

**REPORTS OF INTERNATIONAL  
ARBITRAL AWARDS**

**RECUEIL DES SENTENCES  
ARBITRALES**

**William E. Bowerman and Messrs. Burberry's (Ltd.) (Great Britain) v. United  
Mexican States**

10 April 1931

VOLUME V p. 135



NATIONS UNIES - UNITED NATIONS  
Copyright (c) 2006

of claimant are correct—which can only appear when the merits of the claim are under examination—there could not be assumed free will on the side of the owner. His house was occupied by authorities, civil or military, and he had no other choice than to cede it to them. The fact that now and then he received a certain amount from some of those who were in actual possession, does not change the compulsory character of the occupation nor convert it into a contract of lease. It seems only natural that claimant accepted what those in power were disposed to pay. It is not shown that he declared himself satisfied with these payments, nor that he has ever waived his right to claim for indemnification as soon as this might prove possible.

6. The motion to dismiss is overruled.

-----

WILLIAM E. BOWERMAN AND MESSRS. BURBERRY'S (LIMITED)  
(GREAT BRITAIN) *v.* UNITED MEXICAN STATES

*(Decision No. 25, April 10, 1931. Pages 17-18. See also decision No. 18.)*

-----

NATIONALITY, PROOF OF.—PARTNERSHIP CLAIM.—CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC AS EVIDENCE. Certificate of notary public as to pertinent facts *held* sufficient proof of nationality of British partnership.

*(Text of decision omitted.)*

-----

JOHN WALKER (GREAT BRITAIN) *v.* UNITED MEXICAN STATES

*(Decision No. 26, April 10, 1931. Pages 18-21.)*

-----

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTS OF CIVIL AUTHORITIES.—JURISDICTION.—MOB VIOLENCE. Motion to dismiss in part *allowed*, in so far as claim was based on confiscatory acts of civil authorities, and in part *rejected*, in so far as claim was based on personal injuries from acts of mob violence. Jurisdiction of tribunal over latter portion of claim sustained.

*(Text of decision omitted.)*

-----

DOUGLAS G. COLLIE MacNEILL (GREAT BRITAIN) *v.* UNITED MEXICAN STATES

*(Decision No. 27, majority decision, not concurred in by Mexican Commissioner, April 10, 1931. Pages 21-25.)*

-----

CALVO CLAUSE. To be effective a Calvo Clause must be drafted so as not to permit of doubt as to intentions of parties and must emanate from an act of the national Government and not from a local authority.

*Cross-reference*: Annual Digest, 1931-1932, p. 222.