 6 7 8 9	local level. MR GLEASON: The regional level, I would say, because the local level I would argue would be the villages. Mr Rusu is a level above the local mayors and cadastral agents. Additionally these cadastral agents signed and stamped the leases and, very importantly, they	
11 12 13 14 15 16	MR GLEASON: Of 2010, yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. MR GLEASON: I am going to review the record at some point and if I have made a mistake I will correct myself later. There are a lot of facts.		11 12 13 14 15 16	entered each lease into the lease registry in each village. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You said that the cadastral agents signed the leases. That cannot be? MR GLEASON: They put their stamp on it with an official signature. We can look at the	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I would like to get back into my second overall point which is concerning legitimate expectations and what legitimate expectations were created in this case. There are two categories: The first would be the reliance on the specific host state conduct, and the second would be concerning the predictable and stable and legal administrative		17 18 19 20 21 22 23	lease documents, if you wish. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But the leases are signed in the sense of signing a contract by the landowners and by Mr Grot or Laguardia. MR GLEASON: Sure. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: When you said that the cadastral agents helped to have these signatures	
23 24 25	-				

bign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confiden Revise	
1	MR GLEASON: I think we are talking about	49 10:31 1	5 MR GLEASON: I have not got to them yet. 10:
2	two different procedures. You are absolutely	2	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then there is the
3	correct, that the signature for executing the	3	public law level, and this is the process of
4	contract should be between the landowners and the	4	cadastral agents putting the seal and executing the
5	investor, in this case Mr Grot and his company.	5	registration. When you consult during the coffee
6	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That is not the role	6	break I want to have these two spheres clearer in my
7	of the cadastral agent.	7	mind. We have a sphere of private contracts, and we
8	MR GLEASON: agree.	8	have a sphere of public authority, a registration
9	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: How would you qualify	9	official who registers a contract.
10	the role of the cadastral agent when he helps	10	My initial question was when the cadastral
11	Mr Grot to have the landowner sign a contract and he	11	agent helps Mr Grot, that these leases are signed by
12	gets a little payment for that? Is that not so?	12	the landowners, in what capacity do they work? Do
13	MR GLEASON: There was a small payment in	13	
14	this case for the assistance.	14	
15	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: In which role does the	15	
16	cadastral agent work under these circumstances? The	16	
17	cadastral agent helping Mr Grot to have leases	17	-
18	signed, is that still a role of public authority or	18	5 5
19	is it an agent for Mr Grot?	19	
20	MR GLEASON: I would like to confer on	20	
20	that question with my colleague for one second.	21	seemed to incite this question, was not a signature
22	Before I do, I would like to clarify the signature	22	
23	that I am talking about. What I am talking about is	23	
	a stamp on the actual lease document itself, the	24	
·)/	•	25	
24 25	official stamp of city hall, and a signature of the		
	official stamp of city hall, and a signature of the		
1	cadastral agent, and this represents registration	50 10:32 1	5 THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10:
25 1 2	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to	50 10:32 1 2	5 THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood.
25 1 2 3	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is	50 10:32 1 2 3	5 THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the
25 1 2 3 4	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not	50 10:32 1 2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this
1 2 3 4 5	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral	50 10:32 1 2 3 4 5	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases
1 2 3 4 5 6	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease	50 10:32 1 2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party.	50 10:32 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan	50 10:32 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here.	50 10:32 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we park that and	50 10:32 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that?	50 10:32 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Just a little about it	50 10:32 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 1	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 1	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT : Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER : Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see whether I have the same understanding as you have,	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration process was moving forward.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 1	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT : Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER : Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see whether I have the same understanding as you have, I have the understanding of the whole proceedings.	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration process was moving forward. That leads me into my second point on
123456789101123145167891011213145167189	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT : Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER : Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see whether I have the same understanding as you have, I have the understanding of the whole proceedings. There are three levels: there is the level of two	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration process was moving forward. That leads me into my second point on legitimate expectations which is concerning a
1 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT : Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER : Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see whether I have the same understanding as you have, I have the understanding of the whole proceedings.	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration process was moving forward. That leads me into my second point on legitimate expectations which is concerning a
123456789101123145167891011213145167189	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT : Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER : Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see whether I have the same understanding as you have, I have the understanding of the whole proceedings. There are three levels: there is the level of two	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration process was moving forward. That leads me into my second point on legitimate expectations which is concerning a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see whether I have the same understanding as you have, I have the understanding of the whole proceedings. There are three levels: there is the level of two contracting parties, the Claimants and the	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration process was moving forward. That leads me into my second point on legitimate expectations which is concerning a predictable legal and administrative framework which meets certain minimum standards, including
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 1 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 1 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 1 14 15 16 17 18 19 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 12 14 16 17 18 19 12 14 16 17 18 19 12 14 16 17 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT : Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER : Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see whether I have the same understanding as you have, I have the understanding of the whole proceedings. There are three levels: there is the level of two contracting parties, the Claimants and the landowners, and they sign private contracts	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration process was moving forward. That leads me into my second point on legitimate expectations which is concerning a predictable legal and administrative framework which meets certain minimum standards, including consistency, transparency and decision-making. This
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	cadastral agent, and this represents registration after the cadastral agent has performed his duty to check the leases and register the leases. That is the signature that I am referring to. I am not making any sort of allegation that the cadastral agent had an obligation to execute the lease contract for either private party. Now if I may have a moment to confer on the role of the cadastral agent, my colleague, Coren Hinkle, is a little more well versed on the Moldovan issues here. THE PRESIDENT : Why don't we park that and after the break you can come back on that? PROFESSOR KNIEPER : Just a little about it on this question, because to be clear from the beginning, or to find your understanding or to see whether I have the same understanding as you have, I have the understanding of the whole proceedings. There are three levels: there is the level of two contracting parties, the Claimants and the landowners, and they sign private contracts MR GLEASON : Yes.	50 10:32 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE PRESIDENT: You can continue. We have 10: understood. MR GLEASON: I would like to lead into the next point on this signature because it was at this point, as this process was going on, as the leases were executed but also registered via public law procedures, it was a process that took time. There were over 1500 leases to be executed and registered here. We are in a farming context and President Zelenenco, Vice-President Rusu, the mayors, they assured the Claimants that the process was moving along without issue, both on the public and private side, and it was okay to begin farming. I would like to highlight that point that there were statements made by these public officials that it was okay to begin farming as the registration process was moving forward. That leads me into my second point on legitimate expectations which is concerning a predictable legal and administrative framework which meets certain minimum standards, including consistency, transparency and decision-making. This stable and predictable legal and administrative

www.dianaburden.com

-) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revis			nber 201 a, Austria
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	Floresti district. I would like to briefly go through the legitimate and reasonable expectations that Claimants had concerning this. THE PRESIDENT: Speaking for myself, I am really familiar with this argument. You can save yourself time and go to the issues that you need. This argument we are very fully appraised of. MR GLEASON: Fantastic. I would like to connect one point, if I may, on this. I would like to connect that last point concerning this slide, No 12, the last point I made about specific host state conduct. President Zelenenco, President Rusu and the mayors, assuring Claimants that it was okay to move along and begin farming. I would like to connect that with some points on slide 15. It was very reasonable for Claimants in this case to expect that if there was any alleged problems or perceived problems with the lease process or the lease execution and registration process found by the mayors in the cadastrals, that they would be notified and permitted to fix any errors, and that both local and international due process norms would be followed. I highlight that because we will discuss that.	53 10:37	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 23 24 25	business perspective the work had begun. The necessary equipment had been imported, the employees had been hired in the local Floresti district, the consultants had been engaged, the farming operations had begun in earnest. I would like to go into a little more detail concerning the first two points on this slide, the execution of the leases and the registration of the leases. Everything was moving along just fine until strange events began occurring in Floresti, as this Tribunal is very well aware. In the winter of 2011, a local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta, shows up and starts giving sugar to local landowners. I want to be clear that any alleged complaints concerning these leases from local landowners followed these events and were baseless. It was around this time that local officials began to work in concert with this local third party competitor to take the leased lands from Laguardia and give them to Bio-Alianta. I would like to move on and discuss the signature of the leases between Laguardia SRL and the landowners in this case. I am on slide 19, page 10.	55 10:39
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR FORTIER: When you say slide 15, you are referring to page 15? MR GLEASON: We are looking at the printout I apologise. There are slide numbers and page numbers. THE PRESIDENT: The numbers are at the bottom right-hand corner of each slide. MR GLEASON: They are. On the printout there is a number of each page MR FORTIER: It is slightly confusing THE PRESIDENT: What you might just say is slide 15 on page 8. MR GLEASON: I will have to look at the hard copy, then. I would like to talk about how the investment was properly established in Floresti. That is a point of some dispute between the parties. There is a few points I would like to make. The first is how the grand majority of leases were in fact in a private law context validly executed. This is clear from the record. I would secondly like to discuss how the leases were in fact checked for compliance by local mayors and cadastrals and registered in a public context in all three villages, and from a practical		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	I would like to turn the Tribunal's attention to demonstrative exhibit CH-4. The Respondent in this case argues that many leases were not signed by the landowners. They argued this on a few occasions. On the slide you can see some citations to the Rejoinder in this particular case. That is what is represented on the slide. The Claimants would like to point out to the Tribunal (slide 20) that the majority of the Laguardia leases were in fact signed by the landowners. If we look at the statistics on Claimants' demonstrative exhibit 2, we can see that in all three villages over 90 per cent of the leases actually contained the signature of both Laguardia and the landowners. Claimants took a conservative approach to calculating this number. There are various documents that from Claimants' perspective were signed by the parties, which Respondent would surely disagree with, and we understand that our numbers probably do not add up to your number, but in Claimants' actual analysis of these lease documents many of them contain handwritten names which could be considered signatures in the signature block, but another block for holder of the lease was not	56 10:40

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confiden Revise	
Zbign 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23 24 25	actually signed by that same party, so we did not count those leases which did not contain the double signature, just to be conservative on our estimate here. Even being conservative, we can see that over 90 per cent of the leases were signed taking all three villages into consideration. I would like to also further point out that whether the leases are signed is only an issue concerning the Cosernita lease. It was only Disposition 1-A which stated that a great majority were not signed by the landowners. The Respondent tried to subtly change the argument at this point now saying that many lease agreements were not signed, and they are trying to use this as a general argument attacking all of the Laguardia SRL leases. Throughout this process of attacking the Laguardia leases, it never once has been demonstrated by the Respondent why certain unsigned leases would provide grounds for retroactive refusal and simultaneous deletion of other leases which were properly executed. There has never been any explanation of why some leases that allegedly contain problems would affect other leases whichdo not contain the same problems. No attempt to explain that has been provided.	57	to be assent. 59 10:44 PROFESSOR KNIEPER: We have a disagreement on that point. Then I want to come back to the signature problem. I want to take you to Claimants' memorial, paragraph 281. There you see "Respondent's own cadastrals were responsible for filling out the leases and then registering them", and this is my big question that I have. You put two things together which are strictly separated. There is a private negotiation and execution of a contract in written form, and then you have a registration. One part of this activity is private law and the other part is public law. A cadastral in my evaluation of the files, of the law and Mr Gladei's and Mr Rusu's expert opinions, I have not heard any point why a cadastral agent would be responsible for having a private contract signed? If not, he is engaged by one of the parties to do that as an agent and being paid for it. If not, I remain confused for the totality of the hearing if we do not really differentiate between these two spheres: a private contract signed by private people, helped by perhaps cadastral
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I want to get this straight in my head. I come back to the leases and to the signatures and to the registration because you go too quickly for my brain These are distinct matters. Do we agree that a non-signed lease is a non-valid lease? MR GLEASON: No, we do not. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But leases in agricultural land have to be executed in written form and, according to Moldovan law, written form is respected when the document is signed by both parties. That is your legal expert, and that is the Civil Code of Moldova. There is a certain disagreement between the two of us whether the signature has to be done at the same moment, but there is no doubt under Moldovan law, as I see it, that they have to be signed. Any non-signed contract which needs a written form is a non-valid contract under Moldovan law. MR GLEASON: I believe there is a dispute about that point. If I may explain myself? PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I thought we were in agreement on that?	58	60 representatives of one party, and the public part of 10:46 this whole process, which is stamping and registration. MR GLEASON: I do not think there is any reason that you cannot make that distinction under these facts. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Well, you don't do it and then I am confused. MR GLEASON: I apologise for not doing that. Perhaps it is a difference in legal approach. There are two separate acts here: one is execution of a lease which you are correct in stating is a private law act. The other is registration of the act. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Why do you say cadastrals were responsible for filling out the forms? MR GLEASON: Because there was agreement between Claimants and the local officials in this case that they set the expectation that they would assist in these circumstances PROFESSOR KNIEPER: In a private capacity? If you say that, I am absolutely happy. If you say,

) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis		al 11 Decem Vienna	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 24 25		61 10:47	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 23 24 25	actually what happened. It was a retroactive refusal and simultaneous deletion of these lease registration records. If it sounds strange, it is because it was strange. It was an extraordinary procedure which was not supported by Moldovan law, as will be addressed by the Moldovan legal expert, Roger Gladei, in this case. One last point on this issue. Any time to make an argument concerning alleged problems with singled-out leases was prior to registration, not the retroactive refusal and simultaneous deletion of the lease registrations by mayoral disposition. That as well was not supported by Moldovan law. I would also like to move into the public law context for a moment, if I may be permitted, moving to slide 25, page 13. Respondent argues that there is nothing on record showing that the Laguardia leases were checked for compliance, but that directly ignores the Moldovan law cited by Claimants' expert, Roger Gladei, in his First Report, CEX-1. This perhaps will help answer some of your questions, Mr Knieper, and this is concerning the registration process and the role of cadastral or registrar in this registration process. The record demonstrates that the Laguardia	63 10:50
$1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ 11 \ 12 \ 13 \ 14 \ 15 \ 16 \ 17 \ 18 \ 19 \ 20 \ 12 \ 22 \ 22 \ 24 \ 25$	certain leases which were perhaps allegedly containing problems, whether they were unsigned or whether they contained some of the other problems alleged by Respondent, why those leases which contained these problems themselves, for example, a lease which was unsigned or a lease which was signed by somebody other than the entitled landowner, or leases with the ratios additions and pencil use or lacking in official stamp of Laguardia, why those leases with those problems would affect other leases which did not have or share the same problems. That is a very important point from our perspective. I would like to highlight that. What Respondent tries to do, moving to my next slide slide 23, page 12 of the printed copy is that this argument is misguided and should be rejected if certain leases, even if they did have certain problems, unsigned, whatever the case was, that was not a reason to retroactively refuse and simultaneously delete all of the leases, that was clearly not supported by Moldovan law. I must apologise, I keep saying "retroactively refuse" and "simultaneously delete the lease registrations". I know that is a lot to say, but there is no better way to say it. That is		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 23 24 25	leases were checked for compliance. I have highlighted some passages from Mr Gladei's First Report. You can see that it says, "the authorised person who is the cadastral shall use the Registry as evidence of documents that came in and went out of the mayor's office, and is obliged to verify the completeness of the documents, verify the correctness of the contents of the documents". If I may move along, section 17 of the same regulations states that "upon substantive examination of the documents, the cadastral, the authorised person, shall verify compliance with legislation and, if finding authenticity of the documents, completeness of the information contained therein, and compliance of the form and content of the documents, make the record into the registry". If I may briefly summarise the role of the registrar in registering, the registrar uses the registry as evidence of the documents, shall verify and check compliance and, if finding compliance of the form and the contents of the documents make the record into the Registry. Thus, despite Respondent's arguments that there is nothing on record demonstrating that the mayors or cadastrals checked Laguardia's leases for compliance, that	64

lign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revise		al 11 Decen Vienn	
1	ignores the record itself. The registration of the	65 10:52	1	orders from above to terminate	67 10:55
2	leases themselves are evidence that theregistrars	:	2	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That was later. I am	
3	or cadastrals checked the documents for compliance	:	3	talking about your submission that in January these	
1	and that the mayoral offices in each village	4	4	mayors received orders not to register, and at the	
5	actually found compliance.	4	5	same time you say the conspiracy between the	
3	Similarly, there are two court decisions	(6	Respondent, the mayors and the competitor already	
7	from the Floresti District Court in 2013 and 2014	-	7	was on in January, and then, despite the conspiracy,	
3	taking the same position, that the leases were	1	8	they signed and they register these agreements.	
Э	properly reviewed, for example, using Respondent's	9	9	I do not find the logic behind your submission.	
0	language "checked for compliance" and ultimately	1	10	MR GLEASON: We do not have the detailed	
1	registered.	1	11	thoughts of the mayors. We don't know exactly when	
2	MR FORTIER: Where are those references?	1	12	the orders were given, but we do know that the	
3	MR GLEASON: To the District Court	1		orders were given. It was stated by the Mayor in a	
4	decisions? The 2013 decision is C-43, and the 2014	1	14	statement under oath.	
5	decision is R-6. Specifically the findings for C-43	1	15	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That was after the	
6	are page 10, and for R-6 are on page 7, if that	1	16	registration. She talks about orders to	
7	helps the Tribunal.			de-register. I am talking about January, before the	
8	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: In that context I have		18	initial registration took place. You say in your	
9	another question concerning the timeline. You say			submission that the mayors got orders already in	
0	in your submissions, and you said that already		20	January before any registration had taken place not	
1	today, that from January			to register.	
22	Let's go back to the timeline. Meetings		22	MR GLEASON: I would like to find the	
3	in September, then an extended process of signatures			statement of the mayor, if I may, because I am not	
24	which lasted until December, and then finally			sure we have the same understanding on that.	
25	registration in February, and you ask yourself in		_ _ 25	THE PRESIDENT: Can we do this in order?	
1	your submissions why it took so long for the	66 10:54	1	You are taking us through a timeline.	
	your submissions why it took so long for the cadastral agents to register. The answer that you	10:54	1 2	You are taking us through a timeline. MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with	
1 2 3	, , ,	10:54	2	5 5	68 10:57
2	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you	10:54	2	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with	
2	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute	10:54	2 3	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question –	
2 3 4 5	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got	10:54	2 3 4	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do	
2 3 4 5 6	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register.	10:54	2 3 4 5	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later.	
2 3 4 5 6 7	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the	10:54	2 3 4 5 6	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am	
2 3 4 5 7 8	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the	10:54	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should	10:54	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point.	
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease	10:54	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue.	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister them two or three	10:54 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister them two or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register?	10:54 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister them two or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that?	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up	
2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister them two or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation	
23456789012345	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister them two or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad	
234567890123456	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister themtwo or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to know what was going through their heads without	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context.	
2345678901234567	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister themtwo or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context. Perhaps we have a difference in understanding	
23456789012345678	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister them two or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to know what was going through their heads without being able to speak to them. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But how do you know	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context. Perhaps we have a difference in understanding concerning the context in which it was given, but we will talk about it.	
2 3 4	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister themtwo or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to know what was going through their heads without being able to speak to them. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But how do you know there were orders from above to the mayors that they	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context. Perhaps we have a difference in understanding concerning the context in which it was given, but we will talk about it. I am not sure I can give you an answer	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister themtwo or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to know what was going through their heads without being able to speak to them. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But how do you know there were orders from above to the mayors that they should not register?	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context. Perhaps we have a difference in understanding concerning the context in which it was given, but we will talk about it. I am not sure I can give you an answer concerning what was going through the minds of	
23456789012345678901	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister themtwo or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to know what was going through their heads without being able to speak to them. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But how do you know there were orders from above to the mayors that they should not register?	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 6 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question – THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context. Perhaps we have a difference in understanding concerning the context in which it was given, but we will talk about it. I am not sure I can give you an answer concerning what was going through the minds of people at this time in Moldova, why the leases were	
234567890123456789012	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister themtwo or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to know what was going through their heads without being able to speak to them. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But how do you know there were orders from above to the mayors that they should not register? MR GLEASON: I was going to get to that later. It is on the record. In was given in an	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 1 22	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context. Perhaps we have a difference in understanding concerning the context in which it was given, but we will talk about it. I am not sure I can give you an answer concerning what was going through the minds of people at this time in Moldova, why the leases were registered and then retroactively refused and	
23456789012345678901223	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister themtwo or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to know what was going through their heads without being able to speak to them. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But how do you know there were orders from above to the mayors that they should not register? MR GLEASON: I was going to get to that later. It is on the record. In was given in an ex parte injunction proceeding concerning the	10:54 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 19 20 1 22 23	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context. Perhaps we have a difference in understanding concerning the context in which it was given, but we will talk about it. I am not sure I can give you an answer concerning what was going through the minds of people at this time in Moldova, why the leases were registered and then retroactively refused and simultaneously deleted for the record. That is a	
234567890123456789012	cadastral agents to register. The answer that you give is that the competitor started to distribute sugar, and the other reason was that the mayors got orders from above not to register. The question which I have is why if the mayors got orders from above, and when the conspiracy already started in January, why should they go through this mess of registering 1500 lease agreements and then deregister themtwo or three weeks later? Have they simply refused to register? Do you have an explanationfor that? MR GLEASON: Unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to hear from any of the mayors or cadastrals in this case, and it is impossible to know what was going through their heads without being able to speak to them. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But how do you know there were orders from above to the mayors that they should not register? MR GLEASON: I was going to get to that later. It is on the record. In was given in an	10:54 2 3 4 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 5 4 5	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 1 22	MR GLEASON: I would like to continue with that, if I may. It is an important question THE PRESIDENT: It is up to you, but do not re-do it later. MR GLEASON: I will get to it later. I am going to come back to that point. That is a really important point. THE PRESIDENT: We can park that issue. You are going to deal with it. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It is in your reply, paragraph 513, if you want to look it up MR GLEASON: I have it in my presentation prepared already. I will get to that. I am glad you recognise the mayor's statement in this context. Perhaps we have a difference in understanding concerning the context in which it was given, but we will talk about it. I am not sure I can give you an answer concerning what was going through the minds of people at this time in Moldova, why the leases were registered and then retroactively refused and	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			nber 2017 a, Austria
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	I would like to move on. Professor Sands, may I have a timing update? THE PRESIDENT: All of the questions which are coming from the Tribunal will not be taken from your time. Ms Nitschke, roughly how much time has been used on their own time. THE SECRETARY: About 25 minutes. THE PRESIDENT: Just to highlight a concern, I have calculated that your total PowerPoint is 88 pages. You are now at about 16 and you have used on 90 minutes almost a third. Again, you can assume we have read the detait we really have read the detail. We want to get to these kinds of issues, which is why the questions are helpful. So don't worry, but charge ahead. MR GLEASON: I would just ask that the entirety of the PowerPoint presentation be taken into consideration by the Tribunal. I am sure you will. THE PRESIDENT: Can I check, because it will apply equally to the Respondent, I do not know if you have a PowerPoint, but for my part absolutely. This is, I am assuming, not new legal argument. It is in response to our invitation in the course of the pre-hearing conference that you		$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\24\\25\end{array}$	on this point: there was a pattern of state conduct and I would like to walk this Tribunal through the pattern which occurred in this case. The pattern begins with the already discussed delay in registering the leases. It is an unexplained delay in registration. The leases in their grand majority were validly executed and compliant with Moldovan law. Nonetheless, Respondent will argue that there were no delays, that the documentary evidence on record shows that they were only filed on the day of actual registration. The references that Respondent uses to make this argument are taken from court proceedings where the Claimant was actually not present, so the statement of the mayor was actually taken at face value in the documents which are cited by Respondent on this particular point. There are other points on the record which show that there were unexplained delays concerning registration of the leases. We cannot explain why. We don't know why. It was strange. It was a long and unexplained delay. It was, according to Igor Bugai, a systematic and unreasonable delay approval of lease. Alexei Bugai confirms that he was concerned about delay. He inquired andhe could	71
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	present to us and we have the totality and that will go for both sides. Are you comfortable with that? MR KOPECKY: On the premise, of course. THE PRESIDENT: You can assume it is in, we have it. We will go over it. You do not need to take us through each line. You will never get through the additional 72 pages of 140 plus slides that you need to get through in the time. Do not worry about it. We have it. We are on top of it. MR GLEASON: Great. I would like to move to slide 36, which is on page 18 of the printed copy of the PowerPoint presentation. There is a real key dispute about the attributable acts and omissions of the Respondent in this case. MR FORTIER: Very key. MR GLEASON: It is very key, thank you. The Respondent focuses almost exclusively on the dispositions in this case as being the attributable act that we need to analyse, but there are many more acts and omissions of local officials which need to be attributed to Respondent in this case. In fact, there was a pattern of state conduct. In its Rejoinder, the Respondent states that Claimants merely allege, but neither explain nor prove, a pattern of state conduct. But the record is clear		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 31 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 32 425	not get a response from Mayor Ivanes concerning the lease registration process. There were strange events occurring at this time. That is just the beginning of this pattern. The pattern becomes much more serious very shortly afterwards. Prior to, and in addition to the dispositions, which were the focus of majority of Respondent's pleadings on attribution, the record clearly shows that the mayors attempted to terminate the private lease rights between Laguardia and the landowners. Again, this is prior to the disposition. This brings me back to the quotation concerning the orders from above. We see that statement from Mayor Nina Ivanes, 15 April, talking with president of the Floresti District, "he told me that there is a company, Bio-Alianta, but the contracts, the Laguardia leases, should be terminated". That was a statement given under oath granted in April 2011, but referring back to this time period, the time period concerning the registration of the leases. If I may be permitted, what did the Mayor Nina Ivanes do after receiving these orders from above? She attempted to illegally and unilaterally	

bign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confiden Revise		I 11 Decem Vienna	
		73			75
1	•	11:03 1		MR GLEASON: That is the statement of the	11:05
2 3	We see that in exhibit C-95. C-95 is our illegal, unilateral lease termination notifications signed by	2		mayor saying, "I received orders from above". MR FORTIER: The person above is the	
4	some Varvareuca landowners, signed and stamped by	4		President of the Floresti District, Ruslan	
- 5	the Varvareuca mayor. These took place on,	5		Zelenenco. Does it go above Mr Zelenenco?	
6	I believe, 15 February 2011, so when did Mayor	6		MR GLEASON: We believe it does. We will	
7	Nina Ivanes receive the orders from above? We don't	7		be addressing that later today.	
8	know, but we can reasonably believe it was prior to	8		After the orders from above were issued,	
9	these lease termination notifications being signed	9		the mayors in both villages endeavoured to illegally	
10	We know that the same happened in	10		and unilaterally terminate the private lease rights	
11	Cosernita. We saw notations in the Cosernita land	11		of Laguardia with the landowners in each village.	
12	registry indicating that the Laguardia leases had	12		This despite, very clearly under Moldovan law, such	
13	been terminated between 1 and 3 February 2011,	13		mayors not having any authority to terminate	
14	despite the leases having been registered on	14		contracts between private parties, as very clearly	
15	7 February 2011. Now perhaps in the written	15		stated in the First Expert Report submitted by	
16	pleadings this point was maybe not highlighted as	16	5 1	Roger Gladei, paragraph 58.	
17	much as it should have been, but it is clearly on	17	7	Also this point was stated again in	
18	the record that the mayors in both villages	18	3 1	Mr Gladei's Second Report, CEX-4, paragraph 31, and	
19	attempted to illegally and unilaterally terminate	19) (was agreed upon by Professor Rusu at paragraphs 13	
20	the leases.	20) a	and 14, the issue of validity of agreements is one	
21	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can you go to	21	l t	to be resolved by the parties themselves, and in the	
22	paragraph 313 in your Reply? There you give an	22	2 0	case of a dispute by a court, the city hall may not	
23	explanation and you don't say it is strange; there	23	3 8	assess the validity of a lease agreement. In other	
24	you say they received before the registration, we	24	ł١	words, the mayors had no business being involved in	
	are talking about before the registration. You say	25	5 t	the termination of private lease rights as stated by	
25					
25		74			
1	the initial registration process was slow because	11:04 1	-	Article 1 of the Civil Code of Moldova that there is	
1 2	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register.	11:04 1 2	i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to	
1 2 3	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely.	11:04 1 2 3	i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants	
1 2 3 4	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your	11:04 1 2 3 4	i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of	
1 2 3 4 5	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission.	11:04 1 2 3 4 5	i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6	i e f	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely"	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	i e f	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above.	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6	i e f	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above.	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	i i i i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above.	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	;; ;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	i i f t i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	i i i i i i i i i i 2 i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor",	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question. MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question. MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them or were you coming to them on slide 42? Shall we go	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them or were you coming to them on slide 42? Shall we go through it together? Talking with the President of	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents	76 11:07
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them or were you coming to them on slide 42? Shall we go through it together? Talking with the President of the Floresti District, he told me there is a	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them or were you coming to them on slide 42? Shall we go through it together? Talking with the President of the Floresti District, he told me there is a company, Bio-Alianta, but the other contracts,	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	i i <td< td=""><td>a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the</td><td></td></td<>	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question. MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them or were you coming to them on slide 42? Shall we go through it together? Talking with the President of the Floresti District, he told me there is a company, Bio-Alianta, but the other contracts, Laguardia SRL, should be terminated. From the	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	a i <td< td=""><td>a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the Romanian. I just took the translation. I see the</td><td></td></td<>	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the Romanian. I just took the translation. I see the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 101 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them or were you coming to them on slide 42? Shall we go through it together? Talking with the President of the Floresti District, he told me there is a company, Bio-Alianta, but the other contracts, Laguardia SRL, should be terminated. From the perspective of the Claimants, this is evidence of	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20	a i <td< td=""><td>a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the Romanian. I just took the translation. I see the signature of the lessor and then I see the mayor's</td><td></td></td<>	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the Romanian. I just took the translation. I see the signature of the lessor and then I see the mayor's	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them or were you coming to them on slide 42? Shall we go through it together? Talking with the President of the Floresti District, he told me there is a company, Bio-Alianta, but the other contracts, Laguardia SRL, should be terminated. From the perspective of the Claimants, this is evidence of the order from above?	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a i <td< td=""><td>a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the Romanian. I just took the translation. I see the signature of the lessor and then I see the mayor's signature also, but the declaration is definitely</td><td></td></td<>	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the Romanian. I just took the translation. I see the signature of the lessor and then I see the mayor's signature also, but the declaration is definitely	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	the initial registration process was slow because they got orders from above not to register. MR GLEASON: We say it is likely. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say that in your later submission. MR GLEASON: We say it is "likely". We don't say that we know. We say this is "likely" because the mayors had received orders from above. We do know that they received orders from above. Unfortunately it is going to be impossible for us to know when those orders were received. I cannot answer that question MR FORTIER: But you have heard many times that the orders from above. Have you come to them or were you coming to them on slide 42? Shall we go through it together? Talking with the President of the Floresti District, he told me there is a company, Bio-Alianta, but the other contracts, Laguardia SRL, should be terminated. From the perspective of the Claimants, this is evidence of the order from above? MR GLEASON: Yes. This is a statement	11:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	$\begin{array}{c} a \\ a \\ i \\ i \\ e \\ f \\ f$	a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition to interfere with private affairs as cited by Claimants expert report, No 4, the Second Report of Roger Gladei, paragraph 31.5. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Can we go for a second to your exhibit 95, which you have just mentioned. You see that the mayor terminated the lease agreement, but here I read in the translation I don't know whether it is a court translation I don't know whether it is a court translation it is a termination announcement of 11 February 2011, and here in my text I read that that "the lessor", which means landowner terminates the agreement, not the mayor. MR GLEASON: If you could scroll down in that document and look at the actual documents themselves. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I do not have the Romanian. I just took the translation. I see the signature of the lessor and then I see the mayor's signature also, but the declaration is definitely from the landowner and not from themayor.	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidentia Revised	al 11 December 2 Vienna, Aus
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The termination was 11 expressed by the landowner and not by the mayor. MR GLEASON: The terms of the lease for termination PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It might be legally, he might not be entitled to terminate, but the declaration was done by the landowner and not by the mayor. MR GLEASON: And supported by the mayor. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That is a different matter, but we are still in private/public law. A landowner tried to terminate the lease contract. Is that correct or not? MR GLEASON: Not appropriately, but the allegations show that there are these requests from some landowners. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You want to say it is not correct what I say, that the landowners tried to terminate the lease agreements? MR GLEASON: Some of them may have, yes. The documents speak for themselves. They do PROFESSOR KNIEPER: It seems not to, because I understand it differently from you.	77	79 unilateral agreement, and by court decision, and none of those circumstances exist here. Zero. So it is unclear why the mayor was getting involved in this private relationship THE PRESIDENT: On exhibit C-95, the first page is the number C-95. You then have an English translation and you have then got a huge number of pages down of original language text. Is the translation of page 2 of this document, signature of the lessor, is that the fifth page down, just to be clear? MR GLEASON: I guess that would be the first of those many, many documents. THE PRESIDENT: If we look at that original language text, just going down, the bit where it says "the Varvareuca official, Ms Ivanes, NF" on page 5, is that the bit immediately above the date, 11/02/2011? MR GLEASON: That is right, and unfortunately on some of these copies the stamp is faded. THE PRESIDENT: Whose signature on the right-hand side? MR GLEASON: That is Mayor Nina Ivanes. THE PRESIDENT: Your position is, if I
$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6\\7&8&9&101&12&134&15&16\\17&18&9&20&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&$	landowner, vis-à-vis a private contracting party. 11 That is what I read. Then we have a confirmation by the mayor, but the declaration is definitely to my understanding from the landowner and not from the mayor. INR GLEASON: If we can turn back to slide 46, page 23 of the written presentation, there is a fundamental civil law principle of prohibition of interfering with private affairs, so the mayor has absolutely no business putting any name, signature or any other act under the colour of authority, under any termination notification filed by landowners in this case. They had no business doing this, absolutely none under the law, and it was an act under the colour of authority. That is the Claimants' position on that particular point. If I may point out, I also point out that the termination of a lease was not to be done unilaterally by landowners. The terms for termination of a lease are very clear in this case. The lease contract terminates in very limited cases, expiration of a contract, a declaration of invalidity which comes from the court, not the landowners, cancellation of the contract, and cancellation would be by mutual agreement, not	78 1:09 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	have understood, that a request for termination has 11:12 come in by the private lessor, that it has then been signed and, in effect, approved by the mayor, and that is an act the mayor was not authorised to do? MR GLEASON: That is absolutely correct. THE PRESIDENT: Please proceed. MR GLEASON: Again, there is no reason for the lessees at that point to even have complaints THE PRESIDENT: Signed by the lessor and the mayor. MR GLEASON: Signed by the lessor and the mayor, that is right. There are some concerns that Claimants have concerning the authenticity of some of the signatures of lessors, but we are not going to get into that right now. I would like to highlight that Claimants could not possibly have been in breach of the contract as lessors claimed under these lease termination notifications, as the preparatory works had taken place and Claimants' payment obligations were not due for another ten months. It was all very mysterious. I very much understand your confusion on the point because it was a mysterious thing. If you are confused about what was going on now, imagine how Mr Grot felt in 2011.

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			a, Austr
1	THE PRESIDENT: How many pages have we got	81	1	Claimant first found out that these hundreds of	83
2	here? It is like hundreds of pages. How do you	11:13	2	documents had been signed?	11:16
2	explain that on the same day hundreds of private		2	MR GLEASON: Some time later.	
4	lessors all make an application unilaterally to the		4	THE PRESIDENT: What do you mean?	
5	mayor's office?		5	MR GLEASON: We don't know for Cosernita,	
6	MR GLEASON: This is why we have some		6	it is not clear. We know that it was not at any	
7	concerns about the authenticity of these documents.		7	time in the month, or even months following these	
8	THE PRESIDENT: It may not be only or at		8	documents being signed. If we look at C-95, we can	
9	all a matter of authenticity. The question is what		9	see that these terminations, signed on	
10	propels hundreds of individual lessors on the same		10	11 February 2011, were not sent until 15 March 2011,	
11	day to make an application for termination? One		11	so over a month later, and this is for Varvareuca,	
12	interpretation I am not saying it is my view		12	this is after the date of the disposition in	
13	is that one could infer from that that someone was		13	Varvareuca, which we will turn to shortly.	
14	organising something somewhere?		14	THE PRESIDENT: This is the page 3. It is	
15	MR GLEASON: That is a very reasonable		15	called "Petit Paquet Recommande". So it is a	
16	inference.		16	registered letter that has gone to ICS Laguardia in	
17	THE PRESIDENT: I'm not saying it is my		17	Chisinau.	
18	view, but it is striking that you have one page of		18	MR GLEASON: And that is on 15 March 2011,	
19	translation, they are all in identical terms, and		19	and if you look down, I am sorry it is in Romanian,	
20	there are then hundreds of pages of signed lessor		20	we didn't translate this part, but page 4 is a	
21	and mayorally signed documents. They are all signed		21	"return to sender" notice dated I believe 24 March	
22	by the mayor. On a single day they are all dated		22	THE PRESIDENT: That is page 4 on the	
23	11 February the mayor receives hundreds of pieces		23	documents. Obviously Respondent will have a chance	
	of paper and she signs all of them.		24	to address this. You say this never arrived	
24			25	MR GLEASON: They were never delivered.	
24 25	MR GLEASON: And stamps all of them. We				
	WR GLEASON: And stamps all of them. We				84
1	have the originals if you would like to see them.	82 11:14	1	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of	84 11:17
25	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on	82			84 11:17
25	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there	82	1	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot	84 11:17
25 1 2 3 4	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to	82	1 2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him	84 11:17
25 1 2 3	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants	82	1 2 3	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is	84 11:17
25 1 2 3 4 5 6	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a	82	1 2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice	84 11:17
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease	84 11:17
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written	84 11:17
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions	84
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012	82 11:14	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have	84
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all?	84 11:17
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later.	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of	84
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held.	84
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions – PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle	84
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two	84
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents?	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions – PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a	84
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents? MR GLEASON: Nothing.	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a contract.	84
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosemita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT : Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents? MR GLEASON : Nothing. THE PRESIDENT : What is your submission on	82	$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6\\7&8&9&10&11&12&13&14\\15&16&17&18\end{array}$	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a contract. MR GLEASON: Yes.	84
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT : Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents? MR GLEASON : Nothing. THE PRESIDENT : What is your submission on the opportunity that was given to the Claimant to	82	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions – PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a contract. MR GLEASON: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did they ever have	84
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosemita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents? MR GLEASON: Nothing. THE PRESIDENT: What is your submission on the opportunity that was given to the Claimant to have an opportunity to respond to the mayor's	82	$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6&7\\1&2&3&4&5&6&7&8&9&10&11&12&13&14&15&16&17&18&19&20\end{array}$	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions – PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a contract. MR GLEASON: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did they ever have contact? The question is did the Claimant ever	84
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 2 2 1	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents? MR GLEASON: Nothing. THE PRESIDENT: What is your submission on the opportunity that was given to the Claimant to have an opportunity to respond to the mayor's imminent signature of all of these documents?	82	$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6\\7&8&9&10&11&12&13&14&15&16\\1&1&2&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1$	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions – PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a contract. MR GLEASON: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did they ever have contact? The question is did the Claimant ever contact any of the landowners?	84
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 22 22 22	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents? MR GLEASON: Nothing. THE PRESIDENT: What is your submission on the opportunity that was given to the Claimant to have an opportunity to respond to the mayor's imminent signature of all of these documents? MR GLEASON: There was absolutely no	82	$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6&7&8&9&10&11&12&13&14&15&16&17&18&19&20&2&1&2&2\end{array}$	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions – PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a contract. MR GLEASON: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did they ever have contact? The question is did the Claimant ever contact any of the landowners? MR GLEASON: Concerning these	84
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 2 12 22 23	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents? MR GLEASON: Nothing. THE PRESIDENT: What is your submission on the opportunity that was given to the Claimant to have an opportunity to respond to the mayor's imminent signature of all of these documents? MR GLEASON: There was absolutely no communication, no opportunity. This was happening	82	$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6&7\\&8&9&10&11&12&13&14&15&16\\&12&2&2&2&2&2\end{array}$	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a contract. MR GLEASON: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did they ever have contact? The question is did the Claimant ever contact any of the landowners? MR GLEASON: Concerning these terminations?	84
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 12	have the originals if you would like to see them. I would also like to point out, staying on these termination notifications for a moment, there is no timely notice of these unlawful attempts to terminate Laguardia's leases provided to Claimants at any time. They were never communicated in a timely fashion to the Claimants. Nothing on record shows that the termination notifications from Cosernita were ever even communicated to Claimants prior to the lease registry dated 12 October 2012 being communicated to the Claimants a year and a half later. THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, what notice was the Claimant given before 11 February 2011 as to the transmission to the mayor's office of all these documents? MR GLEASON: Nothing. THE PRESIDENT: What is your submission on the opportunity that was given to the Claimant to have an opportunity to respond to the mayor's imminent signature of all of these documents? MR GLEASON: There was absolutely no	82	$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6&7&8&9&10&11&12&13&14&15&16&17&18&19&20&2&1&2&2\end{array}$	THE PRESIDENT: How did you get hold of this? Could you remind us? MR GLEASON: We would have to ask Mr Grot and perhaps his employees who were working for him at that time, but he does have them now, that is clear. The point is that there is no timely notice whatsoever concerning these illegal lease notifications. The focus was on the written pleadings by Respondent, all on the dispositions – PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did the Claimants have any contact with his contractual parties at all? MR GLEASON: Yes, there were a variety of meetings held. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Because in principle it would have been the obligation of the two contracting parties to talk about culmination of a contract. MR GLEASON: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did they ever have contact? The question is did the Claimant ever contact any of the landowners? MR GLEASON: Concerning these	84

bign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			a, Ausi
1	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Or did you simply rely	85	1	of Cosernita.	87
2	on the mayors and the cadastral agents?	11:18	2	The exact same thing happened in	11:21
2	MR GLEASON: No, absolutely not. There		3	Varvareuca. Again, there was no notification of	
4	were multiple meetings held throughout the fall of		4	Disposition 1-A in Cosernita, no notification of	
5	2010?		5	Disposition 2 in Varvareuca, and while the Claimants	
6	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And then no more		6	had not even been notified of these dispositions,	
7	contact?		7	they were used by the local third party competitor,	
8	MR GLEASON: Farming started, so they were		8	Bio-Alianta, in court proceedings to obtain ex parte	
9	on the landowners' land and presumably there was		9	injunctions.	
10	day-to-day contact concerning the farming		10	The Respondent argues that the injunctions	
11	operations.		11	obtained by Bio-Alianta had nothing to do with	
12	To focus this back on the actual		12	dispositions. They say that at multiple points in	
13	termination process, no, the Claimants did not		13	their Rejoinder, but that simply ignores the record.	
14	discuss termination of these leases with the		14	Slide 54. We see that Disposition 2, we see the	
15	landowners because they were never informed of the		15	complaint filed by Bio-Alianta for this ex parte	
16	alleged terminations of the landowners. But, yes,		16	injunction, which says "the copy of Disposition 2 is	
17	there was contact. This was an ongoing farming		17	attached". It was attached to the complaint. The	
18	operation in small villages. People see each other,		18	ex parte injunction was clearly based on the	
19	people live next to each other, people talk to each		19	disposition which had not even been communicated to	
20	other.		20	Laguardia.	
21	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And they talk about		21	The same goes for Cosernita. Now	
22	many things but not about the termination and the		22	Respondent argues that C-97 and C-33, Bio-Alianta's	
23	intention to terminate these contracts?		23	Statement of Claim for the ex parte in junction along	
24	MR GLEASON: That never came up. It was		24	with the ex parte injunction itself, do not mention	
25	very strange and mysterious. The private lease		25	Disposition 1-A. This ignores C-105, which is the	
		86			88
1	termination notifications were not admissible.	86 11:19	1	order from the court cancelling the injunction which	88 11:22
2	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue.		2	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg	88 11:22
2 3	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also		2 3	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that	88 11:22
2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not		2 3 4	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden.	88 11:22
2 3 4 5	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being		2 3 4 5	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we	88 11:22
2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor,		2 3 4 5 6	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction	88 11:22
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease		2 3 4 5 6 7	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita.	88 11:22
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point,	88 11:22
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita.	88 11:22
2 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca.	88
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed		2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or	88
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same	88
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions	88 11:22
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to	88 11:22
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communications with the third party		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia	88
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased	88
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor. We need to look at the dispositions. We		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased lands.	88
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor. We need to look at the dispositions. We will now turn to the famous dispositions, which have		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased lands. I would like to point the Tribunal's	88 11:22
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor. We need to look at the dispositions. We will now turn to the famous dispositions, which have been subject of much of the conversation in this		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased lands. I would like to point the Tribunal's attention to slide 60. Slide 60 is on page 30 of	88
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor. We need to look at the dispositions. We will now turn to the famous dispositions, which have been subject of much of the conversation in this dispute. We look at Disposition 1-A. We know that		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased lands. I would like to point the Tribunal's attention to slide 60. Slide 60 is on page 30 of the printed copy. Slide 60 demonstrates that, even	88
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor. We need to look at the dispositions. We will now turn to the famous dispositions, which have been subject of much of the conversation in this dispute. We look at Disposition 1-A. We know that that was, like the terminations, not immediately		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased lands. I would like to point the Tribunal's attention to slide 60. Slide 60 is on page 30 of the printed copy. Slide 60 demonstrates that, even before the injunctions were in place, the mayors in	88
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 20\\ 12\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 2$	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor. We need to look at the dispositions. We will now turn to the famous dispositions, which have been subject of much of the conversation in this dispute. We look at Disposition 1-A. We know that that was, like the terminations, not immediately provided to Laguardia SRL, and immediately usedin		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased lands. I would like to point the Tribunal's attention to slide 60. Slide 60 is on page 30 of the printed copy. Slide 60 demonstrates that, even before the injunctions were in place, the mayors in these villages were blocking Laguardia from	88
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 22\\ 22\\ 23\\ 22\\ 22$	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor. We need to look at the dispositions. We will now turn to the famous dispositions, which have been subject of much of the conversation in this dispute. We look at Disposition 1-A. We know that that was, like the terminations, not immediately provided to Laguardia SRL, and immediately usedin Floresti District Court by the local competitor		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased lands. I would like to point the Tribunal's attention to slide 60. Slide 60 is on page 30 of the printed copy. Slide 60 demonstrates that, even before the injunctions were in place, the mayors in these villages were blocking Laguardia from accessing the leased lands.	88
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 20\\ 12\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 2$	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: I would like to also communicate to the Tribunal that while this was not being communicated to Laguardia, it was being communicated to the local third party competitor, Bio-Alianta. This is concerning both the lease terminations and the famous dispositions, which we will get to next. How do we know there was ongoing communication? Slide 51, page 26 of the printed copy. During this process of Laguardia having their leases illegally and unilaterally terminated, whilst this was not being communicated to Laguardia, there were ongoing communications with the third party competitor. We need to look at the dispositions. We will now turn to the famous dispositions, which have been subject of much of the conversation in this dispute. We look at Disposition 1-A. We know that that was, like the terminations, not immediately provided to Laguardia SRL, and immediately usedin		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	shows that the representative of Bio-Alianta, Oleg Utica, used the mayor's disposition to argue that registration of Laguardia's leases was forbidden. Thus, Disposition 1-A was very clearly used if we look at the record to obtain the ex parte injunction in Cosernita. So, again, to summarise on this point, Disposition 1-A is issued in Cosernita. Disposition 2 is issued in Varvareuca. No notification of Disposition 1-A or Disposition 2 is given to Laguardia. At the same time, Bio-Alianta has copies of these dispositions in their hands and they go to the local court to obtain ex parte injunctions against Laguardia blocking them from accessing their validly-leased lands. I would like to point the Tribunal's attention to slide 60. Slide 60 is on page 30 of the printed copy. Slide 60 demonstrates that, even before the injunctions were in place, the mayors in these villages were blocking Laguardia from	88

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confiden Revise		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	hearing, a statement given in the context of a court 1 hearing, where he says, "For more than a month, the mayor does not allow us; he refuses to grant us the contracts so we can't do the land work". In other words, we don't have access to our leased lands we can't perform our farming practices or operations. This statement was given on 8 April 2011. The Cosernita injunction was not granted until 24 March 2011. The Varvareuca injunction was 12 March 2011. Again, 8 April 2011, Ion Tugui is saying we haven't been working the lands for more than a month, so in other words, stretching back to the very latest, early March, more likely late February. So there was absolutely no access to the land. This is just another part of the pattern of state conduct which exists in this case. By this point there was an unexplained delay in the registration of the leases. There was an unlawful attempt to terminate the lease rights between Laguardia and the landowners under the colour of authority of the mayor. There were dispositions issued, illegally, retroactively refusing and simultaneously deleting Laguardia's leases from the lease registries. Laguardia had been blocked from accessing the landsdespite no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 ¹ 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 2 ¹ 21 22 22 22 22	 Claimants allege (you allege) that the Mayor went to the fields alongside local villagers and Bio-Alianta to prevent ICS Laguardia SRL from accessing its leased lands". But there you say it is not the mayor alone; it is also the landowners who block access to the land. Is that what you say? MR GLEASON: The reference that you are referring to actually happens later, and that is after the ex parte injunctions had been cancelled and before separate injunctions had been put in place. It is not clear exactly who was present on those occasions, but what is clear is that the mayor was present and representatives of the third party company were present and that threats were made by the mayor towards Laguardia SRL's employees. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: In my understanding it is different when somebody says a mayor accompanies landowners who want to block access to the 	91 1:26
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	injunctions being in place, despite not having been a notified about any attempts to terminate their leases, despite not having any notice of these dispositions which affect their rights, and the dispositions do affect rights. That is addressed in the slide, as well as Claimants' pleadings, although I may have to leave that point behind in the interests of time today. The investment by this point has been compromised and that extends to the remaining village of Rosietici, and I will address that at the end of my presentation. Yet the pattern of state conduct continued. It did not end there. There was a meeting in late March 2011 – THE PRESIDENT: I think we are quite behind on time. MR GLEASON: I am quite comfortable with where I am on timing. If I may just highlight a few more points on the pattern of state conduct, Claimants really feel this is an important point which affects many of the other arguments at issue in this case. THE PRESIDENT: I want to make sure you can get through this. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I want to take you in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 ² 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 2 ² 22 22 24	 is if the landowners go to block access to their land which they have leased out and/or accompanied by the mayor, is a different statement from saying the mayor blocks access to the land. You would not see a difference? MR GLEASON: I would see a difference here clearly. There are different people involved? PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I had the impression when I read this that you wanted to say that the mayor was present when the villagers went to block access to this land. This is what I read. MR GLEASON: If I could clarify that point, the mayor was perhaps alongside some landowners, but also alongside Bio-Alianta and not just there as support, but actively preventing Laguardia from exercising valid private rights. That is the statement. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. MR GLEASON: I would like to highlight the meeting between Mr Grot and Mr Ruslan Zelenenco in late March where the officials who had invited 	92

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			nber 2 a, Aus
1	can do. The statement from Mayor Nina Ivanes that	93 11 · 29	1	statements of the local mayor and the local	, 95 11:32
2	the orders had come from above, which we have	11.29	2	cadastral which are given in 2013, so	11.52
3	already discussed, that statement was also made to		3	contemporaneous statements in the context of a	
4	Mr Alexei Bugai in a different context. We know		4	criminal investigation in that district at that	
	that there was a failure to return leases and copies		5	-	
5 6	•		-	time, and they are striking statements and I invite the Tribunal. who I am sure has read these	
6 7	of the registries, undermining transparency		6 7		
7	concerning Laguardia's ability to evaluate their		7	statements, to read them once more.	
8	rights and adjudicate their rights, and also		8	There were additional events in 2013	
9	violation of the regulations on keeping agricultural		9	I am not going into those events and the pattern	
10	lease agreements. We know that the local mayors		10	continued in 2014 with the unexplained closure of	
11	generally supported Bio-Alianta, we see that in the		11	Artur Sircu's investigation into the intervention	
12	statement that we have already addressed of		12	and activity in Rosietici without any reasoning or	
13	Ms Nina Ivanes, we see that in Mayor Ianco			notification. If I may also point to exhibit C-88	
14	Jucares(?) we have been discussing, blocking			which is another striking exhibit showing the level	
15	Laguardia and standing alongside Bio-Alianta,		15	of government support for this local third party	
16	threatening Laguardia employees, despite injunctions		16	competitor. It is an interesting and perhaps	
17	having been removed.		17	disturbing read and I invite the Tribunal to read	
18	The pattern continues. Mr Fortier asked		18	that exhibit once more.	
19	earlier was the pattern limited to local officials		19	I would like to move on to my next point,	
20	and the answer to that question is no. The pattern	:	20	unless the Tribunal has other questions concerning	
21	continues up to a national level. There is a summer	1	21	the pattern of state conduct which exists in this	
22	2011 meeting where the Deputy Minister of	1	22	case?	
23	Agriculture and Food Industry says I am going to	1	23	THE PRESIDENT: We will just take a	
24	need a bribe in order to give you any assistance on	:	24	ten-minute break to allow the court reporters a	
	this particular matter. There is a general failure		25	break. We are now at 11.30. We will start at 11.40	
25					
25		94			96
25		94 11:30	1	even if people are not in the room.	96 11:33
	· · ·			even if people are not in the room. (Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am)	
1	of the central Government to respond in any		1	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue.	
1 2 3	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of		1 2	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am)	
1 2	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement.		1 2 3	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue.	
1 2 3 4 5	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012.		1 2 3 4	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that	
1 2 3 4 5 6	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in		1 2 3 4 5	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break.	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are		1 2 3 4 5 6	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013.	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011.	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow.	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who co-ordinates with Bio-Alianta to attack the	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject without having seen them to the point that the two	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who co-ordinates with Bio-Alianta to attack the remaining Laguardia leases in Rosietici, and it was	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject without having seen them to the point that the two additional supplementals are indeed responsive to	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who co-ordinates with Bio-Alianta to attack the remaining Laguardia leases in Rosietici, and it was under pressure from Lilia Mitu, and a	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject without having seen them to the point that the two additional supplementals are indeed responsive to the report of Mr Peer, they are admitted and you may	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who co-ordinates with Bio-Alianta to attack the remaining Laguardia leases in Rosietici, and it was under pressure from Lilia Mitu, and a State Chancellery representative that the mayor's office illegally terminated Laguardia's	11:30	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject without having seen them to the point that the two additional supplementals are indeed responsive to the report of Mr Peer, they are admitted and you may address them, subject to the opportunity for Respondent to have an opportunity to respond to	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who co-ordinates with Bio-Alianta to attack the remaining Laguardia leases in Rosietici, and it was under pressure from Lilia Mitu, and a State Chancellery representative that the mayor's office illegally terminated Laguardia's registrations and attempted to legally register	11:30	$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6\\7&8&9&10&11&12&13&14&15&16\\1&7&1&8&19&20&21\end{array}$	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject without having seen them to the point that the two additional supplementals are indeed responsive to the report of Mr Peer, they are admitted and you may address them, subject to the opportunity for Respondent to have an opportunity to respond to them. Thank you.	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who co-ordinates with Bio-Alianta to attack the remaining Laguardia leases in Rosietici, and it was under pressure from Lilia Mitu, and a State Chancellery representative that the mayor's office illegally terminated Laguardia's registrations and attempted to legally register Bio-Alianta's leases one more time in a different	11:30	$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array}$	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject without having seen them to the point that the two additional supplementals are indeed responsive to the report of Mr Peer, they are admitted and you may address them, subject to the opportunity for Respondent to have an opportunity to respond to them. Thank you. MR GLEASON: On that signature issue	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 0 1 22 23	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who co-ordinates with Bio-Alianta to attack the remaining Laguardia leases in Rosietici, and it was under pressure from Lilia Mitu, and a State Chancellery representative that the mayor's office illegally terminated Laguardia's registrations and attempted to legally register Bio-Alianta's leases one more time in a different village now.	11:30	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject without having seen them to the point that the two additional supplementals are indeed responsive to the report of Mr Peer, they are admitted and you may address them, subject to the opportunity for Respondent to have an opportunity to respond to them. Thank you. MR GLEASON: On that signature issue I would like to make one final point. This	11:33
1 2 3 4 5 6	of the central Government to respond in any meaningful fashion on the various attempts of Laguardia to request assistance and involvement. The pattern continued throughout 2012. I am not going to go through all of these points in the interests of time. As you can see, there are quite a few points that constitute the pattern of state conduct. It is extensive and it continues into 2013 and it perhaps gets worse in 2013. These are the dying days of Laguardia's mitigation efforts after the events of 2011. Mr Grot has already left, fled, for security reasons from Moldova, but nonetheless the coordination between the local government and Bio-Alianta continues, the local prosecutor Lilia Mitu, who co-ordinates with Bio-Alianta to attack the remaining Laguardia leases in Rosietici, and it was under pressure from Lilia Mitu, and a State Chancellery representative that the mayor's office illegally terminated Laguardia's registrations and attempted to legally register Bio-Alianta's leases one more time in a different	11:30	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(Short break from 11.33 to 11.42 am) THE PRESIDENT: Please continue. MR GLEASON: Thank you for that well-appreciated short break. I would like to just before we continue come back to the point concerning signatures on the leases or, more accurately, the lack of signature on certain leases. If I have misspoken on Moldovan law, I do apologise. We would like to reserve the chance for our legal expert, Mr Roger Gladei, to address that issue in more detail tomorrow. THE PRESIDENT: We have had a chance to talk about the issues that came up about new documents. The Tribunal's decision is that subject without having seen them to the point that the two additional supplementals are indeed responsive to the report of Mr Peer, they are admitted and you may address them, subject to the opportunity for Respondent to have an opportunity to respond to them. Thank you. MR GLEASON: On that signature issue	11:33

	ARB 16 8 ew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			nber 201 a, Austri
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	could take a hardline position that 99 per cent of these documents do contain writing in the signature block. Our calculation on the demonstrative exhibit, CH-4, takes an approach which is perhaps a bit more agreeable perhaps than the preferred approach of the Respondent, and is a little more conservative in discussing what a signature is. Our legal expert may address that in a little more detail tomorrow. But this question about signature of leases is really only affecting a small minority of the over 1500 leases at issue in this case. I would like to make that point clear. I would like to move on to my next point. Just before the break we discussed the acts and omissions attributable to the Respondent in this case and discussed how it did constitute a pattern of state conduct. The attributable acts and omissions breach international obligations found under the US-Moldova BIT in this case. This is because the attributable acts and omissions implicate the overall process of decision-making of the Respondent towards Claimants' investments in this case. The Respondent is clearly responsible for the acts and omissions of local and national authorities acting pursuant to their authority, but		$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\23\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\9\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array}$	administrative faults made by local mayors in interpreting the local Moldovan law, Respondent's characterisation of the facts as such should very much be rejected. I would like to spend a few moments discussing the role of the mayors in this case, because that has become an issuethat is disputed between the parties. Respondent attempts to downplay the role of mayors throughout the Rejoinder. They actually claim that Claimants attempt to inflate the role of the mayors by citing a vague proposition in a brochure financed by two regional organisations not representing the official opinion of either, and that the Claimants cites no Moldovan law on this issue. Well, to the contrary, Moldovan law requires the mayors to carry out the constitution and Moldovan legislation and its preventions protecting foreign investment as stated very clearly in the first expert report of Claimants, Roger Gladei's First Report. Also, very importantly, Moldovan law requires mayors to carry out international law. Respondent's arguments that Claimants do not cite to Moldovan law for this proposition and this proposition is not supported by	99 11:47
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	also very importantly in this case acting under the colour of authority, which includes all of the above allegations. As the Tribunal is well aware, the obligations in this case are determined by the BIT and Claimants do stand behind the BIT breaches alleged in the written pleadings and will not restate those here today. I would like to discuss the Respondent's approach to focusing only on the dispositions in this case. Despite their attempts to focus only on the dispositions, we are very concerned about the overall process of Respondents' decision-making, and it does rise to the level of violating international obligations or international delict in this case. This is not, despite Respondent's best attempts to describe it as so, this is not a case concerning a single aberrant decision of a low level local official, but rather there is a pattern of state conduct in this case. Respondents, as the record shows, public officials repeatedly worked with, and on behalf of Bio-Alianta, the local third party competitor, to illegally interfere with the Claimants' investment to destroy their private contract rights in violation of the BIT. This is not a case of simple errors or mistakes or trivial		7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24	Moldovan law is a bald-faced misstatement of Claimants' submissions. I turn the Tribunal's attention to section 6 of Mr Gladei's Second Report, CEX-4, at paragraph 28, which says that the mayor is the head of local public administration. In 28.2.1, "the Mayor has the obligation to comply with international treaties to which the Republic of Moldova is a party". This was cited by the Claimants on multiple occasions in theReply. Those citations are on the slide. Additionally, the Respondent goes to great lengths to discredit the 131-page reports of the EU and the Council of Europe to highly respected international organisations, by describing it as "a brochure financed by two regional organisations". This is a report, whether the official opinion of these organisations or not, which is very much in accordance with the Moldovan legal principles and cites the same legal principles that Claimants' legal experts also cites concerning the role of mayors in the Republic of Moldova. Claimants do not try to inflate the role of the mayors, they cite the actual law concerning the role of the mayors, and we would like to point	100 11:48

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confie Rev	dentia ised	al 11 Decemb Vienna,	
1	out one last point that the citation,	101 11:49	1	not, by themselves, rise to the level of a breach of 1	103
2	Professor Rusu's report, does not directly address		2	international obligations.	
3	this issue in any way, so Tribunal should disregard		3	Third, therefore the only way for	
4	Respondent's attempts to distance itself from the		4	Claimants to have BIT claims based on the	
5	acts of local mayors in this case		5	dispositions is that they actually challenge the	
6	MR FORTIER: What is, in your own words,		6	dispositions through local procedures and the	
7	very briefly, the position of the mayors in this		7	challenge did not actually resolve but compounded or	
8	case? What is it?		8	made the problem worse. The reasoning that	
9	MR GLEASON: They were important players		9	Respondent bases its argument on is that these local	
10	concerning the acts and omissions which breach		10	acts by themselves do not represent the overall	
11	international treaty obligations in this case. They		11	process of the state's decision-making towards the	
12	have significant authority in Moldova and they have		12	Claimants' investment. This argument must fail for	
13	the obligation to uphold international treaties,		13	both factual and legal reasons.	
14	they breached that obligation in the context of the		14	As we have already discussed, the case is	
15	US-Moldova BIT in this case. I would also like to		15	not about the single aberrant act of a low level	
16	highlight that the Claimants' allegations do not		16	official. First and foremost, as Mr Fortier just	
17	focus solely on the mayors.		17	asked, what is the role of mayors? Mayors are not	
18	MR FORTIER: I know, but I am focusing on		18	equivalent to low level clerks, but rather had	
19	the mayors.		19	significant authority in the Republic of Moldova,	
20	MR GLEASON: Even if we do focus solely on		20	and additionally it is not only about the mayors;	
21	the mayors, acts of the mayors by themselves could		21	there are other local, regional and even national	
22	rise to the level of breaching BIT obligations, as		22	officials implicated in this case.	
23	stated by Moldovan law.		23	The Respondent also ignores the other	
24	Which leads me to my next argument can		24	attributable acts and omissions committed by the	
75	I get a time update?		25	local, regional and national authorities pursuant to	
25					
		102			
1	THE SECRETARY: 48.	102 11:51	1	5	
1 2	MR GLEASON: which is concerning		2	the record that the rule of law, at least in the	104 11:53
1 2 3	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts		2 3	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced	
1 2 3 4	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's		2 3 4	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years	
1 2 3 4 5	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is		2 3 4 5	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the	
1 2 3 4 5 6	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail		2 3 4 5 6	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek		2 3 4 5 6 7	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants'	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the only path for Claimants to address was through the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are distinguishable from the case in front of the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the only path for Claimants to address was through the administrative courts no matter what. This argument		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are distinguishable from the case in front of the Tribunal today. The investment in this case was	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the only path for Claimants to address was through the administrative courts no matter what. This argument is based on erroneous assumptions.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are distinguishable from the case in front of the Tribunal today. The investment in this case was very clearly not abandoned after the dispositions.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 101 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the only path for Claimants to address was through the administrative courts no matter what. This argument is based on erroneous assumptions. The first erroneous assumption is that the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are distinguishable from the case in front of the Tribunal today. The investment in this case was very clearly not abandoned after the dispositions. There was in fact years of litigation following the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the only path for Claimants to address was through the administrative courts no matter what. This argument is based on erroneous assumptions. The first erroneous assumption is that the only acts and omissions of the Respondent implicated		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are distinguishable from the case in front of the Tribunal today. The investment in this case was very clearly not abandoned after the dispositions. There was in fact years of litigation following the dispositions alongside mitigation efforts under very	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the only path for Claimants to address was through the administrative courts no matter what. This argument is based on erroneous assumptions. The first erroneous assumption is that the only acts and omissions of the Respondent implicated by Claimants' BIT claims are the dispositions. That		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are distinguishable from the case in front of the Tribunal today. The investment in this case was very clearly not abandoned after the dispositions. There was in fact years of litigation following the dispositions alongside mitigation efforts under very difficult circumstances.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the only path for Claimants to address was through the administrative courts no matter what. This argument is based on erroneous assumptions. The first erroneous assumption is that the only acts and omissions of the Respondent implicated by Claimants' BIT claims are the dispositions. That is not the case.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are distinguishable from the case in front of the Tribunal today. The investment in this case was very clearly not abandoned after the dispositions. There was in fact years of litigation following the dispositions alongside mitigation efforts under very clifficult circumstances. Even taken at face value, the Respondent's argument concerning seeking correction should fail. The Claimants have demonstrated that this case is	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 0 12 22 23	MR GLEASON: which is concerning Respondent's arguments addressing Claimants' efforts to seek correction, a large part of Respondent's pleadings, a large part or element of its defence is based on the idea that Claimants should not prevail on its BIT claims since they failed to seek corrections of the dispositions, and this argument focuses only on the dispositions and relies on the allegation that the dispositions were single aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial administrative faults and there are a plethora of citations to the record concerning Respondent's argument on that point. Respondent essentially advocates that the only path for Claimants to address was through the administrative courts no matter what. This argument is based on erroneous assumptions. The first erroneous assumption is that the only acts and omissions of the Respondent implicated by Claimants' BIT claims are the dispositions. That is not the case.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the record that the rule of law, at least in the context of Claimants' investment in Floresti, faced serious difficulties in 2011 and the years thereafter and, as demonstrated through the Claimants' pleadings, a pattern of state conduct does exist. Thus, the overall process of Respondent's decision-making towards the Claimants' investment rises to the level of violating international obligations or international delict. The Claimants are not in any way seizing on low level act of maladministration as an excuse to abandon the investment and bring BIT claims similar to some of the cases that Respondent cites in support of its argument, and those cases are distinguishable from the case in front of the Tribunal today. The investment in this case was very clearly not abandoned after the dispositions. There was in fact years of litigation following the dispositions alongside mitigation efforts under very clifficult circumstances. Even taken at face value, the Respondent's argument concerning seeking correction should fail.	

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revis		al 11 Decem Vienna	
-	· ·	105			107
1	officials or trivial administrative faults, but a	11:54	1	in response to Claimants' reply argument concerning	11:57
2	pattern of state conduct. The factual premise upon		2	Administrative Court judges' discretion.	
3	which Respondent's arguments is based does not exist		3	This is an attempt of the Respondent to	
4	in this case. Additionally the Claimants did pursue		4	twist Claimants' words. Actually the Reply of	
5	local remedies as addressed in section 7K of the		5	Claimants clearly said that "judges have discretion	
6	Reply, which I will not rehash for the Tribunal here		6	to stay or suspend administrative acts", and	
7	today. That is outlined in some detail in the		7	Professor Rusu actually agrees with this. There is	
8	written pleadings, so we won't address that again.		8	no real dispute on this point. He says that	
9	I would like to, before moving on to my		9	suspension by Administrative Court of the effects of	
10	next point, just test the Respondent's argument on		10	the challenge administrative act is not automatic,	
11	this issue. I would ask what would Laguardia's		11	it should be requested by the Claimant, and	
12	attempt at Administrative Court actually have looked		12	paragraph 70, judge's decision on granting	
13	like in this case? How was the Administrative Court		13	suspension is discretionary, not arbitrary. The	
14	equipped to handle a holistic attack on investment		14	judge may not arbitrarily deny a request for	
15	beyond just the dispositions? Would we have had		15	suspension, but the grounds in paragraph 33.3 of	
16	multiple lawsuits for each act or omission		16	Mr Gladei's Second Expert Report are met. Clearly	
17	attributable to the Respondent in this case? It is			we have agreement between the experts concerning	
			17 10		
8	not clear. Would the mayoral lease terminations and		18	Administrative Court authority discretion on	
9	statements from the mayors, would those not have		19	challenges and suspending administrative acts.	
20	been used to defend against Laguardia's claims		20	But if we dig a little bit further we	
21	attacking the dispositions? If we look closely at		21	start to see that the Respondent's arguments	
22	the record we see that is exactly what happened in		22	concerning administrative suspension of dispositions	
23	some of the cases which did occur in this case, at		23	is incoherent with the totality of their arguments.	
24	the Balti Court of Appeals concerning the Varvareuca		24	On the one hand, in the Counter-Memorial theystate	
25	disposition, and at Chisinau Economic Court		25	that all the Claimants had to do in this case was	
		106			108
1	concerning the Cosernita disposition. Both of these	106 11:55	1	challenge the dispositions in Administrative Court.	108 11:58
1	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not	106 11:55	2	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits	108 11:58
1 2 3	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also	106 11:55	2 3	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the	108 11:58
1 2 3 4	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of	106 11:55	2 3 4	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in	106 11:55	2 3 4 5	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today.	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases.	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument.	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an	106 11:55	2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember,	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember,	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu.	108 11:58
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions were cancelled, but that did not matter to the	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in	108
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu.	108
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions were cancelled, but that did not matter to the	106 11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu. At the same time, the Respondent argues	108
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions were cancelled, but that did not matter to the Cosemita mayor, for example, as we see various	11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu. At the same time, the Respondent argues that the dispositions were a reasonable	108
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions were cancelled, but that did not matter to the Cosernita mayor, for example, as we see various citations to the record on that point.	11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu. At the same time, the Respondent argues that the dispositions were a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law (paragraph 41 and	108
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions were cancelled, but that did not matter to the Cosernita mayor, for example, as we see various citations to the record on that point. My last point here is don't administrative judges actually have discretion and, as such,	11:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu. At the same time, the Respondent argues that the dispositions were a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law (paragraph 41 and paragraph 50 of Professor Rusu's First Report).	108
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 6 17 8 9 20 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions were cancelled, but that did not matter to the Cosemita mayor, for example, as we see various citations to the record on that point. My last point here is don't administrative judges actually have discretion and, as such, shouldn't we ask yourselves how that discretion	11:55	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu. At the same time, the Respondent argues that the dispositions were a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law (paragraph 41 and paragraph 50 of Professor Rusu's First Report). So which is it? All the Claimants had to do was challenge the dispositions in	108
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 22 12 23	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions were cancelled, but that did not matter to the Cosernita mayor, for example, as we see various citations to the record on that point. My last point here is don't administrative judges actually have discretion and, as such, shouldn't we ask yourselves how that discretion would have been used? Respondent says a party may	11:55	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 1\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu. At the same time, the Respondent argues that the dispositions were a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law (paragraph 41 and paragraph 50 of Professor Rusu's First Report). So which is it? All the Claimants had to do was challenge the dispositions in Administrative Court, and there are strong doubts on	108
	courts found that the SRL Laguardia leases were not registered, citing the disposition, but also referencing the unilateral mayoral terminations of the contracts and also statements of the mayors in those cases. Another important question for the Tribunal to address in engaging in this hypothetical: would local officials have even honoured Administrative Court decisions? In this case there is evidence demonstrating an unwillingness of local mayors to follow court decisions in the context of ignoring the cancellation of ex parte injunctions. Remember, Bio-Alianta obtained ex parte injunctions blocking Laguardia from its leased fields. Those injunctions were cancelled, but that did not matter to the Cosemita mayor, for example, as we see various citations to the record on that point. My last point here is don't administrative judges actually have discretion and, as such, shouldn't we ask yourselves how that discretion	11:55	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	The dispositions could be challenged on the merits with suspensive effects. In other words, if the Claimants had merely gone to local Administrative Court, we would not be here today. The problem would have been solved. That is the thrust of the argument. On the other hand, the Respondent's expert agrees that the Administrative Court judges have discretion concerning stay or suspension of an administrative act, and that for discretion to be exercised in favour of suspension, that the decision would need to be based in part on strong doubts on the presumption of legality of the contested administrative act. That is the standard stated in Mr Gladei's report and agreed upon by Mr Rusu. At the same time, the Respondent argues that the dispositions were a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law (paragraph 41 and paragraph 50 of Professor Rusu's First Report). So which is it? All the Claimants had to do was challenge the dispositions in	108

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi		al 11 December 20 Vienna, Austr
4	dispessitions. On an the other band if the	109	4	111
1	dispositions. Or, on the other hand, if the	11:59	1	unique circumstances which are distinguishable from 12:01
2	dispositions are a reasonable interpretation of		2	the case in front of the Tribunal today, and
3 ⊿	Moldovan law, then any attempt to suspend the		3 4	Claimants' request that this attempt be rejected.
4	administrative acts would have likely failed. The arguments are not coherent and this demonstrates a		4 5	To summarise my arguments on the
5 6	lack of strength of these arguments in this case.			requirement or lack of a requirement to seek correction, the idea that the dispositions were
6 7	Fortunately this Tribunal is not required		6 7	based on a reasonable interpretation of law is
8	to engage in the speculation. It is an interesting		8	misguided. It ignores relevant factual context and
9	exercise to test the strength of their arguments,		9	it should be rejected. The argument that the
10	but it is not required because there is neither a		10	illegal acts in this case are limited to simple
11	requirement to pursue a local remedy, nor a		11	aberrant acts of low level officials or trivial
12	requirement to seek correction under the BIT. And		12	administrative faults, ignores the pattern of state
13	to find so would be to do by the back door that		13	conduct in this case. It also ignores the role of
14	which the BIT and ICSID convention expressly		14	the mayors under Moldovan law and it should be
15	excluded by the front door, and that is not my		15	rejected.
16	language but the language of the Helnan ad hoc		16	The notion that the illegal acts would
17	Annulment Committee from 2010 which is cited by the		17	have been corrected by the administrative courts in
18	Respondents.		18	this case had different procedures been followed by
19	We see that nationals and companies of		19	the Claimants is highly speculative and should be
20	neither party have access to binding international		20	rejected. The Respondent ultimately ignores the
21	arbitration without first resorting to domestic		21	myriad attempts that Claimants did engage in to seek
22	courts. The BIT cannot be clearer on this point.		22	correction and remedies in this case. Thus,
23	Local remedies are not needed and to impose such a		23	Respondents' arguments on this point should fail.
	requirement as a constitutive element Claimants		24	If I may, may I please have a time update?
			25	THE SECRETARY: One hour.
24 25	are not confused about the jurisdictional versus		25	
24	are not confused about the jurisdictional versus	110	25	112
24 25	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but		1	112 MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03
24 25 1 2	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a		1 2	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that
24 25 1 2 3	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants'		1 2 3	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights
24 25 1 2 3 4	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts		1 2 3 4	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did
24 25 1 2 3 4 5	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter		1 2 3 4 5	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case.		1 2 3 4 5 6	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings.
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants'
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back.
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the substantive cause of action".	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions – if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith third parties is that even if the dispositions did
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the substantive cause of action". One more case cited by Respondent, it is	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith third parties is that even if the dispositions did take away enforceability of the lease rights against
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the substantive cause of action". One more case cited by Respondent, it is the ECE case, which says, "Where recourse to the	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith third parties is that even if the dispositions did take away enforceability of the lease rights against third parties, it did not matter in this case
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 31 41 51 61 71 18	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the substantive cause of action". One more case cited by Respondent, it is the ECE case, which says, "Where recourse to the local courts has been held to be relevant to the	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith third parties is that even if the dispositions did take away enforceability of the lease rights against third parties, it did not matter in this case because Claimants could still have enforced those
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 314 15 16 17 18 19	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the substantive cause of action". One more case cited by Respondent, it is the ECE case, which says, "Where recourse to the local courts has been held to be relevant to the question of breach, that does not make it into a	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith third parties is that even if the dispositions did take away enforceability of the lease rights against third parties, it did not matter in this case because Claimants could still have enforced those private lease rights against Bio-Alianta because
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 314 15 16 17 18 19 20	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the substantive cause of action". One more case cited by Respondent, it is the ECE case, which says, "Where recourse to the local courts has been held to be relevant to the question of breach, that does not make it into a mandatory precondition for the admissibility of the	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith third parties is that even if the dispositions did take away enforceability of the lease rights against third parties, it did not matter in this case because Claimants could still have enforced those private lease rights against Bio-Alianta because Bio-Alianta was a bad faith third party.
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the substantive cause of action". One more case cited by Respondent, it is the ECE case, which says, "Where recourse to the local courts has been held to be relevant to the question of breach, that does not make it into a mandatory precondition for the admissibility of the claim before an investment Tribunal, nor into a	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith third parties is that even if the dispositions did take away enforceability of the lease rights against third parties, it did not matter in this case because Claimants could still have enforced those private lease rights against Bio-Alianta because Bio-Alianta was a bad faith third party. We need to analyse the situation through
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	substantive nature of Respondent's arguments but to impose a requirement to seek local remedy as a constitutive or substantive element of Claimants' claims without first resorting to domestic courts would render the language of the BIT and the Letter of Submittal meaningless in this particular case. If I can cite just another quote from Helnan, which I think is very instructive in this particular instance, it says that "it would empty the development of investment arbitration of much of its force and effect if, despite a clear intention of state parties not to require the pursuit of local remedies as a precondition to arbitration, such requirement to be read back in as part of the substantive cause of action". One more case cited by Respondent, it is the ECE case, which says, "Where recourse to the local courts has been held to be relevant to the question of breach, that does not make it into a mandatory precondition for the admissibility of the claim before an investment Tribunal, nor into a constitutive requirement for the claim".	12:00	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR GLEASON: There is a brief argument 12:03 made by the Respondent concerning the idea that Claimants could still enforce their lease rights against Bio-Alianta and thus the dispositions did not affect Claimants' rights in this case, so there is no causation. It is this argument concerning bad faith third parties. I would like to very briefly address that argument and point out another inconsistency in Respondent's pleadings. The situation concerning Claimants' ability to enforce the lease rights against Bio-Alianta, and the argument here is that even if the dispositions if I can take a step back. The Respondent's arguments on bad faith third parties is that even if the dispositions did take away enforceability of the lease rights against third parties, it did not matter in this case because Claimants could still have enforced those private lease rights against Bio-Alianta because Bio-Alianta was a bad faith third party. We need to analyse the situation through the lens of what the Claimants knew in 2011, not

bign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confie Rev	dentia rised	al 11 Decem Vienna	
4	union this and month that Oleiner stal vields were not	113	4	etternated to tall to Die Aliante about the conflict	115
1 2	raise this argument that Claimants' right were not affected and there was no causation in this case	12:04	1 2	•	12:07
2 3	because Claimants could have enforced their rights		2	they threatened his life and the security of his family in Colorado.	
3 4	still against Bio-Alianta is another speculative		4	Respondents tried to hold this against the	
5	argument which tries to set up an impossible		5	Claimants stating that the case was dismissed	
6	situation for the Claimants. They say that		6	without prejudice. He could have fulfilled the	
7	Laguardia failed to plead that Bio-Alianta acted in		7	requirements, in other words, engaged in amicable	
8	bad faith. They could have made that argument and		8	dispute resolution with Bio-Alianta, a party that	
9	still enforced their lease rights. We see that at		9	had threatened his life previously, and then refiled	
0	various points of the Rejoinder, at the executive		10	their claim. They did not.	
1	summary, paragraph 83, paragraph 305.		11	This line of reasoning ignores very	
2	If we again put ourselves in this position		12	important facts. By this time it was December 2012,	
3	of Laguardia in 2011, we have to think that		13	two farming seasons had been lost, the investment	
4	Bio-Alianta would have likely argued that they were		14	had been destroyed, Mr Grot had been forced to leave	
5	unaware of any existing rights. They would have		15	Moldova by this point and to wind up his mitigation	
6	argued that at the time their leases were		16	efforts while he was facing serious personal	
7	registered, the Laguardia leases were terminated by		17	security threats.	
8	the mayors and not registered as a result of the		18	Respondent says that they are not trying	
9	dispositions, so there is no way they could be		19	to impose exhaustion of remedies on the Claimants	
0	considered a bad faith third party, and again they		20	but they keep arguing that facts surround	
21	would have cited various pieces of the evidentiary		21	registration are irrelevant. Mr Grot should have	
22	record on file in this case. For example, the		22	returned again and again to court to continue to	
23	mayoral lease terminations, the retroactive refusal		23	enforce his rights even when being threatened with	
24	and simultaneous deletion of Laguardia's leases via		24	death, and this misguided logic should be rejected by the Tribunal.	
		114			116
	themselves.	114 12:05	1	I have one last point I would like to make	116 12:08
	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument		2	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren	116 12:08
2	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably			before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan	116 12:08
2 3 4	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities.		2 3 4	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am,	116 12:08
1 2 3 4 5	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement		2 3	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says		2 3 4 5 6	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this.	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the		2 3 4 5 6 7	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well,	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties.	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point.	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to	116 12:08
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 15	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over twothirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining	116 12:08
234567890123456	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces	116
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution procedures with Bio-Alianta before proceeding to	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces of the broken investment in the other villages.	116
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution procedures with Bio-Alianta before proceeding to evaluate the claims.	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces of the broken investment in the other villages. That is demonstrated by the record. By	116
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution procedures with Bio-Alianta before proceeding to evaluate the claims. Now this ignored the futility argument	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces of the broken investment in the other villages. That is demonstrated by the record. By August 2011, just a few months later, Claimants had	116
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 1 2 8 9 1 8 1 8	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution procedures with Bio-Alianta before proceeding to evaluate the claims. Now this ignored the futility argument raised by Laguardia in this case. This ignored the	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces of the broken investment in the other villages. That is demonstrated by the record. By August 2011, just a few months later, Claimants had entered into new arrangements with the third party,	116
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 1 3 1	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution procedures with Bio-Alianta before proceeding to evaluate the claims. Now this ignored the futility argument raised by Laguardia in this case. This ignored the other ongoing cases between these parties. This	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces of the broken investment in the other villages. That is demonstrated by the record. By August 2011, just a few months later, Claimants had entered into new arrangements with the third party, been growing different crops under servicing	116
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 8 9 10 12 10 12 10 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution procedures with Bio-Alianta before proceeding to evaluate the claims. Now this ignored the futility argument raised by Laguardia in this case. This ignored the	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces of the broken investment in the other villages. That is demonstrated by the record. By August 2011, just a few months later, Claimants had entered into new arrangements with the third party,	116
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 2 3	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution procedures with Bio-Alianta before proceeding to evaluate the claims. Now this ignored the futility argument raised by Laguardia in this case. This ignored the other ongoing cases between these parties. This ignored the parallel State Chancellery proceedings, and it also ignores a very important fact that	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over twothirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces of the broken investment in the other villages. That is demonstrated by the record. By August 2011, just a few months later, Claimants had entered into new arrangements with the third party, been growing different crops under servicing agreements. It was a totally different plan. And to be clear, had the intervention in the other two	116
2345678901234567892223	We also know that Bio-Alianta's argument that they were not acting in bad faith probably would have been supported by the local authorities. I cite once again to the now famous statement of Mayor Nina Ivanes (exhibit C-94), where she says that she was instructed from above to terminate the Laguardia leases for the benefit of Bio-Alianta. The Respondent further argues that all the Claimants had to do was try to sue. All they had to do was sue the lessors and sue the third parties. They also identify the parties agree that Claimants did attempt to enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta and the lessors, and the case was dismissed in 2012. The judge required the Claimants to attempt to engage in amicable dispute resolution procedures with Bio-Alianta before proceeding to evaluate the claims. Now this ignored the futility argument raised by Laguardia in this case. This ignored the other ongoing cases between these parties. This ignored the parallel State Chancellery proceedings,	12:05	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	before handing the baton on to my colleague, Coren Hinkle, who will discuss issues relating to Moldovan law, who is more versed in these issues than I am, and that is the situation in Rosietici. There are a couple of points I would like to make on this. First and foremost, the damages and the loss of the investment in Rosietici can be traced back to Disposition 2 in Varvareuca. How? Well, because after the second disposition over two-thirds of the investment had been destroyed by that point. All attempts after this point were survival or mitigation efforts, and instead of focusing on harvesting in Rosietici, Claimants had to drastically change plans, change the remaining operations as they were trying to pick up the pieces of the broken investment in the other villages. That is demonstrated by the record. By August 2011, just a few months later, Claimants had entered into new arrangements with the third party, been growing different crops under servicing agreements. It was a totally different plan. And	11€

	Jign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidentia Revised	al 11 Decem Vienna	
18Varvareuca. Filed in bulk, all at one time, 34018Respondent's assertion that the city hall's action19persons allegedly signed and submitted these lease19was reasonable, and that this must be taken in light20notification terminations on one day.20of all of the state conduct that has been exhibited21On investigating this, the prosecutor21towards Laguardia, and also take in the context that22found that 38 of these notifications had been signed22in order to justify those dispositions, the city23by dead people and 44 had been signed to redefine the23hall had to do two things: they had to redefine the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22 3	negotiations with a new third party. The change of 12 plans, negotiations, would not have taken application, but they were forced into this mitigation situation as a consequence of the government's intervention in the other villages. The last point I will make is that the Rosietici leases were not properly terminated. The Respondent tried to say that the Claimants should not be able to claim a fourth year of damages for Rosietici because the leases were properly terminated in that village. That is not clear from the record. It ignores C-88, which again is a very interesting exhibit it is the information note of prosecutor Artur Sircu where he calls into question the validity of the lease termination notifications filed in bulk, much like the lease termination notifications we have addressed in Varvareuca. Filed in bulk, all at one time, 340 persons allegedly signed and submitted these lease notification terminations on one day. On investigating this, the prosecutor found that 38 of these notifications had been signed by dead people and 44 had been signed by people who	Revised 117 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23	Again, just by way of introduction, my name is Coren Hinkle, I will be discussing some of the relevant legal matters. While we certainly do defer to the expertise of the Moldovan legal experts, including Professor Rusu, but most assuredly Mr Rod Gladei, I will do my best to attempt to summarise some of the more pertinent Moldovan legal issues today. Fortunately, Mr Gleason covered many of them, so I am going to attempt to address directly just a handful of the issues that are relevant that are in dispute here. I do have an outline. The Tribunal may review the outline I am sure they will but it is outlining some of the issues that I intend to discuss. There are a number of disputed issues specifically. I intend to hone in on issue no 1, which is the reasonableness of the Respondent's assertion that the city hall's action was reasonable, and that this must be taken in light of all of the state conduct that has been exhibited towards Laguardia, and also take in the context that in order to justify those dispositions, the city hall had to do two things: they had to redefine the	
23 That had to do two things. they had to redenine the		were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be	24 25	term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of	
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if".					
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 25 It is also of note that the lack of		counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12	2:10 1	- · ·	
 24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 It is also of note that the lack of 26 It is also of note that the lack of 27 It is also of note that the lack of 28 It is also of note that the lack of 29 It is also of note that the lack of 20 It is also of note that the lack of 21 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 20 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 20 It is also of note that the lack of 21 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 20 It is also of note that the lack of 21 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 22 the higher officials, as well as evidence of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 	2	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of	2:10 1 2	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really	12:15
 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors 	2 3 4	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a	2:10 1 2 3 4	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors	12:15
 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight 	2 3 4 5	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight	2:10 1 2 3 4 5	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to	12:15
 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of the salso of note that the lack of the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, 	2 3 4 5 6	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here.	2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent,	12:15
 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". tis also of note that the lack of tis also of note that the lack of term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". tis also of note that the lack of the lack of the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of 	2 3 4 5 6 7	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of	2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly	
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 1188 1 1 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:10 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 these documents been filed in one day by such a 1 indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors 5 large group of people? I think we have some insight 6 be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, 7 The attempt to exclude the fourth year of 8 was not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to	2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not.	12:15
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 1 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:10 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 4 these documents been filed in one day by such a 5 large group of people? I think we have some insight 6 by looking at this exhibit here. 7 The attempt to exclude the fourth year of 8 losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to 9 damages, which will be addressed in more detail by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by	2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to	12:15
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 1 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:10 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 these documents been filed in one day by such a 5 for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 5 by looking at this exhibit here. 7 The attempt to exclude the fourth year of 6 7 The attempt to exclude the fourth year of 8 losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to 9 9 The next disputed issue that I am going to 10 try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno.	2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions	12:15
24were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be24term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 251counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:10 21reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 22were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 31reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 23back to that interesting question: how could all of 41reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 24these documents been filed in one day by such a 51collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 44these documents been filed in one day by such a 55for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 66by looking at this exhibit here. 7The attempt to exclude the fourth year of 86be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, 78losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to 99The next disputed issue that I am going to 109Andrew Astuno.11With that I will pass the baton to11	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to	2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid	12:15
24were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be24term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 251counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:101reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 122were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 4 these documents been filed in one day by such a 5 large group of people? I think we have some insight 6 by looking at this exhibit here. 71reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 the higher officials, as well as evidence of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors 5 for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 6 be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, 77The attempt to exclude the fourth year of 8 losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to 9 damages, which will be addressed in more detail by 10 Andrew Astuno.9The next disputed issue that I am going to 1011With that I will pass the baton to 1210the kinkle, who will discuss the legal issues 1311disposition. On its face this may not necessarily 1313be all that relevant to the outcome of these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If	2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these	12:15
24were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be24term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of1counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications user suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight 6 by looking at this exhibit here.1reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 the higher officials, as well as evidence of solution with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not.7The attempt to exclude the fourth year of damages, which will be addressed in more detail by 109The next disputed issue that I am going to 1011With that I will pass the baton to 129The next disputed issue that I am going to 1012Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues so concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. 15113THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 10 11 12 13 14 15 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the	12:15
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 1 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:10 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 these documents been filed in one day by such a 3 indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors 5 large group of people? I think we have some insight 5 for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 6 be areasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly 8 losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to 9 The next disputed issue that I am going to 11 With that I will pass the baton to 11 disposition. On its face this may not necessarily 13 concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If 14 therelevant to the outcome of these 14 mayh	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the next two sections, so you will be tight.	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business	12:15
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 1 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:10 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 these documents been filed in one day by such a 1 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 these documents been filed in one day by such a 5 for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 5 bases ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to 9 The next disputed issue that I am going to 10 Andrew Astuno. 10 try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions 11 With that I will pass the baton to 11 12 Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues 10 13 concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If 14 14 we may have a moment to change the chord. 14 15 THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the 14 these dispositions again go to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 17	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the next two sections, so you will be tight. MR FORTIER: Which one of the many papers	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 12 10 11 12 13 14 15 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations in overlooking any known problems or	12:15
24were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be24term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of1counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications back to that interesting question: how could all of a back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a 5 large group of people? I think we have some insight 6 by looking at this exhibit here.1reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 122 2 the higher officials, as well as evidence of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not.1With that I will pass the baton to 10Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord.9The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions 11 did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid 12 disposition. On its face this may not necessarily 13 be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of 14 these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations in overlooking any known problems or obligations to issue a valid disposition, and that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the next two sections, so you will be tight. MR FORTIER: Which one of the many papers should we look at now? The Moldovan legal matters?	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations to issue a valid disposition, and that	12:15
24were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be24term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". It is also of note that the lack of1counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:101reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 122were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here.1reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonableness. So in order for it to the attempt to exclude the fourth year of romer in With that I will pass the baton to it must be a driessed in more detail by Andrew Astuno.9The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the disposition tid disatisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid tid sposition. On its face this may not necessarily the sed dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations in overlooking any known problems or obligations to issue a valid disposition, and that again goes to the mayor's motive.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 11 12 14 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 11 11	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the next two sections, so you will be tight. MR FORTIER: Which one of the many papers should we look at now? The Moldovan legal matters? MR HINKLE: Yes. Just one quick point of	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations to issue a valid disposition, and that again goes to the mayor's motive.	12:15
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor concluded that the documents were suspected to be 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:10 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 these documents been filed in one day by such a 1 reasonableness. So in order for it to 5 by looking at this exhibit here. 5 for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 6 by looking at this exhibit here. 7 it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly 8 losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to 9 The next disputed issue that 1 am going to 10 Andrew Astuno. 10 try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions 11 With that I will pass the baton to 11 the relevant to the outcome of these 12 Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues 12 disposition. On its face this may not necessarily 13 concerning Moldovan law in thi	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the next two sections, so you will be tight. MR FORTIER: Which one of the many papers should we look at now? The Moldovan legal matters? MR HINKLE: Yes. Just one quick point of clarification. You said that there were 21 minutes	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations to issue a valid disposition, and that again goes to the mayor's motive.	12:15
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 118 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 1 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:10 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of 1 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 these documents been filed in one day by such a 5 for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 5 by looking at this exhibit here. 6 be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, 7 The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to manages, which will be addressed in more detail by 0 Andrew Astuno. 9 The next disputed issue that I am going to 11 With that I will pass the baton to 11 did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid 12 Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues 11 did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 21 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10$	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the next two sections, so you will be tight. MR FORTIER: Which one of the many papers should we look at now? The Moldovan legal matters? MR HINKLE: Yes. Just one quick point of clarification. You said that there were 21 minutes left for the next two sections. That does not	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations to issue a valid disposition, and that again goes to the mayor's motive. There are some uncontested issues as well, but Mr Gleason has covered most of them so let me	12:15
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 1 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 1 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:110 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors 5 for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 6 be areasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly 8 was not. 9 The next disputed issue that 1 am going to 10 Andrew Astuno. 11 was not. 11 We may have a moment to change the chord. 11 12 THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the may thave a moment to change the chord. 13 THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the may sin trying to stop Laguardia's business 16 norext two sections. So you will be tight.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 20\\ 12\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22$	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the next two sections, so you will be tight. MR FORTIER: Which one of the many papers should we look at now? The Moldovan legal matters? MR HINKLE: Yes. Just one quick point of clarification. You said that there were 21 minutes left for the next two sections. That does not include the 20-minute additional time for	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations in overlooking any known problems or obligations to issue a valid disposition, and that again goes to the mayor's motive. There are some uncontested issues as well, but Mr Gleason has covered most of them so let me focus on one. This was addressed a little earlier	12:15
24 were abroad at that time, and thus the prosecutor 24 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 25 concluded that the documents were suspected to be 1 term "refuse", and then ignore the term "only if". 1 counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 12:110 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 2 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us 1 reasonableness is evident by the undue pressure from 12 3 back to that interesting question: how could all of 3 collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really 4 indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors 5 for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to 6 be areasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly 8 was not. 9 The next disputed issue that 1 am going to 10 Andrew Astuno. 11 was not. 11 We may have a moment to change the chord. 11 12 THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the may thave a moment to change the chord. 13 THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the may sin trying to stop Laguardia's business 16 norext two sections. So you will be tight.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 20\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	counterfeit. These lease terminations notifications 13 were suspected to be counterfeited. Which brings us back to that interesting question: how could all of these documents been filed in one day by such a large group of people? I think we have some insight by looking at this exhibit here. The attempt to exclude the fourth year of losses ignores Claimants' ex ante approach to damages, which will be addressed in more detail by Andrew Astuno. With that I will pass the baton to Mr Hinkle, who will discuss the legal issues concerning Moldovan law in this particular case. If we may have a moment to change the chord. THE PRESIDENT: 21 minutes left for the next two sections, so you will be tight. MR FORTIER: Which one of the many papers should we look at now? The Moldovan legal matters? MR HINKLE: Yes. Just one quick point of clarification. You said that there were 21 minutes left for the next two sections. That does not include the 20-minute additional time for THE PRESIDENT: Correct. 20 minutes for	2:10 2:10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 3	the higher officials, as well as evidence of collusion with Bio-Alianta, and that really indicates the motive that was supplied by the mayors for a lack of reasonableness. So in order for it to be a reasonable action, the motive must be innocent, it must be a mistake, and in this case it clearly was not. The next disputed issue that I am going to try to focus on is whether or not the dispositions did satisfy the Moldovan requirements for a valid disposition. On its face this may not necessarily be all that relevant to the outcome of these proceedings, the problem is that the invalidity of these dispositions again go to the motive of the mayors in trying to stop Laguardia's business operations to issue a valid disposition, and that again goes to the mayor's motive. There are some uncontested issues as well, but Mr Gleason has covered most of them so let me focus on one. This was addressed a little earlier by the Tribunal, and this is slide 5, page 3. This	12:15

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis		al 11 Decem Vienna	
1		121 12:16	1	collectively indicate what the mayor's motive truly	123
2	first is where there is the mutual agreement of the	12.10	2	Was.	12.20
3	parties. Clearly that was not the case here. The		3	First, in issuing the dispositions, the	
4	second time is if there is a court judgment. That		4	mayor had to redefine a commonly used term "refuse",	
5	as well was not at play here.		5	and then they had to ignore the term "only if" in	
6	These issues are essential in		6	section 20 of the regulations on keeping registers,	
7	understanding how Moldova not only violated its own		7	and that limited the mayor's power exclusively.	
8	laws, its own obligations to its domestic code, but		8	Respondent also provides no evidence of how the	
9	also international obligations as well. Mr Gleason		9	mayors arrived at their alleged interpretation.	
10	addressed that the disposition was one of a series		10	This is pure attorney speculation. Further, the	
11	of acts of state conduct that was taken by		11	chancellery, the Floresti court twice determined	
12	Respondent's officials at many different levels.		12	that the dispositions were ungrounded and again	
13	You will hear testimony in the next couple of days		13	lacked any legal basis.	
14	that it was not only at the lower level, the village		14	What does that mean? That means that in	
15	level, but it was also at the regional level and in		15	their view the dispositions could not be reasonable.	
16	addition it may have even been at the highest level		16	We also have to look at the totality of	
17	of government within Moldova itself.		17	the mayor's action in this situation to determine	
8	Claimants' leases were private party		18	whether or not the action was reasonable. So what	
9	agreements and they became effective upon a		19	do we have? We have an ungrounded disposition	
20	conclusion of those agreements. Their validity has		20	determined by the courts. We have improper or	
21	never been disputed according to Moldovan law.		21	potentially illegal terminations. We have a failure	
22	Now, Respondent assumes, or asserts, that		22	to send the disposition from mandatory review to the	
23	the genesis of the challenge to the disposition was		23	chancellery. We have a failure to include the means	
24	made by Moldova itself, but this is certainly not		24	of how to appeal the disposition itself, a crucial	
~-	the case, because in both Floresti court decisions,		25	due process right, and then we have all of the other	
25					
		122			124
1	in 2013	122 12:18	1	evidence of collusion and co-operation and	
1	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our		2	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason	
1 2 3	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at		2 3	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this	
1 2 3 4	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be		2 3 4	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was.	
1 2 3 4 5	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we		2 3 4 5	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal	
1 2 3 4 5 6	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it.		2 3 4 5 6	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 – the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion		2 3 4 5 6 7	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was. We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the		2 3 4 5 6	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was. We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was. We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in 2013 – THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were	124 12:21
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in 2013 – THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants'	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was the genesis of review of those dispositions and this	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 – the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration. While each argument was presented to the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was the genesis of review of those dispositions and this is well within its right and evidence that Laguardia	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 – the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration. While each argument was presented to the court, and again the court refused to adopt those	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was the genesis of review of those dispositions and this is well within its right and evidence that Laguardia was in fact attempting to challenge the validity of	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration. While each argument was presented to the court, and again the court refused to adopt those arguments that Respondent asserted here today and	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	in 2013 – THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide – Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 – both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was the genesis of review of those dispositions and this is well within its right and evidence that Laguardia was in fact attempting to challenge the validity of these dispositions.	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration. While each argument was presented to the court, and again the court refused to adopt those arguments that Respondent asserted here today and that Moldova asserted at that time, which was that the compulsory elements were not in the lease, these allegations that the compulsory elements were not in	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was the genesis of review of those dispositions and this is well within its right and evidence that Laguardia was in fact attempting to challenge the validity of these dispositions. There were three times when the	12:18	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration. While each argument was presented to the court, and again the court refused to adopt those arguments that Respondent asserted here today and that Moldova asserted at that time, which was that the compulsory elements were not in the lease, these	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was the genesis of review of those dispositions and this is well within its right and evidence that Laguardia was in fact attempting to challenge the validity of these dispositions. There were three times when the dispositions were reviewed and the conclusion was the same each time, that the dispositions were unfounded and that they lacked any legal basis.	12:18	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 21\\ 22\\ 12\end{array}$	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration. While each argument was presented to the court, and again the court refused to adopt those arguments that Respondent asserted here today and that Moldova asserted at that time, which was that the compulsory elements were not in the lease, these allegations that the compulsory elements were not in the lease, the court still found that the dispositions were adopted without any legal basis	
$1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 2 \\ 13 \\ 4 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 9 \\ 20 \\ 1 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 1$	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was the genesis of review of those dispositions and this is well within its right and evidence that Laguardia was in fact attempting to challenge the validity of these dispositions. There were three times when the dispositions were reviewed and the conclusion was the same each time, that the dispositions were unfounded and that they lacked any legal basis. While Respondent maintains that Disposition 1-A was	12:18	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration. While each argument was presented to the court, and again the court refused to adopt those arguments that Respondent asserted here today and that Moldova asserted at that time, which was that the compulsory elements were not in the lease, these allegations that the compulsory elements were not in the lease, the court still found that the dispositions were adopted without any legal basis Principles of administrative certainty that are	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 0 21 22	in 2013 THE PRESIDENT: We are missing in our bundle these slides. We don't need them now, but at the lunch break if we could have them, that would be great. Slide 7 and no doubt slide 8, because we jump from 6-9. (Pause) We have it. MR HINKLE: Despite Respondent's assertion that Respondent itself, Moldova, initiated the challenge to the legality of the disposition, both Floresti court decisions, and you can review the citations themselves on the slide Respondent's exhibit 6, pages 5 and 6 and then also Claimants' exhibit 43 on page 7 both indicate that Laguardia itself and its request sent to the chancellery was the genesis of review of those dispositions and this is well within its right and evidence that Laguardia was in fact attempting to challenge the validity of these dispositions. There were three times when the dispositions were reviewed and the conclusion was the same each time, that the dispositions were unfounded and that they lacked any legal basis.	12:18	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 12\\ 21\\ 22\\ 12\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22\\ 22$	instructions from higher above that Mr Gleason addressed in his part of the report. All of this indicates what the mayor's true motive actually was We can skip over slide 10 the Tribunal is certainly welcome to address it but essentially many of the same arguments that Respondent has raised in this proceeding regarding the compulsory elements to a lease that were allegedly not included in the lease itself when they were registered, those arguments were all raised to both Floresti District Courts in 2013 and 2014, and the Floresti Courts both times refused to adopt those as a basis for refusal of registration. While each argument was presented to the court, and again the court refused to adopt those arguments that Respondent asserted here today and that Moldova asserted at that time, which was that the compulsory elements were not in the lease, these allegations that the compulsory elements were not in the lease, the court still found that the dispositions were adopted without any legal basis	

www.dianaburden.com

bign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confie Rev	dentia vised		a, Austr
1	later, prohibit the mayor from unilaterally	125 12:23	1	issue here.	127 12:26
2	unwinding private lease agreements.	12:23	2	MR FORTIER: Don't waste your time! Go	12:20
3	In his report, Mr Gladei confirms that		3	on.	
4	Disposition 2 would have been subject to the same		4	MR HINKLE: There is a specific procedure	
5	findings and conditions under Disposition 1-A.		5	for registering a lease. Once the agreements are	
6	Thus, to ensure the principles of certainty and		6	concluded, they are reviewed, stamped and provided a	
7	consistency in Moldovan law, the Floresti District		7	specific registration number. Once that happens,	
8	Court decisions relating to Disposition 1-A would		8	the mayor has one opportunity to refuse that lease.	
9	apply to Disposition 2 as well. In the same vein,		9	If the mayor chooses not to refuse that lease, his	
10	because an international tribunals such as this, may		10	power ends there and the District Court decisions in	
11	not act as Courts of Appeal for the application of		11	2013, as well as the decision in 2014, are	
12	domestic Moldovan law, but the Floresti District		12	conclusive on this fact.	
13	Court decisions are conclusive on the legality of		13	The Moldovan courts confirmed that the	
14	groundlessness of the dispositions as well as		14	registration procedure did occur, and that the	
15	groundlessness of the alleged justifications for		15	leases were in fact registered, and they also	
16	those dispositions.		16	confirmed that the power to refuse registration	
17	Under Moldovan law a valid agreement is		17	stops upon that registration itself. Respondent's	
18	concluded upon the agreement of the essential terms		18	legal experts suggested that the mayor adopted a	
19	under Article 6(3) of the Law on Lease Agricultures		19	contorted definition of the term "refuse" to attempt	
20	and that provides those terms for that agreement.		20	to justify those dispositions. That justification	
21	Mr Gladei has reviewed the leases, and he has		21	has no support in the legal record, does not exist	
22	determined that in his mind they were all in fact		22	in Moldovan law, and requires the Tribunal to	
23	valid. While there are a few deviations, those		23	suspend its own understanding of linguistic terms.	
24	deviations were necessary due to the conditions on		24	Claimants submit, and the Moldovan courts	
	the ground in Moldova. The fact that there are no		25	agree, that the plain language of section 20 of the	
25					
		126			128
1	street names, there are no physical addresses, but	126 12:24	1	8 1 3	128 12:28
1 2	there are plots of land and there are specific	126 12:24	2	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have	
1 2 3	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own	126 12:24	2 3	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen	
1 2 3 4	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements	126 12:24	2 3 4	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of	
1 2 3 4 5	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity	126 12:24	2 3 4 5	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage	
1 2 3 4 5 6	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly.	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if"	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court,	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court,	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today.	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8 also.	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power. Rather, it is evidence of the unreasonable extent	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8 also. THE SECRETARY: I think it is after 4.	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power. Rather, it is evidence of the unreasonable extent that the mayors went to to contort themselves and	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8 also. THE SECRETARY: I think it is after 4. MR FORTIER: Because of the numbering,	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power. Rather, it is evidence of the unreasonable extent that the mayors went to to contort themselves and their justification in order to commit their	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8 also. THE SECRETARY: I think it is after 4. MR FORTIER: Because of the numbering, which is somewhat inexact, at the appropriate	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power. Rather, it is evidence of the unreasonable extent that the mayors went to to contort themselves and their justification in order to commit their overreach in this matter.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8 also. THE SECRETARY: I think it is after 4. MR FORTIER: Because of the numbering, which is somewhat inexact, at the appropriate moment, not while you are using your precious time,	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power. Rather, it is evidence of the unreasonable extent that the mayors went to to contort themselves and their justification in order to commit their overreach in this matter. In Respondent's expert's treatise, he	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8 also. THE SECRETARY: I think it is after 4. MR FORTIER: Because of the numbering, which is somewhat inexact, at the appropriate moment, not while you are using your precious time, if the Claimant could give us another set of these	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power. Rather, it is evidence of the unreasonable extent that the mayors went to to contort themselves and their justification in order to commit their overreach in this matter. In Respondent's expert's treatise, he expresses the view that public officials can only do	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8 also. THE SECRETARY: I think it is after 4. MR FORTIER: Because of the numbering, which is somewhat inexact, at the appropriate moment, not while you are using your precious time, if the Claimant could give us another set of these slides.	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power. Rather, it is evidence of the unreasonable extent that the mayors went to to contort themselves and their justification in order to commit their overreach in this matter. In Respondent's expert's treatise, he expresses the view that public officials can only do what the law provides. An ex post refusal is not	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	there are plots of land and there are specific owners in the registry that are registered that own those plots of land, so reference to these elements of the leases themselves do satisfy the validity requirement and I would invite the Tribunal to review Mr Gladei's First Report which addresses the validity very thoroughly. The experts agree that the issues of validity, including the dispute over the essential terms, are to be resolved by the parties in court, and that is the parties to the lease agreement, not the parties here today. MR FORTIER: I think we are missing page 8 also. THE SECRETARY: I think it is after 4. MR FORTIER: Because of the numbering, which is somewhat inexact, at the appropriate moment, not while you are using your precious time, if the Claimant could give us another set of these slides. MR HINKLE: Certainly. This morning we	126 12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"refuse" that Respondent relies upon can only have one meaning. A refusal of anything must happen before the completion of that act. By way of example: a marriage contract. One signs a marriage contract. Once it is signed they cannot refuse to re-sign it. Temporally that is impossible. Moreover, Respondent cites no authority that the term "ex post refusal" exists anywhere in Moldovan law. Additionally, the term "only if" clearly expresses a mandatory exclusion for all other bases except those provided in section 20. Redefining express terms in the law is not a justification for expanding mayoral power. Rather, it is evidence of the unreasonable extent that the mayors went to to contort themselves and their justification in order to commit their overreach in this matter. In Respondent's expert's treatise, he expresses the view that public officials can only do what the law provides. An ex post refusal is not provided, yet in his report he suggest that the	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 20 a, Austi
1	It is also of note that in the same	129	1	refusing it.	131
2	writing he acknowledges that any doubt in applying	12:29	1 2	Moldovan court decisions provide clear	12:32
23	an administrative sanction should favour the			evidence that the dispositions facilitated the	
4	individual instead of the State, so any doubt on			taking of Claimants' investments. They were	
- 5	these dispositions should be found to be exercised			ungrounded and the Tribunal need only look to the	
6	in favour of Laguardia rather than the State.			effects of those dispositions. However, the mayor's	
7	As Mr Gleason noticed, the dispositions			illegal conduct went well beyond just the	
8	not only revoke registration, but deleted the entire		8	dispositions and was a pattern of state conduct. As	
9	record from the registry. Respondents assert that			I have said earlier, they redefined the terms, they	
0	the City Hall had the power to do that in order to			registered the leases before the disposition took	
1	effectuate changes in individual lines of data, and		11	effect, they failed to send them for review, they	
2	that is the important part. The power to correct		12	discriminated against Laguardia in favour of	
3	under Moldovan law only applies to individual lines			Bio-Alianta, they improperly terminated the leases,	
4	of data; it does not apply to the entirety of the			the high-ranking officials pressured the mayors, and	
5	object of the registration under this provision.			then the mayors physically joined Bio-Alianta and	
6	Moreover, the law specifically requires that			some of the landowners in the fields to physically	
7	corrections must be initiated by the data supplier,		17	block Claimant from accessing those lands.	
8	and in this case that would be Laguardia.		18	In addition to the domestic obligations	
9	THE PRESIDENT: Just to say you have about		19	that the mayors were obligated to provide, which are	
0	seven minutes left for the totality between the two		20	that a disposition must contain the means of appeal,	
1	of you, so a lot of this material is in the		21	not just that there is some vague right to appeal in	
2	pleadings and we are aware of all of these points		22	the law, but the means of exactly how to appeal, and	
3	you are making, so don't feel you need to take us		23	that was omitted entirely from the dispositions	
4	through all of the material because we have read all		24	themselves, and that is addressed fairly thoroughly	
25	of this material.		25	in the pleadings.	
		130			132
	MR HINKLE: Let me make one final point. There is a stark difference in how the	130 12:30	1 2	In sum, the leases were validly concluded, properly registered under Moldovan law, and the	132 12:33
2	There is a stark difference in how the	130 12:30	2	In sum, the leases were validly concluded, properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on	132 12:33
2 3	•	130 12:30	2 3	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the	132 12:33
2 3 4	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and	130 12:30	2 3 4	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on	132 12:33
2 3 4 5	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to	12:30	2 3 4	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also	132 12:33
2 3 4 5 6	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and	12:30	2 3 4 5	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that	132 12:33
234557	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to	132 12:33
2 3 4 5 7 3	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the	132 12:33
2 3 4 5 7 3 9	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that.	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions	132 12:33
2 3 5 7 3 9 0	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you.	132 12:33
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable.	132 12:33
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases,	12:30	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you.	132 12:33
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2 3	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all	132 12:33
2 3 4 5 7 3 9 0 1 2 3 4	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how	132 12:33
234567890123456	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general	132 12:33
2345678901234567	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate Laguardia's leases and they have not been challenged	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general before 20 minutes max on Mr Peer?	132 12:33
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate Laguardia's leases and they have not been challenged in any court since. So because the dispositions	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general before 20 minutes max on Mr Peer? THE SECRETARY: Four minutes and 12	132 12:33
234567890123456789	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate Laguardia's leases and they have not been challenged in any court since. So because the dispositions were not communicated to Laguardia after	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general before 20 minutes max on Mr Peer? THE SECRETARY: Four minutes and 12 seconds.	132 12:33
2345678901234567890	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate Laguardia's leases and they have not been challenged in any court since. So because the dispositions were not communicated to Laguardia after Bio-Alianta's leases were registered, the mayor had	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general before 20 minutes max on Mr Peer? THE SECRETARY: Four minutes and 12 seconds. THE PRESIDENT: Four minutes and 12	132 12:33
1234567890123456789201	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate Laguardia's leases and they have not been challenged in any court since. So because the dispositions were not communicated to Laguardia after Bio-Alianta's leases were registered, the mayor had a basis to refuse Bio-Alianta's leases, but chose	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general before 20 minutes max on Mr Peer? THE SECRETARY: Four minutes and 12 seconds. THE PRESIDENT: Four minutes and 12 seconds on damages in generaland then 20 minutes on	132 12:33
234567890123456789012	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate Laguardia's leases and they have not been challenged in any court since. So because the dispositions were not communicated to Laguardia after Bio-Alianta's leases, but chose not to excise that power. So on the one hand we	12:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21 22	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general before 20 minutes max on Mr Peer? THE SECRETARY: Four minutes and 12 seconds. THE PRESIDENT: Four minutes and 12 seconds on damages in generaland then 20 minutes on Mr Peer.	132 12:33
2345678901234567890123	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate Laguardia's leases and they have not been challenged in any court since. So because the dispositions were not communicated to Laguardia after Bio-Alianta's leases were registered, the mayor had a basis to refuse Bio-Alianta's leases, but chose not to excise that power. So on the one hand we have the mayors with a valid reason to refuse	12:30	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 1\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general before 20 minutes max on Mr Peer? THE SECRETARY: Four minutes and 12 seconds. THE PRESIDENT: Four minutes and 12 seconds on damages in generaland then 20 minutes on Mr Peer. MR ASTUNO: I have done a comparative	132
2345678901234567890	There is a stark difference in how the city halls treated Laguardia versus Bio-Alianta, and this is evidenced in the record. With regard to Laguardia, the mayors exceeded their authority and took extraordinary measures to refuse Laguardia's leases after registration when no law permits them the power to do that. Let me contrast that with how they treated Bio-Alianta. The mayors in that case did have a genuine basis to refuse all of Bio-Alianta's leases, because one basis of refusal under section 20 is if the land is already leased, or if the possessor does not have the right to lease that land. As Respondent has already conceded, refusal of Claimants' registration does not invalidate Laguardia's leases and they have not been challenged in any court since. So because the dispositions were not communicated to Laguardia after Bio-Alianta's leases, but chose not to excise that power. So on the one hand we	12:30	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 1\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	properly registered under Moldovan law, and the Respondent's consistent holistic attacks on Laguardia show a pattern of state conduct that also shows the mayors' true and actual motive, and that was not that it was reasonable. They had to redefine the term "refuse", they had to ignore the term "only if", and they had to issue dispositions that were well outside of their power, so it could not be innocently reasonable. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hinkle, thank you for your efficient submissions. We have your slides and we can take note of those as well and we have all the material in the pleadings. Ms Nitschke, how much time do we have to deal with damages in general before 20 minutes max on Mr Peer? THE SECRETARY: Four minutes and 12 seconds. THE PRESIDENT: Four minutes and 12 seconds on damages in generaland then 20 minutes on Mr Peer.	132 12:33

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev		al 11 Decen Vienn	
1	presentation I can assure you that at least four	133 12:34	1	appropriate.	, 135 12:38
2	minutes of it would be limited to analysis of the	12:34	2	That is precisely what both parties have	12:38
2	Claimants' expert report, but I want you to		3	submitted in this instance.	
4	understand that it is interspersed with a		4	While Respondent made a brief argument in	
5	comparative analysis of Respondent's expert report,		5	its Rejoinder that a claim for lost profits based on	
6	so I would propose continuing, as I normally would,		6	discounted cash flow is groundless, the facts in	
7	and exhausting my time, and also assuring you that I		7	this case clearly suggest that Mr Grot had a proven	
8	believe at least four of those minutes would be		8	track record of profitability and success, and	
9	exclusively limited to material you would say for		9	Laguardia's overall technical sophistication and	
0	the Claimants' expert. If that is amenable, I would		10	modern approach to farming practices and prior	
1	like to proceed.		11	success indicate that a forward-looking lost profits	
2	THE PRESIDENT: Let's hear you. I am sure		12	analysis is entirely appropriate.	
3	Mr Kopecky will jump in if you stray in some way.		13	As the Tribunal analyses the various	
4	I have Mr Peer's report in front of me and		14	quantum issues in this matter, it is important to	
5	I appreciate that there is commingling of all these		15	call in mind once more again that this is truly	
6	issues. We will adopt a reasonably flexible		16	supported by the factual record, that being that	
7	attitude.		17	Laguardia was a modern high-yield farming operator.	
8	MR KOPECKY: I do jump in and state that		18	Of course, to first value a company, you must truly	
9	the Tribunal should be the judge of the		19	understand that company. The specific details of	
20	admissibility of further pleadings.		20	that company inform in honest and an objective	
21 22	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for your flexibility.		21 22	valuation analysis. The details of this company and the	
23	MR ASTUNO: May I also clarify that the		22	factual record make it clear that it truly was	
-0	entirety of my PowerPoint provided was 26 slides.		23 24	modern in terms of its business practices. It was	
24				•	
24 25	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is		25	technologically sophisticated. If you look at the	
		134	25	technologically sophisticated. If you look at the	136
25		134 12:35	25	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his	
25	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense.			evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by	
25 1 2	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this		1 2 3	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers,	12:39
25 1 2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact – this all		1 2 3 4	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice.	12:39
25 1 2 3 4 5	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in		1 2 3 4 5	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from	12:39
25 1 2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF		1 2 3 4 5 6	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda	12:39
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his	12:39
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the	12:39
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing	12:39
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot,		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful	12:39
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing	12:39
25 123456789012	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot,		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular	12:39
1234567890123	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming.	12:39
25 12345678901234	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average,	12:39
25 123456789012345	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamentalissue in dispute between	12:39
1234567890123456	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact – this all pertains to quantum analysis – that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in sophisticated farming practices into the Floresti region of Moldova. I remind the Tribunal again that its prior		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamental issue in dispute between the two parties as it pertains to quantum. Respondent, through its expert report, has tried to incorrectly assert the exact opposite, that being	12:39
25 123456789012345678	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact – this all pertains to quantum analysis – that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in sophisticated farming practices into the Floresti region of Moldova. I remind the Tribunal again that its prior business activities in the Stefan Voda region in		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamental issue in dispute between the two parties as it pertains to quantum. Respondent, through its expert report, has tried to incorrectly assert the exact opposite, that being that Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields,	12:39
25 1234567890123456789	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in sophisticated farming practices into the Floresti region of Moldova. I remind the Tribunal again that its prior business activities in the Stefan Voda region in 2009 and the first part of 2010 were profitable in		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamental issue in dispute between the two parties as it pertains to quantum. Respondent, through its expert report, has tried to incorrectly assert the exact opposite, that being that Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been just that, average figures.	12:39
25 12345678901234567890	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in sophisticated farming practices into the Floresti region of Moldova. I remind the Tribunal again that its prior business activities in the Stefan Voda region in 2009 and the first part of 2010 were profitable in nature. I would also like to highlight the fact		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamental issue in dispute between the two parties as it pertains to quantum. Respondent, through its expert report, has tried to incorrectly assert the exact opposite, that being that Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been just that, average figures. I would now like to briefly mention who	12:39
25 123456789012345678901	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact – this all pertains to quantum analysis – that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in sophisticated farming practices into the Floresti region of Moldova. I remind the Tribunal again that its prior business activities in the Stefan Voda region in 2009 and the first part of 2010 were profitable in nature. I would also like to highlight the fact that agriculture in its nature is a de-risked		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamental issue in dispute between the two parties as it pertains to quantum. Respondent, through its expert report, has tried to incorrectly assert the exact opposite, that being that Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been just that, average figures. I would now like to briefly mention who Claimants' damages experts are. Claimants' local	12:39
25 1234567890123456789012	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in sophisticated farming practices into the Floresti region of Moldova. I remind the Tribunal again that its prior business activities in the Stefan Voda region in 2009 and the first part of 2010 were profitable in nature. I would also like to highlight the fact that agriculture in its nature is a de-risked commodities industry, and legal principles are on		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamental issue in dispute between the two parties as it pertains to quantum. Respondent, through its expert report, has tried to incorrectly assert the exact opposite, that being that Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been just that, average figures. I would now like to briefly mention who Claimants' damages experts are. Claimants' local agricultural experts, Dr Andrei Gumovschi and	12:39
1234567890123456789012345678901223	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact – this all pertains to quantum analysis – that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in sophisticated farming practices into the Floresti region of Moldova. I remind the Tribunal again that its prior business activities in the Stefan Voda region in 2009 and the first part of 2010 were profitable in nature. I would also like to highlight the fact that agriculture in its nature is a de-risked commodities industry, and legal principles are on point that would suggest that in this type of		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamental issue in dispute between the two parties as it pertains to quantum. Respondent, through its expert report, has tried to incorrectly assert the exact opposite, that being that Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been just that, average figures. I would now like to briefly mention who Claimants' damages experts are. Claimants' local agricultural experts, Dr Andrei Gumovschi and Dr Mihail Rurac, both PhD	12:39
25 12345678901234567890212 22	THE PRESIDENT: Over 13 pages. That is what I have. MR ASTUNO: Yes, that would make sense. I would like to begin my comments this morning by highlighting the fact this all pertains to quantum analysis that both parties in this matter have conducted a forward-looking DCF analysis, discounted cash flow analysis. This is very explainable and justified upon a review of the factual record in the matter. Laguardia, led by a career farming expert, Mr Grot, with nearly a decade of prior agricultural experience in Europe, in success wherever he basically went, as of 2010 was at the forefront of expanding its already profitable enterprises in sophisticated farming practices into the Floresti region of Moldova. I remind the Tribunal again that its prior business activities in the Stefan Voda region in 2009 and the first part of 2010 were profitable in nature. I would also like to highlight the fact that agriculture in its nature is a de-risked commodities industry, and legal principles are on		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	evidentiary record, Ion Tugui, for example, in his witness statements notes that soil was processed by Laguardia with both pesticides and fertilizers, which was by no means the average regional practice. Moreover, Mr Beril, who we will hear from later today, was the President of the Stefan Voda District, he will testify and consistent with his witness statement that Mr Grot far exceeded the average farming yields of what he was used to seeing in Moldova, again evidencing Laguardia's successful modern high-yield approach to farming. Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been much higher than average, and that is the fundamental issue in dispute between the two parties as it pertains to quantum. Respondent, through its expert report, has tried to incorrectly assert the exact opposite, that being that Laguardia's revenues, in particular yields, would have been just that, average figures. I would now like to briefly mention who Claimants' damages experts are. Claimants' local agricultural experts, Dr Andrei Gumovschi and	

Jigii	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised	Vienna	nber 2 a, Aus
		137	1		139
1 2	mention that their report indicates the modern high yield approach that Laguardia took to its business	12:40	2	producer in Moldova, I direct your attention to point No 4, again that Mr Peer has taken that	12:43
2 3	practices into farming was by no means an average		2	quantification of cost without any adjustments	
3 4	business practice. The report also highlights the		4	whatsoever.	
1 5	fact that Laguardia, as part of its business model,		5	The computation of prices, while there was	
6	used fertilizers and soil protectants in an		6	some discussion as to an issue over inflation, we	
7	above-average manner. Ultimately, our valuation		7	believe that that has been correctly addressed in	
8	expert, Mr Lars Wiechen, prepared a report on the		8	the supplemental report provided today, but if there	
9	basis of the information provided to him in our		9	is any remaining doubt, the issue of inflation	
0	local expert's report.		9 10	should be resolved in favour of Claimants, that	
1	Turning to that report again, this combs		11	being that the local prices should indicate that a	
2	through the most significant issue in dispute		12	local inflation rate should apply.	
3	between the parties as it pertains to quantum, that		13	Now coming to the crux of the matter,	
4	being the calculation of Laguardia's gross margin.		14	yields. Yields is the fundamental issue in dispute.	
5	To understand that calculation, which this Tribunal		15	It is the one variable that in Claimants'	
6	has seen many times before, you would multiply crop		16	perspective most significantly contrasts the quantum	
17	prices times yields equaling revenue, minus direct		17	evaluation approach that we have taken in comparison	
8	costs.		18	to Respondents.	
9	I would now like to evaluate these three		19	Again, I would remind this Tribunal that	
20	variables in some brief detail to reassure the		20	because of Laguardia's higher cost structure to pay	
21	Tribunal that the methodology the Claimant's took to		20	for its quality fertilizers and soil protectants	
22	the calculation of these data inputs was entirely		22	used in above-average amounts, this would naturally	
23	reliable and I would then contrast it to what the		23	imply that it should expect to have higher yields.	
24	Respondent has done in this matter.		24	Indeed, the usage of quality fertilizers, the usage	
25	THE PRESIDENT: And I hope you will,		25	of soil protectants, the usage of modern farming	
1	I have the report in front of me, and I do not see	138 12:42	1	equipment, leads to more generous, more increased	140 12:44
	I have the report in front of me, and I do not see it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer		1 2	equipment, leads to more generous, more increased yield output, and our experts will confirm this and	
1 2 3					
2	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer		2	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and	
2 3	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is		2 3	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural	
2 3 4	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses		2 3 4	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the	
2 3 4 5 6 7	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to		2 3 4 5 6 7	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 12 3 4 5 5	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the	
2345678901234567	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the assumptions that Respondent's quantum expert has		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the average practice, its yields therefore are above	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the assumptions that Respondent's quantum expert has made. Again, we believe that the accurate cost		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the average practice, its yields therefore are above average.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the assumptions that Respondent's quantum expert has made. Again, we believe that the accurate cost		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the average practice, its yields therefore are above average. The proposition, while I know it is a	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 0 1 2 8 9 1 8 1 8	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the assumptions that Respondent's quantum expert has made. Again, we believe that the accurate cost structure would have been higher in this matter, but our experts erred on the side of caution.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the average practice, its yields therefore are above average. The proposition, while I know it is a general one, we believe it needs to be cited. The	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 1 2 2 2 2	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the assumptions that Respondent's quantum expert has made. Again, we believe that the accurate cost structure would have been higher in this matter, but our experts erred on the side of caution. The main takeaways regarding direct costs		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the average practice, its yields therefore are above average. The proposition, while I know it is a general one, we believe it needs to be cited. The proposition that the average Moldova producer does	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 8 9 21 22	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the assumptions that Respondent's quantum expert has made. Again, we believe that the accurate cost structure would have been higher in this matter, but our experts erred on the side of caution. The main takeaways regarding direct costs in addition to the fact that its cost structure		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the average practice, its yields therefore are above average. The proposition, while I know it is a general one, we believe it needs to be cited. The proposition that the average Moldova producer does not use fertilizers, does not use soil protectants	
2345678901234567892223	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the assumptions that Respondent's quantum expert has made. Again, we believe that the accurate cost structure would have been higher in this matter, but our experts erred on the side of caution. The main takeaways regarding direct costs in addition to the fact that its cost structure indicated that it was indeed a high-yield farming		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the average practice, its yields therefore are above average. The proposition, while I know it is a general one, we believe it needs to be cited. The proposition that the average Moldova producer does not use fertilizers, does not use soil protectants at recommended levels is well documented. We refer	
234567890123456789012	it in your presentation, respond to what Mr Peer says, because that is really what your 20 minutes is about, and I don't see that anything here addresses that issue. MR ASTUNO: I will get there within a minute. This slide indicates the direct costs as to what they relate to, was used by both the Respondent and the Claimants in this matter. I just want to highlight that the operating costs that Mr Peer applied were unchanged from those calculations provided by the local experts in this matter. It was a conservative computation of costs moreover, meaning that in all reality these costs were probably going to be higher, and again I believe that is relevant when we address the assumptions that Respondent's quantum expert has made. Again, we believe that the accurate cost structure would have been higher in this matter, but our experts erred on the side of caution. The main takeaways regarding direct costs in addition to the fact that its cost structure		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	yield output, and our experts will confirm this and we think basic literature reports on agricultural science, which we will soon cite as well, confirm this proposition. Our experts, and this pertains to the supplemental charts that will be prepared and produced tomorrow, indicate and they will testify that the local producer does not even apply fertilizers on several of the crops that are at issue here. Moreover, our local experts have prepared evaluations of the costs and the yields of average producers as it pertains to the effect of the usage of soil protectants, and again it is quite obvious that, because Laguardia's approach in using these inputs, if you will, sets it apart from the average practice, its yields therefore are above average. The proposition, while I know it is a general one, we believe it needs to be cited. The proposition that the average Moldova producer does not use fertilizers, does not use soil protectants	

oign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	ised	al 11 Decem Vienna	
1	as such.	141 12:46	1	for a high yield producer that requires additional	143 12:49
2	Again, turning to the importance of		2	and above-average cost outlays to pay for	
3	focusing on company-specific information when		3	fertilizers, soil protectants, modern equipment and	
1	conducting evaluation, we think it is very important		4	machinery. Despite that, Respondent's methodology	
5	to highlight the fact that Claimants' quantum		5	for calculating yields was based on average,	
6	experts generated their yield output data from a		6	regional and national data for four of the five	
7	reputable state-owned agriculture testing centre in		7	crops at issue. You can see that in the original	
3	Moldova known as the Visoca State Testing Centre,		8	report at least for corn, sunflower, autumn wheat	
Э	and this was an approach that was entirely different		9	and canola, regional averages are applied as if	
0	than Mr Peer took, so I believe it is worthwhile to		10	Laguardia would have been achieving those same	
1	provide some overview as to why this truly was a		11	yields. We believe that this was an entirely	
2	reliable comparison in terms of data.		12	inappropriate assessment given that Laguardia was	
3	This centre is located in general		13	not an average producer. It did not have the	
4	proximity to these farmlands in Floresti. There are		14	characteristics of an average producer that would be	
5	similar soil characteristics between this centre and		15	producing such yields.	
6	the soil that Laguardia was using for its farm		16	I would also like to note that in the	
7	activities. Moreover, similar technological		17	supplemental report which was handed to me just	
8	approaches were used in the use of fertilizers		18	minutes before opening statements began, it does	
9	namely, and modern equipment However, this centre		19	appear that for corn there was a revision in	
0	does not use pesticides or soil protectants which		20	Mr Peer's insertion of yields, but it is still an	
1	Laguardia does use, and again we believe this is an		21	average metric. It is not a localised study. The	
2	indication that the yields ultimately were		22	yield that he has updated does not in any way refer	
3	calculated by our expert were too conservative in		23	to a company of the characteristics and the cost	
24	keeping with the conservative calculation in the		24	structure and the overall reasonable expectations of	
25	benchmarking of the cost structure.		25	a high yield producer. There really is no	
		142			144
1	On the whole we believe that a thorough		1	substantive change in what was handed to me, but we	
2	review of the local agriculture expert report that		2	of course are going to evaluate that with our expert	
3	was used then by our quantum expert indicates that a		3	and we are very confident that those discrepancies	
4	reliable and objective study was done. However, as		4	will be fully fleshed out when the experts begin	
5	we turn to the Respondent's valuation methodology,		5	their testimony here.	
6	we note that there was an unfounded assessment, that		6	It should be mentioned that averages are	
7	the entire essence of our expert's calculations were		7	unreliable, and that is because average reported	
3	"based on the author's personal experience". There		8	yields are not the real average in Moldova. This	
9	was no citation next to this comment, there was no		9	information was already provided to Mr Peer in the	
0	justification for this comment, and it is important		10	local expert's report which he relied upon but, more	
1	to point out to this Tribunal that it is indeed not		11	importantly, any independent investigation, any act	
2	the case, that our experts were not using personal		12	upon one's curiosity, if this indeed is the case,	
3	impressions, the calculations that they conducted		13	quickly concludes that, yes, averages are	
4	had nothing to do with their personal or biased		14	unreliable. We refer to multiple studies, including	
5	opinions; rather, they have taken objective criteria		15	a 2015 World Bank report that makes it quite clear	
6	from the Visoca State Centre as it pertains to		16	that the agriculture sector in Moldova is guilty of	
7	yields and they have conducted an objective and fair		17	the trend of underreporting, so to speak. One of	
8	analysis as to what the corresponding costs would be		18	the main incentives would be to save money on one's	
9	for a company operating in the same way that		19	tax liability.	
20	Laguardia was.		20	This underreporting of yields is further	
21	Mr Peer, however, has done something		21	corroborated by a June 2011 interview with the then	
-	entirely different. While, again, let's remind the		22	Moldovan Prime Minister, Vlad Filat, noting that	
			23	sugarbeet tax revenue is believed to be much lower	
3	Tribunal of the fact that the cost structure that				
22 23 24 25	Tribunal of the fact that the cost structure that Respondent has imported into its valuation methodology is the exact same as the cost structure		24 25	than what it truly should be, given this trend of underreporting data. Still, in light of this	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi		al 11 Decem Vienna	
1 2	obvious evidence that Mr Peer had access to, and in light of the obvious fact that averages really are	145 12:51	1 2	There was a change that Claimants made in terms of the networking capital input, and that was	147 12:55
3	not reliable averages, he still inserts this as		3	addressed correctly by Mr Peer. This input now has	
4	though Laguardia would be achieving suchyields.		4	been updated and we recognise that that is a	
5	Using this assumption that Laguardia had		5	necessary part of the DCF calculation, and updated	
6	the cost structure of a high yield producer with an		6	figures will be provided and explained by our expert	
7	above-average cost structure, against the assumption		7	when he testifies.	
8	that it would only achieve the averages that are		8	The discount rate Claimants will argue in	
9	publicly reported, means that the company would have		9	this case should equal the weighted-average cost of	
10	been operating with negative earnings immediately as		10	capital, and we believe we have sound and	
11	of 2011. I would note that in the supplemental		11	fundamental accounting and legal justification for	
12	report that was provided to me this morning, I had		12	that.	
13	confirmed that even with the minor adjustment to the		13	Other valuation issues that occur, and	
14	corn input, we still have the exact same situation,		14	this is notwithstanding the review of what was sent	
15 16	that being that revenues do not equal costs.		15 16	over earlier this morning, but there seems to have	
16 17	We should certainly take a step back and		16 17	been a misapplication of the depreciation variable	
17 10	analyse what this means. This would mean that		17 10	in Respondent's quantum analysis. There also	
18 10	Mr Grot, for the first time in his long and		18 19	appears to be an illogical assessment of a tax	
19 20	successful career as a farming investor and innovator, would have been losing money, and, more		19 20	liability on Laguardia, despite its negative earnings. Respondent's initial report inputs a tax	
20 21	importantly, it assumes that he would have refused		20 21	liability charge against Laguardia, again despite	
21 22	to make any adjustments in his future cost		21	its negative earnings, which seems to defy	
23	structure, despite the fact that he would have been		23	accounting and tax logic.	
	losing money for the first time in his career. We		23	Claimants will make the case that the	
	believe that is quite an astounding assumption to		25	prejudgment interest rate that is appropriate in	
24 25					
		146			148
25	make, especially considering the prior profitable	146 12:53	1	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of	148 12:56
25 1 2	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in		1 2	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we	148
25 1 2 3	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010.		1 2 3	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking		1 2 3 4	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied.	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average		1 2 3 4 5	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova,	148
25 1 2 3 4 5 6	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations.		1 2 3 4 5 6	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available,	148
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland.	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not reliable. In other words, average means something		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland. That is absolutely true. In other words, any	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not reliable. In other words, average means something less, at least as it pertains to what is reported in		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland. That is absolutely true. In other words, any objective business valuation should take into	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not reliable. In other words, average means something less, at least as it pertains to what is reported in Moldova.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland. That is absolutely true. In other words, any objective business valuation should take into account the specific and unique circumstances that	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not reliable. In other words, average means something less, at least as it pertains to what is reported in Moldova. This is no more than a biased exercise in		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland. That is absolutely true. In other words, any objective business valuation should take into account the specific and unique circumstances that make that company different from any other average	148 12:56
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not reliable. In other words, average means something less, at least as it pertains to what is reported in Moldova. This is no more than a biased exercise in picking and choosing which does not accurately		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland. That is absolutely true. In other words, any objective business valuation should take into account the specific and unique circumstances that make that company different from any other average or industry competitor.	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not reliable. In other words, average means something less, at least as it pertains to what is reported in Moldova. This is no more than a biased exercise in picking and choosing which does not accurately reflect the valuation potential of Laguardia on the		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland. That is absolutely true. In other words, any objective business valuation should take into account the specific and unique circumstances that make that company different from any other average or industry competitor. That is exactly what Claimants have	148 12:56
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not reliable. In other words, average means something less, at least as it pertains to what is reported in Moldova. This is no more than a biased exercise in picking and choosing which does not accurately reflect the valuation potential of Laguardia on the date of the government's intervention.		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland. That is absolutely true. In other words, any objective business valuation should take into account the specific and unique circumstances that make that company different from any other average or industry competitor. That is exactly what Claimants have endeavoured to do in this case. There is a footnote	148
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 22	make, especially considering the prior profitable experience that Mr Grot had, namely in Moldova in 2010. On the whole, we believe that the picking and choosing, so to speak, of high costs but average yields, indicates some very powerful revelations. 1. Respondent's quantum analysis fails to recognise that a producer with average yields has dramatically lower costs than what was assumed to be the case for Laguardia, and that Laguardia would have had dramatically higher yields under its cost structure. There is also a blatant failure under these assumptions that average data really is not reliable. In other words, average means something less, at least as it pertains to what is reported in Moldova. This is no more than a biased exercise in picking and choosing which does not accurately reflect the valuation potential of Laguardia on the date of the government's intervention. There are other valuation issues that will		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	this matter should be the weighted-average cost of capital again equal to the discount rate and we believe that at a bare minimum Respondent's sovereign borrowing rate should be applied. The investment after all was in Moldova, it was not in the US, and therefore a US risk-free treasury bond rate does not seem to make much sense As I close my remarks here, and just quickly looking at how much time might be available, I would say that Respondent said at best, in Respondent's Rejoinder at paragraph 333 they note correctly, and this is part of their damages analysis, that a farming business heavily depends on the quality and features of the particular farmland. That is absolutely true. In other words, any objective business valuation should take into account the specific and unique circumstances that make that company different from any other average or industry competitor. That is exactly what Claimants have endeavoured to do in this case. There is a footnote that they cite to this comment, that being that our	148 12:56

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 2017 a, Austria
1	Taking a local company-specific	149 12:57	1	I also understood that it would be circulated now,	151
2	methodology to this overall valuation guestion	12.57	2	not tomorrow during the examination, so we would	15.01
3	absolutely is much more reliable and much more sound		3	kindly ask that this data be sent to us now.	
4	in nature than relying upon average data, especially		4	THE PRESIDENT: Claimant?	
5	when that average data reflects producers and		5	MR GLEASON: No problem.	
6	companies that are fundamentally different from what		6	MR KOPECKY: Also please send it to	
7	Laguardia and what Mr Grot had in place.		7	Ms Cusnir.	
8	Our final remarks here regarding quantum		8	THE PRESIDENT: By the end of the lunch	
9	will be a restatement of what was submitted in our		9	break let's submit those two "supplemental" reports.	
10	request for allocation of costs and damages in this		10	Can I ask that you also email to	
11	matter, that being that the initial investment costs		11	Ms Nitschke the slides so that she has a set also,	
12	as paid for by Mr Grot should be refunded to him		12	and the supplemental report so she has everything?	
13	individually, and that also being that the future		13	We want to send all of that to Mr Craven.	
14	lost profits in this matter should be returned to		14	I think this allows us to take a 45-minute	
15	Laguardia USA as the parent company of the local		15	break for lunch which gives our court reporters a	
16	investment vehicle, and ultimately Mr Grot, as the		16	chance.	
17	sole shareholder of the parent company. This also		17	MR KOPECKY: We only spoke of the	
18	goes without saying, of course, that Respondent's		18	agricultural experts. I understand there will be	
19	advanced arbitration fees should be reimbursed		19	some updates on the quantum numbers as well?	
20	entirely to Mr Grot, who has paid for them		20	MR ASTUNO: Yes.	
21	personally.		21	MR KOPECKY: We would also like to have	
22	On this note, and if there are any		22	that now, if possible.	
23	questions I am happy to entertain them, but		23	MR ASTUNO: Mr Wiechen is in the process	
24	Claimants wish to express their thanks to this		24	of finalising that, because he is not set to testify	
25	Tribunal for its sincere attention, not just to the		25	until Wednesday morning, so I do not believe we can	
		150	4		152
1	quantum issue, but every issue that has been put	12:59	1	give you a final analysis, but we know that there	13:02
2	forth this morning such that Mr Grot, after seven		2 3	will be one.	
3	years, can finally see to it that his rights are			THE PRESIDENT: Are you able to provide that material tomorrow? What I think we would not	
4 5	vindicated. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. That completes		4 5	want to have is that he provides his updated figures	
6	Claimants' opening arguments. We are about 50		6	in the course of his cross-examination because that	
7	minutes behind schedule. The responsibility is ours		7	would leave Respondent in the unhappy position of	
8	and ours alone on the Tribunal. We are very		8	not having had time to prepare the material he is	
9	grateful for your efficiency. The Respondent is of		9	going to provide, and I think in the interests of	
10	course allocated its full 90 minutes or up to 90		10	balance and equality of arms	
11	minutes.		11	MR ASTUNO: Absolutely. I will call	
12	In terms of planning going forward for the		12	Mr Wiechen at lunch and ask if he can complete that	
13	rest of the day, it would help me if I could have a		13	analysis by tomorrow.	
14	sense of how long the Respondent believes it may		14	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. It is now	
15	need for the cross-examination of Mr Grot and		15	exactly one o'clock. We will come back at 13.45.	
16	Mr Beril? I am wondering whether we start now? The		16	You will then have up to 90 minutes to do your	
17	timetable would have us going to 13.35.		17	opening. Depending on the needs of the court	
18	MR KOPECKY: We do not mind starting now.		18	reporters, we will then have another short break.	
19	We would ask for a coffee break in the middle.		19	We will then go into Mr Grot and Mr Beril.	
20	(Short discussion on timing)		20	Can you give us an indication of what you	
21	I have one point of order. We heard this		21	are imagining for cross-examination? This does not	
22	morning that there would be new data from the		22	bind you. It is only for the purposes of planning	
23	agricultural experts and maybe from the quantum		23	our hope that we can finish today. We are all	
24	experts. I understand it was admitted on condition		24	available to go longer today in order to accommodate	
25	that it is responsive to Mr Peer's report. However,		25	that.	

www.dianaburden.com

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi		al 11 Decemb Vienna,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	MR KOPECKY: 90 minutes for Mr Grot. 30 minutes for Mr Beril. THE PRESIDENT: That is very helpful. I think we can easily finish them both in the course of today. Don't feel rushed in relation to your opening. You have 90 minutes allocated to you. There may be questions. You are entitled toyour 90 minutes. Thank you to the Claimants for completing their submissions. We break now and we are back at quarter to two. (Luncheon adjournment from 1.04 pm to 1.47 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Please begin. Opening Submission by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Thank you, Mr President. Dear Mr President, members of the Tribunal, esteemed colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, as Claimants had promised at the outset of their opening, Claimants told us a story. That story is largely unproven. The impugned acts are overwhelmingly not those of the state, and for its most part, Claimants' story is not even central to their claims. Claimants say that the alleged taking occurred at the time of the dispositions. Claimants calculate their quantum accordingly. Instead of commenting on Claimants' story	153			, Aus 155
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	THE PRESIDENT: Please begin. Opening Submission by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Thank you, Mr President. Dear Mr President, members of the Tribunal, esteemed colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, as Claimants had promised at the outset of their opening, Claimants told us a story. That story is largely unproven. The impugned acts are overwhelmingly not those of the state, and for its most part, Claimants say that the alleged taking occurred at the time of the dispositions. Claimants calculate their quantum accordingly.		12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Claimants seek to pin their failures on Respondent. Respondent is not responsible. Claimants were not diligent in establishing their investment. Had Claimants been diligent, they would have ensured that, 1, there was an informed business plan for the project; 2, that the team entrusted with the project was competent; 3, that responsibilities were clearly assigned and fulfilled; 4, that their lease agreements were compliant with the law; 5, that the lease agreements were valid, indeed signed and enforceable under law; 	
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array}$	point by point, I will do what the Tribunal encouraged the parties to do: focus on the essential issues in dispute, working with the evidence that is actually on record, and for the rest I respectfully point to Respondents' written submissions. Please don't be alarmed by the size of the printout in front of you; it is mostly one statement per page, each with a reference to a supporting exhibit, and because it is rather interactive, I would direct your attention to the screens rather than the printout. Our point is the Tribunal encouraged the parties to prepare a timetable, and here I must disappoint. The information the Claimants put on record is contradictory, and preparing a timetable on the relevant facts became impossible. It is unclear, for example, even from Claimants' own timetable, when the leases were signed. It says autumn, autumn 2010, and since we before heard the termination of the leases on a single day is mysterious, I would like to point to Claimants' submission that in two of the villages also a	154 13:49	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	right to connected plots. This is an important issue, which I will revisit later. Claimants would have ensured there was an informed business decision for the project but they only submit what they wanted to achieve. First witness statement Grot, paragraph 18 "I was aware of some farming projects by British investors in the Ukraine and how they had later gone public with their businesses. This long-term view was an important part of my investment in Moldova". But Claimants never submitted how they intended to achieve it. There is no business plan on the record, no offtake agreements, nothing. Had Claimants been diligent the team entrusted with the project would have been competent, yet Mr Grot's team consisted of acquaintances he made by chance in Moldova shortly before. First statement Grot, paragraph 10: "While working in Stefan Voda, I was leaving my hotel one day and I heard a group of gentlemen speaking Polish. I introduced myself to them and I met a gentleman named Igor Bugai, and he gave me his	15

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confiden Revise		
	·	157		159
1		13:53 1	were not outsourced within Claimants' own team.	13:55
2	Alexei Bugai. I have a higher degree in Journalism and Philology with a focus on the management of	2	Example 1, the question who should execute the	
3 ⊿	international investments. Mr Zbigniew Grot hired	4	leases on behalf of Laguardia. Mr Bugai, as administrator, was responsible for the entire	
4 5	me to be Laguardia's administrator for a period of	4	process. Witness statement Bugai, paragraph 2:	
6	one year starting in March 2010 until March 2011.	6	"I was responsible for the entire process of	
7	It happened after Mr Grot met my father Igor Bugai	7	registration".	
8	by chance".	8	Mr Bugai understood that Mr Grot would	
9	Yet Mr Grot's and Mr Bugai's co-operation	9	enter into the lease agreements. Witness statement	
10	was a very short one. Witness statement Bugai,	10	Bugai, paragraph 2: "Mr Grot, with Mr Rusu's help	
11	paragraph 10. "In March 2011, Mr Grot and I decided	11	and expertise, started to meet with the local	
12	that it would be better for me to move on from	12		
13	Laguardia, as we had a difference of opinion	13	-	
14	concerning the methods that we should use to fight	14		
15	back and regain the leases and other further	15	- 5 ,	
16	operation of Laguardia".	16		
17	While Mr Bugai was made responsible for	17		
18	establishing Mr Grot's business, first statement	18		
19	Bugai, paragraph 2: "I was responsible for the	19		
20	entire process of registration", the actual task of	20	offices to sign the completed leases".	
21	establishing the business was outsourced to	21	This is Mr Bugai's signature on record,	
22	officials and civil servants, and referencing his	22		
23	first witness statement, paragraphs 12 and 14,	23		
24	"Mr Grot outsourced marketing and PR for his farming	24	referring only to the leases that were signed by	
25	project, negotiating the leases with the land	25	Laguardia, that Claimants submitted for Cosernita,	
20				
20		158		160
1	owners, obtaining their consent and even filling out :		6	160 13:57
1 2	those thousands of leases".	13:54 1 2	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the	
1 2 3	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only	13:54 1 2 3	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are	
1 2 3 4	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them	13:54 1 2 3 4	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature	
1 2 3 4 5	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The	13:54 1 2 3 4 5	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening.	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource.	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot.	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in	
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\2\\13\\14\\15\end{array}$	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the landowners, Mr Alexei Bugai, who I had hired as an	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of them. However, many others may have been signed by	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of them. However, many others may have been signed by other people working for Laguardia".	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the landowners, Mr Alexei Bugai, who I had hired as an administrator for ICS Laguardia SRL, was told that they were complete and Mr Bugai went to the mayor's	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of them. However, many others may have been signed by other people working for Laguardia".	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the landowners, Mr Alexei Bugai, who I had hired as an administrator for ICS Laguardia SRL, was told that	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of them. However, many others may have been signed by other people working for Laguardia".	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the landowners, Mr Alexei Bugai, who I had hired as an administrator for ICS Laguardia SRL, was told that they were complete and Mr Bugai went to the mayor's offices to sign the completed leases". The whole	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of them. However, many others may have been signed by other people working for Laguardia". Example 2. Who should fill out the leases of Laguardia? Mr Bugai understood that Mr Grot	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the landowners, Mr Alexei Bugai, who I had hired as an administrator for ICS Laguardia SRL, was told that they were complete and Mr Bugai went to the mayor's offices to sign the completed leases". The whole process wasn't even supervised by Laguardia.	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of them. However, many others may have been signed by other people working for Laguardia". Example 2. Who should fill out the leases of Laguardia? Mr Bugai understood that Mr Grot filled out the lease templates, together with the landowners. Witness statement Bugai, paragraph 3	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the landowners, Mr Alexei Bugai, who I had hired as an administrator for ICS Laguardia SRL, was told that they were complete and Mr Bugai went to the mayor's offices to sign the completed leases". The whole process wasn't even supervised by Laguardia. Had Claimants been diligent, they would	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of them. However, many others may have been signed by other people working for Laguardia". Example 2. Who should fill out the leases of Laguardia? Mr Bugai understood that Mr Grot filled out the lease templates, together with the landowners. Witness statement Bugai, paragraph 3	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	those thousands of leases". Yet government officials may only discharge the responsibility that were given to them by law. Second Report Mr Gladei, paragraph 7: "The public administration authorities shall discharge their attributions only in case the established facts and the applicable law give the right to do this thing". We had this during Claimants' opening. No piece of law entitles those officials to execute the responsibilities Mr Grot sought to outsource. Mr Bugai only got involved once all the leases were completed. Witness statement Grot. Paragraph 15: "Once the leases had been filled out by the cadastral agents and signed by the landowners, Mr Alexei Bugai, who I had hired as an administrator for ICS Laguardia SRL, was told that they were complete and Mr Bugai went to the mayor's offices to sign the completed leases". The whole process wasn't even supervised by Laguardia. Had Claimants been diligent, they would have ensured that responsibilities were clearly	13:54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I direct your attention to exhibit C-27 and the interactive slide show on the screen. All those are exhibit C-27. None of those look like the signature of Mr Grot or that of Mr Bugai. Indeed, Respondent noted as much in its Counter-Memorial, Counter-Memorial paragraph 127E. So Mr Grot amended his testimony accordingly, second witness statement Grot, paragraph 5 "These leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Dariusz Kozak". As did Mr Bugai; he too amended his testimony. This is the red line of CWS-5 versus CWS-13, the two witness statements of Mr Bugai on record, where in paragraph 2 he added the language, "There were over a thousand leases and I remember signing many of them. However, many others may have been signed by other people working for Laguardia". Example 2. Who should fill out the leases of Laguardia? Mr Bugai understood that Mr Grot filled out the lease templates, together with the landowners. Witness statement Bugai, paragraph 3 "Then Mr Grot together with each individual landowner filled out a generic lease agreement	

-) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revis			a, Austr
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 5 6 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 3 24 25	landowner. Mr Grot, on the other hand, tasked the cadastral agents with that responsibility, second statement Grot, paragraph 3: "The plan was for the cadastrals to hold the leases, to fill out the relevant details for each lease and to watch the landowners sign the leases in their office". This outsourcing and failure to clearly assign responsibilities had one serious consequence: those responsibilities were not fulfilled. For example, some leases are signed but not stamped by Laguardia (exhibit R-18). Other leases are stamped but not signed on behalf of Laguardia (exhibit R-17). Yet others are neither stamped nor signed (R-20). Had Claimants been diligent, they would have ensured the lease agreements were compliant with the law. Claimants submit that they had an expert attorney at their side for the establishment of their investment, including the leases. Second statement Grot, paragraph 6. "The entire investment is exactly what Mr Levintsa handles as an attorney in Moldova. Mr Levintsa handled the leases in Floresti", yet Mr Levintsa's attribution is entirely		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 12\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 will insist, "only if the documents submitted contain erasures, completions, deleted words or other corrections" or in point (e), much more importantly, "the required signatures or seals are missing". Had Claimants been diligent, they would have ensured that the lease agreements were valid, signed and enforceable. Yet Claimants' leases were invalid, many were not signed even by Laguardia (exhibit R-20), and many of them were not even signed by the landowners (exhibit R-14). For those land plots Claimants never obtained farming rights. As was rightly said today, an unsigned lease is an invalid lease. But for Claimants, as we heard today, and as we read in their submissions, it was irrelevant to timely sign and register all their leases. Claimants' Reply, paragraphs 168 and 169. "Work may have begun before every last lease was signed, however, this is irrelevant". 169: "Claimants also admit that work began before the leases were registered in any of the villages. Again, this is irrelevant". 	163 14:02
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	unclear. He certainly did not ensure that the leases were compliant with the law, since, as Mr Gladei confirms, Claimants' leases were not (First Report of Gladei, paragraph 33). "The lease agreements do not contain the mandatory reference to the residence of the lessor". Paragraph 33.2: "[They] do not contain the mandatory reference to the document certifying the ownership". Paragraph 33.3: "[They] do not contain mandatory reference to the document certifying the ownership". Paragraph 33.3: "[They] do not contain mandatory reference to the liability of the parties". As just shown, many leases were not signed or stamped, and others were actually signed by persons other than the landowners. If we look at contract No 40, a Varvareuca lease of 1 September 2010, in the name of a certain Blanitu Petru Nicolae, and compare this to the contemporaneous register extract, exhibit R-19, we see that for the land plot in question, 108078 the registered owner was Bodron Nicolai Procopi. That is not the same person. Yet other leases contain erasures (exhibit R-16), and all those non-compliances entitle the Mayor to refuse registration, according to Claimants' legal expert, expert report Gladei, paragraph 24: "The mayor's office has the right to refuse to register the lease if", or as Claimants		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 21 22	ensured that they had farming rights to connected plots of land. This is very important. The success of Mr Grot's project depended on farming rights to connected plots of land. "Mr Rusu had picked these lands because they were large unused connected plots of land where Laguardia could do high-technology farming". Yet Claimants did not prove that all lease agreements they sought to conclude wouldestablish connected plots of land, and the burden for this is on them. They didn't prove that they verified this fact at the time. They didn't prove that it still would have been the case without all the lease agreements that remained unsigned and invalid, and I am not talking erasures or pencil use; I am talking unsigned or invalid. But unless that is verified, industrial farming is impossible. This is a satellite image that Claimants put in their Memorial, page 90. I am only using this as an example to visualise the issue. This is not the actual land in question. This is in the vicinity. It is in the Ghindesti Floresti region but it does not display the landplots in question.	164 14:03

bign) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised		iber 201 a, Austri
	· · ·	165			167
1	area right of the red circle. You need to obtain a	14:05	1	relevance for not extending the leases to a fourth	14:07
2	valid lease with each individual landowner who owns		2	year. That means that the leases would have	
3	this field. Those people probably reside in those		3	terminated in the third year, but the exact	
4	houses around there. If you do not do that, the		4	relevance is unclear to us. Finally, I think it is	
5	area lease will have a lot of holes. I apologise		5	worth pointing out that a mayor of a small village	
6	for the artistic value, but the white line would be		6	is not a lawyer, so he may well sign off on things	
7	Respondent's suggested line that the high-technology		7	that he would not be entitled to sign, but the legal	
8	harvester would have to take to actually do any		8	nature of the signature is entirely unclear. THE PRESIDENT: But what steps have you	
9 10	farming while avoiding trespassing on unsigned leases, therefore unleased lands.		9 10	taken you are Moldova, so you have the ability to	
10	All this means that Claimants were not		10		
12	_		11 12	find out what happened. What steps have you taken to find out what happened that caused these farmers	
12	diligent in establishing their investment. The second issue: Claimants were not		12	to act as they did in very large numbers?	
13	diligent in managing their investment. Had		13	MR KOPECKY: Mr President, we have been	
	Claimants been diligent, they would have enforced			unable to find this out. We have inquired but have	
15 16	their lease rights. In particular, Claimants would		15 16	been unable to find this out.	
	C .		17		
17 18	have challenged the dispositions and sought relief in court, not by politicians. They would have sued		17	THE PRESIDENT: Would you accept that it is curious, in the least there may be many	
18 19	Bio-Alianta and the landowners following the		18	explanations, and inferences can be drawn in many	
19 20	applicable procedure, and they would have		20	directions, but would you accept that it is odd for	
20 21	complied with their obligations under the leases		20 21	so large a number of people to engage in the very	
22	THE PRESIDENT: Just as you are jumping		22	same act on the same day?	
22	between two areas, just coming back to something we		22	MR KOPECKY: Well, frankly, I would accept	
23 24	had earlier this morning, exhibit C-95, what is your		23 24	the word "many". I would not accept the word	
24 25	clients' explanation for what caused hundreds of		24 25	"strange" because it is not odd that villagers that	
1	farmers to seek, if you like, deregistration of the	166 14:06	1	have lived together for generations come together	168 14:09
1 2	farmers to seek, if you like, deregistration of the leases? What is your account, and what is the		1	have lived together for generations come together and discuss their situation. They discuss their	168 14:09
					168 14:09
2	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and		2	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and	168 14:09
2 3	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them		2 3	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody",	168 14:09
2 3 4	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and		2 3 4	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and	168 14:09
2 3 4 5	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only		2 3 4 5	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else – this is just speculation – meet together, find the courage and	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else – this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages,	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else – this is just speculation – meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think – THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the nature of the mayor's signature is unclear. It can	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else – this is just speculation – meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think – THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of that?	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the nature of the mayor's signature is unclear. It can be a confirmation of receipt. We don't know what it	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of that? MR KOPECKY: No.	168 14:09
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the nature of the mayor's signature is unclear. It can be a confirmation of receipt. We don't know what it means. That signature doesn't produce any legal	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else – this is just speculation – meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think – THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of that? MR KOPECKY: No. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	168 14:09
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10$	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the nature of the mayor's signature is unclear. It can be a confirmation of receipt. We don't know what it means. That signature doesn't produce any legal effect from the Mayor. We don't know what it does.	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else – this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of that? MR KOPECKY: No. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. MR KOPECKY: My last point is that I point	168 14:09
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 1\end{array}$	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the nature of the mayor's signature is unclear. It can be a confirmation of receipt. We don't know what it means. That signature doesn't produce any legal effect from the Mayor. We don't know what it does. Respondents do not argue that the leases werein	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else – this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of that? MR KOPECKY: No. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. MR KOPECKY: My last point is that I point out that had Claimants been diligent, they would	168 14:09
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the nature of the mayor's signature is unclear. It can be a confirmation of receipt. We don't know what it means. That signature doesn't produce any legal effect from the Mayor. We don't know what it does. Respondents do not argue that the leases werein fact terminated on the basis of those cancellation	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of that? MR KOPECKY: No. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. MR KOPECKY: My last point is that I point out that had Claimants been diligent, they would have enforced their lease rights. As a first step,	168 14:09
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 2\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the nature of the mayor's signature is unclear. It can be a confirmation of receipt. We don't know what it means. That signature doesn't produce any legal effect from the Mayor. We don't know what it does. Respondents do not argue that the leases werein fact terminated on the basis of those cancellation notices, and even Disposition 2 in that village was	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of that? MR KOPECKY: No. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. MR KOPECKY: My last point is that I point out that had Claimants been diligent, they would have enforced their lease rights. As a first step, Claimants would have challenged the dispositions and	168 14:09
$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 21 \\ \end{array}$	leases? What is your account, and what is the evidence supporting that account, that caused them to come together to sign the documents they did, and then presumably go to the Mayor and get the Mayor to also sign those documents? What happened? MR KOPECKY: Mr President, here I can only speculate but I will use the same circumstantial evidence that Claimants use when they say all the leases were probably signed on the same day. These people are in contact, they are very close neighbours, they live together, most of them don't have jobs this is speculation but this is a very poor country and a very poor area, and they probably talk a lot, so they probably got together and discussed it, but on the exhibit itself, first, the nature of the mayor's signature is unclear. It can be a confirmation of receipt. We don't know what it means. That signature doesn't produce any legal effect from the Mayor. We don't know what it does. Respondents do not argue that the leases werein fact terminated on the basis of those cancellation	14:06	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and discuss their situation. They discuss their situation and say "Let's sign leases with somebody", and they may well meet and discuss the situation and say "Well, we are not happy, we are not getting paid" or anything else this is just speculation meet together, find the courage and all write to the mayor. This does not strike me as particularly odd. It would strike me as odd if all the tenants in that building over there terminated their leases at once because they are not talking to each other but we are talking about small villages, connected over generations, in rural Moldova, and their community means something. I think THE PRESIDENT: That is speculation. We don't have any evidence before us to support any of that? MR KOPECKY: No. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. MR KOPECKY: My last point is that I point out that had Claimants been diligent, they would have enforced their lease rights. As a first step,	168 14:09

) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi			nber 2017 a, Austria
1	challenge the dispositions because they did not know	169	1	meet with the President of Floresti District,	171
2	how, when or where (Claimants' Memorial,	14:10	2	Ruslan Zelenenco".	14:12
2	paragraph 76: "Claimants did not know how, when, or		2	Mr Grot sought to challenge a legal	
4	where to challenge the dispositions, because		4	decision in the political forum, second statement	
5	Respondent did not provide the information in		5	Grot, paragraph 7: "We complained to everybody that	
6	violation of Moldovan law". However, both		6	we could in the government".	
7	dispositions informed Claimants of their right		7	Exhibit C-77: "As a result of the	
8	(exhibit C-31, page 3): "Laguardia has the right to		8	accident and divergences created, ICS Laguardia SRL,	
9	challenge it" the disposition "in accordance		9	through the administrator Zbigniew Piotr Grot	
10	to the legal provisions in force".		10	desires to be analysed this situation. Mr	
11	Exhibit C-48. Disposition 2. "Laguardia		11	Prime Minister, Vlad Filat, with all due respect	
12	has the right to challenge it in accordance to the		12	I am asking permission from an official meeting with	
13	legal provisions in force, and would have certainly		13	you".	
14	been diligent to inquire how, when or where to		14	Had Claimants been diligent they would	
15	challenge the dispositions". And not to forget that		15	have enforced their rights and sued Bio-Alianta and	
16	Claimants had an experienced attorney engaged at the		16	the landowners following the applicable procedure.	
17	time including for the leases in Floresti. Second		17	And Claimants did finally attempt to sue the	
18	statement Grot, paragraph 6: "Laguardia's attorney		18	landowners and Bio-Alianta. Exhibit C-123. They	
19	during this entire process of setting up the		19	brought a request against Bio-Alianta and the	
20	investment was Mr Victor Levintsa. "The entire		20	defendants - 526 landowners from Cosernita and the	
21	investment is exactly what Mr Levintsa handles as an		21	City Hall of Cosernita village. Yet without	
22	attorney in Moldova", and indeed, Mr Levintsa		22	justification Claimants failed to comply with the	
23	handled the leases in Floresti		23	applicable procedure.	
24	Claimants wanted to fight the dispositions		24	And the court found that the reasons given	
25	immediately, and were looking for a litigation		25	by the Claimants' representative, namely that there	
		170			172
1	attorney (second statement Grot, paragraph 7):	170 14:11	1	were several litigations against the defendant in	172 14:14
1 2	attorney (second statement Grot, paragraph 7): "I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle		1 2	were several litigations against the defendant in question, and for this reason the Claimants	
	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And			question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such	
2 3 4	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas,		2 3 4	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well	
2 3	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants		2 3	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the	
2 3 4	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time.		2 3 4 5 6	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure	
2 3 4 5 6 7	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the		2 3 4 5 6 7	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record:		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we		2 3 5 6 7 8 9	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure. What would	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts".		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure?	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court, Claimants submit that upon receiving the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there is a settlement procedure before you can escalate	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court, Claimants submit that upon receiving the dispositions they addressed the government.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure. What would have been the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there is a settlement procedure before you can escalate matters to court. That is very common. I think it	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court, Claimants submit that upon receiving the dispositions they addressed the government. Claimants memorial, paragraph 186, "After the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure. What would have been the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there is a settlement procedure before you can escalate matters to court. That is very common. I think it can be found on several of the contracts on record,	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court, Claimants submit that upon receiving the dispositions they addressed the government. Claimants memorial, paragraph 186, "After the Dispositions in Cosernita and Varvareuca initially		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure. What would have been the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there is a settlement procedure before you can escalate matters to court. That is very common. I think it can be found on several of the contracts on record, including Claimants' contracts with I think	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court, Claimants submit that upon receiving the dispositions they addressed the government. Claimants memorial, paragraph 186, "After the Dispositions in Cosernita and Varvareuca initially deprived Claimants of their investments, Mr Grot		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 20 21 20 21 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure. What would have been the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there is a settlement procedure before you can escalate matters to court. That is very common. I think it can be found on several of the contracts on record, including Claimants' contracts with I think Bicoli-Agro I am not certain but the contracts	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court, Claimants submit that upon receiving the dispositions they addressed the government. Claimants memorial, paragraph 186, "After the Dispositions in Cosernita and Varvareuca initially deprived Claimants of their investments, Mr Grot began to seek assistance from various levels of the		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure. What would have been the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there is a settlement procedure before you can escalate matters to court. That is very common. I think it can be found on several of the contracts on record, including Claimants' contracts with I think Bicoli-Agro I am not certain but the contracts they signed with other third parties contained this	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court, Claimants submit that upon receiving the dispositions they addressed the government. Claimants memorial, paragraph 186, "After the Dispositions in Cosernita and Varvareuca initially deprived Claimants of their investments, Mr Grot began to seek assistance from various levels of the Moldovan government", and CWS1, paragraphs 30 and		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure. What would have been the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there is a settlement procedure before you can escalate matters to court. That is very common. I think it can be found on several of the contracts on record, including Claimants' contracts with I think Bicoli-Agro I am not certain but the contracts they signed with other third parties contained this mandatory pre-trial procedure where after you can go	14:14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21 22	"I needed to find a litigation attorney to handle the situation. I wanted to fight immediately". And Claimants did find a litigation attorney, Mr Garmas, in time, and Mr Garmas confirmed that Claimants could still challenge the dispositions at the time. Exhibit C-126, a witness transcript from the Varvareuca injunction hearing, in April 2011, where he, as a representative of Laguardia, put on record: "We did not challenge the Mayor's office acts, we have time for this". Claimants never challenged. Claimants' Reply, paragraph 470: "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". So instead of seeking relief in court, Claimants submit that upon receiving the dispositions they addressed the government. Claimants memorial, paragraph 186, "After the Dispositions in Cosernita and Varvareuca initially deprived Claimants of their investments, Mr Grot began to seek assistance from various levels of the		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	question, and for this reason the Claimants considered that it is not necessary to submit such prior requests cannot be considered a well founded reason for not taking into account the provisions of the law regarding prior procedure before submitting such claims. And for that failure their claim could not proceed. It was dismissed without prejudice. We heard that today. We also heard that the Claimants were entitled to comply, and refile MR FORTIER: Counsel, what would have been the applicable procedure? You say Claimants failed to comply with the applicable procedure. What would have been the applicable procedure? MR KOPECKY: It is our understanding there is a settlement procedure before you can escalate matters to court. That is very common. I think it can be found on several of the contracts on record, including Claimants' contracts with I think Bicoli-Agro I am not certain but the contracts they signed with other third parties contained this	14:14

ign	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi		I 11 Decem Vienna	
1	the dispesition?	173	1	looped but Claimente brooched their loope agreemente	175
	the disposition?	14:15	1	leases but Claimants breached their lease agreements before the dispositions were even issued. We	14:18
2	MR SOFER: I beg your pardon?			•	
3	MR FORTIER: Is that after the issuance of the diagonitien?			already saw C-95, "the lessee breached the terms of	
4 -	the disposition?			the Agreement and the lessee breached the	
5	MR KOPECKY: Yes. The Zahar agreement			requirements for the technological use/work of the	
5	I think is 2012. So that is a very common procedure			land". And Claimants continued breaching their	
7	in Moldova.		7	agreements thereafter. Exhibit C-60.	
8	To take you back to exhibit C-123, the		8	THE PRESIDENT: I am sorry, what was the	
9	court clearly said that "ICS Laguardia SRL [was]		9	breach here?	
0	entitled to address the parties a prior request for		10	MR KOPECKY: The alleged breach was it	
1	all the claims submitted and, in the event that he			appears to have been non-payment and the requirement	
2	will not be satisfied with the decisions taken or			for technological use of the land. I can only take	
3	will not receive an answer within the time limit, he		13	it at face value. It is the will of the landowners	
4	will be entitled to address to the Court a writ of			expressed here in exhibit C-95. We have not been	
5	summons".			able to interview them. But they weren't happy.	
6	Claimants never did.		16 17	And on 13 February 2013, C-60, the	
7	Under Moldovan law parties have to comply			prosecutor writes: "But till the moment the	
8	with procedural rules, and Claimants scream			enterprise you manage did not pay the agricultural	
9	discrimination and arbitrariness but this applies		19	land rental payment for the year 2012, so you	
0	equally to all parties in all instances. C-44: For			gathered a back payment of 850,000 MDL".	
1	his failure to comply with procedural rules, the		21	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: What is that in euros?	
2	Cosernita mayor's appeal was rejected, even at the		22	MR KOPECKY: I think it is 1220.	
3	level of the Supreme Court. As we know, the		23	Now Claimants seek to pin their failures	
24	Cosernita mayor filed an appeal against the court		24 25	on Respondent. In their Reply Memorial, paragraph 392, they submit that they lost their	
	order, I believe it was the one setting aside the				
25					
	disposition, but failed to set forth the grounds for appeal. The court informed the appellant, the mayor, about the necessity to review the appeal to make it well grounded. Finally the Supreme Court considered that the Balti Court of Appeal was right when ordering to send Cosernita mayor's appeal back as the appellants failed to comply with court instructions. The law treats all the same. Claimants did not manage the litigation diligently. Exhibit C-50: "With the participation of plaintiff's representative". Plaintiff here was Bio-Alianta, the defendant was Laguardia. "The defendant's representative in the person of the lawyer Alina Balan being repeatedly summoned in the legal manner, in hearing session did not appeared" and that sounds a bit like Master Yoda but I believe it is clear. They failed to appear in court repeatedly. Exhibit C-112: "ICS	174 14:16	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	entire investment due to and at the time of the dispositions. 392: "The time of the taking is the date of the dispositions". Relating to Cosernita, it was the date of Disposition 1-A, 20 February 2011. In Varvareuca the date of taking was the date of Disposition 2, 10 March 2011, and also in Rosietici the date of taking was 10 March 2011. But Respondent is not responsible. Respondent did not violate its international law obligations nor cause the damage claimed, and this includes the dispositions, which were based on a reasonable reading of the law. First Report Rusu, paragraphs 31 through 50: "I analyse the two elements of the Mayor's dispositions separately", to refuse registration of the lease agreements and to delete the entries. Paragraph 41: "Dispositions 1-A and 2 were a product of a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law to the extent that they provided for the refusal	176 14:19
25 12345678901234567890	disposition, but failed to set forth the grounds for appeal. The court informed the appellant, the mayor, about the necessity to review the appeal to make it well grounded. Finally the Supreme Court considered that the Balti Court of Appeal was right when ordering to send Cosernita mayor's appeal back as the appellants failed to comply with court instructions. The law treats all the same. Claimants did not manage the litigation diligently. Exhibit C-50: "With the participation of plaintiff's representative in the absence of the defendant's representative". Plaintiff here was Bio-Alianta, the defendant was Laguardia. "The defendant's representative in the person of the lawyer Alina Balan being repeatedly summoned in the legal manner, in hearing session did not appeared" and that sounds a bit like Master Yoda but I believe it is clear. They failed to		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	dispositions. 392: "The time of the taking is the date of the dispositions". Relating to Cosernita, it was the date of Disposition 1-A, 20 February 2011. In Varvareuca the date of taking was the date of Disposition 2, 10 March 2011, and also in Rosietici the date of taking was 10 March 2011. But Respondent is not responsible. Respondent did not violate its international law obligations nor cause the damage claimed, and this includes the dispositions, which were based on a reasonable reading of the law. First Report Rusu, paragraphs 31 through 50: "I analyse the two elements of the Mayor's dispositions separately", to refuse registration of the lease agreements and to delete the entries. Paragraph 41: "Dispositions 1-A and 2 were a product of a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan	
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	disposition, but failed to set forth the grounds for appeal. The court informed the appellant, the mayor, about the necessity to review the appeal to make it well grounded. Finally the Supreme Court considered that the Balti Court of Appeal was right when ordering to send Cosernita mayor's appeal back as the appellants failed to comply with court instructions. The law treats all the same. Claimants did not manage the litigation diligently. Exhibit C-50: "With the participation of plaintiff's representative in the absence of the defendant's representative". Plaintiff here was Bio-Alianta, the defendant was Laguardia. "The defendant's representative in the person of the lawyer Alina Balan being repeatedly summoned in the legal manner, in hearing session did not appeared" and that sounds a bit like Master Yoda but I believe it is clear. They failed to appear in court repeatedly. Exhibit C-112: "ICS		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	dispositions. 392: "The time of the taking is the date of the dispositions". Relating to Cosernita, it was the date of Disposition 1-A, 20 February 2011. In Varvareuca the date of taking was the date of Disposition 2, 10 March 2011, and also in Rosietici the date of taking was 10 March 2011. But Respondent is not responsible. Respondent did not violate its international law obligations nor cause the damage claimed, and this includes the dispositions, which were based on a reasonable reading of the law. First Report Rusu, paragraphs 31 through 50: "I analyse the two elements of the Mayor's dispositions separately", to refuse registration of the lease agreements and to delete the entries. Paragraph 41: "Dispositions 1-A and 2 were a product of a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law to the extent that they provided for the refusal	
5 1234567890123456789012	disposition, but failed to set forth the grounds for appeal. The court informed the appellant, the mayor, about the necessity to review the appeal to make it well grounded. Finally the Supreme Court considered that the Balti Court of Appeal was right when ordering to send Cosernita mayor's appeal back as the appellants failed to comply with court instructions. The law treats all the same. Claimants did not manage the litigation diligently. Exhibit C-50: "With the participation of plaintiff's representative in the absence of the defendant's representative". Plaintiff here was Bio-Alianta, the defendant was Laguardia. "The defendant's representative in the person of the lawyer Alina Balan being repeatedly summoned in the legal manner, in hearing session did not appeared" and that sounds a bit like Master Yoda but I believe it is clear. They failed to appear in court repeatedly. Exhibit C-112: "ICS Laguardia SRL did not show up at the term fixed for		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21 22	dispositions. 392: "The time of the taking is the date of the dispositions". Relating to Cosernita, it was the date of Disposition 1-A, 20 February 2011. In Varvareuca the date of taking was the date of Disposition 2, 10 March 2011, and also in Rosietici the date of taking was 10 March 2011. But Respondent is not responsible. Respondent did not violate its international law obligations nor cause the damage claimed, and this includes the dispositions, which were based on a reasonable reading of the law. First Report Rusu, paragraphs 31 through 50: "I analyse the two elements of the Mayor's dispositions separately", to refuse registration of the lease agreements and to delete the entries. Paragraph 41: "Dispositions 1-A and 2 were a product of a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law to the extent that they provided for the refusal of registration of agricultural leases". Paragraph	
25 1234567890123456789	disposition, but failed to set forth the grounds for appeal. The court informed the appellant, the mayor, about the necessity to review the appeal to make it well grounded. Finally the Supreme Court considered that the Balti Court of Appeal was right when ordering to send Cosernita mayor's appeal back as the appellants failed to comply with court instructions. The law treats all the same. Claimants did not manage the litigation diligently. Exhibit C-50: "With the participation of plaintiff's representative in the absence of the defendant's representative". Plaintiff here was Bio-Alianta, the defendant was Laguardia. "The defendant's representative in the person of the lawyer Alina Balan being repeatedly summoned in the legal manner, in hearing session did not appeared" and that sounds a bit like Master Yoda but I believe it is clear. They failed to appear in court repeatedly. Exhibit C-112: "ICS Laguardia SRL did not show up at the term fixed for the appeal and the court ordered the examination in		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 12\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	dispositions. 392: "The time of the taking is the date of the dispositions". Relating to Cosernita, it was the date of Disposition 1-A, 20 February 2011. In Varvareuca the date of taking was the date of Disposition 2, 10 March 2011, and also in Rosietici the date of taking was 10 March 2011. But Respondent is not responsible. Respondent did not violate its international law obligations nor cause the damage claimed, and this includes the dispositions, which were based on a reasonable reading of the law. First Report Rusu, paragraphs 31 through 50: "I analyse the two elements of the Mayor's dispositions separately", to refuse registration of the lease agreements and to delete the entries. Paragraph 41: "Dispositions 1-A and 2 were a product of a reasonable interpretation of Moldovan law to the extent that they provided for the refusal of registration of agricultural leases". Paragraph 50: "also the second disposition" the order	

CSID ARB 16 8 bigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidentia Revised		a, Austi
	$ \begin{array}{c ccccc} 177\\ 1&2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ \end{array} $	enforced against the lessor". Claimants could equally enforce their leases against Bio-Alianta. Second Report Rusu, paragraph 10: "Regardless of the registration of the lease, it is enforceable against third parties acting in bad faith. "Registration of a lease does not automatically make it opposable (enforceable) against third parties". Indeed, in the injunction and in the decision cancelling the injunction the reasoning does not mention registration. If you look at exhibit C-105 – and I will walk you through it – the court finds a preventive measure can be cancelled at the defendant's request. The court further finds that landowners from Cosernita village concluded leases with Laguardia. The lessee worked a part of the lands, about 140 hectares,from 680, and the landowners signed new lease contracts with Bio-Alianta, who requested the court to declare the contracts signed by ICS Laguardia with the owners from Cosernita voided, and requested preventative measures. But Bio-Alianta did not mention any particular reason for the annulment of the contracts, and therefore the court considered that	179 14:24
 even the Floresti District Court has not subjected I am sorry, I am misquoting. The Floresti District Court judgment of 24 July 2014 has not been subject to review by superior courts on the merits. That was my statement. I apologise. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The question comes to my head, given this procedural situation, it is the decision of the Floresti court which entered into force. That was a final and binding decision. MR KOPECKY: That is correct. In any event, dispositions were not challenged by Claimants in court. Claimants never challenged them in court. They admit as much in Memorial paragraph 470. "The only action Claimants did not take was the immediate challenge of the disposition in the local administrative courts". And in any event to that, the dispositions did not prevent the enforcement of Claimants' rights against Bio-Alianta. Claimants could enforce their rights against the landowners regardless of registration. First Report Rusu, paragraph 12. "Unregistered leases remain valid (if the case)", meaning if they are indeed valid, "under civil law, and can be 	178 14:22 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	the seizure measure was inappropriate as it would impede Laguardia from the agricultural work and cause it unfounded prejudice as its lease contracts with the owners had not been terminated, and therefore the court decided to cancel the preventive measure in favour of Bio-Alianta. So to annul Bio-Alianta's injunctions, only Claimants' contractual rights under the law against the landowners were considered, not the registration. Finally, the other impugned conduct that Claimants complain about is neither attributable nor is it proven. It is not attributable. Claimants allege no failure of Respondent's laws or its judiciary to the extent that it was even ceased. Claimants claim damage allegedly caused by Bio-Alianta. However, Bio-Alianta is not attributable to Respondent. The other impugned conduct is not proven either. Claimants did not prove they were induced to invest by any alleged assurances of Respondent and did not prove any of its alleged conspiracies. Claimants' failure to seek correction is relevant on the merits. Claimants agree that not every unlawful act or decision constitutes a BIT breach, and failure to seek correction may be	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			ber 2017 a, Austria
		Revis	ed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17		a, Austri a 183
23 24 25	breached, and those elements are: Claimants impugn particularly low level governmental acts. Those acts were based on a reasonable interpretation of			MR KOPECKY: So if we add the indirect costs and the depreciation expenses, we arrive at total figures of between 85,000 and 133,000 per year	
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array}$	the law. First Report Rusu, paragraphs 31, 41 and 50. Those acts were open to a direct challenge in court. First Report Rusu paragraph 67; Second Report Rusu, paragraph 68. Those challenges would not have been futile. Indeed, the district court seized to review the dispositions' interpretation of the law did not endorse it (C-043) Claimants had legal representation at the time (Second statement Grot, paragraph 6 and 9), lawyers who were aware of the dispositions but held off challenging them, C-126, pages 3 and 4. Yet Claimants never challenged the dispositions. Finally, or semi-finally, to be precise, even if all were true, Respondent did not cause Claimants damage. In Cosernita and Varvareuca the farming rights to those lands were derived from valid lease contracts to the extent those contracts were valid, and Claimants could enforce their rights against landowners regardless of registration (expert report Rusu, paragraph 12) and Claimants could enforce their rights against Bio-Alianta as well regardless of registration (Second Report Rusu, paragraphs 10 and 11). As regards Rosietici, the operations in		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	in indirect costs and deprecation expenses, and if we then subtract this from the EBIT, in that last remaining village of Rosietici, which on Claimants' case is between 353 and 401,000, we still arrive at a positive number. And please don't make me speak about numbers any further, because I am a lawyer, and we have many experts who will hopefully explain those numbers, but to me 353 minus 85 is a positive number and it means that there was no survival mode There may have been an impact, but the operations in Rosietici alone could have borne all alleged indirect costs and depreciation expenses, on Claimants' case, which is not admitted or accepted, but, on their case, Rosietici would have pulled it off alone. Finally, Respondent did not cause Claimants damage, which damage is in any event excessive. We will hear much more on this from the quantum experts on Wednesday, but to summarise lost profits cannot be based on DCF absent a proven record of earnings. Claimants request pre-award interest more than double the alleged actual damage. The quantification blindly relies on the agricultural expert report to be updated without any apparent reasonability check by the quantum expert.	184

-) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised		nber 2017 a, Austria
	· ·	185			187
1	The damage is based on at least partially invalid	14:32	1	speak, the Claimants, will have 15 minutes of direct	14:48
2 3	leases in a four-year lease term, although only three years had been agreed, and the presumed		2 3	examination, which will start now, and you will then be made available to the Respondent, and then the	
4	performance of Claimants' business would have		4	Claimant will have an opportunity to come back to	
5	exceeded the next comparable business more than two		5	you with further questions, but only in relation to	
6	times, and I'm not saying average, I am saying the		6	matters raised by the Respondent in its	
7	next best business would have been exceeded more		7	cross-examination.	
8	than two times.		8	MR GROT: Your honour, before Mr Wells	
9	Nevertheless, Claimants' high-tech farming		9	asks me questions, I think I owe you some	
10	business operations appear to be less		10	information, because to listen, the lawyers, I am	
11	capital-intensive than other comparable businesses.		11	sitting, and there are two different scenarios, so	
12	And finally, Claimants claim the full value of		12	I think I will help you a lot.	
13	assets which they still control.		13	This land which I took in Moldova was	
14	Under those assumptions, corrected,		14	three years unused	
	-		15	THE PRESIDENT: I think there is a	
15 16	Claimants' damage amounts to nil. Mr President, members of the Tribunal,		15	procedure that is agreed as between the parties.	
10	Respondent just outlined why it is not responsible		17	I hope you will have the chance to say –	
17	for the damage Claimants claim. Because Claimants		17	MR GROT: apologise.	
10 19	were not diligent in establishing their investment,		10 19	THE PRESIDENT: No need for an apology at	
20	they were not diligent in managing their investment,		20	all. I express the hope that you will have the	
20 21	and however Claimants seek to pin their failures on		20	chance during the course of the direct and the cross	
22	Respondent, Respondent is not responsible.		22	to address all of the matters you want, and I am	
22	Thank you.		23	sure also my colleagues will have questions, and	
23 24	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Does that		23 24	part of this is to allow you to say what it is you	
24	conclude your opening argument?		24 25	want to say to clarify your witness statement.	
25					
25		196			199
1	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does.	186 14:34	1	MR GROT: Thank you.	188 14:50
1 2	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then		2	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You	
1	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take		2 3	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to	
1 2 3 4	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready		2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells?	
1 2 3	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance		2 3 4 5	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants	
1 2 3 4 5 6	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin		2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side,		2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm)		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 16 17	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then re-direct, you have to make a statement, and I think		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are any corrections he would wish to make to the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then re-direct, you have to make a statement, and I think you have that statement in front of you. I would be		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are any corrections he would wish to make to the documents that are before him, just for the sake of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then re-direct, you have to make a statement, and I think you have that statement in front of you. I would be very grateful if you could just read for the record		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are any corrections he would wish to make to the documents that are before him, just for the sake of good housekeeping. We can then move on	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then re-direct, you have to make a statement, and I think you have that statement in front of you. I would be very grateful if you could just read for the record aloud that statement.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are any corrections he would wish to make to the documents that are before him, just for the sake of good housekeeping. We can then move on MR WELLS: Yes, Mr President.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then re-direct, you have to make a statement, and I think you have that statement in front of you. I would be very grateful if you could just read for the record aloud that statement. MR GROT: I solemnly declare upon my		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are any corrections he would wish to make to the documents that are before him, just for the sake of good housekeeping. We can then move on MR WELLS: Yes, Mr President. Mr Grot, I am showing you on the screen	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then re-direct, you have to make a statement, and I think you have that statement in front of you. I would be very grateful if you could just read for the record aloud that statement. MR GROT: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are any corrections he would wish to make to the documents that are before him, just for the sake of good housekeeping. We can then move on MR WELLS: Yes, Mr President. Mr Grot, I am showing you on the screen CWS-1, witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. Do	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then re-direct, you have to make a statement, and I think you have that statement in front of you. I would be very grateful if you could just read for the record aloud that statement. MR GROT: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are any corrections he would wish to make to the documents that are before him, just for the sake of good housekeeping. We can then move on MR WELLS: Yes, Mr President. Mr Grot, I am showing you on the screen CWS-1, witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. Do you remember this?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR KOPECKY: Yes, it does. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We will then move to the first of our witnesses. Let's just take a 5-minute break so we can get the courtroom ready to hear from Mr Grot. There will be, in accordance with our conversation, 15 minutes of direct to begin with, and then we hand him over to your side, Mr Kopecky. Very good. Back at twenty to three. (Short break from 2.35 pm to 2.45 pm) ZBIGNIEW PIOTR GROT THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, welcome to Vienna. I think Ms Nitschke has already explained to you that you are appearing as a witness in these proceedings, not only as Claimant, and that before you are given an opportunity under direct examination and then cross-examination, and then re-direct, you have to make a statement, and I think you have that statement in front of you. I would be very grateful if you could just read for the record aloud that statement. MR GROT: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE PRESIDENT: So have no worries. You will hopefully be able to say everything you want to say. Mr Wells? Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Mr Grot, could you finish the last sentence, the point you were about to make? MR GROT: The land which I took, the three villages, was unused for three years. This was vacant land, unfarmed, unseeded, unprocessed for three years. THE PRESIDENT: I think it is traditional, just for the record, if you could take him to his witness statement, and then clarify that these are indeed his witness statements, it is indeed his signature, and invite him to say whether there are any corrections he would wish to make to the documents that are before him, just for the sake of good housekeeping. We can then move on MR WELLS: Yes, Mr President. Mr Grot, I am showing you on the screen CWS-1, witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. Do	

bigr) ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi			a, Austr
1	thic2	189	4	beginning that it uses a translation of translation	191
1	this? MR GROT: Yes. No 1.	14:51	1 2	beginning that it was a translation, a translation	14:54
2			2 3	from Romanian into English. MR GROT: Yes.	
3 ⊿	MR WELLS: I am going to briefly take you through it		3 4	MR WELLS: Are you aware of where is the	
4 5	THE PRESIDENT: If you could take him to		4 5	Romanian version of this letter?	
-	his signature and ask whether there are any		6	MR GROT: I never thought about that, but	
6 7	corrections to this document?			there is probably in the translation office,	
8	MR WELLS: Okay. Here is the end of the			translator office, we could find a copy. But	
9	witness statement, Mr Grot. Is that your signature?		9	I don't remember.	
10	MR GROT: Yes.		10	MR WELLS: Have you attempted to look for	
11	MR WELLS: It looks like you have dated			this?	
12	it. What is the date?		12	MR GROT: This issue came to me today, to	
13	MR GROT: It looks like January 11, 2017.			my attention, so for what reason am I supposed to	
14	MR WELLS: Are there any corrections you			look for?	
15	would like to make to the witness statement?		15	MR WELLS: During the production of	
16	MR GROT: During the opening statement of			documents in this case, not from a request from the	
17	Moldova there was a picture, you know –			Respondent but during the submission of documents in	
18	THE PRESIDENT: Sorry, Mr Grot. At this			this case by the Claimants, this is one of the	
19	point, is there anything in this witness statement		19	documents that was submitted, and one of the	
20	that needs to be corrected? Does it accurately			requirements in Procedural Order No 1 is to provide	
20 21	reflect your views?		20 21	an original version of the document. So this is	
21	MR GROT: Yes. This is accurate.			translated into English.	
23	THE PRESIDENT: Good. If we could do the		23	MR GROT: Yes.	
23	same for the second witness statement, just for the		23 24	MR WELLS: We need to identify if this is	
25	sake of good housekeeping, just to make sure it is			your letter and whether or not it was possible to	
		100			400
1	indeed your statement that we are looking at. That	190 14:52		locate the original Romanian version of this letter.	192 14:56
1 2	is all this is about. It is just a formality.		2	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home,	
1	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness		2 3	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so	
1 2 3 4	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot.		2 3 4	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this	
1 2 3 4 5	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes.		2 3 4 5	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in	
1 2 3 4 5 6	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there?		2 3 4 5 6	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes.		2 3 4 5 6 7	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would like to take you through it and show you this		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: Who wrote it?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would like to take you through it and show you this briefly, and note at the top right corner it states		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: Who wrote it? MR GROT: The guy who does translation,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 8 19	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would like to take you through it and show you this briefly, and note at the top right corner it states "Translation from Romanian into English". You will		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: Who wrote it? MR GROT: The guy who does translation, I did in my language and we translated to the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 0	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would like to take you through it and show you this briefly, and note at the top right corner it states "Translation from Romanian into English". You will see that this is in the English language, this		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: Who wrote it? MR GROT: The guy who does translation, I did in my language and we translated to the Romanian guy, he did writing. I was dictating him,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would like to take you through it and show you this briefly, and note at the top right corner it states "Translation from Romanian into English". You will see that this is in the English language, this letter. I will just go through it briefly here.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21 21	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: Who wrote it? MR GROT: The guy who does translation, I did in my language and we translated to the Romanian guy, he did writing. I was dictating him, do this, do this, do that, so when he accomplished	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 14 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 12 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would like to take you through it and show you this briefly, and note at the top right corner it states "Translation from Romanian into English". You will see that this is in the English language, this letter. I will just go through it briefly here. You will see at the end it states "Zbigniew Grot".		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: Who wrote it? MR GROT: The guy who does translation, I did in my language and we translated to the Romanian guy, he did writing. I was dictating him, do this, do this, do that, so when he accomplished the Romanian language, then we translated to	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 23	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would like to take you through it and show you this briefly, and note at the top right corner it states "Translation from Romanian into English". You will see that this is in the English language, this letter. I will just go through it briefly here. You will see at the end it states "Zbigniew Grot". You see the Laguardia stamp. Is this your letter?		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: Who wrote it? MR GROT: The guy who does translation, I did in my language and we translated to the Romanian guy, he did writing. I was dictating him, do this, do this, do that, so when he accomplished the Romanian language, then we translated to English, and the Romanian was sent to those three	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 4 15 6 17 18 19 20 1 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 2	is all this is about. It is just a formality. MR WELLS: Here is CWS-12, second witness statement of Zbigniew Piotr Grot. MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: Is that your signature there? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Does this reflect an accurate statement of your views? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Over to you, Mr Wells. MR WELLS: Thank you. Mr Grot, I have on the screen C-083. Earlier today there was some discussion during the housekeeping about the admissibility of this particular exhibit. I would like to take you through it and show you this briefly, and note at the top right corner it states "Translation from Romanian into English". You will see that this is in the English language, this letter. I will just go through it briefly here. You will see at the end it states "Zbigniew Grot".		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	MR GROT: I was trying to find at home, I was unable, and I never thought this would be so important. By the way, you know, actually this letter could be written from the very beginning in English, though the version of Romanian, this letter I was writing, I hire some Romanian translator in Colorado Springs to do that, because I got a telephone call from Moldova, from anti-corruption department, Mr Lilian Pintia, he called me and he asked me to contact US Embassy to write the letter, and themselves, I mean the anti-corruption and US Embassy, those guys were trying to resolve the problem, you know, the criminal problem MR WELLS: Do you speak Romanian? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: Who wrote it? MR GROT: The guy who does translation, I did in my language and we translated to the Romanian guy, he did writing. I was dictating him, do this, do this, do that, so when he accomplished the Romanian language, then we translated to	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revis			nber 201 a, Austri
bigr 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	locate the original version of this? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: In response to Mr Grot's testimony, the Claimants would request that this exhibit be admitted into evidence, after authentication. MR FORTIER: Mr Grot, you have explained how the document actually saw the light of day. You dictated in English to a Romanian translator. MR GROT: Exactly. MR FORTIER: The letter that is here in our book, is that correct, that is before you? MR GROT: Yes. MR FORTIER: And that letter was translated into Romanian? MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: The Claimants would request again that this particular exhibit be admitted into evidence. THE PRESIDENT: Give us one minute. We will confer.	193 14:57	sed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Vienn Laguardia's ability to make a profit in Stefan Voda, and that can be found on page 31 of the Rejoinder. What type of contracts did Laguardia enter into to perform farming in Stefan Voda? MR GROT: I sign a contract, a lease contract, for one season for 250 ha. MR WELLS: We have heard a lot about leases, over 1,500 leases. How many leases were in Stefan Voda? MR GROT: One. MR WELLS: Did you make an attempt to locate that one lease? MR GROT: Yes. MR WELLS: What happened? Could you find it? MR GROT: Mr Wells, you know, seven years ago if I had knowledge I will go to court, I will hire a person to hold those documents. We transferred from one place to another place, impossible to find MR WELLS: Who looked for that lease?	a, Austr 195
22 23 24 25	(The Tribunal conferred off the record) THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal's position is that we are happy to allow this to be admitted into evidence, but we express no view as to its weight or		22 23 24 25	MR GROT: Well, we checked, because the lease is supposed to be in the CPA office, the bookkeeper's office, and she said she does not have it there.	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	authority or probative value, but subject to that, it is admitted into evidence. MR WELLS: Thank you, Mr President. Mr Grot, with the ten minutes or so that we have remaining in your direct examination, I would like to have questions related to REX-3, the expert report on damages from Mr Michael Peer. Mr Peer's report refers to certain profits obtained by Laguardia in Stefan Voda district, where Laguardia first began farming in Moldova. To be clear, could you just clarify, when was it that Laguardia first entered Moldova? What year? In the Stefan Voda district? MR GROT: 2008. MR WELLS: After that first year you engaged in farming operations. How successful were you with the operations in Stefan Voda? MR GROT: I was happy, and there was, you know, nice profit for this kind of investment. It was only 250 ha, and in the similar situation as Floresti, the land was unused for 5 or 6 years, prior to my investment MR WELLS: The Respondent has requested that the Tribunal make what is called a negative inference for the fact that especially regarding	,	$1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 101121314151617181920122232425$	MR WELLS: And she could not locate it? MR GROT: No. MR WELLS: You have referred to this lease as a servicing contract in your witness statement and pleadings. Since it is missing, can you describe the terms of the contract? The basic terms? MR GROT: The basic terms is I am taking land for one year and I am paying a return for the lease. I remember I think we pay like 8,000 USD for the 250 ha for one farming season. MR WELLS: Moving on to the next question relating to Mr Peer's expert report, the report incorporates, as we heard earlier in the opening statements, what is called "average yields" as part of the calculation. I would like to talk about the differences between Laguardia's approach to farming in comparison to normal Moldovan farming. How did your equipment compare? MR GROT: Prior to my investment in Moldova, there were some modern farms in Moldova. On average, small farms, because there was 50 ha, 70 ha, 30 ha. There was old from the other system, I mean the communist system, farm equipment, which was old equipment, so you can't compete. This is	196 15:02

-) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidenti Revised		iber 201 a, Austr
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 22 \\ 22 \\ 24 \\ 22 \\ 24 \\ 24 \\ 24$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Revised 197 1 15:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Vienna operation. That is at section 3.3 of the report, starting at page 9. Did Laguardia have different business divisions? THE PRESIDENT: I can allow Mr Grot to answer this question, but we are out of time at that point. Pleas do answer that question, Mr Grot. Take as long as you need to answer. MR GROT: You asked me about other? MR WELLS: So the question relates to – Mr Peer's report refers to different business divisions that Laguardia had. MR GROT: No, this is untrue. MR WELLS: So what was Laguardia's business? MR GROT: Farming. MR WELLS: What exactly does that constitute? Presumably what we just talked about, growing crops, but anything else? MR GROT: Growing crops. At this stage of business the plan was to grow a crop. MR WELLS: Nothing else, such as selling equipment? MR GROT: No, absolutely not. MR WELLS: Thank you. No further questions.	a, Aust 199 15:07
23 24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	plough technology, which some people do it like this today in Moldova, no plough, which means using, instead of ploughing the land and making even, you go straight with the planter, so actually there is some kind of disc, which is like knives, cutting the groove and placing the seed, so modern technology is very important, you know? Because, for example, to seed a winter wheat, each seed must be in a certain depth in the soil, so our technology allowed us to plant every single seed on the same level. The old technology, one seed is 7cms, one is 3cms, one is on top, so this is the type of difference in technology. MR WELLS: Getting back to Mr Peer's report again, and what we saw earlier, references in the opening to negative profits, all four years were addressed in the report, if Laguardia had experienced high costs and low yields in such a way that it resulted in negative profits, or no profits rather, is that something that your business could easily have adjusted? What could you have done?	198 15:05 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR GROT: No, absolutely not. MR WELLS: Thank you. No further questions. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: One very technical question. I am sure it is easy to answer. In your first witness statement, paragraph 24, you say that you went back to the United States in December 2011, but I am sure it is 2010. Is that correct? Did you mean 2010? That is a typo? MR GROT: Yes, I went back home for Christmas. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: In 2010? MR GROT: 2010. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Not in 2011? MR GROT: Well, I went back in 2011. Every winter, after season. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You say here in December 2011. What do you mean by that? Did you mean December 2010 or 2011? You say now 2011. MR GROT: No. I said, your Honour, I went	200
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR GROT: Definitely, right away, to fix that because you could switch culture and some other stuff. But, you know, how could you survive four years with no profits, right? MR WELLS: Thank you. Another thing that is addressed in Mr Peer's report is reference to business divisions involved in Laguardia's farming	19 20 21 22 23 24 25	back to the United States every end of December for Christmas, 2010, 2011, 2012. THE PRESIDENT: I think I can clarify. You say here, "with the leases signed and initial operations frozen for winter, in late December 2011 I travelled back to the United States". We think you probably meant to write "December 2010"?	

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia vised	al 11 Decen Vienna	
-	·	201	1	District	203
1		15:11	1	District. MR GROT: Yes.	15:16
2 3	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The other question that I have before we start cross-examination is		2	MR KOPECKY: And to farm that land you had	
3 4	I want to come back to this lease contract in		3	to lease that land. Am I right?	
4 5	Stefan Voda. You said there was only one landowner.		4 5	MR GROT: Yes.	
6	Was that a private landowner?		6	MR KOPECKY: So the leases were the very	
7	MR GROT: It looks like one owner of the		7	core of your investment?	
8	land, yes.		8	MR GROT: Yes.	
9	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: If you say there was		9	MR KOPECKY: And you planned to lease	
10	only one		10	about 3000 ha?	
11	MR GROT: Only one, definitely. I do not		11	MR GROT: Yes.	
12	know if he was subleasing or this was his land, I do		12	MR KOPECKY: That is how much all those	
13	not know.			leases together would have covered?	
14	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Did you have this		14	MR GROT: Yes.	
15	lease registered with the mayor's office in		15	MR KOPECKY: Industrial farming of large	
16	Stefan Voda?		16	plots is, as we heard, more profitable than farming	
17	MR GROT: No, your Honour. This piece of		17	small fields. Is that right?	
18	land was in a different country, we could say that.		18	MR GROT: Yes.	
19	Pridnestrovie Nistria. So this was on the border.		19	MR KOPECKY: So it is important that the	
20	There was Stefan Voda and part of the land was the		20	field that you are farming is one connected plot,	
21	other side. It is like an independent country, I		21	rather than many small ones. Is that correct?	
22	don't know how to figure that Nistria area with		22	MR GROT: Yes.	
23	Tiraspol. The landowner took care of that. He took		23	MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot, when you worked in	
24	the lease, I paid the money and there was no issue		24	Stefan Voda, which for the record is not in	
	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But you did not bother		25	Transnistria but it is indeed on the border, you met	
25					
25		202			204
1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	202 15:12	1	Mr Igor Bugai. Is that right?	
_			1 2	MR GROT: Yes.	
1	to have it registered for the validity of this lease				
1	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract		2	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No.	
1 2 3	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you.		2 3	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish?	204 15:17
1 2 3 4	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes.		2 3 4 5 6	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent		2 3 4 5 6 7	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements.		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125,		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 17 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125, which will appear on the screen. Looking at the		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will be in touch". And then one day I don't remember,	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 17 18	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125, which will appear on the screen. Looking at the original, at the bottom of those pages, every page		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will be in touch". And then one day I don't remember, I called him or he called me, and let's go for a	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125, which will appear on the screen. Looking at the original, at the bottom of those pages, every page is signed, but whether that is your signature?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will be in touch". And then one day I don't remember, I called him or he called me, and let's go for a meeting, so we met together and he said, "Ziggy",	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125, which will appear on the screen. Looking at the original, at the bottom of those pages, every page is signed, but whether that is your signature? MR GROT: This is my signature?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will be in touch". And then one day I don't remember, I called him or he called me, and let's go for a meeting, so we met together and he said, "Ziggy", because I share my thoughts with him, and herein	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 17 18 19 0 21	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125, which will appear on the screen. Looking at the original, at the bottom of those pages, every page is signed, but whether that is your signature? MR GROT: This is my signature? MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot, as you certainly		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will be in touch". And then one day I don't remember, I called him or he called me, and let's go for a meeting, so we met together and he said, "Ziggy", because I share my thoughts with him, and herein Stefan Voda it is a difficult time, there is not	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125, which will appear on the screen. Looking at the original, at the bottom of those pages, every page is signed, but whether that is your signature? MR GROT: This is my signature? MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot, as you certainly know, these proceedings relate to your investment in		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will be in touch". And then one day I don't remember, I called him or he called me, and let's go for a meeting, so we met together and he said, "Ziggy", because I share my thoughts with him, and herein Stefan Voda it is a difficult time, there is not enough land for expansion for us, and he said,	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 9 20 1 22 23	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125, which will appear on the screen. Looking at the original, at the bottom of those pages, every page is signed, but whether that is your signature? MR GROT: This is my signature? MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot, as you certainly know, these proceedings relate to your investment in Moldova and in particular the farming operations you		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: No I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will be in touch". And then one day I don't remember, I called him or he called me, and let's go for a meeting, so we met together and he said, "Ziggy", because I share my thoughts with him, and herein Stefan Voda it is a difficult time, there is not enough land for expansion for us, and he said, "Ziggy, I have a friend in Floresti, he is	15:17
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 11 12 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	to have it registered for the validity of this lease contract? You simply concluded a private contract and you worked this land. MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kopecky? Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Good afternoon, Mr Grot. Welcome to Vienna and welcome to our office. My name is Leon Kopecky and, as you know, I repeat the Republic of Moldova in these proceedings. If I may I will ask you a few questions with regard to your witness statements. We have already established that the signatures on your witness statements were indeed yours. I would like to take you to exhibit C-125, which will appear on the screen. Looking at the original, at the bottom of those pages, every page is signed, but whether that is your signature? MR GROT: This is my signature? MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot, as you certainly know, these proceedings relate to your investment in		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Is Mr Bugai also a farmer? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Bugai speaks Polish? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: He invited you to Floresti to look at some farmland? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: He didn't invite you? MR GROT: Do I have a chance to explain how this happened? MR KOPECKY: Go ahead. MR GROT: When I met Mr Bugai we exchanged telephone numbers. He went back home. I went back to work. The conclusion of our meeting was "we will be in touch". And then one day I don't remember, I called him or he called me, and let's go for a meeting, so we met together and he said, "Ziggy", because I share my thoughts with him, and herein Stefan Voda it is a difficult time, there is not enough land for expansion for us, and he said,	15:17

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised		nber 201 a, Austri
1	They are looking for a farmer to lease the land",	205 15:18	1	running the operation. Is that correct?	207 15:22
2	because the structure of Moldova, after the system		2	MR GROT: Yes.	
3	collapsed, Mr Kopecky, I try to help you because		3	MR KOPECKY: That means that you were also	
4	I was there for four years. I want to assure you		4	responsible for signing and registering the many	
5	that the old pieces, old villages which we took as a		5	leases that we just discussed?	
6	lease, this is one huge piece, because this is old		6	MR GROT: Before I answer this I want to	
7	farm cohorts. Under the Soviet Union there was		7	clarify some stuff which I think will be helpful for	
8	government-owned farms, so when the system collapsed		8	all. I hired Mr Bugai as an administrator.	
9	they cut only on paper okay, they issue title to		9	Actually, I was doing the work, but at that time	
10	you, 2 ha, 2 ha, 2 ha, 2 ha, so there are 500 owners		10	I applied for legal residency in Moldova and	
11	but still one piece of land, so I don't have to jump		11	actually I can't be as a legal administrator on	
12	over one piece to get to another piece. This wasa		12	paper. The prior administrator, I discovered, in	
13	huge, huge farm.		13	the CPA office was stealing money from the accounts,	
14	So Mr Bugai, he arranged a meeting with		14	so I was desperate to switch the person who is	
15	Mr Rusu. We travelled together to Floresti and we		15	controlling the account. I think this was	
16	spoke with Mr Rusu, and, you know, he hugged me like		16	unpleasant for some people from Moldova. He was	
17	that. He said, "Ziggy, you are from Heaven. There		17	stealing my administrators, so this was the reason	
18	are three years unused land. The people wait for		18	why I switched to Mr Bugai.	
19	the bread". So actually the payment for the lease		19	Later on I took responsibility I mean,	
20	every year is 300-kilo of wheat, 100-kilo of		20	they place me, Mr Levintsa, as administrator, when	
21	sunflower, 50 or 80-kilo of corn. The people, they		21	I received what I call the green card in Moldova.	
22	raise their chickens, milk cows, so they are waiting		22	So this was legal for me to be administrator.	
23	for the payment, but for three years none, zero.		23	MR KOPECKY: I understand the	
24	Then I am in the picture and Mr Rusu is		24	administrator now. I want to understand the	
25	telling me, "Hey, next year, in May, there is an		25	registering of the leases, because if you were the	
		206			208
1	election in Moldova". For us it would be great to	15:20	1	man running the operation, I wonder what was	15:24
2	prove to people: hey we, the administration of the		2	Mr Bugai's role, because Mr Bugai says that he was	
3	region, were doing stuff, the land is occupied,			responsible?	
4	income is coming, so Mr Kopecky, from your		4	MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, to sign at that time	
5	statement, I took this, I went there, I was crying		5	any documents you have to be, there are two persons:	
6	"Give me the land, please". I was fighting. No.		6	administrator or a CPA. I can't sign at that time	
7	It is the opposite way. The people, local politics,		7	in a legal way. I don't know why the law is like	
8	they need me and they invited me there, so let's		8	that. I don't know if this is against the law.	
9 10	start from this point.		9 10	I was told I can't sign this document.	
10	This is nothing, you know, like I was hey, I want a big business here, you know, so I move to		10 11	MR KOPECKY: But you testified that you did sign some of the documents?	
12	Floresti from Stefan Voda, and there is opportunity,		12	MR GROT: I did sign, yes.	
12	there is vacant land, but if we take a lease and we		12	MR KOPECKY: Because it was so complicated	
13 14	started our farming, so there was no competition,		14	and specific under law, you entrusted Mr Bugai, and	
14	zero, none.		15	at that time you deemed him to be a competent	
16	MR KOPECKY: Thank you. Going back to		16	administrator?	
17	Mr Bugai, because I want to understand the		17	MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, before I answer this	
18	relationship, Mr Alexei Bugai is the son of		18	I try to help you more. This is not a situation	
19	Mr Igor Bugai?		19	like I am coming to this store and I am asking give	
	MR GROT: Yes.		20	me one kilo of apples. I am meeting the people in	
20	MR KOPECKY: You engaged this Alexei as		21	villages, people farming, the landowners.	
20	administrator of Laguardia?		22	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot, I do not want to	
20 21			22 23	interrupt you unduly, but we are under some	
20 21 22	administrator of Laguardia?			-	
20 21 22 23	administrator of Laguardia? MR GROT: Yes.		23 24	interrupt you unduly, but we are under some	

 tweyrything you want to say, but if you could answer 15:25 the questions as briefly as possible otherwise were in questions do shortly of time, and 1 think this only fair to you and to the Respondent to make sure questions go shortly and answers go shortly. questions go shortly and answers go shortly. MR GROT: Your Honour, I have a question to you. When would be my time? Because I think this is very important for you to make - THE PRESIDENT: We have had a statement to from you. We may well have questions for you and that will be an occasion, but if you could keep your answers to Mr Kopecky: Thank you. I wonder, did that will be an occasion, but if you could keep your answers to Mr KopeckY: Thank you. I wonder, did fjob? MR KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, did fjob? MR RGROT: I could say yes. I was happy with that. MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy with that. MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy with that. MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on behalf of Laguardia? MR GROT: I think this is a difficult question. We are talking about 1300 leases, and you as k me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so a local i could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought to everything was signed to my knowledge MR KOPECKY: The is unsigned. I thought to everything was signed to my knowledge MR KOPECKY: The is a unsigned. I thought to everything was signed to my knowledge MR KOPECKY: The is a unsigned. I thought to everything was signed to my knowledge 	-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised		iber 2017 a, Austria
2 are iquestions as briefly as possible otherwise we will get indificulty of time, and I think it is only fair to you and to the Respondent to make sure questions go shortly, and answers go shortly. 2 are leading the case. But there was no problem. 3 MR RORT: Your Honour, There a question to you. When would be my time? Because I think this is very important for you cand the twill be an occasion, but if you could keep your answers to M Kopecky short and tight, thank you. 5 everything was going in a perfect direction and I was welling to return in spring to continue my business. 1 for you. When would be my time? Because I think this is very important for you cand the twill be an occasion, but if you could keep your answers to M Kopecky short and tight, thank you. 1 MR ROPECKY: But we agree that those I assess the more single, 200 MR ROPECKY: Areal the leases signed to the upstream one bis responsibilities diligently? 1 MR ROPECKY: New Solutions, settime very person – 20 behalf of Laguardia? 1 MR ROPECKY: Areal the leases signed to my knowledge 1 1 MR ROPECKY: I have back home for your was signed to my knowledge 210 MR ROPECKY: I have back home for your was signed to my knowledge 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		· ·	209 15:25	1	then is arrival of a problem and from this point you	211 15:28
3 will get into difficulty of time, and I think it is only fair to you and to the Respondent to make sure questions go shortly, and answers go shortly. 3 1 left to the United States for Christmas, beautiful Christmas in Colorade. In 2010 was happy, to you. When would be my time? Beauses in the to you. When would here yit more? Beauses in Colorade. In Signed? 4 6 MR GROT: Your Honour, I have a question to to you. When would here yit have a question for you and that with bear cocasion, but if you could keep your answers to M KopEGKY: Thank you. I wonder, dd 5 MR KOPECKY: But we agree that those leases and others were not signed? 1 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, dd 1 MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed that with bear. 1 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, dd 1 Alexel Bugal. As you say in your witness statement, no.2, paragraph 5, the leases were signed by one of to puestion. When years in the leases signed on as km, ewell, you want to show me unsigned, so as km, ewell, you want to show me unsigned, so as km, ewell, you want to show me unsigned, so as km, ewell, you want to have me any king about 1300 heases, and you as akm, ewell, you want to have me any king about 1300 heases, and you as akm, ewell, you want to have me any for the statement that the Bugai signed all the leases and that. 1 of Laguardia. 21 agaardia? 1 in December 2010 when I left back home for sign that det statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases and me, well you have to head all the leases and me, well you have to head all the leases and me, well you have head all the leases and me, well you	2			2		
5 gestions go shortly and answers go shortly. 5 everything was going in a perfect direction and 6 MR GROT: Your Honux, I have a question 1 vas waiting to return in spring to continue my 7 byou. When would be my time? Because I think 8 in is very important for you to make - 8 MR KOPECKY: But we agree that those 8 mis very important for you to make - 8 MR KOPECKY: But we agree that those 10 form you. We may well have questions for you and 10 MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed 11 that Wile bage acrossing but it you could keep your 11 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, did 12 answers to Mr KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, did 13 Alexel Bugal. As you say in your witness statement, 16 job? MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 10 Mr GROT: How Kozk, and not the cone we have in the 17 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 17 ford anguardia? 18 Mr Administrator Alexel Bugal? 18 with that. 19 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 10 of Laguardia? 10 10 possession on a power of attome y from Laguardia to represent the interests of Laguardia? 10 10 10	3			3	o .	
5 gestions go shortly and answers go shortly. 5 everything was going in a perfect direction and 6 MR GROT: Your Honux, I have a question 1 vas waiting to return in spring to continue my 7 byou. When would be my time? Because I think 8 in is very important for you to make - 8 MR KOPECKY: But we agree that those 8 mis very important for you to make - 8 MR KOPECKY: But we agree that those 10 form you. We may well have questions for you and 10 MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed 11 that Wile bage acrossing but it you could keep your 11 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, did 12 answers to Mr KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, did 13 Alexel Bugal. As you say in your witness statement, 16 job? MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 10 Mr GROT: How Kozk, and not the cone we have in the 17 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 17 ford anguardia? 18 Mr Administrator Alexel Bugal? 18 with that. 19 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 10 of Laguardia? 10 10 possession on a power of attome y from Laguardia to represent the interests of Laguardia? 10 10 10		5		4		
6 MR GROT: Your Honour, I have a question to you. When would be my time? Because I think is is airy important for you to make - THE PRESIDENT: We have had a statement in this is very important for you to make - THE PRESIDENT: We have had a statement in this is very important for you to make - THE PRESIDENT: We have had a statement in this is very important for you to make - THE PRESIDENT: We have had a statement, answers to M Kopecky with and With Bugai do a good for you participation in the administrator, 2. A participation in the partin the interess of the partin the interess of the partic	5			5		
7 to you. When would be my time? Because I think 7 business. 8 this is very important for you make – 9 THE PRESIDEN: We have had a statement 10 form you. We may well have questors for you and 1 11 that will be an occasion, built you could keep your 12 answers to Mr Kopecky short and tight, thank you. 13 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, did 14 Mr Bugai exercise his responsibilities diigently? 15 Or, to put it more simply, did M Bugai do a good 16 job? 17 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 18 MR KOPECKY: are all the leases signed on 20 behaff of Laguardia? 21 MR GROT: I could say yes, I was happy 14 in Docernber 2010 when I left back home for 13:3:4 23 MR KOPECKY: But an we agree that many 3 Isaid that. 1 1 in Docernber 2010 when I left back home for 13:3:4 24 I could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 13:3:4 25 MR KOPECKY: But an we agree that many 6 Isaid that. 1 of Laguardia?						
8 MR KOPECKY: But we agree that those 9 THE PRESIDENT: We have had a statement 10 from you. We may well have questions for you and 11 that will be an occasion, but if you could keep your 13 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. 14 Mr Bugai exercise his responsibilities diligently? 13 15 Or, to put it more simply, did Mr Bugai do a good 16 Joh? 17 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 18 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 20 question. We are taking about 1300 leases, and you 21 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 21 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 21 Question. We are taking about 1300 leases, and you 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 24 Louid prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 26 In December 2010 when I left back home for 13228 1 of Laguardia? 1 26 MR GROT: Kell, if you prove, if you show 1 7 MR KOPECKY: The lifty have a look at R-20. 8 Basad		•				
9 THE PRESIDENT: We have had a statement if from you. We may well have questions for you and if that will be an occasion, but if you could keep your asserse to Mr Kopecky short and tight, thank you. 9 leases and others were not signed? 10 mR KOPECKY: And those that were signed if job? MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed in that were not all signed by the administrator, if you preside and others were not signed? 10 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, did job? MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed if you preside and others were not signed? 11 MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed job? MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed in that were not all signed by the administrator. 12 MR KOPECKY: And the leases signed on job behalf of Laguardia? MR KOPECKY: And the leases signed on isstice 11 MR KOPECKY: And the leases signed on job behalf of Laguardia? MR KOPECKY: And that were signed in that were not signed? 12 MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed in that were not signed? MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed in that were not signed? 13 MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed in that were not signed? MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed in that were not signed? 14 in December 2010 when I left back home for instates? Im KOPECKY: If i could take you to isstart back were not signed? 15 in bade signed in behalf of isstart back were not signed in				8	MR KOPECKY: But we agree that those	
10 from you. We may well have questions for you and 11 that will be an occasion, but if you could keep your 2 answers to Mr KopeCKY: Thank you. I wonder, did 12 mR KOPECKY: And those that were signed 12 13 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. I wonder, did 14 MB Ugai sevrates his responsibilities diligently? 14 MB Ugai sevrates his responsibilities diligently? Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your Whees statement, 14 MR Ugai of M Kozak. – those guys were in 15 21 question. We are taking about 1300 leases, and you 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 14 MR GROT: Yes. 23 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 5 MR GROT: Yes. 1 of Laguardia? 24 isaid Hat. 14 MR GROT: Yes. 1 1 ask me, well, you tow site open show in the stamp of 12 1 of Laguardia? 24 is as fore for you show 15 is as fore for you dot ase, in the you sow						
11 MR KOPECKY: And tases that were signed 12 answers to Mr Kopecky short and tight, thank you. 13 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. 14 MR KOPECKY: Thank you. 15 Or, to put it more simply, did Mr Bugai do a good 16 job? 17 MR GROT: Louid say yes. I was happy 18 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 20 behalf of Laguardia? 21 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 22 question. We are talking about 1300 leases, and you 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned. I thought 24 Louid prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 26 In Decomber 2010 when I left back home for 27 fit st statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 28 MR KOPECKY: Sex, and the stamp does not have a algore 14 auguardia? 29 MR KOPECKY: Sut can we agree that many 8 Isaid that. 7 MR KOPECKY: Sut can we agree that many 8 Isaid that. 7 MR KOPECKY: Sut can we agree that many 8 leases were not signed on behalf o					5	
12 answers to Mr KOPECKY: Trank you. I worder, did 14 Mr Bugal. As you say in your withess statement, 14 14. Alexel Bugal. As you say in your withess statement, 14 16. Job? 15 Or, to put it more simply, did Mr Bugai do a good is job? 16. Four persons, which was, either yourself, Mr Bugai, 16. Job? 16 Job? MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on a power of atomey person - 20. Job all filese people sign as 14. Mr Administrator Alexel Bugai? 17 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on behalf of Laguardia? 10 MR KOPECKY: It is bacause, and you want to show me unsigned, so 24. I could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 25. everything was signed to my knowledge 21 of Laguardia. 21 1 in December 2010 when Heft back home for 1 sizket attement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 21 of Laguardia. 21 2 Christmas. MR KOPECKY: Bit is because you say in your 1 of Laguardia. 21 3 MR KOPECKY: Bit is not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 1 of Laguardia. 21 4 mR KOPECKY: Bit is not signed, no 1 of Laguardia? 1 1 4 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 1 0 MR GROT: Yes. 1 7 MR KOPECKY: Bit is n				11	MR KOPECKY: And those that were signed	
13 MR KOPECKY: Thark you, I wonder, idd. 13 Alexel Bugai. As you say in your withess statement, 14 Mr Bugai exercise his responsibilities diligently? 14 no.2, paragraph 5, the leases were signed by one of 15 Or, to put it more simply, did Mr Bugai do a good 16 job? 16 17 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 16 Mr Togui or Mr Kozak, and not me ore we have in the 18 with that. 17 rom, another one. Did all these people sign as 18 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed to my knowledge 10 08, Uagl. Tugui and Kozak - those guys were in 21 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 21 possession of a power of atomey from Laguardia to 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 23 MR KOPECKY: I see, and that twas approved 24 loculd prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 210 22 22 25 christnas. 21 of Laguardia, 23 23 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed this, it does mean 2 1 of Laguardia, 23: 3 3 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many					6	
14 Mr Bugai exercise his responsibilities diligently? 14 no.2, paragraph 5, the leases were signed by one of 15 Or, to put it more simply, did Mr Bugai do a good 16 Mr CROT: I could say yes. I was happy 18 with that. 16 Mr SQPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 20 behalf of Laguardia? 18 Mr KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 21 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 22 22 question. We are taiking about 1300 leases, and you 23 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 24 24 Loculd prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 25 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 21 1 in December 2010 when I left back home for 13:3:3 1 2 Christmas. MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 1 4 first statement that K Pugai signed all the leases 2 5 MR KOPECKY: Bits chan we agree that many 1 of Laguardia? 6 asid that. MR KOPECKY: Bits have a look at R-20. 11 MR KOPECKY: Che's have a look at R-20. MR KOPECKY: Che's have a look at R-20. 12						
15 Or, to put it more simply, did Mr Bugai do a good 16 jeb? 17 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 18 with that. 19 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 10 behalf of Laguardia? 21 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 22 question. We are taiking about 1300 leases, and you 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 24 l could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 26 Laguardia? 27 MR GROT: It is igned this, it does mean 1 in December 2010 when I left back home for 13:36 2 Christmas. 7 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 5 MR GROT: It i signed this, it does mean 1 is aid that. 11 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 9 MR KOPECKY: The lefts have a look at R-21. 16 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 17<		-				
16 job? 17 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 18 Mr Casak, and the one we have in the 17 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 18 Mr Casak, and the one we have in the 19 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 10 behalf of Laguardia? 11 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 12 question. We are talking about 1300 leases, and you 13 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 14 in December 2010 when I left back home for 15:27 16 MR GROT: It is because you say in your 17 in December 2010 when I left back home for 15:27 16 MR GROT: It is because you say in your 15:32 1 in December 2010 when I left back home for 15:32 2 MR GROT: Yes. 3 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 16 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 16 5 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 16 10 me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that 17 11 MR KOPECKY: Then lefts have a look at R-2						
17 MR GROT: I could say yes. I was happy 17 room, another one. Did all these people sign as 18 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 18 Mr Administrator Aexel Buga? 20 behalf of Laguardia? 18 Mr Administrator Aexel Buga? 21 MR ROPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 20 Bugai, Tugui and Kozak – those guys were in 22 question. We are taiking about 1300 leases, and you 20 Bugai, Tugui and Kozak – those guys were in 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 1 possession of a power of atorrey from Laguardia. 24 Loculd prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 22 because those leases still had the stamp of 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 21 of Laguardia. 21 2 Christmas. 1 of Laguardia. 13:3 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 1 ff first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 1 of Laguardia. 21 1 is adithat. 1 of Laguardia. 21 13:33 3 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 9 MR KO						
 18 with that. 19 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on behalf of Laguardia? 21 MR GROT: 1 think this is a difficult 22 question. We are talking about 1300 leases, and you 3 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 1 could prove, yes, this is unsigned. 1 thought 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 10 MR KOPECKY: I see, and that was approved 4 loculd prove, yes, this is unsigned. 1 thought 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 21 in December 2010 when I left back home for 2 Christmas. 2 Christmas. 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 5 MR GROT: If 1 signed this, it does mean 6 I said that. 3 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 8 leases were not signed on behalf of 1 said that. 3 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 9 MR GROT: No!I, if you prove, if you show 10 me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that 11 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 13 Laguardia? 4 MR GROT: No. 10 MR GROT: No. 11 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 13 Laguardia? 14 MR GROT: No. 15 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 16 MR GROT: No. 17 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 18 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 19 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 10 to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to 11 sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident. 20 MR GROT: The leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 31 together. If this is the point – 1 mean, there was 32 together. If this is the point – 1 mean, there was 32 together. If this is the point – 1 mean, there was 34 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 3 max core Chrosh the willage, or cadastral engineer, not 		-			-	
 MR KOPECKY: Are all the leases signed on 20 behalf of Laguardia? MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 22 question. We are talking about 1300 leases, and you 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 4 l could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 1 in December 2010 when I left back home for 25 Christmas. 2 Christmas. 2 MR GROT: Yes. 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 5 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 10 me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that 11 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 9 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 10 me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that 11 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 12 Laguardia? 1 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 13 Laguardia? 1 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 14 mR KOPECKY: Then lefts have a look at 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 13 Laguardia? 1 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 13 Laguardia? 1 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 16 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21. 17 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21. 18 mR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21. 19 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 20 to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to 21 sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident. 22 During the business sometimes you get two pieces 23 together. If this is the point – 1 mean, there was 24 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 20 MR GROT: Whe haves, Nr Kopecky, until the leases 21 MR GROT: Well, at no tall the pases before they register. 23 together. If this is the point – 1 mean, there was 24 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 22 MR GROT: The fee, the person who 23 together. If						
 20 behalf of Laguardia? 21 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult question. We are talking about 1300 leases, and you ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned its set. 23 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases for the you so as that MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many for the using signed on behalf of Laguardia? 24 In December 2010 when I left back home for this is the point – I mean, there was a look at R-21. 24 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show me unsigned leases, yos, I could say that all leases were negistered. So an accident. 25 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21. 26 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no that for the game tables as in the process of registration, the person the register for the say in the process of registration, the person is the fore tables as in the process of registration, the person is the register for the say in the process of registration, the person is the fore tables as the set and the for the authority, you buy it the carl you do not buy it off the authority, you buy it the carl you do not buy it off the authority, you buy it the carl you do not buy it off the authority, you buy it the carl you do not buy it off the authority, you buy it the carl you get two pieces it together. If this is the point – I mean, there was a rop of the village, or cadastral engineer, not and the many in the process is the process were proper to a the many is the point – I mean. There was a procees a stamp and he forgot to t					6	
21 MR GROT: I think this is a difficult 22 possession of a power of attorney from Laguardia to 22 guestion. We are talking about 1300 leases, and you ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 22 represent the interests of Laguardia. 23 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 24 I could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 25 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 210 of Laguardia. 23 26 Christmas. 211 of Laguardia. 221 27 Christmas. 211 of Laguardia. 221 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 3 MR KOPECKY: If I could take you to 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 3 MR KOPECKY: If I could take you to 5 MR GROT: If I signed this, it does mean 5 have a sign of Laguardia? 9 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 7 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 10 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 7 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 11 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at 10		-				
22 question. We are talking about 1300 leases, and you 23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 23 l could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 23 MR KOPECKY: I see, and that was approved 24 l could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 26 Perseent the interests of Laguardia. 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 210 1 Christmas. 2 Christmas. 210 1 of Laguardia. 211 2 Christmas. MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 1 of Laguardia. 211 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases MR KOPECKY: If I could take you to 4 exhibit R-18, can we agree that the stamp does not 5 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 7 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 8 say that not all steps in the process were free of mistakes? 0 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 10 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 8 say that not all steps in the process were registered, so 12 MR KOPECKY: Is this not signed, n	21					
23 ask me, well, you want to show me unsigned, so 23 MR KOPECKY: I see, and that was approved 24 I could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 24 because those leases still had the stamp of 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 210 25 2 I in December 2010 when I left back home for 210 21 2 Christmas. MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 1 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases MR GROT: Yes. 3 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 8 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 9 9 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 10 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show mit Stakes? 11 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 16 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 17 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy 18 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting who registered the leases, you know, like I register 14 mR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. MR KOPE	22					
24 I could prove, yes, this is unsigned. I thought 24 because those leases still had the stamp of 25 everything was signed to my knowledge 210 1 in December 2010 when I left back home for 210 2 Christmas. 1 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 1 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 3 5 MR GROT: If I signed this, it does mean 6 6 I said that. 6 7 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 8 9 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 6 11 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 7 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 1 13 Laguardia? 10 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 11 but I could say that all leases were registered, so 15 MR GROT: No. 13 who registered the lease, you know, like I register 14 MR GROT: No. 11 but I could say that all leases were registered, so 15 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. <	23					
25 everything was signed to my knowledge 25 Laguardia? The leases had a stamp? The round stamp 1 in December 2010 when I left back home for 210 1 of Laguardia. 211 2 Christmas. 1 of Laguardia. 213 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 1 of Laguardia. 213 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 3 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 3 6 I said that. 6 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 7 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 6 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 7 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 9 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 7 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 10 me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that 11 but I could say that not all steps in the process were free of 11 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 11 but I could say that all leases were registered, so 12 I caguardia? 14 a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the 14 as a simple thing	24			24		
1 in December 2010 when I left back home for 210 1 of Laguardia. 21 2 Christmas. 1 of Laguardia. 21 315:3 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 1 of Laguardia. 2 MR GROT: Yes. 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 3 MR KOPECKY: If I could take you to 4 exhibit R-16, can we agree that the stamp does not 5 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 6 MR GROT: Yes. 7 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 6 MR GROT: Yes. 7 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 9 MR GROT: Nol, it is not signed, no 11 but I could say that all leases were registered, so 12 Laguardia? 1 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 14 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 10 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 Is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgot to 16 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 Is of the genes: a stamp and he forgot to 16 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no <td>25</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	25					
 2 Christmas. 3 MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your 4 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases 5 MR GROT: If I signed this, it does mean 6 I said that. 7 MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 9 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 10 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 9 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 10 MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to 9 Say that not all steps in the process were free of 9 me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that 11 MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 12 Laguardia? 14 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 16 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 17 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 18 MR GROT: You could see in this case, this 19 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 10 to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to 11 signed this, is the point – I mean, there was 12 to do things. He places as tamp and he forgot to 13 together. If this is the point – I mean, there was 14 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 	1	in December 2010 when Lieft back home for		1	of Laguardia	212
3MR KOPECKY: It is because you say in your3MR KOPECKY: If I could take you to4first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases5MR GROT: If I signed this, it does mean45MR GROT: If I signed this, it does mean6I said that.66I said that.6MR GROT: Yes.7MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many8say that not all steps in the process were free of8leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia?8say that not all steps in the process were free of9MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show9mistakes?10me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that10MR GROT: Well, that would be speculation,11MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at11but I could say that all leases were registered, so12exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of12let's say in the process of registration, the person13Laguardia?13who registered the lease, you know, like I register14MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no14a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the15MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy17MR GROT: No.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy18it off the dealer. I am asking about the lease with1919is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting10MR GROT: The fee, the person who19is o you got a seal, right? So an accident.20MR GROT: The fee, the p			15:20		-	15:30
 first statement that Mr Bugai signed all the leases MR GROT: If I signed this, it does mean I said that. I said that. MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of taguardia? MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no Laguardia? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: So you got a seal, right? So an accident. During the business sometimes you get two pieces to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident. During the business sometimes you get two pieces together. If this is the point I mean, there was to grother with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases the checks all the lease before they register, right, so probably the question is mo						
5MR GROT: If I signed this, it does mean5have a sign of Laguardia?6I said that.6MR GROT: Yes.7MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many88leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia?99MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show810me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that1011MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at1112exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of1213Laguardia?1014MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no1315MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.1416MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no1417MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.1618MR GROT: No.1619MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.16MR GROT: No.1617MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.18is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting10MR GROT: You could see in this case, this19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting10to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to11sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.12buring the business sometimes you get two pieces13together. If this is the point I mean, there was14no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases15no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases					5	
6I said that.6MR GROT: Yes.7MR KOPECKY: But can we agree that many7MR KOPECKY: So, sir, would it be fair to8leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia?8say that not all steps in the process were free of9MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show9mistakes?10me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that10MR GROT: Well, that would be speculation,11MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at11but I could say that all leases were registered, so12exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of12let's say in the process of registration, the person13Laguardia?13who registered the lease, you know, like I register14MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no14a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the15MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.15fee to register.16MR GROT: No.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy17MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.17the car you do not buy it off the authority, you buy18is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting19it off the dealer. I am asking about the lease with19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting20MR GROT: The fee, the person who21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,22During the business sometimes you get two pieces23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no pr		a a			3	
7MR KOPECKY: leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia?7MR KOPECKY: say that not all steps in the process were free of mistakes?9MR GROT: well, if you prove, if you show8say that not all steps in the process were free of mistakes?10me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that the wising de leases, yes, I could say that10MR GROT: well, that would be speculation, the process of registration, the person11MR KOPECKY: texts have a look at taguardia?10MR GROT: who registered the lease, you know, like I register a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the te to register.14MR GROT: MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.16MR KOPECKY: tet's have a look at R-21.16MR GROT: MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.16MR KOPECKY: tet's have a look at R-21.18MR GROT: MR GROT: You could see in this case, this is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 2016MR GROT: the car you do not buy it off the authority, you buy it if fthe dealer. I am asking about the lease with 1919is a simple thing. Sometimes sometimes you get two pieces sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.20MR GROT: The fee, the person who 2120MR GROT: the business sometimes you get two pieces to gether. If this is the point I mean, there was right, so probably the question is more proper to 242424the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	-					
 8 leases were not signed on behalf of Laguardia? 9 MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show 9 me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that 10 MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at 11 MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 13 Laguardia? 14 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 16 MR GROT: No. 17 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21. 18 MR GROT: You could see in this case, this 19 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 20 to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to 21 sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident. 22 During the business sometimes you get two pieces 23 together. If this is the point – I mean, there was 24 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 						
9MR GROT: Well, if you prove, if you show9mistakes?10me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that10MR GROT: Well, that would be speculation,11MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at10MR GROT: Well, that would be speculation,12exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of11but I could say that all leases were registered, so13Laguardia?13who registered the lease, you know, like I register14MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no13a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the15MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.16MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.16MR GROT: No.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy17MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy18MR GROT: You could see in this case, this19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting20to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to20MR GROT: The fee, the person who21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.20MR GROT: The fee, the person who22together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	-					
10me unsigned leases, yes, I could say that10MR GROT: Well, that would be speculation,11MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at11but I could say that all leases were registered, so12exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of12let's say in the process of registration, the person13Laguardia?13who registered the lease, you know, like I register14MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no14a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the15MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy17MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy18is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting10MR GROT: The fee, the person who19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting10MR GROT: The fee, the person who20sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.20MR GROT: The fee, the person who21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,22buring the business sometimes you get two pieces23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not						
11MR KOPECKY: Then let's have a look at exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of Laguardia?11but I could say that all leases were registered, so12exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of Laguardia?12let's say in the process of registration, the person13Laguardia?13who registered the lease, you know, like I register14MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no14a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the15MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy17MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy18MR GROT: You could see in this case, this19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting10to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to19the villager.20to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,22During the business sometimes you get two pieces21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,23together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not						
 12 exhibit R-17. Is this lease signed on behalf of 13 Laguardia? 14 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 16 MR GROT: No. 17 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21. 18 MR GROT: You could see in this case, this 19 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 20 to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to 21 sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident. 22 During the business sometimes you get two pieces 23 together. If this is the point I mean, there was 24 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 						
 13 Laguardia? 13 who registered the lease, you know, like I register 14 MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no 15 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20. 16 MR GROT: No. 17 MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21. 18 MR GROT: You could see in this case, this 19 is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting 20 to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to 21 sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident. 22 During the business sometimes you get two pieces 23 together. If this is the point I mean, there was 24 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 	12					
14MR GROT: No, it is not signed, no14a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the15MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-20.14a car in Colorado, I have to pay the fee. I pay the16MR GROT: No.16MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.1617MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy18MR GROT: You could see in this case, this17the car you do not buy it off the authority, you buy19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting18it off the dealer. I am asking about the lease with19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting19the villager.20to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.21During the business sometimes you get two pieces21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,23together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	13			13		
16MR GROT: No.16MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy17MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.17the car you do not buy it off the authority, you buy18MR GROT: You could see in this case, this18it off the dealer. I am asking about the lease with19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting19the villager.20to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to20MR GROT: The fee, the person who21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,22During the business sometimes you get two pieces22he checks all the leases before they register,23together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not		-				
17MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.17the car you do not buy it off the authority, you buy18MR GROT: You could see in this case, this17the car you do not buy it off the authority, you buy18is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting18it off the dealer. I am asking about the lease with19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting19the villager.20to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to20MR GROT: The fee, the person who21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.20MR GROT: The fee, the person who22During the business sometimes you get two pieces21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,23together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	15	-		15		
18MR GROT: You could see in this case, this18it off the dealer. I am asking about the lease with19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting18it off the dealer. I am asking about the lease with20to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to20MR GROT: The fee, the person who21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.20MR GROT: The fee, the person who22During the business sometimes you get two pieces2123together. If this is the point I mean, there was2324no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases2425the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	16	MR GROT: No.		16	MR KOPECKY: Yes, Mr Grot, but if you buy	
19is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to19the villager.20to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to20MR GROT: The fee, the person who21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,22During the business sometimes you get two pieces22he checks all the leases before they register,23together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	17	MR KOPECKY: Let's have a look at R-21.		17	the car you do not buy it off the authority, you buy	
20to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to20 MR GROT: The fee, the person who21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,22During the business sometimes you get two pieces22he checks all the leases before they register,23together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	18	MR GROT: You could see in this case, this		18	it off the dealer. I am asking about the lease with	
21sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.21registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,22During the business sometimes you get two pieces22he checks all the leases before they register,23together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	19	is a simple thing. Sometimes people were forgetting		19	the villager.	
22During the business sometimes you get two pieces22he checks all the leases before they register,23together. If this is the point I mean, there was23right, so probably the question is more proper to24no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	20	to do things. He places a stamp and he forgot to		20	MR GROT: The fee, the person who	
23 together. If this is the point I mean, there was23 right, so probably the question is more proper to24 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases24 the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	21	sign. So you got a seal, right? So an accident.		21	registers, the Mayor City Hall, you could say that,	
24 no problem with leases, Mr Kopecky, until the leases 24 the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	22	During the business sometimes you get two pieces		22	he checks all the leases before they register,	
	23	together. If this is the point I mean, there was		23		
25 were deleted and Bio-Alianta was registered. So 25 to me.	24			24	the mayor of the village, or cadastral engineer, not	
	25	were deleted and Bio-Alianta was registered. So		25	to me.	

ngn	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi		al 11 Decen Vienna	
-		213	4		215
1	MR KOPECKY: It was their responsibility?	15:31	1	C-125, we are going to look at the English	15:34
2	MR GROT: No, not responsibility. When		2	translation this time, pg.4, of the original	
3 ⊿	I went to Floresti, villagers, landowners, mayors,			translation. You testified at this hearing as a	
4 5	head of region, they actually at the first stage		4 5	representative of Laguardia SRL, Z Grot? Take all	
5 6	there was a handshaking agreement. They said, "Ziggy, after meeting, we are so happy, go to work		6	the time you need. MR GROT: What is the question?	
7	and we will start a process, preparation. All		7	MR KOPECKY: The question is if you	
, 8	leases, we will help you". So not like I came to		8	testified at this hearing as a representative of	
9	Floresti and I was running, like you showed me the		9	Laguardia?	
0	picture, run from one person. Remember the thing,		10	MR GROT: When this hearing took place?	
1	there are 350 people, landowners. These people are		11	MR KOPECKY: 7 and 8 April 2011, so about	
2	very poor people and I am not sure if this will be		12	a month after the dispositions	
3	offensive this is very, like farmers		13	MR GROT: Yes.	
4	I apologise if I use the term "primitive", but let's		14	MR KOPECKY: You testified at the hearing	
5	say in a village like that everything which is said		15	as a representative of Laguardia.	
6	by the mayor is done. If the mayor said: "Hey		16	MR GROT: Yes.	
7	guys, sign those leases", it is done. So this is		17	MR KOPECKY: If we turn to page 3 of the	
8	the kind of organisation, not like I was running		18	document, page 7 of the transcript, when you were	
9	from one place to another to another.		19	asked, you said "all the contracts were signed by	
20	MR KOPECKY: That was Mr Bugai, right?		20	me". Is that correct?	
21	That was his job?		21	MR GROT: Yes.	
2	MR GROT: Yes.		22	MR KOPECKY: So at the time you remembered	
23	MR KOPECKY: But we see that he made		23	that you personally signed those leases?	
24	mistakes, so it seems he was not really as diligent.		24	MR GROT: Okay. Remember one thing: we	
	MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, if this will make		25	are in Moldova 2010, right?	
25					
		214			216
1	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a	214 15:33	1	MR KOPECKY: 11, but yes, at that time.	
1 2	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes.	214 15:33	2	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he	
1 2 3	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do.	214 15:33	2 3	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian.	
1 2 3 4	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes.	214 15:33	2 3 4	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember,	
1 2 3 4 5	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and	214 15:33	2 3 4 5	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that	
1 2 3 4 5 6	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice!	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement,	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness	214 15:33	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is	
123456789012345	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something	
1234567890123456	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred MR GROT: Almost ten years.	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something MR GROT: If I said so, if I signed, yes.	
12345678901234567	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred MR GROT: Almost ten years. MR KOPECKY: Indeed. You say you cannot	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something MR GROT: If I said so, if I signed, yes. So it could happen.	216 15:37
123456789012345678	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred MR GROT: Almost ten years. MR KOPECKY: Indeed. You say you cannot exactly remember who signed which lease when. After	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something MR GROT: If I said so, if I signed, yes. So it could happen. MR KOPECKY: May I now take you to exhibit	
1234567890123456789	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred MR GROT: Almost ten years. MR KOPECKY: Indeed. You say you cannot exactly remember who signed which lease when. After ten years I do understand that.	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something MR GROT: If I said so, if I signed, yes. So it could happen. MR KOPECKY: May I now take you to exhibit C-27, which are the leases that Laguardia signed in	
1	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred MR GROT: Almost ten years. MR KOPECKY: Indeed. You say you cannot exactly remember who signed which lease when. After ten years I do understand that. MR GROT: Yes.	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something MR GROT: If I said so, if I signed, yes. So it could happen. MR KOPECKY: May I now take you to exhibit C-27, which are the leases that Laguardia signed in Cosernita? If we look at the signature page of the first lease, is that your signature? MR GROT: No.	
12345678901234567890212	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred MR GROT: Almost ten years. MR KOPECKY: Indeed. You say you cannot exactly remember who signed which lease when. After ten years I do understand that. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: You would have known at that	214 15:33	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something MR GROT: If I said so, if I signed, yes. So it could happen. MR KOPECKY: May I now take you to exhibit C-27, which are the leases that Laguardia signed in Cosernita? If we look at the signature page of the first lease, is that your signature?	
12345678901234567890123	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred MR GROT: Almost ten years. MR KOPECKY: Indeed. You say you cannot exactly remember who signed which lease when. After ten years I do understand that. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: You would have known at that time, ten years ago you would have known who signed	214 15:33	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something MR GROT: If I said so, if I signed, yes. So it could happen. MR KOPECKY: May I now take you to exhibit C-27, which are the leases that Laguardia signed in Cosernita? If we look at the signature page of the first lease, is that your signature? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: If we move to page 4 which is the signature page of the second lease, exhibit	
1234567890123456789012	you happy, I will say yes, he made mistakes. As a human, we are making mistakes. MR KOPECKY: I agree. We all do. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: So, moving on, Mr Grot, and I am about halfway through MR GROT: That is nice! MR KOPECKY: We already had that statement where you said in your second witness statement, "the leases would have been signed either by Mr Alexei Bugai, Mr Ion Tugui, myself or Mr Darek Kozak". (Paragraph 5, second witness statement). You also say it has been a long time since those events occurred MR GROT: Almost ten years. MR KOPECKY: Indeed. You say you cannot exactly remember who signed which lease when. After ten years I do understand that. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: You would have known at that time, ten years ago you would have known who signed which lease?	214 15:33	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR GROT: I got a lawyer, Mr Garmas, he speaks Russian, and there is translator to Romanian. My Russian is not perfect so I don't remember, Mr Kopecky, what is that MR KOPECKY: We can look at the Romanian original. MR GROT: Okay, but we do not have my actual voice with Mr Garmas' conversation in Russian, right, we don't? MR KOPECKY: But I understand that you too rely and your lawyers rely on cotemporaneous court documents and emphasise how important it is what is said in court. When you sign something MR GROT: If I said so, if I signed, yes. So it could happen. MR KOPECKY: May I now take you to exhibit C-27, which are the leases that Laguardia signed in Cosernita? If we look at the signature page of the first lease, is that your signature? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: If we move to page 4 which is	

-) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confident Revised		iber 201 a, Austri
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR KOPECKY: If I ask you to confirm that also the next few signatures resembling the first two are not yours, you could confirm that none of those signatures under the respective signature page of those leases are yours? MR GROT: No, these are not mine. MR KOPECKY: So most of the leases were not signed by you? MR GROT: I saw three leases. MR KOPECKY: Shall we go on? MR GROT: Up to you. No, if this is not signed, it is not signed, but what is the point? He is a representative of Laguardia. MR KOPECKY: Yes, of course, but you told the court and signed the minutes MR GROT: I don't remember what I said. I spoke with a Russian lawyer. My Russian is 50/50, and I can't remember ten years ago what Garmas lawyer asked me, what I responded, what was translated. Maybe this is a mistake because I don't want to mislead people. So I don't know. I don't remember this moment when I said yes, I did sign all leases. This is ten years ago. Like I said, there was three people to the judge, there was four people: Ziggy Grot, Mr Garmas, translator and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	between us, even lawyer maybe, I did say something, but you are asking me who physically took the leases from Cosernita to Floresti? MR KOPECKY: No, I am asking you if Mr Levintsa handled the leases in Floresti as you testified. MR GROT: Can you explain to me "handle"? MR KOPECKY: If you can explain what you see on the screen. "Mr Levintsa handled the import of equipment, corporate matters for ICS Laguardia SRL, the leases in Floresti He is experienced in all kinds of commercial matters". I ask you what you meant by "handle". MR GROT: Let me explain. I don't remember where we got examples of Moldovan lease I went to Mr Levintsa, he checked the lease and he said, "Yes, this is the lease which we are supposed to use", and I went to a print shop, I ordered 5000 copies and period. This is the Levintsa part. He reviewed the lease, if this is a proper lease for this kind of business, so this is his involvement. Maybe my language is not perfect, but this is what I mean. MR KOPECKY: Because if I look at that,	219
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\23\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array}$	judge, and the person who filed the report, five people involved to produce your statement. So I don't know. My answer is I don't know. MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot, you are not a lawyer, are you? MR GROT: No, I am not a lawyer. MR KOPECKY: Have you studied Moldovan law? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: To set up your investment you hired an attorney, Mr Victor Levintsa. MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he specialises in investments like yours in Moldova MR GROT: He was recommended to me in Warsaw, Poland. He speaks English and so this is one of the reasons why I chose Mr Levintsa MR KOPECKY: He also handled the leases in Floresti, correct? MR GROT: No. MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot, in your second statement, paragraph 6 MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, I want to help you right now. As you know, my language, English, is not perfect. Maybe there is a misunderstanding	218 15:40 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	Mr Garmas. I went to Chisinau, I went to Mr Nagacevschi. I think the first three lawyers in Moldova, Nagacevschi name, I was interested to hire him. He was recommended by some person and in two days he called me, "Ziggy, I apologise, I can't take this case". Victor Levintsa maybe this would be funny, I don't know why he said, "Ziggy, this is 130 kilometres, I don't want to drive there". So later on I discovered there were a lot of people when they heard Bio-Alianta they turned back. They turned back because they're a smelly thing. MR KOPECKY: When you found Mr Garmas to deal with the dispositions, his advice was to first focus on the injunctions that had been issued	220 15:42

-	O ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			nber 201 a, Austr
-	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And you trusted his advice? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, I wish that time I could hire you. You are a lawyer in Moldova, so you could help me. You could save my life. I hired Mr Garmas, yes, because there was no choice for me. MR KOPECKY: I would have been useless. I don't speak any Romanian. MR GROT: But according to your knowledge, what is Ziggy supposed to do? Today from the ten years, you know, at that time I needed a good lawyer there, but there was a strange situation. MR KOPECKY: Moving back to the agriculture, you said that you wanted to lease about 3000 ha, and for that you needed about 1,000 leases. MR GROT: Everything between the villages there was about a thousand. MR KOPECKY: I am not quite sure but there were four digits. MR GROT: That is okay. MR KOPECKY: To fill out the leases you needed the data on the landowners and the plots, correct? MR GROT: Yes.	Revis	sed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 23		a, Aust 223
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 7 22 23 24 25	people from the office, from Zelenenco and Rusu, they asked each village to help because, you are right, the data is there. So we brought the leases, copies and this is not my request, Mr Kopecky, I was not looking for a favour this is the head of the region directed the guy: "Hey, listen, this guy is going to plough the land to produce bread and you must help them to prepare that". So this is the scenario. I have never been to the cadastral office and asked, "Hey, listen, can you?" No. MR KOPECKY: But you say you paid them a small fee for the service of about six lei per		$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 9\\ 20\\ 12\\ 23\\ 24\\ 23\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24\\ 24$	of over 1000 leases for you for free? MR GROT: There is nothing free. I was working on the field MR KOPECKY: No. I am speaking about the cadastral agents, because they imported a lot of data into a thousand leases MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, I don't know. Maybe we are supposed to ask the mayor how this happened, but they tried to help me. They tried to bring me there because they need me, so I don't know. How about if people are doing favours to others, I don't know, so everything must be paid. They ask me to take the land to produce bread because people are hungry. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but they filled out the leases. Did you supervise them while they were doing it? Did Mr Bugai supervise them? MR GROT: Yes. I mean, who supervised? MR KOPECKY: They were filling out a thousand-plus leases. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was no need. They call us when the leases were ready to sign MR KOPECKY: Yes, but the leases have mistakes, so I wonder if somebody checked if they actually did a good job?	224 15:49

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi			nber 20 a, Aust
1	MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, I am not a lawyer,	225 15:50	1	MR GROT: Because they will receive the	227 15:52
2	and I think this is offensive to the intelligence of		2	payment.	
3	these people. You are digging some stuff, leases,		3	MR KOPECKY: But they received that	
4	leases. Listen, you know, at that time ten years		4	nonetheless.	
5	ago I was thinking how to plough the land, how to		5	MR GROT: And village taxes, so it was a	
6	seed the wheat, and you are trying to make a story		6	three-way street.	
7	one signature or two signatures?		7	MR KOPECKY: But the landowners received a	
8	MR KOPECKY: A couple of hundred,		8	fixed amount, no matter if the land produced zero or	
9	actually.		9	one hundred percent?	
10	MR GROT: That is okay, but if you want to		10	MR GROT: Hmm mm.	
11	ask me a nice question so I could help you, I could		11	MR KOPECKY: Because you say in your first	
12	give you some idea about what happened to Laguardia.		12	witness statement that the mayors asked to you start	
13	I know you are escaping from this issue		13	farming right away from the beginning.	
14	MR KOPECKY: I will try to ask nicer, but		14	MR GROT: Yes.	
15	I am doing my best		15	MR KOPECKY: And in your second witness	
16	MR GROT: I know you get hired by people,		16	statement you say you were instructed by the	
17	by Moldova, but I want to just remind you that time		17	district president and Vice-President also to start	
18	when I was working in Moldova, the Prime Minister is		18	farming right away?	
19	in the jail right now for nine years. The other guy		19	MR GROT: Yes.	
20	who was involved in Bio-Alianta, Mr Platon(?), is in		20	MR KOPECKY: Did you get that in writing?	
21	the jail.		21	MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, I don't know how to	
22	MR KOPECKY: I will not be the last one		22	answer. Listen, I am 65 years of age and I left	
23	asking questions. After this will be what is called		23	Poland under a communist system and I feel free.	
24	a re-direct		24	${\rm I}$ could say everything which ${\rm I}$ want to say it. What	
	THE PRESIDENT: Why don't we proceed with		25	was the point?	
25					
25		226			228
1	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving	226 15:51	1	THE PRESIDENT: Briefly.	228 15:53
1 2	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate	226 15:51	2	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the	
1 2 3	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing.	226 15:51	2 3	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or	
1 2 3 4	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming,	226 15:51	2 3 4	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not?	
1 2 3 4 5	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that	226 15:51	2 3 4 5	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot	
1 2 3 4 5 6	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right?	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in the court a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing.	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in the court a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right?	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in the court a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming?	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes.	226	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in the court a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount?	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not	
$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6&7\\1&2&3&4&5&6&7&8&9&10&11\\1&2&1&3&1&4&1&5&1&6\\1&7&1&1&2&1&2&1&2\\1&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2\\1&2&2&2&2$	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount? MR GROT: Yes.	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not have benefited from any extra harvest because they	
$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6\\7&8&9&10&11&12&13\\1&1&5&16&17&18\end{array}$	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: That fixed amount was owed	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not have benefited from any extra harvest because they were paid the same if you worked or not, if the	
$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6\\7&8&9&10&11&2&13&14\\1&1&5&1&6&1&7\\1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\1&1&1&1&$	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: That fixed amount was owed regardless of how good the harvest was.	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 11 2 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 2 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not have benefited from any extra harvest because they were paid the same if you worked or not, if the harvest was good or bad.	
$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6&7\\1&2&3&4&5&6&7&8&9&10&1&1&2\\1&3&1&4&5&1&6&1&7\\1&1&1&1&1&1&1&2&2\\2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2&2\\2&2&2&2&$	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount? MR KOPECKY: That fixed amount was owed regardless of how good the harvest was MR GROT: You are right, yes.	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not have benefited from any extra harvest because they were paid the same if you worked or not, if the harvest was good or bad. MR GROT: But what is the point?	
$\begin{array}{c}1&2&3&4&5&6&7&8&9&10&1&1&2&1&3&1&4&1&5&1&1&2&2&2&1\\&1&2&2&3&4&3&4&3&4&3&2&3&2&2&3&2&3&2&3&2&3$	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount? MR KOPECKY: That fixed amount was owed regardless of how good the harvest was MR GROT: You are right, yes. MR KOPECKY: Am I right in assuming that	226 15:51	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in thecourt a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not have benefited from any extra harvest because they were paid the same if you worked or not, if the harvest was good or bad. MR GROT: But what is the point? THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 21 22	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: That fixed amount was owed regardless of how good the harvest was. MR GROT: You are right, yes. MR KOPECKY: Am I right in assuming that any efforts to increase the harvest would only	226 15:51	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in the court a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not have benefited from any extra harvest because they were paid the same if you worked or not, if the harvest was good or bad. MR GROT: But what is the point? THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, presumably some of the villagers were involved in	
$1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ 11 \ 12 \ 13 \ 14 \ 15 \ 16 \ 17 \ 18 \ 19 \ 21 \ 22 \ 23$	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: That fixed amount was owed regardless of how good the harvest was MR GROT: You are right, yes. MR KOPECKY: Am I right in assuming that any efforts to increase the harvest would only benefit Laguardia?	226 15:51	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in the court a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not have benefited from any extra harvest because they were paid the same if you worked or not, if the harvest was good or bad. MR GROT: But what is the point? THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, presumably some of the villagers were involved in the harvesting of the crop? Who did the harvesting	
$1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ 11 \ 12 \ 13 \ 14 \ 15 \ 16 \ 17 \ 18 \ 19 \ 20 \ 10 \ 10 \ 10 \ 10 \ 10 \ 10 \ 10$	the questions. You have been very helpful in giving short, succinct answers. We very much appreciate that. Carry on exactly as you have been doing. MR KOPECKY: Coming back to the farming, you wanted to launch quite a big operation. Is that right? MR GROT: At that time I used to own 500 ha in Poland, so my next step, because I was successful in Poland, and it is impossible in Poland to get more land so, yes. This is a normal thing. Progress. You are growing, right? MR KOPECKY: And you knew that the lives of the people there relied on that farming? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Under your leases the landowners were to be paid a certain fixed amount? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: That fixed amount was owed regardless of how good the harvest was. MR GROT: You are right, yes. MR KOPECKY: Am I right in assuming that any efforts to increase the harvest would only	226 15:51	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MR KOPECKY: Did you receive the instruction "please start farming" from the mayor or the President in writing, or not? MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, maybe Zbigniew Grot is naive. I am Christian. I believe in God. To me a handshake means a lot. For western civilisation, to us you could challenge in the court a handshaking agreement. This is the United States of America. At that time ten years ago Mr Rusu said, "Ziggy, you are from the Heaven. We need you. Mr Zelenenco, each villager – Ziggy, bravo". So you are asking me I was supposed to ask for a piece of paper, right? No. MR KOPECKY: I am trying to understand one thing. The villagers and the politicians would not have benefited from any extra harvest because they were paid the same if you worked or not, if the harvest was good or bad. MR GROT: But what is the point? THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, presumably some of the villagers were involved in	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi			nber 20 a, Aust
1	everything.	229 15:55	1	each village mayor, they asked us to start as soon	231
2	THE PRESIDENT: But under your proposal?		2	as possible. Remember, this is the end of August.	
3	MR GROT: No, everything will be cropped		3	This is September, October, November, and winter, so	
4	by me, harvested by me.		4	there is no time to play. To me I don't pay any	
5	THE PRESIDENT: But who would do actually		5	attention to details, who said what, if the mayor	
6	all of the work? You were going to do all of the		6	asked me or the President Iurie Leanca ask me.	
7	work personally?		7	I don't pay attention. I know one thing: next day	
8	MR GROT: Laguardia.		, 8	we get a tractor and start ploughing the land.	
	-		-		
9	THE PRESIDENT: And you would not do any		9	And by the way, Mr Kopecky, I would like	
0	of the work with any of the local inhabitants of the		10	to let you know, Mr Tugui I used the term "my right	
1	villages?		11	hand". I think this would be very important for	
2	MR GROT: We would hire some local people,		12	your Honours too. Mr Tugui was appointed to me by	
3	local farmers operating tractors and combines and		13	Mr Rusu. Mr Rusu was at that time the	
4	some other stuff, yes.		14	Vice-President of the Floresti region. Mr Rusu and	
5	THE PRESIDENT: So is it the case that the		15	Mr Tugui, this is a member of the PLMD Party, which	
6	more successful the farm, the more you would hire		16	head of the party at that time was Mr Vlad Filat,	
7	people?		17	Prime Minister, and there is a third guy, Mr Tapu,	
8	MR GROT: Of course, because our dream was		18	he is a congressman, so today I am looking seven or	
9	to hire 50 local people to build a business on a		19	ten years back, so I am not sure if Mr Tugui was	
0	high scale.		20	helping me or he was against me, I don't know.	
1	MR KOPECKY: I would like to make		21	I left Moldova, and this is the truth, because the	
2	reference to a statement submitted by Mr Tugui. He		22	story is rumours. They are talking a story	
3	worked on establishing this project. He was your		23	THE PRESIDENT: Let's go back to	
	right-hand man, Mr Tugui?		24	Mr Kopecky's questions.	
24	ngin-nanu man, ivir rugur:		24		
24 25	MR GROT: Yes.		24	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue,	
	o	230			
25	o	230 15:56	25	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the	
1	MR GROT: Yes.	230 15:56	25	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue,	232 15:59
25 1 2	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes.	230 15:56	25	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the	
25 1 2 3	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration?	230 15:56	25 1 2	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you?	
1 2 3 4	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes.	230 15:56	25 1 2 3	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please.	
1 2 3 4 5 -	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because he explains that farming was started early because he explains that	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring	
1 2 3 4 5 7 3	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible?	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement	
	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 3 9 0 1	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back.	
5 123456739012	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen?	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am	
5 12345 7390123	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay.	
12345673901234	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119	
5 123456739012345	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Resietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We	
1234567390123456	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Resietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a.	
5 12345673901234567	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to obtain a proper harvest".	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a. MR GROT: This is 2011?	
5 123456739012345678	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to obtain a proper harvest". MR GROT: So what is your question?	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a. MR GROT: This is 2011? MR KOPECKY: December 2012. If I can take	
5 1234567890123456789	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to obtain a proper harvest". MR GROT: So what is your question? MR KOPECKY: Is that a correct	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a. MR GROT: This is 2011? MR KOPECKY: December 2012. If I can take you to C-72a, which is dated August 2013, that is a	
25 12345678901234567890	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to obtain a proper harvest". MR GROT: So what is your question? MR KOPECKY: Is that a correct understanding of your business plan?	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a. MR KOPECKY: December 2012. If I can take you to C-72a, which is dated August 2013, that is a decision on the outstanding payment in Rosietici.	
25 123456789012345678901	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to obtain a proper harvest". MR GROT: So what is your question? MR KOPECKY: Is that a correct understanding of your business plan? MR GROT: This is his statement.	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a. MR GROT: This is 2011? MR KOPECKY: December 2012. If I can take you to C-72a, which is dated August 2013, that is a decision on the outstanding payment in Rosietici. If we scroll through it, we see that the amounts are	
5 1234567890123456789012	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to obtain a proper harvest". MR GROT: So what is your question? MR KOPECKY: Is that a correct understanding of your business plan? MR GROT: This is his statement. MR KOPECKY: But is it correct? Did he	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a. MR GROT: This is 2011? MR KOPECKY: December 2012. If I can take you to C-72a, which is dated August 2013, that is a decision on the outstanding payment in Rosietici. If we scroll through it, we see that the amounts are in the region of 400 to 4000 lei	
5 12345678901234567890123	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to obtain a proper harvest". MR GROT: So what is your question? MR KOPECKY: Is that a correct understanding of your business plan? MR KOPECKY: But is it correct? Did he understand it correctly?	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 23	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a. MR GROT: This is 2011? MR KOPECKY: December 2012. If I can take you to C-72a, which is dated August 2013, that is a decision on the outstanding payment in Rosietici. If we scroll through it, we see that the amounts are in the region of 400 to 4000 lei MR GROT: Hmm mm.	
5 1234567890123456789012	MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: And he also submitted a witness statement in this arbitration? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: Because he explains that farming was started early because Laguardia, because you were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible? THE PRESIDENT: Could you take us to the paragraph and the witness statement, and could you for the benefit of the witness put that paragraph on the screen? MR KOPECKY: Yes. It is paragraph 4, last sentence. "The work had to start immediately after signing the contracts as we were interested in processing the lands as soon as possible in order to obtain a proper harvest". MR GROT: So what is your question? MR KOPECKY: Is that a correct understanding of your business plan? MR GROT: This is his statement. MR KOPECKY: But is it correct? Did he	230 15:56	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR KOPECKY: I only have one last issue, Rosietici. In Rosietici you did not pay the landowners in December 2012, did you? MR GROT: One second, please. MR KOPECKY: All the time. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, there was problem. We asked for an extension and actually, in spring 2012, we approached people, we didan announcement on the monitor, we invited people to be paid. There was delay, you are right, absolutely, but some people took the payment and they returned it back. MR KOPECKY: I understand, but I am talking about December 2012 when you did not pay. If I may take you to exhibit C-60a, I understand that these people you did not pay included 119 pensioners who had no other source of income. We will come to this exhibit. It is C-60a. MR GROT: This is 2011? MR KOPECKY: December 2012. If I can take you to C-72a, which is dated August 2013, that is a decision on the outstanding payment in Rosietici. If we scroll through it, we see that the amounts are in the region of 400 to 4000 lei	232

) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			a, Austi
		Revis			
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE PRESIDENT: Could you answer the question. MR KOPECKY: I hate to interrupt but I asked whether you offered these 119 pensioners and the other people you owed money, whether you offered them MR GROT: I don't remember. MR KOPECKY: Because if I take you to exhibit C-67a, you offered rent payment for 2012. It deals with rent payment but it does not mention interest. This is your invitation to the landowners to pay.		13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	people in – MR GROT: But this is connected together. MR KOPECKY: But these people were waiting for your money and you didn't give themany money. MR GROT: Yes. There was delay. There was delay on the payment, yes. MR KOPECKY: Mr Grot, you claim that the Republic of Moldova took from you three years of farming for which you ask 14 million USD in this arbitration, give or take? MR GROT: Yes. MR KOPECKY: If everything worked out the way you planned, how much would one villager or the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, everything which happened after the end of December 2012, if something happened in Moldova there was my representative and there was no Grot any more. There was no Zbigniew Grot. MR KOPECKY: But my point is these villagers had to bear the shortfall because you did not pay them, and later when you offered to pay them you didn't offer them interest, so they gave you a short term loan effectively. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, this land was unused three years prior to when I took the land. MR KOPECKY: I am talking about December 2012. MR GROT: One more time. In 2012 I left Moldova for good. I don't know what happened, if my guy, the administrator offered them interest or not. I don't know. MR KOPECKY: But, Mr Grot, you could have taken out a loan in December to pay those villagers who had nothing else to live on. MR GROT: So what do you want to hear from me now? MR KOPECKY: I want to hear whether you considered it cheaper for them to finance your		5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 22 23 24	villagers in aggregate receive for leasing to you their land? MR GROT: They would receive the amount which we agreed to pay and this is a Moldovan standard. It is nothing like I was cheating on people. This is standard. The people say, "I give you my land, you have to pay me back, 100-kilo, 250 of corn". This is the landowners request. MR KOPECKY: We can agree that what you just mentioned is several orders of magnitude less than 14 million USD. MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, you could ask those questions of our expert. MR KOPECKY: We will. MR GROT: I think you could save time in this moment. I am not an expert. I am not a lawyer. MR KOPECKY: Thank you, Mr Grot. I have no further questions. You have been extremely helpful to us. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr Kopecky. Thank you, Mr Grot. Mr Wells, do you have any questions by way of re-direct on the matters addressed by Mr Kopecky? Re-examination by Claimants	

www.dianaburden.com

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 201 a, Austri
		237	4	Low not reach. I don't have act inmant for	239
1	MR WELLS: Thank you, Mr President. Mr Grot, there was a lot of discussion during your	16:06	1 2	I am not ready, I don't have equipment for	16:09
2				sugarbeet, so Moldova-Zahar pressed on me. They	
3	examination regarding words like, "we" or "you",		3	asked me, "Hey, we will help you. We will buy the	
4	"us", or at one point there was discussion about you		4	planters, we will buy sprayers", and later on it	
5	as a representative for Laguardia. When you say		5	never happened, so they signed with us contracts, so	
6	things in your witness statement like "I signed the		6	they provided to us a service. They planted the	
7	leases", are you referring to you personally, or do		7	seeds and they sprayed the land, and everything was	
8	you mean Laguardia signed?		8	delayed like three or four weeks. As a result of	
9	MR GROT: Yes. This is my company. I.		9	that from 1000 hectares we were supposed to get a	
10	MR WELLS: So would you say that the		10	crop like 30,000 metric tons. We got 3,000	
11	confusion there seems to be a lot of confusion		11	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Wells asked you a	
12	over who signed which leases so when you said		12	simple question: why were they not paid?	
13	things like "me", "we", that is not you personally,		13	MR GROT: Because there was problem with	
14	it is the business?		14	the crop.	
15	MR GROT: Mr Wells, I think you are right,		15	MR WELLS: What were the terms of the	
16	but I would like to let you know that this is ten		16	lease? When were you supposed to pay, and how?	
17	years ago, no 1. No 2, I think there is in the file		17	MR GROT: Well, actually the end of year,	
18	information, for the last eight years I am taking		18	at the end of the season. I'm not sure, we have got	
19	every day seven pills, some kind of medication,		19	Professor Rusu and Mr Gladei, we could see what is	
20	which has side-effects. You are missing the point		20	the flexibility on payment. What time, from where	
21	I took medicine half an hour ago and I am asking		21	to where.	
22	myself why did I do that? So there is some kind of		22	MR WELLS: In general how did it work?	
23	problem sometimes, you know. Time. Time.		23	MR GROT: When you collected the crop, you	
24	MR WELLS: One of the other questions		24	are selling the crop, you get money or you get the	
25	I had or points I just raised was when you said that		25	physical item like sugar beets or wheat, so you are	
		238			240
1	you acted as a representative of Laguardia, was that	16:07	1	giving to people after the harvest.	16:10
2	being made in a technical legal sense or just in		2	MR WELLS: So there was a problem with the	
3	general, you as an owner of Laguardia?		3	harvest?	
4	MR GROT: No. There was a situation,		4	MR GROT: Yes.	
5	I was travelling back to Poland, I was travelling		5	MR WELLS: Professor Knieper asked you a	
6	back to the United States, so we have to handle		6	question earlier in your testimony about the	
7	stuff, you know. So we went to notary in Floresti		7	Stefan Voda lease. He asked about whether you	
8	and I signed a power of attorney for Darek Kozak,		8	registered the lease. Are you aware of whether it	
9	Ion Tugui, so he was representing the interests of		9	was required to be registered, that particular type	
10	Laguardia at that time.		10	of lease?	
11	MR WELLS: So some of these mistakes that		11	MR GROT: I think the next witness,	
12	were discussed, also, are you aware of how many		12	Mr Beril, because he was in this region, you could	
13	mistakes were made?		13	ask if this is required, because I was new in	
14	MR GROT: No.		14	Moldova and today, I know, I am supposed to go here,	
15	MR WELLS: In terms of the Rosietici rent		15	there, ask, you know, but there was no need. I got	
16	payments, why were they not paid?		16	one contract for 250 and there is one guy telling me	
17	MR GROT: To people.		17	"Hey, go ahead, do your job, pay for the lease".	
18	MR WELLS: Which was one of the last		18	And I got piece of paper and that was it. There was	
19	issues which were addressed, the Rosietici rent		19	no question.	
20	payments. Why were they not paid?		20	MR WELLS: There was the discussion of the	
20			21	six lei per lease payment. Was that a bribe?	
20 21	MR GROT: This is related to other			MR GROT: What?	
	business which was contracted with Moldova-Zahar.		22		
21			22	MR WELLS: Was that some kind of a bribe?	
21 22 23	business which was contracted with Moldova-Zahar. We planted 500 ha or 400 ha of sugarbeet on the				
21 22	business which was contracted with Moldova-Zahar.		23	MR WELLS: Was that some kind of a bribe?	

) ARB 16 8 hiew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confider Revise			nber 2017 a, Austria
1	MR GROT: This is for registration of	241 16:12 1	1	for agricultural leasing purposes	243
2	those leases. I think this is Moldova law. You	16:12 1		MR GROT: Yes.	16:16
3	have to pay to register. They place the stamp. You	3		MR WELLS: And that was the purpose of his	
4	have to pay to the mayor's office or a cadastral	4		engagement?	
5	office.	5		MR GROT: Yes.	
6	MR WELLS: Based on what you know, that	6		MR WELLS: When the injunctions that were	
7	six lei per lease payment was required by law?	7		issued against your company in favour of Bio-Alianta	
8	MR GROT: Yes.	8		were issued by the Floresti court, did you have	
9	THE PRESIDENT: What are we looking at	g		knowledge of the dispositions that they used to	
10	here?	1(0	obtain those injunctions?	
11	MR WELLS: This is exhibit C-125, an	1 [.]		MR GROT: No.	
12	exhibit which was used in part of the	12	2	MR WELLS: So the mayor's office had not	
13	cross-examination by the Respondent's counsel. At	1:	3	given you copies of those dispositions?	
14	the beginning of that cross-examination, Mr Grot,	14	4	MR GROT: No. I remember this was	
15	you were asked if the signature on the page, and	1	5	probably summer, we went with Mr Tugui to the	
16	I can't remember which page it was, was your	10	6	mayor's office, Cosernita, and we asked because we	
17	signature. Do you see your signature on any of	1	7	want to do some legal work and he was running from	
18	these pages?	18	8	us, the mayor of the village. He was hiding.	
19	MR GROT: No.	19	9	MR WELLS: Because he still had not given	
20	MR WELLS: I believe it was on here.	20	0	you the decision?	
21	There it is.	2		MR GROT: Because we called and we said we	
22	MR GROT: Yes.	22	2	need a copy.	
23	MR WELLS: Do you understand what this	23	3	MR WELLS: And he would not give you the	
24	document says?	24		copy?	
25	MR GROT: No.	2	5	MR GROT: No.	
1		242			244
1 2	MR WELLS: Do you know what language this is?	2	2	MR WELLS: We can stop there. Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Do	16:17
3	MR GROT: I have no idea.	3		my colleagues have any questions?	
4	MR WELLS: Mr Kopecky also showed you	4		MR KOPECKY: Mr President, may I have two	
5	various leases which contained what he described as	5		questions in re-cross?	
6	mistakes from Laguardia. How many of those leases	6		THE PRESIDENT: Are they brief?	
7	did he actually show you?	7		MR KOPECKY: Very.	
8	MR GROT: Two or three.	8		THE PRESIDENT: Please proceed.	
9	MR WELLS: Beyond those leases which he	9		Further cross-examination by Respondent	
10	actually showed you, would you say that there are on your knowledge more mistakes?	10 1 ⁻		MR KOPECKY: If I could ask my colleagues to pull up C-125, page 2 of the document, which is a	
12	MR GROT: don't know.	1:		translation, under the heading "PG1" it says, "The	
12	MR WELLS: Among the people who signed the	1		representative of Laguardia SRL, V Garmas, explains	
13	leases, so that would be Mr Bugai, Mr Kozak,	14		the Court". So, Mr Grot, you are represented by the	
15	Mr Tugui, they all had authority?	1		attorney Garmas in this hearing.	
16	MR GROT: Yes.	10		MR GROT: I don't remember, but if this	
17	MR WELLS: These were your employees?	1		document proves that, this is true	
18	MR GROT: Yes.	18		MR KOPECKY: The second question I had is	
19	MR WELLS: And they all had the authority	19		to your representation since when have you been the	
20	to use the stamp of the company?	20		administrator of Laguardia SRL?	
21	MR GROT: Yes.	2		MR GROT: You would have to check the	
22	MR WELLS: Just staying on the lease for	2	2	record. I don't remember.	
23	one more minute, Mr Levintsa, your attorney,	23	3	MR KOPECKY: Could it be March 2011?	
24	reviewed the template lease, and according to your	24	4	MR GROT: Mr Kopecky, if you are in	
25	testimony determined that it was a sufficient lease	2	5	possession of this information, share it with me.	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revis		al 11 Decem Vienna	
<u> </u>	· · · ·	245	1	land when they took the land.	247
	MR KOPECKY: I am not. That is why I am	16:19		-	16:23
2			2	Your Honour, I don't know how to say that.	
3	asking.		3	I am 65 and I have got a son, I have got a baby, and	
4 -	MR GROT: I don't remember.		4	Mr Viroel, he told me like that: "Be quiet. If you	
5	MR KOPECKY: Thank you. That is all.		5	want to see your son, your family, be quiet, and	
6	THE PRESIDENT: Excellent. Which of my		6	even if you leave Moldova, we can find youthere".	
7	colleagues would like to go first?		7	Mr Kopecky asked me a lot of questions, and at this	
8	Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal		8	point I was done. I was done. I was thinking how	
9	MR FORTIER: Mr Grot, in paragraph 7 of		9	to secure my investment, because I spent a lot of	
0	your second witness statement, CWS-12, you say in		10	money and I escaped from Moldova.	
1	the middle of that paragraph, "It was very clear		11	If you ask me directly, your Honour, my	
2	that somebody at a high level in the government had		12	knowledge, there are two people behind Bio-Alianta	
3	decided that Bio-Alianta would take over these		13	and Autotehnica. There is Mr Filat and Mr Platon(.)	
4	lands".		14	There is two people. This is my knowledge from	
5	I have two or three questions to ask you		15	speaking to people, doing some homework on the	
6	about that sentence but, before I do, could you tell		16	internet. One of these gentlemen is nine years in	
7	the Tribunal what you know about Bio-Alianta? Who		17	the jail time and the other one is 19.	
8	are they? What were they doing in Moldova? What		18	MR FORTIER: You said in answer to a	
9	did you learn about them at the time?		19	question from counsel for the Respondent that the	
20	MR GROT: Your honour, this is a great		20	Bio-Alianta were very powerful people. Do you	
21	question. Thank you for asking me. Bio-Alianta,		21	remember that?	
2	there is one person, Mr Viroel, he is acting as the		22	MR GROT: Yes. Your Honour, this was told	
23	owner, but he is my knowledge, because I was there		23	by Bio-Alianta's lawyer to me on the steps of the	
24	four years. Everything which happened to me, my		23 24	court when we walked out from the court after	
.4 25	opinion is he is only a face of some big people.			the injunction decision. He spoke English to me and	
		246	4	bo goid "Zigen / Long orbiging your and to findst	
1		246 16:21	1	he said, "Ziggy, I am advising you not to fight. These are powerful people". At the same time, your	248 16:25
1 2	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and		2	These are powerful people". At the same time, your	
1 2 3	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the		2 3	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica,	
1 2 3 4	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument		2 3 4	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually	
1 2 3 4 5	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so		2 3 4 5	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US	
1 2 3 4 5 6	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour,		2 3 4 5 6	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem,		2 3 4 5 6 7	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son,	
123456789012345	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age.	
1234567890123456	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova?	
12345678901234567	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and on one end this receiver is Bio-Alianta and the	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Leave Moldova and go back to the	
123456789012345678	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and on one end this receiver is Bio-Alianta and the sender to Moldova is an offshore company. So,	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Leave Moldova and go back to the States?	
1234567890123456789	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and on one end this receiver is Bio-Alianta and the sender to Moldova is an offshore company. So, common sense, I work all my life with my hands and	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Leave Moldova and go back to the States? MR FORTIER: Yes. What made you leave?	
12345678901234567890	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and on one end this receiver is Bio-Alianta and the sender to Moldova is an offshore company. So, common sense, I work all my life with my hands and if I have got a little bit of money invested I never	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Leave Moldova and go back to the States? MR FORTIER: Yes. What made you leave? MR GROT: I was scared to death and	
123456789012345678901	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and on one end this receiver is Bio-Alianta and the sender to Moldova is an offshore company. So, common sense, I work all my life with my hands and if I have got a little bit of money invested I never established any offshore, so an offshore company was	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Leave Moldova and go back to the States? MR FORTIER: Yes. What made you leave? MR GROT: I was scared to death and actually I don't care any more about business. So	
1234567890123456789012	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and on one end this receiver is Bio-Alianta and the sender to Moldova is an offshore company. So, common sense, I work all my life with my hands and if I have got a little bit of money invested I never established any offshore, so an offshore company was established by serious, serious people, and at the	16:21	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Leave Moldova and go back to the States? MR GROT: I was scared to death and actually I don't care any more about business. So after the business meeting with Bio-Alianta, where	248 16:25
1234567890123456789012	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and on one end this receiver is Bio-Alianta and the sender to Moldova is an offshore company. So, common sense, I work all my life with my hands and if I have got a little bit of money invested I never established any offshore, so an offshore company was established by serious, serious people, and at the same time I would like to let you know, your Honour,	16:21	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Leave Moldova and go back to the States? MR GROT: I was scared to death and actually I don't care any more about business. So after the business meeting with Bio-Alianta, where he is telling me, "Hey, Mr Grot", because we asked I	
123456789012345678921234	figure. Probably I thought, I asked my lawyers and I laughed, you know, and I don't know why we in the 21st century don't have the power or the instrument to do an investigation to ask Moldova, it is so simple to figure who is who, because your Honour, when I got the problem, beginning of the problem, I went to Causeni, which is near Stefan Voda, and I met the major of the Moldova customs, I met the guy before and we got some kind of friendly relation, so I went there and I was actually crying and I said: "Alexander, I have a problem here and there", and so he checked in the system, "I don't care if this is legal or illegal", and the customs file record Bio-Alianta brought to Moldova on 4/2010 a lot of farming equipment, tractors, combines, and on one end this receiver is Bio-Alianta and the sender to Moldova is an offshore company. So, common sense, I work all my life with my hands and if I have got a little bit of money invested I never established any offshore, so an offshore company was established by serious, serious people, and at the	16:21	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	These are powerful people". At the same time, your Honour, I would like to let you know, Mr Utica, I don't know how he is related to US aid, actually my money as a taxpayer, we are helping Moldova, US aid. He is some kind of boss managing the US aid. So I asked lawyers in Moldova how could you get a job like that. Well, special connections. So I know, your Honour, it is difficult for us. I am 40 years in the United States. Our life is different. There it is different. MR FORTIER: Why did you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Why? I told you, your Honour, I wanted to see my son, and I want to raise my son, because at that time he was ten years of age. MR FORTIER: What made you leave Moldova? MR GROT: Leave Moldova and go back to the States? MR GROT: I was scared to death and actually I don't care any more about business. So after the business meeting with Bio-Alianta, where	

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Revi			iber 2017 a, Austria
Zbigr 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Mr Viroel, I will go from here to US Embassy and I will ask for assistance and help, and to that he said, "hey, be careful, be careful". So listen, there were a lot of incidents, your Honour. There were people killed and I witnessed on the field on the farm an A-47 shooting. So I know this is a beautiful job for lawyers, for Mr Kopecky, for Mr Wells, but I was there for four years, and you know I am driving the car which was stopped and you hear A-47, because there was some kind of disagreement, so this made me run because I want to raise my son. I have got two adults, my second marriage, my first wife passed away, and I have a ten years baby. MR FORTIER: In the paragraph to which I directed your attention earlier, which I think is still on the screen, you wrote, "it was very clear that somebody at a high level" "very clear", you say "that somebody at a high level in the government had decided that Bio-Alianta would take over these lands". On what basis do you assert, do you affirm that somebody at a high level of the government had decided that your lands, the land that you had rented, that you had leased, would be taken over by	249 16:27	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	heavy people because Mr Zelenenco stated that. MR FORTIER: It is on that basis that you made an assertion that it was very clear that somebody at a high level in the government had decided that Bio-Alianta would take over those lands? MR GROT: Yes. MR FORTIER: At the commencement of your evidence you were asked by Mr Wells if your witness statements contained the truth, and you said yes. I ask you the same question in respect of exhibit C-83, the letter that you wrote in English, and which was translated in Romanian for transmission to Moldova. You are familiar with that statement? MR GROT: Yes. MR FORTIER: Is everything in that letter that you have written the truth? MR GROT: Yes. MR FORTIER: Thank you. No more questions. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Perhaps we can pick up more or less on your leaving the country or coming back. Were you aware that when you went to Colorado in December 2010 when the leases were not yet registered, and you started to plough the land, as	251
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Bio-Alianta? MR GROT: Your Honour, when I returned back to Moldova in the spring of 2011, we went for a meeting to Mr Zelenenco. He is head of the region, director. Three months before that, or four months before that, Mr Zelenenco is supporting Laguardia, and now I came to the office to ask Mr Zelenenco what happened between October, September and today. What happened? Mr Rusu at that time he is back from me, he don't want to talk to me. Mr Zelenenco and I don't remember exactly who asked, or maybe to go and ask Mr Zelenenco why you supported Bio-Alianta to lease the land? Instead of answering that, Mr Zelenenco pointed to Mr Tugui, because Mr Zelenenco was from a different party than Mr Tugui and Mr Rusu, so Mr Zelenenco he pointed the congressman Tapu. He said, "Mr Tugui, yes, I supported Bio-Alianta, but your Tapu supported them too". This is my conclusion, my thought. Mr Zelenenco, director of the region, he is saying in front of me the congressman, or how you call it, senator or representative of Parliament, supported Bio-Alianta. What was the interest of private party business Bio-Alianta with landowners? This is my conclusion, why I said this is heavy support from		$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	you say, that there were difficulties? MR GROT: Your Honour, the best of my memory, when I was leaving in 2010 I remember the leases were accomplished ready for registration, I left with this knowledge. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Then did you hear in January that there was a distribution of sugar by Bio-Alianta? MR GROT: Your Honour, in January I did receive a telephone call. Actually this call was directed by Mr Rusu. Physically Mr Tugui called me and he said, "Ziggy, have you to come back to Moldova because there is problem There is people trying to take your land". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The crucial period was really around between the beginning of February to 20 February, the crucial period for at least Disposition 1-A. Why did you not come back? Because in your witness statement you say, "I was in a hurry to fight and come back", but why did you wait until the end of March to come back, because then everything had already happened? MR GROT: Your Honour, No 1, there was some family issue, because, you know, I can't explain it right now, but at the same time	252 16:33

-) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confidentia Revised	al 11 Decen Vienna	
1		253 6:35 1	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: That we have heard	255
2	Floresti by Mr Rusu, Mr Zelenenco, and I got the	2	already, but you tell now that you were already	10.50
3	full support of these people, so I asked Mr Tuqui,	3	threatened to be killed in March 2011 and you stayed	
4	I said, "Well, listen, I'm not sure if this is the	4	on until December 2012.	
4 5	truth even, because I left with assurance, hey,	5	MR GROT: Well, 2011, this was not	
_			addressed like to me directly. He stated, you know,	
6 7	everything is okay, we ploughed the land, we planted some part of the winter wheat, and I was preparing	6		
7			"this is powerful people". He didn't say they could	
8	myself for, you know, heavy work in spring but the	8	kill you. "They could kill someone and they will	
9	main thing, to answer you, your Honour, there was a	9	survive", but this happened next year with	
10	family problem and I was unable to jump on the plane	10	Bio-Alianta's owner, which he pointed to me like	
11	right away and come back to Moldova.	11	that, "hey, be careful".	
12	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Is it possible that	12	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you. There is	
13	you have not received these dispositions because you	13	another little question that I have. That concerns	
14	were simply not in Moldova?	14	your dealings with Zahar and Bicoli Agro. You have	
15	MR GROT: No, this is not truth, your	15	said in your witness statement that you signed the	
16	Honour.	16	leases to these two companies, to Zahar in 2011 and	
17	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: I ask the question.	17	to Bicoli Agro in 2013. Did you ask the landowners	
18	I don't want to insinuate that is the way it is.	18	whether it was okay to sign the leases?	
19	I simply want to ask the question you were not in	19	MR GROT: Your Honour, the lease which was	
20	Moldova when the disposition was first delivered,	20	signed to Bicoli Agro was after my departure and	
21	and you were not in Moldova when the injunctions	21	I left a power of attorney. To be honest with you,	
22	were put in place, right?	22	I can't answer. Like I said, Grot was gone from	
23	MR GROT: No. I think in March/April	23	Moldova and I was not interested, so Igor Tcaci was	
24	I was in Moldova	24	administrator and what he did he did, but without	
_				
25	PROFESSOR KNIEPER: You were in Moldova,	25	me, something like that, I can say. I think this is	
25		25	me, sometning like that, I can say. I think this is	256
1	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16	254 6:36 1	a proper statement because I left in December	
1 2	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first	254 5:36 1 2	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012.	
1 2 3	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered?	254 6:36 2 3	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova.	
1 2 3 4	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical	254 5:36 2 3 4	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more".	
1 2 3 4	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it?	
1 2 3 4 5 6	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is	254 6:36 1 2 3 4 5 6	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of	
1 2 3 4 5 6	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this",	254 6:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it	254 6:36 1 2 3 4 5 6	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means	254 6:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it	254 6:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means	254 6:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea.	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this mears injunction disposition I have no idea. Like	254 6:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners?	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after,	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea.	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this mears	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know?	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did a step like that. You are in a new country, you do not know the language, you don't know the law, and	254 ^{6:36} 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No.	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did a step like that. You are in a new country, you do not know the language, you don't know the law, and people try to scare you, so you are running from	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the question, if you say you don't know the details of	256 16:40
1 2 3 4	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT : We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the question, if you say you don't know the details of having to pay this and that, I had the impression	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 15 16 17 18	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT : We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this mears injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did a step like that. You are in a new country, you do not know the language, you don't know the law, and people try to scare you, so you are running from wall to wall. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Were you scared already in March 2011?	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the question, if you say you don't know the details of having to pay this and that, I had the impression from what I read that you paid the agents six lei	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 4 15 16 17 18 19	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 16 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did a step like that. You are in a new country, you do not know the language, you don't know the law, and people try to scare you, so you are running from wall to wall. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Were you scared already in March 2011? MR GROT: In 2011, during the court in Floresti, the injunction I am pronouncing it	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the question, if you say you don't know the details of having to pay this and that, I had the impression from what I read that you paid the agents six lei per contract for helping you to fill it out and then you paid an additional official fee of registration.	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 6 17 18 19 20	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did a step like that. You are in a new country, you do not know the language, you don't know the law, and people try to scare you, so you are running from wall to wall. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Were you scared already in March 2011? MR GROT: In 2011, during the court in Floresti, the injunction I am pronouncing it properly? After the court we stepped outside and	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the question, if you say you don't know the details of having to pay this and that, I had the impression from what I read that you paid the agents six lei per contract for helping you to fill it out and then you paid an additional official fee of registration. Is that a good understanding?	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 6 17 18 19 20 1	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did a step like that. You are in a new country, you do not know the language, you don't know the law, and people try to scare you, so you are running from wall to wall. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Were you scared already in March 2011? MR GROT: In 2011, during the court in Floresti, the injunction I am pronouncing it properly? After the court we stepped outside and Mr Utica, the lawyer for Bio-Alianta, he said,	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the question, if you say you don't know the details of having to pay this and that, I had the impression from what I read that you paid the agents six lei per contract for helping you to fill it out and then you paid an additional official fee of registration. Is that a good understanding? MR GROT: Your Honour, I think this is the	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 1 22 2	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did a step like that. You are in a new country, you do not know the language, you don't know the law, and people try to scare you, so you are running from wall to wall. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Were you scared already in March 2011? MR GROT: In 2011, during the court in Floresti, the injunction I am pronouncing it properly? After the court we stepped outside and Mr Utica, the lawyer for Bio-Alianta, he said, "Ziggy, be careful, this is powerful people", and he	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the question, if you say you don't know the details of having to pay this and that, I had the impression from what I read that you paid the agents six lei per contract for helping you to fill it out and then you paid an additional official fee of registration. Is that a good understanding? MR GROT: Your Honour, I think this is the negative side of my quality of language. Yes,	16:40
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 2 12 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	if I remember your witness statement right, when the 14 injunction was lifted, but not when it was first rendered? MR GROT: We get at that time the physical address of Laguardia in Chisinau. If there is any mail their people will be calling me, "hey, here is the letter", or decision, and "Come on, take this", but there was none. And to be honest, even today it is difficult for me to understand what this means injunction disposition I have no idea. Like I said, at that time I needed a good lawyer after, but it is difficult for me to explain even why I did a step like that. You are in a new country, you do not know the language, you don't know the law, and people try to scare you, so you are running from wall to wall. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Were you scared already in March 2011? MR GROT: In 2011, during the court in Floresti, the injunction I am pronouncing it properly? After the court we stepped outside and Mr Utica, the lawyer for Bio-Alianta, he said,	254 5:36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a proper statement because I left in December PROFESSOR KNIEPER: 2012. MR GROT: And I said, "Goodbye, Moldova. No more". PROFESSOR KNIEPER: This is it? MR GROT: Yes. And I left a power of attorney because there was a lot of equipment PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you don't know whether this assignment went through the approval process with the landowners? MR GROT: No, I have no idea. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: And you were not interested to know? MR GROT: No. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: The last part of the question, if you say you don't know the details of having to pay this and that, I had the impression from what I read that you paid the agents six lei per contract for helping you to fill it out and then you paid an additional official fee of registration. Is that a good understanding? MR GROT: Your Honour, I think this is the	16:40

-) ARB 16 8 niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confide Revis			nber 20 [.] a, Austr
1 2	addition a registration fee for the leases? MR GROT: No. I paid a registration fee.		1 2	MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Are you saying that the	259 16:44
3 4 5 6 7	Not an addition. I paid once. Once. We received the invoice from the village cadastral office and wire-transferred money on the village cadastral office account. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So what you have said		4 5 6 7	advice you received was that you did not need to take any further steps in Moldova? MR GROT: Well, advice of lawyers, Moldovan lawyers, I asked good lawyers to represent my case. They were not interested because when the	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	in your written statement is not completely – you simply did not make the difference? Because there you say you paid two things a registration fee plus a token fee for the agents, because they had – MR GROT: It is different, your Honour. Like I said, this is my statement, and maybe there is some kind of discrepancy between me and my lawyers preparing that, my quality of language, maybe there is misunderstanding or something, but one more time: I paid a one-time registration fee to the cadastral office in each village. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Just one question, Mr Grot. You have described the circumstances in which you left Moldova. You decided you had had enough and you would go back to the United States. At that point did you reflect on the possibility of continuing with legal proceedings in Moldova? After		9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Bio-Alianta appeared the name, they said well, no, no, no, no. So anyway, I tried with Mr Garmas one more time. I don't know if these people were helping me or not, or these people were against me, because I know in the United States I could go to your office, to a lawyer and he will explain to me what option I got here. So I remember I went with Mr Garmas. He is a lawyer in Moldova. He was doing some construction at home and I called him,hey, we have a court date. So he stepped with me to court in short pants. This is the kind of representation where I could go. I asked people for help THE PRESIDENT: Were you surprised? You didn't do badly in the courts of Moldova. MR GROT: Well, your Honour, listen. When I turned to Soroca, I went to the process in the Moldova court, Floresti, and I was losing everything. When I went with the same papers to the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	all, you had had a certain success in the courts of Moldova. Why did you not proceed with legal proceedings in Moldova? I appreciate that you wanted to leave but you could have instructed a lawyer who was there to continue on your behalf with you at a distance, safely away in the United States on your account. Why did you not do that?		2 3 4 5 6 7	Chancellery office and they took the case, they went the same pathway. They got lucky because there was no way, because this is a simple thing. I don't know if this is offensive or not. In Moldova this is public information how much you have to pay to get a good judgment in the court. THE PRESIDENT: Is what you are telling us that the courts of Moldova only came up with decent	260 16:46
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR GROT: Your Honour, this is a great question. I went, one more time, to Mr Nagacevschi, who is a good lawyer, and he advised me because he had documents in the file here are the requests to the Prime Minister or to the Ministry of Finance or the Ministry of Justice, and he said, "Ziggy, go back home. It is not worth it to spend time". This is the statement of the Moldova lawyer.	-	10 11 12 13 14	judgments when the application was made by the Chancellery on behalf of the government? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And your testimony to us is that you were under the impression at that point in 2012 you could not get justice in the courts of Moldova. MR GROT: Exactly.	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	He said, "there is no way, it doesn't make any sense to waste time. You got BIT, only one chance". So this is advice of Mr Nagacevschi, and he started the process of arbitration BIT. He wrote the first documents. So actually I am in front of the lawyer, I am asking what to do, and he said hey, do this. THE PRESIDENT: Are you saying that already in 2012 you had looked at the BIT and you had taken legal advice on the BIT?		19 20 21 22 23	THE PRESIDENT: And this is based on what your then lawyers told you at the time? MR GROT: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So you simply decided to leave. MR GROT: Exactly. THE PRESIDENT: Because you were frightened? MR GROT: Yes, sir.	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	ised	al 11 Decen Vienna	
-		261	4		263
1	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I have no	16:47	1	Disposition 1-A was illegal?	16:49
2	further questions. I do not know if there are any		2	MR GROT: We would have to check the	
3	more questions in addition to those that we have		3	record.	
4	asked?		4	MR GLEASON: Was it after you left	
5	MR GLEASON: If I may be permitted on a		5	Moldova?	
6	couple of points?		6	MR GROT: I think so.	
7	Re-examination by Claimants		7	MR GLEASON: I just wanted to make this	
8	MR GLEASON: Mr Grot, was the agreement		8	point clear to make sure the record was clear. This	
9	with Moldova-Zahar an assignment agreement? Did you		9	was in 2013?	
10	assign your leases to Moldova-Zahar?		10	MR GROT: Yes, so I was gone from Moldova	
11	MR GROT: No.		11	MR GLEASON: So any successful results	
12	MR GLEASON: What was it? Just briefly?		12	concerning the State Chancellery's challenge of your	
13	What kind of agreement was it?		13	dispositions did not happen until 2013?	
14	MR GROT: There was a contract to produce		14	MR GROT: Yes.	
15	sugar beet?		15	MR GLEASON: By this point what was the	
16	MR GLEASON: Could it be accurately		16	status of your investment? Was it in good shape?	
17	described as a servicing agreement?		17	MR GROT: I don't know how to answer that.	
18	MR GROT: Yes.		18	MR GLEASON: Honestly.	
19	MR GLEASON: That was in 2011?		19	MR GROT: Honestly? For many years I am	
20	MR GROT: Yes.		20	working with my family, my brothers, my sister.	
21	MR GLEASON: In 2013 did you assign your		21	When this happened they actually turned from me,	
22	leases to Bicoli Agro?		22	because there was some kind of family money	
23	MR GROT: No.		23	investment, you know, and so the situation was	
24	MR GLEASON: You did not?		24	terrible.	
05	MR GROT: No.		25	MR GLEASON: Terrible. You would describe	
25					
_		262			
1	MR GLEASON: Can I perhaps show you the	262 16:48	1	the situation concerning the investment at the time	
1 2	agreement?	262 16:48	2	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be	
1 2 3	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did	262 16:48	2 3	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible?	
1 2 3 4	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci.	262 16:48	2 3 4	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the	
1 2 3 4 5	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012?	262 16:48	2 3 4 5	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs.	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was	264 16:50
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro?	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No.	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue?	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes.	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases?	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes.	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GROT: Yes. MR GROT: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: I would like to ask more	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14. MR GLEASON: I am going to try to refresh	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: I would like to ask more question concerning the courts of Moldova.	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14. MR GLEASON: I am going to try to refresh your recollection, if I may. I am going to pull up	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: Yes. MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: I would like to ask more question concerning the courts of Moldova. Concerning Disposition 1-A, there was some	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14. MR GLEASON: I am going to try to refresh your recollection, if I may. I am going to pull up the actual document. It is on the record.	
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\2\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\9\\20\end{array}$	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: I would like to ask more question concerning the courts of Moldova. Concerning Disposition 1-A, there was some significant litigation concerning that disposition,	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GROT: Yes. MR GROT: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14. MR GLEASON: I am going to try to refresh your recollection, if I may. I am going to pull up the actual document. It is on the record. (Exhibit C-44 displayed)	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: I would like to ask more question concerning the courts of Moldova. Concerning Disposition 1-A, there was some significant litigation concerning that disposition, correct, by the State Chancellery?	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14. MR GLEASON: I am going to try to refresh your recollection, if I may. I am going to pull up the actual document. It is on the record. (Exhibit C-44 displayed) We are just trying to get the date of this	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: I would like to ask more question concerning the courts of Moldova. Concerning Disposition 1-A, there was some significant litigation concerning that disposition, correct, by the State Chancellery? MR GROT: Yes.	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14. MR GLEASON: I am going to try to refresh your recollection, if I may. I am going to pull up the actual document. It is on the record. (Exhibit C-44 displayed) We are just trying to get the date of this document. Just go to the first page.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 0 12 22 3	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GLEASON: So you weren't aware of the nature of that agreement with Bicoli Agro? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: I would like to ask more question concerning the courts of Moldova. Concerning Disposition 1-A, there was some significant litigation concerning that disposition, correct, by the State Chancellery? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: When was the first decision	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14. MR GLEASON: I am going to try to refresh your recollection, if I may. I am going to pull up the actual document. It is on the record. (Exhibit C-44 displayed) We are just trying to get the date of this document. Just go to the first page. MR GROT: January 21, 2015.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22	agreement? MR GROT: I don't remember. If I did I did at the request of Igor Tcaci. MR GLEASON: Where were you in 2012? MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: In Colorado Springs. MR GROT: No. MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: That was your administrator who was handling that issue? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: So as far as you are aware if the Bicoli Agro is an assignment, that is the only assignment of the Rosietici leases? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: I would like to ask more question concerning the courts of Moldova. Concerning Disposition 1-A, there was some significant litigation concerning that disposition, correct, by the State Chancellery? MR GROT: Yes.	262 16:48	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the disposition was cancelled in 2013 to be terrible? MR GROT: Plus my health condition at the same time. MR GLEASON: Your health was deteriorating. Do you know when Disposition 1-A was finally cancelled by the Moldova court system? MR GROT: No. MR GLEASON: Are you aware of the Supreme Court decision? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: You do not remember exactly when that was? MR GROT: No, I do not remember the day, but I think 13 or 14. MR GLEASON: I am going to try to refresh your recollection, if I may. I am going to pull up the actual document. It is on the record. (Exhibit C-44 displayed) We are just trying to get the date of this document. Just go to the first page.	

	niew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revis			a, Austr
	Cosemita? MR GROT: Yes. MR GLEASON: What was the status of your investment by this point? MR GROT: Disaster. MR GROT: Disaster. MR GROT: Yes. Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal PROFESSOR KNIEPER: Since we are already at C-44, can we see C-42? That is the decision of the State Chancellery, and if you have a look at the date it says May 2012, not 2013. You said it was 2013. MR GLEASON: We were discussing the court decisions, not the – PROFESSOR KNIEPER: But this was the first step of declaring the Disposition 1-A illegal. At that time you were still in Moldova, right, in May 2012? MR GROT: Yes. PROFESSOR KNIEPER: So you received certainly the decision of the State Chancellery	265 16:53	1 2		a, Aus t 267
23 24 25	declaring the Disposition 1-A illegal, even if you don't know what disposition or injunction means, but you were aware that you had a success with the		23 24	MR BERIL: I solemnly declare on my honour and conscience that I will tell you the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.	
$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\23\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array}$	State Chancellery? MR GROT: It is hard to remember, but at that time I was there, I was in Moldova. MR GLEASON: This is a writ of summons. It is essentially a complaint filed by the State Chancellery. THE PRESIDENT: I think we can come back to that with our legal experts. There will be questions about the consequence of this. This probably is not the moment. MR GLEASON: I want to make clear this is not a court decision. THE PRESIDENT: Let's come back to this with our legal experts. We have plenty of wonderful legal experts with us and I think that is the point to address what this is, what its consequence was, and what effect, if any, it had on the legal conditions governing the circumstances. We have just Mr Grot, you have established the point that he was present at the time this came down What its consequences are I think are not for Mr Grot. I think that concludes our examination of Mr Grot. I hope you feel, Mr Grot, that you have had an opportunity to say probably not everything you wanted to say, but sufficient to make you feel		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 23 24 25	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Beril. My name is Professor Philippe Sands. I am a professor at the University of London. To my left is Professor Knieper, and to my right is Mr Yves Fortier. We are the Arbitrators in this case. You are going to have a short number of questions right now from Mr Wells and then Mr Kopecky will cross-examine you, and Mr Wells will then have a chance briefly to respond to anything Mr Kopecky has said. It may be that members of the Arbitral Tribunal will also have some questions. Mr Wells. Examination by Claimants MR WELLS: Thank you, Mr President. Mr Beril, can you just take a look at what you see on the screen here and actually the document in front of you? I would like to ask you to confirm that this is your witness statement and that it is correct? MR BERIL: Yes, yes. It is in English. If I could have it in Romanian? Yes, it is in Romanian now. Yes, I stand by what is in this statement. MR WELLS: Is this your signature here? MR BERIL: Yes, it is.	268 17:14

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confident Revised		
1	MR WELLS: Is this correct to the best of 1	269 7:15 1	country with many, many problems and any witness	271
2	your knowledge?	7:15 1	statement could have some consequences. I did feel	17:20
2	MR BERIL: Yes.	3	some pressure.	
4	MR WELLS: Mr Beril, in your witness	4	MR WELLS: So based on your change in	
5	statement it states that you were the President in	5	circumstances with your new position involved in	
6	the Stefan Voda District in 2008. What was the	6	Romania, could you say whether, based on that change	
7	total time period you were President in the	7	of circumstances, there was any high level support	
8	Stefan Voda District?	8	for the deregistration of the leases in Floresti?	
9	MR BERIL: I was the President between	9	MR BERIL: No. In Floresti I have just	
10	June 2007 and July 2011.	10	been there once and I saw the land of Mr Grot but	
11	MR WELLS: You were President in	11	I had nothing to do with Floresti, either with the	
12	Stefan Voda District when Laguardia entered There	12	village or with the area. I knew what the situation	
13	was a contract for Laguardia to farm in the	13	was there and that was that.	
4	Stefan Voda District. Are you familiar with the	14	MR WELLS: An expert report was submitted	
5	contract? Do you know anything about it?	15	by the Respondent in this case related to the	
6	MR BERIL: I have known Mr Grot from	16	5 5	
7	Mr Mirhot. He had a contract with somebody to use	17	year that Laguardia was in your district, in	
8	and to process the land, but it is not my duty to	18	, , ,	
9	know these sort of things. That was not within my	19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
20	scope because the contracts were not monitored by	20	51	
21	the President of the district.	21	MR BERIL: Everything connected with	
22	MR WELLS: Do you know if it was the type	22	Laguardia's activity in Stefan Voda, they were the	
23	of contract that would need to be registered in	23	lands, they had something that still needed to be	
24	Incal land records? MR BERIL: From what I saw, the contract	24 25	registered. I don't know whether they had losses or not. I do not have this sort of information, but	
25				
	was between Laguardia and the landowner who offered 1	270 7:18 1	all I know is that anybody who was part of this	272 17:22
1	was between Laguardia and the landowner who offered 1 the lease, because this land had been left to rot	270 7:18 1 2	all I know is that anybody who was part of this work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise	
1 2 3		7:18 1		
1	the lease, because this land had been left to rot	7:18 1 2	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise	
1 2 3	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were	7:18 1 2 3	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However,	
1 2 3 4 5	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield	7:18 1 2 3 4	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could	
1 2 3 4 5 6	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land.	7:18 1 2 3 4 5	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job?	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now?	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania.	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister.	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca.	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very	
123456789012345	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no	
1234567890123456	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did you say in the Romanian Parliament, or in the	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no questions of this witness.	272
12345678901234567	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did you say in the Romanian Parliament, or in the Moldova Parliament?	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no questions of this witness. THE PRESIDENT: I then ask my 	
123456789012345678	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did you say in the Romanian Parliament, or in the Moldova Parliament? MR BERIL: In the Romanian Parliament.	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no questions of this witness. THE PRESIDENT: I then ask my distinguished co-arbitrators whether they have any	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did you say in the Romanian Parliament, or in the Moldova Parliament? MR BERIL: In the Romanian Parliament. MR WELLS: Were you concerned about	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no questions of this witness. THE PRESIDENT: I then ask my distinguished co-arbitrators whether they have any questions for this witness? (Pause) 	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did you say in the Romanian Parliament, or in the Moldova Parliament? MR BERIL: In the Romanian Parliament.	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no questions of this witness. THE PRESIDENT: I then ask my distinguished co-arbitrators whether they have any questions for this witness? (Pause) Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal 	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 1	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did you say in the Romanian Parliament, or in the Moldova Parliament? MR BERIL: In the Romanian Parliament. MR WELLS: Were you concerned about submitting a witness statement in this case? MR BERIL: No.	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no questions of this witness. THE PRESIDENT: I then ask my distinguished co-arbitrators whether they have any questions for this witness? (Pause) 	
1 2 3 4	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did you say in the Romanian Parliament, or in the Moldova Parliament? MR BERIL: In the Romanian Parliament. MR WELLS: Were you concerned about submitting a witness statement in this case?	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no questions of this witness. THE PRESIDENT: I then ask my distinguished co-arbitrators whether they have any questions for this witness? (Pause) Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal THE PRESIDENT: If you could just have a look at your witness statement, paragraph 5, you say	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 1 22	the lease, because this land had been left to rot for about 6-7 years, and all the agronomists were saying that it would be impossible to get any yield on that particular land. MR WELLS: Mr Beril, since the time you submitted your witness statement in this case, have you had a change in circumstances such as a new job? Have you moved? What are you doing now? MR BERIL: Yes. I have been recently appointed a counselor to a senator in Romania. THE INTERPRETER: I could not catch the name of the Minister. MR BERIL: Ion Hadârca. THE PRESIDENT: In which Parliament? Did you say in the Romanian Parliament, or in the Moldova Parliament? MR BERIL: In the Romanian Parliament. MR WELLS: Were you concerned about submitting a witness statement in this case? MR BERIL: No. MR WELLS: Were you concerned about your	7:18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	work, in particular the agronomists, did not advise Laguardia to start working these fields. However, he, with his technology, proved that the land could be processed and could have some high yields. MR WELLS: So are you saying that it was a successful operation? MR BERIL: Yes. Yes, indeed, a successful operation. THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the five minutes, I am afraid. I am going to hand over to Mr Kopecky. Cross-examination by Respondent MR KOPECKY: Mr President, thank you very much. Subject to any Tribunal questions, we have no questions of this witness. THE PRESIDENT: I then ask my distinguished co-arbitrators whether they have any questions for this witness? (Pause) Questions by the Arbitral Tribunal THE PRESIDENT: If you could just have a look at your witness statement, paragraph 5, you say	

-	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confid Revi			nber 201 a, Austria
1 2 3 4 5	conversation with the vice Minister in the Minister of Agriculture? MR BERIL: I had a preliminary discussion with Mr Grot when I asked him, I don't remember the date exactly, I was asking him how things were going	273 17:24		MR BERIL: No, I don't know everything. I understand it is a company that was around in the area. That is why I didn't mention it here. I understand it is something like Bio-Alianta or something similar.	275 17:28
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	in Floresti and saying that we were really sorry that he left Stefan Voda because we really thought he was an economic player that was very good for our area. Then he told me that he had very big problems, including the issues of contract, that I thought they were illegal as well. So then I called the vice Minister to give him a hearing so that he could present his case. I asked him to help him to sort out things with the legal division of the Ministry of Agriculture so things could run smoothly. I do confirm that that was the case. He gave me some times when he could meet with the Laguardia people so they could settle the issues and clarify everything. THE PRESIDENT: As far as you know that did not happen? Things were not settled? Things were not clarified? What do you know from your own personal experience about what happened next? MR BERIL: All I know is that after all this situation Mr Grot and Laguardia and the		 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	THE PRESIDENT: Did it mean anything to you, that company? Was it well known? What can you tell us about that company? MR BERIL: I know that Bio-Alianta was doing something with chemicals, other stuff, something like agro and chemical areas, from what I know. I don't know what they are doing now. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Grot told us that he had been told that it was a powerful company. From your own knowledge, do you know whether that is an accurate characterisation of Bio-Alianta? Did it have certain powers? Important people behind it? MR BERIL: Yes. The company is well known in the Republic of Moldova, but it has to be found out with documents who is behind this company. Sometimes in the Republic of Moldova there is a front man but then actually there is a lot of other people behind, maybe people in government who are very powerful. Very influential THE PRESIDENT: Do you have any knowledge	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	administrators of Laguardia had a signed contract in several areas in order to process land plots in Floresti which were then replaced by other contracts, and I wondered at the time whether those other contracts were registered and signed at the town hall. I always thought they were signed and registered. And then I said go to the legal department of the Ministry of Agriculture and see what happened, because it is not possible to replace one contract with another three year old contract which is valid. It has to be according to the law. It cannot just be replaced. And they had a discussion, but the result of the discussions, I had a telephone conversation with him and asked him, and somebody told me that some legal representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food somewhat asked that he should be paid, and I thought that was not right, that was illegal. I actually felt quite embarrassed by this. THE PRESIDENT: When you mentioned that the leases were replaced by another company,do you know the name of that other company which got leases for those agricultural lands?	274	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 22 3 24	as to who is behind this company? MR BERIL: I don't know. If I had enough time I might have found out, if I would have known about this question. THE PRESIDENT: Do you recall whether in the summer of 2011, maybe in July 2011, you had a conversation with Mr Grot in which you described to him the knowledge of the Prime Minister of Moldova in relation to his case? Do you have any memory of such a conversation with Mr Grot? MR BERIL: I did have a chat about it with Mr Grot but I certainly did not have any leeway to discuss this with the Prime Minister, and that is why I advised him to go to the Ministry of Agriculture, because I thought they had the competence to give advice on these issues. But to tell you here today that things are like this or like that, I could not quite tell you, because this is what happened in our country. There are all sorts of things with Ministers, Vice-Ministers, who had the companies, and they acted often through those companies. This is a situation that persists even today. THE PRESIDENT: Could you please put upon the screen paragraph 8 of Mr Grot's second	276 17:30

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confic Rev	dentia ised	al 11 Decem Vienna	
-	· · · · · ·	277			279
1	statement? In the third line of that paragraph it	17:32	1	will report what was being discussed.	17:36
2	says, "Mr Valeriu Beril had high level connections		2	THE PRESIDENT: That wasn't my question.	
3	in his position with the government and even he		3	My question was whether Mr Chitoroaga had told you	
4	later told me in July 2011 that the Prime Minister		4	that the Prime Minister did the Vice-Minister	
5	himself was aware of what was going on and that		5	tell you that the Prime Minister already knew about	
5	nothing would be done to look into the matter".		6	this story?	
7	Do you remember that conversation with		7	MR BERIL: The Vice-Minister told me that	
8	Mr Grot?		8	he would report to him. I could not supervise this.	
9	MR BERIL: Well, what can I say? The		9	I asked Mr Grot to go again to the Ministry of	
0	Prime Minister should know should have known what		10	Agriculture so that everything would be sorted out,	
1	the situation was, but that is why I said, in the		11	but I don't know more than that. I am convinced	
2	Republic of Moldova, a very small country,			somewhat that Mr Stefan Chitoroaga, the	
3	everything is known really. It is a small country.			Vice-Minister of Agriculture, would have brought	
4	In particular with an investor coming from the		14	this to the attention of the Prime Minister.	
5 6	United States. We really don't have that many US		15 16	THE PRESIDENT: One other question in	
6 7	investors in Moldova. THE PRESIDENT: But the form of words that		16 17	relation to farming issues. I am not a farmer. You	
7 0			17 18	were the President of Stefan Voda. Do you know a little bit about how farmers make decisions?	
8 9	Mr Grot uses in his second witness statement is very clear. He doesn't say that the Prime Minister		18	MR BERIL: The district Stefan Voda is an	
9	should have known. He says that you said the		19 20	area of agriculture. 70 per cent of the Republic of	
1	Prime Minister himself was aware of what was going		20 21	Moldova 70 per cent of our GDP is from products	
2	on. Is that accurate?		22	in agriculture. We live from agriculture.	
2 3	MR BERIL: In the Republic of Moldova the		22	THE PRESIDENT: I am just curious to know	
4	Prime Minister has all the time information		23 24	about the following situation, with your expertise,	
	regarding the foreign investment, let alone			with your human experience. In 2010 hundreds of	
25			20		
5		279	20		280
1	investors from the United States. He must have	278 17:34	1	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease	280 17:38
1			1 2	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later,	
1	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is.		1 2	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the	
1 2 3 4	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with		1 2 3 4	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases.	
1 2 3 4 5	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors.		1 2 3	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it	
1 2 3 4 5	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to		1 2 3 4 5 6	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day	
1 2 3 4 5 7	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the	
1 2 3 4 5 7 3	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT: What I am asking is		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT: What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT: What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level"		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT: What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen?	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT : When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL : He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT : What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT: What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to the Vice-Minister of Agriculture. Did you have		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but I will try to answer your question. In my opinion,	
12345673901234567	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT: What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to the Vice-Minister of Agriculture. Did you have conversations with anybody about the knowledge or		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but I will try to answer your question. In my opinion, first of all, the lease contract, the three year	
123456739012345678	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT : When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL : He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT : What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to the Vice-Minister of Agriculture. Did you have conversations with anybody about the knowledge or involvement of the Prime Minister?		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but I will try to answer your question. In my opinion, first of all, the lease contract, the three year lease contracts are registered in the town hall,	
1234567390123456789	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT: What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to the Vice-Minister of Agriculture. Did you have conversations with anybody about the knowledge or		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but I will try to answer your question. In my opinion, first of all, the lease contract, the three year	
12345673901234567890	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT: When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL: He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT: What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to the Vice-Minister of Agriculture. Did you have conversations with anybody about the knowledge or involvement of the Prime Minister? MR BERIL: I had asked the Vice-Minister,		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but I will try to answer your question. In my opinion, first of all, the lease contract, the three year lease contracts are registered in the town hall, which is a public state institution. The town hall	
123456739012345678901	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT : When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL : He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT : What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to the Vice-Minister of Agriculture. Did you have conversations with anybody about the knowledge or involvement of the Prime Minister? MR BERIL : I had asked the Vice-Minister, Mr Chitoroaga, asked him if he could not solve the		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but I will try to answer your question. In my opinion, first of all, the lease contract, the three year lease contracts are registered in the town hall, which is a public state institution. The town hall has a contract. One copy stays with the town hall,	
	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT : When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL : He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT : What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to the Vice-Minister of Agriculture. Did you have conversations with anybody about the knowledge or involvement of the Prime Minister? MR BERIL : I had asked the Vice-Minister, Mr Chitoroaga, asked him if he could not solve the things by himself, to report the issue to the		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but I will try to answer your question. In my opinion, first of all, the lease contract, the three year lease contracts are registered in the town hall, which is a public state institution. The town hall has a contract. One copy stays with the town hall, and one copy goes to the economic player, and one	280
1234567890123456789012	investors from the United States. He must have known what the situation was. Same with Prime Minister today, whoever the Prime Minister is. They have to know the situation with foreign investors. THE PRESIDENT : When you say he had to know, did you at the time back in 2011 have conversations with MR BERIL : He was obliged to know. It was his duty to know. THE PRESIDENT : What I am asking is whether in 2011 you had any conversations with any person. Mr Grot says you had "high level" connections in the position of government. You have told us yourself you were able to introduce him to the Vice-Minister of Agriculture. Did you have conversations with anybody about the knowledge or involvement of the Prime Minister? MR BERIL : I had asked the Vice-Minister, Mr Chitoroaga, asked him if he could not solve the things by himself, to report the issue to the Prime Minister. It was his duty to do so.		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	farmers in the district of Floresti sign a lease with Mr Grot or with Laguardia. A few months later, on 11 February 2011, hundreds of farmers sign the same document purporting to terminate those leases. I was struck by those documents and I thought it strange that hundreds of farmers on the same day would sign the same piece of paper terminating the lease. Assuming that is what has happened, could you explain to us how it could be that so many farmers would come together and do exactly the same thing on the same day? I am just curious, in the farming community, to understand in the context of Moldova of one village or one town, how that could happen? MR BERIL: I was not there present, but I will try to answer your question. In my opinion, first of all, the lease contract, the three year lease contracts are registered in the town hall, which is a public state institution. The town hall has a contract. One copy stays with the town hall, and one copy goes to the economic player, and one stays with the landowner. It is not possible that	

	ARB 16 8 iew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Confiden Revise			nber 2017 a, Austria
		281			283
1	Mayor is under the influence of somebody who would			non compliance, and the technological procedure for	17:44
2	then gather everybody, tell them give them a	2		processing the land has not been done. But I have	
3	story line, and then have other contracts	3		seen the technical installations, I have seen the	
4	THE PRESIDENT: Do you think that is what	4		tractors, the equipment, that were imported by	
5	happened in this case? I appreciate you were not	5		Mr Grot. We never had this sort of technology in	
6	there so what you say is of limited probative value	6		Moldova at the time.	
7	but, just on the basis of what you know, is that	7		THE PRESIDENT: Just below the signature	
8	what happened, do you believe, in this case?	8		of the individual lessor there is another line	
9 10	MR BERIL: I think there is no other way. I think that must have happened. I can't think of	9		signed by the person who we believe to be the mayor of Floresti. What does that say? What has the	
11	any other way. But it is illegal.	1		Mayor of Floresti signed?	
12	THE PRESIDENT: Can I ask you to put up	12		MR BERIL: It is written that there is a	
13	exhibit C-95, page 5? Could you take a moment to			confirmation it is like a confirmation of the	
14	read this document? You probably have never seen it	14			
14	before.	12		mayor of the village of Varvareuca, Mrs Ivanes. It is "I confirm". It is a confirmation of this	
16	MR BERIL: Yes, I can see it. It is in	16		particular notification.	
17	Russian. First of all, this is illegal. It is not	17		THE PRESIDENT: Why would she sign this	
17	written in the language of the state.	18		document?	
10	THE PRESIDENT: Just read the whole	19	-	MR BERIL: I don't think that the Mayor	
20	thing – I am assuming you speak Russian, do you?	20		has to sign a document like this	
20	MR BERIL: Yes.	2		THE PRESIDENT: So why did the Mayor sign	
22	THE PRESIDENT: Let's analyse it. First	22		the document?	
23	could you tell us what it says?	23		MR BERIL: I told you, she must have been	
24	MR BERIL: Well, it says it is a notice	24		under somebody's influence, because while I had	
25	advising a person, a given person, I don't know to	25		different jobs and functions it is for the first	
		282			284
1	whom it is addressed, Laguardia or Bugai, that the	282 17:42 1	1	time that I see such a notice. I have never seen	284 17:46
2	lease contract is being annulled. This is very	2	2	anything like this before. This is not like a	
3	unusual.	3	3	document, an official document.	
4	THE PRESIDENT: You said it was in	4	4	THE PRESIDENT: And the Mayor signs 560	
5	Russian, but why is it in Russian and what is wrong	5	5	more of these documents on the same day. What is	
6	with it being in Russian?	6	6	going on here?	
7	MR BERIL: A notice, a notification, of	7	7	MR BERIL: This means that the Mayor had	
8	contract termination, resilience, is not done like	8		to gather all these people who had to sign,	
9	this. The lessee has to be present and it has to be	9		Mr Bugai, Mr Grot from Laguardia should have been	
10	well-grounded. There have to be some reasons behind	10		invited together, and they should have resolved the	
11	it. Maybe the lessee didn't pay what he had to pay,	1		issue, but not to issue like this a document saying	
12	maybe he did not follow the contractual obligation.	12		things that are totally unclear.	
13	I don't know what else it could be	1:		THE PRESIDENT: And every single one of	
14	THE PRESIDENT: One thing we have been	14		these documents in the typed-up part appears to be	
15	confused about, if you look at the date it says	1		identical. Who do you think would who have prepared	
16	11/02/2011. Do you see that?	16		this document? Would the farmers have all typed up	
17 10	MR BERIL: Yes.	17		exactly the same document? Would they all speak	
18	THE PRESIDENT: If you could read the line	18		Russian? Would they all have type writers or	
19 20	immediately above, could you translate what that line says?	19 20		computers?	
20 21	Ine says? MR BERIL: Sorry, the person who signed,	20 2 ⁻		MR BERIL: I don't think so. I told you, there must have been some influence. All those	
21 22	Poslaro Bos Stefan(,) there is a series of numbers,	2		notices would have been photocopied, the people, the	
22	the data from his passport, ID code, and it says the	23		persons would have been summoned to come, or maybe	
23 24	lessee did not comply with the conditions of the	24		they were visited, something was maybe told to them,	
25	contract, but it didn't mention what exactly was	25		"Look, the Mayor signed; now you have to sign".	
20	Section, sach and thomas what shady was	2		you have to signed, now you have to sign .	
25	Contract, put it dign t mention what exactly was	2	.Э	Look, the iviayor signed; now you have to	o sign .

	285 7:47 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	provides also an opportunity to tease out more of these issues, and in the afternoon we will hear the Claimants' agricultural experts. We have two people	287 17:51
 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. MR FORTIER: Mr President, just following your questions, Mr Beril, you met Mr Zbigniew Grot in 2008. That is almost ten years ago. MR BERIL: Yes. MR FORTIER: Do you consider Mr Grot a friend? 	2 3 4 5 6 7	provides also an opportunity to tease out more of these issues, and in the afternoon we will hear the Claimants' agricultural experts. We have two people	17:51
 MR FORTIER: Mr President, just following your questions, Mr Beril, you met Mr Zbigniew Grot in 2008. That is almost ten years ago. MR BERIL: Yes. MR FORTIER: Do you consider Mr Grot a friend? 	3 4 5 6 7	these issues, and in the afternoon we will hear the Claimants' agricultural experts. We have two people	
 4 your questions, Mr Beril, you met Mr Zbigniew Grot 5 in 2008. That is almost ten years ago. 6 MR BERIL: Yes. 7 MR FORTIER: Do you consider Mr Grot a 8 friend? 	4 5 6 7	Claimants' agricultural experts. We have two people	
 5 in 2008. That is almost ten years ago. 6 MR BERIL: Yes. 7 MR FORTIER: Do you consider Mr Grot a 8 friend? 	5 6 7	-	
6 MR BERIL: Yes. 7 MR FORTIER: Do you consider Mr Grot a 8 friend?	6 7		
7 MR FORTIER: Do you consider Mr Grot a 8 friend?	7	in the morning and one person divided in two in the	
8 friend?		afternoon, so I don't think we have any constraints	
	8	or pressures of time tomorrow, so I would hope we	
9 MR BERIL: I consider him a friend because		are able to finish at 5.30 pm. I have an	
	9	appointment at 6 pm so it would be excellent if we	
10 he invested money in the Republic of Moldova.	10	could, but I don't envisage any difficulty at all.	
1 Unfortunately he had a lot to suffer because of	11	I wish both sides, unless there are any	
2 that. I know him. I would not quite say he is a	12	closing housekeeping matters, a fine evening in this	
3 friend.	13	fine city. Thank you very much indeed.	
4 MR FORTIER: But you kept in touch with	14	(The hearing was adjourned at 5.52 pm)	
15 him for the last ten years?	15		
6 MR BERIL: Yes. Sometimes we saw each	16		
7 other. Once I talked to him over the phone	17		
8 MR FORTIER: Would you describe Mr Grot as	18		
9 an honest man?	19		
0 MR BERIL: I would confirm that Mr Grot is	20		
21 an honest person, and a man who would come to help	21		
22 the economy, lots of people, and I saw his business	22		
23 in Poland, how he was running his business in	23		
24 Poland. If the truth be told, your honours, I have	24		
25 to say I was sometimes surprised that people like	25		
 Mr Grot who come to help us, to teach us, and of 17 course to do his own business, and I am really sorry for what happened. 	286 7:49		
4 MR FORTIER: Thank you very much.			
5 THE PRESIDENT: Mr Wells?			
6 MR WELLS: Nothing further, Mr President.			
7 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Beril,			
8 thank you very much for coming all this way to see			
9 us. The Tribunal very much appreciates that you			
0 have given this matter your time, and we appreciate			
1 and have listened attentively to everything you have			
2 said to us.			
3 You are now released. We now wish you a			
4 wonderful evening in Vienna and a safe trip back to			
5 your home in Moldova, or Romania where you may now			
l6 be living.			
MR BERIL: I thank you for listening to			
18 what I had to say. Please take into account what			
19 I said, that I said it out of honesty. I have no			
20 particular interest to say.			
21 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. We are now at			
22 the end of our first day. I am very grateful to my			
23 colleagues but also mostly to counsel. We are			
24 pretty much on time.			
24 preuvinder on time. 25 We will resume tomorrow at 9.30 am, and we			
li@dianaburden.com www.	.dianaburo		es 1-

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
	79/11 79/18 79/23	221/19 221/23 222/1	30/20 36/5 37/8 70/2	192/16 192/24 193/2
	80/4 80/6 80/10 81/5	222/4 222/25 223/10	133/17 150/17 151/5	193/16 194/2 194/14
MR ASTUNO: [23]	81/14 81/24 82/16	223/17 224/1 224/6	151/16 151/20 152/25	194/22 195/6 195/10
22/3 22/8 22/12 22/16	82/21 83/2 83/4 83/17	224/17 224/20 224/25	153/13 166/6 167/13	195/13 195/20 195/25
23/16 23/20 24/3	83/24 84/2 84/11	225/9 225/15 226/6	167/22 168/17 168/19	196/2 196/11 197/1
24/16 25/21 26/11	84/17 84/21 84/24	226/13 226/16 226/19	172/15 173/4 175/9	197/12 197/19 198/10
26/19 27/10 28/8	85/2 85/7 85/23 86/2	226/23 226/25 227/4	175/21 177/6 178/10	198/22 199/8 199/12
28/14 29/2 132/22	90/16 91/7 91/22 92/6	227/9 227/13 227/18	183/19 183/22 185/25	199/15 199/20 199/23
133/22 134/1 136/24	92/12 92/19 96/3	227/20 228/4 228/19	202/7 202/20 203/2	236/25 237/9 237/23
138/5 151/19 151/22	96/21 101/8 101/19	228/24 229/2 229/7	203/5 203/8 203/11	238/10 238/14 238/17
152/10	102/1 111/25 151/4			239/14 239/21 240/1
MR BERIL: [48]		229/11 229/17 229/24	203/14 203/18 203/22	
267/17 267/22 268/19	261/4 261/7 261/11	230/2 230/17 230/20	204/2 204/4 204/6	240/4 240/19 240/22
268/24 269/2 269/8	261/15 261/18 261/20	230/23 232/2 232/4	204/9 204/12 206/15	240/24 241/5 241/10
269/15 269/24 270/9	261/23 261/25 262/4	232/16 232/22 232/25	206/20 206/23 207/2	241/19 241/22 241/25
270/13 270/17 270/20	262/6 262/9 262/12	233/3 233/5 233/19	207/22 208/9 208/12	242/3 242/8 242/12
270/24 271/8 271/20	262/16 262/22 263/3	233/25 234/10 234/14	209/12 209/18 210/2	242/16 242/18 242/21
272/7 273/2 273/23	263/6 263/10 263/14	234/21 235/2 235/8	210/6 210/10 210/14	243/2 243/5 243/11
274/25 275/8 275/17	263/17 263/24 264/5	235/13 235/16 235/22	210/16 211/7 211/10	243/18 243/22 243/25
276/1 276/10 277/8	264/9 264/12 264/16	236/2 236/11 236/14	211/22 212/2 212/6	268/13 268/23 268/25
277/22 278/8 278/18	264/23 265/2 265/5	237/8 237/14 238/3	212/15 212/25 213/19	269/3 269/10 269/21
278/24 279/6 279/18	265/13 266/3 266/10	238/13 238/16 238/20	213/22 214/2 214/4	270/5 270/18 270/21
280/14 281/8 281/15	MR GROT: [280]	239/12 239/16 239/22	214/7 214/15 214/19	271/3 271/13 272/5
281/20 281/23 282/6	186/20 187/7 187/17	240/3 240/10 240/21	214/24 215/6 215/10	286/5
282/16 282/20 283/11	187/25 188/7 188/23	240/23 240/25 241/7	215/13 215/16 215/21	PROFESSOR
	189/1 189/9 189/12	241/18 241/21 241/24	215/25 216/5 216/10	KNIEPER: [77] 46/2
283/18 283/22 284/6	189/15 189/21 190/4	242/2 242/7 242/11	216/16 216/21 216/25	46/11 48/12 48/17
284/19 285/5 285/8	190/6 190/9 190/23	242/15 242/17 242/20	217/6 217/9 217/13	48/21 49/5 49/8 49/14
285/15 285/19 286/16	191/2 191/5 191/11	243/1 243/4 243/10	218/3 218/6 218/9	50/13 50/22 51/1
MR FORTIER: [46]	191/22 192/1 192/15	243/13 243/20 243/24	218/12 218/17 218/20	57/25 58/7 58/22 59/1
43/16 43/23 44/3 44/8	192/17 193/1 193/9	244/15 244/20 244/23	219/3 219/7 219/23	60/6 60/14 60/21
44/17 45/25 46/9	193/12 193/15 194/13	245/3 245/19 247/21	220/6 220/21 221/1	61/10 65/17 66/17
47/21 47/24 48/2	194/17 195/4 195/9	248/12 248/16 248/19	221/6 221/12 221/17	67/1 67/14 68/10
53/25 54/9 65/11	195/12 195/15 195/21	250/1 251/6 251/14	221/20 221/24 222/2	73/20 74/3 76/5 76/17
70/14 74/12 74/23	196/1 196/7 196/19	251/17 252/1 252/8	222/22 223/8 223/12	76/25 77/4 77/9 77/16
75/2 101/5 101/17	197/3 197/14 197/21	252/22 253/14 253/22	223/24 224/3 224/14	77/21 84/9 84/13
118/16 126/13 126/16	198/18 199/7 199/11	254/3 254/18 255/4	223/24 224/3 224/14	84/18 84/23 84/25
127/1 172/11 172/24	199/14 199/18 199/22	255/18 256/2 256/5	225/13 225/21 226/3	85/5 85/20 90/24
173/2 183/18 183/21	200/7 200/10 200/12	256/10 256/13 256/21	226/11 226/14 226/17	91/16 91/25 92/8
193/6 193/10 193/13	200/17 200/10 200/12 200/12 200/17 200/25 201/6	257/1 257/11 258/8	226/20 226/24 227/2	
245/8 247/17 248/11				92/18 175/20 177/1
248/15 248/18 249/14	201/10 201/16 202/3	258/25 259/4 259/21	227/6 227/10 227/14	178/6 199/25 200/9
251/1 251/7 251/15	202/19 203/1 203/4	260/10 260/15 260/18	227/19 228/1 228/14	200/11 200/14 201/1
251/18 285/2 285/6	203/7 203/10 203/13	260/21 260/24 261/10	229/20 229/25 230/3	201/8 201/13 201/24
285/13 285/17 286/3	203/17 203/21 204/1	261/13 261/17 261/19	230/11 230/18 230/21	202/4 251/20 252/5
MR GLEASON: [137]	204/3 204/5 204/8	261/22 261/24 262/2	231/24 232/3 232/10	252/14 253/11 253/16
31/13 32/11 34/17	204/10 204/13 206/19	262/5 262/8 262/11	232/17 232/23 233/1	253/24 254/16 254/25
34/22 35/5 35/10	206/22 207/1 207/5	262/15 262/21 263/1	233/4 233/15 233/20	255/11 256/1 256/4
35/13 35/18 36/3	208/3 208/11 208/16	263/5 263/9 263/13	234/5 234/12 234/18	256/7 256/11 256/14
36/12 36/17 37/9	209/5 209/16 209/20	263/16 263/18 264/3	234/23 235/4 235/10	256/24 257/6 257/18
39/23 43/20 44/2 44/6	210/4 210/8 210/13	264/8 264/11 264/14	235/14 235/18 235/23	265/8 265/15 265/20
44/14 44/18 46/1 46/5	210/15 210/17 211/9	264/22 265/1 265/4	236/8 236/13 236/17	THE INTERPRETER:
46/10 46/12 47/23	211/18 212/1 212/5	265/6 265/19 266/1	244/3 244/6 244/9	[1] 270/11
48/1 48/4 48/14 48/20	212/9 212/19 213/1	267/9	244/17 244/22 245/1	THE PRESIDENT:
48/25 49/7 49/12	213/21 213/24 214/3	MR HINKLE: [6]	245/4 272/13	[206] 6/1 8/18 8/23 9/9
	214/6 214/14 214/18	118/18 118/24 122/6	MR SOFER: [1] 173/1	9/19 10/1 10/3 10/12
49/19 50/21 50/25	214/22 215/5 215/9	126/21 127/3 129/25	MR WELLS: [99] 7/23	11/8 12/16 12/22
51/16 52/2 53/8 54/2	215/12 215/15 215/20	MR KOPECKY: [187]	8/20 10/10 11/5 14/6	13/18 14/12 14/20
54/7 54/12 58/6 58/20	215/23 216/1 216/7	8/24 9/14 9/23 10/2	15/12 15/20 16/1 16/4	15/14 15/24 16/3 16/5
58/24 60/3 60/8 60/17	216/14 216/20 216/24	11/6 12/14 12/20	18/9 20/15 30/2 30/9	17/18 18/8 18/22
61/5 61/22 65/12	217/5 217/8 217/10	13/17 14/17 17/6 18/3	33/2 37/7 37/24 188/5	19/11 20/14 20/17
66/12 66/20 67/9	217/15 218/5 218/8	19/7 20/9 21/1 21/19	188/19 188/24 189/2	21/17 21/22 21/25
67/21 68/1 68/5 68/12	218/11 218/14 218/19	21/24 22/5 22/10	189/7 189/10 189/13	23/3 23/19 23/21
69/15 70/9 70/15 74/2	218/22 219/6 219/13	22/13 23/2 23/23 24/1	190/2 190/5 190/12	23/24 24/2 24/12
74/5 74/21 74/25 75/5	210/22 219/0 219/13	24/25 26/9 26/21	190/24 191/3 191/9	23/24 24/2 24/12 24/12 24/24 25/11 26/3
76/14 76/22 77/2 77/8				
77/13 77/19 78/5	221/2 221/8 221/15	27/20 29/9 30/12	191/14 191/23 192/14	26/15 26/24 27/23
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova

Word Index Revised

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-28
	076 [1] 13/8	131-page [1] 100/13	83/18 89/7 89/9 89/10	281 [1] 59/6
THE PRESIDENT:	083 [2] 13/8 190/14	133,000 [1] 183/25	89/10 90/14 93/22	2822 [1] 2/10
[167] 28/12 28/20 29/7	1	14 [5] 75/20 157/23	94/11 104/4 112/22	2830 [1] 43/6
29/13 30/7 30/10		163/11 223/14 264/16	113/13 116/19 144/21	287 [1] 1/1
30/17 30/21 32/2	1 September [1]	14 million [2] 235/21	145/11 157/6 157/11	29 [1] 16/11
32/19 33/6 34/20	162/14	236/11	170/8 170/25 176/5	3
34/24 35/7 35/12	1,000 [1] 221/15	140 [2] 70/7 179/17	176/6 176/8 183/11	
35/17 35/23 36/4	1,500 [2] 38/14 195/8	15 [8] 53/17 54/1 54/2		3 February 2011 [1]
36/14 36/18 37/15	1-A [2] 176/18 176/23	54/12 158/15 159/19	200/16 200/17 200/17	73/13
50/11 51/25 53/4 54/5	1.04 pm [1] 153/11	186/6 187/1	200/20 200/23 215/11	3,000 [1] 239/10 3.3 [1] 199/1
54/10 61/17 67/24	1.47 pm [1] 153/11 10 [8] 14/24 55/25	15 April [1] 72/15	232/17 244/23 250/3 254/18 254/19 255/3	30 [5] 12/15 88/19
68/3 68/8 69/2 69/7	65/16 124/5 156/18	15 February 2011 [1] 73/6	255/5 255/16 261/19	153/1 170/23 196/23
69/19 70/3 79/4 79/13	157/11 179/4 182/23	15 March 2011 [2]	269/10 276/6 276/6	30,000 [1] 239/10
79/21 79/24 80/5 80/8	10 March 2011 [2]	83/10 83/18	277/4 278/7 278/12	300-kilo [1] 205/20
80/25 81/7 81/16	176/6 176/8	1500 [3] 52/8 66/9	280/3 282/16	3000 [2] 203/10
82/12 82/17 82/24	100 [1] 12/2	97/11	2012 [24] 4/13 82/10	221/15
83/3 83/13 83/21	100-kilo [2] 205/20	16 [2] 69/10 162/21	94/4 114/15 115/12	305 [1] 113/11
83/25 86/1 90/14	236/7	1615 [1] 3/7	173/6 175/19 183/11	31 [6] 75/18 169/8
90/22 95/22 96/2	1000 [1] 224/1	168 [1] 163/18	200/20 232/2 232/7	170/24 176/14 182/1
96/12 118/14 118/22	1000 hectares [1]	169 [2] 163/18 163/20	232/12 232/18 233/22	195/2
122/1 129/18 132/11	239/9	17 [3] 64/9 161/14	234/2 234/14 234/15	31.5 [1] 76/5
132/19 133/11 133/20 133/24 136/23 137/24	101 [1] 88/24	210/12	255/4 256/2 258/24	313 [1] 73/22
150/4 151/3 151/7	1010 [1] 4/7	18 [4] 70/11 156/6	260/14 262/5 265/12	32 [1] 10/22
152/2 152/13 153/2	105 [2] 87/25 179/12	161/12 212/4	265/19	33 [2] 87/22 162/4
153/11 165/21 167/8	108078 [1] 162/18	186 [2] 30/16 170/19	2012, December [1]	33.2 [1] 162/6
167/16 168/14 168/18	11 [5] 1/21 6/1 182/24	19 [4] 4/7 55/24	233/6	33.3 [2] 107/15 162/9
175/7 185/23 186/1	189/13 216/1	162/17 247/17	2013 [20] 39/2 65/7	333 [1] 148/11
186/10 186/23 187/14	11 February [1] 81/23	2	65/14 94/9 94/9 95/2	340 [1] 117/18
187/18 188/1 188/11	11 February 2011 [4]		95/8 122/1 124/12	350 [1] 213/11
189/4 189/17 189/22	76/11 82/15 83/10	2.35 pm [1] 186/9	127/11 175/16 183/11	353 [2] 184/4 184/8
190/7 190/10 193/19	280/3	2.45 pm [1] 186/9	232/19 255/17 261/21	36 [1] 70/11
193/22 199/3 200/20	11.30 [1] 95/25	20 [18] 14/25 15/2 15/6 15/16 16/1 41/17	263/9 263/13 264/2	38 [1] 117/22
202/5 208/21 209/8	11.33 [1] 96/2		265/12 265/13	392 [2] 175/25 176/2
225/24 227/25 228/20	11.40 [1] 95/25 11.42 [1] 96/2	56/9 118/23 123/6 127/25 128/12 130/12	2014 [7] 65/7 65/14	3cms [1] 198/8
229/1 229/4 229/8	11/02/2011 [2] 79/18	132/17 132/21 138/3	95/10 124/12 127/11 178/4 183/11	4
229/14 230/7 231/22	282/16	161/16 163/10 210/15	2015 [2] 144/15	4 September 2013 [1]
233/13 236/20 239/10	112 [1] 174/20	20 February [1]	264/23	39/2
241/8 244/1 244/5	119 [3] 232/14 233/17		2017 [5] 1/21 6/1	4.58 [1] 267/13
244/7 245/5 257/19	235/11	20 February 2011 [1]	16/10 112/23 189/13	4/2010 [1] 246/15
258/22 259/1 259/19	12 [9] 53/12 62/15	176/5	21 [7] 13/4 30/5 30/10	40 [2] 162/14 248/10
260/6 260/11 260/16		20-minute [1] 118/22	118/15 118/20 210/17	400 [2] 232/22 238/23
260/19 260/22 260/25	178/23 182/21 190/3	2000s [2] 44/20 44/24	264/23	4000 [1] 232/22
266/6 266/12 267/10	245/10	2007 [1] 269/10	21210 [1] 2/15	401,000 [1] 184/4
267/15 267/18 267/25	12 March 2011 [1]	2008 [4] 44/24 194/14	21st century [1] 246/4	405 [1] 91/1
270/14 272/9 272/16	89/10	269/6 285/5	22 [1] 159/16	41 [3] 108/19 176/18
272/20 273/19 274/21	12 October [1] 82/10	2009 [4] 42/20 42/24	23 [2] 62/15 78/7	182/1
275/5 275/12 275/24 276/4 276/23 277/16	1220 [1] 175/22	45/2 134/19	24 [3] 40/3 162/24	42 [2] 74/15 265/10
	123 [2] 171/18 173/8	2010 [31] 42/20 42/25	200/4	43 [3] 65/14 65/15
278/5 278/10 278/22 279/1 279/14 279/22	125 [4] 202/16 215/1	45/10 45/12 45/18	24 July 2014 [1] 178/4	122/13
281/3 281/11 281/18	241/11 244/11	45/24 46/10 46/11	24 March [1] 83/21	44 [4] 117/23 173/20
281/21 282/3 282/13	126 [2] 170/7 182/11	47/24 85/5 109/17	24 March 2011 [1]	264/20 265/10
282/17 283/6 283/16	127E [1] 160/7	134/13 134/19 146/3	89/9	45-minute [1] 151/14
283/20 284/3 284/12	13 [7] 39/5 63/16	154/19 157/6 162/15	25 [3] 63/16 69/7	46 [1] 78/7
285/1 286/4 286/6	75/19 133/25 159/22	200/6 200/6 200/10	232/24	47 [2] 249/6 249/10
286/20	160/13 264/16	200/11 200/17 200/20	250 [7] 41/24 194/20	470 [2] 170/12 178/14
THE SECRETARY: [5]	13 February 2013 [1]	200/25 210/1 211/4	195/6 196/11 232/25	48 [2] 102/1 169/11
69/6 101/25 111/24	175/16	215/25 246/15 251/24	236/7 240/16	4R4 [1] 2/11
126/15 132/17	13.35 [1] 150/17	252/3 279/25	26 [2] 86/11 133/24	5
	13.45 [1] 152/15		27 [4] 160/2 160/4	5-minute [1] 186/4
0	130 kilometres [1] 220/18	73/6 73/13 73/15	216/18 216/24	5.11 pm [1] 267/13
043 [1] 182/7	1300 [1] 209/22	76/11 79/18 80/25 82/15 83/10 83/10	28 [2] 100/5 177/15	5.30 [1] 287/8
071 [1] 13/8			28.2.1 [1] 100/6	5.52 pm [1] 287/14
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
5	850,000 [1] 175/20	115/1 129/19 138/4	152/24	101/21 102/11 102/20
50 [10] 108/20 150/6	88 [3] 69/10 95/13	150/6 168/12 174/4	accompanied [1] 92/3	
174/11 176/15 176/22	117/12	179/17 180/11 184/6	accompanies [1]	104/25 107/6 107/19
182/2 196/22 205/21	89 [2] 13/9 13/17	188/7 190/2 190/15	91/18	108/25 109/4 111/10
217/17 229/19	89a [2] 13/11 13/14	191/6 195/7 196/16	accomplished [2]	111/11 111/16 121/11
50/50 [1] 217/17	9	197/2 199/8 199/17 203/10 209/22 212/18	192/21 252/4 accordance [5] 6/20	153/19 170/10 181/24 181/25 182/2
500 [3] 205/10 226/7	9.30 [2] 6/4 286/25	214/6 215/11 221/14	100/19 169/9 169/12	actual [12] 49/24
238/23	9.31 [1] 6/1	221/15 221/17 222/24	186/5	56/22 71/11 76/16
500,000 [1] 41/8 5000 [1] 219/18	90 [8] 69/11 150/10	223/16 224/4 224/11	according [7] 58/10	85/12 100/24 132/5
51 [2] 4/12 86/11	150/10 152/16 153/1	225/12 232/12 232/24	71/22 121/21 162/22	157/20 164/22 184/22
513 [1] 68/12	153/6 153/7 164/20	234/13 235/4 235/12	221/9 242/24 274/11	216/9 264/19
526 [1] 171/20	90 per cent [2] 56/13	237/4 240/6 240/7	accordingly [2]	actually [50] 18/17
54 [1] 87/14	57/5 91 [1] 12/1	245/16 245/17 245/19 248/21 266/9 269/15	153/24 160/8 account [9] 10/16	26/9 42/23 44/24 56/14 57/1 63/1 65/5
56 [1] 181/2	94 [1] 114/6	248/21 200/9 209/15	148/17 166/2 166/3	71/14 71/15 91/9
560 [1] 284/4	95 [10] 73/2 73/2 76/7	272/25 273/23 275/8	172/5 207/15 257/6	99/10 103/5 103/7
58 [2] 75/16 94/25	79/5 79/6 83/8 165/24	276/4 276/11 278/17	258/7 286/18	105/12 106/21 107/4
59b [1] 94/25 5LN [1] 2/6	175/3 175/14 281/13	278/24 279/5 279/18	accountants [1] 41/7	107/7 124/4 154/4
	97 [1] 87/22	279/24 282/15	accounting [3] 42/17	154/24 162/12 165/8
6	99 per cent [1] 97/1	about December 2012		192/4 193/8 197/11
6 and [1] 122/12	Α	[1] 232/12 above [29] 48/7 66/5	accounts [1] 207/13	198/1 205/19 207/9
6 pm [1] 287/9	a conversation [1]	66/7 66/19 67/1 72/14	accurate [6] 31/12 138/18 189/22 190/9	207/11 213/4 222/12 224/25 225/9 229/5
6-7 [1] 270/3	27/1	72/25 73/7 74/2 74/8	275/16 277/22	232/6 235/1 238/24
6-9 [1] 122/6	a dispute [1] 58/21	74/9 74/14 74/21	accurately [4] 96/8	239/17 242/7 242/10
60 [5] 88/19 88/19 88/20 175/7 175/16	a fundamental [1]	74/25 75/2 75/3 75/5	146/19 189/20 261/16	246/11 248/4 248/21
60a [2] 232/13 232/16	76/2	75/8 79/17 93/2 98/2	Achabou [1] 9/6	252/10 258/21 263/21
616 [1] 3/7	a lot [1] 275/22	114/7 124/2 137/7	ACHAIBOU [2] 4/5	268/16 274/20 275/22
65 [2] 227/22 247/3	a reference [1] 16/16 a result [3] 113/18	139/22 140/17 143/2	9/17	ad [1] 109/16
67 [1] 182/3	171/7 239/8	145/7 282/19 above-average [4]	achieve [3] 145/8 156/5 156/12	adapted [1] 183/3 add [2] 56/21 183/23
67a [1] 233/22	a summer [1] 93/21	137/7 139/22 143/2	achieving [2] 143/10	added [1] 160/15
68 [1] 182/4	A-1 [1] 177/5	145/7	145/4	addition [9] 15/25
680 [1] 179/17	A-47 [2] 249/6 249/10	abroad [1] 117/24	acknowledges [1]	72/6 121/16 131/18
7	a.cusnir [1] 4/14	absence [5] 11/12	129/2	138/22 146/25 257/1
7 February 2011 [1]	a.guzun [1] 4/14	13/14 174/12 174/23	acquaintances [2]	257/3 261/3
73/15	abandon [1] 104/13 abandoned [1] 104/18	181/17	156/17 156/24	additional [24] 14/23
70 [2] 107/12 196/22	aharrant [6] 00/17	184/20	across [1] 38/14 act [20] 59/25 60/13	14/25 15/23 18/17 19/16 20/7 20/13 21/5
70 per cent [2] 279/20	102/11 102/24 103/15	absolutely [21] 23/3	60/14 70/19 78/11	22/4 22/25 23/1 23/7
279/21 71 [2] 13/20 14/7	104/25 111/11	29/14 43/21 44/17	78/15 80/4 103/15	23/8 23/13 23/18 25/3
72 [1] 70/7	abeyance [1] 18/1	49/2 60/23 69/23	104/12 105/16 106/25	25/6 41/25 70/7 95/8
72a [1] 232/19	ability [4] 93/7 112/11	78/10 78/14 80/5	107/10 108/11 108/15	96/17 118/22 143/1
76 [3] 13/20 14/7	167/10 195/1	82/22 84/25 85/3	125/11 128/4 144/11	256/20
169/3	able [14] 7/21 18/7 23/7 34/8 36/16 66/17	89/14 116/25 148/15	167/13 167/22 180/24	additionally [6] 43/1
77 [1] 171/7	117/9 152/3 175/15	149/3 152/11 199/23 232/9 240/24	acted [3] 113/7 238/1 276/21	48/9 100/12 103/20 105/4 128/10
7cms [1] 198/8	177/9 188/3 267/17	accept [5] 22/21	acting [5] 97/25 98/1	additions [1] 62/8
7K [1] 105/5	278/15 287/8	167/17 167/20 167/23	114/3 179/6 245/22	address [45] 14/16
8	about [105] 13/4 15/2	167/24	action [7] 110/15	14/23 14/25 16/20
8 April 2011 [1]	17/2 18/25 21/15 33/3	acceptable [4] 20/16	119/18 120/6 123/17	19/16 19/19 20/5 20/7
215/11	35/22 37/20 37/22 38/15 40/5 40/12	21/22 120/25 121/1	123/18 170/12 178/15	20/11 20/21 21/1 23/2
8 December [1] 19/18	45/10 49/1 49/23	accepted [1] 184/13	actions [3] 38/19 47/2 47/5	23/6 23/9 23/13 25/3 25/14 27/8 29/18
8,000 [1] 196/10	49/23 50/14 53/12	access [11] 89/5 89/14 91/7 91/19	actively [1] 92/16	29/18 29/21 29/24
80-kilo [1] 205/21 80202 [1] 3/8	54/15 58/22 61/12	91/20 92/2 92/5 92/12	activities [2] 134/18	32/24 36/6 42/1 44/6
81 [4] 12/4 12/12	67/3 67/16 67/17	109/20 145/1 221/25	141/17	61/21 83/24 90/11
12/13 12/25	68/18 69/7 69/10 70/9	accessing [5] 88/16	activity [4] 42/20	96/12 96/19 97/8
83 [3] 13/20 113/11	70/13 71/25 73/25	88/23 89/25 91/4	59/14 95/12 271/22	101/2 102/16 105/8
251/12	80/24 81/7 84/16 85/21 85/22 90/2	131/17	acts [31] 40/10 40/12	106/8 112/8 119/10
83a [2] 14/8 14/15	96/14 96/14 96/24	accident [2] 171/8 210/21	60/11 70/13 70/20 97/14 97/17 97/20	124/6 138/16 173/10 173/14 187/22 254/5
85 [1] 184/8	97/9 98/11 103/15	accommodate [1]	97/24 101/5 101/10	266/16
85,000 [1] 183/25	103/20 104/25 109/25			
L	1	www.dianaburden.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova

Word Index Revised

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
Α	12/10 29/25 96/18	148/25 163/22 183/16	107/7 108/9 181/12	248/22 249/20 250/1
addressed [24] 21/24	150/24 184/13 193/5	193/18 198/12 279/9	agricultural [24] 3/17	250/12 250/18 250/23
22/2 24/18 27/8 63/6	193/18 193/24 194/2	against [30] 34/5	3/18 7/20 24/5 26/13	250/24 251/5 252/8
90/5 93/12 105/5	adopt [3] 124/13	88/15 105/20 112/4	26/18 28/12 43/10	254/22 259/8 275/4
117/17 118/9 120/22	124/16 133/16	112/11 112/16 112/19	58/9 93/9 134/11	275/9 275/16
121/10 124/3 131/24	adopted [2] 124/22	113/4 114/13 115/4	134/24 136/22 140/3	Alianta's [9] 87/22
139/7 146/23 147/3	127/18	131/12 145/7 147/21	148/23 150/23 151/18	94/22 114/2 130/11
170/18 198/14 198/24	adults [1] 249/13	171/19 172/1 173/24	175/18 176/21 180/2	130/20 130/21 180/7
236/24 238/19 255/6	advance [3] 10/7	178/20 178/22 179/1	184/24 243/1 274/25	247/23 255/10
282/1	10/17 11/13	179/3 179/5 179/8	287/4	Alina [1] 174/16
addresses [3] 126/1	advanced [1] 149/19	180/8 182/19 182/22	agriculture [18] 26/11	all [118] 6/7 6/8 8/4
126/7 138/4	adverse [2] 42/2 42/7	208/8 220/25 231/20	93/23 134/21 141/7	9/2 15/8 21/15 21/24
addressing [3] 40/15	advice [8] 43/10	243/7 259/11	142/2 144/16 221/14	25/20 26/1 26/12
75/7 102/3	220/23 221/2 258/19	age [2] 227/22 248/15	273/2 273/15 274/8	26/20 45/21 54/25
adequate [2] 29/24	258/25 259/3 259/5	agent [13] 49/7 49/10	274/18 276/15 278/16	56/13 57/5 57/15
41/13	276/16	49/16 49/17 49/19	279/10 279/13 279/20	62/20 69/3 80/21 81/4
adjourned [1] 287/14	advise [1] 272/2	50/1 50/2 50/6 50/9	279/22 279/22	81/9 81/19 81/21
adjournment [1]	advised [2] 258/11	51/11 51/22 59/18	Agricultures [1]	81/22 81/24 81/25
153/11	276/14	59/20	125/19	82/16 82/21 84/9
adjudicate [1] 93/8	advising [3] 41/17	agents [19] 43/9	agro [8] 172/21	84/11 94/5 98/2
adjusted [1] 198/18	248/1 281/25	47/15 48/8 48/9 48/14	255/14 255/17 255/20	107/25 108/21 114/9
adjusting [1] 9/13	advocates [1] 102/15	48/23 51/4 51/15	261/22 262/8 262/14	114/10 116/12 117/18
adjustment [1] 145/13	affairs [2] 76/3 78/9	59/25 60/25 66/2 85/2	275/11	118/3 119/20 120/13
adjustments [2] 139/3	affect [5] 57/23 62/10	158/16 161/3 221/25	agronomists [2]	123/25 124/3 124/11
145/22	90/4 90/5 112/5	223/15 224/5 256/18	270/3 272/2	125/22 128/11 129/22
administration [3]	affected [1] 113/2	257/11	ahead [4] 6/4 69/15	129/24 129/24 130/11
100/6 158/6 206/2	affecting [1] 97/10	aggregate [1] 236/1	204/13 240/17	132/14 133/15 134/4
administrative [37]	affectionately [1] 38/3		aid [3] 248/4 248/6	138/14 148/5 151/13
7/5 46/23 52/20 52/23	affects [2] 90/21	214/21 217/18 217/23	248/6	152/23 158/13 160/3
99/1 102/12 102/17	96/24	225/5 228/10 237/17	aim [1] 39/10	162/21 163/17 164/9
102/25 105/1 105/12	affirm [1] 249/22	237/21 285/5	alarmed [1] 154/6	164/14 165/11 166/9
105/13 106/10 106/20	afraid [1] 272/11	agree [17] 14/19	alerted [2] 24/14 27/5	168/8 168/9 171/11
106/24 107/2 107/6	after [48] 11/3 12/9	45/21 49/8 58/5 58/25	Alexander [1] 246/12	173/11 173/20 173/20
107/9 107/10 107/18	23/12 38/9 41/23 45/2	61/6 61/8 114/12	Alexandru [1] 4/12	174/9 182/14 183/10
107/19 107/22 108/1	45/6 50/2 50/13 67/15	126/9 127/25 180/23	Alexei [10] 71/24 93/4	183/21 184/11 187/20
108/5 108/9 108/11	72/24 75/8 83/12	210/7 211/8 212/4	157/2 158/17 160/10	187/22 190/2 198/13
108/15 108/23 108/25	91/10 94/11 104/18	214/3 230/24 236/9	206/18 206/21 211/13	203/12 207/8 209/19
109/4 111/12 111/17	116/10 116/12 126/16	agreeable [1] 97/5	211/18 214/11	210/4 211/12 211/17
124/23 126/24 129/3	130/7 130/19 148/5	agreed [10] 11/8 12/2	Alexei Bugai [4]	212/8 212/11 212/22
170/14 178/17 181/2	150/2 157/7 170/19	23/3 36/9 75/19	71/24 157/2 211/13	213/7 214/3 215/4
Administrative Court	170/24 172/23 172/25	108/16 185/3 186/25	211/18	215/19 217/22 219/12
[9] 105/12 105/13	173/3 193/5 194/15	187/16 236/4	Alianta [83] 38/22	229/6 229/6 232/4
106/10 107/2 107/9	200/14 205/2 213/6	agreement [29] 31/11	39/9 50/25 55/13	242/15 242/19 245/5
107/18 108/5 108/9	214/17 215/12 225/23	58/24 60/18 61/4 75/23 76/9 76/13	55/21 66/24 72/17 74/18 86/7 87/8 87/11	246/19 258/1 270/3 272/1 273/24 273/24
108/23	230/14 234/2 240/1 247/24 248/22 254/11	75/25 78/25 79/1	87/15 88/2 88/13 91/3	276/19 277/24 280/17
administrative courts	254/21 255/20 257/25	107/17 120/25 121/2	92/15 92/25 93/11	281/17 284/8 284/16
[1] 178/17	263/4 273/24	125/17 125/18 125/20	93/15 94/14 94/16	284/17 284/18 284/21
administrator [19]	afternoon [5] 36/10	126/12 160/24 173/5	98/21 106/15 112/4	286/8 287/10
157/5 158/18 159/4	202/8 267/16 287/3	175/4 213/5 228/9	112/12 112/19 112/20	allegation [2] 50/5
171/9 206/22 207/8	287/6	238/24 261/8 261/9	112/24 113/4 113/7	102/10
207/11 207/12 207/20	afterwards [1] 72/6	261/13 261/17 262/2	113/14 114/8 114/14	allegations [5] 41/15
207/22 207/24 208/6	again [42] 27/24 47/7	262/8	114/17 115/1 115/8	77/15 98/3 101/16
208/16 211/12 211/18	69/11 72/11 75/17	agreements [26]	120/3 130/3 130/10	124/20
234/17 244/20 255/24	80/7 87/3 88/8 89/10	57/13 60/25 66/10	131/13 131/15 165/19	allege [4] 70/24 91/2
262/10	105/8 113/12 113/20	67/8 75/20 77/19	171/15 171/18 171/19	91/2 180/13
administrators [2]	114/5 115/22 115/22	93/10 116/22 121/19	174/14 178/20 179/3	alleged [16] 25/3 42/3
207/17 274/1	117/12 119/1 120/15	121/20 125/2 127/5	179/19 179/23 180/6	53/19 55/15 62/4 63/9
admissibility [4]	120/19 123/12 124/16	155/22 155/23 156/13	180/16 180/16 182/22	85/16 98/6 123/9
13/10 110/20 133/20	134/17 135/15 136/10	159/9 159/12 161/18	210/25 220/20 225/20	125/15 153/22 175/10
190/16	136/25 137/11 138/15	162/5 163/7 164/10	228/25 233/12 235/10	180/20 180/21 184/11
admissible [1] 86/1	138/18 139/2 139/19	164/15 175/1 175/7	243/7 245/13 245/17	184/22
admit [4] 13/15 14/5 163/21 178/14	140/14 141/2 141/21	176/17 176/25	245/21 246/15 246/17	allegedly [6] 35/21
admitted [10] 11/23	142/22 147/21 148/2	agrees [4] 12/11	246/24 247/12 247/20	57/22 62/1 117/19
	1	www.dianaburden.com	1	1

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word Index	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revised	

11 December 2017
Pages 1-287

zbigiliew i loti ellet et al	•			1 4900 1 201
Α	230/1 238/12 242/4 268/11 286/23 287/2	112/21 145/17 176/15 281/22	23/10 23/13 23/25 31/4 41/2 50/5 51/22	appeared [2] 174/18 259/8
allegedly [2] 124/10 180/15	although [2] 90/6	analysed [2] 171/10	53/19 53/23 55/15	appearing [2] 186/13
ALLEN [1] 3/3	185/2	177/23	57/21 58/18 59/17	267/19
allocate [1] 15/12	always [1] 274/6	analyses [1] 135/13	60/4 63/8 66/14 67/20	appears [4] 27/13
allocated [4] 15/6	am [125] 6/1 6/11 8/10		75/13 78/10 78/11	147/18 175/11 284/14
37/20 150/10 153/6	16/19 18/3 22/22	132/24 133/2 133/5	78/12 82/6 83/6 84/11	appellant [1] 174/3
allocation [2] 19/22	27/12 27/16 33/21	134/5 134/7 134/7	84/21 90/2 90/3 93/24	appellants [1] 174/8
149/10	37/21 39/25 41/1 44/7	135/12 135/21 142/18	94/1 95/12 101/3	apple [1] 197/1
allow [9] 10/18 20/4	46/13 49/23 49/23	146/7 147/17 148/13	104/11 109/3 113/15	apples [1] 208/20
24/9 37/22 89/3 95/24	50/4 50/4 51/24 53/5	152/1 152/13	120/17 122/22 123/13	applicable [7] 158/8
187/24 193/24 199/4	55/24 60/8 60/23	and paying [1] 235/2	124/22 126/25 129/2	165/20 171/16 171/23
allowed [1] 198/6	61/12 61/21 67/2	and period [1] 219/19	129/4 130/18 130/25	172/13 172/14 172/15
allows [1] 151/14	67/17 67/23 68/6	and/or [1] 92/3	139/3 139/9 143/22	application [6] 17/25
almost [4] 69/11	68/14 68/19 69/18	ANDREI [2] 3/18	144/11 144/11 145/22	81/4 81/11 117/3
70/17 214/15 285/5	69/23 81/12 83/19	136/22	148/15 148/18 149/22	125/11 260/9
alone [8] 38/20 91/6	90/17 90/18 93/23	ANDREW [3] 3/4 8/15	163/22 165/8 166/19	applied [4] 138/11
91/25 150/8 183/1	94/5 95/6 95/9 96/2	118/10	168/16 168/16 177/21	143/9 148/4 207/10
184/11 184/15 277/25	101/18 116/4 119/10	Andrew Astuno [1]	178/11 178/18 179/23	applies [2] 129/13
along [6] 52/12 53/15	119/13 120/9 133/12	118/10	180/20 180/21 184/6	173/19
55/10 64/9 87/23	149/23 150/16 159/23	ANDRIAN [3] 4/11 9/7	184/17 184/24 188/17	apply [6] 69/21 125/9
170/25	164/16 164/16 164/20	9/18	189/6 189/14 208/5	129/14 139/12 140/9
alongside [5] 91/3	171/12 172/21 175/8	Andrian Guzun [1]	221/8 226/22 228/17	181/11
92/14 92/15 93/15	178/2 178/2 183/22	9/18	229/9 229/10 231/4	applying [1] 129/2
104/20	184/6 185/6 187/10	ANISSA [3] 4/5 9/6	234/4 235/7 235/16	appointed [2] 231/12
aloud [1] 186/20	187/22 188/21 189/3	9/17	236/22 241/17 244/3	270/11
alphabetical [1] 9/16	191/13 196/8 196/9	Anissa Achaibou [1]	246/21 248/21 254/5	appointment [2]
already [29] 25/3	200/2 200/5 203/4	9/17	258/17 259/4 261/2	274/13 287/9
28/11 41/19 47/6	205/24 208/19 208/19	ANN [1] 2/22	263/11 266/17 270/4	appraised [1] 53/8
65/20 66/8 67/6 67/19	208/20 212/18 213/12	ANNA [5] 4/10 9/20	270/23 271/1 271/7	appreciate [6] 36/20
68/14 71/4 93/3 93/12	214/6 218/6 219/4 221/18 224/4 225/1	9/24 10/1 36/7	271/20 272/15 272/18 275/25 276/9 276/12	133/15 226/2 258/4 281/5 286/10
94/12 103/14 130/13	225/15 226/21 227/22	Anna Cusnir [1] 36/7 announcement [2]	278/12 278/12 281/11	appreciated [1] 96/5
130/15 134/14 144/9	228/6 228/15 230/24	76/11 232/7	287/6 287/10 287/11	appreciates [1] 286/9
175/3 186/12 202/14	231/18 231/19 232/11	annul [1] 180/6	anybody [2] 272/1	
214/8 252/22 254/18	234/13 235/12 236/16	annulled [1] 282/2	278/17	appreciation [3] 9/1 11/17 19/13
255/2 255/2 258/24	236/16 237/18 237/21	annulment [2] 109/17	anyone [1] 31/1	approach [15] 32/21
265/9 279/5	239/1 240/14 245/2	179/24	anything [13] 9/25	56/16 60/10 97/4 97/6
also [92] 3/11 8/2 8/5	245/2 247/3 248/1	another [25] 30/24	25/5 25/14 84/24	98/9 118/8 135/10
8/13 11/9 11/15 19/25	248/9 249/9 254/20	50/23 56/25 65/19	128/3 138/4 168/6	136/11 137/2 139/17
20/2 20/8 28/4 33/22	258/21 258/22 263/19	80/21 89/15 95/14	189/19 199/18 268/9	140/15 141/9 148/25
34/23 36/11 36/20	264/17 264/18 268/3	106/7 110/7 112/8	269/15 275/6 284/2	196/17
38/20 40/14 41/9	272/11 272/11 278/11		anyway [1] 259/9	approached [2] 21/4
41/18 50/24 50/25	279/11 279/16 279/23	155/4 195/19 198/23	anywhere [1] 128/9	232/7
52/6 57/7 63/14 75/17	280/11 281/20 286/2	205/12 211/17 213/19	apart [1] 140/16	approaches [1]
76/21 78/17 82/2 86/3 91/6 92/15 93/3 93/8	286/22 286/25	213/19 255/13 274/10	apologise [10] 54/4	141/18
95/13 98/1 99/21	amazing [1] 8/5	274/23 280/24 283/8	60/9 62/22 96/10	appropriate [4]
100/21 101/15 103/23	amenable [2] 23/17	answer [22] 22/7	126/25 165/5 178/6	126/18 135/1 135/12
106/3 106/5 111/13	133/10	63/21 66/2 68/19	187/18 213/14 220/15	147/25
113/25 114/2 114/12	amended [3] 19/17	74/12 93/20 173/13	apology [1] 187/19	appropriately [1]
114/23 119/21 119/25	160/8 160/12	199/5 199/6 199/7	apparent [2] 16/25	77/14
121/9 121/15 122/12	America [2] 3/8 228/9	200/2 207/6 208/17	184/25	approval [2] 71/24
123/8 123/16 126/15	amicable [2] 114/16	209/1 218/3 227/22	appeal [15] 123/24	256/9
127/15 129/1 132/4	115/7	233/14 247/18 253/9	125/11 131/20 131/21	approved [4] 43/13
133/7 133/23 134/20	among [2] 183/8	255/22 263/17 280/16	131/22 173/22 173/24	47/14 80/3 211/23
137/4 143/16 146/13	242/13	answering [1] 250/13	174/2 174/4 174/6	April [7] 72/15 72/20
147/17 149/13 149/17	amongst [1] 27/1	answers [3] 209/5	174/7 174/22 177/13	89/7 89/10 170/8
151/1 151/6 151/10	amount [7] 31/9 37/21	209/12 226/2	177/17 177/21	215/11 253/23
151/11 151/21 154/22	197/9 226/16 226/18 227/8 236/3	ante [1] 118/8 anti [2] 192/9 192/12	Appeal's [1] 177/20	April 2011 [3] 72/20 89/7 89/10
154/23 163/20 166/6	amounts [5] 16/23	anti-corruption [2]	Appeals [1] 105/24 appear [5] 13/21	ARB [2] 1/5 7/5
172/10 176/7 176/22	17/22 139/22 185/15	192/9 192/12	143/19 174/20 185/10	ARB/16/8 [2] 1/5 7/5
177/5 187/23 204/3	232/21	any [112] 12/8 13/14	202/17	arbitral [10] 1/14 5/9
207/3 214/13 217/2	analyse [5] 70/19	14/5 14/25 15/7 20/25	appearance [1] 12/5	5/11 5/15 30/19 31/8
218/18 223/17 227/17				
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word Ind
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revise

dex ed

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-28
Α	Article [3] 76/1 125/19	207/20 209/2 209/2	assets [1] 185/13	94/2 98/10 98/16 99/8
arbitral [4] 245/8	181/15	211/13 211/17 213/24	assign [3] 161/9	101/4 111/21 116/12
265/8 268/11 272/20	Article 1 [1] 76/1	214/1 215/3 215/8	261/10 261/21	attend [1] 11/14
	Article 6 [1] 125/19	215/15 218/24 219/5	assigned [2] 155/21	attending [1] 11/11
Arbitral Tribunal [1]	artistic [1] 165/6	226/3 230/6 230/7	158/24	attention [15] 39/18
268/11	Artur [2] 95/11 117/14	230/15 230/16 230/16	assignment [4] 256/9	39/20 39/22 56/2
arbitrarily [2] 106/25	Artur Sircu [1] 117/14	231/1 231/2 237/5	261/9 262/14 262/15	88/19 100/3 139/1
107/14	as [216] 7/17 7/17	238/1 238/3 239/8	assist [2] 47/9 60/21	149/25 154/10 160/2
arbitrariness [1]	11/11 11/21 13/3 13/8	242/5 245/22 248/5	assistance [5] 49/14	191/13 231/5 231/7
173/19	13/8 17/15 17/21	251/25 261/17 262/13	93/24 94/3 170/22	249/16 279/14
arbitrary [1] 107/13	18/10 18/18 20/8 22/7	262/13 267/19 270/8	249/2	attentively [1] 286/1
arbitration [7] 109/21	24/11 25/17 26/3	273/11 273/20 273/20	assistant [3] 2/19 9/9	attitude [1] 133/17
110/10 110/13 149/19	26/17 27/6 29/4 29/20	276/1 285/18	11/10	attorney [19] 41/16
230/2 235/22 258/20	30/22 31/6 31/6 31/25			123/10 161/20 161/23
Arbitrator [3] 1/15	33/3 33/11 33/19	aside [2] 173/25 177/16	assisted [1] 47/17	169/16 169/18 169/2
1/16 31/7			assisting [2] 47/18	
arbitrators [3] 2/8	33/22 35/12 37/21	ask [45] 24/9 27/4	47/19	170/1 170/2 170/4
268/5 272/18	38/10 38/10 39/4	29/11 30/12 37/13	Assoc [2] 3/16 3/17	211/21 218/11 220/2
are [335]	40/23 42/13 50/17	65/25 69/16 84/3	assume [4] 25/18	220/8 238/8 242/23
area [9] 24/13 165/1	52/5 52/5 52/16 55/11	105/11 106/22 150/19	37/16 69/12 70/4	244/15 255/21 256/7
165/5 166/14 201/22	57/14 58/17 59/20	151/3 151/10 152/12	assumed [1] 146/9	attract [1] 45/16
271/12 273/9 275/3	59/25 63/6 63/13 64/5	189/6 202/12 209/23	assumes [2] 121/22	attracting [1] 47/8
279/20	64/19 70/18 73/16	217/1 219/12 224/8	145/21	attributable [12]
areas [4] 33/14 165/23	73/17 75/14 75/25	224/12 225/11 225/14	assuming [4] 69/23	40/10 40/12 70/13
274/2 275/11	76/3 80/18 80/19	228/13 231/6 235/21	226/21 280/8 281/20	70/18 97/15 97/17
argue [5] 48/6 71/9	82/15 90/6 90/6 92/16	236/12 240/13 240/15	assumption [4]	97/20 103/24 105/17
	94/6 98/3 98/16 98/19	244/10 245/15 246/5	102/19 145/5 145/7	180/11 180/12 180/1
88/3 147/8 166/21	99/3 99/19 100/15	247/11 249/2 250/7	145/25	attributed [1] 70/21
argued [3] 56/4	101/22 102/23 103/14	250/12 251/11 253/17	assumptions [4]	attribution [2] 72/8
113/14 113/16	103/16 104/5 104/12	253/19 255/17 262/17	102/18 138/17 146/14	161/25
argues [6] 56/3 63/16	105/5 106/18 106/21	267/20 268/17 272/17	185/14	attributions [1] 158/
87/10 87/22 108/17	109/24 110/2 110/13	281/12	assurance [1] 253/5	August [4] 46/7
114/9	110/14 113/18 116/16	asked [40] 27/22	assurances [1]	116/19 231/2 232/19
arguing [1] 115/20	117/4 120/2 120/2	93/18 103/17 177/9	180/20	August 2011 [1]
argument [35] 40/15	120/20 121/5 121/9	192/11 199/8 215/19	assure [2] 133/1	116/19
42/7 53/6 53/8 57/12	124/14 124/24 124/24	217/19 222/3 222/9	205/4	August 2013 [1]
57/15 61/10 62/16	125/9 125/10 125/11	222/14 222/22 227/12		232/19
63/9 69/24 71/13		231/1 231/6 232/6	assured [3] 47/9 52/11 222/11	
101/24 102/8 102/14	125/14 125/14 127/11			AUSTRIA [2] 1/20 4/
102/17 103/9 103/12	127/11 129/7 130/14	233/17 239/3 239/11	assuredly [1] 119/6	authenticate [1] 14/
104/15 104/23 105/10	131/8 132/14 133/6	240/5 240/7 241/15	assuring [3] 32/10	authentication [1]
107/1 108/7 111/9	134/13 135/13 136/15	243/16 246/2 247/7	53/14 133/7	193/6
112/1 112/6 112/8	137/5 137/13 138/7	248/7 248/23 250/11	astounding [1]	authenticity [4] 64/1
112/12 113/1 113/5	139/6 140/4 140/13	251/9 253/3 259/6	145/25	80/13 81/7 81/9
113/8 114/2 114/19	141/1 141/8 141/11	259/19 261/4 273/4	ASTUNO [4] 3/4 8/15	author's [1] 142/8
124/15 135/4 185/25	142/4 142/16 142/18	273/14 274/16 274/18	39/21 118/10	authorised [3] 64/3
arguments [19] 16/24	142/25 143/9 145/3	278/19 278/20 279/9	Atelier [1] 2/14	64/12 80/4
	145/10 145/19 146/16	asking [13] 171/12	attached [5] 30/1	authorities [10] 11/2
64/23 90/21 99/23	148/8 149/12 149/15	208/19 212/18 219/2	42/18 87/17 87/17	11/22 11/23 12/9
102/3 105/3 107/21	149/16 151/19 153/16	219/4 225/23 228/12	88/25	34/13 97/25 103/25
107/23 109/5 109/6	157/13 158/17 159/3	237/21 245/3 245/21	attack [3] 41/11 94/16	112/25 114/4 158/6
109/9 110/1 111/4	160/6 160/11 161/23	258/22 273/5 278/11	105/14	authority [22] 30/4
111/23 112/14 124/7	162/2 162/11 162/25	asks [1] 187/9	attacking [3] 57/15	49/18 51/8 51/14
124/11 124/17 150/6	163/13 163/15 163/16	assent [1] 59/1	57/16 105/21	61/14 75/13 76/24
arise [1] 15/1	164/21 165/22 167/13	assert [3] 129/9	attacks [1] 132/3	78/11 78/15 89/21
arms [3] 6/7 29/16	168/8 168/9 168/22	136/17 249/22	attempt [16] 57/24	97/25 98/2 101/12
152/10	169/21 170/9 171/7	asserted [2] 124/17	89/19 99/11 105/12	103/19 104/1 107/18
around [5] 28/2 55/18	173/23 174/8 177/5	124/18	107/3 109/3 111/3	128/8 130/5 194/1
165/4 252/16 275/2		assertion [3] 119/18		212/17 242/15 242/1
arranged [1] 205/14	178/14 180/1 180/3		112/25 114/13 114/16	
arrangements [2]	181/17 182/22 182/25	122/7 251/3	118/7 119/7 119/10	automatic [1] 107/10
16/9 116/20	186/13 186/14 187/16	asserts [1] 121/22	127/19 171/17 195/11	automatically [1]
arrival [1] 211/1	193/25 194/20 196/4	assess [2] 29/6 75/23	attempted [6] 72/9	179/7
arrive [3] 183/14	196/14 196/15 199/7	assessment [3] 142/6		Autotehnica [1]
183/24 184/4	199/7 199/21 202/10	143/12 147/18	115/1 191/10	247/13
arrived [2] 83/24	202/21 203/16 205/5	assessments [2]	attempting [1] 122/17	
123/9	206/21 207/8 207/11	27/18 148/23	attempts [9] 82/4 90/2	154/19 154/19
0,0				
	1		1	
I				

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Rev

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
Α	badly [1] 259/21	81/8 82/13 99/4	beautiful [2] 211/3	89/11 89/25 90/1 90/9
availability [1] 181/4	Balan [1] 174/16	106/25 107/11 108/2	249/7	91/10 91/11 92/24
	balance [1] 152/10	108/5 108/11 108/13	became [2] 121/19	93/14 93/17 105/20
available [4] 6/17	bald [1] 100/1	109/13 109/22 110/14	154/16	106/23 108/6 110/18
148/9 152/24 187/3	bald-faced [1] 100/1	110/18 111/3 111/9	because [142] 9/11	111/17 111/18 114/4
average [32] 136/4	Balti [3] 105/24 174/6	111/14 111/19 113/19	16/17 20/11 21/12	115/13 115/14 115/14
136/9 136/13 136/19	177/20	115/24 116/8 116/23	22/2 25/7 26/14 30/11	116/11 116/21 116/24
137/3 137/7 138/25	bang [1] 20/22	117/9 117/25 118/2	30/16 37/13 44/1 48/6	117/22 117/23 118/4
139/22 140/13 140/17	Bank [2] 140/25	118/9 118/16 119/2	50/15 52/4 53/25 58/3	119/20 121/16 121/21
140/18 140/21 143/2	144/15	119/19 120/6 120/6	60/18 63/4 67/23	125/4 130/17 136/13
143/5 143/13 143/14	bankrupting [1] 39/9	120/7 120/13 122/4	69/20 74/1 74/8 77/23	136/19 138/19 139/7
143/21 144/7 144/8	bare [1] 148/3	122/25 123/15 126/11	80/23 84/14 85/15	143/10 145/10 145/20
145/7 146/5 146/8	based [22] 18/5 24/8	126/23 129/5 129/5	94/25 97/20 99/7	145/23 147/4 147/16
146/14 146/15 147/9	87/18 102/6 102/18	129/17 129/18 132/10	109/10 112/18 112/19	150/1 155/17 156/14
148/1 148/18 149/4	103/4 105/3 108/13	133/2 133/8 133/19	113/3 116/10 117/10	156/15 158/15 158/22
149/5 185/6 196/15	110/25 111/7 135/5	138/15 139/10 140/7	121/25 122/5 125/10	160/10 160/17 161/17
196/22	142/8 143/5 166/24	140/20 142/18 143/14	126/17 129/24 130/12	163/6 163/24 164/14
average-level [1]	176/12 181/25 184/20	144/4 144/6 144/18	130/18 138/3 139/20	165/15 167/14 167/16
138/25	185/1 241/6 260/17	144/23 144/24 145/4	140/15 144/7 151/24	168/21 169/14 171/14
averages [6] 143/9	271/4 271/6	146/9 146/23 147/6	152/6 154/9 164/6	172/12 172/15 174/24
144/6 144/13 145/2	baseless [1] 55/17	147/18 148/1 148/4	167/25 168/11 169/1	175/11 175/14 178/4
145/3 145/8	bases [2] 103/9	148/9 149/9 149/12	169/4 177/9 177/19	180/4 181/22 182/5
avoiding [1] 165/9	128/12	149/14 149/19 150/22	184/6 185/18 187/10	183/1 184/10 185/3
award [5] 30/16 30/20	basic [3] 140/3 196/6	151/1 151/3 151/18	192/8 195/22 196/22	185/7 214/10 214/13
31/8 32/24 184/21	196/8	152/2 153/7 154/6	197/17 198/4 198/20	220/24 221/7 222/21
aware [17] 33/10	basically [1] 134/13	155/2 155/6 157/5	204/20 205/2 205/3	226/1 226/3 236/19
55/12 98/3 129/22	basis [17] 26/13 31/13	157/12 165/6 166/18	205/6 206/17 207/25	244/19 270/2 270/10
156/6 182/10 191/4	33/2 34/14 122/22	167/7 167/18 167/19	208/2 208/13 209/7	271/10 275/14 282/14
238/12 240/8 251/23	123/13 124/14 124/22	171/10 172/4 172/19	210/3 211/24 217/20	283/2 283/23 284/9
262/7 262/13 264/10	130/11 130/12 130/21	173/12 173/14 177/9	219/24 220/7 220/21	284/21 284/22 284/23
265/25 271/20 277/5	130/25 137/9 166/22	177/23 178/25 179/13	221/6 222/14 223/3	beet [1] 261/15
277/21	249/22 251/2 281/7	180/25 181/18 182/13	223/13 224/5 224/10	beets [1] 239/25
away [8] 18/6 112/16	baton [3] 39/23 116/2	184/20 184/24 185/10	224/13 226/8 227/1	before [54] 8/1 8/5
198/19 227/13 227/18	118/11	186/5 186/18 187/3	227/11 228/17 229/18	10/10 21/1 21/3 21/21
249/14 253/11 258/7	battles [1] 39/14	188/3 189/20 192/3	230/4 230/5 230/5	22/18 25/19 28/19
В	be [280] 6/3 7/17 8/1	192/5 192/25 193/5	230/25 231/21 233/21	28/24 43/20 49/22
baby [3] 11/13 247/3	10/20 12/10 13/21	193/18 193/24 194/10	234/7 238/25 239/13	67/17 67/20 73/24
249/14	13/24 14/5 14/15 15/2	195/2 195/23 198/5	240/12 240/13 243/16	73/25 82/14 86/24
back [69] 27/2 37/12	15/7 15/20 16/21 17/1	204/17 206/1 207/7	243/19 243/21 245/23	88/21 91/11 96/6
46/17 50/13 51/19	17/13 17/19 17/23	207/11 207/22 208/5	246/6 247/9 248/15	97/14 105/9 110/21
58/2 59/4 61/5 61/10	18/7 18/22 19/21	208/15 208/24 209/7	248/23 248/24 249/10	114/17 116/2 128/4
61/19 65/22 68/7	21/23 22/1 22/6 22/7	209/11 212/7 212/10	249/12 250/14 251/1	131/10 132/17 137/16
72/13 72/20 78/6	23/4 23/7 25/6 25/15	213/12 220/16 224/12	252/13 252/19 252/21	143/18 154/19 156/18
85/12 89/12 96/7	26/17 27/5 28/7 28/9	225/22 225/23 226/16	252/24 253/5 253/13	163/19 163/21 168/16
109/13 110/14 112/13	29/19 30/17 31/9 32/1	228/21 229/3 231/11	256/1 256/7 257/9	172/7 172/17 175/2
116/9 118/3 145/16	32/12 32/13 32/17	232/8 232/24 237/11	257/11 258/11 259/7	186/14 187/8 188/18
152/15 153/9 157/15	32/19 32/25 33/10	240/9 242/14 244/23	259/12 260/2 260/3	193/12 201/3 207/6
165/23 173/8 174/7	33/10 33/14 33/21	246/1 247/4 247/5	260/23 263/22 269/20	208/17 212/22 245/16
175/20 186/8 187/4	35/6 35/19 35/21 36/8	249/3 249/3 249/25	270/2 273/7 274/9	246/10 250/5 250/6
198/11 200/4 200/8	36/9 36/16 36/23	254/6 254/8 254/23	276/15 276/18 283/24	253/1 281/15 284/2
200/13 200/19 200/24	36/25 37/3 37/4 37/6	254/25 255/3 255/11	285/9 285/11	beg [1] 173/2
200/13/200/19/200/24	37/11 37/14 37/14	255/21 261/5 261/16	become [1] 99/7	began [9] 18/13 45/9
206/16 210/1 220/20	38/24 41/20 42/7	264/2 266/8 268/10	becomes [2] 18/2	45/10 55/11 55/18
220/21 221/13 226/4	42/11 42/13 46/21	269/23 270/4 271/23	72/5	143/18 163/21 170/22
231/19 231/23 232/10	46/22 47/5 48/6 48/14	272/5 274/11 274/12	been [124] 8/4 11/23	194/10
236/7 238/5 238/6	49/4 50/15 52/8 53/22	274/19 275/19 277/6	12/24 14/14 16/13	begin [14] 6/22 7/22
248/17 250/3 250/9	53/24 55/15 56/24	279/10 280/9 282/9	24/14 25/1 27/9 29/23	22/19 33/3 37/20
251/23 252/12 252/18	57/3 58/9 58/15 58/17	282/9 282/10 282/13	31/20 31/23 35/16	40/19 40/19 52/13
252/20 252/21 253/11	59/1 59/18 61/4 62/16	283/9 284/14 285/24	37/20 38/10 39/7 55/2	52/16 53/15 134/3
257/23 258/15 266/7	63/6 63/15 69/4 69/17	286/16 287/9	55/3 55/4 57/17 57/21	144/4 153/12 186/6
266/13 278/7 286/14	70/21 72/18 72/23	be March 2011 [1]	57/25 61/18 69/6	beginning [9] 7/2
bad [8] 112/6 112/14	74/10 74/19 75/7	244/23	73/13 73/14 73/17	50/16 72/4 191/1
112/20 113/8 113/20	75/21 77/5 77/6 78/18	bear [3] 27/3 36/23	80/2 80/17 83/2 84/15	192/5 227/13 241/14
112/20 113/8 113/20	78/25 79/10 79/12	234/7	86/19 87/6 87/19	246/7 252/16
11-10 11310 220/13				
		www.dianaburden.com	I	l

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word Index	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revised	

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
В	114/21 129/20 136/14	112/19 112/20 112/24	29/20 31/6 33/13	158/13 158/17 158/19
begins [1] 71/4	137/13 141/15 165/23	113/4 113/7 113/14	52/12 53/23 56/14	159/3 159/5 159/8
begun [3] 55/1 55/5	183/25 184/4 187/16	114/8 114/14 114/17	58/11 70/2 73/18 75/9	159/10 159/18 159/19
163/19	196/17 219/1 221/16	115/1 115/8 120/3	86/7 103/13 106/1	160/5 160/10 160/12
behalf [11] 3/2 4/2	250/8 252/16 257/14	130/3 130/10 131/13	121/25 122/9 122/13	160/14 160/20 160/22
98/21 159/3 161/13	269/9 270/1	131/15 165/19 171/15	124/12 124/13 124/24	204/1 204/3 204/5
209/20 210/8 210/12	beyond [8] 17/4 24/14	171/18 171/19 174/14	134/5 135/2 136/3	204/14 205/14 206/17
258/6 260/10 267/6	25/5 27/10 27/18	178/20 179/3 179/19	136/23 138/8 146/24	206/18 206/19 207/8
behest [1] 38/21	105/15 131/7 242/9	179/23 180/6 180/16	153/4 169/6 176/23	207/18 208/2 208/14
behind [14] 67/9	biased [2] 142/14	180/16 182/22 210/25	287/11	209/14 209/15 210/4
82/24 90/7 90/16 98/5	146/18	220/20 225/20 228/25	bother [1] 201/25	211/13 211/15 211/18
148/25 150/7 246/1	Bicoli [7] 172/21	233/12 235/10 243/7	bottom [2] 54/7	211/20 213/20 214/11
247/12 275/17 275/20	255/14 255/17 255/20	245/13 245/17 245/21	202/18	224/17 242/14 282/1
275/23 276/1 282/10	261/22 262/8 262/14	246/15 246/17 246/24	Box [1] 36/10	284/9
being [30] 6/8 12/22	Bicoli Agro [6] 255/14		brain [1] 58/4	Bugai's [4] 157/9
33/9 57/4 59/20 66/17	255/17 255/20 261/22	249/20 250/1 250/12	brains [1] 9/13	159/21 160/1 208/2
70/18 73/9 75/24	262/8 262/14	250/18 250/23 250/24 251/5 252/8 254/22	bravo [1] 228/12	build [1] 229/19
82/11 83/8 86/5 86/5	Bicoli-Agro [1] 172/21	259/8 275/4 275/9	breach [11] 40/13 80/17 97/18 101/10	building [2] 3/7 168/10
86/14 90/1 115/23	big [7] 28/1 59/9 164/25 206/11 226/5	275/16	103/1 110/19 175/9	
135/16 136/17 137/14	245/25 273/9	Bio-Alianta's [9]	175/10 180/25 181/17	built [1] 38/1 bulk [2] 117/16 117/18
138/25 139/11 145/15	bigger [1] 32/24	87/22 94/22 114/2	181/18	Bun [1] 4/12
148/22 149/11 149/13	bind [1] 152/24	130/11 130/20 130/21	breached [5] 101/14	bundle [1] 122/3
174/16 238/2 279/1	binding [2] 109/20	180/7 247/23 255/10	175/1 175/3 175/4	burden [2] 2/22
282/2 282/6	178/10	bit [37] 22/17 40/14	181/23	164/11
believe [27] 33/14	Bio [92] 38/22 39/9	45/7 46/3 79/15 79/17	breaches [1] 98/5	business [48] 45/14
46/6 58/21 73/6 73/8	50/25 55/13 55/21	97/5 97/19 98/4 98/5	breaching [2] 101/22	55/1 61/3 75/24 78/10
75/6 83/21 133/8	66/24 72/17 74/18	98/24 101/15 101/22	175/6	78/13 120/16 134/18
138/16 138/18 139/7	86/7 87/8 87/11 87/15	102/7 102/21 103/4	bread [3] 205/19	135/24 137/2 137/4
140/20 141/10 141/21	87/22 88/2 88/13 91/3	104/13 107/20 109/12	222/19 224/13	137/5 148/13 148/16
142/1 143/11 145/25	92/15 92/25 93/11	109/14 109/22 110/5	break [29] 25/17	155/18 156/4 156/12
146/4 147/10 148/3 151/25 173/25 174/19	93/15 94/14 94/16	174/18 180/24 181/3	25/19 26/25 27/6 28/3	156/23 156/25 157/18
228/6 241/20 281/8	94/22 98/21 106/15	181/6 181/16 181/17	28/4 28/24 28/25 29/6	157/21 185/4 185/5
283/9	112/4 112/12 112/19	181/18 181/22 246/20	31/3 31/10 31/17	185/7 185/10 197/5
believed [1] 144/23	112/20 112/24 113/4	258/18 258/20 258/24	50/13 51/6 95/24	198/17 198/25 199/3
believes [2] 17/12	113/7 113/14 114/2	258/25 272/25 279/18	95/25 96/2 96/5 97/14	199/10 199/14 199/20
150/14	114/8 114/14 114/17	Blanitu [1] 162/15	122/4 150/19 151/9	206/11 210/22 211/7
below [1] 283/7	115/1 115/8 120/3	blatant [1] 146/13	151/15 152/18 153/9	219/21 229/19 230/20
benchmarking [1]	130/3 130/10 130/11	blindly [1] 184/23	186/4 186/9 267/11	237/14 238/22 248/21
141/25	130/20 130/21 131/13	block [8] 56/24 56/25	267/13	248/22 250/24 270/23
benefit [4] 35/7 114/8	131/15 165/19 171/15	91/6 91/19 92/2 92/11	bribe [3] 93/24 240/21	
226/23 230/10	171/18 171/19 174/14	97/3 131/17	240/23	286/2
benefited [1] 228/17	178/20 179/3 179/19	blocked [1] 89/25	brief [4] 112/1 135/4	businesses [2] 156/9
BERIL [19] 3/14 5/12	179/23 180/6 180/7	blocking [4] 88/16	137/20 244/6	185/11
7/15 11/4 136/5	180/16 180/16 182/22 210/25 220/20 225/20	88/22 93/14 106/15	briefly [16] 7/7 8/9 16/20 29/1 53/2 64/17	but it [1] 254/12
150/16 152/19 153/2	228/25 233/12 235/10	blocks [2] 91/20 92/5 Bodron [1] 162/19	10/20 29/1 53/2 04/17	buy [5] 212/16 212/17 212/17 239/3 239/4
240/12 267/12 267/14	243/7 245/13 245/17	bond [1] 148/7	189/3 190/18 190/21	
267/16 268/2 268/15	245/21 246/15 246/17	book [1] 193/12	209/2 228/1 261/12	С
269/4 270/6 277/2	246/24 247/12 247/20	bookends [1] 43/25	268/9	C-043 [1] 182/7
285/4 286/7	247/23 248/22 249/20	bookkeeper's [1]	bring [2] 104/13 224/9	
best [12] 9/21 10/17	250/1 250/12 250/18	195/24		
25/17 98/15 119/6	250/23 250/24 251/5	border [2] 201/19	British [1] 156/7	C-083 [2] 13/8 190/14
148/10 177/8 185/7	252/8 254/22 255/10	203/25	brochure [2] 99/12	C-101 [1] 88/24
222/12 225/15 252/2	259/8 275/4 275/9	born [1] 38/1	100/16	C-105 [2] 87/25
269/1	275/16	borne [1] 184/11	broken [1] 116/17	179/12
better [4] 8/12 22/8		borrowing [1] 148/4	brothers [1] 263/20	C-112 [1] 174/20
62/25 157/12	39/9 50/25 55/13	Bos [1] 282/22	brought [4] 171/19	C-123 [2] 171/18
between [37] 1/6 6/7 34/15 37/12 49/4	55/21 66/24 72/17	boss [1] 248/6	222/15 246/15 279/13	173/8
54/15 57/12 49/4 54/17 55/23 58/14	74/18 86/7 87/8 87/11	both [44] 6/21 6/22	brutal [1] 37/21	C-125 [4] 202/16
59/23 60/19 67/5	87/15 88/2 88/13 91/3	7/3 7/9 7/11 7/14	Bugai [50] 71/23	215/1 241/11 244/11
72/10 73/13 75/14	92/15 92/25 93/11	10/15 10/19 10/25	71/24 93/4 156/22	C-126 [2] 170/7
89/20 91/23 92/21	93/15 94/14 98/21	14/21 16/19 25/12	157/1 157/2 157/7	182/11
94/14 99/8 107/17	106/15 112/4 112/12	26/17 29/15 29/16	157/10 157/17 157/19	C-27 [4] 160/2 160/4
	1	www.dianaburden.com	•	

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
C	135/15 152/11 192/9	cannot [14] 36/8	144/12 146/10 147/9	CH-3 [3] 35/4 35/9
C-27 [2] 216/18	207/21 224/22 250/21	48/14 60/5 71/20	147/24 148/21 158/7	36/5
216/24	252/10 252/10	74/11 106/25 109/22	164/14 177/19 178/24	CH-4 [6] 35/10 35/13
C-31 [1] 169/8	called [14] 35/18	122/25 128/6 172/4	181/11 181/19 181/20	35/18 35/25 56/2 97/4
C-33 [1] 87/22	83/15 192/10 194/24	184/20 197/19 214/16	183/5 183/18 184/4	CH-5 [1] 36/1
C-42 [1] 265/10	196/15 204/18 204/18	274/12	184/13 184/14 191/16	chair [1] 6/10
C-43 [2] 65/14 65/15	220/15 225/23 243/21	canola [1] 143/9	191/18 210/18 211/2	challenge [21] 103/5
C-44 [3] 173/20	252/11 259/16 272/23	capacity [5] 51/12	220/16 229/15 259/7	103/7 107/10 108/1
264/20 265/10	273/12	51/13 51/22 51/23	260/1 268/6 270/7	108/22 121/23 122/9
C-48 [1] 169/11	calling [1] 254/6	60/22	270/20 271/15 273/13	122/17 169/1 169/4
C-50 [1] 174/11	calls [1] 117/14	Capex [1] 22/11	273/17 276/9 281/5 281/8	169/9 169/12 169/15 170/6 170/10 170/13
C-58 [1] 94/25	came [9] 30/20 64/5 85/24 96/14 191/12	capital [4] 147/2 147/10 148/2 185/11	case for [1] 49/14	170/0 170/10 170/13
C-59b [1] 94/25	213/8 250/7 260/8	capital-intensive [1]	cases [8] 32/13 78/21	228/8 263/12
C-60 [2] 175/7 175/16	266/20	185/11	104/14 104/15 105/23	challenged [9] 106/24
C-60a [2] 232/13	can [111] 7/8 7/13	car [4] 212/14 212/17	106/6 110/25 114/21	108/2 130/17 165/17
232/16	7/17 7/18 9/25 10/8	223/3 249/10	cash [2] 134/7 135/6	168/23 170/11 178/12
C-67a [1] 233/22	14/3 15/5 17/12 19/6	card [2] 156/23	catch [1] 270/12	178/13 182/12
C-71 [1] 13/20	19/8 21/16 25/13 29/6	207/21	categories [1] 46/20	challenges [2] 107/19
C-72a [1] 232/19	29/12 31/1 31/11	care [3] 201/23 246/14		182/4
C-76 [1] 13/20	31/18 32/21 34/14	248/21	113/2	challenging [2] 38/7
C-77 [1] 171/7 C-83 [2] 13/20 251/12	36/3 36/10 36/11	career [3] 134/10	cause [5] 110/15	182/11
C-88 [2] 95/13 117/12	36/15 37/13 37/14	145/19 145/24	176/11 180/3 182/14	Chambers [1] 2/5
C-89 [2] 13/9 13/17	37/16 38/24 43/18	careful [6] 16/10	184/16	chance [16] 10/19
C-89a [2] 13/9 13/17 C-89a [2] 13/11 13/14	48/16 50/13 52/1 53/6	17/20 249/3 249/3	caused [4] 165/25	25/19 27/25 28/4
C-94 [1] 114/6	56/5 56/12 57/4 64/3	254/23 255/11	166/3 167/12 180/15	83/23 96/11 96/13
C-95 [9] 73/2 73/2	67/25 68/9 68/19	carefully [1] 16/15	Causeni [1] 246/8	151/16 156/17 157/8
79/5 79/6 83/8 165/24	69/12 69/20 70/4 73/8	carry [4] 46/1 99/17	caution [1] 138/20	187/17 187/21 204/11
175/3 175/14 281/13	73/21 76/6 78/6 83/8	99/22 226/3	CC [2] 1/15 2/9	208/25 258/18 268/9
C-97 [1] 87/22	90/24 93/1 94/6	case [146] 1/5 7/5	ceased [1] 180/14	chancellery [14]
c.lindinger [1] 4/9	101/24 110/7 112/13	9/23 16/23 17/22	cel [1] 4/12	94/19 114/22 122/14
c/o [1] 2/14	116/8 122/10 124/5	17/23 18/4 18/13 19/1	cent [5] 56/13 57/5	123/11 123/23 177/4
Cabinet [1] 2/10	128/2 128/20 132/14	22/25 23/19 30/8 31/6	97/1 279/20 279/21	260/1 260/10 262/21
cadastral [41] 35/5	133/1 143/7 150/3 151/10 151/25 152/12	32/13 32/15 32/16 32/17 32/18 32/22	central [3] 52/24 94/1 153/21	262/24 265/11 265/22 266/1 266/6
39/1 39/4 43/9 47/15	152/20 152/23 153/4	33/1 33/19 33/20	centre [7] 1/2 141/7	Chancellery's [1]
48/8 48/9 48/14 48/23	166/7 166/17 167/19	38/24 39/19 40/11	141/8 141/13 141/15	263/12
49/7 49/10 49/16	172/17 172/19 172/23	41/3 41/12 41/21 42/6	141/19 142/16	change [15] 22/5
49/17 50/1 50/2 50/5	175/12 178/25 179/13	42/18 45/20 46/20	century [1] 246/4	22/10 23/13 24/14
50/9 51/4 51/10 51/22	181/2 181/18 186/4	47/1 47/3 47/7 47/18	certain [15] 52/21	27/15 57/12 116/15
59/15 59/17 59/24	188/19 195/2 196/5	49/5 49/14 53/18	57/18 58/14 62/1	116/15 117/1 118/14
60/24 63/24 64/4	197/20 199/4 200/21	55/24 56/3 56/6 60/20	62/17 62/17 96/9	144/1 147/1 270/8
64/11 66/2 85/2 95/2 158/16 161/3 212/24	210/7 212/4 214/25	61/8 62/18 63/7 66/15	162/15 172/21 183/14	271/4 271/6
221/25 222/21 223/15	216/6 219/7 219/8	70/14 70/18 70/21	194/8 198/5 226/16	changes [4] 24/16
224/5 241/4 257/4	222/22 232/18 236/9	71/3 73/1 75/22 76/24	258/1 275/17	27/18 27/20 129/11
257/5 257/18	244/1 247/6 251/21	78/13 78/20 89/16	certainly [11] 33/20	characterisation [2]
cadastrals [8] 53/22	255/25 262/1 265/10	90/22 95/22 97/11	119/3 121/24 124/6	99/3 275/16
54/24 59/7 60/16	266/7 268/15 271/18	97/16 97/19 97/23	126/22 145/16 162/1	characterised [1]
64/24 65/3 66/15	272/25 275/7 277/9	98/1 98/4 98/10 98/14	169/13 202/21 265/22	26/17
161/5	280/25 281/12 281/16	98/16 98/19 98/25	276/12	characterises [1]
calculate [1] 153/23	can't [12] 89/4 89/6	99/6 101/5 101/8	certainty [2] 124/23	177/4
calculated [2] 69/9	196/25 207/11 208/6	101/11 101/15 102/22	125/6	characteristics [3]
141/23	208/9 217/18 220/15 241/16 252/24 255/22	103/14 103/22 104/16 104/17 104/24 105/4	certifying [1] 162/8	141/15 143/14 143/23
calculates [1] 42/23	241/16 252/24 255/22 281/10	105/13 105/17 105/23	Cervin [2] 30/6 30/10 CEX [4] 42/19 63/21	charge [2] 69/15 147/21
calculating [2] 56/17	Canada [1] 2/11	106/11 107/25 109/6	75/18 100/4	chart [1] 35/14
143/5	cancel [1] 180/5	110/6 110/16 110/17	CEX-1 [2] 42/19 63/21	charts [1] 140/7
calculation [10] 22/12	cancellation [4] 78/24	111/2 111/10 111/13	CEX-4 [2] 75/18 100/4	
25/8 97/3 137/14	78/25 106/14 166/22	111/18 111/22 112/5	CH [12] 34/21 34/25	cheaper [1] 234/25
137/15 137/22 141/24	cancelled [5] 91/10	112/17 113/2 113/22	35/4 35/9 35/10 35/13	cheating [1] 236/5
147/5 196/16 271/16	106/17 179/14 264/2	114/14 114/20 115/5	35/18 35/25 36/1 36/5	check [6] 50/3 64/20
calculations [4] 35/20	264/8	118/13 120/7 121/3	56/2 97/4	69/20 184/25 244/21
138/11 142/7 142/13	cancelling [2] 88/1	121/25 129/18 130/10	CH-1 [1] 34/21	263/2
California [1] 3/7 call [10] 31/15 38/3	179/10	134/24 135/7 142/12	CH-2 [1] 34/25	checked [10] 54/23
μ		www.dianaburden.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revi

	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
С	civil [6] 58/13 76/1	164/9 164/19 165/11	27/23	37/5 153/16 187/23
	76/2 78/8 157/22	165/13 165/15 165/16	clarified [1] 273/22	244/3 244/10 245/7
checked [9] 63/18	178/25	166/9 168/21 168/23	clarify [10] 49/22	286/23
64/1 64/25 65/3 65/10	Civil Code [2] 58/13	168/25 169/3 169/7	51/20 92/13 133/23	collected [1] 239/23
195/22 219/16 224/24 246/13	76/1	169/16 169/24 170/4	187/25 188/14 194/11	collectively [1] 123/1
checking [1] 16/2	civilisation [1] 228/7	170/5 170/11 170/13	200/21 207/7 273/19	collegial [1] 6/24
checks [1] 212/22	CL [6] 12/1 12/2 12/4	170/17 170/19 170/21	clear [41] 17/19 27/5	collusion [2] 120/3
chemical [2] 197/10	12/12 12/13 12/25	171/14 171/17 171/22	28/7 28/9 33/10 42/6	124/1
275/11	CL-100 [1] 12/2	172/2 172/10 172/13	50/15 54/21 55/15	Colorado [8] 3/7 38/4
chemicals [2] 197/17	CL-81 [4] 12/4 12/12	173/16 173/18 174/10	68/25 70/25 78/20	115/3 192/8 211/4
275/10	12/13 12/25	174/24 175/1 175/6	79/11 82/13 83/6 84/6	212/14 251/23 262/6
chickens [1] 205/22	CL-91 [1] 12/1	175/23 178/12 178/13	91/12 91/13 97/12	colour [6] 76/24 78/11
Chisinau [5] 4/13	claim [13] 87/23 99/10		104/1 105/18 110/11	78/15 89/21 98/2
83/17 105/25 220/11	110/21 110/22 115/10	180/11 180/12 180/15	116/23 117/11 128/24	104/1
254/5	117/9 135/5 172/8	180/19 180/23 181/6	131/2 135/23 144/15	combines [2] 229/13
Chitoroaga [4] 272/23	180/15 181/14 185/12	181/12 181/23 182/8	158/24 174/19 192/25	246/16
278/20 279/3 279/12	185/18 235/19	182/12 182/15 182/19	194/11 228/21 245/11	combs [1] 137/11
choice [1] 221/6	Claimant [30] 3/12 5/2		249/17 249/18 251/3	come [39] 14/3 20/9
chooses [1] 127/9	7/22 10/8 11/5 14/5 18/9 19/4 20/15 20/17	184/21 185/12 185/18 185/18 185/21 187/1	263/8 263/8 266/11 277/19	27/2 33/16 36/22 37/1 37/5 43/20 44/12
choosing [3] 130/24	21/4 21/18 21/21 24/3	188/5 191/18 193/4	clearer [2] 51/6	50/13 51/19 58/2 59/4
146/5 146/19	26/14 29/2 32/9 37/24	193/17 236/25 261/7	109/22	61/19 68/7 74/14 80/2
chord [2] 37/12	20/14/29/2/32/9/37/24 42/4 71/14 82/14	268/13	clearly [23] 40/23	93/2 96/7 152/15
118/14	82/19 83/1 84/20	Claimants' [89] 8/2	51/17 62/21 72/9	166/4 168/1 177/2
chose [3] 130/21	107/11 126/20 131/17	8/10 9/1 11/21 19/17	73/17 75/12 75/14	177/8 187/4 201/4
218/17 220/10	151/4 186/14 187/4	19/20 19/24 21/16	87/18 88/5 92/8 97/23	232/16 252/12 252/18
Christian [1] 228/6	Claimants [184] 1/9	34/19 35/1 35/9 35/25	99/19 104/18 107/5	252/20 252/21 253/11
Christmas [5] 200/9	3/2 5/5 5/7 5/10 5/13	39/15 40/16 40/20	107/16 120/7 121/3	254/7 266/7 266/13
200/20 210/2 211/3	10/11 12/2 13/12	42/3 42/8 42/24 56/12	128/11 135/7 155/21	280/10 284/23 285/21
211/4	13/24 14/25 18/5	56/18 56/22 59/5	158/23 161/8 173/9	286/1
	18/11 18/16 20/1	61/24 63/20 78/16	clerks [1] 103/18	comes [3] 15/9 78/23
circle [1] 165/1	24/10 24/20 26/2	80/20 90/6 97/22	client [2] 8/17 38/2	178/7
circulate [1] 21/10	27/22 30/4 30/19 36/7	98/23 100/2 100/20	clients' [1] 165/25	comfortable [5] 23/22
circulated [2] 25/7 151/1	40/4 42/11 47/13	101/16 102/3 102/21	climate [1] 148/24	37/4 37/7 70/2 90/17
circumstances [17]	50/20 52/11 53/4	103/12 104/3 104/6	close [3] 19/6 148/8	coming [11] 48/24
15/8 19/1 31/10 49/16	53/14 53/18 56/8	104/8 107/1 107/4	166/11	69/4 74/15 139/13
60/21 79/2 104/21	56/16 60/19 70/23	110/3 111/3 112/5	closed [2] 39/3 82/24	165/23 206/4 208/19
111/1 121/1 148/17	74/20 76/3 80/13	112/10 113/1 118/8	closely [1] 105/21	226/4 251/22 277/14
181/8 181/9 257/21	80/16 82/5 82/7 82/9	121/18 122/12 130/16	closing [5] 20/14	286/8
266/18 270/8 271/5	82/11 84/10 85/13	131/4 133/3 133/10	20/21 23/19 155/4	commencement [1]
271/7	87/5 90/20 91/2 96/25	136/21 136/21 139/15	287/12	251/8
circumstantial [1]	98/5 99/10 99/14	141/5 150/6 153/20	closings [1] 23/15	comment [4] 14/8
166/8	99/20 99/24 100/10	153/25 154/17 154/21	closure [1] 95/10	142/9 142/10 148/22
citation [2] 101/1	100/23 102/6 102/16	154/24 158/9 159/1	co [6] 2/8 3/8 94/16	commenting [1]
142/9	103/4 104/11 104/24	162/3 162/23 163/8	124/1 157/9 272/18	153/25
citations [5] 56/6	105/4 107/5 107/25	163/18 169/2 170/12	co-arbitrators [2] 2/8	comments [1] 134/3
100/11 102/13 106/19	108/4 108/21 109/24	171/25 172/20 178/19 180/7 180/22 181/1	272/18	commercial [2] 41/17
122/11	111/19 111/21 112/3 112/18 112/22 112/23	180/7 180/22 181/1 181/13 181/16 181/21	co-operation [2] 124/1 157/9	219/12 commingling [1]
cite [6] 99/24 100/24	112/18/12/22/112/23	183/5 183/5 183/7	co-ordinates [1]	133/15
110/7 114/5 140/4	114/12 114/15 114/24	183/18 184/3 184/13	94/16	commingling of [1]
148/22	115/5 115/19 116/14	185/4 185/9 185/15	code [4] 58/13 76/1	133/15
cited [8] 63/19 71/16	116/19 117/8 127/24	287/4	121/8 282/23	commit [1] 128/17
76/3 100/9 109/17	137/21 138/9 139/10	claimed [2] 80/18	coffee [7] 25/16 27/6	committed [2] 29/16
110/16 113/21 140/20	147/1 147/8 147/24	176/11	28/24 28/25 31/17	103/24
cites [5] 99/14 100/20	148/20 149/24 153/8	claims [11] 19/20	51/5 150/19	Committee [1] 109/17
100/21 104/14 128/8	153/16 153/17 153/21	102/7 102/21 103/4	coherent [1] 109/5	commodities [2]
citing [2] 99/11 106/3	153/23 154/14 155/8	104/13 105/20 110/4	cohorts [1] 205/7	134/22 134/24
city [10] 6/3 49/25	155/10 155/12 155/15	114/18 153/21 172/7	collapsed [2] 205/3	common [3] 172/18
75/22 119/18 119/22	155/17 155/25 156/3	173/11	205/8	173/6 246/19
129/10 130/3 171/21	156/11 156/14 158/22	clarification [5] 14/22	colleague [5] 8/23 9/7	commonly [1] 123/4
212/21 287/13 City Hall [3] 129/10	159/25 161/17 161/19	18/18 18/24 25/23	49/21 50/9 116/2	communicate [3]
City Hall [3] 129/10 171/21 212/21	162/25 163/6 163/12	118/20	colleagues [11] 20/19	10/17 18/3 86/4
city halls [1] 130/3	163/15 163/20 163/24	clarifications [1]	25/15 36/15 36/24	communicated [8]
ony mans [1] 100/0				
		www.dianaburden.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
C	completes [1] 150/5	185/25	235/14 271/21	18/12

Communication 2011 Competition [1] 128/18 127/12 17/14 <	С	completes [1] 150/5	185/25	235/14 271/21	18/12
B2/6 82/2 82/21 82/6 Completion [1] 12/4 12/16 12/16 12/16 2/17/2 / 8/14 9/37 18/2/16 B3/6 86/14 / S1/6 4/1 Completion [1] 12/16 2/17/2 / 8/14 Contant [1] 16/2 2 26/7/2 Contant [1] 16/2 2 26/7/2 B3/7 B3/7 Sa/7 8 6/11 Sa/7 8 6/11 Sa/7 8 6/11 Contant [2] 16/2 2 26/7/2 Contant [1] 16/2 2 26/7/2 B3/7 B3/7 Sa/7 8 6/11 Sa/7 8 6/11 Contant [2] 16/2 2 26/7/2 Contant [1] 16/2 2 26/7/2 Contant [1] 16/2 2 26/7/2 B3/7 B3/7 Completing [2] 16/2 1 Contant [2] 16/2 1 Contant [2] 16/2 1 Contant [1] 16/2 1 <td>communicated [8]</td> <td>completing [1] 153/8</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	communicated [8]	completing [1] 153/8			
BeB (B B/14 B/719 Completions [1] 11/12 17/15 1/19/16 20/22 Consciuus [2] Cons					
130/19 complete [1/] complete [1/] complete [1/] bit 22/20/24 concluse [2] 14/12 bit 22/20/24 concluse [2] bit 22/20/24					
Communication 14 64/12 64/15 64/20 conclusion [6] 39/13 61/21 consequence [4] 108/24 Communications [1] 64/12 64/15 64/26 Conclusion [6] 39/13 61/21 consequence [4] 108/24 Community [2] 19/24 168/14 Conclusion [6] 39/13 121/20 12/20 204/16 consequence [4] 52/9 64/26 54/25 Community [2] 19/24 168/14 Condition [2] 150/24 condition [2] 150/24 condition [5] 12/57 condition [6] 19/9 11/14/21 14/24 28/72 8/51 8/4 18/12 continue [4] 90/13 11/14/14/23 16/71 continue [4] 90/13 11/14/23 continue [4] 90/13 28/62 9/63 9/66 115/22 21/16 28/66 27/4 21/16 28/66 27/4 21/16 28/66 27/4 21/16 28/66 27/4 21/16 19/96 28/62 9/64 9/66 115/22 21/16 28/66 27/4 21/16 28/66 27/4 21/16 19/97 21/16 19/97 21/16 19/97 28/72 8/51 8/4 18/12 21/16 19/97 21/16 19/97 21/16 19/97 21/16 19/97 21/16 19/97 <td>130/19</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	130/19				
64/23 64/15 64/20 64/25 65/3 65/5 121/20 122/20 204/16 consent [1] 158/1 context [18] 32/14 80/15 communications [1] 65/16 22/12 context [18] 32/14 context [18] 32/14 22/12 communications [1] 65/16 62/16 consequence [2] context [18] 32/14 220/12 communications [1] 65/16 62/16 consequences [2] context [18] 32/14 220/12 communications [1] 63/15 65/16 68/15 consequences [2] consequences [2] conservative [7] 11/14 10/33 10/14 220/12 conduct [23] 46/22 conduct [23] 46/22 consideration [2] 50/15 78/14 11/14 11/12 11/14 11/12 11/14 11/12 11/14 11/12 11/14 11/12 11/14 11/12 11/14 11/12 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 11/14 <t< td=""><td>communication [2]</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	communication [2]				
Communit (2) 66/10 280/15 consequence [4] consequence [4] 227/23 Community [2] 169/24 conclusive [2] 126/13 266/16 68/15 28/9 28/9 26/16 68/17 29/12 26/12 27/12 10/14/14 68/16 68/17 29/12 26/12 27/12 10/14/14 68/16 68/17 29/12 26/12 27/12 10/14/14 68/16 68/17 29/14 68/16 68/17 29/14 11/18 11/18 11/18 11/14 14/14	82/23 86/11				
Boh 3 compliances [1] compliances [1] conclusive [2] 127/12 17/14 [16]/9.266/9 52/9 44/20 54/25 227/23 compliant [4] 7/8 compliant [4] 7/8 28/15 55/15 66/16 57/357/4977 28/14 13/4/25 28/14 <					
community [2] 162/21 127/12 266/16 66/17 89/18 64/15 227/12 companies [5] 109/19 155/23 16/11/18 16/21 condition [2] 150/24 20012 companies [5] 109/19 206/12 conditions [5] 125/24 27/17 24/18 206/13 conditions [5] 125/24 14/14/24 266/16 66/16 57/3 57/4 97/7 27/17 24/18 11/42 125/24 14/14/24 26/17 80/18 30/14 12/14/24 27/17 24/18 13/14 12/14 13/14 12/14/24 28/17					
12/123 280/12 compliant [4] 71/8 comparisot [5] 109/19 280/12 consplicate [1] 260/12 consplicate [1] 260/12 consplicate [1] 280/12 consider [6] 280/12 cons					
Commanies [G] 155/23 161/18 162/2 264/4 266/21 271/2 101/14 10/43 10/44 10/43 10/44 10/43 10/44 10/44 10/44 10/44 10/44 10/44 10/44 10/44 10/44 10/44 10/4					
companies [6] 109/11 108/11/2 119/11 <t< td=""><td></td><td>155/23 161/18 162/2</td><td></td><td></td><td>101/14 104/3 106/13</td></t<>		155/23 161/18 162/2			101/14 104/3 106/13
1496 255/16 276/22 200/13 200/12 220/24 consumpliad [2] 165/21 211/18 250/26 220/24 consumpliad [2] 165/21 211/18 250/26 220/24 consumpliad [2] 165/21 211/18 250/26 220/24 220/24 220/24 consumpliad [2] 165/21 113/20 172/3 172/41 220/24 220/24 220/24 consumpliad [2] 13/26 20/12 consumpliad [2] 13/26 20/12 20		complicated [1]	conditions [5] 125/5		
276/22 complete [12] 165/21 28/2/4 136/13 14/0.23 14/1/23 14/1/43 14/1/4 64/119 41/20 45/1 40/5 complete [11] 14/25 consider [6] 199 180/21 25/51 181/4 181/21 7217 74/18 91/15 complete [11] 11/22 172/11 172/14 90/13 90/19 94/8 57/6 69/18 94/4 95/10 175/6 73/17 22 172/11 172/14 104/6 105/2 11/1/3 57/6 69/18 94/4 95/10 175/6 continuel [4] 90/13 73/17 23/22 14/1/3 149/17 133/17 13/16/17 57/6 69/18 94/4 95/10 175/6 continuel [4] 90/13 73/17 23/22 02/37 compounded [1] 131/8 13/2/14/8/1 113/20 172/3 172/4 93/14 93/18 23/16 22/57/6 22/57/7 compulsory [3] 124/9 conducted [4] 134/6 consisten [2] 25/7 continuous [1] 40/25 Compartson [2] 133/13 19/7 50/18 9/14 13/16 13/20 50/8 13/16 13/20 50/8 13/13 149/1 concerned [1] 29/17 concerned [1] 29/17 concerned [1] 29/17 consisten [3] 40/2 14/3/3 14/2/7 Comparison [3] 13/16 13/20 consisten [3] 40/2 14/3/3 14/2/7 14/3/3 14/2/7 139/17 14/1/1 19/7 concerned [1] 29/17 concerned [1] 29/17 concerned [1] 29/17					
Company 124] 38/6 complied with [1] 48/25 53/13 70/22 155/5 18/14 181/21 88/2 96/3 96/6 115/22 72/17 74/18 91/15 complied with [1] 16/5/1 70/25 71/18 9/16 28/57 28/59 2116 62/96 28/14 13/5/18 13/5/19 13/5/20 17/12 17/21/1 17/21/1 17/14 80/16 28/57 28/99 2116 62/96 28/14 2116 62/96 28/14 13/20 14/20 148/18 17/17 73/21 17/48 10/46 105/2 11/1/3 consideration [2] 21/16 62/96 28/14 continued [4] 90/13 23/76 22/20 24/7 compounded [1] 13/20 12/1/113/7 17/3/21 17/48 10/46 105/2 11/1/3 11/3/20 17/23 17/24 continues [4] 93/14 27/82 275/14 275/18 compulsory [3] 12/40 conducted [4] 13/40 1 consistency [2] 52/7 contonuous [1] 40/25 contonuous [1] 40/25 contonuous [1] 40/25 contonuous [1] 40/25 contort [7] 12/46 contort [7] 12/47 consistency [2] 52/2 25/7/5 contort [7] 12/47 consistency [2] 52/7 contort [7] 12/47 contort [7] 14/12 13/27 contort [7] 12/47 contort [7] 12/47 contort [7] 12/47					
14/16 14/12 165/21 171/22 171/22 171/21 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
1211 74/16 39/19 00/13 90/19 94/8 consideration [2] consideration [2] consideration [2] consideration [2] consideration [2] continued [4] 90/13 90/19 94/8 consideration [2] continued [4] 90/13 90/19 94/8 57/6 69/18 consideration [2] continued [4] 90/13 90/19 94/8 57/6 69/18 consideration [2] continued [4] 90/13 90/19 94/8 57/6 69/18 consideration [2] continued [4] 90/13 90/19 94/8 57/6 69/18 consideration [2] consideration [2] continued [4] 90/13 22/17 consideration [2] continued [4] 90/13 22/1 consideration [2] 22/17 continued [4] 90/13 22/1 consideration [2] 22/1 continued [4] 90/13 22/1 consideration [2] 22/1 22/1 22/2 22/2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
130 130 130 130 130 130 143 130 130 143 130 1					
136/22 14/03 136/27 1476/8 103/6 105/2 11113 considered [9] 56/14 continues [4] 59/18 149/21 145/15 149/17 282/24 119/20 121/11 131/7 13/26 172/26 180/9 continues [4] 59/18 246/18 246/21 274/22 275/7 compounded [1] 13/17 13/21 174/8 119/20 121/11 131/7 174/61 179/25 180/9 continues [4] 59/18 275/8 275/14 275/18 275/8 275/14 275/18 computots [1] 14/21 consister [6] 52/12 consister [6] 12/19 consister [1] 12/19 continues [1] 40/25 consister [2] 52/22 consister [2] 52/22 consister [2] 52/22 consister [3] 30/21 consister [3] 30/21 consister [3] 30/21 consister [3] 30/21 consister [3] 40/25 48/19 58/12 59/14 13/23 13/35 concerved [1] 30/15 concerved [1] 30/17 concerved [1] 30/17 concerved [1] 30/17 consister [3] 40/25 48/19 58/12 59/14 13/23 13/35 concerved [1] 30/17 consister [3] 40/25 48/19 58/16 58/15 57/6 57/7 68/16 59/16 59/23 68/17 concerved [1] 30/17 concerved [1] 30/17 consistures [3] 40/24 28/16 82/33 28/14 consistures [1] 40/25 68/16 59/17 269/24 68/16 59/17 269/27					
143/1 43/1 43/15 143/17 113/20 122/172/15 127/24 93/21 94/8 94/15 246/18 246/21 274/23 103/7 13/8 132/4 180/10 174/6 179/25 180/9 continuing [2] 133/6 274/24 275/2 275/1 276/17 compounded [1] 13/8 132/4 180/10 174/6 179/25 180/9 continuing [2] 13/16 276/8 275/4 275/7 compounded [1] 13/8 132/4 180/10 conducted [4] 141/4 contacting [1] 41/4 contacting [1] 41/4 contacting [1] 41/4 contacting [1] 42/16 contacting [1] 42/16 control [1] 22/19 control [1] 22/19 control [1] 22/19 25/12 5/12 control [1] 22/19 25/12 5/14 control [1] 22/19 25/12 5/12 control [1] 12/19 25/12 5/12 25/12 5/19 13/3 13 13/3 13/3 13 13/3 13/3 13 13/3 13/3 13 13/3 13/3 13/3					
1439/1 1439/13 1439/1 237/12 42/12 1439/17 246/18 246/21 274/2 275/20 276/1 compounded [1] 137/18 122/12 186/0 277/22 275/7 276/8 275/14 275/18 275/20 276/1 137/18 122/12 180/9 180/18 conducting [1] 141/1 276/20 276/1 considering [2] 33/6 181/1 234/25 conducting [1] 141/1 200/14 141/12 28/4 consistency [2] 52/22 control (1] 128/16 257/25 control (1] 128/16 control (1] 127/19 control (1] 128/16 control (1] 128/17 control (1] 128/16 control (1] 128/17 control (1] 128/16 control (1] 128/17 control (1] 128/16 control (1] 128/17 control (1] 128/16 control (1] 128/16 control (1] 128/16 control (1] 128/17 control (1] 128/17					
25/19/22/24/27 103/7 103/7 180/18 181/1 234/25 257/25 274/24/275/2 275/7 compromised [1] 00/10 142/13		compounded [1]			continuing [2] 133/6
274/24 275/2 275/7 Compromised [1] contacted [4] 134/5 consisten [2] 27/1 contacted [4] 134/5 275/8 275/14 275/18 computes [1] 124/19 124/20 consisten [2] 27/1 consisten [2] 52/2 contorted [1] 127/19 275/80 276/1 computes [1] 124/19 124/20 consisten [2] 52/2 contorted [1] 127/19 276/80 276/1 computer [1] 28/16 consisten [2] 52/2 contorted [1] 127/19 276/80 276/1 computer [1] 28/16 consisten [2] 52/2 contorted [1] 127/19 276/80 272 133/5 computer [1] 28/16 conferred [1] 193/2 conspiracies [1] formation [2] 32/1 276/14 conceived [1] 39/7 concerved [1] 28/16 conferred [1] 128/16 formation [1] 128/16 276/16 concerved [1] 21/12 confirm [1] 01/108 constitute [3] 94/7 formation [1] 28/17 276/16 concerved [1] 212/12 confirmation [5] 78/2 constitute [3] 94/2 formation [1] 28/17 266/14 208/15 confirms [1] 128/15 formation [1] 28/17 constitute [3] 94/7 formation [1] 22/17 266/14 208/15 concerved [1] 31/27 constitute [3] 94/7 formation [1] 28/17 constitute [3] 71/			180/18		
275/8 275/14 275/18 90/10 142/13 142/17 148/23 146/1 comtors [1] 129/16 275/20 276/1 compulsory [3] 124/9 conducting [1] 141/4 consisted [1] 156/16 contract [52] 42/5 2000 gmpulsory [3] 124/9 confer [6] 27/12 28/4 31/16 49/20 50/8 125/17 consistent [3] 40/2 48/19 48/25 49/4 2000 gmpulsory [3] 124/9 confer [6] 27/12 28/4 31/16 49/20 50/8 125/17 50/16 60/16/16 49/11 50/7 51/7 59/23 60/24 61/13 2000 gmpulsor [1] 128/19 concent [1] 130/15 conferred [1] 193/22 conspiracies [1] 180/21 77/12 78/21 78/22 2000 gmpulsor [3] 132/17 concerned [7] 21/12 confirent [1] 141/3 conspiracies [1] 180/21 77/12 78/21 78/22 2000 gmpulsor [3] 132/17 concerned [1] 39/17 confirent [1] 141/3 constitute [3] 94/7 180/24 180/21 77/12 78/21 78/22 2000 gmpulsor [3] 12/17 concerned [1] 21/12 confirent [1] 141/3 constitute [3] 94/7 180/24 180/24 17/12 78/26 180/24 17/12 78/26 180/24 17/12 78/26 180/24 17/12 78/26 180/24 17/12 78/26					continuous [1] 40/25
275/20 276/1 compulsory [3] 124/19 (24/9) conducting [1] 141/14 (2) consistency [2] 52/20 contorted [1] 12/19 276/20 276/1 compary-specific [2] 124/19 (24/9) consistency [2] 52/20 consistency [2] 52/20 contorted [1] 12/19 276/20 276/1 computer [1] 38/13 139/5 138/13 139/5 consistenc [3] 40/25 49/19 48/25 49/4 276/20 276/1 computer [1] 28/17 conferred [1] 130/15 conceeded [1] 130/15 concered [1] 130/15 concered [1] 130/15 concered [1] 139/17 conspiracies [1] 58/19 59/12 59/19 276/19 concered [1] 30/15 concered [1] 130/15 conferring [1] 28/1 conspiracies [1] 58/14 55/135/6 276/16 concernel [1] 19/22 concernel [1] 24/24 20/2 constitute [3] 94/7 92/24 28/5 128/6 276/16 competenc [1] 19/26 51/15 56/16 57/9 27/02 constituter [3] 78/2 constituter [3] 18/24 229/12 23/52 constituter [3] 18/24 229/12 23/52 constituter [3] 18/24 220/22 23/52 constituter [3] 18/24 220/22 23/52 constituter [3] 18/24 220/22 23/52 constituter [3] 18/24 220/17 23/16 constituter [3] 29/17 220/17 23/16 27/41/25 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Comparato [2] computation [2] 31/16 49/20 50/8 125/7 48/19 48/25 49/4 Comparato [2] 138/13 139/5 comstanti [3] 48/19 48/25 49/4 49/11 50/7 51/9 58/18 Comparative [2] 132/23 133/5 conceived [1] 39/21 consistent [3] 40/15 59/23 60/24 61/13 Compared [1] 2162/16 conceived [1] 39/17 conspiracies [1] 77/12 78/27 78/22 Compared [1] 39/17 conceived [1] 39/17 conspiracies [1] 77/12 78/27 78/27 Compared [1] 39/17 conceived [1] 39/7 conspiracies [1] 77/12 78/27 78/27 Compared [1] 39/17 140/2 140/4 217/1 constitute [3] 94/7 186/24 128/5 128/6 Competenc [1] 136/25 concerved [1] 27/12 28/17 28/27 0 constituties [1] 180/24 202/2 202/2 202/2 202/2 202/2 202/2 202/2 202/2 203/2 Zof/16 competinor [1] 28/37 58/20 contimet [4] 127/13 28/37 5 constitute [2] 20/17 20/17 20/37 28/17 28/27 constitute [1] 10/21 10/22 22/31/0 27/17 27/10 27/17 27/10 28/17 28/27 28/17 28/27 constitution [1] 99/17 28					
14/17/3 138/13 138/13 139/21 consistent [3] 40/25 49/11 50/12 56/12<	company-specific [2]				
Comparative [2] 165/13 computer [1] 36/17 conference [3] 31/3 33/12 69/25 58/19 59/12 59/19 132/23 133/5 conceived [1] 33/12 69/25 conceived [1] 33/12 69/25 conceived [1] 13/27 58/19 59/12 59/19 132/23 133/5 conceived [1] 33/12 69/25 conferring [1] 180/21 78/24 80/18 84/17 Compared [1] 32/17 conceived [1] 39/7 confirm [1] 144/3 constitute [3] 94/7 Compared [1] 196/25 confirm [10] 101/10/8 constitute [3] 94/7 180/24 78/24 80/18 84/17 Competence [1] 196/25 confirm [10] 101/10/8 constitutes [3] 91/7 120/14 28/5 195/6 Competence [1] 196/25 confirm [10] 101/10/8 constitutes [1] 180/24 20/7 235/5 240/16 266/19 Competence [1] 196/27 283/15 283/15 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 283/13 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
165/11 comparative [2] computers [1] 284/19 33/12 69/25 conspiracies [1] 59/23 60/24 61/13 132/22 133/5 conceived [1] 30/15 conceived [1] 30/15 conferred [1] 19/22 conferred [1] 19/22 conferred [1] 19/22 conspiracies [1] 59/23 60/24 61/13 compare [2] 162/16 32/17 conceived [1] 39/17 conceived [1] 39/17 conferred [1] 10/1 10/8 confirm [10] 10/1 10/8 conspiracies [1] 59/23 60/24 61/13 139/17 141/12 196/18 50/24 71/12 59/11 140/2 140/4 217/1 constitutie [3] 94/17 166/14 86/20 20/2 202/2					
Comparative [2] Conceded [1] 130/15 concended [1] 130/15 77/12 78/24					
13/2/23 13/3 conceived [t] 39/7 concern [1] 69/9 conferring [1] 28/1 confient [1] 144/3 confient [1] 146/1 constitute [1] 180/2 226/14 226/14 226/14 226/14 226/14 269/15 269/16 269/17 269/22 27/11 27/14 248/14 269/17 269/12 269/14 269/14 269/14 269/14 269/14 269/14 269/14 269/14 269/14 269/14 269/22 269/14 269/14 269/22 269/16 269/14 269/24					
Compared [1] 102/10 concernel [1] 69/9 confident [1] 144/3 67/5 67/7 98/24 128/5 128/6 comparison [3] 13/13 50/24 71/25 98/11 concernel [7] 100/1 10/8 constitute [3] 94/7 98/24 128/5 128/6 139/17 14/1/12 196/18 concerning [60] 31/23 35/20 37/11 20/12 202/2				conspiracy [3] 66/8	78/24 80/18 84/17
compared [1] 32/17 concerned [1] 21/17 contrim [10] 10/17 <th10 17<="" th=""> <th10< td=""><td></td><td>concern [1] 69/9</td><td></td><td></td><td>98/24 128/5 128/6</td></th10<></th10>		concern [1] 69/9			98/24 128/5 128/6
comparison [3] 130/24 /11/25 98/11 140/2 /140/4 /21/11 197/16 199/17 196/4 196/6 /201/4 139/17 141/12 196/18 176/25 270/19 270/22 2177/3 268/17 273/16 constitutes [1] 180/24 202/2 206/2 206					
139/17 141/12 196/25 27/01/2 27/1/3 280/17 27/3/3 27/3/3 20/21 23/3/2 20/21 23/3/2 20/21 23/3/2 20/21 23/3/2 20/21 23/3/2 20/21 23/3/2 20/21 23/3/2 20/21 23/3/2 20/14 20/21 23/3/2 20/14 20/21 23/3/2 20/14 20/21 23/3/2 20/14 20/21 23/3/2 20/14 20/17 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Competence [1] 31/23 35/20 37/11 confirmation [5] 78/2 constitutive [3] 261/14 269/13 269/25 276/16 40/15 42/3 42/8 42/9 43/4 46/18 46/22 47/2 283/15 109/24 110/3 110/22 269/17 269/23 269/25 competent [3] 155/20 55/16 57/9 63/9 63/23 55/16 57/9 63/9 63/23 confirmed [4] 127/13 287/6 274/10 280/17 280/22 206/14 65/19 66/23 68/17 65/19 66/23 68/17 confirms [3] 71/24 259/16 57/9 280/23 280/24 282/2 206/14 68/6 86/3 67/6 68/23 87/7 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 confirms [3] 71/24 259/16 208/15 consultants [1] 55/4 contracting [4] 50/2C 56/6 86/6 86/23 87/7 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 100/21 100/24 101/10 100/22 102/13 104/23 confusing [2] 54/10 contact [9] 45/15 50/21 5//4 contractis [2] 43/6 61/7 78/1 84/16 complained [3] 171/2 100/21 100/24 101/10 100/22 102/13 104/23 109/25 282/15 contauts [1] 55/4 contractis [2] 43/6 61/7 78/1 84/16 50/21 51/7 51/6 complaine [3] 7/14 12/2 112/6 112/10 109/25 282/15 confusing [2] 54/10 85/7 85/10 85/17 85/23 89/4 106/5 57/22 57/24 97/2 179/18 179/20 172/25 complete [3] 7/14 1					
Competence [1] 276/16 40/15 42/3 42/8 42/9 43/4 46/18 46/22 47/2 52/19 53/4 53/11 55/7 166/18 283/13 283/13 283/15 109/24 110/3 110/22 constraints [2] 208/24 269/17 269/23 269/25 156/16 208/15 competition [1] 206/14 40/15 42/3 42/8 42/9 43/4 46/18 46/22 47/2 166/18 283/13 283/13 109/24 110/3 110/22 269/17 269/23 269/25 206/14 206/14 55/16 57/9 63/9 63/23 127/16 145/13 170/5 287/6 274/10 280/17 280/20 206/14 65/19 66/23 68/17 68/20 71/19 72/1 72/14 72/21 80/13 127/16 145/13 170/5 259/16 280/23 280/24 282/2 complaine [1] 72/14 72/21 80/13 102/2 102/13 104/23 125/3 162/3 consult [2] 41/15 51/5 contracting [4] 50/20 complaine [1] 171/5 105/24 106/1 107/1 100/21 100/24 101/10 109/25 282/15 confusing [2] 54/10 61/17 8/1 84/16 50/21 51/7 51/16 complaine [1] 171/5 105/24 106/1 107/1 102/2 102/13 104/23 109/25 282/15 84/11 84/20 84/21 72/18 74/18 75/14 somplaine [3] 31/23 55/16 80/8 18/17 260/5 confusion [4] 51/25 80/23 237/11 237/11 confusion [4] 51/25 80/23 237/11 237/11 172/19 172/20 172/21 somplaint [3] 158/14<	compete [1] 196/25				
276/16 276/16 276/16 277/10	competence [1]				
156/16 208/15 52/19 53/4 53/11 55/7 confirmed [4] 127/13 287/6 274/10 280/17 280/20 206/14 55/16 57/9 63/9 63/23 127/16 145/13 170/5 construction [1] 287/6 280/23 280/24 28/2 206/14 65/19 66/23 68/17 52/19 53/4 53/11 57/7 66/23 68/17 confirming [1] 47/18 287/6 280/23 280/24 28/2 55/13 55/20 66/3 67/6 72/14 72/21 80/13 84/7 84/22 85/10 86/7 confirming [1] 171/5 confused [6] 26/22 43/7 consultatis [1] 55/4 contracting [4] 50/20 66/6 86/16 86/23 87/7 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 confused [6] 26/22 43/7 consultatis [1] 55/4 contracting [4] 50/20 complaint [1] 180/11 100/21 100/24 101/10 109/25 282/15 contusing [2] 54/10 84/18 4/20 84/21 50/21 51/7 51/16 complaints [3] 31/23 105/24 106/1 107/1 105/24 106/1 107/1 confusion [4] 51/25 86/23 37/17 85/10 85/17 85/3 289/4 106/5 complete [3] 7/14 152/2 120/20 263/12 containg [4] 51/25 contain [1] 56/23 179/18 179/20 179/25 55/16 80/8 concerts [5] 17/10 concerts [5] 17/10 concerts [3] 53/10 53/11 53/16 274/5 280/18 281/3 completel [3] 15					
135/16 206/15 55/16 57/9 63/9 63/23 127/16 145/13 170/5 construction [1] 280/23 280/24 282/2 206/14 65/19 66/23 68/17 68/20 71/19 72/1 confirms [3] 71/24 259/16 259/16 282/8 282/25 55/13 55/20 66/3 67/6 68/23 87/7 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 conflict [1] 115/1 consult [2] 41/15 55/4 consultants [1] 55/4 consultants [1] 55/4 contracts [28] 43/14 20mplain [1] 180/11 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 59/21 60/8 80/24 109/25 282/15 contact [9] 45/15 50/21 51/7 51/16 complaint [3] 87/15 105/24 106/1 107/1 102/2 102/13 104/23 105/24 106/1 107/1 59/21 60/8 80/24 84/11 84/20 84/21 72/18 74/18 75/14 complaint [3] 87/15 105/24 106/1 107/1 102/2 102/13 104/23 confusion [4] 51/25 84/11 84/20 84/21 72/18 74/18 75/14 complaint [3] 87/15 105/24 106/1 107/1 confusion [4] 51/25 80/23 237/11 237/11 85/10 85/17 85/23 89/4 106/5 complete [3] 7/14 126/21 262/20 263/12 congressman [3] 131/20 162/5 162/7 179/18 179/20 179/25 complete [3] 7/14 158/10 82/18 251/19 contact [3] 53/10 53/11 53/16 251/19 220 163/2 239/5 269/20 274/4 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>287/6</td><td>274/10 280/17 280/20</td></t<>				287/6	274/10 280/17 280/20
206/14 65/19 66/23 68/17 66/19 66/23 68/17 confirming [1] 4/1/8 259/16 282/8 28/25 55/13 55/20 66/3 67/6 68/20 71/19 72/1 72/14 72/21 80/13 confirms [3] 71/24 125/3 162/3 consults [1] 55/4 consultats [1] 55/4 consultats [1] 55/4 contracted [1] 238/2 55/16 80/8 68/16 86/23 87/7 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 confused [6] 26/22 confused [6] 26/22 43/7 contracts [28] 43/14 100/21 100/24 101/10 100/21 100/24 101/10 59/21 60/8 80/24 109/25 282/15 contusing [2] 54/10 61/24 contact [9] 45/15 82/3 28/17 50/21 51/7 51/16 complained [1] 171/5 105/24 106/1 107/1 confusing [2] 54/10 109/25 282/15 84/11 84/20 84/21 72/18 74/18 75/14 somplained [3] 71/4 105/24 106/1 107/1 confusion [4] 51/25 confusion [4] 51/25 85/10 85/17 85/23 89/4 106/5 166/11 192/11 172/19 172/20 172/21 complete [3] 7/14 1262/19 262/20 263/12 congressman [3] 131/20 162/5 162/7 180/3 182/18 182/18 195/3 215/19 20/2 239/5 269/20 274/4 239/5 269/20 274/4 239/5 269/20 274/4 239/5 269/20 274/4 239/5 269/20 274/4 239/5 269/20 274/4 239/5 269/20 274/4 274/5 280/18 281/3					
competitor [12] 38/22 55/13 55/20 66/3 67/6 86/6 86/16 86/23 87/7 95/16 98/22 148/19 complaine [1] 171/5 complaine [1] 171/5 complaint [3] 87/15 87/17 266/5 68/20 71/19 72/1 72/14 72/21 80/13 84/7 84/22 85/10 86/7 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 100/21 100/24 101/10 100/21 100/24 101/10 102/2 102/13 104/23 109/25 282/15 consult [2] 41/15 51/5 consultants [1] 55/4 consulte [2] 43/6 43/7 contracting [4] 50/20 61/7 78/1 84/16 contract [9] 45/15 complaine [1] 171/5 complaint [3] 87/15 87/17 266/5 100/21 100/24 101/10 107/17 107/22 108/10 107/17 107/22 108/10 107/17 107/22 108/10 107/17 107/22 108/10 112/2 112/6 112/10 complete [3] 7/14 152/12 158/19 109/25 282/15 concerns [5] 17/10 47/1 80/12 81/7 264/1 264/25 concerns [5] 17/10 47/1 80/12 81/7 255/13 80/23 237/11 237/11 congressman [3] 23/11 53/16 contains [1] 56/3 57/2 57/23 57/24 97/2 131/20 162/5 162/7 162/9 162/20 163/2 containe [8] 56/14 62/3 62/5 64/14 180/3 182/18 182/18 12/21 158/19 complete [3] 7/14 158/20 159/20 600000000000000000000000000000000000		65/19 66/23 68/17	confirming [1] 47/18	259/16	282/8 282/25
55/13 55/20 66/3 67/6 72/14 7		68/20 71/19 72/1			contracted [1] 238/22
86/6 86/16 86/23 87/7 95/16 98/22 148/19 complaine [1] 180/11 complained [1] 171/5 complained [1] 172/2 108/21 confact [1] 158/14 158/20 159/20 concerts [5] 17/10 complained [3] 158/14 158/20 159/20 concerts [5] 17/10 complained [3] 158/14 158/20 159/20 concerts [2] 55/19 112/25 concerts [2] 164/10 confuctor [1] 38/21 connected [9] 156/1 164/11 168/13 203/20 consuited [2] 43/6 84/11 84/20 84/21 containel [8] 56/14 containing [1] 62/2 containing [1] 62/2 containing [1] 62/2 containing [1] 62/2 containing [1] 62/2 61/7 43/18 47/18 55/2 61/7 43/18 47/18 55/2 61/7 43/18 55/14 82/18 180/3 225/14 239/5 269/20 274/4 274/5 280/18 281/3 contractual [3] 84/11 180/8 282/12 61/24 274/5 280/18 281/3 contractual [3] 84/11 180/8 282/12					contracting [4] 50/20
95/16 98/22 148/19 93/7 95/20 96/7 98/17 confused [6] 26/22 43/7 contracts [28] 43/14 complain [1] 180/11 100/21 100/24 101/24 101/10 59/21 60/8 80/24 contact [9] 45/15 50/21 50/21 51/16 80/14 72/18 74/18 75/14 72/18 74/18 75/14 72/18 74/18 75/14 72/18 74/18 75/14 85/78 85/78 85/10 85/17 85/23 89/4 106/5 72/18 74/18 75/14 85/23 89/4 106/5 72/18 74/18 75/14 85/78 85/10 85/10 85/17 85/23 89/4 106/5 172/21 172/19 172/20 172/21 172/19 172/20 172/21 18/13 157/14 262/19 262/18 80/23 237/11 257/25 57/25 57/25 57/25 57/25 18/13 182/18 182/18 180/3 182/18 180/3 182/18 180/3 182/18 239/5 269/20 274/4 239/5 <					
complaind [1] 180/11 complained [1] 171/5 complained [1] 171/5 complaint [3] 87/15 87/17 266/5 105/24 106/1 107/1 complaints [3] 31/23 55/16 80/8 112/2 112/6 112/10 complete [3] 7/14 152/12 158/19 262/19 262/20 263/12 completed [3] 158/14 158/20 159/20 concerns [5] completely [2] 61/16 257/8 concert [2] completeness [2] 64/7 64/14					
complaint [3] 87/15 87/17 266/5 105/24 106/1 107/1 complaint [3] 87/15 87/17 266/5 107/17 107/22 108/10 complaints [3] 31/23 55/16 80/8 112/2 112/6 112/10 complete [3] 7/14 152/12 158/19 262/19 262/20 263/12 completed [3] 158/14 158/20 159/20 concerns [5] completely [2] 61/16 257/8 concert [2] completeness [2] 64/7 64/14 105/24 106/1 107/1 105/24 106/1 107/1 107/17 107/22 108/10 112/2 112/6 112/10 118/13 157/14 262/18 80/23 237/11 237/11 262/19 262/20 263/12 231/18 250/17 250/21 264/1 264/25 congressman [3] 231/18 250/17 250/21 162/9 162/20 163/2 connect [3] 53/10 62/3 62/5 64/14 172/22 176/23 242/5 239/5 269/20 274/4 255/13 concert [2] 55/19 112/25 conclude [2] 164/10 164/11 168/13 203/20 containing [1] 62/2 contradict [1] 154/25 contradict [1] 155/2<	complain [1] 180/11				
complaint [3] 61/11 107/17 107/12 108/10 61/24 166/11 192/11 172/19 172/19 172/20 172/21 somplaints [3] 31/23 55/16 80/8 112/2 111 1164/1 164/1 1164/1 1164/1 111 111					
87/17 260/5 complaints [3] 31/23 55/16 80/8 complete [3] 7/14 152/12 158/19 completed [3] 158/14 158/20 159/20 completely [2] 61/16 257/8 completeness [2] 64/7 64/14 87/17 260/5 112/2 112/6 112/10 118/13 157/14 262/18 262/19 262/20 263/12 264/1 264/25 concerns [5] 17/10 completed [3] 158/14 158/20 159/20 concert [2] 55/13 concert [2] 55/19 112/25 64/7 64/14 112/25 conclude [2] 164/10 164/11 168/13 203/20 containing [1] 62/2 containing [1] 62/2 contradict [1]					
complaints [3] 31/23 55/16 80/8 118/13 157/14 262/18 complete [3] 7/14 152/12 158/19 264/1 264/25 completed [3] 158/14 158/20 159/20 concerns [5] 17/10 completely [2] 61/16 257/8 concert [2] 55/19 completeness [2] 64/7 64/14					179/18 179/20 179/25
55/16 80/8 262/19 262/20 263/12 congressman [3] 131/20 162/5 162/7 195/3 215/19 230/15 complete [3] 7/14 264/1 264/25 231/18 250/17 250/21 162/9 162/20 163/2 239/5 269/20 274/4 completed [3] 158/14 262/19 262/20 263/12 congressman [3] 131/20 162/5 162/7 195/3 215/19 230/15 completed [3] 158/14 264/1 264/25 concerns [5] 17/10 conjunction [1] 38/21 contained [8] 56/14 239/5 269/20 274/4 completely [2] 61/16 255/13 concert [2] 55/19 connected [9] 156/1 172/22 176/23 242/5 contractual [3] 84/11 completeness [2] 64/7 64/14 112/25 conclude [2] 164/10 164/11 168/13 203/20 contemplated [1] 155/2					
152/12 158/19 204/1 264/25 231/18 250/17 250/21 102/9 162/20 165/2 239/5 269/20 274/4 completed [3] 158/14 concerns [5] 17/10 47/1 80/12 81/7 conjunction [1] 38/21 contained [8] 56/14 274/5 280/18 281/3 completely [2] 61/16 255/13 concert [2] 55/19 112/25 connected [9] 156/1 251/10 251/10 contractual [3] 84/11 112/25 conclude [2] 164/10 164/11 168/13 203/20 contemplated [1] 62/2 containing [1] 62/2 contradictions [1] 155/2			congressman [3]		
completed [3] 158/14 concerns [5] 17/10 conjunction [1] 38/21 contained [8] 56/14 274/5 280/18 281/3 158/20 159/20 47/1 80/12 81/7 255/13 connect [3] 53/10 62/3 62/5 64/14 172/22 176/23 242/5 completely [2] 61/16 255/13 concert [2] 55/19 112/25 connected [9] 156/1 251/10 180/8 282/12 contradict [1] 180/8 282/12 completeness [2] 64/7 64/14 112/25 164/11 168/13 203/20 contemplated [1] 62/2 containing [1] 62/2 contradict [1] 155/2					
158/20 159/20 47/1 80/12 81/7 connect [3] 53/10 62/3 62/5 64/14 contractual [3] 84/11 255/13 255/13 53/11 53/16 172/22 176/23 242/5 180/8 282/12 completely [2] 61/16 257/8 concert [2] 55/19 164/1 164/5 164/6 251/10 contractual [3] 84/11 completeness [2] 64/7 64/14 112/25 conclude [2] 164/10 164/11 168/13 203/20 contemplated [1] contradictions [1]					
completely [2] 61/16 255/13 53/11 53/16 17/2/22 17/6/23 180/8 282/12 257/8 concert [2] 55/19 112/25 connected [9] 156/1 251/10 contradict [1] 154/25 64/7 64/14 64/14 164/11 168/13 203/20 contemplated [1] 155/2					contractual [3] 84/11
257/8 concert [2] 55/19 connected [9] 156/1 251/10 contradict [1] 154/25 64/7 64/14 64/14 164/11 168/13 203/20 containing [1] 62/2 contradict [1] 154/25					
completeness [2] conclude [2] 164/10 164/11 168/13 203/20 contemplated [1] 155/2					
	64/7 64/14		104/11/100/15/205/20		100/2
www.dianaburden.com			www.dianaburdon.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revi

· J	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-207
С	correctness [1] 64/8	209/1 209/11 209/17	124/21 125/8 125/13	244/9 268/8 272/13
contradictory [1]	Correia [1] 2/14	209/24 210/10 210/18	126/11 127/10 130/18	cross-examination
154/15	corresponding [1] 142/18	212/3 212/11 212/21 216/16 217/3 221/4	131/2 151/15 152/17 165/18 168/24 170/16	[14] 5/6 5/8 5/14 150/15 152/6 152/21
contrary [2] 99/16	corroborated [1]	221/5 221/5 225/11	171/24 172/18 172/24	186/16 187/7 201/3
128/25	144/21	225/11 227/24 228/8	173/9 173/14 173/23	202/7 241/13 241/14
contrast [2] 130/9	corroborates [1]	230/8 230/9 233/12	173/24 174/3 174/5	244/9 272/13
137/23	35/15	233/14 234/19 236/12	174/6 174/8 174/20	cross-examine [1]
contrasts [1] 139/16 contributed [1] 19/3	corroboration [1]	236/15 239/19 240/12	174/22 177/6 177/13	268/8
control [1] 185/13	36/1	244/10 244/23 245/16	177/14 177/15 177/18	crucial [3] 123/24
controlling [1] 207/15	corruption [2] 192/9	248/7 254/24 255/7	177/20 177/23 178/1	252/15 252/17
convention [1] 109/14	192/12	255/8 258/5 259/12	178/3 178/9 178/13	crux [1] 139/13
conversation [9] 27/1	Cosernita [31] 57/9 73/11 73/11 82/9 83/5	259/19 260/14 261/16 268/21 270/12 271/2	178/13 179/13 179/14 179/19 179/25 180/5	crying [2] 206/5 246/11
86/19 186/6 216/9	87/1 87/4 87/21 88/7	271/6 272/4 272/5	182/3 182/5 195/17	culmination [1] 84/16
273/1 274/16 276/7	88/9 89/8 106/1	272/21 273/13 273/16	216/12 216/14 217/15	culture [2] 197/7
276/10 277/7	106/18 159/25 170/20	273/17 273/18 276/18	220/5 228/8 233/10	198/20
conversations [3] 278/8 278/12 278/17	171/20 171/21 173/22	276/24 278/20 279/8	243/8 244/14 247/24	curiosity [1] 144/12
conversion [1] 41/9	173/24 174/7 176/3	280/8 280/9 280/13	247/24 254/19 254/21	curious [3] 167/18
convinced [1] 279/11	177/16 179/15 179/21	281/13 281/23 282/13	259/17 259/17 259/24	279/23 280/11
coordination [1]	182/16 183/2 183/14	282/18 282/19 287/10	260/6 264/8 264/11	current [1] 24/9
94/13	216/19 219/3 243/16 265/1	Council [1] 100/14	264/25 265/14 266/12 267/1	currently [2] 13/7 18/15
copies [8] 79/20 88/13	265/1 cost [17] 18/21 138/18	counsel [11] 6/23 8/11 21/3 31/6 33/21	Court of Appeal [2]	18/15 CUSNIR [9] 4/10 9/20
93/5 126/23 126/25	138/22 138/24 139/3	33/23 170/25 172/12	174/6 177/13	9/24 10/3 10/9 11/13
219/19 222/16 243/13	139/20 141/25 142/23	241/13 247/19 286/23	Court of Appeal's [1]	36/7 36/16 151/7
copy [13] 21/18 29/12 54/14 62/15 70/11	142/25 143/2 143/23	counselor [1] 270/11	177/20	customers [1] 197/18
86/12 87/16 88/20	145/6 145/7 145/22	count [1] 57/2	courtroom [1] 186/4	customs [2] 246/9
191/8 243/22 243/24	146/11 147/9 148/1	Counter [3] 107/24	courts [20] 102/17	246/14
280/20 280/21	Costa [2] 30/6 30/10	160/7 160/7	106/2 109/22 110/4	cut [1] 205/9
core [1] 203/7	Costa Rica [2] 30/6 30/10	Counter-Memorial [3] 107/24 160/7 160/7	110/18 111/17 123/20 124/12 124/13 125/11	cutting [1] 198/2 CWS [8] 159/15
COREN [5] 3/4 8/13	costs [23] 19/3 19/21	counterfeit [1] 118/1	127/13 127/24 170/15	159/22 160/13 160/13
50/9 116/2 119/2	19/24 137/18 138/7	counterfeited [1]	178/5 178/17 258/1	170/23 188/22 190/3
Coren Hinkle [1] 119/2	138/10 138/13 138/14	118/2	259/21 260/8 260/14	245/10
coren.hinkle [1] 3/10	138/21 140/12 142/18	country [10] 140/24	262/18	CWS-1 [3] 159/15
CORINA [1] 2/24	145/15 146/5 146/9	166/14 201/18 201/21	covered [3] 119/9	170/23 188/22
corn [5] 143/8 143/19	146/25 149/10 149/11 183/13 183/17 183/24	251/22 254/13 271/1 276/19 277/12 277/13	120/21 203/13 cows [1] 205/22	CWS-12 [2] 190/3 245/10
145/14 205/21 236/8	184/1 184/12 198/15	couple [5] 116/6	CPA [3] 195/23 207/13	
corner [3] 11/10 54/7	cotemporaneous [1]	121/13 225/8 261/6	208/6	160/13
190/18	216/12	267/9	CRACIUNEANU [2]	CWS-5 [1] 160/13
corporate [1] 219/10 correct [29] 15/8	could [130] 7/3 7/22	courage [1] 168/7	3/5 8/16	D
22/12 35/3 46/5 46/15	8/20 9/10 9/11 10/1		Craven [1] 151/13	
49/3 60/12 77/13	11/18 13/13 13/16	10/15 11/16 12/24		damage [9] 176/11
77/18 80/5 118/23	14/10 15/4 17/5 26/17 27/4 30/12 30/18	14/2 19/23 20/21 21/6 25/23 29/1 29/19 35/2	created [7] 24/20 40/7 43/15 46/20 51/24	180/15 182/15 184/17 184/17 184/22 185/1
129/12 177/10 178/11	30/25 31/10 37/10	36/13 37/9 38/4 69/25	86/25 171/8	185/15 185/18
193/12 200/6 203/21	42/13 56/23 71/25	70/3 135/18 144/2	criminal [4] 39/2 39/6	damages [13] 19/22
207/1 215/20 218/19	76/15 80/17 81/13	149/18 150/10 152/6	95/4 192/14	39/22 116/7 117/9
220/5 220/25 221/23 222/25 230/19 230/22	84/2 92/13 97/1	153/4 187/21 217/14	criteria [1] 142/15	118/9 132/16 132/21
262/21 268/19 269/1	101/21 108/2 112/3	229/18 286/2	crop [8] 137/16	134/25 136/21 148/12
corrected [3] 111/17	112/18 113/3 113/8	court [105] 2/21 11/16		149/10 194/7 271/16
185/14 189/20	113/19 115/6 118/3	65/6 65/7 65/13 71/13	239/10 239/14 239/23	DAN [2] 3/17 8/23 DANIELA [1] 2/24
correction [10] 40/16	122/4 123/15 126/20 132/9 150/13 164/7	74/23 75/22 76/10 78/23 79/1 86/23 87/8	239/24 cropped [1] 229/3	Daniela [1] 2/24 Darek [2] 214/12
102/4 104/23 109/12	170/6 171/6 172/8		crops [5] 116/21	238/8
111/6 111/22 180/22	178/21 179/2 182/19	95/24 105/12 105/13	140/10 143/7 199/18	Darek Kozak [1]
180/25 181/13 181/21 corrections [6] 102/8	182/21 184/11 186/19	105/24 105/25 106/10	199/19	238/8
129/17 163/3 188/17	188/6 188/13 189/5	106/12 107/2 107/9	cross [17] 5/6 5/8	Dariusz [1] 160/11
189/7 189/14	189/23 191/8 192/5	107/18 108/1 108/5	5/14 150/15 152/6	data [19] 129/11
correctly [6] 28/24	192/25 194/11 195/14	108/9 108/23 115/22	152/21 186/16 187/7	129/14 129/17 137/22 141/6 141/12 143/6
46/9 139/7 147/3	196/1 198/17 198/18 198/20 198/21 201/18	121/4 121/25 122/10 123/11 124/16 124/16	187/21 201/3 202/7 241/13 241/14 244/5	144/25 146/14 149/4
148/12 230/23	100/20 100/21 201/10	120/11 127/10 124/10	2 T I/ IO 2 T I/ I T 244/J	
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
D	157/11 180/5 181/19	deleting [1] 89/23	115/14 116/11	262/3 262/4 263/13
	245/13 249/20 249/24	deletion [4] 57/20	detail [8] 55/7 69/12	270/15 271/2 272/2
data [9] 149/5	251/5 257/22 260/20	63/2 63/11 113/24	69/13 96/12 97/9	272/24 273/21 275/6
150/22 151/3 197/8	decision [37] 10/17	delict [2] 98/14 104/10		275/16 276/11 276/12
221/22 222/1 222/15 224/6 282/23	11/2 26/9 52/22 52/24	deliver [1] 28/20	detailed [1] 67/10	278/7 278/16 278/23
date [14] 79/18 83/12	65/14 65/15 79/1	delivered [2] 83/25	details [6] 47/20	279/4 282/12 282/24
146/21 176/3 176/4	92/24 96/15 97/21	253/20	135/19 135/22 161/6	283/21
176/5 176/6 176/7	98/12 98/17 103/11	Deloitte [2] 3/18 42/19	231/5 256/16	didn't [11] 83/20
189/12 259/17 264/21	104/8 107/12 108/12	demonstrate [1]	details of [1] 47/20	164/12 164/13 204/10
265/12 273/5 282/15	127/11 156/4 171/4	42/19	deteriorating [1]	234/9 235/16 255/7
dated [5] 81/22 82/10	177/3 177/20 177/22	demonstrated [4]	264/7	259/21 275/3 282/11
83/21 189/11 232/19	178/9 178/10 179/10	57/18 104/5 104/24	determine [1] 123/17	282/25
dates [2] 43/19 44/18	180/24 232/20 243/20	116/18	determined [5] 98/4	difference [11] 34/15
day [27] 12/19 23/12	247/25 254/7 262/23 264/11 264/24 265/10	demonstrates [4] 40/23 63/25 88/20	123/11 123/20 125/22 242/25	60/10 68/16 91/21 91/23 92/6 92/7 130/2
71/11 81/3 81/11	265/22 266/12	109/5	determining [1] 181/5	157/13 198/9 257/9
81/22 85/10 85/10	decision-making [6]	demonstrating [2]	development [1]	differences [3] 32/9
117/20 118/4 150/13	52/22 52/24 97/21	64/24 106/11	110/10	196/17 197/21
154/20 154/23 156/20	98/12 103/11 104/8	demonstration [1]	deviations [2] 125/23	different [33] 9/12
166/10 167/22 193/8	decisions [13] 65/6	61/13	125/24	37/12 48/24 49/2
204/17 222/7 231/7	65/14 106/10 106/13	demonstrative [4]	DIANA [1] 2/22	61/11 77/10 91/18
237/19 264/15 267/1	121/25 122/10 125/8	36/1 56/2 56/12 97/3	dictated [1] 193/9	92/4 92/8 93/4 94/22
280/6 280/11 284/5 286/22	125/13 127/10 131/2	demonstratives [1]	dictating [1] 192/20	111/18 116/21 116/22
day-to-day [1] 85/10	173/12 265/15 279/18	35/12	did [144] 14/19 17/20	121/12 122/25 141/9
days [9] 6/5 6/19 20/9	decisive [1] 181/19	denied [1] 106/25	18/6 23/20 26/8 30/15	142/22 148/18 149/6
33/20 37/2 94/10	declaration [5] 76/21	Denver [1] 3/8	31/18 41/13 41/15	181/8 181/10 187/11
121/13 220/15 267/9	76/25 77/7 78/3 78/22	deny [1] 107/14	42/4 42/12 44/24	197/1 197/13 199/2
DCF [3] 134/6 147/5	declaration from [1]	department [2]	47/10 57/1 57/2 62/11	199/10 201/18 248/11
184/20	76/25	192/10 274/8	62/17 72/23 73/6 84/1	248/11 250/15 257/12 283/25
de [3] 2/14 67/17	declare [4] 13/6 179/19 186/21 267/23	departure [1] 255/20 depended [1] 164/4	84/10 84/19 84/20 85/1 85/13 90/13	differentiate [1] 59/22
134/21	declaring [2] 265/17	Depending [1] 152/17	97/16 103/7 105/4	differently [1] 77/23
de-register [1] 67/17	265/23	depends [1] 148/13	105/23 106/17 111/21	difficult [8] 30/23
de-risked [1] 134/21	deducted [2] 37/6	deprecation [1] 184/1	112/4 112/15 112/17	104/21 204/21 209/21
dead [1] 117/23	37/15	depreciation [10] 21/9		246/1 248/9 254/9
deadline [1] 12/9	deemed [1] 208/15	22/4 22/10 22/11	126/23 127/14 130/10	254/12
deal [11] 14/3 15/16 17/1 23/10 24/23	deepening [1] 38/13	27/15 147/16 183/9	143/13 160/11 162/1	difficulties [2] 104/4
25/17 25/18 28/14	deeply [1] 6/15	183/17 183/24 184/12	164/9 166/4 167/13	252/1
68/10 132/16 220/23	defence [1] 102/5	deprived [1] 170/21	168/25 169/1 169/3	difficulty [2] 209/3
dealer [1] 212/18	defend [1] 105/20	depth [1] 198/6	169/5 170/4 170/10	287/10
dealing [1] 44/11	defendant [2] 172/1	Deputy [1] 93/22	170/13 171/17 173/16	dig [1] 107/20
dealings [1] 255/14	174/14	deregister [1] 66/10	174/10 174/17 174/21	digging [1] 225/3 digits [1] 221/19
deals [1] 233/23	defendant's [3] 174/13 174/15 179/14	deregistration [2] 166/1 271/8	175/18 176/10 177/18 178/15 178/19 179/23	diligence [2] 41/14
Dear [1] 153/15	defendants [1] 171/20		180/19 180/21 182/7	41/25
death [3] 115/24	defer [2] 26/23 119/4	describe [4] 98/16	182/14 184/16 192/19	diligent [19] 155/8
233/7 248/20	definitely [5] 76/21	196/6 263/25 285/18	192/20 195/3 195/11	155/10 155/15 155/17
decade [1] 134/11	78/3 197/15 198/19	described [5] 27/19	196/18 199/2 200/6	156/14 158/22 161/17
December [26] 1/21	201/11	242/5 257/21 261/17	200/16 201/14 201/25	163/6 163/24 165/12
6/1 11/22 12/9 13/12 16/10 19/18 65/24	definition [1] 127/19	276/7	208/11 208/12 209/13	165/14 165/15 168/21
115/12 200/5 200/16	defy [1] 147/22	describing [1] 100/15	209/15 211/17 217/22	169/14 171/14 174/24
200/17 200/19 200/23	degree [2] 37/17	designated [2] 35/16	219/1 223/21 223/25	185/19 185/20 213/24
200/25 210/1 232/2	157/2	36/2	224/16 224/17 224/25	diligently [3] 42/12
232/12 232/18 233/6	delay [10] 37/2 71/5	desires [1] 171/10	227/20 228/2 228/23	174/10 209/14
234/2 234/13 234/20	71/6 71/22 71/23	desperate [1] 207/14	230/22 232/1 232/2	direct [19] 24/22 26/1
251/24 255/4 256/1	71/25 89/18 232/9 235/17 235/18	despite [20] 38/17 41/14 61/25 64/22	232/7 232/12 232/14 233/5 234/7 237/22	28/15 29/5 137/17 138/7 138/21 139/1
December 11 [1] 6/1	delayed [1] 239/8	67/7 73/14 75/12	233/5 234/7 237/22 239/22 242/7 243/8	154/10 160/2 182/2
December 2010 [1]	delaying [1] 25/20	89/25 90/1 90/3 93/16	245/19 248/12 252/6	186/6 186/15 186/17
200/25	delays [2] 71/9 71/19	98/10 98/15 110/11	252/9 252/18 252/20	187/1 187/21 194/5
decent [2] 260/8	delete [4] 62/20 62/23	122/7 128/24 143/4	254/12 255/17 255/24	225/24 236/23
267/1	176/17 176/24	145/23 147/19 147/21	255/24 257/9 257/24	directed [3] 222/18
decide [1] 20/19 decided [13] 10/18	deleted [4] 68/23	destroy [1] 98/23	258/2 258/8 259/3	249/16 252/11
10/23 13/3 41/11	129/8 163/2 210/25	destroyed [3] 38/22	261/9 261/21 261/24	direction [1] 211/5

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
D	display [1] 164/24	243/13 253/13 263/13	81/2 82/25 83/4 86/10	12/1 13/10 13/24 36/2
	displayed [1] 264/20	dispositions' [1]	87/11 87/24 89/4 90/5	47/21 48/17 56/18
directions [1] 167/20	disposition [62] 57/10		93/1 96/10 97/2 98/5	56/22 64/5 64/7 64/8
directly [5] 63/19	63/12 72/12 83/12	dispute [14] 54/17	99/24 100/23 101/16	64/11 64/14 64/16
101/2 119/10 247/11	86/20 87/4 87/5 87/14	58/21 70/13 75/22	101/20 102/25 103/10	64/19 64/21 65/3
255/6	87/16 87/19 87/25	86/20 107/8 114/16	107/25 108/22 109/13	71/16 76/16 77/21
director [3] 222/6	88/3 88/5 88/9 88/10	115/8 119/12 126/10	110/23 114/10 114/11	79/13 81/7 81/21
250/5 250/20	88/11 88/12 105/25	136/14 137/12 139/14	119/3 119/6 119/12	82/16 82/21 83/2 83/8
disagree [1] 56/20	106/1 106/3 116/9	154/3	119/23 123/19 126/5	83/23 96/15 97/2
disagreement [3]	116/10 120/12 120/18	disputed [5] 39/25	126/25 128/20 129/10	117/25 118/4 155/1
58/14 59/2 249/11	121/10 121/23 122/9	99/7 119/15 120/9	130/8 132/16 133/18	163/1 166/4 166/6
disappoint [1] 154/14	122/23 123/19 123/22	121/21	138/1 142/14 145/15	188/18 191/16 191/17
Disaster [1] 265/5	123/24 125/4 125/5	DISPUTES [1] 1/3	148/21 150/18 151/25	191/19 195/18 208/5
disc [1] 198/2	125/8 125/9 131/10	disregard [1] 101/3	152/16 154/1 154/2	208/11 216/13 258/12
discharge [2] 158/4	131/20 166/23 169/9	distance [2] 101/4	158/8 162/5 162/7	258/21 275/20 280/5
158/6	169/11 170/14 173/1	258/6	162/9 164/7 165/4	284/5 284/14
disclosed [1] 18/18	173/4 174/1 176/4	distinct [1] 58/5	165/4 165/8 166/21	does [53] 24/13 30/13
disclosure [1] 16/8	176/6 176/22 177/5	distinction [1] 60/5	181/6 183/6 188/22	31/25 32/15 34/4 34/6
discount [2] 147/8	177/16 178/16 252/18	distinguish [1] 61/15	189/23 192/8 192/15	42/16 45/25 46/1
148/2	253/20 254/10 262/19	distinguishable [2]	192/21 192/21 192/21	49/15 61/8 75/5 75/6
discounted [2] 134/7	262/20 263/1 264/2	104/16 111/1	197/23 199/6 200/16	84/5 89/3 98/13 101/2
135/6	264/7 264/25 265/17	distinguished [1]	201/11 201/12 204/11	104/7 105/3 110/19
discovered [2] 207/12	265/23 265/24	272/18	208/22 209/15 210/20	118/21 123/14 127/21
220/19	Disposition 1-A [19]	distribute [2] 33/5	212/17 214/3 214/18	129/14 130/13 130/16
discredit [1] 100/13	57/10 86/20 87/4	66/3	216/8 221/10 222/12	140/9 140/21 140/22
discrepancies [1]	87/25 88/5 88/9 88/11	distributed [1] 33/9	229/5 229/6 229/9	141/20 141/21 143/18
144/3	122/23 125/5 125/8	distribution [3] 33/8	234/22 236/22 237/7	143/22 146/19 148/7
discrepancy [1]	176/4 177/16 252/18	158/25 252/7	237/22 240/17 241/17	152/21 164/24 166/20
257/14	262/19 263/1 264/7	district [42] 38/13	241/23 242/1 243/17	168/8 179/6 179/11
discretion [7] 106/21	264/25 265/17 265/23	43/7 45/5 45/8 45/9	244/2 245/16 246/5	181/14 185/24 186/1
106/22 107/2 107/5	Disposition 2 [11]	45/13 47/23 48/1 53/1	247/20 249/22 249/22	189/20 190/8 192/18
107/18 108/10 108/11	87/5 87/14 87/16	55/3 65/7 65/13 72/16	254/13 258/8 258/22	195/24 199/16 210/5
discretionary [1]	88/10 88/12 116/9	74/17 75/4 86/23	258/22 259/21 261/2	212/4 233/23 283/10
107/13	125/4 125/9 166/23	92/23 95/4 124/12	264/7 264/13 264/15	doesn't [3] 166/19
discriminated [1]	169/11 176/6	125/7 125/12 127/10	269/15 269/22 271/11	258/17 277/19
131/12	dispositions [89]	136/7 171/1 177/15	271/25 273/16 273/22	doing [16] 37/4 60/9
discrimination [1]	70/18 72/7 84/9 86/8	177/23 178/1 178/3	274/23 275/15 275/25	78/13 197/11 206/3
173/19	86/17 86/18 87/6	182/5 194/9 194/13	276/5 276/9 277/7	207/9 224/11 224/17
discuss [16] 25/16	87/12 88/13 89/22	203/1 227/17 269/6	278/22 279/17 280/10	225/15 226/3 245/18
39/25 40/17 53/25	90/4 90/5 98/9 98/11	269/8 269/12 269/14	281/4 281/8 281/20	247/15 259/15 270/9
54/22 55/22 85/14	102/8 102/9 102/10	269/21 271/17 271/18	282/16 284/15 285/7	275/10 275/12
98/8 116/3 118/12	102/21 102/24 103/5	279/19 280/1	286/2	Dolzer [3] 12/18 12/22
119/15 168/2 168/2	103/6 104/18 104/20	disturbing [1] 95/17	do-able [1] 7/21	12/23
168/4 177/3 276/13	105/15 105/21 107/22	divergences [1] 171/8		domestic [6] 33/22
discussed [15] 10/7	108/1 108/2 108/18	divided [1] 287/5	13/15 14/12 27/9	109/21 110/4 121/8
10/10 13/22 16/21	108/22 109/1 109/2	division [1] 273/15	27/25 34/20 49/24	125/12 131/18
27/16 47/7 71/5 93/3	111/6 112/4 112/13	divisions [3] 198/25	58/11 76/16 79/9	don't [93] 17/20 50/12
97/14 97/16 103/14	112/15 113/19 113/25	199/3 199/11	86/25 162/8 189/7	60/7 67/11 69/15
166/16 207/5 238/12	119/22 120/10 120/15	do [183] 7/18 7/21	191/21 193/8 208/9	71/21 73/7 73/23 74/7
279/1	122/15 122/18 122/20	9/25 10/18 12/21 13/3	215/18 241/24 244/11	76/10 83/5 89/5
discussing [7] 40/10	122/21 123/3 123/12	14/9 18/17 20/10	244/17 264/19 264/22	106/20 122/3 127/2
40/19 93/14 97/7 99/6	123/15 124/22 125/14	20/12 21/2 23/5 23/5	268/16 280/4 281/14	129/23 138/4 153/5
119/2 265/14	125/16 127/20 129/5	25/2 26/4 27/6 30/4	283/18 283/20 283/22	154/6 166/12 166/18
discussion [10] 17/2	129/7 130/18 131/3	30/25 31/24 32/24	284/3 284/3 284/11	166/20 168/16 177/10
96/24 139/6 150/20	131/6 131/8 131/23	37/22 40/13 41/3 41/9	284/16 284/17	184/5 191/9 201/22
190/15 237/2 237/4	132/8 153/23 165/17	44/3 49/22 51/12	document and [1]	204/17 205/11 208/7
240/20 273/3 274/14	168/23 169/1 169/4	51/12 51/16 56/21	76/16	208/8 216/4 216/10
discussions [1]	169/7 169/15 169/24	57/23 58/5 58/7 59/20	documentary [1]	217/16 217/20 217/21
274/15	170/6 170/18 170/20	59/22 60/4 60/7 60/15	71/10	217/21 218/3 218/3
dismissed [4] 19/21	175/2 176/2 176/3	61/17 62/14 66/12	documentation [1]	219/14 220/17 220/18
114/15 115/5 172/9	176/12 176/16 176/18	66/18 67/9 67/10	11/19	221/8 223/1 223/18
disparate [1] 110/25	176/23 177/12 178/12	67/12 67/25 68/4 68/5	documented [1]	223/21 224/7 224/10
dispense [1] 10/24	178/18 182/10 182/12	69/21 70/5 70/8 72/24	140/23	224/11 225/25 227/21
dispensed [2] 11/14	215/12 220/23 243/9	74/9 76/18 77/21 80/4	documents [51] 11/21	231/4 231/7 231/20
25/2				
	l	l <u></u>		

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word Index	11 December 2017
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revised	Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
D	230/25 233/10 237/2	elements [7] 124/9	enough [4] 181/20	102/19
	246/24 254/19	124/19 124/20 126/4	204/22 257/23 276/2	error [1] 25/5
don't [39] 233/20	duty [4] 50/2 269/18	176/15 181/19 181/23	enshrined [1] 124/24	errors [2] 53/23 98/25
234/16 234/18 239/1	278/10 278/22	else [5] 168/6 199/18	ensure [2] 125/6	escalate [1] 172/17
242/12 244/16 244/22	dying [1] 94/10	199/21 234/21 282/13	162/1	escaped [2] 233/7
245/1 245/4 246/3		elsewhere [1] 19/5	ensured [6] 155/18	247/10
246/4 246/13 247/2	E	email [3] 36/11 36/16	156/3 158/23 161/18	escaping [1] 225/13
248/4 248/21 250/10	each [33] 7/4 28/10	151/10	163/7 164/1	especially [6] 31/25
250/11 253/18 254/14	29/15 41/1 47/15	embarrassed [1]	enter [5] 43/13 116/25	
256/8 256/16 259/10	47/16 48/11 48/11	274/20	159/9 159/12 195/3	149/4 194/25
260/3 262/3 263/17	54/7 54/9 65/4 70/6	Embassy [3] 192/11		
265/24 271/24 273/4	75/11 85/18 85/19	192/13 249/1	116/20 178/9 194/12	42/9 142/7
275/1 275/12 276/2	85/19 105/16 122/21	emphasise [1] 216/13		essential [5] 121/6
277/15 279/11 281/25	124/15 154/8 154/25	employees [5] 55/2	enterprise [1] 175/18	125/18 126/10 154/2
282/13 283/19 284/20	160/23 160/25 161/6	84/4 91/16 93/16	enterprises [1] 134/14	
287/6 287/10	165/2 168/12 198/5	242/17	entertain [1] 149/23	essentially [3] 102/15
done [16] 11/1 58/15	222/14 223/17 228/12	empt [1] 32/25	enthusiastic [1]	124/7 266/5
77/7 78/18 132/23	231/1 257/18 285/16	empty [1] 110/9	223/19	establish [2] 164/10
137/24 142/4 142/21	eager [3] 7/11 7/12			202/24
198/18 213/16 213/17	33/7	encouraged [2] 154/2 154/12	129/8 142/7 157/20	
247/8 247/8 277/6	earlier [12] 27/16	end [20] 12/19 31/7	159/4 159/6 161/22	established [10] 40/9 41/19 44/14 54/16
282/8 283/2	32/23 93/19 120/22	36/22 37/3 90/12	169/19 169/20 176/1	158/7 181/18 202/14
door [2] 109/13	131/9 147/15 165/24	90/13 151/8 170/24	219/25 220/2	246/21 246/22 266/19
109/15	190/14 196/14 198/12			
doors [2] 8/8 82/24	240/6 249/16	177/17 189/8 190/22	entirely [9] 131/23	establishing [9] 155/9
double [2] 57/2	earliest [1] 46/7	200/19 231/2 233/8 234/2 239/17 239/18	135/12 137/22 141/9 142/22 143/11 149/20	155/16 156/25 157/18 157/21 163/25 165/12
184/22	early [4] 20/23 45/23	246/17 252/21 286/22		
doubt [11] 11/1 12/24	89/13 230/5		161/25 167/8	185/19 229/23
23/7 35/1 58/16 61/19	early March [1] 89/13	endeavoured [2] 75/9	entirety [7] 19/21	establishment [1]
122/5 129/2 129/4		148/21	31/21 32/22 69/17	161/20
139/9 267/9	earnest [1] 55/5 earnings [4] 145/10	endorse [2] 182/7 183/6	129/14 132/25 133/24	esteemed [1] 153/15
doubts [2] 108/13	147/20 147/22 184/21		entitle [1] 162/21	estimate [1] 57/3
108/23	easily [2] 153/4	ends [1] 127/10	entitled [9] 32/9 62/7	EU [1] 100/13
down [11] 8/14 9/12	198/18	enforce [8] 112/3	77/6 146/24 153/7	Europe [2] 100/14
9/13 30/20 76/15 79/8		112/11 114/13 115/23	167/7 172/11 173/10	134/12
79/10 79/15 83/19	easy [1] 200/2 EBIT [1] 184/2	178/21 179/2 182/19	173/14	euros [1] 175/21
183/3 266/20	ECE [1] 110/17	182/21	entitlement [1] 15/3	evaluate [4] 93/7
downplay [1] 99/9	economic [3] 105/25	enforceability [1]	entitles [1] 158/10	114/18 137/19 144/2
Dr [4] 1/16 2/13	273/8 280/21	112/16	entries [1] 176/17	evaluation [5] 59/15
136/22 136/23		enforceable [4]	entrusted [4] 155/19	134/25 139/17 141/4
Dr Andrei Gumovschi	economy [1] 285/22 effect [6] 80/3 110/11	155/24 163/8 179/5	156/15 156/25 208/14	181/22
[1] 136/22		179/7	environment [1] 38/7	evaluations [1]
Dr Mihail Rurac [1]	131/11 140/13 166/20 266/17	enforced [7] 112/18	envisage [1] 287/10	140/12
136/23	effective [1] 121/19	113/3 113/9 165/15 168/22 171/15 179/1	equal [3] 145/15 147/9	
dramatically [2] 146/9	effectively [1] 234/10		148/2	80/8 82/9 83/7 86/24
146/11		enforcement [1]	equaling [1] 137/17	87/6 87/19 88/20 96/1
drastically [1] 116/15	effects [4] 107/9 108/3 131/6 237/20	178/19	equality [3] 29/16	101/20 103/21 104/22
drawn [1] 167/19	effectuate [1] 129/11	engage [6] 41/13	32/10 152/10	106/9 112/12 112/15 115/23 121/16 140/9
dream [2] 229/18	efficacy [1] 181/4	109/8 111/21 114/16 167/21 177/11	equally [6] 9/2 10/21 32/8 69/21 173/20	145/13 153/21 154/17
233/8	efficiency [1] 150/9		179/2	158/1 158/21 158/25
drive [1] 220/18	efficient [1] 132/13	engaged [8] 41/24 43/2 55/4 59/19 115/7		163/9 163/10 166/23
driving [1] 249/9	efforts [8] 40/16 40/20		equipment [13] 55/2 140/1 141/19 143/3	173/22 175/2 178/1
due [12] 12/24 18/15	94/11 102/3 104/20			180/14 182/14 183/1
29/1 35/2 41/13 41/25	115/16 116/13 226/22	engagement [1] 243/4 engaging [2] 45/3	199/22 219/10 239/1	183/3 197/15 197/25
53/24 80/21 123/25	eight [1] 237/18	106/8	246/16 256/7 283/4	219/1 222/9 235/6
125/24 171/11 176/1	either [9] 36/24 50/7	engineer [2] 39/4	equipped [1] 105/14	247/6 253/5 254/8
Duly [1] 30/8	99/14 160/10 180/19	212/24	equivalent [1] 103/14	254/12 265/6 265/23
during [28] 14/2 15/4	181/7 211/15 214/10	English [17] 13/7	erasures [3] 162/20	276/23 277/3
15/18 19/23 20/5	271/11	13/20 30/16 79/6	163/2 164/16	evening [2] 286/14
26/25 28/25 29/6	elaboration [1] 33/15	190/19 190/20 191/2	errata [3] 21/9 27/8	287/12
33/11 35/22 51/5	election [1] 206/1	190/19 190/20 191/2	27/8	event [4] 173/11
86/12 151/2 158/9	electronic [1] 36/14	193/9 215/1 218/16	erratum [1] 25/8	178/12 178/18 184/17
169/19 187/21 189/16	element [4] 61/7	218/24 247/25 251/12	erred [1] 138/20	events [7] 55/11 55/17
190/15 191/15 191/17	102/5 109/24 110/3	268/20	erroneous [2] 102/18	72/3 94/11 95/8 95/9
210/22 220/2 222/5		200/20	Circlicous [2] 102/10	1210 07111 0010 0010
		<u> </u>		
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
E	150/15 151/2 152/6	174/11 174/20 175/7	236/13 236/16 271/14	F
events [1] 214/14	152/21 174/22 186/16	175/14 179/12 190/16	expert's [6] 26/13	face [5] 71/16 104/22
ever [3] 82/9 84/19	186/16 187/2 187/7	193/5 193/18 202/16	28/12 128/19 137/10	120/12 175/13 245/25
84/20	188/5 194/5 201/3	210/12 212/4 214/25	142/7 144/10	faced [2] 100/1 104/3
every [11] 150/1	202/7 236/25 237/3	216/17 216/23 232/13	expertise [3] 119/4	facilitated [1] 131/3
163/19 180/24 198/7	241/13 241/14 244/9	232/16 233/22 241/11	159/11 279/24	facing [1] 115/16
200/14 200/19 202/18	261/7 266/22 268/13	241/12 251/11 264/20	experts [39] 3/15 4/15	fact [31] 18/14 19/2
205/20 211/19 237/19	272/13	281/13	7/19 7/20 8/22 20/8	19/25 21/14 25/25
284/13	examine [1] 268/8	exhibit 2 [1] 56/12	23/11 24/5 29/12 43/10 61/20 100/21	42/21 47/10 54/20
every end [1] 200/19	example [14] 62/5 65/9 106/18 113/22	exhibit 43 [1] 122/13 exhibit 6 [1] 122/12	107/17 119/5 126/9	54/23 56/10 70/21
everybody [3] 112/23	128/5 136/1 154/17	exhibit 95 [1] 76/7	127/18 136/21 136/22	104/19 114/23 122/17
171/5 281/2	159/2 160/19 161/11	exhibited [1] 119/20	138/12 138/20 140/2	125/22 125/25 127/12
everything [32] 28/22	164/21 197/21 197/22	exhibits [3] 24/11	140/6 140/11 141/6	127/15 134/4 134/20
33/11 34/9 34/10	198/4	34/11 42/18	142/12 144/4 146/23	137/5 138/22 141/5
55/10 151/12 188/3	examples [1] 219/15	exist [5] 30/13 79/2	148/23 150/23 150/24	142/23 145/2 145/23
197/16 209/1 209/25	exceeded [4] 130/5	104/7 105/3 127/21	151/18 177/24 184/7	146/23 164/13 166/22
211/5 213/15 221/16	136/8 185/5 185/7	existed [1] 28/11	184/19 266/8 266/14	183/4 194/25
224/12 227/24 229/1 229/3 234/1 235/24	excellent [6] 8/19	existing [3] 18/19	266/15 287/1 287/4	facts [9] 39/18 46/16 60/6 99/3 115/12
239/7 245/24 251/16	20/22 35/9 220/10	29/24 113/15	expiration [1] 78/22	115/20 135/6 154/16
252/22 253/6 259/25	245/6 287/9	exists [4] 30/12 89/16	explain [14] 57/25	158/8
266/24 271/21 273/19	except [1] 128/12	95/21 128/9	58/22 70/24 71/20	factual [7] 42/16
275/1 277/13 279/10	excessive [1] 184/18	expand [1] 45/8	81/3 184/7 204/11	103/13 105/2 111/8
286/11	exchange [3] 21/8	expanding [7] 41/22	219/7 219/8 219/14	134/9 135/16 135/23
evidence [24] 17/13	22/9 27/16	43/1 43/4 43/5 45/24	252/25 254/12 259/13	factually [1] 110/25
64/5 64/19 65/2 71/10	exchanged [1] 204/14	128/14 134/14	280/9	faded [1] 79/21
74/20 94/24 106/11	excise [2] 130/22	expansion [3] 43/23	explainable [1] 134/8	fail [3] 103/12 104/23
120/2 122/16 123/8	130/24	43/25 204/22	explained [3] 147/6	111/23
124/1 128/15 131/3	excited [1] 20/24	expect [2] 53/18	186/12 193/7	failed [12] 20/1 102/7
145/1 154/3 166/3	exclude [1] 118/7 excluded [1] 109/15	139/23 expectation [1] 60/20	explains [2] 230/4 244/13	109/4 113/7 131/11
166/9 168/16 193/5	exclusion [1] 128/11	expectations [10]	explanation [6] 19/9	171/22 172/13 174/1
193/19 193/25 194/2	exclusively [3] 70/17	40/6 43/15 43/20	35/22 57/22 66/12	174/8 174/19 177/16
251/9	123/7 133/9	44/13 46/19 46/19	73/23 165/25	235/6
evidenced [1] 130/4	excuse [1] 104/12	52/19 53/3 61/9	explanations [2] 18/6	fails [1] 146/7
evidencing [1] 136/10	execute [4] 50/6 51/15		167/19	failure [15] 93/5 93/25
evident [1] 120/1	158/11 159/2	expecting [1] 18/16	express [6] 12/20	123/21 123/23 146/13
evidentiary [3] 31/22 113/21 136/1	executed [6] 52/6	expeditiously [1] 6/19		161/8 172/8 173/21 180/13 180/22 180/25
ex [14] 66/23 87/8	52/8 54/20 57/21 58/9	expending [1] 17/24	187/20 193/25	180/13 180/22 180/25
87/15 87/18 87/23	71/7	expenses [5] 183/9	expressed [4] 6/25	181/21
87/24 88/6 88/15	executing [2] 49/3	183/17 183/24 184/1	28/16 77/2 175/14	failures [3] 155/12
91/10 106/14 106/15	51/4	184/12	expresses [2] 128/11	175/23 185/21
118/8 128/9 128/21	execution [5] 47/11	experience [10] 31/5	128/20	fair [6] 15/8 29/17
ex ante [1] 118/8	53/20 55/8 59/12	39/5 40/22 41/17	expressing [4] 6/22	32/20 142/17 209/4
ex parte [11] 66/23	60/11	134/12 142/8 146/2	17/21 17/25 51/13	212/7
87/8 87/15 87/18	executive [1] 113/10 exercise [3] 109/9	197/8 273/23 279/25	expression [1] 77/24	fairly [3] 6/6 6/19
87/23 87/24 88/6	146/18 209/14	experienced [3] 169/16 198/15 219/11	expressly [1] 109/14 extend [1] 11/17	131/24
88/15 91/10 106/14	exercised [2] 108/12	expert [51] 3/17 3/18	extended [1] 65/23	faith [10] 19/10 22/21
106/15	129/5	4/16 9/7 9/8 20/13	extending [1] 167/1	32/21 112/7 112/14
ex post [1] 128/9	exercising [1] 92/17	22/18 23/15 24/11	extends [1] 90/10	112/20 113/8 113/20
exact [5] 87/2 136/17	exhausting [1] 133/7	24/19 25/24 42/22	extension [1] 232/6	114/3 179/6
142/25 145/14 167/3	exhaustion [1] 115/19		extensive [1] 94/8	fall [3] 45/23 45/24
exactly [24] 44/23	exhibit [55] 12/16	63/20 75/15 76/4	extent [8] 18/20 23/5	85/4
67/11 91/12 105/22	35/19 56/2 56/12 73/2	96/11 97/8 99/20	61/6 128/15 176/20	familiar [4] 34/13 53/6
131/22 148/20 152/15 161/23 169/21 193/10	76/7 79/5 95/13 95/14	107/16 108/8 133/3	180/14 181/13 182/18	251/14 269/14 family [7] 115/3 233/9
199/16 214/17 222/7	95/18 97/4 114/6	133/5 133/10 134/10	extra [4] 15/16 20/5	247/5 252/24 253/10
223/23 226/3 230/25	117/13 118/6 122/12	136/16 137/8 138/17	20/20 228/17	263/20 263/22
250/11 260/16 260/22	122/13 154/9 160/2	141/23 142/2 142/3	extract [1] 162/17	famous [3] 86/8 86/18
264/13 273/5 280/10	160/4 161/12 161/14	144/2 147/6 161/20	extracts [1] 32/6	114/5
282/25 284/17	162/17 162/20 163/10	162/23 162/23 177/9	extraordinary [4] 31/9	Fantastic [1] 53/9
examination [32] 5/5	163/11 165/24 166/16	177/14 177/25 182/20	63/4 68/24 130/6	far [6] 11/10 16/24
5/6 5/7 5/8 5/10 5/13	169/8 169/11 170/7	183/6 183/7 184/24	extremely [2] 34/16	17/14 136/8 262/13
5/14 7/15 15/19 64/11	171/7 171/18 173/8	184/25 194/7 196/13	236/19	273/20
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
F	feel [12] 7/20 29/20	financed [2] 99/12	43/2 43/4 43/7 43/23	58/19 59/12 64/15
farm [13] 38/1 38/1	29/23 34/8 36/24	100/16	44/14 45/9 45/13	64/21 277/17
43/6 45/4 141/16	90/20 129/23 153/5	financial [1] 42/17	45/17 45/18 47/8	formality [1] 190/2
196/24 202/25 203/3	227/23 266/23 266/25	find [20] 27/2 32/19	47/23 53/1 54/16 55/3	formally [1] 31/6
205/7 205/13 229/16	271/2	33/12 34/16 50/16	55/11 65/7 72/16	forms [1] 60/17
249/6 269/13	fees [1] 149/19	67/9 67/22 109/13	74/17 75/4 86/23	forth [3] 37/12 150/2
farmed [1] 41/4	FELIX [3] 4/5 9/6 9/18	167/11 167/12 167/15	104/3 121/25 122/10	174/1
farmer [6] 26/14 38/3	Felix Schneider [1]	167/16 168/7 170/2	123/11 124/12 124/13	forthcoming [1] 20/12
40/21 204/3 205/1	9/18	170/4 191/8 192/2	125/7 125/12 134/15	Fortier [9] 1/15 2/9
279/16	felt [2] 80/25 274/20	195/14 195/20 247/6	141/14 161/25 164/23	2/10 6/12 7/25 27/4
farmers [10] 166/1	fertilizers [11] 136/3	finding [2] 64/13	169/17 169/23 171/1	93/18 103/16 268/5
167/12 213/13 229/13	137/6 139/21 139/24	64/20	177/6 177/15 177/22	Fortunately [2] 109/7
279/18 280/1 280/3	140/10 140/22 141/18	findings [2] 65/15	178/1 178/3 178/9	119/9
280/6 280/10 284/16	143/3 197/3 197/10	125/5	194/21 202/24 202/25	forum [1] 171/4
farming [64] 38/5	197/17	finds [2] 179/13	204/7 204/23 204/24	forward [7] 45/21
38/13 38/18 38/23	few [12] 32/15 45/23	179/15	205/15 206/12 213/3	52/17 134/6 134/25
39/15 43/5 52/9 52/13	54/18 56/5 90/18 94/7	fine [7] 6/3 20/18 24/2	213/9 218/19 219/3	135/11 146/25 150/12
52/16 53/15 55/4 85/8	99/5 116/19 125/23	29/8 55/10 287/12	219/5 219/11 222/6	forward-looking [4]
85/10 85/17 89/6	202/12 217/2 280/2	287/13	222/10 231/14 238/7	134/6 134/25 135/11
115/13 134/10 134/15	field [4] 165/3 203/20	finish [4] 152/23	243/8 253/2 254/20	146/25
135/10 135/17 136/9	224/3 249/6	153/4 188/6 287/8	259/24 271/8 271/9	found [17] 33/23
136/11 137/3 138/23	fields [6] 38/10 91/3	first [84] 8/22 9/16	271/11 273/6 274/3	40/13 53/21 65/5 83/1
139/25 145/19 148/13	106/16 131/16 203/17	12/6 17/6 21/21 25/16	280/1 283/10 283/11	97/18 106/2 117/22
155/25 156/7 157/24	272/3	25/19 27/13 38/6	flow [2] 134/7 135/6	124/21 129/5 171/24
163/12 164/1 164/4	fifth [1] 79/10	39/17 40/5 41/23	fluent [1] 31/15	172/19 177/13 195/2
164/8 164/18 165/9	fight [5] 157/14	42/11 44/11 44/15	fly [1] 183/15	220/22 275/19 276/3
182/16 183/10 185/9	169/24 170/3 248/1	44/20 45/4 46/21	focus [14] 39/17	founded [1] 172/5
194/10 194/16 195/4	252/20	52/25 54/19 55/7	39/20 39/22 72/7 84/8	four [18] 122/25
196/11 196/17 196/18	fighting [1] 206/6	63/20 64/2 75/15 79/5	85/12 98/10 101/17	132/18 132/20 133/1
197/12 198/25 199/15	figure [6] 21/14 44/22	79/13 83/1 99/20	101/20 120/10 120/22	133/8 143/6 155/6
202/23 203/15 203/16	197/6 201/22 246/2	99/21 102/19 103/16	154/2 157/3 220/24	185/2 198/13 198/21
203/20 206/14 208/21	246/6	108/20 109/21 110/4	focuses [2] 70/17	205/4 211/15 217/24
226/4 226/13 227/13	figures [8] 21/12	116/7 121/2 123/3	102/9	221/19 239/8 245/24
227/18 228/3 230/5	27/17 136/19 147/6	126/7 134/19 135/18	focusing [5] 31/7 98/9	
235/21 246/16 279/16	152/5 183/6 183/16	145/18 145/24 156/5	101/18 116/13 141/3	four-year [1] 185/2
280/12	183/25	156/18 157/18 157/23	follow [3] 36/11	fourth [3] 117/9 118/7
farmland [2] 148/14	Filat [4] 144/22 171/11		106/12 282/12	167/1
204/8	231/16 247/13	168/22 176/14 177/14	followed [4] 43/10	framework [4] 46/24
farmlands [1] 141/14	file [7] 13/21 13/25	178/23 182/1 182/3	53/24 55/17 111/18	47/14 52/20 52/24
farms [3] 196/21	113/22 177/17 237/17	186/3 194/10 194/12	following [6] 83/7	France [1] 2/15
196/22 205/8	246/15 258/12	194/15 200/3 206/24		frankly [1] 167/23
fashion [2] 82/7 94/2	filed [10] 13/12 71/11	210/4 213/4 216/20	279/24 285/3	fraudulent [1] 39/6
fast [1] 7/10	78/12 87/15 117/16	217/2 220/12 220/23	food [3] 93/23 197/19	FRAUKE [2] 2/18 6/13
father [1] 157/7	117/18 118/4 173/24	222/9 223/14 227/11	274/18	Frauke Nitschke [1]
faults [5] 99/1 102/12	218/1 266/5	245/7 249/13 253/20 254/2 258/20 262/23	footnote [2] 30/14 148/21	6/13 frog [7] 15/17 148/6
102/25 105/1 111/12	files [1] 59/15 fill [6] 47/20 160/19			free [7] 15/17 148/6 212/8 224/1 224/2
favour [9] 108/12	161/5 221/21 222/4	264/22 265/16 280/17 280/23 281/17 281/22	forbidden [1] 88/4 force [5] 110/11	212/8 224/1 224/2 227/23 267/4
129/3 129/6 131/12	256/19			
139/10 180/6 222/17		283/25 286/22	169/10 169/13 178/10	friend [4] 204/23
243/7 262/24	filled [4] 158/15	fist [1] 6/6	280/24	285/8 285/9 285/13
favours [1] 224/11	160/21 160/24 224/15 filling [5] 59/7 60/16	20/20 20/23 36/2	forced [2] 115/14 117/3	friendly [1] 246/10
features [1] 148/14	158/1 223/25 224/19	143/6 218/1 272/10	forefront [1] 134/13	frightened [1] 260/24 fro [1] 23/25
February [14] 65/25	final [8] 25/22 39/10	fix [2] 53/23 198/19	foreign [6] 41/18	front [15] 32/18 38/25
73/6 73/13 73/15	96/23 130/1 149/8	fixed [4] 174/21	45/17 47/8 99/19	104/16 109/15 111/2
76/11 81/23 82/15	152/1 155/25 178/10	226/16 226/18 227/8	277/25 278/4	133/14 138/1 154/7
83/10 89/14 175/16	finalising [1] 151/24	flag [1] 23/7	foremost [3] 42/11	186/18 188/25 250/21
176/5 252/16 252/17	finally [12] 40/16	fled [1] 94/12	103/16 116/7	258/21 267/21 268/17
280/3	65/21 150/3 167/4	fleshed [1] 144/4		275/22
fee [17] 212/14 212/15	171/17 174/5 180/10		forge [1] 40/22	
212/20 222/24 223/2	182/13 182/13 184/16	flexibility [3] 37/17 133/22 239/20	forget [1] 169/15 forgetting [1] 210/19	frozen [1] 200/23 fulfil [1] 235/8
223/4 223/5 223/5	185/12 264/8	flexible [1] 133/16	forgot [1] 210/19	fulfilled [4] 115/6
223/16 223/17 223/24	finance [2] 234/25	Floresti [76] 38/12	form [10] 17/14 24/11	155/22 158/24 161/10
256/20 257/1 257/2	258/14	38/18 40/7 40/9 41/22	36/14 58/10 58/10	full [5] 29/17 32/15
257/10 257/11 257/17	200/17			

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
	genuine [1] 130/11	3/9 3/9 3/10	246/20 247/3 247/3	186/11 188/6 188/21
full [3] 150/10	get [38] 19/16 23/11	gmail.com [1] 2/16	249/12 253/2 258/18	188/22 189/9 189/18
185/12 253/3	28/23 29/12 33/23	GMBH [1] 4/6	259/14 260/2 274/24	190/4 190/13 190/22
fully [3] 6/6 53/8 144/4	46/17 58/1 66/21 68/6	go [56] 7/7 9/10 9/12	governing [1] 266/18	193/7 194/4 199/4
functions [1] 283/25	68/14 69/13 70/6 70/8	9/13 10/7 17/6 24/14	government [18]	199/6 202/8 202/21
fundamental [5] 76/2	72/1 80/15 84/1 86/9	24/20 27/18 40/2 41/1 53/2 53/7 55/6 58/4	43/13 94/1 94/14	203/23 206/25 208/22 212/16 214/5 215/4
78/8 136/14 139/14	90/24 101/25 138/6 166/5 186/4 205/12	65/22 66/9 70/2 70/5	95/15 121/17 158/3 170/18 170/23 171/6	217/25 218/4 218/21
147/11	209/3 210/22 225/16	73/21 74/15 75/5 76/6	205/8 245/12 249/20	228/5 234/4 234/5
fundamentally [1]	226/10 227/20 231/8	88/14 92/2 94/5	249/23 251/4 260/10	234/19 235/19 236/18
149/6	239/9 239/24 239/24	120/15 127/2 152/19	275/23 277/3 278/14	236/22 237/2 241/14
funder [2] 16/14 18/19	248/7 254/4 260/6	152/24 166/5 172/23	government's [2]	244/14 245/9 248/23
funders [2] 16/17	260/14 264/21 270/4	190/21 195/17 198/1	117/5 146/21	255/22 257/21 261/8
16/18 funding [8] 16/9 16/12	gets [2] 49/12 94/9	204/13 204/18 209/5	government-approved	266/19 266/21 266/23
17/2 17/9 17/15 18/11	getting [3] 79/3 168/5	209/5 213/6 217/10	[1] 43/13	266/23 269/16 271/10
18/12 18/22	198/11	231/23 240/14 240/17	government-owned	273/4 273/25 275/13
funde [1] 10/5	Ghindesti [1] 164/23	245/7 248/17 249/1	[1] 205/8	276/7 276/10 276/12
funny [2] 37/14	GIEDRE [2] 3/5 8/15	250/11 257/23 258/15	governmental [1]	277/8 277/18 278/13
220/17	give [35] 7/12 8/2	259/12 259/19 264/22	181/24	279/9 280/2 283/5
further [24] 5/8 18/8	12/15 21/21 21/21	274/7 276/14 279/9	graciously [1] 6/21	284/9 285/4 285/7
18/25 26/6 26/7 27/22	22/15 28/5 32/15	God [1] 228/6	grand [2] 54/19 71/7	285/18 285/20 286/1
57/7 107/20 114/9	35/16 36/14 43/18	goes [10] 25/5 26/18	grant [1] 89/3	Grot's [7] 156/16
123/10 133/20 144/20	55/21 66/3 68/19	87/21 91/20 91/24 91/25 100/12 120/19	granted [3] 14/24	157/9 157/18 159/14
157/15 177/11 177/12	73/22 93/24 126/20 152/1 152/20 155/3	91/25 100/12 120/19 149/18 280/21	72/20 89/8 granting [1] 107/12	164/4 193/3 276/25 ground [1] 125/25
179/15 184/6 187/5	158/8 177/10 193/20	going [50] 8/14 16/19	grateful [4] 6/15 150/9	
199/24 236/19 244/9	197/20 206/6 208/19	21/23 22/1 23/10	186/19 286/22	282/10
259/4 261/2 286/6	225/12 235/16 235/22	25/18 30/24 32/7	Gray [1] 2/5	groundless [1] 135/6
futile [1] 182/5	236/6 243/23 271/18	35/24 37/11 39/25	great [8] 17/1 57/10	groundlessness [2]
futility [1] 114/19	273/12 276/16 281/2	41/1 41/12 44/5 46/13	70/10 100/12 122/5	125/14 125/15
future [2] 145/22 149/13	given [32] 15/16 17/13	52/5 66/16 66/21 68/7	206/1 245/20 258/9	grounds [3] 57/19
	17/21 19/10 25/3	68/10 68/20 74/10	green [2] 164/25	107/15 174/1
G	29/23 32/9 34/23	79/15 80/14 80/24	207/21	group [2] 118/5
gained [2] 17/1 17/23	35/11 36/8 66/22	93/23 94/5 95/9	groove [1] 198/3	156/20
GALIS [1] 2/25	67/12 67/13 68/17	119/10 120/9 138/15	gross [1] 137/14	grow [1] 199/20
Garmas [13] 170/4	72/19 74/23 82/14	144/2 150/12 150/17	GROT [154] 1/8 3/12	growing [4] 116/21
170/5 216/2 217/18	82/19 88/12 89/1 89/7 95/2 143/12 144/24	152/9 189/3 206/16 211/5 215/1 222/19	3/14 5/4 7/6 7/15 8/17 10/14 11/3 14/11	199/18 199/19 226/11
217/25 220/5 220/11	158/4 171/24 178/8	229/6 230/24 264/17	14/15 15/14 15/19	guaranteed [1] 17/13 guess [1] 79/12
220/22 221/6 244/13	186/15 243/13 243/19	264/18 268/6 272/11	38/2 38/4 38/5 39/14	guidance [1] 29/19
244/15 259/9 259/15	281/25 286/10	273/5 277/5 277/21	40/4 40/21 41/4 41/11	guided [1] 47/13
Garmas' [1] 216/9 gather [2] 281/2 284/8	aives [2] 25/19 151/15	284/6	41/15 41/18 41/24	guilty [1] 144/16
gather [2] 281/2 284/8	giving [5] 34/17 34/18	gone [6] 16/24 83/16	42/23 43/2 43/12	GUMOVSCHI [2] 3/18
gathered [1] 175/20 gave [3] 156/22 234/9	55/14 226/1 240/1	108/4 156/8 255/22	44/20 44/22 45/18	136/22
273/17	glad [1] 68/14	263/10	47/9 48/20 49/5 49/11	guy [10] 192/18
GDP [1] 279/21	GLADEI [18] 3/16	good [32] 6/2 7/18	49/17 49/19 51/11	192/20 222/9 222/18
general [11] 36/22	3/16 3/17 8/22 63/7	7/24 8/25 18/9 19/10	51/15 60/24 80/25	222/19 225/19 231/17
43/22 57/14 93/25	63/20 75/16 76/5	22/21 30/2 32/21	84/3 92/21 94/12	234/17 240/16 246/10
110/24 132/16 132/21	96/11 119/6 124/25	41/24 186/8 188/19	114/25 115/14 115/21	guys [3] 192/13
140/20 141/13 238/3	125/3 125/21 158/5	189/23 189/25 197/18	134/10 135/7 136/8	211/20 213/17
239/22	162/3 162/4 162/23	197/18 202/8 209/15	145/18 146/2 149/7	GUZUN [3] 4/11 9/7
generally [6] 34/13	239/19 Gladei's [8] 59/16	221/11 224/25 226/19 228/19 234/16 254/11	149/12 149/16 149/20 150/2 150/15 152/19	9/18
40/0 47/13 47/14	64/2 75/18 99/21	256/21 258/11 259/6	153/1 156/6 156/18	Н
93/11 181/7	100/4 107/16 108/16	260/6 263/16 267/6	156/24 157/4 157/7	H3B [1] 2/11
generated [1] 141/6	126/7	267/16 273/8	157/11 157/24 158/11	ha [17] 41/24 43/6
generations [2] 168/1	glance [1] 27/14	Goodbye [1] 256/3	158/14 159/8 159/10	194/20 195/6 196/11
100/10	GLEASON [11] 3/3	got [31] 7/4 21/20	159/15 159/17 159/19	196/22 196/23 196/23
generic [1] 100/24	3/6 8/12 8/13 39/17	25/20 51/1 66/4 66/7	160/1 160/5 160/8	203/10 205/10 205/10
generous [1] 140/1 genesis [2] 121/23	39/23 119/9 120/21	67/19 74/2 79/7 81/1	160/9 160/20 160/23	205/10 205/10 221/15
122/15	121/9 124/2 129/7	158/13 166/15 192/8	161/2 161/4 161/22	226/8 238/23 238/23
gentleman [1] 156/22	Gleason Wells [1]	210/21 216/2 219/15	169/18 170/1 170/21	had [184] 9/11 10/18
gentlemen [4] 8/21	8/12	239/10 239/18 240/15	171/3 171/5 171/9	11/13 13/3 13/9 21/18
153/16 156/20 247/16	gleasonwells.com [3]	240/18 246/7 246/10	182/9 186/5 186/10	23/9 24/23 26/2 27/21

ICSID ARB 16 8	W
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Plotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
Н	119/23 129/10 171/21	41/2 42/14 50/2 57/17	220/17 222/11 229/22	Heaven [2] 205/17
	212/21 274/6 280/18	57/21 57/25 58/15	229/23 230/1 230/4	228/11
had [174] 27/24	280/19 280/20	61/18 69/5 78/9 80/1	230/22 231/18 231/20	heavily [1] 148/13
38/10 41/4 41/17 45/14 50/6 53/4 55/1	hall's [1] 119/18	80/2 83/16 88/13 90/9	233/10 238/9 240/7	heavy [3] 250/25
45/14 50/6 53/4 55/1 55/2 55/3 55/4 55/5	halls [2] 45/19 130/3	92/24 94/12 95/6	240/12 242/5 242/7	251/1 253/8
60/24 66/13 66/25	hand [14] 11/10 39/23	95/20 99/7 100/7	242/9 243/17 243/18	hectare [1] 197/10
67/20 73/12 74/8	54/7 79/23 107/24	110/18 119/20 120/21	243/19 243/23 245/22	hectares [1] 239/9
75/24 78/13 80/20	108/8 109/1 130/22	121/20 124/8 125/21	245/23 245/25 246/13	hectares, from [1]
83/2 86/24 87/6 87/11	159/17 161/2 186/7	125/21 127/8 127/21	247/4 247/25 248/1	179/17
87/19 89/24 91/10	229/24 231/11 272/11	130/15 136/16 137/16	248/4 248/6 248/15	held [5] 45/19 84/13
91/11 92/9 92/22 93/2	handed [3] 28/19	137/24 138/17 139/2	248/23 248/25 249/2	85/4 110/18 182/10
96/13 103/18 105/15	143/17 144/1	139/7 142/21 142/24	250/4 250/9 250/10	Helnan [2] 109/16
107/25 108/4 108/21	handful [1] 119/11	143/22 146/8 147/3	250/16 250/17 250/20	110/8
111/18 114/10 114/10	handing [1] 116/2	149/20 150/1 151/11	252/12 254/22 254/23	help [26] 12/18 45/25
115/9 115/13 115/14	handle [5] 105/14	151/12 162/24 169/8	255/6 255/7 255/10	59/25 60/25 63/21
115/14 116/11 116/14	170/2 219/7 219/13	169/12 178/1 178/4	255/24 255/24 258/11	150/13 159/10 187/12
116/19 116/23 117/22	238/6	186/12 194/23 214/13	258/12 258/14 258/17	197/6 205/3 208/18
117/23 119/23 119/23	handled [6] 161/24	237/20 268/10 274/11	258/19 258/20 258/22	213/8 218/23 221/5
123/4 123/5 128/23	169/23 218/18 219/5	275/19 277/24 280/8	259/13 259/15 259/15	222/3 222/12 222/14
129/10 130/20 132/6	219/9 219/25	280/20 282/9 282/9	259/17 266/19 269/17	222/20 224/9 225/11
132/7 132/8 135/7	handles [2] 161/23	283/2 283/10 283/20	272/4 273/7 273/8	239/3 249/2 259/19
142/14 145/1 145/5	169/21	hate [1] 233/16	273/9 273/9 273/13	273/14 285/21 286/1
145/12 146/2 146/11	handling [1] 262/11	have [480]	273/17 273/17 274/13	helped [3] 48/23
149/7 152/8 153/16	hands [2] 88/14	haven't [1] 89/11	274/19 275/13 277/3	59/24 92/23
155/17 155/25 156/8	246/19	having [19] 6/15 8/8	277/19 277/20 278/1	helpful [11] 16/21
156/14 157/13 158/9	handshake [1] 228/7	10/9 11/13 16/14	278/6 278/9 278/20	33/13 33/23 34/16
158/15 158/17 158/22	handshaking [2]	16/22 29/17 45/6	278/24 278/25 278/25	36/25 69/14 153/3
159/17 161/9 161/17	213/5 228/8	59/18 73/14 75/13	279/8 282/11 282/12	207/7 208/24 226/1
161/19 163/6 163/24	handwritten [1] 56/23		285/10 285/11 285/12	236/20
164/1 164/5 165/14	happen [7] 128/3	96/16 130/25 152/8	285/23	helping [7] 38/18
165/24 168/21 169/16	216/16 263/13 272/24	256/17	He invited [1] 204/7	49/17 51/15 231/20
171/14 174/24 180/4	273/21 280/14 280/25	he [190] 12/24 22/7	head [9] 58/2 100/5	248/5 256/19 259/11
181/22 182/8 183/3	happened [31] 39/19 63/1 73/10 87/2	28/16 38/11 41/7	178/8 213/4 222/8 222/10 222/17 231/16	helps [3] 49/10 51/11 65/17
185/3 195/17 198/14	105/22 157/7 166/6	41/13 43/6 43/6 43/9	250/4	
199/11 203/3 209/9	167/11 167/12 195/14	44/24 44/25 45/2 45/8 45/10 45/12 45/14	heading [1] 244/12	her [5] 36/11 36/12 36/14 36/16 36/17
211/24 211/25 214/8	204/12 224/8 225/12	47/7 47/8 47/9 49/10	heads [1] 66/16	here [67] 6/9 8/1 8/8
220/24 230/14 232/15	234/2 234/3 234/16	49/11 59/19 71/24	health [2] 264/4 264/6	
234/7 234/21 235/5	239/5 245/24 250/8	71/25 71/25 72/16	healthy [1] 197/18	43/25 50/11 52/9 57/4
235/7 237/25 242/15	250/9 252/22 255/9	74/17 77/6 84/5 89/2	hear [25] 7/11 10/2	60/11 76/9 76/12 79/2
242/19 243/12 243/19	263/21 273/23 274/9	89/3 107/8 115/6	13/16 14/16 17/4 18/5	81/2 92/7 98/7 105/6
244/18 245/12 249/20	276/19 280/8 281/5	115/16 117/14 125/21	20/24 28/5 29/22	106/20 108/5 110/23
249/23 249/24 249/25	281/8 281/10 286/3	128/19 128/22 129/2	37/23 38/15 66/14	112/12 118/6 119/12
251/4 252/22 256/17	happening [1] 82/23	134/12 136/7 136/9	121/13 124/25 133/12	121/3 121/5 124/17
257/11 257/22 257/22	happens [2] 91/9	143/22 144/10 145/3	136/5 177/18 184/18	126/13 127/1 138/4
258/1 258/1 258/12	127/7	145/21 145/23 147/7	186/5 234/22 234/24	140/11 144/5 148/8
258/24 258/25 265/25	happy [14] 9/2 10/9	151/24 152/5 152/8	249/10 252/6 287/1	149/8 154/13 155/6
266/17 266/24 267/1 267/1 267/2 267/3	22/15 36/14 60/23	152/12 156/17 156/22	287/3	166/7 174/13 175/9
269/17 270/2 270/8	149/23 168/5 175/15	160/12 160/15 162/1	heard [21] 14/13	175/14 181/8 181/10
271/11 271/23 271/24	193/24 194/18 209/17	167/6 167/7 170/9	17/15 19/12 22/9	183/19 189/8 190/3
273/3 273/9 274/1	211/4 213/6 214/1	173/11 173/13 177/9	25/12 32/3 33/18	190/21 193/11 197/9
274/13 274/14 274/14	hard [2] 54/14 266/2	188/17 192/10 192/10	37/22 59/17 74/13	200/15 200/22 204/20
274/15 275/14 276/2	hardline [1] 97/1	192/20 192/21 201/12	150/21 154/19 156/20	206/11 222/11 240/14
276/6 276/15 276/21	harvest [7] 226/19	201/23 204/7 204/10	163/15 172/10 172/10	241/10 241/20 246/12
277/2 278/6 278/12	226/22 228/17 228/19	204/15 204/18 204/19	195/7 196/14 203/16	249/1 254/6 258/12
278/13 278/19 279/3	230/17 240/1 240/3	204/22 204/23 204/24	220/20 255/1	259/14 268/16 268/24
282/11 283/5 283/24	harvested [1] 229/4	205/14 205/16 205/17	hearing [21] 1/19 14/2	
284/7 284/8 285/11	harvester [1] 165/8	207/16 208/2 210/20	19/24 21/3 33/12 37/3	hesitate [1] 41/3
286/18	harvesting [3] 116/14	210/20 212/22 213/23	39/13 59/22 69/25	hey [17] 205/25 206/2
Hadârca [1] 270/14	228/23 228/23	213/24 214/1 216/2	89/1 89/2 155/3 170/8	206/10 213/16 222/18
half [3] 8/12 82/12	has [80] 6/13 8/3 12/4	217/12 218/13 218/15	174/17 215/3 215/8	222/22 239/3 240/17
237/21	12/24 14/14 16/13	218/16 218/18 219/11	215/10 215/14 244/15	248/23 248/25 248/25
halfway [1] 214/6	19/3 21/18 24/20 25/1	219/16 219/16 219/19	273/13 287/14	249/3 253/5 254/6
hall [10] 49/25 75/22	27/5 27/9 33/18 39/6	220/4 220/14 220/15	hearings [1] 29/19	255/11 258/22 259/16

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
H	115/23 124/3 125/3		I also [2] 133/23 151/1	112/13 166/7 175/12
hiding [1] 243/18	125/22 127/9 128/22	hopelessly [1] 35/3	l always [1] 274/6	199/4 214/25 232/18
high [25] 40/22	136/1 136/7 145/18	host [4] 46/21 46/25	l am [109] 6/11 8/10	255/25 281/16
131/14 135/17 136/11	145/22 145/24 150/3	53/12 181/2	16/19 18/3 22/22	I can't [9] 207/11
137/1 138/23 143/1	152/5 152/6 156/22	hotel [1] 156/19	27/12 27/16 33/21	208/6 208/9 217/18
143/25 145/6 146/5	156/25 157/22 157/24 159/22 160/8 160/12	hour [2] 111/25 237/21	37/21 39/25 41/1 44/7 46/13 49/23 49/23	220/15 241/16 252/24 255/22 281/10
164/7 165/7 185/9	173/21 188/13 188/15	housekeeping [7] 7/8	50/4 50/4 51/24 53/5	I cannot [1] 74/11
197/19 198/15 229/20	188/15 189/6 201/12	20/25 30/3 188/19	55/24 60/8 60/23	I certainly [1] 276/12
245/12 249/18 249/19	209/14 213/21 219/21	189/25 190/15 287/12	61/12 61/21 67/2	I check [1] 69/20
249/23 251/4 271/7 272/5 277/2 278/13	220/23 221/2 230/21	houses [1] 165/4	67/17 67/23 68/14	I chose [2] 218/17
high-ranking [1]	243/3 272/4 273/13	how [76] 12/19 15/2	68/19 69/18 69/23	220/10
131/14	276/9 277/3 277/18	15/19 15/20 29/20	81/12 90/17 90/18	I cite [1] 114/5
high-tech [1] 185/9	278/10 278/22 282/23	40/4 40/5 40/8 40/12	93/23 94/5 95/9	I close [1] 148/8
high-technology [2]	285/22 285/23 286/2	43/17 49/9 54/15 54/19 54/22 66/18	101/18 119/10 119/13 120/9 133/12 149/23	I come [2] 33/16 58/2 I confirm [1] 283/15
164/7 165/7	hit [1] 10/20 Hmm [2] 227/10	69/5 80/25 81/1 81/2		I consider [1] 285/9
high-yield [4] 40/22	232/23	84/1 86/10 97/16	164/16 171/12 175/8	I could [21] 7/22
135/17 136/11 138/23	Hmm mm [2] 227/10	105/13 106/22 116/9	178/2 178/2 183/22	11/18 13/16 27/4
higher [10] 120/2 124/2 136/13 138/15	232/23	118/3 121/7 123/8	184/6 185/6 187/10	92/13 150/13 209/17
124/2 136/13 138/15	hoc [1] 109/16	123/24 130/2 130/9	187/22 188/21 189/3	209/24 210/10 212/3
139/23 146/11 157/2	hold [6] 18/1 31/19	131/22 132/15 148/9	196/8 196/9 200/2	212/11 221/4 225/11
highest [1] 121/16	84/1 115/4 161/5	150/14 156/8 156/11	205/24 208/19 208/19	225/11 227/24 259/12
highlight [12] 52/14	195/18	169/2 169/3 169/14	208/20 213/12 214/6	259/19 268/21 270/12
53/25 62/13 69/8	holder [1] 56/25 holding [1] 31/20	193/8 194/16 195/8 196/18 198/21 201/22	218/6 219/4 224/4 225/1 225/15 227/22	276/18 279/8 I created [1] 51/24
80/16 90/18 92/20	holes [1] 165/5	203/12 204/12 216/13	228/6 228/15 230/24	I decided [1] 157/11
101/16 114/24 134/20	holistic [2] 105/14	223/2 224/8 224/10	231/18 231/19 232/11	I did [12] 23/20 192/19
138/10 141/5 highlighted [4] 21/13	132/3	225/5 225/5 226/19	234/13 236/16 236/16	208/12 217/22 219/1
64/2 73/16 183/12	home [7] 192/2 200/8	226/25 227/21 235/25	237/18 237/21 239/1	223/21 252/9 254/12
highlighting [1] 134/4	204/15 210/1 258/15	238/12 239/16 239/22	240/14 245/2 245/2	262/3 262/4 271/2
highlights [1] 137/4	259/16 286/15	242/6 247/2 247/8	247/3 248/1 248/9	276/11
highly [2] 100/14	homework [1] 247/15	248/4 248/7 250/21 260/5 263/17 271/19	249/9 254/20 258/21 258/22 263/19 264/17	I didn't [1] 275/3 I direct [2] 139/1
111/19	homing [2] 33/13 34/14	273/5 279/18 280/9	264/18 268/3 272/11	160/2
him [37] 8/13 11/14	Hon [2] 1/15 2/9	280/13 285/1 285/23	272/11 278/11 279/11	I directed [1] 249/16
39/1 43/12 60/25 84/4	hone [1] 119/16	however [19] 14/8		I discovered [2]
92/23 92/23 137/9 149/12 186/7 188/13	honest [6] 22/6	17/15 22/24 25/4	281/20 286/2 286/22	207/12 220/19
188/16 188/18 189/5	135/20 254/8 255/21	29/11 36/10 41/1	l answer [2] 207/6	l do [17] 18/17 26/4
192/20 204/18 204/20	285/19 285/21	131/6 141/19 142/4	208/17	32/24 37/22 60/4 67/9
208/15 220/14 259/16	Honestly [2] 263/18 263/19	142/21 150/25 160/17		69/21 76/18 96/10
273/4 273/5 273/13	honesty [1] 286/19	163/20 169/6 180/16 181/7 185/21 272/3	60/9 165/5 178/6 187/18 213/14 220/15	119/12 133/18 151/25 208/22 214/18 245/16
273/14 273/14 274/16	honour [28] 6/10	huge [5] 31/9 79/7	l applied [1] 207/10	271/25 273/16
274/16 276/8 276/14	186/22 187/8 200/18		l appreciate [3]	I don't [35] 76/10
278/15 278/20 279/8	201/17 209/6 245/20	hugged [1] 205/16	133/15 258/4 281/5	138/4 191/9 204/17
285/9 285/12 285/15 285/17	246/6 246/23 247/2	human [2] 214/2	l as [1] 33/22	205/11 216/4 217/16
himself [3] 277/5	247/11 247/22 248/3	279/25	l ask [6] 151/10 217/1	217/20 217/21 219/14
277/21 278/21	248/9 248/13 249/5	hundred [2] 225/8	219/12 251/11 253/17	220/18 221/8 231/4
HINKLE [8] 3/4 8/13	250/2 252/2 252/9	227/9	281/12	231/7 233/20 239/1
39/20 50/10 116/3	252/23 253/9 253/16 255/19 256/22 257/12	hundreds [10] 81/2 81/3 81/10 81/20	l asked [8] 246/2 248/7 253/3 259/6	244/16 244/22 245/1 245/4 246/13 247/2
118/12 119/2 132/12	258/9 259/22 267/23	81/23 83/1 165/25	259/19 273/4 273/14	248/4 248/21 250/11
hire [7] 192/7 195/18	Honourable [1] 6/11	279/25 280/3 280/6	279/9	253/18 262/3 273/4
220/13 221/4 229/12 229/16 229/19	honoured [2] 7/25		l beg [1] 173/2	275/1 276/2 279/11
hired [7] 55/3 157/4	106/10	hurry [1] 252/20	I believe [8] 46/6	283/19 284/20 287/6
158/17 207/8 218/11	honours [2] 231/12	hyperlinked [2] 12/5	58/21 73/6 83/21	287/10
221/5 225/16	285/24	12/14	138/16 173/25 228/6	l escaped [2] 233/7
his [65] 8/23 9/9 14/12	hope [13] 6/25 11/15 29/15 36/22 37/3	hypothetical [1] 106/9		247/10 I express [1] 187/20
15/22 15/22 28/16	137/25 152/23 155/1	1	l call [1] 207/21 l called [3] 204/18	I feel [1] 227/23
38/5 38/6 42/10 42/10	187/17 187/20 266/23	I actually [1] 274/20		l get [1] 101/25
45/16 49/5 50/2 63/20	267/7 287/7	I advised [1] 276/14	I came [2] 213/8 250/7	
84/4 84/11 115/2 115/2 115/9 115/15	hopefully [3] 18/16		I can [10] 68/19 110/7	
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
1	I may [18] 36/6 40/19	271/10 285/22	I turned [1] 259/23	287/11
l got [5] 240/15	47/5 50/8 53/10 63/15	I say [2] 77/18 277/9	I understand [16]	I witnessed [1] 249/6
240/18 246/7 253/2	64/9 64/17 67/23	I second [1] 8/25	36/9 44/16 51/17	I wonder [5] 19/5
259/14	72/23 78/17 90/18	I see [5] 58/17 76/19	77/23 77/24 150/24	27/25 208/1 209/13
l guess [1] 79/12	95/13 111/24 202/11	76/20 211/23 284/1	151/18 207/23 216/11	224/24
I had [14] 27/21	232/13 261/5 264/18	I shall [1] 186/22	224/15 232/11 232/13	I wondered [1] 274/4
145/12 158/17 195/17	I mean [6] 192/12	I share [1] 204/20	235/11 274/13 275/2	I work [1] 246/19
237/25 244/18 256/17	196/24 207/19 210/23	I sign [1] 195/5	275/4	I would [85] 8/2 8/6
271/11 273/3 274/15	219/23 224/18	I signed [4] 210/5	I use [2] 197/5 213/14	11/9 22/6 32/25 42/1
276/2 278/19 283/24	I mention [1] 136/25	216/15 237/6 238/8	I used [3] 33/21 226/7	43/25 44/21 46/17
286/18	I met [5] 156/21	I simply [1] 253/19	231/10	47/3 48/5 48/6 49/20
I hate [1] 233/16	204/14 222/8 246/9	I solemnly [2] 186/21	I very [1] 80/22	49/22 52/3 52/14 53/2
I have [56] 6/9 10/6	246/9	267/23	I want [24] 44/18 51/6	53/9 53/10 53/16
11/14 13/8 27/24	I might [1] 276/3	I speak [1] 31/14	51/19 55/15 58/1 59/4	54/15 54/18 54/22
28/23 46/14 50/17	I mislead [1] 223/21	I spent [1] 247/9	59/5 90/23 90/25	55/6 55/22 56/1 57/7
50/18 51/1 59/9 59/17	I misunderstood [2]	I spoke [2] 204/25	132/24 133/3 201/4	61/4 61/6 61/8 62/13
64/1 65/18 66/6 68/13	15/21 44/9	217/17	205/4 206/11 206/17	63/14 67/22 69/1
69/2 69/9 96/9 116/1	I move [1] 206/11	I stand [1] 268/22	207/6 207/24 218/23	69/16 70/10 71/2
131/9 132/23 133/14	I must [2] 62/22	I suggest [1] 25/13	225/17 227/24 234/24	80/16 82/2 86/3 88/18
134/1 138/1 150/21	154/13	I supported [1]	248/14 249/12 266/11	92/7 92/20 95/19 96/6
157/2 190/13 201/3	I needed [3] 170/2	250/18	I wanted [4] 170/3	96/23 97/12 97/13
204/11 204/23 209/6	221/11 254/11	I suppose [1] 43/24	233/8 233/9 248/14	98/8 99/5 101/15
212/14 222/21 236/18	I never [3] 191/6	I supposed [1] 191/13	I was [65] 15/21 15/22	105/9 112/7 114/24
242/3 244/4 245/15	192/3 246/20	I switched [1] 207/18	16/2 17/19 51/20	126/6 133/6 133/10
246/12 246/20 247/3	I normally [1] 133/6	I take [1] 233/21	66/21 156/6 156/19	134/3 136/20 137/19
247/3 249/12 249/14	l now [1] 216/17	I talked [1] 285/17	157/19 159/6 192/2	139/19 143/16 145/11
254/10 255/13 256/11	I only [1] 231/25	I thank [2] 267/5	192/3 192/7 192/20	148/10 154/10 154/21
269/16 270/10 271/9	I ordered [1] 219/18	286/17	194/18 197/7 197/11	167/23 167/24 186/18
283/2 283/3 284/1	l owe [1] 187/9	I then [1] 272/17	205/4 206/5 206/6	190/16 194/6 196/16
285/24 286/19 287/8	I paid [5] 201/24	I think [60] 12/17	206/10 207/9 207/14	202/16 221/7 229/21
l hear [1] 37/23	256/24 257/2 257/3	14/18 15/1 18/24	208/9 209/17 211/4	231/9 237/16 246/23
I heard [2] 22/9	257/17	22/17 25/1 29/3 33/10	211/6 213/9 213/18	248/3 267/20 268/17
156/20	I pay [1] 212/14	37/16 49/1 61/15	222/17 223/19 224/2	276/3 285/12 285/20
I hire [1] 192/7	I please [1] 111/24	90/15 110/8 118/5	225/5 225/18 226/8	287/7
I hired [2] 207/8 221/5	I read [4] 76/9 76/12	126/14 126/16 151/14	228/13 233/7 235/3	l'm [4] 81/17 185/6
I hope [7] 29/15 36/22	78/2 256/18	152/4 152/9 153/4	238/5 238/5 238/25	239/18 253/4
37/3 137/25 187/17	I recall [1] 26/10	167/4 172/18 172/20	240/13 245/23 246/11	i.e [1] 176/24
266/23 267/7	I received [2] 75/2	173/6 175/22 177/8	247/8 247/8 247/8	lanco [1] 93/13
l included [1] 19/2	207/21	186/12 186/17 186/25	248/20 249/8 252/3	ICS [10] 41/19 45/1
l intend [2] 119/15	I register [1] 212/13	187/9 187/12 187/15	252/19 253/1 253/7	83/16 91/4 158/18
119/16	I remain [1] 59/21	188/12 196/10 207/7	253/10 253/24 255/23	171/8 173/9 174/20
l introduce [1] 8/5	l remember [10]	208/24 209/3 209/7	259/24 263/10 266/3	179/20 219/10
l introduced [1]	160/16 196/10 222/7	209/21 220/9 220/12	266/3 269/9 273/5	ICSID [10] 1/5 2/17
156/21	223/19 223/23 230/25	223/20 225/2 231/11	280/5 280/15 285/25	7/5 8/3 9/1 30/21
l invested [1] 248/24	243/14 252/3 254/1	236/15 237/15 237/17	I went [20] 132/25	30/22 30/23 33/21
l invite [2] 95/5 95/17	259/14	240/11 241/2 249/16	170/25 200/8 200/13	109/14
l just [6] 7/2 10/8	I remind [1] 134/17	253/23 256/22 263/6	200/18 204/15 206/5	ID [1] 282/23
76/19 138/9 237/25	I repeat [2] 160/25	264/16 266/7 266/21	213/3 219/16 219/18	idea [9] 102/6 111/6
263/7	202/10	266/22 272/10 281/9	220/11 220/11 235/9	112/2 202/24 225/12
l keep [1] 62/22	I respectfully [1]	281/10	246/8 246/11 246/24	242/3 254/10 256/11
I knew [1] 271/12	154/4	I thought [11] 16/20	258/10 259/14 259/23	271/19
I know [15] 7/9 62/24	I responded [1]	44/10 58/23 209/24	259/25	identical [2] 81/19
140/19 225/13 225/16	217/19	246/2 246/25 253/1	I will [31] 7/7 22/19	284/15
231/7 240/14 248/9	I returned [1] 250/2	273/11 274/19 276/15	31/16 39/23 40/2 40/3	identification [1]
249/7 259/12 272/1	I right [2] 203/4	280/5	40/19 46/15 54/13	16/14
273/24 275/9 275/12	226/21	I told [3] 248/13	68/14 90/11 105/6	identify [3] 15/4
285/12	I said [20] 33/11 44/7	283/23 284/20	117/6 118/11 119/2	114/12 191/24
I laughed [1] 246/3	200/18 210/6 216/15	I took [5] 187/13	119/6 154/1 156/2	identity [1] 47/19
l left [11] 210/1 211/3	217/16 217/22 217/23	188/8 206/5 207/19	166/8 179/12 187/12	ignore [4] 42/16
227/22 231/21 234/15	223/3 238/25 246/12	237/21	190/21 195/17 195/17	119/24 123/5 132/7
252/5 253/1 253/5	248/25 250/25 253/4	I travelled [1] 200/24	202/12 214/1 225/14	ignored [3] 114/19
255/21 256/1 256/6	254/11 256/3 257/13	I tried [1] 259/9	225/22 249/1 267/24	114/20 114/22
l look [1] 219/24	274/7 277/11 286/19	I try [2] 205/3 208/18	280/16	ignores [13] 63/19
I made [2] 18/25 53/12	I saw [4] 217/9 269/25	I turn [2] 16/6 100/3	I wish [3] 221/3 267/5	65/1 87/13 87/25

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al y Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
1	impressive [1] 8/4	169/22 177/13 178/25	146/24 147/20 149/11	interested [7] 220/13
ignores [9] 103/23	improper [2] 123/20	179/9 182/5 188/15	200/22	230/6 230/15 235/7
111/8 111/12 111/13	223/22	188/15 190/1 202/15	initially [2] 38/17	255/23 256/13 259/7
111/20 114/23 115/11	improperly [1] 131/13	203/25 214/16 272/8	170/20	interesting [4] 95/16
117/12 118/8	impugn [1] 181/23	287/13	initiated [2] 122/8 129/17	109/8 117/13 118/3
ignoring [1] 106/13	impugned [3] 153/19 180/10 180/18	independent [2] 144/11 201/21	injunction [18] 66/23	interests [7] 73/1 90/8 94/6 152/9 211/22
Igor [7] 71/23 156/22	in April 2011 [1] 170/8		66/24 87/16 87/18	238/9 270/24
157/7 204/1 206/19	in December [2]	indicate [7] 33/17	87/23 87/24 88/1 88/6	interfere [2] 76/3
255/23 262/4	234/20 256/1	34/2 122/13 123/1	89/8 89/9 170/8 179/9	98/22
Igor Bugai [2] 71/23 157/7	in December 2010 [2]	135/11 139/11 140/8	179/10 247/25 254/2	interfering [1] 78/9
Igor Tcaci [1] 255/23	210/1 251/24	indicated [1] 138/23	254/10 254/20 265/24	international [20] 1/2
II [1] 181/15	in December 2011 [2]	indicates [9] 36/21	injunctions [16] 87/9	40/13 53/24 97/18
illegal [17] 73/2 84/7	200/5 200/16	120/4 124/4 137/1	87/10 88/15 88/21	98/13 98/14 99/23
111/10 111/16 123/21	in December 2012 [1] 232/2	138/7 140/25 142/3 146/6 267/21	90/1 91/10 91/11 93/16 106/14 106/15	100/8 100/15 101/11 101/13 103/2 104/10
131/7 177/5 177/13	in February [1] 65/25	indicating [1] 73/12	106/16 180/7 220/24	104/10 109/20 121/9
246/14 263/1 265/17	in late [1] 92/22	indication [3] 33/23	243/6 243/10 253/21	124/24 125/10 157/4
265/23 273/11 274/20 280/25 281/11 281/17	in March 2011 [3]	141/22 152/20	Inn [1] 2/5	176/10
illegally [7] 72/25	157/11 254/18 255/3	indicative [1] 181/16	innocent [1] 120/6	internet [1] 247/16
73/19 75/9 86/13	in March/April [1]	indirect [6] 183/9	innocently [1] 132/10	interpretation [10]
89/22 94/20 98/22	253/23	183/13 183/17 183/23	innovator [1] 145/20	81/12 108/19 109/2
illogical [1] 147/18	in May [1] 205/25 in May 2012 [1]	184/1 184/12 individual [8] 81/10	input [4] 6/21 145/14 147/2 147/3	111/7 122/24 123/9 176/19 177/1 181/25
image [1] 164/19	265/19		inputs [3] 137/22	182/6
imagine [1] 80/25	inability [1] 42/3	160/23 160/25 165/2	140/16 147/20	interpreted [1] 32/13
imagining [1] 152/21	inadmissible [2] 13/6	283/8	inquire [1] 169/14	interpreters [3] 2/23
immediate [2] 170/13 178/15	181/14	individually [1]	inquired [2] 71/25	11/16 267/15
immediately [9] 16/25	inappropriate [2]	149/13	167/15	interpreting [1] 99/2
79/17 86/21 86/22	143/12 180/1	induced [1] 180/19	insertion [1] 143/20	interrelated [1] 26/12
145/10 169/25 170/3	incentives [1] 144/18	industrial [2] 164/18	inserts [1] 145/3	interrupt [2] 208/23
230/14 282/19	incidents [1] 249/4 incite [1] 51/21	203/15 industrially [1] 202/25	insight [1] 118/5	233/16 interspersed [1]
imminent [1] 82/21	inclination [4] 14/4	industry [3] 93/23	insist [1] 163/1	133/4
impact [1] 184/10 impede [1] 180/2	17/3 20/4 25/15	134/22 148/19	installations [1] 283/3	intervention [4] 95/11
implicate [1] 97/21	inclined [3] 10/18	inelegantly [1] 18/3	instance [2] 110/9	116/23 117/5 146/21
implicated [2] 102/20	14/5 23/5	inexact [1] 126/18	135/3	interview [2] 144/21
103/22	include [2] 118/22 123/23	infer [1] 81/13 inference [4] 42/2	instances [1] 173/20 instead [7] 15/18	175/15 introduce [11] 7/3
imply [1] 139/23	included [3] 19/2	42/7 81/16 194/25	116/13 129/4 153/25	7/23 8/5 8/9 8/20 9/4
import [1] 219/9	124/10 232/14	inferences [1] 167/19	170/16 197/25 250/13	11/10 21/10 21/16
importance [1] 141/2	includes [3] 43/24	inflate [2] 99/11	institution [1] 280/19	26/7 278/15
important [22] 62/12 68/3 68/8 90/20 101/9	98/2 176/12	100/23	instructed [3] 114/7	introduced [2] 44/20
106/7 114/23 115/12	including [15] 11/22	inflation [3] 139/6	227/16 258/5	156/21
129/12 135/14 141/4	19/19 19/20 23/14	139/9 139/12	instruction [1] 228/3	introduction [2] 12/12
142/10 156/1 156/10	41/16 52/21 119/5 126/10 140/24 144/14	influence [3] 281/1 283/24 284/21	instructions [2] 124/2 174/9	119/1 invalid [5] 163/9
164/3 192/4 198/4	146/23 161/21 169/17	influenced [1] 21/14	instructive [1] 110/8	163/14 164/15 164/17
203/19 209/8 216/13 231/11 275/17	172/20 273/10	influential [1] 275/24	instrument [1] 246/4	185/1
importantly [7] 42/15	incoherent [1] 107/23	inform [2] 135/20	integrity [1] 17/11	invalidate [1] 130/16
48/10 98/1 99/22	income [2] 206/4	220/10	intelligence [1] 225/2	invalidity [2] 78/23
144/11 145/21 163/4	232/15	information [17]	intend [3] 20/11	120/14
imported [4] 55/2	inconsistency [1] 112/9	25/20 27/14 64/14 117/13 137/9 141/3	119/15 119/16 intended [2] 28/13	invariably [1] 31/7 inversion [1] 10/20
142/24 224/5 283/4	incorporates [1]	144/9 154/14 169/5	156/11	invert [2] 10/24 35/24
impose [3] 109/23 110/2 115/19	196/14	177/10 187/10 197/8	intensive [1] 185/11	invest [2] 52/25
impossible [9] 66/15	incorrectly [1] 136/17	237/18 244/25 260/5	intention [2] 85/23	180/20
74/10 113/5 128/7	increase [1] 226/22	271/25 277/24	110/11	invested [4] 38/6
154/16 164/18 195/20	increased [1] 140/1 indeed [26] 9/24	informed [6] 85/15 155/18 156/4 169/7	interactive [2] 154/9 160/3	246/20 248/24 285/10 investigating [1]
226/9 270/4	18/25 20/10 22/21	174/3 233/11	interest [9] 147/25	117/21
impression [3] 92/9	22/25 23/19 96/17	inhabitants [1] 229/10		investigation [5] 39/2
256/17 260/13 impressions [1]	138/23 139/24 142/11	initial [9] 38/11 51/10	234/9 234/17 235/4	95/4 95/11 144/11
142/13	144/12 155/24 160/6	67/18 74/1 92/1	250/23 286/20	246/5
		www.dianahurdan.aam		

Investment [74] 15/9 16/6 16/23 17/6 147/19 147/22 149/25 21/20 22/13 23/18 KLINGST [2] 2/20 3/13 3/13 3/13 3/13 3/13 3/13 3/13 3/13	ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
Instrument P1 P1/10		-		21/20 22/13 23/18	_
38/11 38/13 38/19 11/22 11/24 18/2 18/5 10/06 11/4/23 16/010 28/7 26/19 3/16 3/30 Spir 26/14 10/36	in ve etment [74] 4/2				
Barch 3 agn 5 4 006 4 000 Barch 1 Ban		17/22 17/24 18/2 18/5	160/6 174/23 176/10	28/7 28/19 31/18 33/5	knew [5] 112/22
40/8 40/8 40/14 43/8 41/1 19/25 26/81 26/82 27/87 27/		18/11 18/14 19/7	177/19 180/3 180/13	36/25 37/18 43/19	
41/21 24/20 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Jank aging 4/23 Zells 2/6/15/2019 Ifsent [12] 49/24 401 2/24 fold / 1019 / 9/10 601/2 1/2012 Jank 24 4/12 4/25 Jank 31/25 3/22/4 Jank 31/26 3/26/27/17/2 Jank 31/26 3/26/27/27/2 Jank 31/26 3/26/27/27/2 Jank 31/26 3/27/27/2 J					
44/2 44/12 45/9 45/77 26/21 2/15 26/23 8/7/4 101/4 12/17/ 7/916 8/21 39/15 200/2					
47/3 47/3 <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>					
9/224 9/23 9/919 32/25 3/4 / 45/20 12/24 1/24/10 1/27/17 96/6 9/74 10/316 87/20 9/25 1/25 7/3 10/31 210/43 10/46 61/25 61/25 63/6 68/9 16/6 16 6/25 7/21 16/6 7/3 6/16 3/21 16/6 7/3 6/17 6/17/1 16/6 7/3 6/17 6/17/1 16/6					
10.31 2 104/3 104/9 61/21 61/25 63/8 68/9 Inter [1] 231/6 1161/9 1161/9 1191/1 191/1 201/2 62/24 1100/1 100/21 115/13 96/25 90/21 96/12 96/25 90/21 96/12 171/15 72/24 73/7 131/21 136/19 138/9 66/16 66/16 67/11 146/24 148/5 149/11 119/16 156/9 105/11 171/16 72/24 73/7 131/21 136/19 138/9 131/21 132/21 136/19 131/21 132/21 136/19 131/21 132/21 136/11 131/21 132/21 136/11 131/21 131/21 131/21 131/21 131/21 131/21 131/21 131/21 131/21 131/21 13	92/24 98/23 99/19				
Total J, 194/1 TS20 90/21 98/12 TS20 90/21 98/12 <thts20 12<="" 21="" 90="" 98="" th=""> <thts20 12<="" 21="" 90="" 98="" th=""></thts20></thts20>	103/12 104/3 104/9				
10:0:10:11:10:17 190/2 297/11 190/7 72/15 72/24 73/7 131/21 130/21 130/21 130/21 730/7 <td< td=""><td>104/13 104/17 105/14</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	104/13 104/17 105/14				
Ibbs Ibbs <th< td=""><td>110/10 110/21 115/13</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	110/10 110/21 115/13				
140/16 140/16<	116/8 116/11 116/17				
149/16 1559/ 155/11 127/1 132/8 136/14 1 1 16/10 66/20 93/4 155/16 156/17 166/20 169/21 139/9 139/14 140/11 139/9 139/14 140/11 143/7 150/1 150/1 136/19 186/13 188/18 93/10 10/18 114/2 161/22 163/22 166/21 143/7 150/1 150/1 143/7 150/1 150/1 143/19 12/21 194/11 194/17 136/24 140/19 152/1 120/22 203/7 218/10 172/25 191/12 201/22 52/2 164/21 165/13 156/16 76/77 67/17 156/17 67/7 71 156/17 172/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/12 199/21 201/12 201/22 199/21 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/22 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 201/12 20					
1sb/10 1sb/10 1sb/10 1sb/10 1sb/11 1sb/11<			33/13/14/0 203/14		
1101/22 163/25 166//2 139/9 139/14 140/11 jail [3] 225/19 225/21 189/24 189/24 189/25 109/20 136/24 140/19 152/20 1201/22 203/7 218/10 156/2 164/21 165/13 january [10] 65/21 190/21 30/17 223/21 190/21 30/17 223/21 2201/22 03/2 216/25 252/24 262/11 278/21 252/9 264/23 256/17 20/16 256/17 20/17 257/17 20/17			J		
165/14 165/20 169/21 14/17 160/12 166/12 26/17 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>jail [3] 225/19 225/21</td><td></td><td></td></td<>			jail [3] 225/19 225/21		
176/1 185/2 196/20 156/2 166/2 156/13 January [10] 65/21 257/6 226/17 228/21 166/3 67/3 216/21 20/1 220/3 246/25 252/9 246/25 252/9 24/21 252/9 24/23 256/9 26/13 216/21 166/8 67/3 67/7 67/17 236/10 237/25 28/21 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 20/22 20/7 20/81 20/14 20/22 20/7 20/81 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 198/21 20/14 20/14 20/22 20/7 20/81 198/15 27/19 200/22 20/7 20/81 20/72 20/14 20/14 20/14 20/12 20/24 20/10 20/12 20/14 20/14 20/12 20/24 20/24 20/14 20/14 20/12 20/24 20/24 20/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/17 21/16 20/17 21/16 20/2 20/17 21/16 20/17 20/16 20/2 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/14 20/17 21/14 20/14 20/14 20/17					
194/19 194/12 194/12 194/12 194/12 194/14<			-		
2/2/2/2 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/1 2/2/2 <					
2479 263/16 263/23 252/24 262/11 22/81/1 252/24 262/11 22/81/1 253/2 264/21 22/81/2 198/21 201/12 201/12 201/13 264/1 266/14 277/25 investments [6] 44/13 88/10 80/22 175/2 251/2 264/22 272/21 274/12 28/17 28/17 201/22 02/20 202/22 70/21 2181/4 158/04 (71) 75/8 88/9 249/7 27/08 justice [3] 177/18 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/14 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/24 220/17 22/11 218/25 23/22 23/27 223/2 23/18 22/21 223/12 23/14 220/17 22/11 218/27 22/14 22/14 22/17 22/11 221/2 22/12 22/17 22/17 22/17 221/12 23/16 23/23/23 221/12 23/16 23/23/23 231/20 23/12 23/16 23/23/23 231/20 23/22 23/23 23/27 231/20 23/22 23/23 23/27 231/20 23/22 23/21 23/21/23 231/20 23/21/23 23/27 231/20 23/21/23 23/27 231/20 23/21/23 23/27 231/20 23/21/23 23/21 231/20 23/21/23 23/21 231/20 23/21/23 23/21 231/20 23/21/23 23/21 231/20 23/21/23 23/21 231/20 23/21/23 23/21/23 231/20 23/21/22 23/21 231/20					195/16 197/9 198/4
264/1 265/4 277/05 294/11 284/11 January 21 [1] 199/13 226/19 268/15 271/9 201/22 202/10 200/22 investments [6] 44/13 88/10 89/22 175/2 job [7] 209/16 213/21 220/11 281/7 281/9 205/16 206/10 200/21 investor [3] 44/5 262/24 280/24 220/24 243/7 243/8 224/25 240/17 248/8 284/13 281/3 208/12 208/12 281/9 228/12 281/9 228/12 281/9 228/12 281/9 228/12 281/9 228/12 281/9 228/12 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 228/14 281/9 2		252/24 262/11 278/21	252/9 264/23	263/7 264/21 264/22	198/21 201/12 201/13
investments [6] 44/13 issue [6] 10/15/18 20/16 20/17 21/11 20/16 20/17 21/11 20/16 20/17 21/11 20/16 20/17 21/11 20/17 21/11 20/16 20/17 21/11 20/16 20/17 21/11 20/17 21/11 20/16 20/17 21/11 20/17 21/17 20/17 21/17 20/17 21/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/17		284/11 284/11			
97/22 131/4 157/4 88/12 1732 130/1 28/17 28/179 28/17 28/179 28/17 28/179 28/17 28/179 21/12 14/18 31/83 170/21 218/14 220/2 42/37 243/8 224/7 270/8 24/7 270/8 23/7 285/3 21/712 14/18 31/83 21/712 14/18 31/83 21/712 14/18 31/83 21/712 14/18 31/83 21/712 14/18 31/83 21/712 14/18 31/83 21/712 14/18 31/18 21/712 14/18 31/18 21/712 14/18 28/17 22/18 223/21 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/14 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 21/10 21/11 21/3 22/17 21/12 14/18 22/17 22/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 22/17 22/17 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/18 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/18 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/18 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/28 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/28 23/17 23/17 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/28 23/17 23/18 23/17 23/18 23/17 23/28 24/17 24/12 24/17 2		issued [10] 75/8 88/9		272/21 274/12 279/23	205/16 206/10 206/11
170/21 218/14 220/24 223/7 243/8 224/25 240/17 (247)8 283/7 285/3 211/21 218/3 218/3 170/21 218/14 165/17 277/14 165/17 277/14 165/17 277/14 166/17 217/14 218/24 202/17 221/11 170/21 218/21 166/17 277/14 166/17 217/14 167/17 11 171/12 128/3 218/3 170/21 218/21 166/17 277/14 166/17 217/14 171/12 128/3 218/3 223/22 223/14 223/14 223/17 218/24 220/17 221/11 170/21 218/21 166/17 217/14 16/17 18 15/1 joining [2] 9/22 30/7 127/10 128/14 128/17 225/12 225/13 225/14 221/12 231/12 21/17 221/12 231/12 21/17 221/12 231/12 21/12 21/12 21/12 221/12 231/12 21/12 21/12 221/12 231/12 21/12 21/12 231/12 231/12 21/12 21/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 21/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 231/12 241/12 241/12 231/12 231/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 241/12 24					
investor [3] 49/5 262/24 260/24 264/24 260/24 264/24 260/14 218/24 220/17 221/1 145/19 277/14 issues [52] 7/5 7/8 7/9 jobs [2] 166/13 283/25 258/14 260/14 223/2 223/18 223/21 1westors [3] 49/6 9/21 10/6 11/18 15/1 joined [1] 131/15 jost [2] 166/13 283/25 258/14 260/14 223/2 223/18 223/21 278/5 10/23 19/19 19/22 joined [1] 131/15 joined [1] 131/15 128/14 128/17 1wite [3] 12/10 13/13 56/12 26/2 66/18 Journalism [1] 157/2 justifications [1] 237/2 246/3 246/3 232/8 253/1 284/10 116/4 118/12 119/8 114/15 133/19 217/24 justifie [1] 134/8 24/14 240/15 241/6 237/8 253/1 284/10 110/14 118/12 119/8 110/75 108/9 judgment [1] 140/1 121/20 11/22 111/22 246/3 246/3 246/3 257/4 133/16 135/16 133/16 135/16 judgment [1] 107/2 133/16 135/16 256/14 269/10 246/2 24/14 255/16 256/8 1mvoice [2] 23/6 23/16 23/14 139/25 130/3 44/1 120/20 12/16 128/14 120/20 24/16 28/13 256/2 256/8 266/2 2271/24 273/12 25/14 1mvoice [2] 23/6 23/12 23/6 110/11 120/12 113/13 13/13 13/18 135/16 130/14 13/17 13/12 256/2					
145/19 277/14 Issues [5]//17/16 [2]/100 17/2 [100 17320/25] 230/14 200174 223/2 23018 223/1 156/7 277/16 278/1 278/15 11/18 15/1 10/13 11/5 10/13 11/5 10/13 11/5 12/10 13/15 221/2 23/16 223/18 223/1 278/5 21/1 2/13 2/214 21/1 2/213 2/214 10/13 11/5 10/13 11/5 12/10 13/15 221/2 23/16 23/18 225/1 278/5 21/1 2/213 2/214 20/14 2/213 2/214 10/15 13/17 10/15 13/7 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 221/2 23/16 23/18 225/1 230/2 230/2 269/2 21/10 2/13 2/214 20/14 26/14 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/16 12/10 13/15 12/10 13/16 12/10 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11 13/15 12/11				justice [3] 177/18	
investors [5] 41/18 9/21 10/6 11/18 15/1 joining [2] 9/22 36/7 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 127/20 128/14 128/17 128/14 12/20 23/16 237/32 328/7 23/16 237/32 328/7 23/16 237/32 328/7 23/16 237/32 328/7 23/16 237/32 328/7 23/16 237/32 328/7 24/17 24/15 24/16 23/16 237/32 328/7 24/17 24/17 24/15 24/16 23/16 237/32 328/7 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 23/16 237/32 328/7 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/17 24/1			jobs [2] 166/13 283/25		
1667/277/16 278/5 1767/278/5 11/12/12/14/14/28/11/12/12 171/22/14/21/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/14/14/28/11/12/12 171/22/14/21/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/14/21/21 171/22/14/21/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/14/21/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21/22/14/21/22/21/21 171/22/14/21/22/21/22 11/12/12/21/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/12/12/21 171/22/14/21/22 11/14/11 171/22/14/21/22 11/14/11 171/22/14/21/22 11/14/11 171/22/14/21/22 11/14/11 171/22/14/22 11/14/11 171/22/14/22 11/14/11 171/22/14/22 11/14/11 171/22/14/22 11/14/10 171/22/14/22 11/14/10 171/22/14/22 11/14/10 171/22/14/14/14/14/14 11/14/10					
27/3/3 27/3/2 23/24 23/25 25/4 Journalism [1] 157/2 justifications [1] 23/20 23/16 23/18 23/24 23/24 25/10 26/2 26/18 Journalism [1] 137/2 judge [5] 107/14 23/16 23/123 238/7 16/19 95/5 95/17 29/18 3/124 32/11 34/20 37/14 44/5 114/15 133/19 217/24 judges [6] 107/14 24/12 24/0/15 24/16 16/14 96/17 206/8 169/14 96/14 116/3 169/14 96/14 116/3 100/75 108/9 127/20 23/16 23/23 26/14 232/8 253/1 284/10 119/11 119/14 119/16 107/5 108/9 120/20 121/6 126/9 25/24 25/3/2 26/12 19/22 20/47 206/8 119/11 119/14 119/16 107/5 108/9 120/20 121/6 126/9 25/24 25/3/2 26/12 19/22 20/47 206/8 13/16 135/14 146/22 judgment [1] 20/9 12/14 178/3 260/6 12/14 178/3 260/6 19/25 218/2 227/14 133/16 135/14 146/22 judgment [1] 260/9 12/14 178/3 260/6 25/14 26/12 26/12 28/12 227/14 115/21 13/31 33/18 20/51 13/13 13/18 20/51 26/12 26/12 26/12 26/12 19/25 218/2 227/15 11 [1 44/1 119/16 12/26/71 27/12 27/14 27/32 27/32 27/32 27/32 27/32 27/32 27/32 27/32 27/32 27/32					
Invitation [2] 69/24 invite [8] 12/10 13/13 16/19 95/5 95/17 16/19 95/5 95/17 16/19 95/5 95/17 16/19 18/12 43/21 25/10 26/2 26/18 29/18 31/24 32/11 34/20 37/14 44/5 Jucares [1] 93/14 judge [5] 107/14 judge [5] 107/14 judge [5] 107/14 judge [5] 107/14 judge [5] 107/14 judge [5] 107/14 judge [5] 107/12 judges [3] 106/21 107/5 108/9 125/15 justified [1] 134/8 justify [2] 119/22 24/12 24/12 245/14 24/12 24/12 245/14 25/14 255/16 259/10 25/14 256/16 259/10 25/12 26/12 266/15 269/15 269/12 27/12 277/12 278/12 276/12 277/12 278/1 276/16 277/4 219/21 278/18 100 [8] 43/11 88/25 100/11 23/3 11 [51] 13/3 13/18 205/11 21/11 13/21 21/11 23/3 11 [32] 21/11 23/3 11 [32] 21/11 23/3 11 [32] 21/11 23/3 12 24/12 237/19 278/12 277/10 278/4 278/2 278/17 278/2 278/12 278/2 278/17 278/2 278/17 278/2 278/12 278/2 278/17 27	278/5				
223/24 29/18 31/24 32/11 judge [5] 107/14 justified [1] 134/8 240/14 240/15 241/6 16/19 95/5 95/17 34/20 37/14 44/5 114/15 133/19 217/24 justified [1] 134/8 240/14 240/15 241/6 128/6 188/16 204/10 34/20 37/14 44/5 114/15 133/19 217/24 justified [1] 134/8 240/14 240/15 241/6 128/6 188/16 204/10 69/14 96/14 116/3 judge's [1] 107/12 judge's [1] 107/12 judge's [1] 107/12 246/3 246/3 246/23 32/2 204/7 206/8 119/11 119/14 119/14 119/14 116/3 judge's [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 246/3 246/23 109/12 72/6 133/16 135/14 146/2 judgment [4] 14/10 121/4 178/3 260/6 121/4 178/3 260/6 123/6 141/24 259/12 260/4 261/2 10xolce [9] 75/24 75/24 75/12 273/10 273/19 julg [4] 178/2 69/10 276/6 277/4 kep [5] 39/18 39/25 265/24 269/15 269/19 28/22 271/5 115 [50] 13/9 14/10 133/13 133/18 205/11 276/6 277/4 kill [4] 233/12 254/24 273/20 273/22 273/24 28/10 136/1 180/11 19/20 38/18 70/22 91/4 99/18 102/5 133/13 133/18 205/11 276/6 277/4 276/6 277/4 276/6 277/4 276/6 277/4 276/6 277/4 276/6 277/4 276/6 277/4 276	invitation [2] 69/24				
Invite [6] 12/10 13/13 34/20 37/14 44/15 13/16 13/15 13/16 13/16 13/17 24/1<	233/24				
16/19 95/5 95/17 126/6 188/16 204/10 invited [7] 45/13 92/22 204/7 206/8 232/8 253/1 284/10 invites [1] 45/17 inviting [1] 7/22 133/16 135/14 146/22 257/4 218/1 10/11 19/14 119/16 107/5 108/9 iudge's [1] 107/12 judge's [1] 107/12 jud	invite [8] 12/10 13/13				
12/0/0 188/16 204/10 69/14 96/14 116/3 judge's [1] 107/12 judge's [1] 107/12 247/2 248/3 248/4 232/8 253/1 284/10 119/11 119/14 119/16 119/11 119/14 119/16 107/5 108/9 keep [4] 14/19 62/22 252/24 253/8 254/14 232/8 253/1 284/10 119/11 119/14 119/16 120/20 121/6 126/9 judges' [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 252/24 253/8 254/14 256/13 256/16 259/10 10/15 19/3 29/28 158/13 133/16 135/14 146/22 judges' [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 256/14 256/16 259/10 256/14 256/16 259/10 276/16 279/16 279/16 287/3 judgeira [1] 260/9 judgeira [1] 260/9 keep [1] 285/14 265/24 269/15 269/19 265/24 269/15 269/19 278/2 22 271/5 278/16 279/16 287/3 judgeira [1] 20/14 July [4] 178/4 269/10 276/6 277/4 kil [4] 233/12 254/24 273/20 273/22 273/24 19/20 28/17 281/2 257/3 115/21 115/21 13/14 13/14 13/13 133/18 205/11 13/16 13/1 13/91 205/21 208/20 236/7 279/11 279/17 279/23 10/14 20/7 11/4 121/16 11/2 20/18 11/4/21 269/10 205/21 208/20 236/7 279/11 279/17 279/23 11/20 13/2 13/9 13/9 14/10 120/27 jumping [1] 165/22 11/14/21 278/72 24/24 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
Invite [1] 45/17 116/4 118/12 119/8 judges [3] 106/21 K 248/9 249/7 249/9 92/22 204/7 206/8 119/11 119/14 119/16 107/5 108/9 115/20 209/11 252/24 253/8 254/14 10/11 119/11 119/14 119/16 120/20 121/6 126/9 judges [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 256/13 256/16 259/10 110/11 119/11 119/14 119/16 120/20 121/6 126/9 judges [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 256/13 256/16 259/10 110/11 119/17 1119/16 123/3 155/6 238/19 273/10 273/19 judgment [4] 14/10 123/6 141/24 256/13 256/16 259/10 257/4 276/16 279/16 287/3 judigment [1] 260/10 121/4 178/3 260/6 123/6 141/24 263/17 263/23 264/7 198/25 218/2 225/20 276/16 279/16 287/3 judigment [1] 269/10 276/6 277/4 Kep [1] 233/3 173/31 233/12 254/24 273/20 273/22 273/24 198/25 218/2 225/20 239/25 it [56] 13/9 14/10 133/13 133/18 205/11 Kill [4] 233/12 254/24 276/2 277/14 Kill [4] 233/12 254/24 276/2 277/14 276/2 277/14 255/13 276/2 277/12 275/12					
92/22 2047 19/11 119/14 119/16 107/5 108/9 keep [4] 14/19 62/22 252/24 253/8 254/14 119/11 119/14 119/16 107/5 108/9 judges' [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 256/13 256/16 259/10 110/11 119/14 119/16 107/5 108/9 judges' [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 256/13 256/16 259/10 110/11 119/14 119/16 120/20 121/6 126/9 judges' [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 256/13 256/16 259/10 127/4 133/16 135/14 156/2 121/4 178/3 260/6 121/4 178/3 260/6 123/6 141/24 256/13 256/16 259/10 257/4 238/19 273/10 273/19 judgements [1] 260/9 judgements [1] 280/14 265/24 269/15 269/19 269/22 271/24 272/1 198/25 218/2 225/20 239/25 itt [521] 276/6 277/4 kill [4] 233/12 254/24 275/12 275/12 275/12 275/15 219/21 278/18 119/20 38/18 70/22 239/25 139/14 180/25 139/24 140/11 133/13 133/18 205/11 kille [3] 205/20 205/20 276/12 277/10 278/4 276/12 277/10 278/4 276/12 277/12 275/15 276/22 277/12 278/12 100/13 136/21 238/9 100/13 16/11 10/11 120/12 108/14 140/17 141/16 129/17 1269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 278/17 281/25 282/13 163/16 163/20 163/23 139/21 140/17 141/16 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>K</td> <td></td>				K	
232/30 203/1 264/10 120/20 121/6 126/9 judges' [1] 107/2 115/20 209/11 254/14 255/6 256/8 invites [1] 45/17 133/16 135/14 146/22 judgment [4] 14/10 128/17/8/3 260/6 123/6 141/24 256/13 256/16 259/10 involved [2] 223/6 238/19 273/10 273/19 judgments [1] 260/9 123/6 141/24 263/17 263/23 264/7 257/4 276/16 279/16 287/3 judgments [1] 180/14 July [4] 178/4 269/10 265/24 269/15 269/19 278/12 278/22 271/5 it [521] it [521] judgment [1] 260/9 kep [1] 23/3 23/8 249/5 276/6 277/4 219/21 278/18 its [56] 13/9 14/10 133/13 133/18 205/11 255/3 255/8 276/2 277/1/2 275/12 27				keep [4] 14/19 62/22	
Invites [1] 45/17 133/16 135/14 146/22 judgment [4] 14/10 keeping [3] 93/9 256/13 256/16 259/10 invoived [9] 75/24 147/13 154/3 155/6 121/4 178/3 260/60 121/4 178/3 260/60 123/6 141/24 263/17 263/23 264/7 79/3 92/8 158/13 276/6 277/4 issuing [1] 123/3 it [521] 276/6 277/4 265/24 269/15 269/19 198/25 218/2 225/20 228/22 271/5 item [3] 30/3 44/1 July 2011 [3] 269/10 275/6 277/4 265/24 269/15 269/19 198/25 218/2 225/20 it [56] 13/9 14/10 13/3/13 133/18 205/11 276/6 277/4 255/3 276/2 277/10 278/8 10n [8] 43/11 88/25 13/9 14/10 133/13 133/18 205/11 255/3 276/2 277/10 278/4 101 [3] 136/1 160/11 19/20 38/18 70/22 19/10 136/12 80/9 205/21 208/20 205/20 278/7 278/9 278/10 201 [4] 13/14 132/16 19/20 38/18 70/22 19/19 17/18 19/18 253/10 205/21 208/20 205/20 278/7 278/9 278/10 201 [1] 12/24 10/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 28/17 281/25 28/13 100/14 12/16 127/12					
147/13 154/3 155/6 127/4 178/3 260/6 123/6 141/24 259/12 260/4 261/2 257/4 238/19 273/10 273/19 judicary [1] 180/4 265/24 269/15 269/19 263/17 263/23 264/7 79/3 92/8 158/13 issuing [1] 123/3 judicary [1] 180/4 269/12 25/24 265/24 269/15 269/19 198/25 218/2 225/20 it [521] judicary [1] 180/4 July [4] 178/4 269/10 276/6 277/4 265/24 269/15 269/19 228/22 271/5 item [3] 30/3 44/1 July 2011 [3] 269/10 276/6 277/4 kill [4] 233/12 254/24 273/20 273/22 273/24 219/21 278/18 item [1] 44/1 jump [6] 40/4 122/6 255/8 255/8 276/2 277/10 278/4 219/21 278/18 19/20 38/18 70/22 jumping [1] 165/22 June [2] 144/21 205/21 208/20 236/7 276/12 275/12 275/15 2101 136/1 160/11 10/27 103/9 104/15 jumping [1] 165/22 June 2007 [1] 269/10 205/21 208/20 236/7 276/12 277/14 102/7 103/9 104/15 102/7 103/9 104/15 jume [2] 144/21 269/10 276/2 277/4 281/7 281/25 282/13 101 136/1 288/9 102/7 103/9 104/15 102/7 103/9 104/15 269/10 276/2 277/14 281/7 281/25 282/13 102/17 103/9 104/15 102/7 103/9 104/15					
257/4 238/19 2/3/10 2/3/19 judicity [1] 200/9 kept [1] 200/9 263/14 200/14 263/17 263/23 264/1 79/3 92/8 158/13 276/16 279/16 287/3 judicity [1] 123/3 judicity [1] 180/14 kept [1] 203/14 265/24 269/15 269/19 198/25 218/2 225/20 it [521] issuing [1] 123/3 july [4] 178/4 269/10 70/12 70/15 70/16 276/2 277/24 272/1 228/22 271/5 item [3] 30/3 44/1 239/25 276/6 277/4 kill [4] 233/12 254/24 273/10 273/10 273/12 275/12 219/21 278/18 its [56] 13/9 14/10 139/13 133/18 205/11 jump [6] 40/4 122/6 255/8 255/8 276/2 277/10 278/4 219/21 278/18 11/9 17/18 19/18 13/13 133/18 205/11 kille [5] 205/20 205/20 278/7 278/9 278/10 210/11 238/9 17/9 17/18 19/18 19/20 38/18 70/22 91/4 99/18 102/5 133/13 133/18 205/11 kilo [5] 205/20 205/20 278/7 278/9 278/10 100 Tugui [4] 88/25 89/10 136/1 238/9 100/7 103/9 104/15 100/7 103/9 104/15 269/10 213/18 219/21 237/19 281/7 281/25 282/13 103/13 10/25 102/7 103/9 104/15 102/7 103/9 104/15 269/10 213/18 219/21 237/19 281/7 281/25 282/13 163/16 163/20 163/23 155/5 135/24 136					
involved [9] 75/24 276/16 279/16 28/73 judiciary [1] 180/14 key [5] 39/18 39/25 265/24 269/15 269/19 79/3 92/8 158/13 issuing [1] 123/3 july [4] 178/4 269/10 276/6 277/4 kill [4] 233/12 254/24 273/22 273/24 228/22 271/5 jumy [3] 30/3 44/1 276/6 277/4 kill [4] 233/12 254/24 275/12 275/12 275/12 219/21 278/18 239/25 jump [6] 40/4 122/6 255/8 255/8 276/2 277/10 278/4 219/21 278/18 its [56] 13/9 14/10 133/13 133/18 205/11 kilo [5] 205/20 205/20 276/2 277/10 278/4 219/10 136/1 268/19 17/9 17/18 19/18 jump [6] 40/4 122/6 255/3 25/3 276/2 277/10 278/4 219/10 136/1 238/9 10/17 10/8 10/25 jumping [1] 165/22 June [2] 144/21 269/10 205/21 208/20 236/7 278/7 28/9 278/10 102/7 103/9 104/15 106/16 110/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 281/7 281/25 282/13 102/7 103/9 104/15 106/16 110/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 248/6 248/24 249/11 195/17 209/25 221/9 163/16 163/20 163/23 is execution [1] 60/11 137/2 137/5 138/22 isue [84] 10/13 10/25 139/21 140/17 141/16 12/15 13/16 16/2		238/19 273/10 273/19	judgments [1] 260/9	kept [1] 285/14	263/17 263/23 264/7
Involved [5] 13/24 issuing [1] 123/3 July [4] 178/4 269/10 70/12 70/15 70/16 269/22 271/24 272/1 79/3 92/8 158/13 issuing [1] 123/3 it [521] issuing [1] 123/3 276/6 277/4 275/8 255/8 275/12 275/1		276/16 279/16 287/3	judiciary [1] 180/14	key [5] 39/18 39/25	
198/25 218/2 225/20 228/22 271/5 involvement [3] 94/3 219/21 278/18 it [521] item [3] 30/3 44/1 239/25 278/6 277/4 219/21 278/18 itil [4] 233/12 254/24 273/20 273/22 273/24 198/25 218/2 2271/5 involvement [3] 94/3 239/25 276/6 277/4 255/8 255/8 276/2 275/12 275/15 219/21 278/18 239/25 item 1 [1] 44/1 jump [6] 40/4 122/6 255/3 255/8 276/2 277/10 278/4 19/20 38/18 70/22 17/9 17/18 19/18 133/13 133/18 205/11 133/13 133/18 205/11 kilo [5] 205/20 205/20 278/7 278/9 278/10 19/20 38/18 70/22 91/4 99/18 102/5 jumping [1] 165/22 June [2] 144/21 205/21 208/20 236/7 281/7 281/25 282/13 19/20 38/18 70/22 91/4 99/18 102/5 jumping [1] 165/22 June [2] 144/21 205/21 208/20 236/7 281/7 281/25 282/13 100/T 136/1 238/9 106/16 110/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 281/7 281/25 282/13 102/7 103/9 104/15 121/7 121/8 121/8 109/25 jurisdictional [1] 257/14 259/18 261/13 269/10 135/5 135/24 136/16 135/5 135/24 136/16 109/25 just [100] 7/2 7/7 7/12 263/22 27/14 259/18 261/13 242/11 243/9 245/23 247/12 247/14 252/5 269/2 275/15 275/25 269/2 275/1		issuing [1] 123/3	July [4] 178/4 269/10		
228/22 271/5 item [3] 30/3 44/1 July 2011 [3] 269/10 25/8 255/8 274/24 275/1 275/9 involvement [3] 94/3 239/25 276/6 277/4 killed [3] 233/8 249/5 276/2 277/10 278/4 19/21 278/18 item 1 [1] 44/1 its [56] 13/9 14/10 133/13 133/18 205/11 255/3 276/2 277/10 278/4 19/20 38/18 70/22 17/9 17/18 19/18 12/3 133/13 133/18 205/11 255/3 205/21 208/20 205/20 278/7 278/9 278/10 19/20 38/18 70/22 91/4 99/18 102/5 10/2/7 103/9 104/15 165/22 June [2] 144/21 269/10 205/21 208/20 205/20 279/11 279/17 279/23 10/2/7 103/9 104/15 100/2/5 100/11 120/12 June [2] 144/21 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 205/21 208/20 236/7 279/11 279/17 279/23 100/2/7 103/9 104/15 106/16 110/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 205/21 208/20 236/7 285/12 1013 10/25 134/14 134/17 134/21 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 248/6 248/24 249/11 195/17 209/25 221/9 135/5 135/24 136/16 137/2 137/5 138/22 139/8 19 10/7 10/8 19/9/2 263/22 263/22 269/2 275/15 275/25 269/2 275/15 275/25 269/2 275/15 275/25		it [521]			
involvement [3] 94/3 239/25 276/6 277/4 275/12 275/12 275/12 275/15 19/21 278/18 item 1 [1] 44/1 jump [6] 40/4 122/6 255/3 276/2 277/10 278/4 10n [8] 43/11 88/25 13/9 14/10 133/13 133/18 205/11 255/3 276/2 277/10 278/4 17/9 17/18 19/18 19/20 38/18 70/22 jumping [1] 165/22 June [2] 144/21 205/21 208/20 236/7 278/7 278/9 278/10 19/20 38/18 70/22 91/4 99/18 102/5 jumping [1] 165/22 June [2] 144/21 269/10 213/18 219/21 237/19 281/7 281/25 282/13 10/20 13/1 238/9 106/16 110/11 120/12 106/16 110/11 120/12 269/10 213/18 219/21 237/19 285/12 108/16 163/20 163/23 134/14 134/17 134/21 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 285/12 133/13 13/2 137/5 138/22 135/5 135/24 136/16 June 2011 [1] 144/21 248/6 248/24 249/11 195/17 209/25 221/9 139/21 140/17 141/16 137/2 137/5 138/22 139/21 140/17 141/16 12/15 13/16 16/2 219/12 269/2 275/15 275/25 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 14/2/24 146/11 146/24 17/15 17/19 19/9 219/12 Xinds [3] 32/10 69/13 269/2 275/15 275/25 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 14/2/24 146					
219/21 278/18 Item 1 [1] 44/1 Jump [6] 40/4 122/6 255/3 276/2 277/10 278/4 10n [8] 43/11 88/25 13/9 14/10 133/13 133/18 205/11 205/21 208/20 236/7 278/7 278/9 278/10 89/10 136/1 160/11 17/9 17/18 19/18 19/20 38/18 70/22 jumping [1] 165/22 kilo [5] 205/20 205/20 279/11 279/17 279/23 19/20 38/18 70/22 91/4 99/18 102/5 jumping [1] 165/22 June [2] 144/21 213/18 219/21 237/19 285/12 89/10 136/1 238/9 102/7 103/9 104/15 106/16 110/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 281/7 281/25 282/13 100/16 110/11 120/12 121/7 121/8 121/8 122/14 122/16 127/23 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 know that [1] 237/16 103/16 163/20 163/23 135/5 135/24 136/16 Juny 211 109/25 263/22 247/12 247/14 252/5 135/5 135/24 136/16 137/2 137/5 138/22 139/8 /19 10/7 10/8 219/12 kinds [3] 32/10 69/13 246/8 278/21 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 142/24 146/11 146/24 17/15 17/19 19/9 Kindg [1] 2/6 219/12 Known [12] 120/17					
Ion [8] 43/11 88/25 89/10 136/1 160/11 214/11 238/9 270/14 Ion Tugui [4] 88/25 89/10 136/1 238/9 IONESCU [1] 2/24 iron [1] 6/6 irrelevant [4] 115/21 163/16 163/20 163/23 is execution [1] 60/11 issuance [1] 173/3 issue [84] 10/13 10/25 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 13/9 14/10 17/9 17/18 19/18 19/20 38/18 70/22 91/4 99/18 102/5 102/7 103/9 104/15 269/10 269/10 106/16 110/11 120/12 121/7 121/8 121/8 102/7 103/9 104/15 102/7 103/9 104/15 121/7 121/8 121/8 102/7 103/9 104/15 122/14 122/16 127/23 109/25 just [100] 7/2 7/7 7/12 8/9 8/19 10/7 10/8 139/21 140/17 141/16 142/24 146/11 146/24 17/15 17/19 19/9 133/13 133/18 205/11 205/21 208/20 236/7 kilometres [1] 200/18 kind [15] 194/19 198/2 237/22 240/23 246/10 248/6 248/24 249/11 257/14 259/18 261/13 263/22 kindly [1] 151/3 kinds [3] 32/10 69/13 219/12 Kingdom [1] 2/6 2/8/7 278/9 278/10 279/17 279/23 285/12 know that [1] 237/16 knowledge [14] 195/17 209/25 221/9 242/11 243/9 245/23 263/22 kindly [1] 151/3 kinds [3] 32/10 69/13 219/12 Kingdom [1] 2/6					
89/10 136/1 160/11 11/9 17/9 17/18 19/18 235/10 205/21 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
214/11 238/9 270/14 19/20 38/18 70/22 Jumping [1] 165/22 Kilometres [1] 220/18 281/7 281/25 282/13 Ion Tugui [4] 88/25 9/14 99/18 102/5 June [2] 144/21 213/18 219/21 237/19 285/12 89/10 136/1 238/9 100/16 110/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 248/6 248/24 249/11 295/12 100/15 16/2 121/7 121/8 121/8 122/14 122/16 127/23 Jurisdictional [1] 257/14 259/18 261/13 242/11 243/9 245/23 163/16 163/20 163/23 135/5 135/24 136/16 135/5 135/24 136/16 109/25 just [100] 7/2 7/7 7/12 Kindly [1] 151/3 247/12 247/14 252/5 issuance [1] 173/3 139/21 140/17 141/16 12/15 13/16 16/2 8/9 8/19 10/7 10/8 219/12 Kindly [1] 2/6 276/8 278/17 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 142/24 146/11 146/24 17/15 17/19 19/9 Kindly [1] 2/6 141/8 214/20 214/21					
Ion Tugui [4] 88/25 89/10 136/1 238/9 9/14 99/18 102/5 102/7 103/9 104/15 June [2] 144/21 269/10 Xind [15] 194/19 198/2 213/18 219/21 237/19 237/22 240/23 246/10 Xind [11] 237/16 know that [1] 237/16 IONESCU [1] 2/24 iron [1] 6/6 irrelevant [4] 115/21 163/16 163/20 163/23 is execution [1] 60/11 issuance [1] 173/3 issue [84] 10/13 10/25 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 102/7 103/9 104/15 102/7 103/9 104/15 102/7 103/9 104/15 122/14 122/16 127/23 134/14 134/17 134/21 134/14 134/17 134/21 135/5 135/24 136/16 137/2 137/5 138/22 139/21 140/17 141/16 142/24 146/11 146/24 June 2007 [1] 269/10 June 2007 [1] 269/10 June 2007 [1] 269/10 June 2011 [1] 144/21 257/14 259/18 261/13 263/22 Xind [15] 194/19 198/2 213/18 219/21 237/19 242/12 247/14 252/5 263/22 Kind [15] 194/19 198/2 213/18 219/21 237/19 242/12 247/14 252/5 263/22 Kind [15] 194/19 198/2 213/18 219/21 237/19 242/17 240/13 247/14 263/22 Kind [16] 2 242/12 247/14 252/5 269/2 275/15 275/25 issuance [1] 173/3 issue [84] 10/13 10/25 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 139/21 140/17 141/16 142/24 146/11 146/24 8/9 8/19 10/7 10/8 12/15 13/16 16/2 17/15 17/19 19/9 Xinds [3] 32/10 69/13 219/12 276/8 278/17 known [12] 120/17 141/8 214/20 214/21					
89/10 136/1 238/9 10/1 102/7 103/9 104/15 209/10 10NESCU [1] 2/24 106/16 110/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 237/22 240/23 246/10 109/25 221/9 10S/16 163/20 163/23 106/16 110/11 120/12 June 2007 [1] 269/10 248/6 248/24 249/11 195/17 209/25 221/9 163/16 163/20 163/23 134/14 134/17 134/21 109/25 263/22 263/22 kindly [1] 151/3 242/11 243/9 242/11 247/12 247/14 257/14 259/18 263/22 kindly [1] 151/3 263/22 263/22 kindly [1] 151/3 269/2 275/15 275/25 269/2 275/15 275/25 276/8 276/8 278/17 269/2 276/8 278/17 219/12 11/12 11/1 120/17 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 21	Ion Tugui [4] 88/25				
IONESCO [1] 2/24 iron [1] 6/6 irrelevant [4] 115/21 163/16 163/20 163/23 is execution [1] 60/11 issuance [1] 173/3 issue [84] 10/13 10/25 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 121/7 121/8 121/8 121/7 121/8 121/8 122/14 122/16 127/23 134/14 134/17 134/21 135/5 135/24 136/16 137/2 137/5 138/22 139/21 140/17 141/16 142/24 146/11 146/24 June 2011 [1] 144/21 Jurisdictional [1] Jurisdictional [1] Jurisdictional [1] 109/25 just [100] 7/2 7/7 7/12 8/9 8/19 10/7 10/8 12/15 13/16 16/2 17/15 17/19 19/9 248/6 248/24 249/11 257/14 259/18 261/13 263/22 kindly [1] 151/3 kinds [3] 32/10 69/13 219/12 Kingdom [1] 2/6 195/17 209/25 221/9 242/11 243/9 245/23 247/12 247/14 252/5 269/2 275/15 275/25 269/2 275/15 275/25 276/8 278/17 known [12] 120/17 141/8 214/20 214/21					
irron [1] 6/6 irrelevant [4] 115/21 122/14 122/16 127/23 jurisdictional [1] 257/14 259/18 261/13 242/11 243/9 245/23 163/16 163/20 163/23 134/14 134/17 134/21 109/25 109/25 263/22 247/12 247/14 252/5 269/2 275/15 275/25 issuance [1] 173/3 139/21 140/17 141/16 137/2 137/5 138/22 8/9 8/19 10/7 10/8 219/12 219/12 260/2 276/13 219/12 276/8 278/17 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 142/24 146/11 146/24 17/15 17/19 19/9 17/15 17/19 19/9 Kingdom [1] 2/6 141/8 214/20 214/21	IONESCU [1] 2/24				
163/16 163/20 163/23 134/14 134/17 134/21 109/25 263/22 247/12 247/14 252/5 163/16 163/20 163/23 135/5 135/24 136/16 109/25 263/22 kindly [1] 151/3 269/2 247/12 247/14 252/5 269/2 275/15 275/25 269/2 275/15 275/25 269/2 275/15 275/25 276/8 278/17 139/21 140/17 141/16 12/15 13/16 16/2 19/12 19/12 kinds [3] 32/10 69/13 219/12 known [12] 120/17 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 141/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8 141/8 214/20 214/21 141/8	iron [1] 6/6				
163/16 163/20 163/23 135/5 135/24 136/16 just [100] 7/2 7/7 7/12 kindly [1] 151/3 269/2 275/15 275/25 issuance [1] 173/3 139/21 140/17 141/16 12/15 13/16 16/2 12/15 13/16 16/2 219/12 Kindly [1] 2/6 269/2 275/15 275/25 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 142/24 146/11 146/24 17/15 17/19 19/9 Kindly [1] 151/3 269/2 275/15 275/25 276/8 278/17	irrelevant [4] 115/21				
is execution [1] 60/11 137/2 137/5 138/22 8/9 8/19 10/7 10/8 kinds [3] 32/10 69/13 276/8 278/17 issue [84] 10/13 10/25 139/21 140/17 141/16 12/15 13/16 16/2 219/12 kinds [1] 2/6 219/12 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 142/24 146/11 146/24 17/15 17/19 19/9 Kingdom [1] 2/6 141/8 214/20 214/21					
issuance [1] 17/3/3 139/21 140/17 141/16 12/15 13/16 16/2 219/12 known [12] 120/17 issue [84] 10/13 10/25 142/24 146/11 146/24 17/15 17/19 19/9 Kingdom [1] 2/6 141/8 214/20 214/21	is execution [1] 60/11				
Issue [84] 10/13 10/25 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6 11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6		120/21 140/17 141/16			
11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6					
www.dianaburden.com	11/20 13/2 14/19 15/6				
www.dianaburden.com					
			www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-28
К	146/10 146/20 146/24	landowner [18] 49/11	lasted [1] 65/24	lawyers [12] 182/10
known [8] 269/16	147/19 147/21 149/7	62/7 76/13 76/22 77/2	lastly [1] 8/16	187/10 216/12 220/12
275/7 275/18 276/3	149/15 157/13 157/16	77/7 77/12 78/1 78/4	late [10] 12/11 13/12	246/2 248/7 249/8
277/10 277/13 277/20	158/18 158/21 159/3	160/24 161/1 165/2	44/12 45/23 45/24	257/15 259/5 259/6
278/2	159/25 160/18 160/20	201/5 201/6 201/23	46/7 89/14 90/14	259/6 260/18
knows [1] 112/23	161/12 161/14 163/9	232/25 270/1 280/22	92/22 200/23	LEA [2] 2/20 11/11
KOPECKY [43] 4/3	164/7 169/8 169/11	landowners [64] 43/3		lead [2] 8/11 52/3
9/5 9/17 12/13 133/13	170/9 171/8 173/9	43/6 43/14 47/17	[1] 200/23	leading [1] 211/2
186/8 202/6 202/10	174/14 174/21 179/16	47/19 47/20 48/20	late February [1]	leads [4] 43/16 52/18
205/3 206/4 208/4	179/20 180/2 190/23	49/4 50/21 51/12	89/14	101/24 140/1
208/17 209/12 210/24	194/9 194/10 194/12	55/15 55/17 55/24	late March 2011 [1]	Leanca [1] 231/6
213/25 216/5 218/23	195/3 198/14 199/2	56/4 56/11 56/15	90/14	learn [2] 12/24 245/1
220/9 221/3 222/16	199/11 206/22 209/20	57/11 72/11 73/4	later [26] 14/11 46/15	lease [159] 43/13
224/7 224/21 225/1	210/8 210/13 211/21	75/11 77/16 77/18	52/25 66/11 66/22	45/22 47/11 47/20
227/21 228/5 231/9	211/22 211/25 212/1	78/13 78/19 78/24	67/2 68/5 68/6 74/5	48/11 48/11 48/17
232/5 233/6 234/1	212/5 215/4 215/9	84/21 85/15 85/16	75/7 82/12 83/3 83/11	48/25 49/24 50/6
234/11 235/3 235/9	215/15 216/18 217/13	89/20 91/6 91/19	91/9 116/19 125/1	53/20 53/20 56/22
236/12 236/21 236/24	219/10 220/25 225/12	91/24 92/2 92/15	136/6 156/2 156/8	56/25 57/9 57/13 58/
242/4 244/24 247/7	226/23 229/8 230/5	131/16 158/17 159/12	207/19 220/19 233/3	58/6 60/12 60/25 62/
249/8 267/3 268/8	237/5 237/8 238/1	160/22 161/7 162/13	234/8 239/4 277/4	62/6 62/24 63/2 63/1
268/10 272/12	238/3 238/10 242/6	163/11 165/19 171/16	280/2	66/9 71/24 72/2 72/1
Kopecky's [1] 231/24	244/13 244/20 250/6	171/18 171/20 175/13	latest [1] 89/13	73/1 73/3 73/9 75/10
KOZAK [9] 4/17 9/9	254/5 269/12 269/13	178/22 179/15 179/18	laughed [1] 246/3	75/23 75/25 76/8 77/
9/19 160/11 211/16	270/1 271/16 271/17	180/9 182/20 208/21	launch [1] 226/5	77/12 77/19 78/18
211/20 214/12 238/8	272/3 273/18 273/25	213/3 213/11 221/22	law [88] 8/11 8/14	78/20 78/21 80/18
242/14	274/1 280/2 282/1	226/16 226/24 227/7	39/21 51/3 51/13 52/6	82/10 84/7 85/25 86/
KPMG [5] 4/17 4/17	284/9	232/2 233/24 236/8	54/20 58/10 58/17	89/19 89/24 93/10
21/5 21/8 21/9	Laguardia's [29]	250/24 255/17 256/10	58/20 59/14 59/15	
Kraven [1] 11/12	47/14 64/25 82/5 88/4	landowners' [2] 39/8	59/16 60/13 62/21	112/16 112/19 113/9
 I	89/23 93/7 94/10 94/20 105/11 105/20	85/9	63/5 63/13 63/15	113/23 113/25 117/1
<u>L</u>	113/24 120/16 130/6	landownership [1] 47/16	63/19 71/8 75/12 76/2 77/11 78/8 78/14	117/16 117/19 118/1 120/24 124/9 124/10
I.kopecky [1] 4/8	130/17 135/9 136/10	landplots [1] 164/24	96/10 99/2 99/15	120/24 124/9 124/10
la [1] 2/14	136/12 136/18 137/14	lands [21] 39/8 55/20	99/16 99/22 99/23	125/19 126/12 127/5
lack [5] 96/8 109/6	139/20 140/15 157/5	88/17 88/23 89/5	99/24 100/1 100/24	127/8 127/9 130/14
111/5 119/25 120/5	169/18 195/1 196/17	89/11 89/25 91/5	101/23 104/2 108/19	155/22 155/23 159/9
lacked [2] 122/22	198/25 199/13 220/2	131/17 164/6 165/10	109/3 111/7 111/14	159/12 160/21 160/24
123/13	271/22	179/17 182/17 230/6	116/4 118/13 120/24	161/6 161/18 162/4
lacking [1] 62/9	land [78] 39/11 58/9	230/16 245/14 249/21	121/21 122/24 124/24	162/14 162/25 163/7
ladies [1] 153/16	73/11 85/9 89/4 89/15	249/24 251/6 271/23	124/25 125/7 125/12	163/13 163/14 163/1
Laguardia [152] 38/6	91/7 91/19 91/21 92/3	274/25	125/17 125/19 127/22	164/9 164/14 164/25
38/17 38/18 39/10	92/5 92/12 126/2	language [21] 32/9	128/10 128/13 128/21	165/2 165/5 165/16
39/14 41/20 45/1	126/4 130/13 130/14	65/10 79/8 79/15	129/13 129/16 130/7	168/22 175/1 176/17
47/17 48/20 55/20	157/25 162/18 163/12	109/16 109/16 110/5	131/22 132/2 155/23	176/24 179/5 179/6
55/23 56/10 56/14	164/2 164/5 164/7	127/25 128/24 160/15	155/24 158/5 158/8	179/18 180/3 182/17
57/15 57/17 62/9	164/11 164/22 175/6	190/20 192/19 192/22	158/10 161/19 162/2	185/2 195/5 195/12
63/18 63/25 72/10	175/12 175/19 187/13	218/24 219/22 242/1	169/6 172/6 173/17	195/21 195/23 196/3
72/18 73/12 74/19	188/8 188/10 194/21	254/14 256/23 257/15	174/9 176/10 176/13	196/10 201/4 201/15
75/11 83/16 86/5	196/9 197/25 201/8	267/17 281/18	176/20 177/1 178/25	201/24 202/1 203/4
86/12 86/14 86/22	201/12 201/18 201/20	large [7] 102/4 102/5	180/8 181/19 182/1	203/9 205/1 205/6
86/24 87/20 88/12	202/3 202/25 203/3	118/5 164/6 167/13	182/7 208/7 208/8	205/19 206/13 210/1
88/15 88/22 89/20	203/4 204/22 204/25	167/21 203/15	208/14 218/8 241/2	212/13 212/18 214/1
89/24 91/4 91/16	205/1 205/11 205/18	largely [1] 153/18	241/7 254/14 274/11	214/22 216/20 216/2
92/17 93/15 93/16	206/3 206/6 206/13	larger [1] 43/5	laws [2] 121/8 180/13	219/15 219/16 219/1
94/3 94/17 106/2	222/19 224/13 225/5	LARS [2] 3/18 137/8	lawsuits [1] 105/16	219/20 219/20 221/1
106/16 113/7 113/13	226/10 227/8 231/8	last [24] 8/16 11/13	lawyer [23] 167/6	222/25 223/4 223/5
113/17 114/8 114/20	234/11 234/12 236/2	13/13 30/3 35/19	174/16 184/6 216/2	223/16 223/17 223/2
119/21 122/13 122/16	236/7 238/24 239/7	37/10 53/11 53/12	217/17 217/19 218/5	238/25 239/16 240/7
129/6 129/18 130/3	247/1 247/1 248/25	63/8 101/1 106/20	218/6 219/1 221/4	240/8 240/10 240/17
130/5 130/19 130/25	249/24 250/13 251/25	116/1 117/6 163/19	221/11 223/22 225/1	240/21 241/7 242/22
131/12 132/4 134/10	252/14 253/6 269/18	168/20 184/2 188/7	236/17 247/23 254/11	242/24 242/25 250/1
135/17 136/3 137/2	269/24 270/2 270/5	225/22 230/12 231/25	254/22 258/5 258/11	255/19 270/2 280/1
137/5 141/16 141/21	271/10 272/4 274/2	237/18 238/18 256/15	258/16 258/21 259/13	280/8 280/17 280/18
142/20 143/10 143/12	280/25 283/2	285/15	259/15	282/2
145/4 145/5 146/10	200120 20012	200/10	200/10	
		<u> </u>		
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	Word In
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	Revise

ndex sed

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
1	224/23 225/3 225/4	lei [9] 222/24 223/2	218/17 219/5 219/9	limit [1] 173/13
	226/15 237/7 237/12	223/16 223/20 232/22	219/16 219/19 219/25	limited [9] 16/11 45/7
lease execution [1] 47/11	241/2 242/5 242/6	240/21 241/7 256/18	220/3 220/16 242/23	78/21 93/19 111/10
leased [9] 55/20 88/16	242/9 242/14 251/24	256/24	Levintsa's [1] 161/25	123/7 133/2 133/9
88/23 89/5 91/5 92/3	252/4 255/16 255/18	LELIA [1] 2/25	liability [4] 144/19	281/6
106/16 130/13 249/25	256/24 257/1 261/10	lengths [1] 100/13	147/19 147/21 162/10	LINDINGER [1] 4/4
leases [207] 35/20	261/22 262/15 271/8	lengthy [1] 17/1	life [5] 115/2 115/9	line [15] 8/14 31/8
35/25 38/14 48/10	274/23 274/24 280/4	lens [1] 112/22	221/5 246/19 248/10	32/14 32/23 44/15
48/14 48/18 49/17	leasing [2] 236/1		lifted [1] 254/2	70/6 115/11 160/13
50/3 50/3 51/11 51/24	243/1	202/10	light [6] 12/7 25/23	165/6 165/7 277/1
52/5 52/8 54/19 54/23	least [14] 8/17 10/24	Leon Kopecky [3] 9/5		281/3 282/18 282/20 283/8
55/8 55/9 55/16 55/23	61/1 61/16 61/24 104/2 133/1 133/8	9/17 202/10 less [4] 146/16 185/10	193/8	lines [2] 129/11
56/3 56/10 56/13 57/2	143/8 146/16 155/2	236/10 251/22	11/9 12/10 14/9 14/11	129/13
57/5 57/8 57/15 57/17	167/18 185/1 252/17	lessee [7] 39/9 175/3	14/14 14/16 17/4	linguistic [1] 127/23
57/19 57/20 57/22	leave [11] 13/25 90/7	175/4 179/16 282/9	20/13 21/10 21/15	list [5] 2/1 3/1 4/1 9/12
57/23 58/2 58/8 59/8	115/14 152/7 247/6	282/11 282/24	21/21 22/6 22/24 25/9	9/21
62/1 62/4 62/8 62/10	248/12 248/16 248/17	lessees [1] 80/8	30/25 42/1 43/11	listen [9] 187/10
62/10 62/17 62/20 63/10 63/18 64/1	248/19 258/4 260/21	lessor [10] 76/12	43/12 43/25 46/17	222/18 222/22 225/4
64/25 65/2 65/8 68/21	leaves [1] 13/20	76/20 79/10 80/2 80/9	47/3 49/20 49/22 52/3	227/22 248/25 249/4
71/5 71/6 71/20 72/18	leaving [3] 156/19	80/11 81/20 162/6	52/14 53/2 53/9 53/10	253/4 259/22
72/22 73/12 73/14	251/22 252/3	179/1 283/8	53/16 54/15 54/18	listened [1] 286/11
73/20 82/5 85/14	led [1] 134/10	lessors [6] 80/14	54/22 55/6 55/22 56/1	listening [1] 286/17
86/13 88/4 89/18	leeway [1] 276/12	80/18 81/4 81/10	56/8 57/7 62/13 63/14	literature [1] 140/3
89/24 90/3 93/5 94/17	left [24] 6/12 6/13	114/11 114/14	67/22 68/2 69/1 70/10	
94/22 96/8 96/9 96/24	11/10 12/4 94/12	let [15] 8/9 20/18	71/2 80/16 81/2 82/1	169/25 170/2 170/4
96/25 97/10 97/11	118/15 118/21 129/20 210/1 211/3 227/22	20/23 20/24 26/25 120/21 130/1 130/9	82/2 86/3 86/21 88/18 92/20 95/19 96/6	174/10 220/8 262/20
106/2 113/16 113/17	231/21 234/15 252/5	155/5 219/14 231/10	96/10 96/23 97/12	litigations [1] 172/1 little [19] 9/10 18/24
113/24 114/8 114/13	253/1 253/5 255/21	237/16 246/23 248/3	97/13 98/8 99/5	20/4 30/23 37/14 46/3
117/7 117/10 121/18	256/1 256/6 257/22	277/25	100/25 101/15 105/9	49/12 50/10 50/14
125/21 126/5 127/15	263/4 268/4 270/2	let's [21] 28/1 28/21	105/13 112/7 114/24	55/6 61/1 97/6 97/8
130/7 130/11 130/17	273/7	33/1 61/21 65/22	114/24 116/1 116/6	107/20 120/22 246/20
130/20 130/21 131/10 131/13 132/1 154/18	legal [66] 4/16 7/19	133/12 142/22 151/9	117/16 133/11 134/3	255/13 272/25 279/18
154/20 157/15 157/25	8/10 8/22 9/7 11/19	168/3 183/7 186/3	134/20 136/20 137/19	live [4] 85/19 166/12
158/2 158/14 158/15	30/4 31/16 31/22	204/18 206/8 210/11	143/16 151/21 154/21	234/21 279/22
158/20 159/3 159/18	33/16 46/23 52/20	210/15 210/17 212/12	160/1 160/1 160/4	lived [1] 168/1
159/20 159/23 159/24	52/23 58/12 60/10	213/14 231/23 266/13	166/1 174/18 189/11	lives [1] 226/12
160/9 160/16 160/19	61/20 63/6 68/25	281/22	189/13 189/15 190/17	living [1] 286/16
161/5 161/7 161/11	69/23 96/11 97/8	letter [16] 13/4 83/16	194/6 196/10 196/16	LLOYD [1] 2/22
161/13 161/21 161/24	100/19 100/20 100/21 103/13 118/12 118/18	110/5 190/21 190/23 191/5 191/25 192/1	197/21 197/21 197/23 198/2 201/7 201/21	loan [3] 234/10 234/20 235/1
162/2 162/3 162/11	119/3 119/4 119/8	192/5 192/6 192/11	202/16 205/16 206/10	local [81] 24/5 38/22
162/20 163/8 163/17	122/22 123/13 124/22	193/11 193/14 251/12	208/7 208/19 212/13	41/6 43/3 43/9 43/9
163/21 165/10 165/21	127/18 127/21 134/22	251/16 254/7	213/8 213/9 213/13	43/10 43/12 47/2
166/2 166/10 166/21	147/11 162/23 166/19	letters [1] 41/5	213/15 213/18 217/23	47/12 47/13 48/4 48/6
167/1 167/2 168/3 168/11 169/17 169/23	167/7 169/10 169/13	level [38] 42/20 48/4	218/14 223/3 229/21	48/7 53/23 54/23 55/3
175/1 176/21 178/24	171/3 174/17 177/9	48/5 48/6 48/7 50/19	231/9 236/5 237/3	55/13 55/14 55/16
179/3 179/16 185/2	177/23 177/25 182/8	50/24 51/3 93/21	237/6 237/13 237/16	55/18 55/19 60/19
195/8 195/8 195/8	207/10 207/11 207/22	95/14 98/13 98/17	239/8 239/10 239/25	70/20 86/6 86/23 87/7
200/22 203/6 203/13	208/7 238/2 243/17	101/22 102/11 102/24	245/7 246/23 247/4	88/14 91/3 93/10
207/5 207/25 209/19	246/14 257/25 258/2	103/1 103/15 103/18	248/3 248/8 254/10	93/19 94/14 94/15
209/22 210/4 210/8	258/25 266/8 266/14	104/9 104/12 104/25	254/13 255/6 255/10	95/1 95/1 95/15 97/24
210/10 210/24 210/24	266/15 266/17 273/15	111/11 121/14 121/15	255/22 255/25 257/13	98/18 98/21 99/1 99/2
211/9 211/14 211/24	274/7 274/17 287/1 legality [4] 108/14	121/15 121/16 138/25 173/23 181/24 198/7	262/17 268/17 275/4 275/11 276/17 276/18	100/6 101/5 103/6 103/9 103/21 103/25
211/25 212/11 212/22	108/24 122/9 125/13	245/12 249/18 249/19	282/8 283/13 283/20	105/5 106/9 106/12
213/8 213/17 214/10	legally [2] 77/5 94/21	249/23 251/4 271/7	284/2 284/2 284/11	108/4 109/11 109/23
215/23 216/18 217/5	legislation [2] 64/13	277/2 278/13	285/25	110/2 110/12 110/18
217/7 217/9 217/23	99/18	levels [4] 50/19	likely [6] 74/3 74/6	112/25 114/4 136/21
218/18 219/2 219/5 219/11 221/15 221/21	legitimate [9] 40/6	121/12 140/23 170/22	74/7 89/13 109/4	137/10 138/12 139/11
222/4 222/15 223/8	43/15 43/20 44/13	Levintsa [16] 161/23	113/14	139/12 140/9 140/11
223/12 224/1 224/6	46/18 46/19 52/19	161/24 169/20 169/21	Lilia [2] 94/15 94/18	142/2 144/10 149/1
224/16 224/20 224/22	53/3 61/9	169/22 207/20 218/11	Lilian [1] 192/10	149/15 159/11 170/14
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
L	lots [1] 285/22	129/23 197/25 214/2	135/14 137/24 138/9	283/19 283/21 284/4
local [10] 170/25	love [1] 38/5	maladministration [1]	138/12 138/19 139/13	284/7 284/25
178/16 181/4 206/7	lovely [1] 6/3	104/12	148/1 149/11 149/14	Mayor Ivanes [1] 72/1
220/5 229/10 229/12	low [10] 98/17 102/11	man [8] 38/1 38/3	227/8 277/6 286/10	mayor's [26] 64/6
229/13 229/19 269/24	102/24 103/15 103/18	206/25 208/1 229/24	matters [15] 7/9 19/15	68/15 76/20 81/5
localised [2] 143/21	104/12 104/25 111/11 181/24 198/15	275/22 285/19 285/21 manage [2] 174/10	20/5 20/8 20/21 58/5 118/18 119/3 172/18	82/16 82/20 88/3 94/19 120/19 123/1
148/24	lower [3] 121/14	175/18	187/6 187/22 219/10	123/7 123/17 124/4
locate [4] 192/1 193/1	144/23 146/9	management [1]	219/12 236/23 287/12	131/6 158/19 159/19
195/12 196/1	LUCIA [2] 3/5 8/16	157/3	max [1] 132/17	162/24 166/17 170/10
located [2] 42/13	lucky [1] 260/2	managing [4] 155/11	may [66] 6/25 13/25	173/22 174/7 176/15
141/13 logic [3] 67/9 115/24	lunch [7] 31/3 31/10	165/14 185/20 248/6	14/15 15/1 15/20	201/15 241/4 243/12
147/23	31/17 122/4 151/8	mandatory [7] 110/20	16/21 18/7 18/22 36/6	243/16
London [2] 2/6 268/3	151/15 152/12	123/22 128/11 162/5	37/4 37/5 40/19 47/5	mayoral [6] 63/12
long [9] 17/1 43/17	Luncheon [1] 153/11	162/7 162/9 172/23	50/8 53/10 58/22	65/4 105/18 106/4
66/1 71/21 145/18	М	manner [2] 137/7	63/15 64/9 64/17	113/23 128/14
150/14 156/9 199/7	machinery [1] 143/4	174/17	67/23 68/3 69/2 72/23	mayorally [1] 81/21
214/13	made [34] 9/15 12/4	many [39] 38/10 39/18 40/2 45/18 56/3 56/23	75/22 77/20 78/17 81/8 90/7 90/18 95/13	mayors [61] 43/9 47/12 48/8 52/11
long-term [1] 156/9	18/25 23/14 39/1 41/8	57/13 70/19 74/13	96/18 97/8 106/23	53/14 53/21 54/24
longer [1] 152/24	46/14 52/15 53/12	79/13 79/13 81/1	107/14 111/24 111/24	64/24 66/4 66/7 66/14
look [49] 12/16 22/3	61/18 91/15 92/25	85/22 90/21 118/17	118/14 119/13 120/12	66/19 67/4 67/6 67/11
27/25 28/2 28/25 31/2	93/3 99/1 103/8 112/2	119/9 121/12 124/7	121/16 125/10 133/23	67/19 72/9 73/18 74/8
32/22 44/21 48/16 54/13 56/11 68/12	113/8 121/24 135/4	137/16 160/16 160/17	150/14 153/7 155/3	75/9 75/13 75/24 85/2
76/16 79/14 83/8	138/18 147/1 156/17	162/11 163/9 163/10	158/3 160/17 163/18	88/21 93/10 99/1 99/6
83/19 86/17 86/20	157/17 187/3 213/23	167/18 167/19 167/24	167/6 167/18 168/4	99/9 99/11 99/17
88/6 88/24 105/21	214/1 238/2 238/13	184/7 195/8 203/21	180/25 181/4 184/10	99/22 100/22 100/24
118/18 123/16 131/5	248/16 248/19 249/11	207/4 210/7 238/12	202/11 205/25 209/10	100/25 101/5 101/7
135/25 160/1 160/4	251/3 260/9 271/20	242/6 263/19 271/1	216/17 232/13 244/4	101/17 101/19 101/21
162/13 179/11 183/7	magnificently [1] 6/14 magnitude [1] 236/10	271/1 277/15 280/9 March [19] 83/10	261/5 264/18 265/12 265/19 268/10 286/15	101/21 103/17 103/17 103/20 105/19 106/5
183/12 183/15 191/10	mail [1] 254/6	83/18 83/21 89/9	maybe [22] 9/13 20/13	
191/14 204/8 210/11	main [5] 2/20 11/11	89/10 89/13 90/14	26/23 73/16 150/23	120/4 120/16 123/9
210/15 210/17 215/1	138/21 144/18 253/9	92/22 157/6 157/6	217/20 218/25 219/1	128/16 128/23 130/5
216/6 216/19 219/24 223/13 265/11 268/15	MAIN-KLINGST [2]	157/11 170/25 176/6	219/22 220/16 223/21	130/10 130/23 131/14
272/22 277/6 282/15	2/20 11/11	176/8 244/23 252/21	224/7 228/5 250/11	131/15 131/19 213/3
284/25	maintains [1] 122/23	253/23 254/18 255/3	257/13 257/16 275/23	227/12
looked [4] 19/5	major [1] 246/9	March 2010 [1] 157/6	276/6 282/11 282/12	mayors' [1] 132/5
105/12 195/21 258/24	majority [6] 46/8	margin [1] 137/14	284/23 284/24	MDL [1] 175/20
looking [17] 27/13	54/19 56/9 57/10 71/7	Marie [1] 2/10	mayor [85] 66/25	me [116] 8/9 8/11
45/8 45/10 54/3 118/6	72/7 make [57] 7/13 15/5	marked [1] 35/12	67/13 67/23 71/15 72/1 72/15 72/23 73/5	12/15 30/18 32/4
134/6 134/25 135/11	17/3 23/12 26/6 33/19	market [1] 45/3 marketing [1] 157/24	73/6 75/2 76/8 76/14	43/16 46/8 52/18 61/17 72/13 72/16
146/25 148/9 169/25	37/10 54/18 60/5 63/9	marriage [3] 128/5	76/22 76/24 77/2 77/8	74/17 101/24 120/21
190/1 202/17 205/1	64/16 64/21 71/13	128/5 249/13	77/9 78/3 78/5 78/9	130/1 130/9 133/14
222/17 231/18 241/9	81/4 81/11 90/23	MARTIN [3] 4/17 9/9	79/3 79/24 80/3 80/4	138/1 143/17 144/1
looks [3] 189/11 189/13 201/7	96/23 97/12 110/19	9/19	80/10 80/12 81/22	145/12 150/13 155/5
losing [3] 145/20	116/1 116/6 117/6	Martin Kozak [1] 9/19	81/23 86/25 89/3	156/22 157/5 157/12
145/24 259/24	130/1 134/2 135/23	Master [1] 174/18	89/21 91/2 91/6 91/13	168/8 168/9 184/5
loss [1] 116/8	145/22 146/1 147/24	material [10] 18/2	91/16 91/18 91/20	184/8 187/9 191/12
losses [2] 118/8	148/7 148/18 174/5	29/24 29/25 129/21	91/24 91/25 92/4 92/5	192/10 192/11 197/6
271/24	179/7 181/2 181/14 184/5 186/17 188/7	129/24 129/25 132/15	92/11 92/14 93/1	199/8 204/18 205/16
lost [7] 115/13 135/5	188/17 189/15 189/25	133/9 152/4 152/8	93/13 95/1 100/5	205/25 206/6 206/8
135/11 146/25 149/14	194/24 195/1 195/11	materials [1] 26/7 mathematical [2] 25/5	100/7 106/18 114/6 123/4 125/1 127/8	206/8 207/20 207/22 208/20 209/23 209/23
175/25 184/19	208/25 209/4 209/8	25/9	127/9 127/18 130/20	210/10 212/25 213/9
lot [24] 17/3 17/24	213/25 225/6 229/21	Matrix [1] 2/5	162/22 166/5 166/5	215/20 217/19 218/15
38/15 42/13 46/15 62/24 129/21 165/5	233/2 257/9 258/17	matrixlaw.co.uk [1]	166/20 167/5 168/8	219/2 219/7 219/14
166/15 187/12 195/7	263/7 263/8 266/11	2/7	173/24 174/4 177/16	220/15 221/5 221/6
220/19 223/20 224/5	266/25 279/18	matter [27] 13/23 14/1		222/11 224/9 224/9
228/7 237/2 237/11	makes [1] 144/15	15/4 16/20 26/17 40/1	213/16 222/6 223/7	224/10 224/12 225/11
246/16 247/7 247/9	making [11] 6/16 50/5	77/11 81/9 93/25	224/8 228/3 231/1	228/6 228/13 229/4
249/4 256/7 275/22	52/22 52/24 97/21 98/12 103/11 104/8	102/17 106/17 112/17	231/5 243/18 281/1	229/4 231/4 231/6
285/11	50/12 100/11 10 4 /0	128/18 134/6 134/9	283/9 283/11 283/14	231/6 231/12 231/20
		www.dionahurdan.ac		
		www.dianaburden.com		

M 107/24 160/7 160/7 273/2 135/10 135/17 135/2 75/12 96/9 99/2 99/15 323/11 224/22 36/7 75/22 476/1 Minister [1] 144/22 136/11 137/1 139/25 99/24 100/1 100/19 237/13 223/23 236/7 memory [3] 46/8 276/20 Minister [2] 276/20 198/3 99/24 100/1 100/19 245/24 246/25 247/4 747/14 747/31 316/10 135/17 135/24 99/24 100/1 100/19 99/24 100/1 100/19 245/24 246/25 247/4 747/14 747/3 316/32 326/25 motification [1] 27/2 111/14 116/31 110/13 247/7 247/11 477/3 173/23 28/25 minot [1] 145/13 minot [1] 145/13 modification [2] 19/24 126/71 1277/13 127/22 252/1 258/45 246/14 176/24 108/4 motify [1] 145/13 minot [1] 145/13 motify [1] 145/13 107/24 110/17 119/17 131/2 132/24 144/2 259/17 253/25 7/14 278/1 179/17 72/24 128/17 136/34 168/4 193/20 136/34 18/3 137/24 128/17 136/34 18/3 27/14 259/17 179/24 108/4 motify [1] 26/21 170/17 19/17 170/17 19/17 137/17 126/17 137/17 126/17 137/17 126/17 137/17 126/17 137/17 126/17 137/17 126/17	ICSID ARB 16 8 Zhigniow Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
Inst. Fe (1) Inst. Fe (1)<	-	-		135/10 135/17 135/24	75/12 96/9 99/2 99/15
233/11 234/23 2367 11/19/14/22 11/19/14/23 100/13 233/12 234/23 2367 11/19/14/23 10/19/14/23 10/19/14/23 24/016 244/25 245/21 22/03 27/03 27/04/23 10/19/14/23 24/07 244/25 244/23 27/04/23 10/19/14/23 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 24/07 24/04/24 27/04/24 10/12/3 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 24/07 24/04/24 10/12/3 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 24/07 24/04/24 10/12/3 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 25/04/14/22/24 10/12/3 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 25/04/14/22/24 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 10/11/14/24 25/04/14/22/24 10/11/14/24 10/11/		164/20 169/2 170/19	Minister to [1] 273/12		99/16 99/18 99/22
237/13 232/13 memory [3] 438 minister [2] 27/620 modification [1] 225 245/22 246/22 246/22 226/21 276 modification [2] 21 245/22 246/22 24/12 246/22 24/12 246/22 24/12 246/22 24/12		175/24 178/14		141/19 143/3 196/21	99/24 100/1 100/19
240/16 244/25 244/25 244/25 244/25 244/25 244/25 1119/21 1119/					
245/22 246/25 247/2 Ministry [7] 258/14 277/14 1111 111 111 111<					
24/17 24/17 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
24/12 24/12 24/12 24/12 24/12 12/14 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
220/10 220/10<	247/25 248/23 249/11				
144/2 236/10 274/22 97/10 4/12 4/12 4/17 1/12 1/12 1/12 1/2/2 1/4/22 285/2 257/14 286/11 70/24 108/4 minus [2] 137/17 1/8/3 7/8/3					
259/1 (239/1 (
200/3 20/14 20/17 20/07 70/24 108/4 184/8 41/12 41/13 44/21 14/12 41/14 41/13 44/21 14/12 41/14 41/14 44/14/14 14/12 41/14 41/14 44/14/14 14/12 41/14 41/14 44/14 14/12 41/14 41/14 44/14 14/12 41/14 41/14 44/14 14/12 41/14 41/14 44/14 14/12 41/14 41/14 44/14 14/12 41/14 41/21 41/14 41/21 14/11 41/12 41/11 41/21 14/11 41/11 41/21/21 14/11 41/11 41/21 14/11 41/11 41/21 14/11 41/11 41/21 14/11 41/11 41/21/21 14/11 41/11 41/21/21					
259/17 263/21 267/17 ments [6] 1/125 108/2 minute [8] 2/12 44/24 45/6 46/24 289/6 2739 273/17 274/17 minutes [8] 16/9 g6/24 118/22 138/7 76/1 94/13 97/19 22/2 36/13 97/6 42/1 2739 273/17 274/17 met [11] 45/14 107/16 minutes [38] 14/25 12/2 15/2 56/13 68/21 22/2 36/13 97/6 42/1 283/1 12/11 266/24 2006 246/9 285/1 15/2 15/6 15/6 15/2 12/1 136/2 12/2 10/15 103/19 115/15 20/16 20/17 22/17/2 13/14 14/16 14/2 22/2 36/13 37/6 42/1 200/16 200/17 207/19 methodology [6] 69/11 88/25 118/15 14/22 15/2 11/17 12/17 12/17 12/17 12/2 11/17 12/17 12/2 28/16 26/16 201/16 200/17 207/19 meaning[1] 12/3 23/8 13/21 13/2 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21					
2739 273/17 274/17 17/119 17/722 7/83 95/24 118/22 138/7 52/25 58/13 68/21 moment [16] 14/3 27714 278/7 mess [1] 66/9 moss [11] 62/1 moss [11] 62/1 moment [16] 14/3 2714 278/7 mess [11] 66/9 minutes [38] 14/25 101/15 103/19 115/15 508 58/16 63/15 82/2 38/4 123/14 145/17 106/2 1457/7 203/25 15/2 15/6 15/16 15/24 12/17 121/17 121/12 118/14 126/9 22/8 16 37/8 64/21 32/1 128/24 129/20 24/9 24/9 24/9 285/4 15/2 15/6 15/16 15/24 12/17 121/17 121/14 118/20 141/18/22 139/2 12/17 14/14 126/9 28/1/3 moments [2] 36/25 22/18 2378 275/6 13/22 133/2 13/26 14/25 18/1/5 14/25 18/1/5 14/25 18/1/5 14/25 18/1/5 14/25 18/1/5 14/25 18/1/5 14/21 14/14 14/2 28/1/3 moments [2] 36/25 98/1/3 12/21 12/21 13/21 13/2 13/21 13/21 13/2 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21 13/21		merits [6] 17/25 108/2	minute [8] 27/12	44/24 45/6 46/24	218/7 219/15 236/4
27774 Z7977 180/23 151/14 180/4 139/20 76/139/13 97/19 moment [16] 14/3 mea.com [17] 3/44 3/61 moment [16] 14/3 24/23 24/23 24/23 22/21 61/2		177/19 177/22 178/5	95/24 118/22 138/7	52/25 58/13 68/21	259/6
mear. [1] mess [1]					
meant [11] 43/4 infer [11] 43/4 infer [12] 43/4 infer [26] 12/7 infer [27]					
83/4 123/14 145/1 15/2					
192/12 196/24 200/6 206/14 200/14 200/15 206/14 200/14 200/14 200/16 201/12 236/16 260/10 200/16 200/17 207/19 methodology [6] 69/11 80/25 28/19 69/7 134/16 136/10 139/1 28/11/3 220/16 200/17 207/19 methods [1] 157/14 14/25 138/25 137/21 142/5 138/21 133/2 138/16 146/2 146/17 Monday [2] 16/21 142/5 1200/17 methods [1] 157/14 132/21 133/2 133/8 169/22 17/024 173/7 144/16 146/2 146/17 monents [2] 36/25 138/16 147/1 138/25 137/21 142/5 118/32 133/8 169/22 17/024 173/7 144/16 146/2 146/17 monents [2] 36/25 meaningles [1] 94/7 1153/2 153/6 153/2 153/6 153/2 153/6 199/17 201/24 207/13 223/7 11/06 19/47 Michael Peer [3] 9/19 27/7 42/22 114/16 140/24 265/16 236/26 247/10 24/27 265/16 236/26 247/12 24/7/12 25/37 248/24 257/3 263/22 265/10 265/10 265/16 236/27 265/12 26/27 265/12 26/12 265/12 26/27 265/12 26/12 265/12 26/27 265/12 26/27 265/12 26/27 265/12 26/27 265/12 26/12 265/12 26/27 265/12 26/27 26					
2007 2007 <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>					
210/52 210/52 134/25 137/25 142/25					
224/18 23/8 27/50 142/25 143/4 149/2 132/17 132/18 132/20 148/5 156/10 156/71 Monday [2] 1/21 6/1 meaning [3] 128/3 methods [1] 157/14 132/21 133/2 133/8 161/24 167/10 168/13 montay [2] 1/21 6/1 meaning [3] 128/3 methods [1] 157/14 132/21 133/2 133/8 161/24 167/10 168/13 montay [2] 1/21 6/1 meaning [3] 128/3 methods [1] 157/14 133/3 143/18 150/7 161/24 167/10 168/13 montay [2] 2/17 122/32 meaning [3] 28/21 Michael Peer [3] 9/19 Michael Peer [3] 9/19 Michael Peer [3] 9/19 193/2 127/1 122/17 207/16 207/2 127/25 205/10 202/11 202/23 246/20 247/10 248/5 137/3 145/9 145/17 mid [2] 44/19 44/23 missaplication [1] 205/16 207/2 125/25 205/10 montor [1] 23/28 137/3 145/9 145/17 mid [2] 150/19 missaplication [1] 235/14 220/13 221/4 montor [1] 28/20 205/12 22/57 205/12 22/57 203/12 23/7 116/19 137/2 168/11 186/14 mid [2] 12/17 missiead[2] 17/2 236/12 23/7 116/19 205/12 22/57 203/12 23/7 116/19 203/12 23/7 116/19 203/12 23/7 116/19 139/2 12/27/22/27 239/22 mid [2] 30/1 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
International December 201 Instruct (1) 157/14 132/21 133/21 137/34 161/24 Instruct (2) 161/24 133/31 163/31 <					
[1] 2007/ meaning [3] 128/3 metric [2] 143/21 138/3 143/18 150/7 169/22 170/24 173/7 144/16 145/24 meaning [1] 19/2 meaning [1] 19/2 153/1 153/2 153/6 194/10 194/12 196/21 223/9 223/0 233/18 1106 meaning [1] 21/2 19/7 153/1 153/2 153/6 194/10 194/12 196/21 223/9 223/0 233/18 1106 meaning [2] 26/21 76/3 123/14 123/23 162/1 67/9 197/16 201/24 207/13 223/7 76/3 123/14 123/23 123/14 123/23 126/14 177/16 189/17 280/21 102/23 23/16 235/16 239/24 131/20 131/22 136/4 131/20 131/22 136/4 11/8 115/2 207/16 207/21 215/25 23/16 235/16 239/24 131/20 131/22 136/4 11/8 11/5/2 11/8 115/2 207/16 207/21 215/25 23/16 235/16 239/24 136/21 68/14 184/9 162/1 67/9 44/14 128/21 11/8 11/8 11/8 11/8 11/5/2 207/16 207/12 215/25 28/12 25/12 228/7 254/9 265/24 21/17 11/8 15/17 125/27 13/8/14 13/8/2 23/17 23/17 23/17 14/16 14/8/2 219/13 measure [2] 10/6 17/7/5 77/16 148/9 276/3 13/8/5 13/6/5 19/6/5 37/10 23/17 25/27 12/17 23/17 23/27/17 2/4/27/8 23/17 23/17 23/27/17 23/17 23/17 23/27/11/2<					
138/14 178/24 239/10 150/10 150/11 152/16 187/13 189/17 192/9 201/24 207/13 223/7 138/14 178/24 MICHAEL [7] 4/17 9/9 153/8 186/6 187/1 196/21 197/9 197/16 233/20 233/18 110/6 meaningles [1] 194/7 194/7 194/7 196/21 197/9 197/16 235/16 233/22 76/13 123/14 123/23 16/21 197/9 197/16 235/16 233/22 245/12 245/25 206/1 207/10 248/24 257/5 263/22 248/27 245/5 263/22 248/24 257/5 263/22 248/24 257/5 263/22 248/24 257/5 263/22 248/27 245/9 265/24 248/24 249/24 248/27 249/14 monitor [1] 237/8 monitor [1] 232/8 245/14 monitor [1] 232/8 monitor [1] 232/8 monitor [1] 232/8 monitor [1] 232/8 monitor [1] 237/2 286/10 monitor [1] 237/8 89/2 89/17 149/9 89/2 89/17 149/9 233/3 250/2 253/2 253/2 253/2 286/12 89/2 89/17 149/2 89/2 89/17 149/9 233/3 250/2 550/5 236/2 236/3 256/16 236/4 80/2 89/2 89/17 149/9 233/3 250/2 255/2 255/2 256/2 80/2 89/2 89/17 149/9 233/3 250/2 253/2 253/2 253/2 280/2 241/12 242/14 245/14 230/2 246/2 24/2 24/2 241/14 24/9/9 233/3 250/2 250/2 253/2 2					
meaningful [1] 94/2 meaningless [1] 1106 MICHAEL [7] 4/17 99 Tis3/1 153/2 153/6 153/1 153/2 153/6 194/10 194/10 194/12 196/21 221/2 123/2 23/2 023/2 123/2			150/10 150/11 152/16	187/13 189/17 192/9	201/24 207/13 223/7
meaningless [1] 9/19/21// 50/44/2/2 153/6 160/6 167/1 150/21 169/4 2171 150/21 169/61/207/10 253/16 253/24 110/6 meaningless [1] 19/4/7 110/6 150/21 169/61/207/10 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/21 246/2 257/12 20/22 285/10 monitor [1] 263/20 246/2 257/12 20/22 285/10 monitor [1] 263/20 246/2 257/12 20/22 286/10 monitor [1] 263/20 246/2 257/12 20/22 286/10 monitor [1] 263/20 286/12 11/2 246/2 247/10 248/5 286/10 monitor [1] 263/20 89/2 89/12 215/12 286/13 89/2 89/12 215/12 286/14 monitor [1] 263/20 89/2 89/12 215/12 286/14 80/2 83/22 89/2 89/12 215/12 13/21 222/21 236/4 235/20 238/21 236/4 234/24 280/2 233/3 250/5 250/5 80/2 83/21 253/21 89/2 89/12 215/21 89/2 89/12 215/21 89/2 89/12 215/21 89/2 89/12 215/21 89/2 89/12 215/21 89/2 89/12 215/21 89/2 89/12 215/21 89/2 89/12 215/21 89/2 89/12 215/21			153/1 153/2 153/6	194/10 194/12 196/21	223/9 223/20 233/18
110/6 194/4 111/15 191/24 202/2 240/20 240/10 240/10 240/20 240/10					
111 22/7					
76/13 123/14 123/23 22/1 4222 misapplication [1] 20/171 213/25 28/10 131/20 13/12 13/2 13/120 13/122 13/21 Michael Peer's [1] 21/14 220/17 225/18 231/21 21/14 220/13 221/4 137/13 145/17 middle [2] 150/19 24/11 mislead [2] 17/21 23/17 234/3 23/16 23/17 234/3 23/16 monitor [1] 28/28 197/12 207/3 223/18 middle [2] 150/19 24/11 mislead [1] 61/17 mislead [1] 61/17 23/17 234/3 23/16 monitor [1] 28/28 28/17 middle [2] 200/25 21/17 13/26 22 misleading [1] 61/17 23/17 24/12 24/51 246/5 23/12 23/2 23/12 23/2 12/2 12/2 12/2 12/	means [23] 26/21				
13/12 (15) 13/12 (15) 25/4 misguide [3] 62/16 25/17 225/18 231/21 month [5] 83/7 83/11 13/13 (15) 15/17 (15) 11/18 (15)/24 233/7 234/3 234/16 month [5] 83/7 83/11 13/12 (15) 11/18 (15)/24 233/7 234/3 234/16 month [5] 83/7 83/11 13/12 (15) 15/17 (15) 15/16 (14) 23/7 24/3 234/16 month [5] 83/7 83/11 13/12 (15) 15/17 (14) 23/7 24/3 234/16 80/2 18/7 215/76 month [5] 83/7 83/11 13/12 (15) 15/17 (14) 15/16 (14) 23/3 (14) 23/3 (14) 23/3 (14) 28/7 (25) 260/2 (25) 18/7 (14) 13/2 (12) 23/3 (11) month [6] (12) 23/3 (11) meatic [1] 237/17 milion [6] (12/21 (27)/11 163/5 (16) (52) (25) (22) (25)/2 (25)					
13/13 143/15 143/15 143/15 143/15 mid [2] 44/19 44/23 mid [2] 150/19 235/12 235/2 236/22 month [5] 83/7 83/11 146/15 165/11 166/17 mid [2] 150/19 245/11 mislead [2] 217/21 235/2 235/20 238/22 238/2 239/2 240/14 89/2 89/12 215/12 228/7 254/9 265/24 might [6] 15/9 54/11 mislead [2] 217/21 235/2 125/12 238/2 4 239/2 240/14 80/21 83/7 116/19 228/7 254/9 265/24 mislead [2] 200/25 MiHAL [2] 31/7 missquoting [1] 178/2 246/9 246/15 246/18 80/21 83/7 116/19 219/13 million [2] 235/21 missquoten [1] 96/9 missquoten [1] 96/9 252/13 253/11 253/14 Montréal [1] 2/11 measures [2] 130/6 million [2] 237/21 misstatement [1] 251/3 255/11 253/14 251/3 252/11 253/14 251/3 225/11 253/14 42/15 44/7 46/3 50/10 medicine [1] 237/21 mind [6] 12/21 27/11 100/1 253/20 253/21 253/24 42/15 44/7 46/3 50/10 168/7 171/1 273/18 mind [1] 68/20 mistake [4] 9/15 46/14 257/22 257/25 258/2 89/2 89/11 89/11 medicine [1] 237/21 mind [1] 68/20 mistake [12] 21/7 260/4 260/6 250/15 97/6 97/8 110/16 168/7 170 4/17 273/18 mininum [2] 52/21 14/10 145/20 146/18	131/20 131/22 136/4				
140, 13, 163, 11, 160, 19 midfle [2] 150, 19 235, 4235, 20238, 22 89/2 89, 12 215, 12 167, 21 68, 14, 184, 9 245, 11 months [8] 450, 23 months [8] 450, 23 284, 7 mispt [6] 159, 95, 11 missing [7] 13/2 245, 148, 246, 5 80/21 83, 71 16, 19 284, 7 missing [7] 13/2 246, 12, 246, 12 256, 12					
16/12/12/100/14/164/9 245/11 245/11 223/21 238/24/239/2240/14 months [8] 45/23 19/124 207/3 223/18 might [6] 15/9 54/11 misleading [1] 61/17 24/12/245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2245/18 246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 23/21/2246/5 25/13/226/24/24/6 25/13/226/24/24/6 25/13/226/24/24/7 25/13/226/24/24/7 25/13/226/24/24/7 25/13/226/24/24/24/24/24/22/2225/7 25/13/226/24/24/24/24/24/22/22/24/24/24/24/24/24/					
19/124/20/13/223/16 might [6] 15/9 54/11 misleading [1] 61/17 24/12/245/18/246/5 80/21/83/7 116/19 228/7 254/9 266/24 mislexing [1] 17/15 77/6 148/9 276/3 mislopt [6] 15/9 52/5 21/9/13 24/12/245/18/246/5 24/12/245/18/246/5 23/3 250/5/250/5 250/7 250/13/25/7 42/7 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
228/7 77/5 77/6 148/9 276/3 misquoting [1] 178/2 246/9 246/15 246/18 233/3 250/5 250/5 284/7 24/7 248/12 248/16 248/7 247/10 248/5 280/2 219/13 milk[1] 205/22 13/22 122/2 126/14 248/7 248/12 248/16 Montreal [1] 2/11 measures [3] 179/13 milk[1] 205/22 13/22 122/2 126/14 248/17 250/3 251/14 Montreal [1] 2/11 measures [2] 130/6 milion [2] 235/21 misspoken [1] 96/9 252/13 253/11 253/14 251/6 70/19 72/5 85/6 medication [1] 237/21 mid [6] 12/21 27/11 100/1 253/22 52/52 256/3 56/6 70/19 72/5 85/6 89/2 89/11 89/13 medication [1] 237/21 minds [1] 68/20 mistake [4] 9/15 46/14 257/22 257/23 258/14 259/4 90/19 94/22 95/7 meeting [1] 90/14 minster [30] 93/22 misuderstanding [2] 250/25 263/10 264/8 135/15 140/1 140/1 204/16 204/19 205/14 misunderstanding [2] 270/25 275/19 275/24 144/30 145/20 146/33 235/10 246/24 248/22 258/13 270/13 277/4 misunderstanding [2] 270/25 275/19 275/12 149/3 149/3 163/3 236/2 241/14 236/2 278/14 278/3 278/3 270/13 277/4 28/25 278/3 279/4 28/26 28/10 286/15 208/18 209/15 21/22			misleading [1] 61/17		
meant [2] 200/25 MiHAL [2] 3// 7 missing [7] 13/2 247/6 247/10 248/7 280/2 219/13 mik [1] 205/2 13/22 12/21 248/7 241/7 248/7 241/7 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>246/9 246/15 246/18</td> <td>233/3 250/5 250/5</td>				246/9 246/15 246/18	233/3 250/5 250/5
219/13 130/23 120/7 130/23 130/23 130/23 140/3 140/3 140/14 140/14 130/23 130/23 130/23 130/14 140/14					
measure [3] 179/13 milk [1] 205/22 183/5 196/5 23/20 248/17 250/3 251/1 more [68] 9/10 16/16 180/1 180/6 million [2] 235/21 236/21 misstatement [1] 253/2 1253/21 253/1 1253/14 25/14 33/22 40/7 179/22 mind [6] 12/21 27/11 mind [6] 12/21 27/11 misstatement [1] 253/2 525/23 256/3 89/2 89/11 89/13 medication [1] 237/21 minds [1] 68/20 mistake [4] 9/15 46/14 257/22 257/25 258/2 89/2 89/11 89/13 168/7 171/1 273/18 minum [2] 52/21 120/7 217/20 258/3 259/16 259/4 90/19 94/22 95/7 90/19 94/22 95/7 168/7 171/1 273/18 minum [2] 52/21 120/7 217/20 258/3 258/16 259/4 90/19 94/22 95/7 90/19 94/22 95/7 168/7 171/1 273/18 minum [2] 52/21 13/5 18/13 212/9 260/4 260/15 97/6 97/8 110/16 204/16 204/19 205/14 Minister [3] 93/22 148/3 263/5 263/10 264/8 135/5 140/1 140/1 208/20 213/6 222/5 77/14 273/1 273/2 273/12 27/14 227/14 228/24 28/11 238/13 263/5 263/10 264/8 135/5 140/1 140/18 208/20 23/6 285/10 246/24 248/22 27/17/12 27/14					
180/1 180/6 miniton [2] 235/21 misspace [1] 90/9 252/13 253/11 225/14 25/14 33/22 40/7 measures [2] 130/6 miniton [2] 235/21 236/11 misspace [1] 25/22 253/21 253/24 42/15 44/7 46/3 50/10 179/22 medication [1] 237/19 mind [6] 12/21 27/11 100/1 253/25 255/23 256/3 89/2 89/11 89/13 medication [1] 237/21 minds [1] 68/20 mistake [4] 9/15 46/14 257/22 257/25 258/2 89/2 89/11 89/13 168/7 17/1/1 273/18 minimum [2] 52/21 121/6 98/25 181/3 212/9 260/4 260/8 260/15 97/6 97/8 110/16 92/21 93/22 171/12 148/3 224/24 238/11 238/13 263/5 263/10 264/8 135/15 140/1 140/1 204/16 204/19 205/14 116/4 118/9 119/7 258/3 270/17 144/10 145/20 146/18 145/20 146/18 206/2 204/24 248/22 273/1 273/2 273/12 218/25 257/16 270/25 275/19 275/21 149/3 163/3 236/22 24/14 266/8 260/15 266/8 260/15 288/6 285/10 286/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 250/4 274/14 276/8 276/13 277/4 15/21 44/9 277/23 279/21 280/13 185/7 197/20 203/16 251/2 228/13 253/1 277/24 278/3 278/3 104/20 115/15 116/13 283/2 238/22 238/2 239/2					
measures [2] 130/6 179/22 230/11 mind [6] 12/21 27/11 medication [1] 237/2 medication [1] 237/2 minds [1] 68/20 minister [1] 217/6 minister [3] 90/14 92/21 93/22 13/12 minstatement [1] 120/7 217/20 253/20 253/21 253/24 255/23 256/3 42/15 44/7 46/3 50/10 55/6 70/19 72/5 85/6 medication [1] 237/21 meet [5] 159/11 168/4 minsts [1] 68/20 minister [30] 93/22 mistake [4] 9/15 46/14 120/7 217/20 259/15 259/21 259/24 90/19 94/22 95/7 meet [1] 217/6 minimum [2] 52/21 204/16 204/19 205/14 208/20 213/6 222/5 235/10 246/24 248/22 Minister [30] 93/22 171/11 225/18 231/17 misunderstanding [2] 218/25 257/16 misunderstanding [2] 218/25 257/16 260/4 260/8 260/15 97/6 97/8 110/16 97/6 97/8 110/16 97/6 97/8 110/16 258/13 270/13 272/24 258/13 270/13 272/24 Minister [30] 93/22 171/11 225/18 231/17 218/25 257/16 misunderstanding [2] 218/25 257/16 270/25 275/19 275/21 276/8 277/12 277/16 144/10 145/20 146/18 135/1 140/1 146/20 277/23 279/12 207/16 144/3 149/3 163/3 135/7 197/20 203/16 250/4 274/14 meets [1] 52/21 member [1] 231/15 member [3] 153/15 185/16 268/10 member [3] 153/15 278/18 278/19 278/22 278/23 279/4 279/13 279/14 117/4 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 mm [2] 227/10 232/23 mode [1] 137/5 mode [1] 137/5 Moldovan [59] 8/22 9/6 38/20 39/21 45/3 58/19 63/10 58/17 261/3 262/17 272/25 271/1 228/10 225/10 261/3 262/17 272/25 185/16 268/10 memorial [9] 59/5 Minister of [2] 93/22 Moder [1] 137/5 mode [1] 137/5 63/13 63/19 71/8 moreover [6] 128/8					
17/9/22 medication [1] 237/21 medicine [1] 237/21 meet [5] 159/11 168/4 168/7 171/1 273/18 meeting [15] 90/14 92/21 93/22 171/12 204/16 204/19 205/14 204/16 204/19 205/14 235/10 246/24 248/22 250/4 274/14 meeting [9] 45/19 46/4 46/6 47/10 47/10 65/22 84/13 85/4 230/25 51/7 125/22 135/15 150/18 minds [1] 68/20 minimum [2] 52/21 12/7 mistake [4] 9/15 46/14 120/7 217/20 98/25 181/3 212/9 260/4 260/8 260/15 213/24 214/1 214/2 261/9 261/10 262/18 213/24 238/11 238/13 263/5 263/10 264/8 242/6 242/11 265/18 266/3 270/17 270/25 275/19 275/21 270/25 275/19 275/21 144/10 145/20 146/18 135/15 140/1 140/1 277/24 278/3 277/4 278/16 278/18 277/4 277/24 278/3 278/3 278/16 278/18 278/3 278/16 278/18 278/19 277/24 278/3 279/4 member [1] 231/15 member [3] 153/15 185/16 268/10 member [3] 153/15 mistake [4] 9/15 46/14 120/7 217/20 258/3 258/16 259/4 213/24 214/1 214/2 242/2 423/11 238/13 263/5 263/10 264/8 242/6 242/11 242/6 242/11 258/3 270/13 277/24 218/25 257/16 277/12 277/16 277/12 277/19 277/21 278/16 278/18 278/3 278/16 278/18 278/3 278/16 278/18 278/3 278/16 278/18 278/3 279/13 279/14 minister of [2] 93/22 mistake [4] 9/15 46/14 120/7 217/20 242/12 217/7 242/17 228/13 265/25 257/16 277/25 275/19 275/21 277/22 277/23 279/21 280/13 258/16 268/10 208/18 209/15 212/23 238/22 238/24 239/2 238/22 238/24 239/2 238/22 238/24 239/2 238/22 238/24 239/2 238/22 238/24 239/2 238/2 238/24 239/2 238/2 238/24 239/2 238/2 238/24 239/2 238/2 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 242/11 242/23 248/21 257/17 258/10 259/10 261/3 262/17 272/25 279/11 228/5 279/11 264/5 287/2 mode [1] 137/5 modern [11] 40/22 89/2 89/11 89/13 90/19 9/22 257/17 258/10 261/3 63/19 71/8	measures [2] 130/6				
medication [1] 237/21 meet [5] 159/11 168/4 minds [1] 68/20 minds [1] 68/20 mine [1] 217/6 minimum [2] 52/21 204/16 204/19 205/14 204/16 204/19 205/14 204/16 204/19 205/14 204/16 204/19 205/14 205/12 32/21 204/16 204/19 205/14 205/12 32/21 205/12 13/22 171/12 204/16 204/19 205/14 205/12 213/22 171/12 205/12 213/22 205/12 213/22 171/12 205/12 213/22 171/12 205/12 213/22 171/12 205/12 213/22 205/12 213/22 171/12 205/12 213/22 205/12 213/22 185/5 205/12 213/22 213/2 205/12 213/22 213/2 205/12 213/22 213/2 205/12 213/22 213/2 205/12 213/22 213/2 205/12 213/2 20/					
minds [1] 63/21 minds [1] 68/20 mistakes [12] 21/7 259/15 259/21 259/24 95/18 96/8 96/12 97/5 168/7 171/1 273/18 mine [1] 217/6 mistakes [12] 21/7 98/25 181/3 212/9 260/4 260/8 260/15 97/6 97/8 110/16 202/1 93/22 171/12 148/3 224/2 4 21/1 214/2 263/5 263/10 264/8 135/15 140/1 140/1 204/16 204/19 205/14 Minister [30] 93/22 171/1 125/18 231/17 242/6 242/11 263/5 263/10 264/8 135/15 140/1 140/1 208/20 213/6 222/5 258/13 270/13 272/24 171/1 125/18 231/17 misunderstanding [2] 270/25 275/19 275/21 149/3 149/3 163/3 250/4 274/14 276/8 276/13 277/4 278/16 276/13 277/4 218/25 257/16 276/8 276/12 277/16 184/18 184/22 185/5 250/2 284/13 85/4 277/2 278/3 278/3 15/21 44/9 238/2 238/24 239/2 284/14 234/15 235/7 230/25 278/16 278/18 278/19 117/4 238/22 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 261/9 261/10 278/22 278/32 379/4 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 Moldovar [59] 8/22 9/6 38/20 39/21 45/3 279/13 279/14 279/13 279/14 Minister in [1] 273/1 moder [1] 137/5 58/19 62/21 63/5 63/6 279/11 284/5 287/2 864/10 <	medication [1] 237/19				
Inter [1] 217/1 213/24 213/27 213/24 213/24 213/27 213/24 213/24 213/24 213/27 213/24 213/24 213/24 213/24 213/24 213/24 213/24 213/24 213/24 213/24					
168/7 17/17/12/3/18 minimum [2] 52/21 213/24 213/24 214/12 261/9 261/10 262/18 116/4 118/9 119/7 92/21 93/22 171/12 148/3 224/24 238/11 238/12 263/5 263/5 263/10 264/8 135/15 140/1 140/1 204/16 204/19 205/14 213/24 242/6 242/11 265/2 266/3 270/17 144/10 145/20 146/18 208/20 213/6 221/2 171/11 225/18 231/17 misunderstanding [2] 270/25 275/19 275/12 144/10 145/20 146/18 208/20 213/6 270/13 272/24 275/21 218/25 257/16 270/25 275/19 275/21 149/3 149/3 163/3 208/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 250/4 274/14 277/10 277/19 277/21 104/20 15/21 44/9 283/6 285/10 286/15 208/18 208/15 208/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 284/24 284/12 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
meeting [15] 90/14 92/21 93/22 171/12 204/16 204/19 205/14 208/20 213/6 222/5 235/10 246/24 248/22 250/4 274/14 meetings [9] 45/19 46/4 46/6 47/10 47/10 65/22 84/13 85/4 230/25 members [3] 153/15 185/16 268/10 memorial [9] 59/5 148/3 148/3 148/3 224/24 238/11 238/13 242/6 242/11 misunderstanding [2] 218/25 257/16 misunderstanding [2] 218/25 257/16 misunderstanding [2] 270/25 275/19 275/21 218/25 257/16 misunderstanding [2] 270/25 275/19 275/21 277/23 279/21 280/13 185/16 268/10 mmemorial [9] 59/5 135/15 140/1 140/1 144/10 145/20 146/18 242/6 242/11 218/25 257/16 misunderstanding [2] 270/25 275/19 275/21 218/25 257/16 misunderstanding [2] 277/23 279/21 280/13 15/21 44/9 mitigation [5] 94/11 104/20 115/15 116/13 278/22 278/23 279/4 279/4 279/5 279/7 279/13 279/14 Minister of [2] 93/22 135/15 140/1 140/1 144/10 145/20 146/18 149/3 149/3 163/3 276/8 277/12 277/16 277/23 279/21 280/13 283/6 285/10 286/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 283/22 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 226/10 229/16 229/16 238/22 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 242/11 242/23 248/21 234/4 234/15 235/7 242/11 242/23 248/21 251/19 251/22 256/4 257/17 258/10 259/10 261/3 262/17 272/25 279/11 284/5 287/2 modern [11] 40/22					
204/16 204/19 205/14 208/20 213/6 222/5 235/10 246/24 248/22 250/4 274/14 Minister [30] 93/22 171/11 225/18 231/17 258/13 270/13 272/24 258/13 270/13 272/24 258/13 270/13 272/24 273/1 273/2 273/12 276/8 276/13 277/16 273/1 273/2 273/12 276/8 277/12 277/16 184/18 184/22 185/5 277/23 279/21 280/13 185/7 197/20 203/16 283/6 285/10 286/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 283/2 238/24 239/2 261/9 261/10 144/10 145/20 146/18 149/3 149/3 163/3 276/8 277/12 277/16 184/18 184/22 185/5 208/18 209/15 212/23 283/2 238/24 239/2 226/10 229/16 229/16 228/10 229/16 229/16 238/22 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 261/9 261/10 65/22 84/13 85/4 230/25 277/24 278/3 278/3 278/16 278/18 278/19 278/22 278/23 279/7 279/13 279/14 mitigation [5] 94/11 104/20 115/15 116/13 278/22 278/23 279/7 279/13 279/14 Moldova-Zahar [5] 238/22 238/24 239/2 261/9 261/10 226/10 229/16 229/16 228/10 229/16 229/16 238/20 39/21 45/3 50/10 58/17 member [1] 231/15 members [3] 153/15 185/16 268/10 memorial [9] 59/5 Minister of [2] 93/22 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 moder [1] 137/5 moder [11] 40/22 Moldovan [59] 8/22 9/6 38/20 39/21 45/3 50/10 58/17 261/3 262/17 272/25 279/11 284/5 287/2 moreover [6] 128/8		148/3			
208/20 213/6 222/5 17/1/11 225/18 23/1/7 Imsunderstanding [2] 270/25 27/5/21 149/3 149/3 163/3 208/20 213/6 222/5 258/13 270/13 272/24 258/13 270/13 272/24 218/25 257/16 276/8 277/12 277/16 184/18 184/22 185/5 250/4 274/14 276/8 276/13 277/4 276/8 276/13 277/4 15/21 44/9 283/6 285/10 286/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 46/4 46/6 47/10 47/10 277/24 278/3 278/3 15/21 44/9 238/2 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 200/25 278/16 278/18 278/19 277/24 278/3 278/3 117/4 04/20 115/15 116/13 283/6 285/10 286/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 201/25 278/16 278/18 278/19 277/24 278/3 278/3 117/4 238/22 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 279/13 279/14 78/22 278/23 279/7 117/4 Nitu [2] 94/15 94/18 Moldovan [59] 8/22 257/17 258/10 259/10 385/16 268/10 279/13 279/14 Minister in [1] 273/1 Mineter of [2] 93/22 modern [11] 40/22 50/10 58/17 261/3 262/17 272/25 38/19 62/21 63/5 63/6 63/13 63/19 71/8 279/11 284/5 287/2 moreover [6] 128/8					
235/10 246/24 248/22 258/13 270/13 272/24 218/25 257/16 276/8 277/12 277/16 184/18 184/22 185/5 250/4 274/14 273/1 273/2 273/12 273/1 273/2 273/12 152/1 44/9 277/23 279/21 280/13 185/7 197/20 203/16 46/4 46/6 47/10 47/10 277/10 277/19 277/21 276/8 276/13 277/4 15/21 44/9 283/6 285/10 286/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 65/22 84/13 85/4 277/24 278/3 278/3 278/16 278/18 278/19 117/4 283/2 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 230/25 278/16 278/18 278/19 117/4 104/20 115/15 116/13 283/2 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 member [1] 231/15 279/13 279/14 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 Moldovan [59] 8/22 251/19 251/22 256/4 185/16 268/10 279/13 279/14 Minister in [1] 273/1 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 Moldovan [59] 8/22 257/17 258/10 259/10 185/16 268/10 Minister of [2] 93/22 modern [11] 40/22 50/10 58/17 261/3 262/17 272/25 279/11 284/5 287/2 moreover [6] 128/8 Molern [11] 40/22 63/13 63/19 71/8 moreover [6] 128/8					
250/4 274/14 273/1 273/2 273/12 msunderstood [2] 277/23 279/21 280/13 185/7 197/20 203/16 meetings [9] 45/19 276/8 276/13 277/4 15/21 44/9 283/6 285/10 286/15 208/18 209/15 212/23 46/4 46/6 47/10 47/10 277/10 277/19 277/21 mitigation [5] 94/11 104/20 115/15 116/13 283/2 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 230/25 278/16 278/18 278/19 117/4 04/20 115/15 116/13 283/2 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 member [1] 231/15 279/13 279/14 Nitu [2] 94/15 94/18 Moldovan [59] 8/22 251/19 251/22 256/4 mmbers [3] 153/15 279/13 279/14 Minister in [1] 273/1 Model [1] 137/5 58/19 62/21 63/5 63/6 263/13 63/19 71/8 memorial [9] 59/5 59/5 modern [11] 40/22 63/13 63/19 71/8 moreover [6] 128/8					
meetings [9] 45/19 277/10 277/19 277/21 mitigation [5] 94/11 Moldova-Zahar [5] 226/10 229/16 229/16 229/16 46/4 46/6 47/10 47/10 277/24 278/3 278/3 278/16 278/18 278/19 104/20 115/15 116/13 238/22 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 230/25 278/16 278/18 278/19 278/22 278/23 279/4 117/4 261/9 261/10 242/11 242/23 248/21 member [1] 231/15 279/4 279/5 279/7 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 Moldovan [59] 8/22 9/6 38/20 39/21 45/3 257/17 258/10 259/10 185/16 268/10 Minister in [1] 273/1 Minister of [2] 93/22 modern [11] 40/22 58/19 62/21 63/5 63/6 279/11 284/5 287/2 modern [11] 40/22 63/13 63/19 71/8 moreover [6] 128/8					
46/4 46/6 47/10 47/10 277/24 278/3 278/3 104/20 115/15 116/13 238/22 238/24 239/2 234/4 234/15 235/7 65/22 84/13 85/4 278/16 278/18 278/19 278/16 278/18 278/19 117/4 261/9 261/10 242/11 242/23 248/21 230/25 278/16 278/18 278/19 278/22 278/23 279/4 117/4 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 261/9 261/10 242/11 242/23 248/21 279/13 279/14 279/13 279/14 Minister in [1] 273/1 Minister of [2] 93/22 model [1] 137/5 58/19 62/21 63/5 63/6 261/3 262/17 272/25 85/16 268/10 minister of [2] 93/22 modern [11] 40/22 63/13 63/19 71/8 moreover [6] 128/8	meetings [9] 45/19				
05/22 64/13 65/4 230/25 278/16 278/18 278/19 78/22 278/23 279/4 117/4 261/9 261/10 242/11 242/23 248/21 member [1] 52/21 278/16 278/18 278/19 279/4 279/5 279/7 117/4 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 Moldovan [59] 8/22 251/19 251/22 256/4 members [3] 153/15 279/13 279/14 Minister in [1] 273/1 Minister of [2] 93/22 Model [1] 137/5 58/19 62/21 63/5 63/6 261/3 262/17 272/25 memorial [9] 59/5 59/5					
230/25 278/22 278/23 279/4 Mitu [2] 94/15 94/18 Moldovan [59] 8/22 251/19 251/22 256/4 member [1] 231/15 279/4 279/5 279/7 279/13 279/14 mm [2] 227/10 232/23 9/6 38/20 39/21 45/3 257/17 258/10 259/10 185/16 268/10 Minister in [1] 273/1 Minister of [2] 93/22 modern [11] 40/22 58/19 62/21 63/5 63/6 279/11 284/5 287/2 memorial [9] 59/5 59/5 modern [11] 40/22 63/13 63/19 71/8 moreover [6] 128/8					
medets [1] 32/21 member [1] 231/15 members [3] 153/15 185/16 268/10 memorial [9] 59/5 mm [2] 227/10 232/23 9/6 38/20 39/21 45/3 257/17 258/10 259/10 259/10 259/10 259/10 259/10 261/3 262/17 272/25 279/13 261/3 262/17 272/25 279/11 284/5 287/2 263/13 63/13 63/13 63/19 71/8 261/3 262/17 272/25 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 263/13 63/13 63/19 71/8 261/3 262/17 272/25 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 279/11 284/5 287/2 263/13 63/13 63/19 71/8 263/13 263/19 71/8 263/13 263/13 263/13 263/13 263			-		
members [1] 231/15 279/13 279/14 mode [1] 184/9 50/10 58/10 58/17 261/3 262/17 272/25 185/16 268/10 Minister in [1] 273/1 mode [1] 137/5 58/19 62/21 63/5 63/6 279/11 284/5 287/2 memorial [9] 59/5 59/5					
Minister in [1] 273/1 model [1] 137/5 58/19 62/21 63/15 63/6 279/11 284/5 287/2 memorial [9] 59/5 Minister of [2] 93/22 modern [11] 40/22 63/13 63/19 71/8 moreover [6] 128/8					
memorial [9] 59/5 Minister of [2] 93/22 modern [11] 40/22 63/13 63/19 71/8 moreover [6] 128/8			model [1] 137/5		279/11 284/5 287/2
		Minister of [2] 93/22	modern [11] 40/22	63/13 63/19 71/8	moreover [6] 128/8
www.dianaburden.com					
www.dianaburden.com					
			www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
Μ	Mr Darek Kozak [1]	164/4 193/3 276/25	8/22 96/11	Ms Giedre Stasiunaite
moreover [5] 129/16	214/12	Mr Hinkle [2] 39/20	Mr Rusu [17] 43/12	[1] 8/15
136/5 138/14 140/11	Mr Dariusz Kozak [1]	118/12	45/17 48/7 108/16	Ms Ivanes [1] 79/16
141/17	160/11 Mr Filat [1] 247/13	Mr Igor Bugai [2] 204/1 206/19	164/5 204/25 205/15 205/16 205/24 228/10	Ms Lea [1] 11/11 Ms Lucia
morning [14] 6/2 7/24	Mr Fortier [4] 7/25	Mr lon Tugui [2]	231/13 231/13 231/14	Craciuneanu [1] 8/16
8/25 15/16 126/22	27/4 93/18 103/16	160/11 214/11	250/9 250/16 252/11	Ms Nina Ivanes [1]
134/4 145/12 147/15	Mr Garmas [10] 170/4		253/2	93/13
150/2 150/22 151/25	170/5 216/2 217/25	Mr Kopecky [39]	Mr Rusu's [2] 59/16	Ms Nitschke [7] 8/3
165/24 287/1 287/5	220/5 220/11 220/22	12/13 133/13 186/8	159/10	15/5 15/11 32/4 69/5
most [9] 21/13 119/5 120/21 137/12 139/16	221/6 259/9 259/15	202/6 205/3 206/4	Mr Stefan Chitoroaga	151/11 186/12
153/20 159/23 166/12	Mr Garmas' [1] 216/9	208/4 208/17 209/12	[2] 272/23 279/12	much [47] 10/14
217/7	Mr Gladei [5] 125/3	210/24 213/25 216/5	Mr Tapu [1] 231/17	10/21 12/19 13/19
mostly [2] 154/7	125/21 158/5 162/3	218/23 220/9 221/3	Mr Ted [1] 8/12	17/23 19/12 27/3 46/2
286/23	239/19	222/16 224/7 224/21	Mr Tugui [13] 211/16	48/3 51/19 68/25 69/5
motive [7] 120/4	Mr Gladei's [7] 59/16 64/2 75/18 100/4	225/1 227/21 228/5 231/9 232/5 233/6	229/22 229/24 231/10 231/12 231/15 242/15	72/5 73/17 80/22 86/19 99/4 100/18
120/6 120/15 120/19	107/16 108/16 126/7	234/1 234/11 235/3	243/15 250/14 250/16	110/10 117/16 132/16
123/1 124/4 132/5	Mr Gleason [7] 39/17	235/9 236/12 236/21	250/17 252/11 253/3	136/13 144/23 148/7
move [23] 7/10 7/19	39/23 119/9 120/21	236/24 242/4 244/24	Mr Utica [3] 233/10	148/9 149/3 149/3
11/4 11/18 33/25 34/4	121/9 124/2 129/7	247/7 249/8 267/3	248/3 254/22	160/6 163/3 178/14
34/8 36/3 45/21 53/15	Mr Grot [122] 7/15	268/8 268/10 272/12	Mr Valeriu Beril [1]	184/18 186/24 203/12
55/22 61/21 63/14 64/9 69/1 70/10 95/19	8/17 10/14 11/3 14/11	Mr Kopecky's [1]	277/2	223/2 226/2 235/25
97/13 157/12 186/3	14/15 15/14 15/19	231/24	Mr Victor Levintsa [3]	244/2 257/19 260/5
188/19 206/11 216/22	38/4 38/5 39/14 40/4	Mr Kozak [2] 211/16	169/20 218/11 220/3	267/5 268/1 272/15
moved [2] 38/11	40/21 41/4 41/11	242/14	Mr Viroel [3] 245/22	286/4 286/8 286/9
270/9	41/15 41/18 41/24	Mr Kraven [1] 11/12	247/4 249/1	286/24 287/13
moving [10] 52/12	42/23 43/2 43/12 44/20 44/22 45/18	Mr Lars Wiechen [1] 137/8	Mr Vlad Filat [1] 231/16	multiple [5] 85/4 87/12 100/10 105/16
52/17 55/10 61/9	47/9 48/20 49/5 49/11	Mr Levintsa [10]	Mr Wells [13] 39/24	144/14
62/14 63/16 105/9	49/17 49/19 51/11	161/23 169/21 169/22	187/8 188/4 190/12	multiply [1] 137/16
196/12 214/5 221/13	51/15 60/24 80/25	207/20 218/17 219/5	195/16 236/22 237/15	must [17] 62/22
Mr [434] Mr Administrator [1]	84/3 92/21 94/12	219/9 219/16 219/25	249/8 251/9 268/7	103/12 119/19 120/6
211/18	114/25 115/14 115/21	242/23	268/8 268/12 286/5	120/7 128/3 129/17
Mr Alexei Bugai [5]	134/10 135/7 136/8	Mr Levintsa's [1]	Mr Wiechen [2]	131/20 135/18 154/13
93/4 158/17 160/10	145/18 146/2 149/7	161/25	151/23 152/12	198/5 222/20 224/12
206/18 214/11	149/12 149/16 149/20	Mr Lilian [1] 192/10	Mr Yves Fortier [1]	278/1 281/10 283/23
Mr Andrew Astuno [1]	150/2 150/15 152/19 153/1 156/24 157/7	Mr Michael [1] 9/9 Mr Michael Peer [1]	268/5 Mr Zbigniew [2] 38/2	284/21 mutual [2] 78/25
8/15	157/11 157/24 159/8	194/7	157/4	121/2
Mr Astuno [1] 39/21	150/10 150/15 150/17	Mr Mirhot [1] 269/17		my [147] 6/9 6/11 6/12
Mr Beril [15] 7/15 11/4	160/1 160/5 160/8	Mr Nagacevschi [3]	285/4	6/13 8/10 8/11 9/4 9/5
136/5 150/16 152/19	160/20 160/23 161/2	220/12 258/10 258/19	Mr Zelenenco [14]	9/21 11/10 20/19
153/2 240/12 267/12 267/16 268/2 268/15	170/21 171/3 186/5	Mr Peer [12] 28/14	75/5 222/8 228/11	22/20 22/23 25/15
269/4 270/6 285/4	186/11 188/6 188/21	96/18 118/24 132/17	250/4 250/6 250/7	25/15 27/19 28/7 31/5
286/7	189/9 189/18 190/13	132/22 138/2 138/10	250/10 250/12 250/14	32/12 36/24 37/4 39/5
Mr Bugai [27] 157/17	193/7 194/4 199/4	139/2 142/21 144/9	250/15 250/16 250/20	43/16 44/15 46/8
158/13 158/19 159/3	199/6 202/8 202/21 203/23 206/25 212/16	145/1 147/3 Mr Boor's [9] 24/22	251/1 253/2 Mrc [1] 283/14	46/17 49/21 50/9 51/6
159/8 159/18 159/19	214/5 218/4 218/21	Mr Peer's [9] 24/22 133/14 143/20 150/25	Mrs [1] 283/14 Mrs Ivanes [1] 283/14	51/10 52/18 58/2 58/4 59/8 59/15 62/14
160/5 160/12 160/14	234/19 235/19 236/18	194/8 196/13 198/11	MS [27] 2/18 2/20 2/22	
160/20 204/3 204/5	236/22 237/2 241/14	198/24 199/10	2/22 2/24 2/25 2/25	78/3 81/12 81/17
204/14 205/14 206/17	244/14 245/9 248/23	Mr Platon [2] 225/20	8/3 8/15 8/16 9/20	90/12 91/17 95/19
207/8 207/18 208/14 209/14 209/15 210/4	257/21 261/8 266/19	247/13	9/24 10/3 10/9 11/11	97/13 101/24 105/9
211/15 213/20 224/17	266/21 266/23 266/23	Mr President [21]	11/13 15/5 15/11 32/4	106/20 109/15 111/4
242/14 284/9	269/16 271/10 273/4	17/7 19/8 20/10 21/2	36/16 69/5 79/16	116/2 119/1 119/6
Mr Bugai's [4] 157/9	273/25 275/13 276/7	21/3 24/4 26/20 27/11	93/13 132/15 151/7	132/25 133/7 133/24
159/21 160/1 208/2	276/10 276/12 277/8	153/14 153/15 166/7	151/11 186/12	134/3 148/8 156/10
Mr Chitoroaga [2]	277/18 278/13 279/9 280/2 283/5 284/9	167/14 185/16 188/20 194/3 237/1 244/4	Ms Anna [1] 9/24 Ms Anna Cusnir [1]	156/19 157/1 157/7 168/20 170/25 178/5
278/20 279/3	285/7 285/18 285/20	268/14 272/14 285/3	9/20	178/8 186/21 187/23
Mr Coren Hinkle [1]	286/1	286/6	Ms Cusnir [5] 10/3	191/13 192/19 194/22
8/13	Mr Grot's [7] 156/16	Mr Rod [1] 119/6	10/9 11/13 36/16	196/20 197/4 197/8
Mr Craven [1] 151/13 Mr Dan [1] 8/23	157/9 157/18 159/14	Mr Roger Gladei [2]	151/7	197/8 197/8 202/9

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
Μ	147/5 172/3	214/7 225/11	240/19 240/24 241/19	277/6 286/6
my [69] 202/20	necessity [1] 174/4	nicer [1] 225/14	241/25 242/3 243/11	notice [8] 82/4 82/14
204/20 207/17 209/7	need [35] 11/14 22/2	NICOARA [2] 3/17	243/14 243/25 251/19	83/21 84/6 90/3
209/25 211/6 216/4	25/21 29/21 32/10	8/23	252/23 253/15 253/23	281/24 282/7 284/1
216/8 217/17 218/3	32/13 33/5 33/19 53/7	Nicolae [1] 162/16	254/10 256/4 256/11	noticed [2] 21/7 129/7
218/24 219/22 221/5	70/5 70/8 70/19 70/20	Nicolai [1] 162/19	256/11 256/14 257/2	notices [2] 166/23
222/16 223/22 225/15	86/17 93/24 108/13	nil [1] 185/15	258/17 259/8 259/9	284/22
226/8 231/10 233/8	112/21 122/3 129/23	Nina [8] 66/25 72/15	259/9 259/9 260/3	noticing [1] 27/12
233/9 233/9 234/3	131/5 150/15 165/1 187/19 191/24 199/7	72/24 73/7 79/24 93/1 93/13 114/6	261/1 261/11 261/23 261/25 262/9 264/9	notification [9] 78/12 86/25 87/3 87/4 88/11
234/6 234/16 236/7	206/8 215/5 222/11	Nina Ivanes [6] 72/15	264/15 267/8 270/21	95/13 117/20 282/7
237/9 244/3 244/10	200/8 215/5 222/11	72/24 73/7 79/24 93/1	271/9 272/15 275/1	283/16
245/6 245/23 245/24	240/15 243/22 259/3	114/6	281/9 286/19	notifications [13]
246/2 246/19 246/19	269/23	nine [2] 225/19 247/16		73/3 73/9 80/19 82/3
246/25 247/9 247/11	needed [7] 109/23	Nistria [2] 223/19/24//10	191/20 237/17 252/23	82/8 84/8 86/1 117/16
247/14 248/5 248/14	170/2 221/11 221/15	201/22	No 12 [1] 53/12	117/17 117/22 118/1
248/14 249/12 249/13	221/22 254/11 271/23	NITSCHKE [10] 2/18	No 2 [1] 237/17	166/24 166/25
249/13 250/19 250/19		6/13 8/3 15/5 15/11		notified [3] 53/22 87/6
250/24 252/2 255/20	needs [5] 58/18 58/25 140/20 152/17 189/20	32/4 69/5 132/15	No 4 [2] 76/4 139/2 No 40 [1] 162/14	90/2
256/23 257/13 257/14	negative [7] 145/10	151/11 186/12	No 6 [3] 11/25 12/8	noting [1] 144/22
257/15 259/7 263/20	147/19 147/22 194/24	no [176] 1/5 7/5 11/1	14/24	notion [1] 111/16
263/20 263/20 264/4	198/13 198/16 256/23	11/25 12/8 12/23	no.2 [1] 211/14	notwithstanding [1]
267/23 268/2 268/3	negotiating [1]	13/18 13/24 14/8	non [7] 58/6 58/6	147/14
268/4 269/18 269/19	157/25	14/24 15/15 17/17	58/18 58/19 162/21	November [3] 13/4
272/17 279/2 279/3	negotiation [1] 59/11	18/19 21/25 23/7	175/11 283/1	16/11 231/3
280/16 286/22	negotiations [2]	24/18 26/5 29/10	non compliance [1]	November 21 [1] 13/4
myriad [1] 111/21	117/1 117/2	29/23 33/21 35/1 39/3	283/1	November 29 [1]
myself [9] 31/15 46/15	neighbours [1]	42/9 53/12 57/24 58/7	non-compliances [1]	16/11
53/5 58/22 156/21	166/12	58/16 58/25 61/19	162/21	now [65] 15/10 16/6
160/11 214/11 237/22	neither [6] 70/24	62/25 71/9 75/24 76/4	non-payment [1]	19/20 20/1 22/15 26/2
253/8	109/10 109/20 160/1	78/10 78/13 80/7 82/4	175/11	27/9 28/1 28/3 31/6
mysterious [4] 80/22	161/15 180/11	82/22 82/23 84/6 85/3	non-signed [2] 58/6	33/10 34/17 36/16
80/23 85/25 154/21	networking [1] 147/2	85/6 85/13 87/3 87/4	58/18	41/25 47/24 50/8
mystery [1] 68/24	never [25] 57/17 57/21		non-valid [2] 58/6	57/13 69/10 73/15
N	70/6 82/6 83/24 83/25	93/20 99/14 102/17	58/19	80/15 80/25 84/5
	85/15 85/24 116/24	107/8 112/6 113/2	none [7] 78/14 79/2	86/18 87/21 94/23
Nagacevschi [4]	121/21 156/11 163/12	113/19 116/25 119/17	160/4 205/23 206/15	95/25 114/5 114/19
220/12 220/13 258/10	170/11 173/16 177/13	122/5 123/8 125/25	217/3 254/8	118/18 121/22 122/3
258/19	178/13 182/12 191/6	126/1 127/21 128/8	nonetheless [3] 71/8	136/20 137/19 139/13
naive [1] 228/6	100/2 202/24 220/5	130/7 136/4 137/3	94/13 227/4	147/3 150/16 150/18
name [13] 6/9 8/10 9/4	246/20 281/14 283/5	139/2 142/9 142/9	nonpayment [1] 18/14	
78/10 119/2 157/1	284/1	143/25 146/18 151/5	normal [3] 196/18	152/14 153/9 175/23
162/15 202/10 220/13	Nevertheless [1]	156/12 156/13 158/10	197/14 226/10	183/15 186/25 187/2
259/8 268/2 270/13	185/9	158/24 162/14 168/18	normally [1] 133/6	200/17 207/24 216/17
274/24	new [19] 25/4 25/6	180/13 181/10 181/18	norms [1] 53/24	218/24 225/19 234/23
named [1] 156/22	25/9 25/25 26/1 27/14	184/9 187/19 188/2	northern [1] 38/12	250/7 252/25 255/2
namely [3] 141/19	28/18 29/25 41/11	189/2 191/20 192/16	not [494]	267/4 268/7 268/22
146/2 171/25	69/23 96/14 116/20	193/2 193/25 196/2	notary [1] 238/7	270/9 275/12 284/25
names [2] 56/23 126/1	117/1 150/22 179/18	197/17 197/17 197/22	notations [1] 73/11	286/13 286/13 286/15
national [5] 93/21	240/13 254/13 270/8	197/24 198/16 198/22	note [15] 13/11 16/10	286/21
97/24 103/21 103/25	271/5	199/12 199/23 199/24	16/12 19/17 28/22	number [16] 7/4 10/6
143/6	next [33] 6/5 6/18 8/11		117/13 119/25 129/1	11/18 21/12 33/4 54/9
nationals [1] 109/19	8/13 13/2 20/9 33/25	204/4 204/9 206/6	132/14 142/6 143/16	56/17 56/21 79/6 79/7
naturally [1] 139/22	24/4 52/4 62/14 95/10	206/14 210/14 210/14	145/11 148/11 149/22	119/15 127/7 167/21
nature [9] 17/14 110/1	86/9 95/19 97/13	210/16 210/24 211/2	190/18	184/5 184/9 268/6
132/24 134/20 134/21	101/24 105/10 118/16	213/2 216/21 216/25	noted [5] 12/5 16/15	numbering [1] 126/17
149/4 166/17 167/8 262/8	118/21 120/9 121/13	217/6 217/11 218/6	18/10 30/8 160/6	numbers [14] 21/14
	142/9 183/20 185/5	218/9 218/20 219/4	notes [1] 136/2	21/15 54/4 54/5 54/6
near [1] 246/8	185/7 196/12 205/25	221/6 222/22 224/4	nothing [18] 63/17	56/20 151/19 167/13
nearly [1] 134/11	217/2 226/8 231/7	224/21 227/8 228/14	64/23 82/7 82/17	183/13 183/14 184/6
necessarily [2] 25/25	240/11 255/9 267/9	228/25 229/3 231/4	87/11 92/25 142/14	184/8 204/15 282/22
120/12	273/23	232/15 234/4 234/5	156/13 186/23 199/21	numerical [1] 24/15
necessary [9] 18/20	NF [1] 79/17	236/19 237/17 237/17	206/10 224/2 234/21	
18/22 23/13 23/15	nice [4] 6/16 194/19	238/4 238/14 240/15	236/5 267/25 271/11	0
34/2 55/2 125/24				o'clock [1] 152/15
L	1	www.dianaburden.com	1	1

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
0	212/18	one [140] 8/13 9/20	129/13 131/5 132/8	option [1] 259/14
oath [4] 67/14 72/19	offensive [3] 213/13	14/8 16/14 16/16 19/9	145/8 151/17 152/22	OQ [2] 1/15 2/9
74/23 267/20	225/2 260/4	21/12 25/22 27/4 27/5	156/5 158/3 158/7	oral [2] 47/1 47/4
object [3] 25/2 25/6	offer [2] 233/5 234/9 offered [8] 140/25	28/10 29/14 30/3 30/4 30/23 30/24 32/14	158/13 159/24 163/1 164/20 166/7 170/12	orange [1] 197/1 order [26] 9/11 9/12
129/15	233/2 233/17 233/18	34/4 35/14 35/22	175/12 177/5 177/20	9/16 10/20 10/24
objected [1] 12/25	233/22 234/8 234/17	36/15 36/18 37/10	178/15 180/7 185/2	11/24 12/8 14/24
objection [4] 13/15	270/1	39/11 41/1 49/21	186/14 187/5 194/20	24/18 26/5 35/25
13/18 30/4 30/6 objective [5] 135/20	office [27] 9/3 64/6	53/10 59/13 59/19	201/5 201/10 201/11	67/25 74/21 88/1
142/4 142/15 142/17	81/5 82/16 94/20	60/1 60/11 63/8 75/20	205/9 209/4 223/9	93/24 119/22 120/5
148/16	161/7 162/24 170/10	81/11 81/13 81/18	226/22 231/25 245/25	128/17 129/10 150/21
obligated [1] 131/19	191/7 191/8 195/23	94/22 96/23 101/1	258/18 260/8 262/14	152/24 173/25 176/22
obligation [6] 50/6	195/24 201/15 202/9 207/13 222/13 222/21	107/24 110/16 111/25 116/1 117/18 117/20	280/25 open [2] 14/19 182/2	191/20 230/16 274/2 ordered [2] 174/22
84/15 100/7 101/13	241/4 241/5 243/12	118/4 118/17 118/19	opening [39] 5/2 5/3	219/18
101/14 282/12	242/16 250/7 257/4	120/22 120/24 121/10	8/7 15/9 15/13 15/15	ordering [1] 174/7
obligations [17] 40/13	257/6 257/18 259/13	127/8 128/3 128/5	16/1 20/6 20/11 22/2	orders [21] 66/5 66/7
80/20 97/18 98/4 98/14 101/11 101/22	260/1	130/1 130/12 130/22	22/18 22/20 22/23	66/19 67/1 67/4 67/12
103/2 104/10 120/18	offices [3] 65/4	139/15 140/20 144/17	23/6 23/8 28/18 29/4	67/13 67/16 67/19
121/8 121/9 131/18	158/20 159/20	150/21 152/2 152/15	33/4 33/6 35/7 35/9	72/14 72/24 73/7 74/2
165/21 174/25 176/11	official [12] 48/16	154/7 154/23 156/19	35/22 36/3 37/7 37/13	74/8 74/9 74/11 74/14
235/2	49/25 51/9 62/9 79/16 98/18 99/13 100/17	157/6 157/10 161/9 173/25 177/5 191/18	37/19 37/24 39/15 143/18 150/6 152/17	75/2 75/8 93/2 236/10
obliged [2] 64/6 278/9	103/16 171/12 256/20	191/19 193/20 195/6	153/6 153/13 153/17	ordinates [1] 94/16 organic [1] 197/16
observations [1] 17/9	284/3	195/10 195/12 195/19	158/9 185/25 189/16	organisation [1]
observer [1] 11/11	officials [26] 38/20	196/9 196/11 198/8	196/14 198/13	213/18
obtain [7] 18/22 87/8 88/6 88/15 165/1	39/12 41/6 43/3 43/12	198/8 198/8 200/1	openings [7] 7/11	organisations [4]
230/17 243/10	47/2 52/15 55/18	201/5 201/7 201/10	7/14 11/3 15/5 20/24	99/13 100/15 100/16
obtained [4] 87/11	60/19 70/20 92/22	201/11 203/20 204/17	21/24 28/22	100/18
106/15 163/12 194/9	93/19 98/20 102/11	205/6 205/11 205/12	operating [6] 41/20	organise [1] 47/10
obtaining [3] 38/9	102/25 103/22 105/1 106/9 111/11 120/2	208/20 211/14 211/16 211/17 213/10 213/19	44/25 138/10 142/19 145/10 229/13	organising [2] 47/9 81/14
38/14 158/1	121/12 128/20 131/14	215/24 218/17 220/4	operation [13] 43/5	original [11] 24/7 29/5
obvious [3] 140/15	157/22 158/3 158/10	225/7 225/22 227/9	85/18 124/1 157/9	79/8 79/15 143/7
145/1 145/2	offshore [3] 246/18	228/15 231/7 231/25	157/16 181/15 199/1	191/21 192/1 193/1
obviously [5] 10/9 22/3 32/8 36/8 83/23	246/21 246/21	232/3 233/12 234/15	207/1 208/1 226/5	202/18 215/2 216/7
occasion [1] 209/11	offtake [1] 156/13	235/25 237/4 237/24	271/19 272/7 272/9	originally [1] 27/19
occasions [3] 56/5	often [1] 276/21	238/18 240/16 240/16	operations [22] 42/8	originals [5] 13/2
91/13 100/10	Oh [1] 222/10	242/23 245/22 246/17	42/10 42/10 42/24	13/21 13/25 14/4 82/1
occupied [1] 206/3	okay [14] 29/7 36/18 52/13 52/16 53/14	247/16 247/17 254/24 257/17 257/17 257/20	45/4 47/15 55/4 85/11 89/6 116/16 120/17	other [85] 8/21 15/7 16/16 16/16 18/22
occur [3] 105/23	189/8 205/9 215/24	258/10 258/18 259/9	182/25 183/2 183/10	20/25 21/14 23/25
127/14 147/13	216/8 221/20 225/10	271/16 274/10 279/15	183/18 184/10 185/10	31/3 31/17 31/24
occurred [4] 71/3 153/22 154/23 214/14	253/6 254/25 255/18	280/13 280/13 280/20	194/16 194/17 200/23	57/20 57/23 59/14
occurring [2] 55/11	old [7] 196/23 196/25	280/21 280/21 282/14	202/23 235/1	60/13 62/3 62/7 62/10
72/3	198/7 205/5 205/5	284/13 287/5	operator [1] 135/17	66/4 71/18 74/18
October [3] 82/10	205/6 274/10	one o'clock [1]	opinion [6] 39/6 99/14	
231/3 250/8	Oleg [1] 88/2 omission [1] 105/16	152/15 one's [2] 144/12	100/17 157/13 245/25 280/16	85/19 85/20 89/4 89/12 90/21 95/20
odd [4] 167/20 167/25	omissions [12] 38/19	144/18	opinions [2] 59/17	103/21 103/23 108/3
168/9 168/9	40/11 40/13 70/13	one-time [1] 257/17	142/15	108/8 108/25 109/1
of December [1] 200/19	70/20 97/15 97/18	ones [1] 203/21	opportunities [3]	114/21 115/7 116/17
of December 2012 [1]	97/20 97/24 101/10	ongoing [4] 85/17	44/21 45/7 45/11	116/23 117/5 123/25
234/2	102/20 103/24	86/10 86/15 114/21	opportunity [20] 23/9	128/12 146/15 146/22
of December 8 [1]	omitted [1] 131/23	only [68] 16/12 17/13	26/6 29/17 29/21	147/13 148/15 148/18
16/10	on December 6 [2] 11/22 13/12	21/11 22/21 30/7 30/11 30/13 31/15	29/24 32/11 41/12 61/20 66/14 82/19	154/25 157/15 159/17 160/18 161/2 161/12
of February [1]	on to [1] 95/19	36/22 57/8 57/9 71/11	82/20 82/23 96/19	162/13 162/20 163/3
252/16	once [16] 23/9 57/17	81/8 96/24 97/10 98/9	96/20 127/8 186/15	168/12 172/22 180/10
of March [1] 252/21 of March 2011 [1]	95/7 95/18 114/5	98/10 102/9 102/16	187/4 206/12 266/24	180/18 185/11 196/23
170/25	127/5 127/7 128/6	102/20 103/3 103/20	287/2	198/20 199/8 201/2
of Mayor [1] 114/6	135/15 158/13 158/15	119/24 120/25 121/7	opposable [1] 179/7	201/21 225/19 229/14
off [6] 167/6 182/11	168/11 257/3 257/3	121/14 123/5 128/2	opposite [2] 136/17	232/15 233/18 237/24
184/15 193/22 212/17	271/10 285/17	128/10 128/20 129/8	206/7	238/21 247/17 262/25

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
0	185/17	83/22 86/11 88/19	158/5 158/15 159/5	91/1
other [10] 274/3	outlining [1] 119/14	100/13 120/23 122/13	159/10 159/19 160/7	paragraph 41 [1]
274/5 274/24 275/10	output [2] 140/2 141/6		160/9 160/15 160/22	108/19
275/22 279/15 281/3	outset [2] 44/4 153/17 outside [2] 132/9	159/22 164/20 169/8 188/25 195/2 199/2	161/4 161/22 162/4 162/6 162/9 162/24	paragraph 470 [1] 178/14
281/9 281/11 285/17	254/21	202/18 215/17 215/18	169/3 169/18 170/1	paragraph 5 [4] 160/9
others [9] 1/8 7/6	outsource [1] 158/12	216/19 216/22 216/23	170/12 170/19 171/5	214/12 272/22 272/23
18/19 160/17 161/15 162/12 183/8 211/9	outsourced [3]	217/4 241/15 241/16	175/25 176/18 176/21	paragraph 50 [1]
224/11	157/21 157/24 159/1	244/11 264/22 281/13	177/15 178/14 178/23	108/20
otherwise [1] 209/2	outsourcing [1] 161/8	page 10 [2] 55/25 65/16	179/4 181/2 182/3	paragraph 513 [1]
our [92] 6/13 6/22	outstanding [5] 11/20 16/7 18/15 19/14	page 12 [1] 62/15	182/4 182/9 182/21 200/4 211/14 214/12	68/12 paragraph 56 [1]
7/13 7/19 7/20 8/6	232/20	page 13 [1] 63/16	218/22 223/14 230/9	181/2
8/14 8/17 9/2 9/4 9/6 9/7 9/8 9/12 9/13	over [39] 6/4 10/19	page 15 [1] 54/2	230/10 230/12 245/9	paragraph 58 [1]
11/16 11/16 11/17	20/9 31/3 31/10 31/17	page 18 [1] 70/11	245/11 249/15 272/22	75/16
13/4 13/22 14/4 17/2	38/14 39/10 41/8	page 2 [2] 79/9 244/11		paragraph 6 [4]
18/6 18/7 19/2 19/14	41/17 45/23 52/8	page 22 [1] 159/16	paragraph 1 [1] 157/1	161/22 169/18 182/9
20/4 20/13 24/5 28/5	56/13 57/4 70/5 83/11 97/11 116/10 124/5	page 23 [1] 78/7 page 26 [1] 86/11	paragraph 10 [4] 14/24 156/18 157/11	218/22 paragraph 67 [1]
28/17 29/4 29/12	126/10 133/25 139/6	page 3 [4] 83/14	179/4	182/3
31/22 32/2 35/6 37/15	147/15 160/15 168/10	120/23 169/8 215/17	paragraph 12 [2]	paragraph 68 [1]
38/2 56/20 57/3 62/12 69/24 73/2 89/5 89/6	168/13 186/7 190/11	page 30 [1] 88/19	178/23 182/21	182/4
96/11 97/3 97/7 122/2	195/8 205/12 224/1	page 31 [1] 195/2	paragraph 127E [1]	paragraph 7 [6] 11/24
137/7 137/9 138/20	237/12 245/13 249/21	page 4 [3] 83/20 83/22		12/7 158/5 170/1
140/2 140/6 140/11	249/25 251/5 267/9 272/11 285/17	216/22 page 5 [2] 79/17	paragraph 14 [1] 223/14	171/5 245/9 paragraph 70 [1]
141/23 142/3 142/7	overall [8] 46/18	281/13	paragraph 15 [2]	107/12
142/12 144/2 146/23	97/21 98/12 103/10	page 7 [3] 65/16	158/15 159/19	paragraph 76 [1]
147/6 148/22 149/8 149/9 151/15 152/23	104/7 135/9 143/24	122/13 215/18	paragraph 18 [1]	169/3
154/12 172/16 177/23	149/2	page 8 [3] 54/12	156/6	paragraph 8 [1]
177/25 186/3 186/6	overlook [1] 22/23	126/14 159/22	paragraph 186 [1]	276/25
193/12 197/22 198/6	overlooking [1] 120/17	page 9 [1] 199/2 page 90 [1] 164/20	170/19 paragraph 2 [4]	paragraph 83 [1] 113/11
202/9 204/16 206/14	overreach [1] 128/18	pages [15] 1/1 21/11	157/19 159/5 159/10	paragraphs [8] 61/16
222/12 229/18 236/13	overview [1] 141/11	21/12 30/16 69/10	160/15	75/19 157/23 163/18
238/24 248/10 266/8 266/14 266/22 273/8	overwhelmingly [1]	70/7 79/8 81/1 81/2	paragraph 24 [2]	170/23 176/14 182/1
276/19 279/21 286/22	153/19	81/20 122/12 133/25	162/24 200/4	182/23
287/1	owe [1] 187/9	182/11 202/18 241/18	paragraph 28 [2]	paragraphs 31 [1] 176/14
ours [2] 150/7 150/8	owed [2] 226/18 233/18	paid [29] 59/20 61/1 61/2 149/12 149/20	100/5 177/15 paragraph 281 [1]	parallel [1] 114/22
ourselves [2] 27/1	own [16] 39/11 59/6	168/6 201/24 222/23	59/6	pardon [1] 173/2
113/12	69/6 101/6 121/7	223/9 223/15 223/17	paragraph 3 [3] 13/5	parent [2] 149/15
out [55] 6/20 7/8 15/1 24/20 34/17 36/23	121/8 126/3 127/23	223/20 223/23 224/12	160/22 161/4	149/17
44/22 56/8 57/7 59/7	154/17 159/1 226/7	226/16 228/18 232/8	paragraph 305 [1]	park [2] 50/12 68/9
60/16 63/10 64/5	267/2 267/17 273/22	238/16 238/20 239/12	113/11	Parliament [5] 250/22
78/17 78/17 82/2 83/1	275/15 286/2 owned [2] 141/7	256/18 256/20 256/24 256/25 257/2 257/3	paragraph 31 [1] 75/18	270/15 270/16 270/17 270/18
92/3 99/17 99/23	205/8	257/10 257/17 274/19	paragraph 31.5 [1]	part [36] 22/20 24/6
101/1 112/8 142/11	owner [5] 162/18	pants [1] 259/18	76/5	24/11 30/15 38/7
144/4 158/1 158/15 160/19 160/21 160/24	201/7 238/3 245/23	paper [7] 36/8 81/24	paragraph 313 [1]	38/12 45/16 51/18
161/5 167/5 167/11	255/10	205/9 207/12 228/13	73/22	59/13 59/14 60/1
167/12 167/15 167/16	owners [5] 126/3	240/18 280/7	paragraph 33 [1]	69/22 83/20 89/15
168/21 183/8 199/5	158/1 179/20 180/4 205/10	papers [2] 118/17 259/25	162/4 Paragraph 33.2 [1]	102/4 102/5 108/13 110/14 124/3 129/12
221/21 222/4 223/25	ownership [1] 162/8	Paquet [1] 83/15	162/6	134/19 137/5 147/5
224/16 224/19 234/20 235/1 235/24 247/24	owns [1] 165/2	paragraph [74] 11/24	paragraph 33.3 [2]	148/12 153/20 156/10
256/19 267/20 273/14	P	12/7 13/5 14/24 28/10	107/15 162/9	179/17 187/24 196/15
275/20 276/3 279/10		32/23 59/6 68/12	paragraph 333 [1]	201/20 219/19 241/12
286/19 287/2	page [46] 34/20 54/2 54/5 54/9 54/12 55/25	73/22 75/16 75/18 76/5 91/1 100/5	148/11	253/7 256/15 272/1 284/14
outcome [1] 120/13	62/15 63/16 65/16	107/12 107/15 108/19	paragraph 392 [1] 175/25	parte [11] 66/23 87/8
outlays [1] 143/2	65/16 70/11 78/7 79/6	108/20 113/11 113/11	paragraph 4 [1]	87/15 87/18 87/23
outline [4] 40/3 44/16 119/12 119/13	79/9 79/10 79/17	148/11 156/6 156/18	230/12	87/24 88/6 88/15
outlined [2] 105/7	81/18 83/14 83/20	157/1 157/11 157/19	paragraph 405 [1]	91/10 106/14 106/15
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
Р	pattern [24] 70/22	245/25 246/22 247/12	284/23	plan [6] 116/22 155/19
partially [1] 185/1	70/25 71/1 71/3 71/4	247/14 247/15 247/20	perspective [7] 32/2	156/12 161/4 199/20
	72/5 72/5 89/15 90/12	248/2 249/5 251/1	55/1 56/18 61/24	230/20
	90/19 93/18 93/19	252/13 253/3 254/6	62/13 74/20 139/16	plane [1] 253/10
2/1 3/1 4/1	93/20 94/4 94/7 95/9	254/15 254/23 255/7	pertains [7] 134/5	planned [3] 29/4
participation [1]	95/21 97/16 98/18	259/10 259/11 259/19	136/15 137/13 140/6	203/9 235/25
174/11	104/6 105/2 111/12	273/18 275/17 275/23	140/13 142/16 146/16	planning [2] 150/12
particular [34] 8/3 8/7	131/8 132/4	275/23 284/8 284/22	pertinent [1] 119/7	152/22
33/18 34/3 34/5 34/6	Pause [2] 122/6	285/22 285/25 287/4	pesticides [2] 136/3	plans [2] 116/15 117/2
36/25 37/1 37/5 37/20	272/19	per [17] 41/8 56/13	141/20	plant [1] 198/7
37/23 41/3 41/25 56/6	pay [28] 18/16 139/20	57/5 97/1 154/8	Petit [1] 83/15	planted [3] 238/23
71/17 78/16 93/25	143/2 175/18 196/10	183/25 197/10 222/24	Petru [1] 162/15	239/6 253/6
110/6 110/9 118/13	212/14 212/14 231/4	223/16 223/20 232/25	pg.4 [1] 215/2	planter [1] 198/1
136/12 136/18 148/14	231/7 232/1 232/12	240/21 241/7 254/24	PG1 [1] 244/12	planters [1] 239/4
165/16 179/24 190/16	232/14 233/25 234/8	256/19 279/20 279/21	PhD [1] 136/23	Platon [2] 225/20
193/18 202/23 240/9	234/8 234/20 235/6	perceived [1] 53/19	Philippe [4] 1/17 2/4	247/13
270/5 272/2 277/14	236/4 236/7 239/16	percent [1] 227/9	6/9 268/2	play [2] 121/5 231/4
283/16 286/20	240/17 241/3 241/4	perfect [4] 211/5	Philippe Sands [1]	player [2] 273/8
particularly [3] 94/24	246/25 256/17 260/5	216/4 218/25 219/22	6/9	280/21
168/9 181/24	282/11 282/11	perform [2] 89/6	philippesands [2] 2/7	players [1] 101/9
parties [50] 3/11 6/7	paying [3] 18/21	195/4	2/7	plead [1] 113/7
6/23 7/3 10/25 16/19	196/9 235/2	performance [1]	Philology [1] 157/3	pleadings [15] 34/11
17/5 20/25 25/13	payment [18] 18/15	185/4	phone [1] 285/17	72/8 73/16 84/9 90/6
29/17 29/20 34/15	49/12 49/13 80/20	performed [1] 50/2	photocopied [1]	98/6 102/5 104/6
41/18 43/3 45/21	175/11 175/19 175/20	perhaps [23] 14/9	284/22	105/8 112/9 129/22
50/20 54/17 56/19	205/19 205/23 227/2	17/5 19/4 22/17 23/1	physical [3] 126/1	131/25 132/15 133/20
58/12 59/20 75/14	232/10 232/20 233/22	23/18 31/2 31/11	239/25 254/4	196/5
75/21 84/11 84/16	233/23 235/18 239/20	42/15 59/24 60/10	physically [4] 131/15	Pleas [1] 199/6
99/8 110/12 112/7 112/15 112/17 114/11	240/21 241/7	62/1 63/21 68/16	131/16 219/2 252/11	please [17] 34/4 36/18
114/12 114/21 121/3	payments [3] 233/3	73/15 84/4 92/14 94/9	pick [2] 116/16 251/21	41/3 80/6 86/2 96/3
126/11 126/12 126/13	238/16 238/20	95/16 97/4 97/5	picked [1] 164/5	111/24 151/6 153/12
134/5 135/2 136/15	PEER [19] 4/17 9/9	251/21 262/1	picking [2] 146/4	154/6 184/5 206/6
137/13 154/2 154/13	9/19 22/7 28/14 42/22	period [11] 72/21	146/19	228/3 232/3 244/8
162/10 172/22 173/10	96/18 118/24 132/17	72/21 157/5 219/19	picture [3] 189/17	276/24 286/18
173/17 173/20 179/5	132/22 138/2 138/10	223/24 233/9 235/4	205/24 213/10	plenty [1] 266/14
179/8 187/16	139/2 141/10 142/21	252/15 252/17 269/7	piece [9] 158/10	plethora [1] 102/12
parties' [1] 7/14	144/9 145/1 147/3	280/23	201/17 205/6 205/11	PLMD [1] 231/15
partly [1] 10/24	194/7	permission [1] 171/12		plot [2] 162/18 203/20
partner [1] 8/12	Peer's [10] 24/22 25/4	permit [1] 181/20	240/18 280/7	plots [13] 39/8 39/10
partners [1] 8/14	133/14 143/20 150/25	permits [1] 130/7	pieces [5] 81/23	126/2 126/4 156/1
parts [3] 32/6 37/13	194/8 196/13 198/11	permitted [5] 47/5	113/21 116/16 205/5	163/12 164/2 164/5
39/16	198/24 199/10	53/23 63/15 72/23	210/22	164/6 164/11 203/16
party [38] 16/9 16/12	pencil [2] 62/8 164/16		pills [1] 237/19	221/22 274/2
16/14 16/17 17/2 17/9	pensioners [3] 232/15		pin [3] 155/12 175/23	plough [5] 197/23
17/14 18/11 18/12	233/17 235/11	PERNT [3] 4/4 9/5	185/21	197/24 222/19 225/5
18/19 29/15 33/17	people [82] 59/24	9/17	Pintia [1] 192/10	251/25
50/7 50/24 55/13	68/21 85/18 85/19	persists [1] 276/22	PIOTR [10] 1/8 3/12	ploughed [1] 253/6
55/19 57/1 60/1 78/1	85/19 92/8 96/1	person [25] 7/4 45/15	3/14 5/4 7/6 38/2	ploughing [3] 197/21
86/6 86/15 87/7 91/14	117/23 117/23 118/5	64/4 64/12 75/3	171/9 186/10 188/22	197/25 231/8
95/15 98/22 100/9	160/18 165/3 166/11	162/20 174/16 195/18	190/4	plural [1] 16/18
106/23 109/20 112/20	167/21 192/24 197/23	207/14 211/19 212/12	Piotr Grot [2] 7/6 38/2	
113/20 115/8 116/20	205/18 205/21 206/2	212/20 213/10 218/1	place [18] 2/10 2/14	257/10 264/4
117/1 121/18 231/15	206/7 207/16 208/20	220/14 233/12 245/22	67/18 67/20 73/5	pm [9] 153/11 153/11
231/16 250/15 250/23	208/21 210/19 211/17	254/24 278/13 281/25	80/20 88/21 90/1	186/9 186/9 267/13
pass [1] 118/11	213/11 213/11 213/12	281/25 282/21 283/9	91/12 116/24 149/7	267/13 287/8 287/9
passage [1] 31/5	217/21 217/24 217/25	285/21 287/5	195/19 195/19 207/20	287/14
passages [1] 64/2	218/2 220/19 222/13	personal [5] 115/16	213/19 215/10 241/3	PO1 [2] 32/4 36/21
passed [2] 42/14	224/11 224/13 225/3	142/8 142/12 142/14	253/22	PO6 [1] 36/20
249/13	225/16 226/13 229/12	273/23	placed [1] 22/8	point [116] 14/22
passing [1] 37/12	229/17 229/19 232/7	personally [5] 149/21	places [1] 210/20	14/22 18/2 25/22 29/3
passport [1] 282/23	232/8 232/10 232/14	215/23 229/7 237/7	placing [1] 198/3	29/23 32/20 33/18
patchwork [1] 110/25	233/11 233/18 235/13 235/15 236/6 236/6	237/13	plain [1] 127/25	33/24 33/25 34/3 34/5
path [1] 102/16		persons [5] 117/19 162/13 208/5 211/15	Plaintiff [1] 174/13 plaintiff's [1] 174/12	34/7 37/23 42/1 42/16 42/21 43/16 45/2
pathway [1] 260/2	238/17 240/1 242/13	102/13 200/3 211/13	piainun 5 [1] 1/4/12	42/21 43/10 43/2
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
P	positive [2] 184/5	preparation [1] 213/7	108/14 108/24	51/15 51/15 51/22
point [97] 46/14	184/8	preparatory [1] 80/19	pretty [2] 37/21	52/13 54/20 59/11
46/18 52/4 52/5 52/14	Poslaro [1] 282/22	prepare [5] 10/19	286/24	59/14 59/18 59/23
52/18 53/10 53/11	possession [3] 39/8 211/21 244/25	29/13 152/8 154/13 222/20	prevail [1] 102/6	59/24 59/25 60/13 60/22 60/24 61/2 61/7
53/12 54/17 56/8 57/7	possessor [1] 130/13	prepared [8] 6/14 21/9	prevent [2] 91/4	61/13 72/10 73/1
57/12 58/22 59/3	possibility [4] 19/15	24/6 68/14 137/8	preventative [1]	75/10 75/14 75/25
59/17 61/18 62/12	26/5 27/5 257/24	140/7 140/12 284/15	179/21	76/3 77/11 77/25
63/8 68/7 68/8 71/1	possible [10] 27/7	preparing [4] 28/17	preventing [1] 92/16	77/25 78/1 78/9 79/4
71/17 73/16 75/17 78/16 78/17 78/17	151/22 191/25 209/2	154/15 253/7 257/15	preventions [1] 99/18	80/2 81/3 85/25 92/17
80/8 80/23 82/2 84/6	230/7 230/16 231/2	presence [3] 10/14	preventive [2] 179/13	98/23 112/19 121/18
88/8 88/18 89/17 90/7	253/12 274/9 280/22	10/22 12/13	180/5	125/2 201/6 202/2
90/9 90/20 92/14	possibly [4] 16/16		previous [3] 18/7 19/9	
94/24 95/13 95/19	26/7 36/20 80/17	71/15 91/12 91/14	39/9	private/public [1]
96/7 96/16 96/23	post [2] 128/9 128/21 potential [2] 27/7	91/15 92/11 266/20 273/13 280/15 282/9	previously [2] 114/25 115/9	77/11 privilege [1] 6/10
97/12 97/13 100/25	146/20	presentation [10]	prices [3] 137/17	probably [17] 56/21
101/1 102/14 105/10	potentially [2] 28/19	35/7 36/12 37/15	139/5 139/11	114/3 138/15 165/3
106/19 106/20 107/8	123/21	68/13 69/17 70/12	Pridnestrovie [1]	166/10 166/14 166/15
109/22 111/23 112/8	power [15] 123/7	78/7 90/12 133/1	201/19	191/7 200/25 212/23
115/15 116/1 116/11 116/11 116/12 117/6 118/19	127/10 127/16 128/14	138/2	Prime [19] 144/22	214/23 243/15 246/2
130/1 134/23 139/2	128/23 129/10 129/12	presented [1] 124/15	171/11 225/18 231/17	266/10 266/24 281/14
142/11 150/21 154/1	130/8 130/22 132/9	president [55] 1/17	258/13 276/8 276/13	285/1
154/1 154/5 154/12	211/21 238/8 246/4	2/3 2/19 7/24 17/7	277/4 277/10 277/19	probative [2] 194/1
154/21 163/3 168/20	255/21 256/6	19/8 20/10 21/2 21/3	277/21 277/24 278/3	281/6
168/20 177/3 188/7	powerful [8] 146/6	24/4 26/20 27/11 37/8	278/3 278/18 278/22	problem [22] 29/10
189/19 199/6 206/9	233/11 247/20 248/2 254/23 255/7 275/14	43/7 43/8 45/13 45/16 47/6 47/12 47/25 48/1	279/4 279/5 279/14 Prime Minister [15]	31/15 31/16 59/5 103/8 108/6 120/14
210/23 211/1 217/12	275/24	52/10 52/10 53/13	171/11 231/17 276/13	151/5 192/14 192/14
227/25 228/20 234/6	PowerPoint [6] 36/5	53/13 72/16 74/16	277/4 277/10 277/19	210/24 211/1 211/2
237/4 237/20 247/8	69/10 69/17 69/22	75/4 136/6 153/14	277/21 277/24 278/3	232/5 237/23 239/13
257/24 260/13 263/8 263/15 265/4 266/15	70/12 133/24	153/15 166/7 167/14	278/3 278/18 278/22	240/2 246/7 246/7
266/19	powers [1] 275/17	171/1 185/16 188/20	279/4 279/5 279/14	246/12 252/13 253/10
pointed [3] 250/14	PR [1] 157/24	194/3 204/24 227/17	Prime Minister is [1]	problematic [2] 10/23
250/16 255/10	practical [1] 54/25	227/17 228/4 231/6	225/18	32/19
pointing [1] 167/5	practice [3] 136/4 137/4 140/17	231/14 237/1 244/4 268/14 269/5 269/7	Prime Minister of [1]	problems [15] 31/4 53/19 53/19 57/23
points [15] 34/15 40/1	practices [5] 89/6	269/9 269/11 269/21	Prime Minister or [1]	53/19 53/19 57/23 57/24 62/2 62/3 62/5
53/17 54/18 55/7	134/15 135/10 135/24	272/14 279/17 285/3	258/13	62/10 62/11 62/18
71/18 87/12 90/19	137/3	286/6	Prime Minister, Vlad	63/9 120/17 271/1
94/5 94/7 113/10	pre [5] 32/25 33/12	President between [1]		273/10
116/6 129/22 237/25	69/25 172/23 184/21	269/9	primitive [1] 213/14	procedural [9] 11/24
261/6 Poland [14] 38/2 41/5	pre-award [1] 184/21	President in [2] 269/7	principal [2] 44/5	12/8 14/24 24/18 26/5
41/6 41/7 41/8 197/5	pre-empt [1] 32/25	269/11	44/10	173/18 173/21 178/8
218/16 226/8 226/9	pre-hearing [2] 33/12	President lurie [1]	principle [5] 76/2 78/8	
226/9 227/23 238/5	69/25	231/6	84/14 181/11 278/25	Procedural Order [6]
285/23 285/24	pre-trial [1] 172/23	President of [6] 74/16		11/24 12/8 14/24
Polish [3] 156/21	precious [1] 126/19 precise [2] 46/4	75/4 136/6 171/1 269/21 279/17	100/20 124/23 125/6 134/22	24/18 26/5 191/20
197/6 204/5	182/13	President Rusu [1]	print [1] 219/18	procedure [17] 47/11 63/5 68/25 127/4
political [1] 171/4	precisely [3] 26/15	53/13	printed [4] 62/15	127/14 165/20 171/16
politicians [3] 165/18	135/2 140/25	President Zelenenco	70/11 86/11 88/20	171/23 172/6 172/13
168/24 228/16	precondition [2]	[2] 52/10 53/13	printout [4] 54/4 54/8	172/14 172/15 172/17
politics [1] 206/7	110/13 110/20	press [1] 20/23	154/7 154/11	172/23 173/6 187/16
poor [3] 166/14 166/14 213/12	predictable [3] 46/23	pressed [1] 239/2	printouts [1] 33/4	283/1
portion [1] 22/23	52/20 52/23	pressure [3] 94/18	prior [17] 33/5 63/10	procedures [5] 49/2
position [16] 10/21	preferred [1] 97/5	120/1 271/3	72/6 72/11 73/8 82/10	52/7 103/6 111/18
11/1 12/12 14/15 65/8	prejudgment [1]	pressured [1] 131/14	134/11 134/17 135/10	114/17
78/16 79/25 97/1	147/25	pressures [1] 287/7	146/1 172/4 172/6	proceed [20] 6/5 6/19
101/7 113/12 152/7	prejudice [3] 115/6 172/9 180/3	prestigious [1] 8/1 presumably [4] 85/9	173/10 194/22 196/20 207/12 234/12	20/24 21/1 25/13 28/21 29/2 29/4 29/20
193/23 262/25 271/5	preliminary [1] 273/3	166/5 199/17 228/22	prior to [1] 234/12	30/25 31/13 32/21
277/3 278/14	premise [2] 70/3	presumed [1] 185/3	private [44] 50/7	33/2 34/14 80/6
positions [2] 10/15	105/2	presumption [2]	50/21 50/24 51/7	133/11 172/9 225/25
181/7				
L	1	www.dianaburdon.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
P	268/4	prosecutor [5] 94/15	281/12	quick [2] 31/2 118/19
proceed [2] 244/8	professor at [1] 268/3 Professor Dolzer [3]	117/14 117/21 117/24 175/17	putting [3] 9/16 51/4 78/10	quickly [3] 58/4 144/13 148/9
258/2 proceeded [1] 6/25	12/18 12/22 12/23	protectants [7] 137/6		quiet [2] 247/4 247/5
proceeding [5] 35/17	professor from [1]	139/21 139/25 140/14		quite [11] 90/15 90/17
66/23 74/23 114/17	197/5 Professor Knieper [4]	140/22 141/20 143/3 protecting [1] 99/19	QC [2] 1/15 2/9 qualify [1] 49/9	94/7 140/14 144/15 145/25 221/18 226/5
124/8 proceedings [20] 6/10	7/25 177/7 2/0/5	prove [9] 70/24 164/9	quality [6] 6/7 139/21	274/20 276/18 285/12
6/14 17/12 30/20	208/4	164/12 164/13 180/19	139/24 148/14 256/23	quotation [1] 72/13
31/21 33/21 33/22	Professor Philippe [1] 268/2	180/21 206/2 209/24 210/9	257/15 quantification [2]	quote [1] 110/7
38/4 38/16 50/18	Professor Rolf	proved [1] 272/4	139/3 184/23	R
71/14 87/8 114/22 120/14 186/14 202/11	Knieper [1] 6/12	proven [4] 135/7	quantum [26] 9/8	R-14 [1] 163/11
202/22 257/25 258/3	Professor Rusu [3]	180/12 180/18 184/20	24/19 26/11 26/14	R-16 [1] 162/21
267/8	107/7 119/5 239/19 Professor Rusu's [2]	proves [1] 244/17 provide [11] 18/17	26/18 26/19 26/21 42/22 134/5 135/14	R-17 [2] 161/14 210/12
process [44] 43/15	101/2 108/20	21/5 30/15 57/19	136/15 137/13 138/17	R-18 [2] 161/12 212/4
45/22 47/18 51/3 51/23 52/5 52/7 52/11	Professor Sands [1]	131/2 131/19 141/11	139/16 141/5 142/3	R-19 [1] 162/17
52/17 52/24 53/20	69/1	152/3 152/9 169/5	146/7 147/17 149/8	R-20 [3] 161/16
53/21 53/24 57/16	Professor Viorel [1] 9/18	191/20 provided [19] 15/24	150/1 150/23 151/19 153/23 183/6 184/19	163/10 210/15 R-21 [1] 210/17
60/2 63/23 63/24	profit [3] 42/23 194/19		184/25	R-6 [2] 65/15 65/16
65/23 72/2 74/1 85/13 86/12 97/21 98/12	195/1	86/22 126/23 126/25	quarter [1] 153/10	raise [6] 7/10 31/25
103/11 104/7 123/25	profitability [1] 135/8	127/6 128/12 128/22	Quebec [1] 2/11	113/1 205/22 248/14
151/23 157/20 158/21	profitable [6] 38/9 134/14 134/19 146/1	133/24 137/9 138/12 139/8 144/9 145/12	query [2] 15/17 17/21 question [67] 27/4	249/12 raised [7] 16/23 31/23
159/5 159/6 169/19	183/1 203/16	147/6 176/20 239/6	28/7 37/2 41/2 44/16	114/20 124/8 124/11
212/8 212/12 213/7 220/1 220/2 233/10	profits [11] 135/5	provides [6] 12/8	49/21 50/15 51/10	187/6 237/25
256/10 258/20 259/23	135/11 146/25 149/14	123/8 125/20 128/21	51/18 51/18 51/21	ranking [1] 131/14
269/18 274/2	184/20 194/8 198/13 198/16 198/16 198/22	152/5 287/2 provision [1] 129/15	59/9 65/19 66/6 68/3 74/12 81/9 84/20	rate [9] 21/8 22/10 27/16 139/12 147/8
processed [2] 136/2	271/20	provisions [3] 169/10	91/25 92/1 93/20 97/9	147/25 148/2 148/4
272/5 processing [3] 230/6	Progress [1] 226/11	169/13 172/6	106/7 110/19 117/15	148/7
230/16 283/2	prohibit [1] 125/1	proximity [1] 141/14	118/3 149/2 159/2	rather [14] 24/7 27/25
Procopi [1] 162/19	prohibition [2] 76/2	public [24] 38/20 39/12 49/18 51/3 51/8	162/18 164/22 164/24 172/2 177/8 178/7	28/3 32/6 37/2 98/18 103/18 128/15 129/6
produce [8] 24/6	prohibitive [1] 30/17	51/13 51/23 52/6	196/12 199/5 199/6	142/15 154/9 154/10
24/10 42/4 166/19 218/2 222/19 224/13	project [8] 45/22	52/12 52/15 54/24	199/9 200/2 201/2	198/17 203/21
261/14	155/19 155/20 156/4	59/14 60/1 61/3 61/14	209/6 209/22 212/23 215/6 215/7 225/11	ratios [1] 62/8 re [10] 5/7 5/10 68/5
produced [3] 21/6	156/15 157/25 164/4 229/23	63/14 77/11 98/20 100/6 128/20 156/8	230/18 233/15 239/12	128/7 186/17 225/24
140/8 227/8	projects [2] 40/23	158/6 260/5 280/19	240/6 240/19 244/18	236/23 236/25 244/5
producer [10] 138/24 139/1 140/9 140/21	156/7	publicly [1] 145/9	245/21 247/19 251/11	261/7
143/1 143/13 143/14	promised [1] 153/17	pull [2] 244/11 264/18 pulled [1] 184/14	253/17 253/19 255/13 256/16 257/20 258/10	re-cross [1] 244/5 re-direct [3] 186/17
143/25 145/6 146/8	pronouncing [1] 254/20	purchased [2] 41/19	262/18 276/4 279/2	225/24 236/23
producers [2] 140/13 149/5	proof [1] 42/9	44/25	279/3 279/15 280/16	re-do [1] 68/5
producing [1] 143/15	propels [1] 81/10	pure [1] 123/10	questioning [1] 23/14	
product [2] 176/19	proper [8] 24/24 41/13 86/24 197/9 212/23		questions [47] 5/9 5/11 5/15 36/21 61/25	5/7 5/10 236/25 261/7 re-sign [1] 128/7
176/25	219/20 230/17 256/1	purporting [1] 280/4 purpose [2] 39/7	63/22 69/3 69/14	reach [1] 31/11
production [2] 21/7 191/15	properly [11] 24/21	243/3	95/20 149/23 153/7	read [28] 16/15 33/11
products [1] 279/21	40/8 43/2 44/14 54/16	purposes [3] 32/5	187/5 187/9 187/23	34/8 34/10 34/10
professional [1] 39/5	57/21 65/9 117/7 117/10 132/2 254/21	152/22 243/1 pursuant [4] 11/24	194/6 199/25 202/12 209/2 209/5 209/10	34/11 34/11 34/12 69/12 69/13 76/9
professionals [1]	proposal [2] 20/16	13/4 97/25 103/25	225/23 226/1 231/24	76/12 78/2 92/10
41/16 professor [25] 1/16	229/2	pursue [2] 105/4	236/13 236/19 236/23	92/12 95/6 95/7 95/17
1/17 2/4 2/13 4/16	propose [3] 6/5 18/4	109/11	237/24 244/3 244/5	95/17 110/14 129/24
6/12 7/25 9/8 9/18	133/6 proposed [2] 27/7	pursuit [1] 110/12 put [16] 8/5 28/1 32/7	245/8 245/15 247/7 251/20 261/2 261/3	163/16 186/19 256/18 267/20 281/14 281/19
12/18 12/22 12/23	28/8	48/15 59/10 91/11	265/8 266/9 267/2	282/18
69/1 75/19 101/2 107/7 108/20 119/5	proposition [6] 99/12	113/12 150/1 154/14	267/2 267/3 268/7	reading [1] 176/13
177/7 197/5 239/19	99/25 99/25 140/5	164/20 170/9 209/15	268/11 272/15 272/16	ready [7] 17/17
240/5 268/2 268/3	140/19 140/21	230/10 253/22 276/24	272/19 272/20 285/4	183/22 186/4 224/22
	l	www.dianaburden.com	I	l

Recommande [1] Recommande [1] reflects [1] 149/5 refront [1] 129/17 71/5 127/6 207/4 207/25 26/8 153/5 187/5 (21/27) 239/1 252/4 239/1 252/4 recommendation [1] reflects [1] 149/12 refusel [1] 29/15 71/5 127/6 207/4 207/25 26/8 153/5 187/5 207/25 24/8 153/5 187/5 21/6 129/12 reality [1] 28/15 recommended [4] 63/16 7/19 17/6 21/21 14/12 21/21 17/16 127/16 20/22 18/22 reflects [1] 149/12 reflect [1] 20/15 reflects [1] 149/12 reflect [1] 20/15 reflect [2] 20/14 33/13 39/16 30/2 60/24 0/23 40/22 40/24 1/23 40/15 reflect [3] 10/16 reflect [3] 20/14 reflect [3] 13/35 refle	ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
Gready J3 Zai2/2 Zai7/2 Zai7/2 <thzai7 2<="" th=""> Zai7/2 <thzai7 2<="" th=""> <thzai7 2<="" th=""> <thzai7 2<="" th=""></thzai7></thzai7></thzai7></thzai7>	R	Recommande [1]			26/8 153/5 187/5
Auge 123 Auge 13 Auge 14 Auge 13 Auge 14 <	ready [3] 238/25				
Teal 13 Crownended [4] 632 (2) Fight [1] 132 (2) Fight [2] 133 (2) 133 (
Hanse Guil 19/15 43/11 140/23 218/15 128/21 130/15 Guil 2 130/15 Televance [2] 167/1 reality [1] 20/15 13/3 14/25 218/15 13/3 14/25 218/15 13/3 14/25 218/15 13/3 14/25 211 13/3 14/25 211 13/3 14/35 221 12/21 13/3 14/35 221 13/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/35 21 12/21 13/3 14/32 12/31 13/31 13/3 14/32 12/31 13/31 13/3 14/32 12/31 13/31 13/3 14/32 12/31 13/31 13/31 11/32 11/31 13/3 14/32 12/31 13/31					
reality [1] 138/14 220/14 120/21 130/2					286/13
reality [25] e14 18/3 33/3 39/15 20/15 20/15 19/24 11/1 29/12 30/15 60/22 68/7 68/24 60/2 90/20 90/20 40/25 40/24 20/15 40/25 40/25 40/25 40/25 40/15 40/15 50/25 68/7 68/24 60/21 90/20 90/20 40/25 40/25 40/25 40/15 50/25 68/7 68/24 60/21 90/20 90/25 40/25 40/25 40/25 40/15 50/25 68/7 68/24 60/20 90/20 90/25 40/25 40/25 40/25 50/25 68/7 68/24 60/20 90/20 90/25 40/25 40/25 40/25 50/25 76/16 70/25 71/10 71/18 70/25 71/10 71/18 70/21 72/19 41/22 70/25 71/10 71/18 70/21 72/19 41/22 70/25 71/10 71/18 70/21 72/21 22/24 70/21 72/21 22/24 70/21 72/22 22/37 70/25 71/10 71/18 70/21 72/21 72/21 72/21 72/21 70/21 72/22 72/21 72/21 72/21 70/21 72/21 72/21 7				• • • •	
33/13 39/16 53/6 13/16 1/16 1/17 1/2015 13/16 1/17 1/2015 13/16 1/17 1/2015 60/12 607 602/2 607 602/2 21/11 2/1212301/5 52/25 1/2015 52/15					
58/22 88/7 89/24 40/23 40/25 42/6 42/9 127/19 127/9 127/16 58/3 59/13 60/3 60/13 60/3 60/13 38/21 41/16 43/3 97/10 110/23 120/3 54/2 63/7 63/25 122/19 12/27 128/6 53/6 53/0 163/23 110/18 111/8 119/3 138/3 14/32/5 14/27 54/2 64/9 46/14 127/9 12/27 128/6 53/6 53/0 163/23 110/18 111/8 119/3 27/16 27/18 72/7 110/71/18 63/2 66/14 128/23 130/6 130/14 163/24 66/14 13/27 27/16 27/18 72/7 110 71/18 64/2 64/24 14/12 14/24	33/13 39/19 53/6				
19/12 99/12 99/12 99/12 19/13 42/16 46/9 46/14 127/19 128/2 128/6 63/8 63/10 63/23 110/11 120/13 138/6 13/8/3 143/25 145/2 64/16 64/22 64/24 130/21 130/23 132/7 67/16 67/18 67/20 119/11 120/13 138/6 27/16 22/23 72/17 77/15 26/7 77/16 71/18 71/27 1/18 71/27 116/12 16/22 110/11 120/21 119/11 120/13 138/6 27/16 26/8 70/25 71/10 71/18 77/18 71/8 27/77 116/22 16/21 110/12 120/17 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/12 14/14 127/7 116/17 16/21 17/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/20 12/7 126/17 16/21 17/					
138/3 143/25 143/25 143/2 54/2 15 03/1 03/25 139/2 150/1 03/25 139/2 150/1 03/25 139/3 143/25 143/25 154/1 5 13/25 139/2 150/2 13/27 139/2 150/2 13/27 139/2 150/2 13/27 277/1 5 26/2 70/2 7/10 7/116 166/2 5 6/20 170/2 11/2 7/12 7/27 141/2 14/2 14/25 141/2 14/2 14/25 141/2 14/2 14/2 14/25 116/2 1 50/20 12/21 139/2 150/1 10/14 166/2 5 6/20 170/2 11/2 7/10 141/2 14/21 141/21 141/21 141/2					
146/14 213/24 252/16 64/16 64/22 64/24 130/21 130/23 132/1 67/16 67/18 67/20 174/16 16/16 180/23 273/6 273/777113 63/25 07/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/22 61/26/16 162/26 12/26/26 176/16 67/20 176/20<		54/21 63/17 63/25	128/23 130/6 130/11	63/24 65/1 65/25	119/11 120/13 138/16
273/6 273/7 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
21713 2002 72/8 73/18 82/7 87/13 68/22 124/13 124/16 74/1 88/4 89/16 146/15 149/3 62/19 66/4 80/7 116/25 130/23 172/2 116/25 130/23 172/2 116/25 130/24 129/15 reliance [1] 48/17 116/25 130/24 181/10 113/21 124/14 127/7 128/24 129/8 129/15 128/24 129/8 129/15 reliance [1] 49/17 20/2 113/25 130/1 154/4 133/16 129/17 129/9 130/4 133/16 regain [1] 157/15 regain [6] 13/11 162/2 176/16 176/21 176/24 reliance [1] 48/23 120/9 121/7 133/16 154/15 155/1 156/13 128/32 13/8/1 154/4 regarding [6] 13/11 162/2 176/16 13/22 178/2 reliance [1] 16/17 reliance [1] 16/17 120/9 121/7 119/19 145/21 16/44 202/2 22/17 128/83/21 14/9 223/8 223/2 23/8 reping [1] 14/9 120/9 122/2 128/14 159/21 16/44 203/2 23/14 23/17 223/8 223/2 23/21 22/17 123/16 13/26 remain [6] 13/3 16/21 123/16 13/26 14/19 records [4] 14/17 regards [2] 14/17 remain [6] 13/3/2 remain [6] 13/3/2 remain [6] 13/3/2 remain [6] 13/					
Presson Presson <t< td=""><td>277/15 286/2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	277/15 286/2				
16/19/25 100/4 60/7 104/2 105/22 106/19 refuses [1] 89/3 177/4 127/16 127/17 relied [2] 14/10 172/5 179/24 181/10 139/13 22/116/18 117/12 regin [2] 89/3 128/24 129/8 129/15 28/13 relied [2] 14/10 172/5 179/24 181/10 135/23 136/1 154/4 131/1 116/22 176/16 176/21 176/24 176/16 176/21 176/24 168/17 168/24 170/16 178/25 108/18 154/15 155/1 156/13 21/8 30/24 130/4 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/8 129/16 128/24 129/16 128/24 129/16 128/24 129/16 128/24 129/16 128/24 129/16 128/24 129/16 128/24 12/17 128/24 12/17 128/16 128/24 12/17 128/16 128/16 128/16 128/16 128/17 128/16 128/17 128/16 128/17 128/17 128/17 <					
110/20 130/22 110/21					
112/15 12/12 12/12 12/12 13/14 13/14 relief [5] 19/12 22/12 19/13 13/14 13/14 13/14 13/14 relief [5] 19/12 22/12 18/12/5 13/14 15/15 15/16					
reasonability [1] 134/9 139/1 39/1 162/2 167/2 13/2 167/2 13/					
184/25 153/25 130/1 134/4 regardlog [1] 13/11 10/2 170/16 170/2 170/4 170/4 reflet [5] 10/29 120/2 199/2 1107 116/12 10/24 123/15 159/14 159/21 160/14 202/12 178/12 120/2 178/12 120/2 rely [3] 16/12 120/2 120/6 122/24 123/15 203/24 223/1 24/22 12/48 138/21 149/8 223/5 223/5 223/6 223/8 rely [3] 16/17 149/4 rely [3] 16/17 149/4 120/6 122/24 123/15 203/24 223/1 24/22 177/25 223/10 223/11 223/11 rely [3] 10/23 14/1 130/21 130/2 246/15 263/32 63/8 277/25 223/10 223/11 223/11 remainin [6] 13/23 14/1 130/21 120/5 records [4] 42/12 179/44 182/20 182/22 256/20 256/24 257/14 remainin [6] 10/23 remainin [6] 10/23 19/17 120/11 120/5 records [4] 42/12 179/44 182/20 182/2 257/10 257/17 registries [3] 80/24 93/8 113/25 remainin [6] 10/24 remainin [6] 10/24 remainin [6] 10/24 remainin [6] 10/24 remainin [2] 61/23 181/16 remainin [2] 61/23 181/16 remainin [2] 61/23 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16 181/16					165/17 168/24 170/16
reasonable [18] 53/1 8/15/1 159/14 159/21 169/14 202/12 179/11 180/18 rely [3] 85/1 216/12 120/6 122/24 123/16 123/16 123/16 123/16 123/16 123/17 18/15 18/16 18/16 18/17					
35/17 170/9 172/19 186/13 186/14 186/13 186/14 186/13 186/14 186/13 186/14 186/13 186/14 186/13 186/13 186/14 186/13 186/13 186/14 186/13 186/13 186/14 186/13 186/14 186/13 <td>reasonable [18] 53/3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	reasonable [18] 53/3				
11920/6 122/4 123/14 138/21 149/4 223/5 223/5 223/5 123/14 13/23 14/14 120/6 122/14 123/14 23/14 223/14 223/14 223/14 13/23 14/14 143/24 176/25 181/25 223/24 223/14 23/14 23/14 23/14 223/14 223/14 223/14 223/14 23/14 23/14 23/14 23/14 23/14 23/14 23/14 23/14 23/14 <					
1201 (12) 1201 (12)					
123/10 123/10 246/15 263/3 277/25 223/24 241/1 23/14 23/14 223/24 221/1 22/14 241/1 22/22 22/20 22/20 22/20 22/20 22/20 22/20 22/20 22/20 22/21 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>remain [4] 13/23 14/1</td>					remain [4] 13/23 14/1
176/25 181/25 264/19 regardless [5] 178/22 256/22 256/22 256/22 757/17 remained [1] 166/1 119/17 120/17 records [1] 177/17 records [1] 120/17 226/12 257/2 257/12 57/17 remained [1] 169/15 133/16 records [1] 110/17 records [1] 110/17 records [1] 120/17 184/18 184/15 189/24 133/16 records [1] 110/17 red fine [3] 119/12 206/12 226/12 257/12 registrations [3] 94/17 184/16 184/15 184/16 133/16 records [1] 110/17 red fine [3] 111/27 220/8 20/12 registrations [3] 93/12 184/16 181/16 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
reasonableness [3] 119/17 120/1 120/5 reasonabl(2] 73/8 reasonabl(1] 177/17 reasonabl(2] 73/8 reasonabl(1] 177/17 reasonabl(2] 73/8 red [3] 21/13 160/13 red [3] 21/13 122/25 red [3] 26/4 26/10 276/5 red [3] 21/13 160/13 ref red [1] 12/13 ref red [1] 13/19 red [3] 21/13 122/25 red [1] 160/14 receipt [1] 166/18 receipt [1] 166/18 reference [5] 12/3 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/32 27/1 228/2 28/12 20/12 28/12 20/12 28/12 20/12 ref rescipt [2] 166/13 ref remc [5] 12/3 13/24 16/16 16/17 register [2] 50/3 66/2 register [2] 50/3 26/21 references [5] 40/25 references [2] 106/4 reference [1] 18/3 reference [2] 106/4 reference [1] 15/9 refielt [1] 172/1 reference [2] 19/48 reference					
119/17 120/1 120/5 42/17 165/1 199/14 167/1 182/25 184/14 184/3 194/14 184/3 194/14 184/3 194/14 184/3 194/14 184/3 194/14 184/3 194/14 184/3					
recurse [1] 110/17 182/25 registry [3] 89/24 remains [2] 61/23 reasoned [1] 17/17 185/15 red [3] 21/13 180/13 181/16 reasoned [1] 171/17 182/25 registry [3] 48/11 64/12 131/16 reasons [7] 9/22 94/12 123/4 132/7 222/8 222/10 22/12 82/10 128/1 64/16 64/19 64/22 21/23 28/20 29/4 171/24 128/17 82/17 22/8 22/10 22/12 82/10 128/1 remains [2] 61/23 13/24 61/13 148/18 149/8 149/8 148/8 149/8 148/8 149/8 148/8 149/8 148/8 149/8 149/8 148/8 149/8 148/8 149/8 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
133/10 reasoned [1] 177/17 reasoned [1] 177/17 red [3] 21/13 160/13 region [15] 13/4/16 13/4/16 14/16 64/12 remarks [6] 22/20 103/8 115/11 179/10 redefine [3] 119/23 206/3 213/4 222/7 73/12 82/10 126/3 148/8 149/8 reasons [7] 9/22 94/12 103/13 122/27 redefine [1] 131/9 231/14 232/2 2240/12 73/12 82/10 126/3 148/8 149/8 reasume [1] 137/20 refer [5] 15/13 22/7 redefine [6] 125/13 22/7 regional [9] 48/5 regulation [1] 128/1 109/23 110/13 111/22 receipt [1] 166/18 refer [6] 12/17 91/8 register [20] 50/3 66/2 remetby [2] 109/11 remetby [2] 109/11 17/3/3 227/1 228/2 162/7 162/10 198/24 66/5 66/14 66/20 67/2 remetby [2] 109/11 remetby [2] 109/11 receive [7] 73/7 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/24 16/16 16/17 143/6 143/9 references [5] 40/25 66/5 66/14 66/20 67/2 references [5] 40/25 66/5 66/14 66/20 67/2 references [5] 40/25 67/17 67/21 74/2 reference [1] 16/16 16/27 references [5] 40/25 163/17 212/13 21/13 22/7 reference [1] 16/24 17/16 22/77 23/31 25/7 111/9 reference [1] 22/32 22/72 22/72 23/22 22/72 22/72 23/22 22/72 22/72/2 23/22 22/72 22/72 23/22 22/72	reasonably [2] 73/8				
reasoning [1] 11/1/1/1 165/1 134/18 164/23 204/24 registry [9] 48/11 64/4 remarks [6] 22/20 103/8 115/11 179/10 redefine [3] 119/23 206/3 213/4 222/7 73/12 82/10 126/3 148/8 149/8 94/12 103/13 122/25 redefining [1] 128/13 22/20 22/10 22/10 73/12 82/10 126/3 148/8 149/8 94/12 103/13 122/25 Redefining [1] 128/13 250/4 250/20 regulation [3] 64/10 109/23 110/13 111/22 recall [3] 26/4 26/10 refer [5] 15/13 22/7 regional [9] 48/5 regulations [3] 64/10 115/19 181/5 receive [7] 73/7 reference [15] 12/3 103/25 121/15 136/4 rehash [1] 105/6 remember [37] 106/1 receive [7] 73/7 126/4 154/8 162/5 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 rejected [9] 42/11 rejected [9] 42/11 110/2 remember [37] 106/1 receive [17] 73/7 126/4 154/8 162/5 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/9 111/15 111/20 124/17 213/24 216/4 236/12 23/6 227/3 162/17 162/17 108/2 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 rejecte [9] 42/11 214/17 215/24 216/4 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/2 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/9 111/5 111/20 219/15 222/7 223/19 214/16 24/22 24/16 207/21 223/6 227/3 257/3 25					
reasons [7] 9/12 redefine [3] 119/23 206/3 213/4 222/7 64/16 64/19 64/22 22/23 28/20 29/4 103/8 115/11 179/10 redefine [3] 119/23 22/8 22210 222/18 73/12 82/10 126/3 148/8 149/8 94/12 103/13 122/25 redefine [1] 131/9 23/14 23/22 240/12 129/9 remedicing [1] 128/3 71/24 218/17 282/10 refer [5] 15/13 22/7 regional [9] 48/5 regulations [3] 64/10 109/23 110/13 111/22 receipt [1] 166/16 13/22 144/14 99/13 100/16 103/21 93/9 123/6 remedy [2] 109/11 receive [1] 166/16 13/24 16/16 16/17 143/6 143/9 register [20] 50/3 66/2 repister [21] 18/14 register [20] 50/3 66/2 repister [21] 18/14 register [20] 50/3 66/2 repister [21] 18/14 references [5] 40/25 fe3/16 6/17 67/21 74/2 <					
reasons [7] 9/22 94/12 103/13 122/25 171/24 218/17 82/10 123/4 132/17 redefining [1] 128/13 redefining [1] 128/13 redefining [1] 128/13 receive [1] 137/20 123/4 132/17 redefining [1] 128/13 receive [1] 137/20 13/12 82/10 126/37 redefining [1] 128/13 regulation [1] 128/13 regulation [1] 128/13 regulation [1] 128/13 regulation [1] 128/13 receive [7] 73/7 143/8 149/8 regulation [1] 128/13 receive [7] 73/7 143/8 143/9 regulation [1] 128/13 receive [7] 73/7 143/2 14/14 regulation [3] 64/10 regulation [3] 64/10 regulation [3] 64/10 remedies [6] 105/5 109/23 110/13 111/22 regulation [3] 64/10 remedies [6] 105/6 remedies [6] 105/6 74/9 247/18 276/5 13/24 16/16 16/17 receive [7] 73/7 13/24 16/16 16/17 reference [15] 12/3 13/24 16/16 16/17 130/25 121/15 136/4 register [20] 50/3 66/2 regic [1] 181/6 reimbursed [1] register [20] 50/3 66/2 regic [1] 181/6 reimbursed [1] relect [1] 181/6 190/10 126/3 110/2 74/9 24/14 236/1 236/3 252/10 receive [17] 11/21 13/24 16/16 16/17 182/4 173/22 71/12 103/25 121/15 136/4 references [5] 40/25 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 register [31] 52/6 52/16 50/14 73/24 74/8 190/10 204/17 213/20 reject [31] 52/6 52/16 50/14 73/24 74/8 110/2 reference [5] 40/25 74/9 74/11 75/2 286/24 72/72 253/13 257/3 259/3 265/21 receive [1] 124/17 receives [1] 124/17 receives [1] 124/17 receives [1] 124/17 receives [1] 124/17 receives [1] 124/17 reference [2] 15/14 43/22 50/4 51/20 54/2 72/20 91/9 159/24 12/21 24/16 244/22 24/16 24/16 244/22 24/16 24/16 244/22 24/16 24/16 244/22 24/16 24/16 244/22 24/16 24/16 244/22 24/17 24/16 244/22 24/16 24/16 244/22 24/17 24/16 244/22 24/17 24/17 213/20 26/10 134/6 238/21 26/10 134/6 238/		redefine [3] 119/23			
94/12 103/13 122/25 171/24 218/17 282/10 reference [1] 13/19 23/1/4 23/22 24/0/12 reference [1] 128/1 reference [1] 128/1 recall [3] 26/4 26/10 refere [5] 15/13 22/7 regional [9] 48/5 regulations [3] 64/10 13/24 16/16 16/7 276/5 receive [7] 73/7 13/26/16/16 16/7 14/32 12/2 12/15 136/4 reference [1] 105/6 remember [37] 106/1 173/13 227/1 228/2 13/6/16 16/2 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 reject [1] 181/6 196/10 20/4/7 213/10 236/1 236/3 252/10 received [17] 11/21 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 reject [1] 181/2 196/10 20/4/7 213/10 66/25 67/4 73/24 74/8 126/4 154/8 162/5 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 reject [1] 11/2 110/2 196/10 20/4/7 213/10 229/2 references [5] 40/25 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/9 111/15 111/20 196/10 20/4/7 213/10 26/25 67/4 73/24 74/8 138/23 257/3 24/13 24/13 23/22 23/3 223/2 23/23 23/25 23/12 259/3 265/21 referencing [2] 106/4 referencing [2] 106/4 registered [3] 52/6 52/8 54/24 65/11 99/10 113/10 135/5 24/1/2 24/1/2 23/20 24/1/2 24/1/2 70/17 receiver [1] 24/6/17 referencing [2] 15/14 106/3 13/17 113/18 148/11 195/		123/4 132/7		73/12 82/10 126/3	148/8 149/8
171/24 218/17 282/10 Redefining [1] 128/13 250/4 250/20 regulation [1] 128/13 109/23 110/13 111/22 recall [3] 26/4 26/10 refer [5] 15/13 22/7 140/23 143/22 144/14 99/13 100/16 103/21 93/9 123/6 remedy [2] 109/11 receipt [1] 166/18 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/24 16/16 16/17 register [20] 50/3 66/2 remedy [2] 109/11 110/2 73/13 227/1 228/2 126/4 154/8 162/5 162/7 162/10 198/24 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 reject [1] 181/6 160/16 188/23 19/19 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/24 162/7 162/10 198/24 94/21 162/17 162/25 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 reject [1] 181/6 160/16 188/23 19/19 236/12 326/27 references [5] 40/25 references [5] 40/25 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/9 111/15 111/20 214/17 215/24 216/4 24/19 24/11 75/2 86/24 198/12 references [3] 52/6 52/8 54/24 65/11 99/10 113/10 135/5 233/20 241/16 243/14 25/3 265/21 reference [2] 106/4 157/22 52/8 54/24 65/11 99/10 113/10 135/5 245/4 247/21 250/11 74/9 74/11 75/2 reference [2] 196/3 reference [3] 15/24 160/12 138/8 262/2 27/3 264/13 264/15 25/9 265/21 referen					
140/23 143/22 144/14 276/5 99/13 100/16 103/21 13/24 16/16 16/17 93/9 123/6 remedy [2] 109/11 276/5 reference [15] 12/3 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/25 121/15 136/4 143/6 143/9 remeby [2] 109/11 receive [7] 73/7 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/24 16/16 16/17 register [20] 50/3 66/2 redet [1] 181/6 remeber [37] 106/1 173/13 227/1 228/2 162/7 162/10 198/24 66/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 rejecte [9] 42/11 160/16 188/23 191/9 236/1 236/3 252/10 references [5] 40/25 references [5] 40/25 163/17 76/21 74/2 62/16 99/4 111/3 217/16 217/18 217/22 240/721 223/6 227/3 referencing [2] 106/4 referencing [2] 106/4 register [31] 52/6 52/6 56/6 70/23 87/13 233/20 241/16 243/14 259/3 265/21 referencing [2] 106/4 referencing [2] 106/4 referencing [2] 106/4 24/3 referencing [2] 106/4 23/22 23/3223/4 24/16 244/22 245/1 259/3 265/21 referencing [2] 106/4 referencing [2] 106/4 referencing [2] 15/14 30/5 56/6 70/23 87/13 24/16 244/12 206/17 receives [1] 81/27 referencing [2] 15/14 106/3 113/17 113/18 relate [3] 16/12 138/8 262/3 264/13 264/15 202/12 201/22 21/1 21/14 16/16 10/27 referencing [2] 19/2 <td< td=""><td>171/24 218/17 282/10</td><td></td><td></td><td>regulation [1] 128/1</td><td></td></td<>	171/24 218/17 282/10			regulation [1] 128/1	
receint [5] 204 201/0 reference [15] 12/3 103/25 121/15 136/4 rehash [1] 105/6 110/2 receive [7] 73/7 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/24 16/16 16/17 register [20] 50/3 66/2 rehash [1] 105/6 remember [37] 106/1 173/13 227/1 228/2 162/17 162/10 198/24 166/5 66/11 166/20 67/4 reject [1] 181/6 160/16 188/23 191/9 236/1 236/3 252/10 162/7 162/10 198/24 166/5 66/11 66/20 67/4 reject [1] 181/6 196/10 204/17 213/10 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/24 198/12 references [5] 40/25 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/9 111/15 211/9 222/2 23/3 223/2 207/2 123/6 227/3 27/3 257/3 referring [9] 15/14 referring [9] 15/14 referring [9] 15/14 241/3 223/20 241/16 243/14 70/17 referring [9] 15/14 68/22 73/14 83/16 148/11 195/2 223/20 241/15 24/12 20/11 245/4 247/12 1250/11 70/17 referring [9] 15/14 43/22 50/4 51/20 54/2 106/3 113/17 113/18 148/11 195/2 226/2 273/4 277/7 receives [1] 81/23 refers [2] 194/8 102/2 12/12 21/15 130/20 13/10 132/2 106/3 13/17 113/18 266/2 273/4 277/17 receives [1] 127/010 refers [2] 194/8 102/2/1 210/25 212/11 24/14 21/15	reassure [1] 137/20				
27/0/5 13/24 16/16 16/17 receive [T] 73/7 13/24 16/16 16/17 13/24 16/16 16/17 143/6 143/9 receive [T] 73/7 18/8 18/25 27/17 91/8 173/13 227/1 228/2 126/4 154/8 162/5 236/1 236/3 252/10 126/1 162/10 198/24 236/2 23/6 227/3 162/7 162/10 198/24 66/2 5 67/4 73/24 74/8 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/21 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/21 references [5] 40/25 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/21 references [5] 40/25 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/21 references [2] 106/4 72/07/2 1223/6 227/3 reference [1] 196/3 receiver [1] 246/17 reference [2] 106/4 receives [1] 81/23 reference [1] 196/3 references [2] 106/4 122/10 25 4/2 157/22 reference [2] 106/4 157/22 reference [1] 196/3 references [2] 106/4 106/3 113/17 113/18 receiver [1] 246/17 reference [1] 196/3 reference [2] 194/8 122/11 126/3 127/15 receives [1] 12/20/10 referes [2] 194/8 10/17 122/13 240/8 240/9 receives [1] 12/01 referes [2] 194/8 10/17 referes [2] 194/8 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
receive [1] 160/16 18/8 18/25 27/17 91/8 register [20] 50/3 66/2 149/19 160/16 18/23 19/19 173/13 227/1 228/2 126/4 154/8 162/7 162/7 162/7 162/7 162/10 19/24 166/5 66/5 66/1 66/20 67/4 rejecter [1] 18/8 18/23 19/19 160/16 18/23 19/19 19/17 12/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/17 11/					remember [37] 106/14
173/13 227/1 228/2 126/4 154/8 162/5 66/5 66/71 66/20 67/4 reject [1] 181/6 196/10 204/17 213/10 236/1 236/3 252/10 229/22 162/7 162/10 198/24 29/22 162/7 162/10 198/24 214/17 215/24 216/4 26/25 67/4 73/24 74/8 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/24 23/18 65/12 71/12 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/9 111/15 111/20 214/17 215/24 216/4 207/21 223/6 227/3 236/2 27/3 198/12 referencing [2] 106/4 157/22 223/23 230/25 231/2 259/3 265/21 referencing [9] 15/14 157/22 referred [31] 52/6 30/5 56/6 70/23 87/13 233/20 241/16 243/14 259/3 265/21 referred [1] 196/3 referred [31] 52/6 52/8 54/24 65/11 30/5 56/6 70/23 87/13 245/4 247/21 250/14 43/22 50/4 51/20 54/2 157/22 73/14 83/16 148/11 195/2 262/3 264/13 264/15 262/3 264/13 264/15 170/17 receiving [2] 72/24 170/17 refers [2] 194/8 124/11 126/3 127/15 162/18 163/22 201/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 26/2 273/4 277/7 199/10 refile [1] 172/11 refers [2] 194/8 251/25 269/23 271/24 relates [1] 199/9 114/25 134/17 139/19 199/10 referes [2] 27/6 146/20 refers [2] 27/6 146/20		18/8 18/25 27/17 91/8	register [20] 50/3 66/2		
236/1 236/3 252/10 162/7 162/10 198/24 94/21 162/17 162/25 163/67/21 74/2 162/60 99/4 111/3 214/17 215/24 2164 229/22 94/21 162/17 162/25 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/9 111/15 111/20 219/15 222/7 223/19 66/25 67/4 73/24 74/8 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/24 163/17 212/13 212/15 115/24 173/22 219/15 222/7 223/19 207/21 223/6 227/3 198/12 references [5] 40/25 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/15 111/20 219/15 222/7 223/19 259/3 265/21 referred [1] 196/3 referring [9] 15/14 referring [9] 15/14 86/22 73/14 83/16 30/5 56/6 70/23 87/13 245/4 247/21 250/11 70/17 receives [1] 81/23 referring [9] 15/14 106/3 113/17 113/18 relate [3] 16/12 138/8 262/3 264/13 264/15 72/20 91/9 159/24 130/20 13/110 132/2 124/11 126/3 127/15 referes [2] 194/8 202/12 201/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 26/22 273/4 271/7 199/10 refies [2] 194/8 202/12 201/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 26/23 264/15 26/26/23 271/24 114/25 134/17 139/19 199/10 refies [2] 194/8 202/12 201/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 24/14 221/15 26/22 273/4 271/7 remombered [1] 215/22 114/2					196/10 204/17 213/10
received [17] rife references [5] 40/25 163/17 212/13 212/15 111/9 111/9 111/15 111/20 219/15 223/23 233/20 223/23 233/20 223/23 233/20 223/23 233/20 241/16 243/14 207/21 223/6 227/3 223/23 233/20 241/16 243/14 241/16 243/14 244/16 244/16 244/16 244/16 244/16 244/16 244/16 244/16 244/12 245/1 233/20 241/16 243/14 244/16 244/12 243/14 244/16 244/12 243/14 244/16 244/16 244/12 245/1 245/4 241/12 203/20 241/16 244/12 245/1 245/4 244/16 244/12 245/1 245/4 244/16 244/16 244/16 245/4 241/12 203/11 219/15 221/12 245/4 241/12 203/12 245/4 241/12 261/1 202/22 261/1 202/22 261/21 245/4 241/12 261/21 266/22 273/4 271/7 remombered [1] 213/17					
00/23 6/1/4 / 73/24 / 74/6 74/9 74/11 75/2 86/24 207/21 223/6 227/3 259/3 265/21 43/18 65/12 71/12 198/12 212/22 223/3 223/4 241/3 115/24 173/22 223/23 230/25 231/2 233/20 241/16 243/14 200/23 87/13 227/7 253/13 257/3 259/3 265/21 referencing [2] 106/4 157/22 registered [31] 52/6 52/8 54/24 65/11 30/5 56/6 70/23 87/13 99/10 113/10 135/5 223/23 230/25 231/2 233/20 241/16 243/14 receiver [1] 246/17 receives [1] 81/23 receiving [2] 72/24 170/17 referring [9] 15/14 43/22 50/4 51/20 54/2 122/12 201/4 106/3 113/17 113/18 106/3 113/17 113/18 relate [3] 16/12 138/8 202/1 31/10 132/2 2264/13 264/15 266/2 273/4 277/7 receiving [2] 72/24 170/17 refers [2] 194/8 102/18 163/22 201/15 162/18 163/22 201/15 relate [7] 24/4 24/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 remembered [1] 215/22 recognise [4] 33/19 68/15 146/8 147/4 recollection [1] 264/18 115/9 reflect [5] 27/6 146/20 189/21 190/8 257/24 274/5 274/7 280/18 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relating [7] 19/22 47/2 47/10 116/3 125/8 176/3 196/13 114/23 16/8	received [17] 11/21				
1/4/9 1/41/17/3/2 80/24 207/21 223/6 227/3 227/7 253/13 257/3 259/3 265/21 198/12 referencing [2] 106/4 157/22 241/3 registered [31] 52/6 52/8 54/24 65/11 Rejoinder [10] 13/6 30/5 56/6 70/23 87/13 99/10 113/10 135/5 233/20 241/16 243/14 244/16 244/22 245/1 245/4 247/21 250/11 receiver [1] 246/17 receiver [1] 81/23 receiving [2] 72/24 170/17 recently [1] 270/10 RECHTSANWÄLTE [1] 4/6 refers [2] 194/8 199/10 68/22 73/14 83/16 106/3 113/17 113/18 106/3 113/17 113/18 106/3 113/17 113/18 102/1 31/10 132/2 202/1 210/25 212/11 202/1 210/25 212/11 216/12 138/8 202/22 relate [3] 16/12 138/8 202/22 266/2 273/4 277/7 remembered [1] 215/22 refers [2] 194/8 199/10 202/1 210/25 212/11 212/13 240/8 240/9 refile [1] 172/11 refile [1] 172/11 refile [1] 115/9 refile [1] 119/9 refile [1] 115/9 refile [1] 119/9 refile [1] 115/9 refile [1] 115/9 refile [1] 115/9 refile [1] 116/2 189/21 190/8 257/24 Rejoinder [10] 13/6 removed [1] 93/17					
20/721 223/6 227/3 referencing [2] 106/4 registered [31] 52/6 30/5 56/6 70/23 87/13 244/16 244/22 245/1 227/7 253/13 257/3 259/3 265/21 referred [1] 196/3 referred [1] 196/3 99/10 113/10 135/5 245/4 247/21 250/11 receives [1] 81/23 referring [9] 15/14 68/22 73/14 83/16 148/11 195/2 252/3 254/1 259/14 170/17 receiving [2] 72/24 72/20 91/9 159/24 106/3 113/17 113/18 124/11 126/3 127/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 266/2 273/4 277/7 recently [1] 270/10 refers [2] 194/8 124/11 126/3 127/15 162/18 163/22 201/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 215/22 refiel [1] 172/11 refiel [1] 172/11 212/13 240/8 240/9 247/4 247/15 remind [7] 30/18 84/2 199/10 refile [1] 172/11 274/5 274/7 280/18 relating [7] 19/22 47/2 142/22 225/17 refile [1] 115/9 refict [5] 27/6 146/20 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17					
22/1/ 253/13 257/3 157/22 52/8 54/24 65/11 99/10 113/10 135/5 245/4 247/21 250/11 259/3 265/21 referred [1] 196/3 referring [9] 15/14 68/22 73/14 83/16 148/11 195/2 252/3 254/1 259/14 receives [1] 81/23 referring [9] 15/14 106/3 113/17 113/18 148/11 195/2 266/2 273/4 247/21 250/11 170/17 recently [1] 270/10 72/20 91/9 159/24 130/20 131/10 132/2 refers [2] 194/8 202/1 210/25 212/11 26/10 194/6 238/21 266/2 273/4 277/7 199/10 refiel [1] 172/11 refiel [1] 172/11 212/13 240/8 240/9 248/4 271/15 remind [7] 30/18 84/2 199/10 refiel [1] 115/9 refiel [1] 115/9 274/5 274/7 280/18 registering [9] 51/24 142/22 225/17 reminds [1] 32/4 recollection [1] 264/18 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17					
receiver [1] 246/17 referred [1] 196/3 68/22 73/14 83/16 148/11 195/2 252/3 254/1 259/14 receives [1] 81/23 referring [9] 15/14 106/3 113/17 113/18 relate [3] 16/12 138/8 262/3 264/13 264/15 receiving [2] 72/24 43/22 50/4 51/20 54/2 124/11 126/3 127/15 relate [3] 16/12 138/8 262/3 264/13 264/15 170/17 72/20 91/9 159/24 130/20 131/10 132/2 related [7] 24/4 24/15 remembered [1] 237/7 162/18 163/22 201/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 215/22 recognise [4] 33/19 refile [1] 172/11 212/13 240/8 240/9 relates [1] 199/9 114/25 134/17 139/19 68/15 146/8 147/4 refile [1] 172/11 251/25 269/23 271/24 registering [9] 51/24 47/10 116/3 125/8 reminds [1] 32/4 7264/18 189/21 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17				99/10 113/10 135/5	245/4 247/21 250/11
receives [1] 81/23 receiving [2] 72/24 170/17 recently [1] 270/10 RECHTSANWÄLTE [1] 4/6 recognise [4] 33/19 68/15 146/8 147/4 recollection [1] 264/18 referring [9] 15/14 43/22 50/4 51/20 54/2 72/20 91/9 159/24 237/7 100/3 113/17 113/18 124/11 126/3 127/15 130/20 131/10 132/2 202/1 210/25 212/11 212/13 240/8 240/9 refate [3] 16/12 138/8 202/22 206/2 273/4 277/7 remembered [1] 215/22 recognise [4] 33/19 68/15 146/8 147/4 recollection [1] 264/18 refile [1] 172/11 189/21 190/8 257/24 100/3 113/17 113/18 124/11 126/3 127/15 120/21 210/25 212/11 212/13 240/8 240/9 relate [3] 16/12 138/8 202/22 206/2 273/4 277/7 remembered [1] 215/22 refile [1] 172/11 refiled [1] 115/9 264/18 refile [1] 172/11 refiled [1] 115/9 251/25 269/23 271/24 274/5 274/7 280/18 relating [7] 19/22 47/2 47/10 116/3 125/8 reminds [1] 32/4 remotely [2] 4/10 36/ removed [1] 93/17					
receiving [2] 72/24 43/22 50/4 51/20 54/2 124/11 126/3 12/15 202/22 206/2 2/3/4 27/17 170/17 72/20 91/9 159/24 130/20 131/10 132/2 related [7] 24/4 24/15 215/22 237/7 162/18 163/22 201/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 215/22 recently [1] 270/10 refers [2] 194/8 202/1 210/25 212/11 248/4 271/15 remind [7] 30/18 84/2 [1] 4/6 refile [1] 172/11 215/125 269/23 271/24 relates [1] 199/9 114/25 134/17 139/19 68/15 146/8 147/4 refiled [1] 115/9 274/5 274/7 280/18 47/10 116/3 125/8 reminds [1] 32/4 reflect [5] 27/6 146/20 189/21 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17					
170/17 72/20 9/19 159/24 130/20 131/10 132/2 related [1] 24/4 24/15 remembered [1] recently [1] 270/10 237/7 162/18 163/22 201/15 26/10 194/6 238/21 215/22 RECHTSANWÄLTE refers [2] 194/8 202/1 210/25 212/11 248/4 271/15 remind [7] 30/18 84/2 [1] 4/6 recognise [4] 33/19 refile [1] 172/11 215/25 269/23 271/24 relates [1] 199/9 114/25 134/17 139/19 68/15 146/8 147/4 refiled [1] 115/9 274/5 274/7 280/18 47/10 116/3 125/8 reminds [1] 32/4 reflect [5] 27/6 146/20 189/21 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17					
recently [1] 270/10 refers [2] 194/8 202/1 210/25 212/11 248/4 271/15 remind [7] 30/18 84/2 [1] 4/6 199/10 114/25 134/17 139/19 251/25 269/23 271/24 248/4 271/15 remind [7] 30/18 84/2 [1] 4/6 recognise [4] 33/19 refile [1] 172/11 251/25 269/23 271/24 274/5 274/7 280/18 relating [7] 19/22 47/2 14/25 134/17 139/19 68/15 146/8 147/4 reflect [5] 27/6 146/20 274/5 274/7 280/18 registering [9] 51/24 176/3 196/13 remotely [2] 4/10 36/ 264/18 189/21 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17	170/17				
[1] 4/6 199/10 212/13 240/8 240/9 relates [1] 199/9 114/25 134/17 139/19 [6] 4/6 refile [1] 172/11 251/25 269/23 271/24 relating [7] 19/22 47/2 142/22 225/17 68/15 146/8 147/4 refiled [1] 115/9 refiled [1] 115/9 refiled [1] 115/9 146/20 142/22 225/17 76/3 196/13 remotely [2] 4/10 36/ 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17					
[1] 4/6 refile [1] 172/11 251/25 269/23 271/24 relating [7] 19/22 47/2 142/22 225/17 68/15 146/8 147/4 refiled [1] 115/9 274/5 274/7 280/18 47/10 116/3 125/8 reminds [1] 32/4 7ecollection [1] 189/21 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17					114/25 134/17 139/19
68/15 146/8 147/4 reflect [5] 27/6 146/20 27/4/5 27/4/7 280/18 47/10 116/3 125/8 reminds [1] 32/4 recollection [1] 264/18 189/21 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17			251/25 269/23 271/24		142/22 225/17
recollection [1] refrect [5] 27/6 146/20 registering [9] 51/24 176/3 196/13 remotely [2] 4/10 36/ 264/18 189/21 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 remotely [2] 93/17					
264/18 189/21 190/8 257/24 59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9 relation [8] 14/23 16/8 removed [1] 93/17			• • • • •		remotely [2] 4/10 36/7
www.dianaburdon.com		189/21 190/8 257/24	59/8 61/14 64/18 66/9	relation [8] 14/23 16/8	removed [1] 93/17
www.dianaburdan.com					
			www.dianahurdan.acm		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
R	174/15 215/4 215/8	resolution [2] 114/16	39/11 40/15 41/15	revelations [1] 146/6
render [1] 110/5	215/15 217/13 234/4	115/8	42/2 42/21 59/6 64/23	revenue [3] 27/17
rendered [1] 254/3	237/5 238/1 244/13	resolve [3] 31/18	65/9 72/8 98/8 98/15	137/17 144/23
rent [4] 233/22 233/23	250/22	103/7 192/13	99/2 99/23 101/4	revenues [3] 136/12
238/15 238/19	representatives [3] 60/1 91/14 274/17	resolved [5] 75/21 126/11 139/10 155/2	102/3 102/4 102/13 104/8 104/22 105/3	136/18 145/15 review [17] 22/16
rental [1] 175/19	represented [3] 56/7	284/10	105/10 107/21 108/8	22/18 32/11 46/13
rented [1] 249/25	220/4 244/14	resorting [2] 109/21	110/1 112/9 112/14	119/13 122/10 122/15
repeat [2] 160/25	representing [2]	110/4	119/18 121/12 122/7	123/22 126/7 131/11
202/10 repeatedly [4] 98/20	99/13 238/9	respect [2] 171/11	122/11 127/17 128/19	134/9 142/2 147/14
112/24 174/16 174/20	represents [1] 50/1	251/11	132/3 133/5 138/17	174/4 177/19 178/4
replace [1] 274/9	REPUBLIC [16] 1/11	respected [2] 58/11	142/5 143/4 146/7	182/6
replaced [3] 274/3	4/8 4/13 7/6 100/8	100/14	147/17 147/20 148/3	reviewed [6] 65/9
274/12 274/23	100/22 103/19 202/11	respectfully [1] 154/4	148/11 149/18 165/7	122/20 125/21 127/6
reply [11] 68/11 73/22	235/20 270/25 275/19 275/21 277/12 277/23	respecting [1] 6/6 respective [1] 217/4	180/13 241/13 Respondents [9]	219/20 242/24 revised [2] 24/6 28/18
91/1 100/10 105/6	279/20 285/10	respond [8] 24/21	98/19 109/18 115/4	revision [1] 143/19
107/1 107/4 163/18	reputable [1] 141/7	26/2 28/17 82/20 94/1	129/9 139/18 155/1	revisit [1] 156/2
170/12 175/24 181/1	request [36] 13/5 16/7	96/20 138/2 268/9	155/5 166/21 181/9	revoke [1] 129/8
report [86] 21/5 21/8 22/15 22/18 22/22	16/10 16/11 17/8	responded [1] 217/19	Respondents' [3]	REX [5] 14/23 15/1
24/19 24/22 25/4	17/18 18/7 19/11	Respondent [124]	98/12 111/23 154/5	15/11 42/22 194/6
25/24 26/13 27/13	19/17 19/20 20/2 21/4	1/12 4/2 5/3 5/6 5/8	response [15] 14/6	REX-3 [5] 14/23 15/1
28/12 28/17 28/18	24/9 24/24 27/22 36/6	5/14 8/24 10/9 11/7	16/13 18/10 18/13	15/11 42/22 194/6
29/5 29/7 42/19 42/23	37/11 42/2 80/1 94/3	11/21 12/11 13/13	24/17 24/22 26/1 28/6 28/16 29/5 32/12	Rica [2] 30/6 30/10
63/21 64/3 75/15	106/24 107/14 111/3 122/14 126/23 149/10	13/16 14/13 16/8 17/5 17/8 17/12 17/17	69/24 72/1 107/1	right [63] 6/11 9/5 19/23 22/15 22/24
75/18 76/4 76/4 96/18	171/19 173/10 179/14	18/14 18/21 19/15	193/3	28/15 44/2 48/2 54/7
99/20 99/21 100/4	184/21 191/16 193/4	19/16 19/18 23/23	responsibilities [7]	79/19 79/23 80/12
100/17 101/2 107/16	193/17 222/16 236/8	24/1 24/9 24/25 26/22	155/21 158/11 158/23	80/15 113/1 122/16
108/16 108/20 124/3 125/3 126/7 128/22	262/4	29/9 30/12 30/19	158/25 161/9 161/10	123/25 130/14 131/21
133/3 133/5 133/14	requested [7] 34/24	31/19 35/1 40/11	209/14	156/1 158/8 162/24
136/16 137/1 137/4	42/5 66/24 107/11	42/15 56/3 56/19	responsibility [6]	165/1 169/7 169/8
137/8 137/10 137/11	179/19 179/21 194/23	57/11 57/18 62/4	150/7 158/4 161/3	169/12 174/6 190/18
138/1 139/8 140/24	requests [5] 16/7 19/24 77/15 172/4	62/14 63/16 67/6 69/21 70/14 70/17	207/19 213/1 213/2 responsible [15] 47/7	197/6 197/7 198/19 198/22 203/4 203/17
142/2 143/8 143/17	258/13	70/21 70/23 71/9	59/7 59/18 60/16	204/1 210/21 212/23
144/10 144/15 145/12	require [1] 110/12	71/12 71/17 83/23	97/23 155/14 157/17	213/20 215/25 216/10
147/20 150/25 151/12 158/5 162/4 162/23	required [7] 109/7	84/9 87/10 87/22	157/19 159/4 159/6	218/24 220/1 222/1
176/14 177/14 178/23	109/10 114/15 163/4	96/20 97/6 97/15	176/9 185/17 185/22	222/15 225/19 226/6
179/3 182/1 182/3	240/9 240/13 241/7	97/22 97/23 99/8	207/4 208/3	226/11 226/20 226/21
182/4 182/20 182/23	requirement [10]		responsive [2] 96/17	227/13 227/18 228/14
183/7 184/24 194/7	109/11 109/12 109/24	103/9 103/23 104/14	150/25	229/24 231/10 232/9
194/8 196/13 196/13	110/2 110/14 110/22 111/5 111/5 126/6	105/17 106/23 107/3 108/17 110/16 110/23	rest [3] 150/13 154/4 267/8	237/15 252/25 253/11 253/22 254/1 265/18
198/12 198/14 198/24	175/11	111/20 112/2 114/9	restate [1] 98/7	268/4 268/7 274/19
199/1 199/10 218/1	requirements [4]	115/18 117/8 121/22	restatement [1] 149/9	right-hand [3] 54/7
271/14 278/21 279/1	115/7 120/11 175/5	122/8 122/23 123/8	result [7] 113/18	79/23 229/24
279/8 reported [3] 144/7	191/20	124/8 124/17 128/2	122/24 171/7 197/19	rightly [1] 163/13
145/9 146/16	requires [5] 99/17	128/8 130/15 135/4	223/22 239/8 274/15	rights [35] 19/18
reporters [5] 2/21	99/22 127/22 129/16	136/16 137/24 138/8	resulted [1] 198/16	19/25 20/3 72/10
11/16 95/24 151/15	143/1	142/24 148/10 150/9	results [2] 41/24	75/10 75/25 89/19
152/18	resembling [1] 217/2 reserve [6] 13/3 14/10	150/14 152/7 153/13 155/3 155/13 155/14	263/11 resume [1] 286/25	90/4 90/5 92/17 93/8 93/8 98/24 112/3
reports [7] 24/7 27/7	14/14 22/24 28/1	160/6 169/5 175/24	retroactive [4] 57/19	112/5 112/11 112/16
28/8 34/12 100/13	96/10	176/9 176/10 180/17	63/1 63/11 113/23	112/19 113/3 113/9
140/3 151/9	reserved [6] 13/9	180/20 181/12 182/14	retroactively [5] 62/19	
represent [3] 103/10 211/22 259/6	19/18 19/23 19/25	184/16 185/17 185/22	62/23 68/22 89/22	163/12 164/1 164/4
representation [3]	20/3 26/5	185/22 187/3 187/6	128/23	165/16 168/22 171/15
182/8 244/19 259/18	reserving [1] 11/1	191/17 194/23 202/7	return [6] 29/1 83/21	178/19 178/21 180/8
representations [2]	reside [1] 165/3	209/4 244/9 247/19	93/5 177/21 196/9	182/17 182/19 182/22
47/1 47/5	residence [1] 162/6	271/15 272/13 Respondent's [52]	211/6	rise [3] 98/13 101/22 103/1
representative [16]	residency [1] 207/10 resident [1] 38/5	Respondent's [52] 13/5 16/11 17/10	returned [4] 115/22 149/14 232/10 250/2	rises [1] 104/9
88/2 94/19 170/9	resilience [1] 282/8	19/19 24/19 25/11	returning [1] 170/24	risk [1] 148/6
171/25 174/12 174/13			311 110/21	

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
R	216/4 216/10 217/17	162/19 166/8 166/10	saying [22] 48/24	161/3 161/21 165/13
	217/17 281/17 281/20	167/22 167/22 174/9	57/13 62/22 75/2	169/17 170/1 171/4
risk-free [1] 148/6	282/5 282/5 282/6	189/24 198/7 228/18	81/12 81/17 89/11	176/22 179/3 182/3
risked [1] 134/21	284/18	246/23 248/2 251/11	91/20 91/21 91/24	182/9 182/23 189/24
RL [2] 30/5 30/10	RUSU [42] 4/16 9/8	252/25 259/25 260/2	92/4 149/18 185/6	190/3 214/9 214/12
RL-21 [2] 30/5 30/10	9/19 43/8 43/12 45/14	264/5 278/2 280/4	185/6 250/20 258/23	216/23 218/21 227/15
Rod [1] 119/6	45/15 45/17 47/6	280/6 280/7 280/10	259/2 262/25 270/4	232/3 244/18 245/10
ROGER [8] 3/16 8/22	47/12 47/25 48/7	280/11 280/24 284/5	272/6 273/6 284/11	249/13 276/25 277/18
63/7 63/20 75/16 76/5	52/10 53/13 75/19	284/17	saying the [1] 91/24	secondly [1] 54/22
96/11 99/21	107/7 108/16 119/5	sanction [1] 129/3	says [27] 64/3 79/16	seconds [3] 12/16
Roger Gladei [4] 63/7	164/5 176/14 177/14	Sands [6] 1/17 2/4 6/9		132/19 132/21
63/20 75/16 76/5	178/23 179/3 182/1	7/24 69/1 268/2	93/23 100/5 106/23	secretary [2] 2/18
Roger Gladei's [1]	182/3 182/4 182/21	satellite [1] 164/19	107/8 110/9 110/17	6/13
99/21	182/23 204/25 205/15	satisfaction [1] 31/13	114/6 115/18 138/3	section [8] 64/9 100/4
role [18] 33/17 45/16	205/16 205/24 222/13	satisfactory [2] 23/16	154/18 208/2 241/24	105/5 123/6 127/25
49/6 49/10 49/15	228/10 231/13 231/13	29/2	244/12 265/12 277/2	128/12 130/12 199/1
49/18 50/9 63/23	231/14 239/19 250/9	satisfied [4] 10/11	277/20 278/13 281/23	section 17 [1] 64/9
64/17 99/6 99/9 99/11	250/16 252/11 253/2	17/16 61/4 173/12	281/24 282/15 282/20	section 20 [3] 123/6
100/21 100/23 100/25	Rusu's [4] 59/16	satisfy [2] 120/11	282/23	128/12 130/12
103/17 111/13 208/2	101/2 108/20 159/10	126/5	says May 2012 [1]	section 3.3 [1] 199/1
Rolf [3] 1/16 2/13 6/12	République [1] 2/14	Saulieu [1] 2/15	265/12	section 6 [1] 100/4
rolf.knieper [1] 2/16		save [4] 53/6 144/18	scale [1] 229/20	section 7K [1] 105/5
Romania [3] 270/11	S	221/5 236/15	scare [1] 254/15	sections [2] 118/16
271/6 286/15	safe [1] 286/14	saw [9] 73/11 175/3	scared [3] 233/7	118/21
Romanian [22] 76/19	safely [1] 258/7	193/8 198/12 217/9	248/20 254/17	sector [1] 144/16
83/19 190/19 191/2	safety [1] 270/23	269/25 271/10 285/16	scenario [1] 222/21	secure [1] 247/9
191/5 192/1 192/6	said [76] 14/14 27/21	285/22	scenarios [1] 187/11	security [3] 94/12
192/7 192/15 192/20	33/11 44/4 44/7 44/10	say [113] 9/25 16/22	schedule [2] 6/4	115/2 115/17
192/22 192/23 193/9	48/13 48/22 65/20	17/20 22/19 23/5	150/7	see [66] 7/8 17/20
193/15 216/3 216/6	107/5 118/20 131/9	23/20 25/16 30/23	scheme [1] 39/6	31/4 31/11 31/18
221/8 251/13 268/21	148/10 163/13 173/9	44/1 48/6 54/1 54/11	SCHNEIDER [3] 4/5	36/17 38/25 40/24
268/22 270/16 270/18	195/24 200/18 201/5	60/15 60/23 60/23	9/6 9/18	41/4 41/5 41/9 50/16
room [4] 8/20 96/1	204/19 204/22 204/24	62/25 62/25 65/19	schoenherr.eu [5] 4/8	56/5 56/12 57/4 58/17
211/17 267/5	205/17 210/6 213/5	67/5 67/18 73/23	4/9 4/9 4/14 4/14	59/6 64/3 72/14 73/2
Rosietici [23] 35/4	213/15 213/16 214/9	73/24 73/25 74/3 74/4	Schottenring [1] 4/7	76/8 76/19 76/20 82/1
39/1 40/18 90/11	215/19 216/14 216/15	74/6 74/7 74/7 77/17	SCHÖNHERR [3] 4/6	83/9 85/18 87/14
94/17 95/12 116/5	217/16 217/22 217/23	77/18 82/25 83/24	4/12 8/7	87/14 91/21 92/6 92/7
116/8 116/14 117/7	219/17 220/17 221/14	87/12 91/1 91/5 91/7	Schönherr's [1]	93/11 93/13 94/6
117/10 176/7 182/25	223/3 228/10 231/5	92/10 112/24 113/6	126/24	105/22 106/18 107/21
183/1 184/3 184/11	237/12 237/25 238/25	117/8 129/19 133/9	science [1] 140/4	109/19 113/9 138/1
184/14 232/1 232/1	243/21 246/12 247/18	148/10 153/21 164/25	scope [2] 177/19	138/4 143/7 150/3
232/20 238/15 238/19	248/1 248/25 248/25	166/9 168/3 168/5	269/20	162/17 190/20 190/22
262/15	249/3 250/17 250/25	172/13 183/20 187/17	scream [1] 173/18	190/23 210/18 211/23
rot [1] 270/2	251/10 252/12 253/4	187/24 187/25 188/3	screen [10] 36/12	213/23 219/9 232/21
roughly [1] 69/5	254/11 254/22 254/24	188/4 188/16 200/4	160/3 188/21 190/14	233/9 233/9 239/19
round [1] 211/25	255/15 255/22 256/3	200/15 200/17 200/22	202/17 219/9 230/11	241/17 247/5 248/14
rule [3] 10/22 104/2	257/7 257/13 258/14	201/9 201/18 206/25	249/17 268/16 276/25	265/10 267/9 268/15
110/24	258/17 258/22 259/8	208/25 209/1 209/17	screens [1] 154/10	274/8 281/16 282/16
rules [2] 173/18	265/12 268/10 274/7	210/3 210/10 211/13	Scretariat [1] 2/17	284/1 286/8
173/21	277/11 277/20 278/25	212/8 212/11 212/12	scroll [2] 76/15	seed [6] 198/3 198/5
rumours [1] 231/22	282/4 286/12 286/19	212/21 213/15 214/1	232/21	198/5 198/7 198/8
run [3] 213/10 249/12	286/19	212/21 213/13 214/1 214/13 214/16 219/1	seal [2] 51/4 210/21	225/6
273/16	sake [2] 188/18	219/25 222/23 223/15	seals [1] 163/4	seeds [1] 239/7
running [7] 207/1	189/25	219/23 222/23 223/13	search [1] 42/12	seeing [3] 27/17 36/17
208/1 213/9 213/18	same [55] 25/10 31/19			136/9
243/17 254/15 285/23	38/20 50/17 57/1	237/10 242/10 245/10	season [4] 195/6 196/11 200/14 239/18	seek [18] 13/25 21/15
RURAC [2] 3/17	57/24 58/16 61/17	247/2 249/19 252/1	seasons [1] 115/13	40/16 102/4 102/7
136/23	62/11 64/10 65/8 67/5	252/19 255/7 255/25	second [44] 8/25	109/12 110/2 111/5
rural [1] 168/13	67/24 73/10 81/3	256/16 257/10 266/24	10/13 22/5 39/19	111/21 155/12 166/1
rushed [1] 153/5	81/10 87/2 87/21	266/25 267/22 270/16	43/16 46/17 46/22	170/22 175/23 180/22
Ruslan [4] 43/8 75/4	88/12 100/20 108/17	271/6 272/22 277/9	49/21 51/18 52/18	180/25 181/13 181/21
92/21 171/2	122/21 124/7 125/4	277/19 278/6 281/6	75/18 76/4 76/6 100/4	185/21
Ruslan Zelenenco [2]	125/9 129/1 142/19	283/10 285/12 285/25	102/23 107/16 116/10	seeking [2] 104/23
43/8 171/2	142/25 143/10 145/14	286/18 286/20	102/23 107/16 116/10	170/16
Russian [11] 216/3		200/10/200/20	121/7 130/3 100/0	170/10
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
S	setting [10] 41/14	showing [4] 41/7	117/22 117/23 128/6	sit [1] 267/7
seem [2] 31/25 148/7	43/17 43/19 43/22	63/17 95/14 188/21	154/18 155/24 158/16	sitting [3] 6/11 31/6
seemed [1] 51/21	44/1 44/11 169/19	shown [1] 162/11	159/22 159/23 159/24	187/11
seems [5] 77/22	173/25 220/1 220/3	shows [7] 55/14 71/10	160/10 160/17 161/11	situation [27] 40/17
147/15 147/22 213/24	settle [1] 273/18	72/9 82/8 88/2 98/20	161/13 161/15 162/11	112/10 112/21 113/6
237/11	settled [1] 273/21	132/5	162/12 163/8 163/9	116/5 117/4 123/17
seen [7] 96/16 137/16	settlement [2] 1/2 172/17	shut [1] 183/2	163/11 163/19 166/10 172/22 179/18 179/20	145/14 168/2 168/3 168/4 170/3 171/10
188/25 281/14 283/3	seven [6] 39/13	side [13] 31/1 31/3 31/17 52/13 79/23	200/22 202/19 209/19	178/8 194/20 208/18
283/3 284/1	129/20 150/2 195/16	138/20 161/20 186/7	209/25 210/4 210/5	221/12 238/4 263/23
sees [1] 17/17	231/18 237/19	186/25 201/21 237/20	210/8 210/12 210/14	264/1 271/12 273/25
seized [3] 13/23 14/1	several [7] 140/10	256/23 267/2	211/9 211/11 211/12	276/22 277/11 278/2
182/6	140/24 172/1 172/19	side-effects [1]	211/14 214/10 214/17	278/4 279/24
seizing [1] 104/11	233/3 236/10 274/2	237/20	214/21 215/19 215/23	six [8] 222/24 223/2
seizure [1] 180/1	shall [8] 12/10 64/4	sides [9] 6/21 7/9	216/15 216/18 217/8	223/16 223/20 240/21
selling [2] 199/21	64/12 64/19 74/15	10/15 10/19 14/21	217/12 217/12 217/15	241/7 256/18 256/24
239/24	158/6 186/22 217/10	29/15 33/13 70/2	237/6 237/8 237/12	sixth [1] 14/22
semi [1] 182/13 semi-finally [1]	shape [2] 7/18 263/16	287/11	238/8 239/5 242/13	size [1] 154/6
182/13	share [4] 27/2 62/11	sign [36] 49/11 50/21	255/15 255/20 274/1	skip [1] 124/5
senator [2] 250/22	204/20 244/25	128/7 158/20 159/18	274/5 274/6 282/21	slide [32] 53/11 53/17
270/11	shareholder [1]	159/20 161/7 163/17	283/9 283/11 284/25	54/1 54/4 54/7 54/12
send [7] 8/6 36/10	149/17	166/4 166/6 167/6	significant [7] 40/2	55/8 55/24 56/5 56/7
123/22 131/11 151/6	she [16] 9/25 36/8	167/7 168/3 195/5	40/10 42/17 101/12	56/9 62/14 62/15
151/13 174/7	36/11 66/25 67/16	208/4 208/6 208/9	103/19 137/12 262/20	63/16 70/11 74/15
sender [2] 83/21	72/25 81/24 114/6	208/11 208/12 210/21	significantly [1]	78/6 86/11 87/14
246/18	114/7 151/11 151/12	211/17 212/5 213/17	139/16	88/19 88/19 88/20
sense [9] 7/12 24/24	195/24 195/24 196/1	216/14 217/22 224/22	signing [4] 48/19	90/6 100/11 120/23
48/19 134/2 148/7	283/17 283/23	238/25 255/18 280/1	160/16 207/4 230/15	122/5 122/5 122/11
150/14 238/2 246/19	sheet [1] 21/10	280/3 280/7 283/17	signs [4] 50/25 81/24	124/5 138/7 160/3
258/17	shooting [1] 249/7	283/20 283/21 284/8	128/5 284/4	183/20
sent [5] 83/10 122/14	shop [1] 219/18	284/25	SILVIA [1] 2/25	slides [10] 35/8 35/9
147/14 151/3 192/23	short [14] 28/8 96/2	signature [51] 48/16	similar [6] 104/14	40/24 70/7 122/3
sentence [3] 188/7	96/5 150/20 152/18 157/10 186/9 209/12	49/3 49/22 49/25 50/4 51/20 51/21 51/23	141/15 141/17 181/19 194/20 275/5	126/21 132/13 133/24 151/11 183/15
230/13 245/16	226/2 234/10 259/18	52/4 55/23 56/14	Similarly [1] 65/6	
sentences [1] 32/15	267/13 268/6 280/23	56/24 57/3 58/15 59/4	simple [7] 32/14 98/25	slight [1] 10/23 slightly [3] 9/12 11/12
separate [2] 60/11	shortfall [1] 234/7	76/20 76/21 76/23	111/10 210/19 239/12	54/10
91/11	shortly [5] 72/6 83/13	78/10 79/9 79/22	246/6 260/3	slippage [1] 37/22
separated [1] 59/11	156/17 209/5 209/5	82/21 96/8 96/22 97/2	simply [10] 24/15	slow [1] 74/1
separately [2] 15/12	should [53] 29/23	97/7 97/9 154/23	66/11 85/1 87/13	slowly [2] 9/11 45/3
176/16	33/10 34/8 36/2 42/7	159/14 159/21 160/4	202/2 209/15 253/14	small [13] 49/13 85/18
September [7] 39/2	42/11 49/4 62/16 66/8	166/17 166/19 167/8	253/19 257/9 260/20	96/25 97/10 167/5
46/4 46/8 65/23	66/20 72/18 73/17	188/16 189/6 189/9	simultaneous [4]	168/12 196/22 203/17
162/14 231/3 250/8	74/19 99/3 101/3	190/6 202/19 202/20	57/20 63/2 63/11	203/21 222/24 223/15
Sergiu [3] 43/8 45/14 45/15	102/6 104/23 107/11	216/19 216/20 216/23	113/24	277/12 277/13
Sergiu Rusu [1] 45/15	111/9 111/14 111/19	216/24 217/4 225/7	simultaneously [4]	smaller [1] 45/4
series [2] 121/10	111/23 115/21 115/24	241/15 241/17 241/17	62/20 62/23 68/23	smelly [1] 220/21
282/22	117/8 118/18 129/3	268/24 283/7	89/23	smoothly [1] 273/16
serious [7] 17/10 72/5	129/5 133/19 139/10	signatures [12] 48/23	since [10] 19/2 102/7	so [232] 6/5 7/3 7/15
104/4 115/16 161/9	139/11 139/12 139/23	56/24 58/3 65/23	130/18 154/19 162/2	7/17 7/18 8/19 9/11
246/22 246/22	144/6 144/24 145/16	80/14 96/7 159/23	196/5 214/14 244/19	9/13 10/22 11/3 12/3
servants [1] 157/22	147/9 148/1 148/4	163/4 202/15 217/2	265/9 270/6	13/12 14/2 15/5 16/4
serves [1] 46/8	148/16 149/12 149/14	217/4 225/7	sincere [2] 8/6 149/25	
service [5] 6/18 9/1	149/19 157/14 159/2	signed [99] 35/25	single [12] 31/8 32/23	
222/24 223/16 239/6	160/19 181/11 274/19	48/9 48/14 48/19	81/22 98/17 102/10	27/23 28/10 29/12
servicing [3] 116/21	277/10 277/10 277/20 284/9 284/10	48/25 49/18 51/11	102/24 103/15 104/25	30/15 36/11 40/2 48/3 49/12 57/1 66/1 69/15
196/4 261/17	shouldn't [1] 106/22	56/4 56/10 56/19 57/1 57/5 57/8 57/11 57/14	154/20 154/23 198/7 284/13	71/15 73/6 74/24 78/9
session [1] 174/17	show [10] 71/19 77/15		singled [1] 63/10	79/2 83/11 83/15 85/8
set [13] 38/18 40/4	132/4 160/3 174/21	58/18 59/19 59/23	singled-out [1] 63/10	88/8 89/4 89/12 89/14
40/6 40/20 60/20	190/17 209/23 210/9	62/6 67/8 73/3 73/4	sir [2] 212/7 260/25	95/2 98/16 101/3
92/23 113/5 126/20	242/7 262/1	73/9 80/3 80/9 80/11	Sircu [1] 117/14	105/8 108/21 109/13
151/11 151/24 174/1	showed [3] 213/9	81/20 81/21 81/21	Sircu's [1] 95/11	110/23 112/5 113/19
177/15 218/10	242/4 242/10	83/2 83/8 83/9 117/19	sister [1] 263/20	118/16 119/10 120/5
sets [2] 140/16 183/8				
	l	www.dianaburden.com		l

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-28
S	141/20 143/3 148/24	32/1 33/1 126/18	speculative [2]	starts [1] 55/14
so [176] 120/21	198/6	274/18 279/12	111/19 113/4	STASIUNAITE [2] 3/5
123/18 126/4 129/4	sole [3] 39/7 149/17	somewhere [1] 81/14		8/15
129/21 129/23 130/18	166/25	son [7] 206/18 233/9	40/14 99/5 223/19	state [44] 12/11 40/11
130/22 132/9 133/6	solely [2] 101/17	247/3 247/5 248/14	258/15	46/22 46/25 51/14
141/10 144/17 146/5	101/20	248/14 249/12	spent [1] 247/9	53/13 70/22 70/25
	solemnity [1] 267/22	soon [4] 140/4 230/6	sphere [5] 51/7 51/8	71/1 89/16 90/12
151/2 151/11 151/12	solemnly [2] 186/21	230/16 231/1	61/2 61/3 61/12	90/19 94/8 94/19
151/25 160/8 164/25	267/23	sophisticated [2]	spheres [4] 51/6	95/21 97/17 98/19
166/15 166/25 167/6	solve [1] 278/20	134/15 135/25	59/23 61/13 61/15	104/6 105/2 107/24
167/10 167/21 170/16	solved [1] 108/6	sophistication [1]	split [1] 39/15	110/12 111/12 114/22
173/6 175/19 177/21	some [96] 14/16 15/10		spoke [5] 151/17	119/20 121/11 129/4
180/6 183/23 186/4	18/2 20/13 31/14	Soroca [1] 259/23	204/25 205/16 217/17	129/6 131/8 132/4
186/25 187/11 188/2	35/21 38/9 38/19 40/9	sorry [9] 44/8 51/24	247/25	133/18 141/7 141/8
191/13 191/21 192/3	40/14 43/11 43/18	83/19 175/8 178/2	sprayed [1] 239/7	142/16 153/20 177/4
192/21 194/4 196/25	44/18 46/14 47/4	189/18 273/6 282/21	sprayers [1] 239/4	262/21 262/24 263/12
197/11 198/1 198/3		286/2		
198/6 198/9 199/9	53/16 54/17 56/5		spring [5] 45/10 211/6	
199/13 201/19 203/6	57/22 62/3 63/21 64/2	sort [6] 7/8 50/5	232/6 250/3 253/8	266/6 280/19 281/18
203/19 204/19 205/8	73/4 77/16 77/20	269/19 271/25 273/14	spring/summer [1]	State Chancellery [9]
205/10 205/11 205/14	79/20 80/12 80/13	283/5	45/10	94/19 114/22 177/4
205/19 205/22 206/4	81/6 83/3 92/14	sorted [1] 279/10	Springs [2] 192/8	262/21 262/24 265/11
206/8 206/11 206/14	104/14 105/7 105/23	sorts [1] 276/20	262/6	265/22 266/1 266/6
207/14 207/17 207/22	118/5 119/2 119/7	sought [6] 158/11	SRL [17] 39/9 41/20	State Chancellery's
208/13 209/23 210/21	119/14 120/20 131/16	164/10 165/17 168/24	45/1 55/23 57/15	[1] 263/12
	131/21 133/13 137/20	171/3 202/24	74/19 86/22 91/4	state's [1] 103/11
210/21 210/25 212/7	139/6 141/11 146/6	sound [3] 25/9 147/10	106/2 158/18 171/8	state-owned [1] 141/
212/11 212/23 213/6	151/19 155/2 156/7	149/3	173/9 174/21 215/4	stated [12] 57/10
213/8 213/17 213/24	161/11 187/9 190/14	sounds [2] 63/3	219/11 244/13 244/20	66/25 67/13 75/15
214/5 215/11 215/22	192/7 196/21 197/5	174/18	SRL's [1] 91/16	75/17 75/25 99/19
216/4 216/15 216/16	197/23 198/2 198/20	source [1] 232/15	stable [2] 46/23 52/23	101/23 108/15 190/25
217/7 217/21 218/2	204/8 207/7 207/16	southern [2] 38/7 45/5		251/1 255/6
218/16 219/21 220/18	208/11 208/23 220/14	sovereign [2] 51/14	stage [3] 26/23 199/19	
221/4 222/3 222/12	223/21 225/3 225/12	148/4	213/4	35/4 35/23 38/25 39/1
222/15 222/20 223/5	228/22 229/12 229/14	Soviet [1] 205/7		44/22 67/14 67/23
223/9 223/19 223/20			stamp [13] 48/15	
223/21 223/25 224/10	232/9 237/19 237/22	Soviet Union [1]	49/24 49/25 62/9	68/15 71/15 72/15
224/12 224/24 225/11	238/11 240/23 243/17	205/7	79/20 190/23 210/20	72/19 74/22 74/24
226/8 226/10 227/5	245/25 246/10 247/15	space [2] 6/16 6/16	211/24 211/25 211/25	75/1 87/23 88/24 89/1
228/12 229/15 230/18	248/6 248/24 249/11	Spanish [6] 30/7	212/4 241/3 242/20	89/7 92/4 92/18 93/1
231/3 231/18 231/19	252/24 253/7 257/14	30/12 30/14 31/1	stamped [7] 48/10	93/3 93/12 114/5
234/9 234/22 235/6	259/16 262/19 263/22	31/14 31/16	73/4 127/6 161/12	136/8 154/7 156/6
237/10 237/12 237/22	268/11 271/2 271/3	speak [12] 31/14	161/13 161/15 162/12	156/18 157/1 157/10
238/6 238/7 238/9	272/5 273/17 274/17	66/17 77/21 144/17	stamping [2] 60/2	157/18 157/23 158/14
238/11 239/2 239/5	282/10 284/21	146/5 184/5 186/22	61/14	159/5 159/9 159/15
239/5 239/25 240/2	somebody [12] 62/7	187/1 192/15 221/8	stamps [1] 81/25	159/18 159/22 160/9
242/14 243/12 244/14	91/18 168/3 224/24	281/20 284/17	stand [3] 98/5 148/25	160/22 161/4 161/22
	245/12 249/18 249/19	speaking [4] 53/5	268/22	169/18 170/1 171/4
246/5 246/11 246/13	249/23 251/4 269/17	156/20 224/4 247/15	standard [4] 31/20	178/6 182/9 186/17
246/18 246/21 248/7	274/16 281/1	speaks [4] 31/1 204/5		186/18 186/20 187/25
248/8 248/21 248/25	somebody's [1]	216/3 218/16	standards [1] 52/21	188/14 188/22 189/9
249/4 249/7 249/11	283/24	special [1] 248/8	standing [1] 93/15	189/15 189/16 189/19
250/16 253/3 254/15	someone [2] 81/13	specialises [1] 218/13	•	189/24 190/1 190/4
255/23 256/8 257/7	255/8	specialist [1] 39/4	stark [1] 130/2	190/9 196/4 200/3
258/18 258/21 259/9	something [22] 10/2	specialists [1] 47/16		206/5 206/25 209/9
259/14 259/17 260/20			start [16] 11/3 36/20	
262/7 262/13 263/6	27/10 29/22 30/1	specific [12] 46/21	95/25 107/21 150/16	210/4 211/13 214/8
263/10 263/11 263/23	81/14 142/21 146/15	46/25 53/12 126/2	187/2 201/3 206/9	214/9 214/13 218/2
265/21 271/4 272/6	165/23 168/14 197/21	127/4 127/7 135/19	213/7 227/12 227/17	218/22 223/14 227/12
273/12 273/13 273/15	198/17 216/14 219/1	141/3 148/17 149/1	228/3 230/14 231/1	227/16 229/22 230/2
	234/3 255/25 257/16	197/20 208/14	231/8 272/3	230/9 230/21 237/6
2/3/18 2/8/22 2/9/10		specifically [4] 65/15	started [9] 66/3 66/8	245/10 251/14 252/19
273/18 278/22 279/10 280/9 281/6 283/21	271/23 275/4 275/5			
280/9 281/6 283/21	275/10 275/11 284/24	119/16 128/1 129/16	85/8 154/24 159/11	254/1 255/15 256/1
280/9 281/6 283/21 284/20 287/6 287/7		119/16 128/1 129/16	85/8 154/24 159/11 206/14 230/5 251/25	254/1 255/15 256/1 257/8 257/13 258/16
280/9 281/6 283/21 284/20 287/6 287/7 287/9	275/10 275/11 284/24	119/16 128/1 129/16		
280/9 281/6 283/21 284/20 287/6 287/7 287/9 soil [12] 136/2 137/6	275/10 275/11 284/24 sometimes [6] 210/19	119/16 128/1 129/16 speculate [1] 166/8	206/14 230/5 251/25 258/19	257/8 257/13 258/16
280/9 281/6 283/21 284/20 287/6 287/7 287/9 soil [12] 136/2 137/6 139/21 139/25 140/14	275/10 275/11 284/24 sometimes [6] 210/19 210/22 237/23 275/21 285/16 285/25	119/16 128/1 129/16 speculate [1] 166/8 speculation [7] 109/8	206/14 230/5 251/25	257/8 257/13 258/16 268/18 268/23 269/5
280/9 281/6 283/21 284/20 287/6 287/7 287/9 soil [12] 136/2 137/6	275/10 275/11 284/24 sometimes [6] 210/19 210/22 237/23 275/21	119/16 128/1 129/16 speculate [1] 166/8 speculation [7] 109/8 123/10 166/13 168/7	206/14 230/5 251/25 258/19 starting [3] 150/18	257/8 257/13 258/16 268/18 268/23 269/5 270/7 270/20 271/2
280/9 281/6 283/21 284/20 287/6 287/7 287/9 soil [12] 136/2 137/6 139/21 139/25 140/14	275/10 275/11 284/24 sometimes [6] 210/19 210/22 237/23 275/21 285/16 285/25	119/16 128/1 129/16 speculate [1] 166/8 speculation [7] 109/8 123/10 166/13 168/7	206/14 230/5 251/25 258/19 starting [3] 150/18	257/8 257/13 258/16 268/18 268/23 269/5 270/7 270/20 271/2

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
S	still [24] 9/23 49/18	31/22 37/24 67/3 67/9	summarise [5] 64/17	surrounding [1] 11/19
statements [21] 20/6	61/23 77/11 112/3	67/19 74/5 82/18	88/8 111/4 119/7	survival [2] 116/12
22/19 34/12 35/15	112/18 113/4 113/9	153/13 154/22 191/17	184/19	184/9
41/7 41/10 52/15 95/1	124/21 143/20 144/25	submissions [9] 19/6		survive [2] 198/21
95/3 95/5 95/7 105/19	145/3 145/14 164/13	26/7 65/20 66/1 100/2	34/22 113/11	255/9
106/5 136/2 143/18	170/6 184/4 185/13	132/13 153/9 154/5	summed [1] 38/24	suspected [2] 117/25
160/14 188/15 196/15	205/11 211/24 235/7	163/16	summer [7] 45/10 45/12 45/18 45/23	118/2
202/13 202/15 251/10	243/19 249/17 265/18 271/23	submit [10] 20/2 127/24 151/9 156/5	93/21 243/15 276/6	suspend [3] 107/6 109/3 127/23
states [20] 3/8 64/10	stop [4] 41/1 42/1	161/19 168/25 170/17	summoned [2] 174/17	suspending [1]
70/23 181/2 190/18	120/16 244/1	172/3 175/25 181/9	284/23	107/19
190/22 200/5 200/19	stopped [1] 249/10	Submittal [1] 110/6	summons [2] 173/15	suspension [7]
200/24 211/3 228/9 238/6 248/10 248/18	stops [1] 127/17	submitted [19] 12/9	266/4	106/24 107/9 107/13
257/23 258/7 259/12	store [1] 208/19	27/9 29/11 30/5 30/7	sunflower [2] 143/8	107/15 107/22 108/10
269/5 277/15 278/1	story [12] 37/25	42/18 75/15 117/19	205/21	108/12
STATESCU [1] 2/25	153/18 153/18 153/20	135/3 149/9 156/11	superior [1] 178/5	suspensive [1] 108/3
stating [2] 60/12	153/25 225/6 231/22	159/25 163/1 173/11	supervise [3] 224/16	switch [2] 198/20
115/5	231/22 233/8 278/24	191/19 229/22 230/1	224/17 279/8	207/14
Statistical [1] 35/20	279/6 281/3 straight [2] 58/2 198/1	270/7 271/14 submitting [2] 172/7	supervised [2] 158/21 224/18	switched [1] 207/18 sympathetic [1] 6/24
statistics [1] 56/11	strange [10] 55/11	270/20	supplemental [12]	system [7] 196/23
status [2] 263/16	63/3 63/4 71/21 72/2	substance [1] 22/20	24/8 24/13 27/7 28/8	196/24 205/2 205/8
265/3	73/23 85/25 167/25	substantive [6] 27/18	28/10 29/7 139/8	227/23 246/13 264/8
stay [3] 107/6 108/10	221/12 280/6	64/10 110/1 110/3	140/7 143/17 145/11	systematic [1] 71/23
267/6	stray [1] 133/13	110/15 144/1	151/9 151/12	
stayed [1] 255/3 staying [2] 82/2	street [3] 3/7 126/1	subtly [1] 57/12	supplementals [1]	<u>T</u>
242/22	227/6	subtract [1] 184/2	96/17	table [4] 9/14 42/22
stays [2] 280/20	strength [2] 109/6	success [7] 42/10	supplied [1] 120/4	183/13 183/16
280/22	109/9	134/12 135/8 135/11	supplier [1] 129/17	tables [9] 21/13 24/6
stealing [2] 207/13	stressful [2] 235/12 267/7	164/3 258/1 265/25	support [11] 7/20 21/5	24/8 24/10 24/21 28/9 28/11 28/11 183/8
207/17	stretching [1] 89/12	successful [13] 38/1 40/22 41/23 45/6	92/16 92/25 95/15 104/15 127/21 168/16	take [52] 26/9 39/10
Stefan [37] 38/8 41/23	strict [1] 15/2	136/10 145/19 194/16	250/25 253/3 271/7	40/2 55/20 59/5 70/6
42/5 42/8 42/20 42/24	strictly [3] 47/22	226/9 229/16 263/11	supported [12] 62/21	90/25 95/23 97/1
45/5 45/7 134/18	59/11 61/12	271/19 272/7 272/8	63/5 63/13 77/9 93/11	112/13 112/16 119/21
136/6 156/19 194/9 194/13 194/17 195/1	strike [2] 168/8 168/9	successfully [1] 41/4	99/25 114/4 135/16	129/23 132/14 145/16
195/4 195/9 201/5	striking [3] 81/18 95/5	succinct [3] 34/19	250/12 250/18 250/18	148/16 151/14 165/8
201/16 201/20 203/24	95/14	34/21 226/2	250/22	170/13 173/8 175/12
204/21 206/12 240/7	strong [3] 94/25	such [19] 75/12 99/3	supporting [5] 11/19	178/15 186/3 188/13
246/8 269/6 269/8	108/13 108/23	102/23 106/21 109/23	76/25 154/8 166/3	189/3 189/5 190/17
269/12 269/14 271/18	strongly [2] 29/16 30/1	110/13 118/4 125/10	250/6	199/7 202/16 206/13 212/3 214/25 215/4
271/22 272/23 273/7	struck [2] 12/3 280/5	141/1 143/15 145/4 150/2 172/3 172/7	suppose [1] 43/24 supposed [9] 191/13	216/17 220/15 224/13
279/12 279/17 279/19	structure [13] 138/19	198/15 199/21 270/8	195/23 219/17 221/10	230/8 232/13 232/18
282/22	138/22 138/24 139/20	276/10 284/1	224/8 228/13 239/9	233/21 235/22 245/13
Stefan Voda [33] 38/8	141/25 142/23 142/25	sudden [1] 10/20	239/16 240/14	249/20 251/5 252/14
41/23 42/5 42/8 42/20 42/24 45/5 45/7	143/24 145/6 145/7	suddenly [1] 39/3	Supreme [6] 173/23	254/7 259/4 267/11
134/18 136/6 156/19	145/23 146/12 205/2	sue [4] 114/10 114/11	174/5 177/14 177/18	267/12 268/15 281/13
194/9 194/13 194/17	studied [1] 218/7	114/11 171/17	264/10 264/25	286/18
195/1 195/4 195/9	studies [2] 140/24	sued [2] 165/18	Supreme Court [2]	takeaways [1] 138/21
201/5 201/16 201/20	144/14	171/15	173/23 177/18	taken [27] 10/15 10/16
203/24 206/12 240/7	study [2] 142/4 143/21	suffer [1] 285/11 sufficient [4] 32/5	sure [25] 7/13 12/18 15/5 23/12 44/19	10/21 11/2 16/9 28/22 36/23 67/20 69/4
246/8 269/6 269/8	stuff [7] 198/21 206/3	33/18 242/25 266/25	48/21 67/24 68/19	69/17 71/13 71/16
269/12 269/14 271/18	207/7 225/3 229/14	sugar [5] 55/14 66/4	69/18 90/23 95/6	80/20 104/22 116/24
271/22 273/7 279/17	238/7 275/10	239/25 252/7 261/15	119/13 133/12 187/23	117/2 119/19 121/11
279/19	subject [10] 20/19	sugarbeet [3] 144/23	189/25 200/2 200/5	139/2 139/17 142/15
step [6] 112/13 145/16 168/22 226/8 254/13	25/15 37/18 86/19	238/23 239/2	208/25 209/4 213/12	167/10 167/11 173/12
265/17	96/15 96/19 125/4	suggest [4] 25/13	221/18 231/19 239/18	234/20 249/25 258/25
stepped [2] 254/21	178/4 194/1 272/15	128/22 134/23 135/7	253/4 263/8	takes [3] 18/24 45/22
259/17	subjected [1] 178/2	suggested [2] 127/18	surely [1] 56/19	97/4
steps [5] 167/9 167/11	subleasing [1] 201/12		surprised [3] 33/1	taking [14] 39/7 57/5 65/8 68/1 131/4 149/1
212/8 247/23 259/4	submission [15] 5/2	Suite [2] 2/10 3/7	259/20 285/25	153/22 172/5 176/2
stick [2] 34/1 37/18	5/3 25/6 25/24 26/16	sum [1] 132/1	surround [1] 115/20	100122 11210 11012

ICSID ARB 16 8 Word Index Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova Revised				11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
Т	160/25 242/24	testifies [3] 14/11	88/16 90/2 90/4 91/19	60/8 61/4 65/23 65/24
taking [5] 176/5	templates [1] 160/21	15/14 147/7	92/2 93/7 93/8 97/25	66/10 67/7 68/22
176/7 196/8 235/1	Temporally [1] 128/7	testify [3] 136/7 140/8	98/10 98/23 107/23	76/20 78/2 79/6 79/7
237/18	ten [24] 11/22 11/23	151/24	109/9 112/3 113/3	80/2 81/20 85/6 109/3
talk [12] 40/5 40/12	20/14 20/20 21/11	testimonies [1] 24/11	113/9 113/16 114/13	115/9 119/24 122/12
54/15 68/18 84/16	21/11 38/10 80/21	testimony [13] 14/12	115/10 121/20 123/9	123/5 123/25 130/24
85/19 85/21 96/14	95/24 194/4 214/15	15/22 15/23 29/13	123/15 128/17 128/17	131/15 132/21 137/23
115/1 166/15 196/16	214/18 214/21 217/18	35/16 121/13 144/5	130/5 132/9 137/1	142/3 144/21 152/16
250/10	217/23 221/10 225/4	160/8 160/12 193/4	141/6 142/14 144/5	152/18 152/19 160/23
talked [2] 199/17	228/10 231/19 237/16	240/6 242/25 260/12	148/12 149/24 153/9	166/5 183/15 184/2
285/17	248/15 249/14 285/5	testing [2] 141/7	153/17 153/21 153/23	186/2 186/7 186/16
talking [18] 49/1	285/15 ten-minute [1] 95/24	141/8 text [3] 76/12 79/8	155/9 155/11 155/12 155/16 155/22 156/9	186/16 187/2 187/3 188/14 188/19 192/22
49/23 49/23 61/12	tenants [1] 168/10	79/15	158/1 158/7 161/7	204/17 205/24 210/11
67/3 67/17 72/15	term [17] 119/24	than [30] 28/1 28/3	161/20 161/21 163/16	211/1 252/6 252/22
73/25 74/16 164/16	119/24 123/4 123/5	32/6 37/2 44/7 62/7	163/17 163/25 164/20	256/19 256/25 260/18
164/17 168/11 168/12	127/19 128/1 128/9	89/2 89/12 97/5 116/4	165/12 165/14 165/16	267/12 268/7 268/9
209/22 231/22 232/12	128/10 132/7 132/8	129/6 136/13 138/25	165/21 168/2 168/2	272/17 273/9 273/12
234/13 235/12	156/9 174/21 185/2	141/10 144/24 146/9	168/11 168/14 168/22	274/3 274/7 275/22
talks [1] 67/16	213/14 223/22 231/10	146/18 149/4 154/11	169/7 170/21 171/15	281/2 281/3
Tapu [3] 231/17	234/10	162/13 184/22 185/5	172/8 174/25 175/1	THEODORE [1] 3/3
250/17 250/18	terminate [16] 67/1	185/8 185/11 203/16	175/6 175/23 175/24	there [305]
task [1] 157/20	72/9 73/1 73/19 75/10	203/21 235/1 236/11	175/25 178/21 179/2	thereafter [2] 104/5
tasked [2] 159/17	75/13 77/6 77/12	250/15 279/11	181/14 181/22 182/19	175/7
161/2	77/19 77/25 82/5	thank [68] 6/8 6/16	182/22 184/14 185/19	therefore [13] 7/16
tax [5] 144/19 144/23	85/23 89/19 90/2	8/6 8/18 8/24 12/25	185/20 185/21 205/22	10/23 19/10 21/9 23/4
147/18 147/20 147/23	114/7 280/4	13/19 14/21 17/7	213/1 236/2 254/6	26/19 103/3 140/17
taxes [1] 227/5	terminated [14] 72/19	18/23 23/21 27/3	them [66] 9/16 14/1	148/6 165/10 177/25
taxpayer [1] 248/5	73/13 74/19 76/8	37/25 39/24 46/2	14/5 23/2 33/5 51/1	179/25 180/5
Tcaci [2] 255/23 262/4	86/13 94/20 113/17	46/12 61/23 70/16	55/21 56/23 59/8	therein [2] 64/15
teach [1] 286/1 team [10] 7/23 8/4 8/6	117/7 117/11 131/13	92/19 96/4 96/21	66/10 66/17 74/14	176/23
8/10 8/11 9/4 155/19	166/22 167/3 168/10	118/25 132/11 132/12	74/15 77/20 81/24	these [136] 6/10 6/14
156/14 156/16 159/1	180/4	133/21 150/5 152/14	81/25 82/1 84/5 88/16	12/3 13/4 13/10 17/11
tease [1] 287/2	terminates [2] 76/13	153/8 153/14 168/19	92/24 95/7 96/16	24/10 24/11 24/15
tech [1] 185/9	78/21	185/23 185/24 186/2	96/19 96/21 119/10	24/21 29/19 31/5
technical [5] 37/13	terminating [1] 280/7	186/24 188/1 190/11	120/21 122/3 122/4	31/21 32/10 38/15
135/9 200/1 238/2	termination [23] 73/3	190/13 194/3 198/23	130/7 131/11 136/24	40/12 40/24 42/12
283/3	73/9 75/25 76/11 77/1	199/24 202/5 206/16	136/25 149/20 149/23	43/14 47/16 48/9
technological [4]	77/4 78/12 78/18	209/12 209/13 236/18	153/4 155/7 156/21	48/23 49/16 51/6
141/17 175/5 175/12	78/20 80/1 80/19	236/21 236/22 237/1	158/4 159/13 160/17	51/11 52/15 55/16
283/1	81/11 82/3 82/8 85/13		163/10 164/12 166/3	55/17 56/22 58/5
technologically [1]	85/14 85/22 86/1	245/21 251/19 255/12	166/12 175/15 178/13	59/23 60/6 60/21
135/25	117/15 117/17 120/24	257/19 261/1 267/5	182/11 183/7 222/3	61/12 61/15 62/5 63/2
technology [13] 164/7	154/20 282/8	267/10 268/1 268/14	222/20 222/23 224/16 224/17 233/19 234/8	67/3 67/8 69/13 72/24 73/5 73/9 77/15 79/20
165/7 197/4 197/7	terminations [11]	272/14 285/2 286/4		
197/12 197/22 197/23	83/9 84/23 85/16 86/8	286/7 286/8 286/17 286/21 287/13	234/8 234/9 234/17 234/25 235/7 235/16	80/18 81/7 82/3 82/4 82/16 82/21 83/1 83/7
198/3 198/6 198/8	86/21 105/18 106/4 113/23 117/20 118/1		245/19 250/19 281/2	83/9 84/7 84/22 85/14
198/10 272/4 283/5	123/21	thanks [3] 6/22 8/2 149/24	281/2 284/24	85/23 87/6 88/13
Ted [1] 8/12	terms [22] 23/10 25/9	that [1251]	themselves [18] 7/3	88/22 90/3 94/5 94/10
ted.gleason [1] 3/9	37/19 77/3 78/19	that and [1] 50/12	12/2 48/25 62/5 65/2	94/25 95/6 97/2
telephone [6] 10/10	81/19 125/18 125/20	that point [1] 58/22	75/21 76/17 77/21	100/18 103/9 106/1
33/12 192/9 204/15	126/11 127/23 128/13	the December 7 [1]	101/21 103/1 103/10	109/6 114/21 116/4
252/10 274/15	131/9 135/24 141/12	12/9	114/1 122/11 126/5	116/25 117/19 117/22
telephonically [1]	147/2 150/12 175/3	the injunction [1]	128/16 131/24 154/25	118/1 118/4 120/13
9/22	196/6 196/7 196/8	247/25	192/12	120/15 121/6 122/3
tell [13] 16/4 35/2	238/15 239/15	the Laguardia [1]	then [89] 7/4 7/19	122/18 124/19 126/4
245/16 255/2 267/24	terrible [3] 263/24	273/18	8/14 8/15 8/16 8/23	126/20 126/23 126/25
272/25 275/8 276/17	263/25 264/3	the Levintsa [1]	9/5 9/7 11/4 14/3	129/5 129/22 133/15
276/18 278/24 279/5	terrifically [1] 35/3	219/19	15/11 17/17 20/18	137/19 137/22 138/14
281/2 281/23	test [2] 105/10 109/9	their [95] 6/23 8/7	24/20 29/5 32/24	140/16 141/14 146/14
telling [5] 183/19	testified [5] 208/10	19/21 24/7 29/13	35/11 36/16 40/3 44/9	156/24 160/9 164/5
205/25 240/16 248/23	215/3 215/8 215/14	48/15 66/16 69/6 71/7	44/13 50/23 51/2	166/10 167/12 181/7
260/7	219/6	86/12 87/13 88/14	54/14 59/4 59/8 59/13	186/13 188/14 202/11
template [3] 43/13				
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
т	178/14 178/24 180/19	248/24 249/16 253/23	280/5 284/21	17/24 18/20 19/16
these [30] 202/22	185/13 185/20 205/1	255/25 256/22 263/6	though [2] 145/4	20/5 20/7 20/13 20/22
211/17 213/11 217/6	205/9 205/9 205/21	264/16 266/7 266/15	192/6	23/1 23/7 23/9 23/13
225/3 232/14 233/17	205/22 206/8 206/8	266/21 266/22 272/10	thought [18] 10/16	23/19 25/3 28/3 33/25
234/6 235/12 235/15	207/20 212/22 213/4	281/4 281/9 281/10	15/23 16/20 44/10	36/24 37/14 37/15
238/11 241/18 242/17	213/5 220/20 220/20	281/10 283/19 284/15	58/23 191/6 192/3	37/21 40/2 40/10
245/13 247/16 248/2	220/20 222/14 223/25	284/20 287/6	209/24 246/2 246/25	40/14 40/17 41/8
249/21 253/3 253/13	224/5 224/9 224/9	thinking [7] 7/13	250/19 253/1 273/7	42/14 44/25 52/7 53/7
255/16 259/10 259/11	224/10 224/12 224/15	15/22 15/22 19/2	273/11 274/6 274/19	55/18 61/22 63/8 67/5
267/8 269/19 272/3	224/16 224/19 224/22	23/18 225/5 247/8	276/15 280/5	68/21 69/5 69/5 69/6
276/16 284/5 284/8	224/24 227/1 227/3	third [35] 16/8 16/12	thoughts [2] 67/11	70/8 72/3 72/21 72/21
284/14 287/3	228/17 231/1 231/22	16/14 16/17 17/2 17/9	204/20	82/6 83/3 83/7 84/5
they [247] 8/4 13/25	232/10 233/12 234/9	17/14 18/11 18/12	thousand [4] 160/16	88/13 90/8 90/16 94/6
14/2 14/14 20/8 21/1	236/3 238/16 238/20	18/19 39/21 55/13	221/17 224/6 224/20	94/22 95/5 101/25
24/7 28/9 28/10 28/13	239/2 239/5 239/6	55/19 69/11 86/6	thousand-plus [1]	108/17 111/24 113/16
29/18 31/20 37/1	239/6 239/7 239/12	86/15 87/7 91/14	224/20	115/12 117/18 117/24
42/13 45/21 48/10	241/3 242/15 242/19	95/15 98/21 103/3	thousands [1] 158/2	118/22 121/4 122/21
48/15 48/25 50/21	243/9 244/6 245/18	112/7 112/15 112/17	threatened [4] 115/2	124/18 126/19 127/2
51/12 51/13 51/14	245/18 246/25 247/1	112/20 113/20 114/11	115/9 115/23 255/3	132/16 133/7 145/18
52/11 53/22 54/8 56/4	254/24 255/7 255/8	116/20 117/1 167/3	threatening [1] 93/16	145/24 148/9 152/8
57/14 58/17 59/25	255/8 257/11 259/7	172/22 179/5 179/8	threats [2] 91/15	153/22 164/13 169/17
60/20 60/20 61/1 61/2	259/8 260/1 260/1	231/17 277/1	115/17	170/5 170/6 170/11
62/2 62/3 62/17 66/9	260/2 263/21 271/22	thirds [2] 18/6 116/10	three [41] 6/5 6/18	173/13 176/1 176/2
66/11 66/19 67/8 67/8	271/23 271/24 272/18	thorough [1] 142/1	20/9 26/3 37/2 38/14	182/9 197/16 199/5
71/11 73/24 74/2 74/9	273/11 273/18 274/6	thoroughly [2] 126/8	39/16 44/5 44/7 44/10	204/21 207/9 208/4
77/21 78/13 81/19	274/14 274/14 275/12	131/24	45/20 50/19 54/25	208/6 208/15 208/24
81/21 81/22 82/6	276/15 276/21 278/4	those [120] 7/8 7/10	56/13 57/6 66/10	209/3 209/7 211/19
83/25 84/19 85/8	284/10 284/17 284/18	10/8 11/23 13/24 14/8	122/19 137/19 183/10	214/13 214/21 214/23
85/15 85/21 87/7	284/24	15/6 20/5 20/8 20/21	185/3 186/8 187/14	215/2 215/5 215/22
87/12 88/14 92/3	they're [1] 220/21	22/13 22/14 22/19	188/8 188/9 188/11	216/1 220/10 221/3
92/25 95/5 96/18	thing [21] 25/10 29/14	22/21 25/9 27/23	192/23 202/25 205/18	221/11 222/9 225/4
99/10 100/24 101/9	32/8 48/24 61/17	28/20 31/9 33/9 35/14	205/23 217/9 217/24	225/17 226/7 228/10
101/11 101/12 101/14	80/24 87/2 158/9	38/4 38/15 38/20 41/2	220/12 227/6 234/12	231/4 231/13 231/16
102/7 103/5 107/24	198/23 210/19 213/10	45/11 47/4 57/2 62/4	235/20 239/8 242/8	232/4 234/15 235/3
110/24 113/6 113/8	215/24 220/21 226/10	62/9 62/10 65/12	245/15 250/5 274/10	236/15 237/23 237/23
113/14 113/15 113/19	228/16 231/7 253/9	74/11 79/2 79/13	280/17	238/10 239/20 245/19
113/20 114/3 114/10	260/3 280/11 281/20	91/13 95/9 98/7	three-way [1] 227/6	246/23 247/17 248/2
114/12 115/2 115/10	282/14	100/10 104/15 105/19	through [43] 7/7 10/7	248/15 250/9 252/25
115/18 115/20 116/16	things [20] 14/9 59/10		14/12 40/2 40/3 41/5	254/4 254/11 257/17
117/3 119/13 119/23	85/22 119/23 167/6	119/22 121/20 122/15	43/14 45/14 47/4	257/17 258/10 258/16
121/19 122/22 123/5	210/20 237/6 237/13	124/11 124/14 124/16	47/13 48/24 53/2 66/9	258/18 259/10 260/18
124/10 125/22 126/24	257/10 269/19 273/5	125/16 125/20 125/23	66/16 68/1 68/20 70/6	264/1 264/5 265/18
127/6 127/15 128/6	273/14 273/16 273/21	126/4 127/20 128/12	70/7 70/8 71/2 74/16	266/3 266/20 269/7
130/9 130/17 131/4	273/21 276/17 276/20	131/6 131/17 132/14	90/24 94/5 102/16	270/6 274/4 276/3
131/9 131/9 131/11	278/21 284/12 285/1	133/8 138/11 143/10	103/6 104/5 112/21	277/24 278/7 283/6
131/11 131/13 132/6	think [79] 12/17 14/18	144/3 151/9 153/19	129/24 132/25 136/16	284/1 286/10 286/24
132/7 132/8 138/8	15/1 18/24 22/17 24/8	158/2 158/10 158/25	137/12 171/9 176/14	287/7
140/8 142/13 142/15	24/24 25/1 29/3 33/10	160/3 160/4 161/10	179/12 189/4 190/17	time for [1] 118/22
142/17 148/11 148/22	37/16 49/1 60/4 61/15	162/21 163/11 165/3	190/21 214/6 232/21	timeline [6] 34/24
155/17 156/4 156/5	90/15 110/8 113/13	165/3 166/6 166/22	256/9 267/8 267/15	35/1 35/2 65/19 65/22
156/8 156/11 158/19	118/5 126/14 126/16	166/24 181/23 181/24	276/21	68/1
158/22 161/17 161/19	140/3 141/4 151/14	182/2 182/4 182/17	through this [1] 90/24	
162/7 162/9 163/6	152/4 152/9 153/4	182/18 183/6 183/15	throughout [8] 7/1	25/24 26/8
163/25 164/1 164/6	167/4 168/14 172/18	183/16 184/8 185/14	31/21 31/23 40/24	timely [4] 82/4 82/7
164/10 164/12 164/12	172/20 173/6 175/22	192/13 192/23 195/18	57/16 85/4 94/4 99/9	84/6 163/17
164/13 165/15 165/18	177/8 186/12 186/17	202/18 203/12 211/8	thrust [1] 108/7	times [10] 6/7 37/6
165/20 166/4 166/9	186/25 187/9 187/12	211/11 211/20 211/24	thus [7] 64/22 88/5	74/13 122/19 124/13
166/11 166/12 166/14	187/15 188/12 196/10	213/17 214/14 215/23	104/7 111/22 112/4	137/16 137/17 185/6
166/15 167/13 168/2	200/21 200/24 207/7	217/4 217/5 223/11	117/24 125/6	185/8 273/17
168/4 168/11 168/21	207/15 208/24 209/3	233/2 234/20 236/12	tight [4] 6/4 7/17	timetable [6] 6/20
168/25 169/1 170/18	209/7 209/21 220/9	241/2 242/6 242/9	118/16 209/12	150/17 154/13 154/15
171/14 171/18 172/22	220/12 223/20 225/2	243/10 243/13 251/5	till [1] 175/17	154/18 155/3
174/19 174/24 175/15	231/11 236/15 237/15	256/24 261/3 274/4	time [153] 6/9 7/16	timetabling [2] 7/17
175/25 175/25 176/20	237/17 240/11 241/2	274/25 276/22 280/4	12/6 14/23 15/12	34/2

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Word Index Revised		11 December 2017 Pages 1-287
Т	59/21 70/1 107/23	2/18 2/19 5/9 5/11	120/16 192/2 192/13	128/1
timing [6] 32/1 37/11	123/16 129/20	5/15 8/1 13/6 13/9	197/7 225/6 228/15	unaware [1] 113/15
37/18 69/2 90/18	totally [2] 116/22	14/10 14/19 16/25	252/14 264/21	unchanged [1] 138/11
150/20	284/12	17/13 17/16 21/22	Tugui [22] 43/11	unclear [9] 17/14 79/3
timings [1] 37/22	touch [2] 204/17	29/9 30/22 30/23	88/25 89/10 136/1	154/17 154/24 162/1
Tiraspol [1] 201/23	285/14	31/19 32/18 33/17 33/24 36/21 37/1	160/11 211/16 211/20 214/11 229/22 229/24	166/17 167/4 167/8 284/12
title [1] 205/9	towards [5] 91/16 97/22 103/11 104/8	37/17 41/2 47/4 55/12	231/10 231/12 231/15	uncontested [1]
today [39] 7/14 8/1	119/21	56/9 65/17 69/4 69/18	231/19 238/9 242/15	120/20
14/11 23/11 28/18	town [5] 274/6 280/13	71/2 86/4 95/6 95/17	243/15 250/14 250/16	under [55] 30/19 32/4
29/12 32/18 36/10 65/21 75/7 90/8 98/7	280/18 280/19 280/20	95/20 98/3 101/3	250/17 252/11 253/3	40/14 49/16 58/16
104/17 105/7 108/5	traced [1] 116/8	104/17 105/6 106/8	turn [11] 12/19 15/4	58/19 60/5 67/14
111/2 112/23 119/8	track [2] 61/5 135/8	109/7 110/21 111/2	16/6 56/1 78/6 83/13	72/19 74/23 75/12
124/17 126/13 136/6	tractor [1] 231/8	114/25 115/25 119/13	86/18 100/3 142/5	76/24 78/11 78/12
139/8 152/23 152/24	tractors [3] 229/13	120/23 124/5 126/6	155/5 215/17	78/14 78/15 80/18
153/5 163/13 163/15	246/16 283/4 tradition [1] 33/16	127/22 131/5 132/24 133/19 134/17 135/13	turned [5] 31/9 220/20 220/21 259/23 263/21	89/20 94/18 97/19 98/1 104/1 104/20
172/10 190/14 191/12	traditional [1] 188/12	137/15 137/21 139/19	turning [3] 15/11	109/12 111/14 116/21
197/24 221/10 231/18	transcript [2] 170/7	142/11 142/23 149/25	137/11 141/2	125/5 125/17 125/19
240/14 250/8 254/8	215/18	150/8 153/15 154/1	turns [1] 32/23	129/13 129/15 130/12
276/17 276/23 278/3 TODD [2] 3/3 8/10	transfer [1] 223/7	154/12 181/1 181/20	twenty [1] 186/8	132/2 146/11 146/13
Todd Wells [1] 8/10	transferred [2] 195/19		twice [1] 123/11	155/24 165/21 173/17
todd.wells [1] 3/9	257/5	220/10 245/8 245/17	twist [1] 107/4	174/25 178/25 180/8
together [17] 59/10	translate [4] 32/6 32/8		two [68] 8/21 12/1	185/14 186/15 205/7
74/16 160/21 160/23	83/20 282/19	271/18 272/15 272/20 286/9	14/8 18/6 20/1 20/9 21/7 21/15 22/13	208/14 208/23 217/4 226/15 227/23 229/2
166/4 166/12 166/15	translated [7] 30/14 191/22 192/19 192/22	Tribunal's [10] 26/23	22/14 22/19 24/15	235/2 244/12 260/13
168/1 168/1 168/7	193/15 217/20 251/13	39/18 39/20 39/22	24/21 27/6 28/8 34/20	281/1 283/24
203/13 204/19 205/15	translation [19] 13/21	56/1 61/25 88/18	35/11 37/2 46/20 49/2	undermining [1] 93/6
210/23 235/14 280/10 284/10	31/4 31/12 32/5 32/14	96/15 100/3 193/23	50/19 51/6 55/7 58/15	underreporting [3]
token [2] 61/1 257/11	76/9 76/10 76/19 79/7	tribunals [2] 125/10	59/10 59/23 60/11	144/17 144/20 144/25
told [23] 72/16 74/17	79/9 81/19 190/19	181/3	61/12 61/15 65/6	understand [37]
92/24 153/18 158/18	191/1 191/1 191/7	tried [9] 57/12 77/12	66/10 84/15 96/16	10/14 10/21 11/2
208/9 217/14 247/4	192/18 215/2 215/3 244/12	77/18 115/4 117/8	99/12 100/16 115/13	11/15 36/9 44/3 44/16
247/22 248/13 260/18	translations [2] 13/7	136/16 224/9 224/9 259/9	116/10 116/23 118/16 118/21 119/23 120/25	51/16 51/17 56/20 77/23 77/24 80/22
273/9 274/17 275/13	31/24	tries [3] 62/14 110/23	129/20 136/15 151/9	132/25 133/4 135/19
275/14 277/4 278/15	translator [5] 191/8	113/5	153/10 154/22 160/13	137/15 150/24 151/18
279/3 279/7 283/23 284/20 284/24 285/24	192/7 193/9 216/3	trip [1] 286/14	165/23 176/15 185/5	206/17 207/23 207/24
tomorrow [12] 7/16	217/25	trivial [5] 98/25	185/8 187/11 208/5	214/18 216/11 224/15
7/19 23/11 24/12	transmission [2]	102/11 102/25 105/1	210/22 217/3 220/14	228/15 230/23 232/11
96/12 97/9 140/8	82/15 251/13	111/11	225/7 242/8 244/4	232/13 235/11 241/23
151/2 152/4 152/13	Transnistria [1] 203/25	troubled [1] 33/14 true [6] 122/25 124/4	245/15 247/12 247/14 249/12 255/16 257/10	254/9 267/17 274/13 275/2 275/4 280/12
286/25 287/7	transparency [3]	132/5 148/15 182/14	287/4 287/5	understanding [15]
tons [1] 239/10	17/11 52/22 93/6	244/17	two-page [1] 34/20	10/25 27/19 32/16
too [7] 58/4 141/23	travelled [2] 200/24		two-thirds [2] 18/6	50/16 50/17 50/18
160/12 216/11 231/12 250/19 267/7	205/15	135/18 135/23 141/11	116/10	67/24 68/16 78/4
took [30] 27/12 38/5	travelling [2] 238/5	144/24	type [6] 134/23 195/3	91/17 121/7 127/23
38/11 52/7 56/16 66/1	238/5	trust [1] 15/7	198/9 240/9 269/22	172/16 230/20 256/21
67/18 73/5 76/19	treasury [1] 148/7	trusted [1] 221/2	284/18	understood [14] 11/4
130/6 131/10 137/2	treated [2] 130/3 130/9	truth [13] 186/22 186/23 186/23 231/21	typed [2] 284/14 284/16	11/6 11/7 15/19 28/23 32/3 33/24 34/3 34/7
137/21 141/10 187/13	treaties [2] 100/8	251/10 251/17 253/5	typed-up [1] 284/14	52/2 80/1 151/1 159/8
188/8 201/23 201/23	101/13	253/15 267/22 267/24	typo [2] 25/8 200/7	160/20
205/5 206/5 207/19 215/10 219/2 228/25	treatise [1] 128/19	267/25 267/25 285/24		undue [1] 120/1
232/10 234/12 235/20	treatment [1] 197/11	try [15] 7/13 14/11	U	unduly [1] 208/23
237/21 247/1 260/1	treats [1] 174/9	27/2 100/23 110/24	Ukraine [1] 156/8	unexplained [5] 71/6
top [5] 19/5 70/9	treaty [1] 101/11	114/10 120/10 155/4	ultimately [5] 65/10	71/19 71/22 89/17
190/18 190/25 198/9	trend [2] 144/17 144/24	205/3 208/18 222/12 225/14 254/15 264/17	111/20 137/7 141/22 149/16	95/10 unfarmed [1] 188/10
total [3] 69/9 183/25	trespassing [1] 165/9	225/14 254/15 264/17 280/16	unable [4] 167/15	unfortunately [7] 40/1
269/7	trial [1] 172/23	trying [13] 18/3 32/17	167/16 192/3 253/10	42/4 42/13 66/13
totality [10] 16/22 17/22 19/1 31/2 37/19	Tribunal [83] 1/14 2/2	57/14 115/18 116/16	unambiguous [1]	74/10 79/20 285/11
11/22 19/1 31/2 31/19				
1		www.dianaburden.com	1	

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
U	unused [7] 38/10	USA [1] 149/15	135/18 165/6 175/13	249/18 251/3 257/19
unfounded [3] 122/22	164/6 187/14 188/9	usage [4] 139/24	185/12 194/1 281/6	267/5 268/1 272/14
142/6 180/3	194/21 205/18 234/11	139/24 139/25 140/14	variable [2] 139/15	273/8 273/9 275/24
ungrounded [3]	unusual [1] 282/3	USD [5] 41/8 196/10	147/16	275/24 277/12 277/18
123/12 123/19 131/5	unwillingness [1]	232/25 235/21 236/11	variables [1] 137/20	282/2 286/4 286/8
unhappy [1] 152/7	106/12	use [30] 15/3 15/10	variation [1] 15/10	286/9 286/22 287/13
unilateral [3] 73/3	unwinding [1] 125/2 up [43] 14/3 15/9 19/5	15/17 15/18 20/6 22/11 57/14 62/8 64/4	variety [1] 84/12	via [2] 52/6 113/24 vice [21] 43/8 45/13
79/1 106/4	20/9 31/7 38/18 38/24	140/22 140/22 141/18	various [11] 19/19 31/23 45/19 56/17	45/16 47/6 47/12
unilaterally [7] 72/25	40/4 40/6 40/20 41/14	141/20 141/21 157/14	94/2 106/18 113/10	47/25 48/1 52/10
73/19 75/10 78/19	43/17 43/19 43/22	164/16 166/8 166/9	113/21 135/13 170/22	204/24 227/17 231/14
81/4 86/13 125/1	44/1 44/11 55/14	175/5 175/12 197/2	242/5	272/24 273/1 273/12
Union [1] 205/7 unique [3] 111/1	56/21 68/4 68/12	197/4 197/5 197/8	Varvareuca [23] 66/24	276/20 278/16 278/19
148/17 148/24	85/24 92/23 93/21	197/9 197/10 213/14	73/4 73/5 79/16 83/11	278/23 279/4 279/7
United [14] 2/6 3/8	96/14 113/5 115/15	219/18 242/20 269/17	83/13 87/3 87/5 88/10	279/13
200/5 200/19 200/24	116/16 150/10 152/16	use/work [1] 175/5	89/9 105/24 116/9	Vice-Minister [6]
211/3 228/9 238/6	169/19 174/21 217/11 218/10 220/1 220/3	used [22] 15/3 33/21 43/13 69/6 69/11	117/18 162/14 170/8 170/20 176/5 182/16	278/16 278/19 278/23 279/4 279/7 279/13
248/10 257/23 258/7	244/11 251/21 260/8	86/22 87/7 88/3 88/5	183/2 183/16 183/18	Vice-Ministers [1]
259/12 277/15 278/1	264/18 276/24 281/12	105/20 106/23 123/4	222/7 283/14	276/20
United States [12]	284/14 284/16	136/9 137/6 138/8	vehicle [2] 41/21	Vice-President [11]
200/5 200/19 200/24 211/3 228/9 238/6	update [3] 69/2	139/22 141/18 142/3	149/16	43/8 45/13 45/16 47/6
248/10 257/23 258/7	101/25 111/24	226/7 231/10 241/12	vein [1] 125/9	47/12 47/25 48/1
259/12 277/15 278/1	updated [7] 24/10	243/9	verified [3] 42/21	52/10 204/24 227/17
university [2] 197/6	27/17 143/22 147/4	useless [1] 221/7	164/12 164/18	231/14
268/3	147/5 152/5 184/24 updates [1] 151/19	uses [3] 64/18 71/12 277/18	verify [4] 64/6 64/7 64/12 64/19	vicinity [1] 164/23 Victor [4] 169/20
unlawful [3] 82/4	uphold [1] 101/13	using [8] 65/9 126/19	versed [2] 50/10 116/4	
89/19 180/24	uploaded [1] 36/9	140/15 141/16 142/12	versed on [1] 50/10	Victor Levintsa [1]
unleased [1] 165/10	upon [14] 64/10 75/19	145/5 164/20 197/24	version [5] 191/5	220/16
unless [6] 18/1 20/25 25/14 95/20 164/17	105/2 108/16 121/19	Utica [4] 88/3 233/10	191/21 192/1 192/6	VICTORIA [3] 4/4 9/5
287/11	125/18 127/17 128/2	248/3 254/22	193/1	9/17
unpleasant [1] 207/16	134/9 144/10 144/12	V	versus [3] 109/25	Victoria Pernt [2] 9/5
unprocessed [1]	149/4 170/17 186/21	V Garmas [1] 244/13	130/3 160/13	9/17 VIENNA [9] 1/20 4/7
188/10	urgently [1] 170/24 us [85] 6/4 8/8 9/21	v.pernt [1] 4/9	very [114] 6/16 6/21 6/23 7/7 7/12 7/25 8/6	VIENNA [8] 1/20 4/7 6/3 8/8 186/12 202/9
unproven [1] 153/18	0/22 10/5 16/4 10/24	vacant [3] 188/10	8/9 10/4 10/14 10/21	267/6 286/14
unreasonable [3] 19/4	20/18 20/23 20/24	204/25 206/13	13/19 15/2 16/9 16/20	view [13] 12/20 13/9
71/23 128/15 unreasoned [1]	21/4 25/19 26/25 27/3	vague [2] 99/12	17/20 18/9 20/18	13/14 13/22 17/25
177/21	27/5 27/6 28/19 31/20	131/21	20/23 27/3 30/2 33/23	21/16 25/11 81/12
Unregistered [1]	32/2 32/15 33/14	VALERIU [4] 3/14	34/1 46/2 46/7 48/3	81/18 123/15 128/20
178/23	34/17 35/2 36/23 37/4	5/12 267/14 277/2	48/10 51/17 51/19	156/9 193/25
unreliable [2] 144/7	43/18 58/15 68/1 70/1	VALERIU BERIL [2] 5/12 267/14	53/8 53/17 55/12	views [7] 10/16 20/19
144/14	70/6 74/10 84/2 89/3 89/3 97/19 101/15	valid [17] 58/6 58/19	62/12 70/15 70/16 72/5 75/12 75/14	28/14 28/16 34/19 189/21 190/9
unseeded [1] 188/10	118/2 126/20 129/23	92/17 120/11 120/18	78/20 78/21 80/22	village [29] 35/4 45/19
unsigned [13] 35/21	148/6 148/6 150/17	125/17 125/23 130/23	80/22 81/15 85/25	47/15 47/17 48/12
57/18 62/2 62/6 62/18 96/24 163/13 164/15	151/3 151/14 152/20	155/24 163/7 165/2	88/5 89/13 96/25 98/1	65/4 75/11 90/11
164/17 165/9 209/23	153/18 167/4 168/16	178/24 178/25 182/17	98/11 99/3 99/19	94/23 117/11 121/14
209/24 210/10	183/19 192/11 192/12	182/18 235/5 274/11	99/21 100/18 101/7	166/23 167/5 171/21
until [11] 14/10 55/11	193/20 198/6 204/22	validity [9] 75/20	104/18 104/20 110/8	179/15 184/3 212/24
65/24 83/10 89/9	206/1 219/1 224/22 228/8 230/8 231/1	75/23 117/15 121/20 122/17 126/5 126/8	112/7 114/23 115/11 117/12 126/8 134/8	213/15 222/14 223/6 227/5 231/1 243/18
151/25 157/6 210/24	236/20 237/4 239/5	126/10 202/1	141/4 144/3 146/6	257/4 257/5 257/18
252/21 255/4 263/13	239/6 243/18 248/4	validly [4] 54/20 71/7	150/8 153/3 157/10	271/12 280/13 283/14
until December [1]	248/5 248/6 248/9	88/16 132/1	164/3 166/11 166/13	villager [3] 212/19
65/24 until December 2012	249/1 260/7 260/12	validly-leased [1]	166/14 167/13 167/21	228/12 235/25
[1] 255/4	266/15 267/3 272/25	88/16	172/18 173/6 186/8	villagers [11] 91/3
until March 2011 [1]	275/8 275/13 277/15	valuation [11] 26/14	186/19 186/24 192/5	92/11 167/25 213/3
157/6	278/15 280/9 281/23	26/15 135/21 137/7 142/5 142/24 146/20	198/4 200/1 203/6	222/6 228/16 228/22
untimeliness [1]	286/1 286/1 286/9 286/12	146/22 147/13 148/16	209/8 213/12 213/13 226/1 226/2 231/11	234/7 234/20 235/6 236/1
24/19	US-Moldova BIT [2]	140/22 147/13 140/10	233/11 244/2 244/7	villages [24] 38/14
untimely [1] 22/18	97/19 101/15	value [8] 71/16 104/22		38/15 45/20 48/7
untrue [1] 199/12	-			
L		www.dianaburdon.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
V	91/19 132/24 133/3	125/9 125/14 127/11	124/9 124/11 124/11	10/18 10/25 12/12
	138/9 151/13 152/5	131/7 132/9 132/14	124/19 124/20 124/22	13/3 14/14 14/18 17/4
villages [20] 54/25	164/25 177/10 187/22	140/4 140/23 151/19	125/22 125/24 127/15	17/16 18/3 20/12 22/5
56/13 57/6 73/18 75/9	187/25 188/3 201/4	167/6 167/23 168/4	130/19 130/20 131/4	23/4 25/7 27/18 28/25
85/18 88/22 116/17	205/4 206/11 206/17	168/5 172/4 174/5	131/19 132/1 132/9	32/16 33/12 34/17
116/24 117/5 154/22	207/6 207/24 208/22	182/22 195/22 200/13	134/19 138/11 138/15	34/18 36/17 39/19
163/22 168/12 183/10	208/25 209/1 209/23	209/10 209/23 210/9	141/18 141/22 141/23	46/19 49/23 51/12
188/9 202/25 205/5	217/21 218/23 220/18	212/10 239/17 248/8	142/7 142/12 154/18	54/11 56/7 62/13 63/1
208/21 221/16 229/11	225/10 225/17 227/24	253/4 255/5 259/5	155/8 155/10 155/15	66/16 68/20 72/23
Ville [1] 2/10	234/22 234/24 243/17	259/8 259/22 273/11	155/21 155/22 155/24	77/18 78/2 80/24 81/9
vindicated [1] 150/4	247/5 248/14 249/12	275/7 275/18 277/9	158/4 158/14 158/19	82/13 82/18 83/4 91/7
violate [1] 176/10	250/10 253/18 253/19	281/24 282/10	158/23 159/1 159/24	91/13 92/12 97/7
violated [1] 121/7	266/11	well-appreciated [1]	160/15 161/10 161/18	101/6 101/8 102/17
violating [3] 98/13	wanted [13] 92/10	96/5	162/2 162/3 162/11	103/17 105/11 105/22
104/9 181/3	156/5 169/24 170/3	well-grounded [1]	162/12 163/7 163/8	110/23 112/22 112/23
violation [4] 93/9	220/7 221/14 226/5	282/10	163/9 163/10 163/21	112/23 123/1 123/14
98/24 169/6 181/6	233/8 233/9 248/14		164/6 165/11 165/13	123/18 124/4 128/21
violent [1] 38/21	258/4 263/7 266/25	WELLS [18] 3/3 3/6 8/10 8/12 39/24 187/8		134/1 135/2 136/9
VIOREL [3] 4/16 9/8			166/10 166/21 166/25	
9/18	wanting [2] 18/1	188/4 190/12 195/16	169/25 172/1 172/11	137/23 138/2 138/3
Viroel [3] 245/22	33/15 Waraaw [4] 218/16	236/22 237/15 239/11	175/2 176/12 176/18	138/8 142/18 144/1
247/4 249/1	Warsaw [1] 218/16	249/8 251/9 268/7	177/12 178/12 180/9	144/24 145/17 146/9
vis [2] 78/1 78/1	was [553]	268/8 268/12 286/5	180/19 181/25 182/2	146/16 147/14 148/20
vis-à-vis [1] 78/1	was December 2012	went [38] 45/2 64/5	182/10 182/14 182/17	149/6 149/7 149/9
visit [1] 44/24	[1] 115/12	91/2 92/11 128/16	182/18 183/2 185/19	152/4 152/20 154/1
visited [1] 284/24	wasn't [2] 158/21	131/7 132/25 134/13	185/20 188/7 192/13	155/5 156/5 161/23
Visoca [2] 141/8	279/2	158/19 159/19 170/25	194/16 195/8 196/21	165/24 165/25 166/2
142/16	waste [2] 127/2	200/4 200/8 200/13	197/15 198/13 202/15	166/2 166/6 166/18
visualise [1] 164/21	258/18	200/18 204/15 204/15	203/6 206/3 207/3	166/20 167/9 167/11
Vlad [3] 144/22	watch [1] 161/6	206/5 213/3 219/16	207/25 210/8 210/19	167/11 167/12 169/21
171/11 231/16	way [31] 6/24 7/2	219/18 220/11 220/11	210/25 211/9 211/11	172/12 172/14 175/8
Vlad Filat [1] 171/11	14/16 16/24 25/13	235/9 238/7 243/15	211/12 211/14 211/20	175/21 183/19 187/24
Voda [34] 38/8 41/23	25/17 29/2 62/25	246/8 246/11 246/24	212/8 212/11 215/18	189/12 191/13 194/12
42/5 42/8 42/20 42/24	101/3 103/3 104/11	250/3 251/23 256/9	215/19 217/7 220/19	194/24 195/3 195/14
45/5 45/7 134/18	113/19 119/1 128/4	258/10 259/14 259/23	221/19 223/15 224/17	196/15 197/2 197/14
136/6 156/19 194/9	133/13 142/19 143/22	259/25 260/1 285/1	224/19 224/22 226/16	198/12 198/18 199/13
194/13 194/17 195/1	192/4 198/15 206/7	were [274] 10/18 21/7	227/16 228/18 228/22 229/6 230/6 230/15	199/16 199/17 200/16
195/4 195/9 201/5	208/7 227/6 231/9	23/17 24/6 24/18 40/7	235/7 235/15 238/12	207/21 208/1 215/6
201/16 201/20 203/24	235/25 236/23 253/18 258/17 260/3 281/9	43/11 43/15 44/5 44/5	238/13 238/16 238/19	216/5 216/13 217/12 217/16 217/18 217/19
204/21 206/12 240/7			238/20 239/9 239/12	217/19 219/8 219/12
246/8 269/6 269/8	281/11 286/8	46/6 46/8 46/19 52/6		
269/12 269/14 271/18	WC1R [1] 2/6	52/8 52/14 54/19	239/15 239/16 241/15 242/17 243/6 243/8	219/22 221/10 223/18
271/22 273/7 279/17	we [628]	54/23 55/17 56/3		225/12 225/23 227/24
279/19	Wednesday [3] 29/13	56/10 56/18 57/5	245/18 247/20 249/4	228/20 230/18 231/5
voice [1] 216/9	151/25 184/19 week [3] 11/13 13/13	57/11 57/13 57/20 58/23 59/7 60/16 61/1	249/5 251/9 251/23 251/24 252/1 252/4	234/16 234/22 236/9 239/15 239/19 239/20
voided [1] 179/21				
W	18/17 weekend [1] 10/19	61/2 62/1 62/2 63/18 64/1 65/8 66/19 67/12	253/14 253/19 253/21 253/22 253/25 254/17	240/22 240/25 241/6 241/9 241/23 242/1
		67/13 68/21 71/7 71/9	255/2 256/12 259/7	241/9 241/23 242/1 242/5 245/17 245/18
wait [2] 205/18 252/21	weeks [3] 26/3 66/11 239/8	71/11 71/19 72/2 72/7	259/10 259/11 259/20	242/5 245/17 245/18 245/18 245/18 248/19
waiting [4] 36/19	weight [1] 193/25	74/11 74/15 75/8	260/13 260/23 262/5	249/22 250/8 250/9
205/22 211/6 235/15		80/21 82/6 82/9 83/10	265/14 265/18 265/25	250/23 254/9 255/24
walk [4] 40/3 47/4	weighted [2] 147/9 148/1	83/25 84/4 84/12 85/4	269/5 269/7 269/11	250/23 254/9 255/24 256/18 257/7 258/22
71/2 179/12	weighted-average [2]	85/8 85/15 86/1 86/15	269/20 270/3 270/19	259/14 260/7 260/17
walked [1] 247/24	147/9 148/1	87/7 88/21 88/22	270/22 271/20 271/22	261/12 261/13 263/15
wall [2] 254/16 254/16	welcome [7] 6/2 6/8	89/21 91/15 91/15	273/5 273/6 273/11	265/3 265/24 266/16
want [71] 7/10 7/10	10/4 124/6 186/11	95/8 101/9 102/10	273/21 273/22 274/3	266/16 266/17 266/20
7/16 10/7 15/2 15/7	202/9 202/9	102/24 106/2 106/17	274/5 274/6 274/23	267/22 268/15 268/22
15/9 15/18 18/17 20/7	welcoming [2] 11/15	102/24 100/2 100/17	278/15 279/17 281/5	269/6 269/25 270/9
21/1 25/14 29/18	38/17	113/14 113/16 113/17	283/4 284/24	271/12 273/22 273/23
29/22 31/19 31/24	well [51] 18/18 50/10	114/3 116/12 116/16	weren't [2] 175/15	274/9 275/7 275/11
32/25 33/20 34/1 37/1	55/12 60/7 63/13 90/6	117/3 117/7 117/10	262/7	275/12 276/19 277/5
37/5 44/18 45/21 51/6	96/5 98/3 99/16 116/9	117/24 117/25 118/2	western [2] 197/11	277/9 277/10 277/21
51/19 55/15 58/1 59/4	120/2 120/20 121/5	118/20 121/18 122/19	228/7	278/2 278/11 279/1
59/5 68/12 69/13	120/2 120/20 121/3	122/20 122/21 123/12	what [213] 10/17	280/8 281/4 281/6
77/17 90/23 90/25	121/0122/10124/24	122120 122121 120/12		20010 20117 201/0
		www.dianaburden.com		

ICSID ARB 16 8	
Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova	

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
W	31/12 50/17 57/8	242/5 242/9 244/11	250/25 252/18 252/20	239/4 249/1 249/2
what [14] 281/7	58/15 62/2 62/3 76/10	245/6 245/24 246/8	254/12 258/2 258/8	254/6 254/25 255/8
281/8 281/23 282/5	100/17 120/10 123/18	249/10 249/15 249/16	275/3 276/14 277/11	259/13 266/8 267/8
282/11 282/13 282/19	150/16 181/5 181/22	251/13 255/10 255/19	282/5 283/17 283/21	267/11 267/22 267/24
282/25 283/10 283/10	188/16 189/6 191/25	257/22 267/21 267/21	WIECHEN [4] 3/18	268/8 268/8 268/11
284/5 286/3 286/18	202/19 233/17 233/18	270/15 274/3 274/11	137/8 151/23 152/12	279/1 280/16 286/25
286/18	234/24 240/7 240/8	274/24 276/7 280/19	wife [1] 249/13	287/1 287/3
whatever [1] 62/18	255/18 256/9 271/6	287/1	will [202] 7/7 7/9 7/16	willing [1] 22/22
whatsoever [3] 39/3	271/24 272/18 274/4	while [20] 33/9 36/19	11/3 11/4 11/15 11/21	wind [1] 115/15
84/7 139/4	275/15 276/5 278/12	86/4 87/5 115/16	12/19 12/23 13/23	winter [6] 55/12 198/5
wheat [6] 143/8 198/5	279/3 which [193] 6/24 10/6	119/3 122/23 124/15 125/23 126/19 135/4	14/1 14/15 15/11 16/4 20/20 22/19 23/6 23/7	200/14 200/23 231/3 253/7
205/20 225/6 239/25	11/20 12/2 12/4 12/8	139/5 140/19 142/22	23/8 23/11 23/12	wire [2] 223/7 257/5
253/7	13/2 13/7 15/1 16/11	156/18 157/17 165/9	25/16 25/18 27/1 27/3	wire-transfer [1]
when [103] 15/4 15/8	18/6 18/15 19/22	224/16 280/23 283/24	28/2 28/4 28/5 28/23	223/7
15/13 15/14 18/12	19/25 20/2 21/1 21/10	whilst [1] 86/13	28/24 29/4 29/19	wire-transferred [1]
18/25 20/8 28/5 32/17	23/14 26/18 28/17	white [1] 165/6	31/16 33/10 34/2	257/5
33/18 33/20 44/20	30/8 30/16 30/19 31/8	who [84] 6/13 7/4 8/20		wisdom [2] 26/23
45/10 48/22 49/10	31/16 33/16 35/12	11/11 11/12 20/1	36/16 36/22 36/23	27/2
51/5 51/10 54/1 58/11 59/25 61/14 61/20	35/14 35/20 40/7 42/5	27/22 31/1 31/1 35/15	37/3 37/6 37/17 37/18	wish [8] 20/6 48/17
66/7 67/11 73/6 74/11	42/19 43/16 44/23	38/1 41/16 45/14	38/15 39/17 39/20	149/24 188/17 221/3
82/25 91/18 92/10	45/5 45/9 46/18 49/15	45/15 47/6 51/9 59/25	39/21 39/23 40/2 40/3	267/5 286/13 287/11
92/11 114/25 115/23	50/24 51/20 52/19	64/4 84/4 91/6 91/12	40/4 40/5 40/9 40/12	with Bio-Alianta [1]
122/19 124/10 130/7	52/20 56/19 56/23	91/19 92/22 94/15	40/14 40/17 40/19	94/16
138/16 141/3 144/4	57/2 57/10 57/20	95/6 116/3 116/4	40/24 46/15 51/19	withdraw [3] 17/17
147/7 149/5 154/18	57/23 58/18 59/10	117/23 118/12 136/5	53/25 54/13 61/19	18/7 19/10
154/24 166/9 169/2	60/2 60/12 62/1 62/4 62/6 62/6 62/11 63/5	136/20 149/20 158/17 159/2 160/19 165/2	61/19 61/20 63/6 63/21 68/6 68/14	within [7] 18/16 121/17 122/16 138/6
169/3 169/14 174/7	65/24 66/6 68/17 69/3	179/19 182/10 184/7	68/18 69/4 69/19	159/1 173/13 269/19
181/5 192/21 194/11	69/14 70/11 70/20	192/17 192/18 195/21	69/21 70/1 70/5 70/6	without [18] 18/8
203/23 204/14 205/8	71/3 71/16 71/18 72/7	207/14 212/13 212/20	71/9 75/6 77/24 83/13	25/20 52/12 66/16
207/20 209/7 210/1	76/7 76/13 78/23	214/17 214/21 218/1	83/23 86/9 86/18	95/12 96/16 109/21
213/2 214/17 215/10	83/13 86/8 86/18	219/2 220/4 222/9	90/11 95/23 95/25	110/4 115/6 124/22
215/18 216/14 217/22 220/20 220/22 224/22	87/16 87/19 87/25	224/18 225/20 228/23	98/6 105/6 116/3	139/3 149/18 164/14
225/18 232/12 234/8	88/1 88/24 89/16 90/4	229/5 231/5 232/15	117/6 118/9 118/11	171/21 172/9 181/3
234/12 235/9 237/5	90/21 92/3 93/2 95/2	234/21 235/6 237/12	118/12 118/16 119/2	184/24 255/24
237/12 237/25 239/16	95/14 95/21 97/4 98/2	242/13 245/17 246/1	119/6 119/14 121/13	witness [60] 34/12
239/23 243/6 244/19	100/5 100/8 100/18	246/6 246/6 250/11	124/25 133/13 133/16	41/10 44/22 136/2
246/7 247/1 247/24	101/10 101/24 102/2	258/5 258/11 262/11	136/5 136/7 137/25	136/8 156/6 156/25
250/2 251/23 251/24	105/3 105/6 105/23	270/1 272/1 272/24	138/6 140/2 140/4	157/10 157/23 158/14
252/3 253/20 253/21	106/25 108/21 109/14 109/17 110/8 110/17	275/20 275/23 276/1	140/7 140/8 140/16 144/4 146/22 147/6	159/5 159/9 159/15 159/18 159/22 160/9
254/1 254/2 259/7	111/1 113/5 117/12	276/20 281/1 282/21 283/9 284/8 284/15	147/8 147/24 149/9	160/13 160/22 170/7
259/22 259/25 260/9	118/2 118/9 118/17	284/15 285/21 286/1	151/18 152/2 152/11	186/13 187/25 188/14
262/23 263/21 264/7	119/17 124/18 124/25	whoever [1] 278/3	152/15 152/16 152/18	188/15 188/22 189/9
264/14 269/12 272/24	126/7 126/18 131/19	whole [12] 17/3 32/7	152/19 154/1 155/2	189/15 189/19 189/24
273/4 273/17 274/22	136/4 137/15 138/24	32/8 50/18 60/2 61/3	156/2 163/1 165/5	190/3 196/4 200/3
278/6 280/25 where [33] 38/6 61/16	140/4 141/20 143/17	142/1 146/4 158/20	166/8 173/12 173/13	202/13 202/15 206/24
65/12 71/14 79/16	144/10 146/19 147/22	186/23 267/25 281/19	173/14 175/13 177/2	211/13 214/9 214/12
89/2 90/18 91/1 92/22	151/15 156/2 176/12	whom [3] 11/17 43/11	177/7 177/9 177/23	223/14 227/12 227/15
93/22 110/17 114/6	177/4 177/18 177/23	282/1	179/12 183/20 184/7	230/2 230/9 230/10
117/14 121/1 121/2	178/9 183/13 183/14	Whose [1] 79/22	184/18 186/2 186/5	237/6 240/11 245/10
160/14 164/7 169/2	184/3 184/13 184/17	why [49] 32/19 35/2	187/1 187/2 187/2	251/9 252/19 254/1
169/4 169/14 170/8	185/13 187/2 187/13	50/12 57/18 57/22	187/4 187/12 187/17	255/15 267/20 268/18
172/23 177/3 191/4	188/8 196/24 197/18	59/17 60/15 61/25	187/20 187/23 188/3	269/4 270/7 270/20
194/9 214/9 219/15	197/23 197/24 198/2	62/4 62/9 66/1 66/6 66/8 68/21 69/14	190/19 190/21 190/22 193/21 195/17 195/17	271/1 272/16 272/19 272/22 277/18
239/20 239/21 248/22	202/17 203/24 205/5 207/7 211/15 213/15	71/20 71/21 79/3 81/6	202/12 202/17 204/16	witnessed [1] 249/6
259/19 262/5 286/15	214/17 214/22 216/18	141/11 181/10 185/17	207/7 209/3 209/11	witnesses [5] 3/13
whereas [1] 25/9	216/22 219/17 227/24	207/18 208/7 218/17	213/7 213/8 213/12	35/15 36/1 154/25
wherever [2] 21/13	231/15 232/19 234/1	220/10 220/17 225/25	213/25 214/1 222/11	186/3
134/12	235/21 236/4 237/12	237/22 238/16 238/20	225/14 225/22 225/23	won't [2] 36/23 105/8
whether [40] 7/2	237/20 238/18 238/19	239/12 245/2 246/3	227/1 229/3 232/16	wonder [7] 7/2 19/5
12/11 15/18 17/21 19/5 20/7 21/16 31/11	238/22 241/12 241/16	248/12 248/13 250/12	236/14 239/3 239/3	20/7 27/25 208/1
13/3 20/1 21/10 31/11				
L		www.dianaburdon.com		1

ICSID ARB 16 8 Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al v Republic of Moldova

Word Index Revised

11 December 2017 Pages 1-287

Zbigniew Piotr Grot et al	v Republic of Moldova	Revised		Pages 1-287
W	Y	241/22 242/16 242/18	138/2 138/3 139/1	261/10
wonder [2] 209/13	year [26] 41/8 41/23	242/21 243/2 243/5	150/9 152/16 153/5	ZBIGNIEW [15] 1/8
224/24	44/23 45/4 45/6 82/11	247/22 248/19 250/17	153/7 154/10 160/2	3/12 3/14 5/4 7/6 38/2
wondered [1] 274/4	117/9 118/7 157/6	251/7 251/10 251/15	165/24 166/2 173/2	157/4 171/9 186/10
wonderful [2] 266/14	167/2 167/3 175/19	251/18 256/6 256/23	185/25 186/7 186/25	188/22 190/4 190/22
286/14	183/25 185/2 194/12	259/1 260/11 260/19	187/8 187/25 189/9	228/5 234/5 285/4
wondering [1] 150/16	194/15 196/9 205/20	260/25 261/18 261/20	189/21 190/1 190/6	Zbigniew Grot [1]
word [2] 167/24	205/25 233/12 239/17	262/12 262/16 262/22	190/9 190/23 191/25	190/22
167/24	254/24 255/9 271/17	263/10 263/14 264/12	194/5 196/4 196/19	
words [15] 15/10	274/10 280/17	265/2 265/7 265/20	197/2 198/17 200/3 200/18 201/17 202/12	GROT [5] 5/4 171/9
75/24 89/5 89/12	year and [1] 233/12	267/18 268/20 268/20 268/21 268/22 268/25	200/18/201/17/202/12/202/15/202/19/202/22	186/10 188/22 190/4 Zelenenco [21] 43/8
101/6 107/4 108/3	years [43] 38/11 39/14	269/3 270/10 272/8	202/13/202/19/202/22	52/10 53/13 75/5 75/5
108/25 115/7 146/15	40/21 104/4 104/19	272/8 275/18 281/16	206/24 209/6 209/11	92/21 171/2 222/8
148/15 163/2 237/3	150/3 183/11 185/3	281/21 282/17 285/6	210/3 211/13 214/9	222/13 228/11 250/4
262/25 277/17	187/14 188/9 188/11	285/16	216/12 216/20 216/24	250/6 250/7 250/10
work [23] 8/4 49/16	194/21 195/16 198/13	yesterday [1] 13/22	218/2 218/10 218/21	250/12 250/14 250/15
51/12 51/13 55/1	198/22 205/4 205/18 205/23 214/15 214/18	yet [17] 20/12 51/1	221/9 223/14 226/15	250/16 250/20 251/1
55/19 89/4 163/18 163/21 175/5 180/2	203/23 214/15 214/18 214/21 217/18 217/23	90/12 128/22 156/16	227/11 227/15 229/2	253/2
204/16 207/9 213/6	221/11 225/4 225/19	157/9 158/3 158/24	229/23 230/18 230/20	zero [4] 79/2 205/23
229/6 229/7 229/10	227/22 228/10 231/19	159/22 161/15 161/25	231/12 233/24 234/25	206/15 227/8
230/14 239/22 243/17	234/12 235/20 237/17	162/20 163/8 164/9	235/2 235/8 235/16	Ziggy [17] 38/3
246/19 253/8 272/2	237/18 245/24 247/16	171/21 182/11 251/24	237/2 237/6 240/6	204/19 204/23 205/17
worked [8] 6/20 98/20	248/10 248/15 249/9	yfortier.ca [1] 2/12	240/17 241/16 241/17	213/6 217/25 220/15
179/16 202/3 203/23	249/14 263/19 270/3	yield [14] 27/17 40/22		220/17 221/10 222/11
228/18 229/23 235/24	285/5 285/15	135/17 136/11 137/2 138/23 140/2 141/6	242/24 243/7 244/19 245/10 245/20 246/6	228/10 228/12 233/11 248/1 252/12 254/23
working [11] 84/4	years' [2] 39/5 41/17	143/1 143/22 143/25	246/23 247/2 247/5	258/15
89/11 112/24 154/3	yellow [1] 183/12	145/6 197/19 270/4	247/5 247/11 247/22	200/10
156/19 160/18 181/15	yes [156] 10/3 10/12	yields [25] 38/9 136/9		
224/3 225/18 263/20	11/6 14/7 16/3 16/5	136/13 136/18 137/17	249/5 249/16 249/24	
272/3	23/24 27/21 29/3	139/14 139/14 139/23	250/2 250/18 251/8	
works [2] 80/19 154/24	31/14 35/7 36/4 37/8 37/9 44/16 46/1 46/7	140/12 140/17 141/22	251/9 251/22 252/2	
World [2] 140/25	46/11 47/24 50/22	142/17 143/5 143/11	252/9 252/14 252/19	
144/15	74/22 77/20 84/12	143/15 143/20 144/8	252/23 253/9 253/15	
World Bank [2]	84/18 84/25 85/16	144/20 145/4 146/6	254/1 255/14 255/15	
140/25 144/15	118/19 134/2 144/13	146/8 146/11 196/15	255/19 256/22 257/8	
worries [1] 188/2	151/20 173/5 186/1	198/15 272/5	257/12 258/6 258/7	
worry [2] 69/15 70/9	188/20 188/24 189/2	Yoda [1] 174/19	258/9 259/13 259/22	
worse [3] 94/9 103/8	189/10 189/22 190/5	you [885] you come [1] 177/2	260/12 260/18 261/10 261/21 262/10 262/24	
265/6	190/7 190/10 190/24	you have [1] 76/7	263/12 263/16 264/6	
worth [2] 167/5	191/3 191/23 193/13	you on [1] 14/17	264/18 265/3 267/2	
258/15	193/16 195/13 200/8	you that [1] 278/24	267/17 268/18 268/24	
worthwhile [1] 141/10		you to [1] 209/8	269/2 269/4 270/7	
would [302] writ [2] 173/14 266/4	203/2 203/5 203/8 203/11 203/14 203/18	your [216] 6/18 7/11	270/22 270/23 270/23	
write [3] 168/8 192/11	203/22 204/2 204/6	7/20 7/23 11/1 12/12	271/4 271/5 271/17	
200/25	206/20 206/23 207/2	12/20 13/5 15/3 16/1	272/22 272/25 273/22	
writers [1] 284/18	208/12 209/17 209/24	17/25 19/6 20/24 22/2	275/15 279/24 279/25	
writes [1] 175/17	210/10 211/10 212/2	22/15 23/6 23/8 23/14	280/16 285/4 285/24	
writing [6] 97/2 129/2	212/6 212/16 213/22	23/15 26/16 31/1	286/10 286/15	
192/7 192/20 227/20	214/1 214/4 214/19	31/12 33/7 33/19	yours [5] 9/11 202/16	
228/4	214/23 214/24 215/13	33/20 33/25 34/1 35/7	217/3 217/5 218/14	
written [15] 58/9	215/16 215/21 216/1	35/8 35/25 36/15 36/23 37/6 37/19	yourself [4] 53/7 65/25 211/15 278/15	
58/10 58/19 59/12	216/15 217/14 217/22	44/16 50/16 51/18	yourselves [1] 106/22	
73/15 78/7 84/8 98/6	218/12 219/17 220/6	51/18 56/21 58/12	Yves [5] 1/15 2/9 2/10	
105/8 154/5 192/5	221/1 221/6 221/24	61/16 63/22 65/20	6/11 268/5	
251/17 257/8 281/18	222/2 224/18 224/23	66/1 67/3 67/9 67/18	yves.fortier [1] 2/12	
283/12 wrong [2] 35/3 282/5	226/10 226/14 226/17	68/11 69/5 69/9 73/22	<u> </u>	
wrote [4] 192/17	226/20 227/14 227/19 229/14 229/25 230/3	74/4 76/7 79/25 80/22	Z	
249/17 251/12 258/20	230/12 233/1 233/4	82/18 91/1 91/25	Zahar [8] 173/5	
	235/17 235/18 235/23	101/6 126/19 127/2	238/22 238/24 239/2	
	237/9 240/4 241/8	132/13 132/13 133/21	255/14 255/16 261/9	
		www.dianaburden.com		