



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW, GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNICATION (IJLGC)

[www.ijlgc.com](http://www.ijlgc.com)



## DOES E-ARBITRATION PROVIDE A SUITABLE RESPONSE FOR THE “NEW NORMAL” PHENOMENON DURING THE ERA OF COVID-19 PANDEMIC?

Mohamad Fateh Labanieh<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad Azam Hussain<sup>\*2</sup>, Nazli Mahdzir<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of law, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia  
Email: fatih.labanie@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> School of law, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia  
Email: hmazam@uum.edu.my

<sup>3</sup> School of law, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia  
Email: mnazli@uum.edu.my

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding Author

### Article Info:

Received date: 09.11.2020  
Revised date: 15.11.2020  
Accepted date: 10.12.2020  
Published date: 10.03.2021

### To cite this document:

Labanieh, M. F., Hussain, M. A., & Mahdzir, N. (2021). Does E-Arbitration Provide A Suitable Response for The “New Normal” Phenomenon During the Era of Covid-19 Pandemic?. International Journal of Law, Government and Communication, 6 (22), 215-226.

DOI: 10.35631/IJLGC.6220021.

This work is licensed under [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



### Abstract:

The COVID-19 pandemic has put the global justice system under pressure and strain. Malaysia is among the countries that have been fundamentally strived to enhance access to justice for the disputing parties through traditional arbitration during the chaos of COVID-19. For instance, several well-known arbitration centres allow the conduct of oral hearings electronically besides other arbitral proceedings. By using legal research methodology, this article endeavours to examine whether e-arbitration can provide a suitable response for the “new normal” phenomenon during the COVID-19 pandemic. The collected data is then analytically and critically analysed using the content analysis method. This article finds that there are legal ambiguity and logistical challenges regarding the use of technologies for the purpose of oral hearing. Also, there is an urgent need to ensure that the right to equal treatment will not be compromised during e-hearing. Furthermore, the Malaysian authorities should examine the possibility of implanting e-arbitration on a full scale, since the role of electronic communication technologies in e-arbitration is fundamental rather than limited and restricted on facilitating the process of resolution as applied in traditional arbitration. Finally, this humble article provides several recommendations to enhance access to justice during and after the era of the COVID-19 pandemic because “Justice delayed is justice denied”.

### Keywords:

Traditional Arbitration, E-arbitration, Dispute Resolution, COVID-19, ODR

### Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic is spreading like wildfire without any restrictions. The number of coronavirus cases has increased dramatically. It reaches 129, 502, 962 million cases in the

world (World Meters, 2021). In Malaysia, the total number of cases reaches 345,500 thousand cases. The total deaths and recovered cases are 1272 and 329,624, respectively (Ibid). The dilemmas coming with the era of the COVID-19 pandemic are paralysing negatively the smooth running of businesses globally. Several sanitary and preventative measures, such as the travel bans and restrictions, have been adopted until now. These measures play a considerable role in putting global justice under pressure and strain because the disputing parties and their counsels to the traditional arbitration are not able to have face-to-face (F2F) meetings, communications and interactions.

Hence, in a short stretch of time, the international arbitration centres, including the Asian International Arbitration Center (hereinafter referred to as “AIAC”), have substantially responded to these challenges in order to facilitate access to justice and ensure that the process of resolution is running quickly, easily, and efficiently. They have swiftly developed new approaches and ways of working. For instance, AIAC announced in October 2020 that the conduct of the in-person hearing is not allowed during the Conditional Movement Control Order (CMCO), and AIAC encourages electronic hearing (hereinafter referred to as “e-hearing”) (AIAC, 2020). In the same vein, the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA) also binds the parties to fill their requests via e-mail (casework@lcia.org) or through its online filing system (LCIA, 2020). Furthermore, it obligates the arbitral members to deliver the arbitral award electronically through e-mail (Ibid).

Regardless of the level of response and support that the international arbitration centres have taken, it might be clear that the COVID-19 pandemic poses an opportunity to enhance the process of resolution through electronic arbitration (hereinafter referred to as “e-arbitration”) compared with traditional arbitration. This is because e-arbitration is entirely based on using electronic communication technologies, and the parties still have the power to control the processes of resolution. For instance, they can agree on the seat of arbitration, the applicable procedural and substantive law, besides other procedural matters. Based on the previous facts, this article is devoted to examine whether e-arbitration can provide a suitable response for the “new normal” phenomenon during the COVID-19 pandemic.

### **Problem Statement**

Alternative dispute resolution (hereinafter referred to as “ADR”) mechanisms have emerged to support the traditional approach of resolution, such as litigation, because the latter has faced several challenges that might negatively affect its effectiveness and the justice system in Malaysia. For instance, litigation is an adversarial mechanism that leads to a win-lose situation. Therefore, litigation is increasingly giving way to ADR mechanisms, including but not limited to traditional arbitration (Oraegbunam & Okafor, 2013). The same thing has been highlighted by the former justice Sandra Day O’Connor. According to her,

The courts should be the places where the disputes end—after alternative methods of resolving disputes have been considered and tried [emphasis added] (Calvi & Coleman, 2011, p.84).

During the era of COVID-19 pandemic, the use of electronic communication technologies in the context of traditional arbitration has been increased dramatically. As mentioned earlier, several arbitration centres have allowed the conduct of the oral hearing electronically. However, traditional arbitration in its current form is not sufficient to provide a suitable

response to the threats brought by the COVID-19 pandemic (Adolf, 2020) (Labanieh, Hussain & Mahdzir 2020). The problem of this article is then described as follows:

- 1- What is the legal position of e-hearing in Malaysia?
- 2- What are the logistical challenges affecting the credibility of e-hearing in Malaysia?
- 3- How can the establishment of e-arbitration enhance access to justice in Malaysia during and after the era of the COVID-19 pandemic?

### **Research Method and Scope**

This article is based on doctrinal legal research for several reasons. Firstly, doctrinal legal research is “research in law” (Vibhute & Aynalem, 2009). Secondly, it contributes to the consistency, certainty, and continuity of the law and initiates further development of doctrines and legal principles (Ibid). Thirdly, it shows the areas of difficulty and, perhaps, anticipates future developments (Hutchinson, 2008). Fourthly, it is the most popular among the legal researchers (Singhal & Malik, 2012) and legal academics in the Commonwealth (Hutchinson & Nigel, 2012) because it contains several approaches for analysing the data, such as analytical, critical, and descriptive (Tiller & Cross, 2006). Therefore, doctrinal legal research is the best fit for this article. It helps in examining whether e-arbitration can provide a suitable response for the “new normal” phenomenon during the era of COVID-19 pandemic.

Concerning the type of data, both primary and secondary data are used in this article. Primary data is sourced from Laws and Acts. For example, the Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646), I-Arbitration Rules 2018, UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration 1985, and other relevant laws to this topic. Furthermore, the secondary data is sourced from books, journal articles and online resources, such as Lexis Malaysia, JStore, Lexis Advance, and Taylor and Francis.

As for data collection, this article adopts a library-based approach that essentially involves the perusal, interpretation, and analysis of the collected data. Moreover, primary and secondary data are analytically and critically analysed using the content analysis method. Because content analysis is used in legal studies (Hall & Wright, 2008), and it assists the authors to understand and analyse the data collected from primary and secondary sources.

Finally, this article focuses mainly on analysing how e-arbitration can provide a suitable response for the “new normal” phenomenon during the era of COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, it starts with examining the legal position of e-hearing in Malaysia. Then it highlights the logistical challenges affecting the credibility of e-hearing in Malaysia. Finally, it discusses how the establishment of e-arbitration can enhance access to justice in Malaysia during and after the era of COVID-19 pandemic.

### **Literature Review**

The term “e-arbitration” has been defined as a dispute resolution mechanism in which all of its procedures are conducted in the online environment by using electronic communication technologies, such as e-mail, online conferencing, or chat groups (Arsic, 1997). Similarly, Amro (2019) stated that in e-arbitration, the e-arbitral proceedings, including the oral hearing, are entirely made online. From a legal standpoint, article 2 of Shenzhen Court of International Arbitration (SCIA)-Online Arbitration Rules 2019 states that e-arbitration “refers to a dispute

resolution method of conducting arbitration by use of the Internet or other information technologies.”

Besides, the term “new normal” is generally defined as “a hitherto unusual state of affairs that suddenly becomes standard or typical” (Collins Dictionary, 2021). In the context of this article, the term “new normal” means the instability in the accessibility of justice in Malaysia due to preventive and health measures, such as social distancing and movement control order (MCO).

Moreover, studies on the disputes resolution framework in Malaysia are considerably increasing due to the need for finding an effective method to resolve commercial disputes quickly and smoothly. The present literature on dispute resolution in the Islamic law discovered that the primary objective is the settlement of dispute regardless of the way of resolution (Rashid, 2004). More specifically, the use of traditional arbitration has been significantly encouraged because of its valuable advantages (Florescu, 2020); for instance, it is a confidential (Nevisandeh, 2015) and private mechanism. However, traditional arbitration is not much appealing as it used to be. Specifically, several notable studies pointed out the hitches facing traditional arbitration in resolving the commercial disputes, including Islamic banking disputes (Labanieh, Hussain & Mahdzir, 2019), (Rahman, 2019), (Oseni, 2016), (Mohamed, Makhtar, Hamid & Asari, 2016), (Rashid, 2005). In the same vein, Alam (2014) concluded that traditional arbitration would be enhanced if its challenges are adequately addressed. For this reason, Labanieh & Hussain (2020) highlighted the advantages of establishing e-arbitration in Malaysia. In another contribution, Labanieh, Hussain & Mahdzir (2020) scrutinised the critical role of e-arbitration in improving the quality and service delivery in the Malaysian dispute resolution industry. Due to the fact that there is a need to explore new options and mechanisms for resolving the existing disputes in the critical situations, such as the COVID-19 pandemic (Bateson, 2020).

In a nutshell, a closer look at the previous literature reveals some shortcomings. Remarkably, three main gaps need to be appropriately addressed, namely (i) the legal position of e-hearing in Malaysia; (ii) the logistical challenges affecting the credibility of e-hearing in Malaysia; (iii) the way forward to enhance access to justice in Malaysia during and after the era of COVID-19 pandemic. Finally, it is argued and believed that an article such this would positively contribute to the field of legal studies as it concentrates on finding a suitable way to enrich the current dispute resolution framework in Malaysia.

### **The Legal Position of E-Hearing in Malaysia**

The following discusses three main issues; firstly, whether the oral hearing is a mandatory requirement under Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646); secondly, the validity of e-hearing according to Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) and I-Arbitration Rules 2018; thirdly, the need to ensure the right of equal treatment in the e-hearing.

Regarding the first issue, e-hearing is a familiar concept in international arbitration. It is 25% to 30% quicker than a traditional hearing (Croagh, Gemma & Rahul, 2017), and it has been utilised to hear witnesses in international arbitrations (Wang, 2018) (Hill, 1999). Oral hearings can be conducted electronically through a built-in platform, such as Arbitration Place Virtual (Arbitration Place, 2020) or by using several applications, such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Skype or Webex. Thus, it can be said that the conduct of the oral hearings electronically could help in reducing carbon dioxide emission and global warming.

Indeed, e-hearing is not a new phenomenon; a great variety of arbitration laws allow the conduct of the oral hearings electronically (UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules 2013, articles 28(3); Dutch Code of Civil Procedure 2015, article 1072b(4)). In the context of Malaysia, section 26 of Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) deals with oral hearings in traditional arbitration. Section 26(1) addresses only the general entitlement of a party to oral hearings (as a substantive to the arbitral proceedings carried out on the basis of documents and other materials). However, section 26 does not determine the procedural aspect, such as the timing or number of oral hearings. Besides, section 26 recognises the right of oral hearing, but this right can be waived (it is not a mandatory requirement). More specifically, section 26(1), in general, gives discretionary power to the arbitral tribunal to conduct the arbitral proceedings without the need for an oral hearing. It states that;

Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the arbitral tribunal shall decide whether to hold oral hearings for the presentation of evidence or oral arguments, or whether the proceedings shall be conducted on the basis of documents and other materials.

Furthermore, any party to traditional arbitration has the legal power to request the arbitral tribunal to hold an oral hearing. This happens only when the parties do not waive their right to have an oral hearing. Section 26(2) of Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) states that;

Unless the parties have agreed that no hearings shall be held, the arbitral tribunal shall upon the application of any party hold oral hearings at an appropriate stage of the proceedings.

Regarding the second issue, it is worth noting that Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) does not expressly validate and legalise e-hearing, unlike I-Arbitration Rules 2018 (I-Arbitration Rules 2018, Rule 12). However, e-hearing is valid and legal according to Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) because the party autonomy's principle is the essential and fundamental principle in traditional arbitration. Well-known authors state that;

Party autonomy is the guiding principle in determining the procedure to be followed in an international commercial arbitration. It is a principle that has been endorsed not only in national laws, but by international arbitral institutions and organisations (Redfern & Hunter, 2004, p.267).

Moreover, the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration 1985 (hereinafter referred to as "MLICA 1985") has recognised the principle of party autonomy. Article 19(1) of the MLICA 1985 states that;

Subject to the provisions of this law, the parties are free to agree on the procedure to be followed by the arbitral tribunal in conducting the proceedings.

According to the Commentary, article 19(1) considered the most significant provision in the MLICA 1985 because it recognises the freedom of the parties to lay down the rules of procedure (UNCITRAL, 1985). This freedom enables the parties to tailor the rules in



accordance with their necessities and preferences. They can do so by (a) preparing and developing their own set of rules; (b) opt for a standard set of rules that are provided by an arbitration institution; or (c) referring to a procedure of a particular legal system (Ibid).

In the Malaysian context, Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) is based on MLICA 1985. Section 21(1) of Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) is identical to article 19(1) of MLICA 1985. It stipulates that;

Subject to the provisions of this Act, the parties are free to agree on the procedure to be followed by the arbitral tribunal in conducting the proceedings.

A closer look at section 21(1) shows that the principle of party autonomy has been granted and assured. This means that the parties to traditional arbitration can select or design the rules of procedure in line with their specific necessities and preferences. For instance, the parties can agree on using electronic communication technology, such as video-conference, to conduct the oral hearing. Moreover, section 21(2) of Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) states that;

Where the parties fail to agree under subsection (1), the arbitral tribunal may, subject to the provisions of this Act, conduct the arbitration in such manner as it considers appropriate.

Based on the above, it is clear that section 21(2) provides the arbitral tribunal with extensive power to decide how to conduct the traditional arbitral proceedings (only in the case when the parties failed to do so). In simple words, the arbitral tribunal will have the power to agree on using electronic communication technologies, such as video conference, to conduct the oral hearings. Also, it is significant to note that section 21(3)(a) aims to suit the variety of the parties' needs and wishes, and it protects traditional arbitration from any constraints imposed by the Malaysian laws, including the rules on evidence. For instance, the arbitral tribunal has the power to determine the relevance, materiality, admissibility, and weight of any evidence. The same power has proven under the Evidence Act 1950 (Act 56). Notably, section 2 of the Evidence Act 1950 (Act 56) states that "this Act shall apply to all judicial proceedings in or before any court, but not to affidavits presented to any court or officer nor to proceedings before an arbitrator".

Another solution to legalise e-hearings appears clearly by invoking section 22(3) of Act 2005 (Act 646). This section allows the arbitral tribunal, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, to meet at any place it considers appropriate for the purpose of hearing witnesses, experts or the parties. Therefore, it is argued that by virtue of section 22(3), there is no legal restriction preventing the arbitral tribunal from selecting the "Internet" as an appropriate place to conduct the oral hearings. In view of this, the participants, such as parties and arbitrators, need to use electronic communication technology, such as video conference, to carry out the oral hearings.

Despite the above arguments and facts, it is argued that although e-hearing is valid according to Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) and I-Arbitration Rules 2018, however, Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) and I-Arbitration Rules 2018 do not provide specific protocols and guidelines for conducting the e-hearing. Therefore, the Malaysian lawmakers should bring a new amendment to Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) and I-Arbitration Rules 2018. The purpose of this

amendment is to determine the procedures that should be adopted and followed to manage and administrate the e-hearing.

Regarding the third issue, the arbitral tribunals should be aware that the procedural imbalances occurring because of the measures adopted in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic could provide the losing party with a substantial reason to challenge the arbitral award. This happens in two situations; firstly, the losing party was not be able to present his/her case. Secondly, the arbitral tribunal failed to treat the parties with equality (the violation of the right of equal treatment). In the light of this, article V(1)(b) of the New York Convention 1958 (hereinafter referred to as “NY Convention 1958”) states that;

Recognition and enforcement of the award may be refused, at the request of the party against whom it is invoked, only if that party furnishes to the competent authority where the recognition and enforcement is sought, proof that: The party against whom the award is invoked was not given proper notice of the appointment of the arbitrator or of the arbitration proceedings or was otherwise unable to present his case.

In fact, the right of equal treatment obligates the arbitral tribunal to treat the parties with equality and give them a reasonable opportunity to present their arguments. This right has been granted and assured globally (article 31(b) of WIPO-Expedited Arbitration Rules). In Malaysia, section 20 of Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) sets out the essential requirements that the arbitral tribunal should adhere in order to ensure procedural justice. In particular, section 20 obligates the arbitral tribunal to treat the parties with equality and give each party a reasonable and fair opportunity to present his/her case. Likewise, article 17(1)-Part II of I-Arbitration Rules 2018 follows the exact words used in section 20 of Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646). However, section 20 and article 17 (1) are not in conformity with article 8 of the MLICA 1985 because article 8 gives each party a “full opportunity” to present his/her arguments and evidence, instead of a “reasonable and fair opportunity” as applied under section 20 and article 17 (1).

Undoubtedly, breaching the right of equal treatment will pave the way to set aside the arbitral award or make it unenforceable under sections 37(1) (a) (iii) and 39(1) (a) (iii) of Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646), respectively. In the context of this article, the right of equal treatment in e-hearing will be violated on several occasions. Firstly, when either party lacks the technical ability to participate in the case (Georgievna & Evgenievna, 2017). Secondly, when either party has no sufficient access to Internet (Zheng, 2017). Thirdly, when either party has no sufficient knowledge and skills on using the required technologies. In the light of this, Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) and I-Arbitration Rules 2018 should come up with a new section or rule that determines exactly how the right of equal treatment can be assured during the e-hearing. This would play a vital role in protecting the arbitral award and ensuring a smooth and effective resolution.

### **The Logistical Challenges Affecting the Credibility of E-Hearing in Malaysia**

The COVID-19 pandemic brings about a welcome change to the disputing parties in traditional arbitration. However, several logistical challenges need to be adequately addressed in order to ensure effective e-hearing. For example, there is a need to consider the possible differences in time zones between the participants, such as parties and arbitrators, in e-hearing. This issue can be easily resolved when the arbitral tribunal divides the e-hearing into several parts, and each

part of the e-hearing should be held for a short set of time. Doing so will avoid any potential imbalance between the parties and mitigate the difficulty in fixing the date and time of e-hearing.

Furthermore, the cross-examination of witnesses constitutes a significant challenge if it is made electronically for two fundamental reasons. Firstly, the inability of assessing the strength and credibility of the submitted evidence by the parties. Secondly, the difficulty in examining the witness's body language and behaviour. These arguments are justified because of the fact that video-conference blocks the arbitrators and the disputants from observing and examining the expressions of the witnesses (Ortiz, 2005). In contrast, the interactions among the individuals (disputing parties) by using video-conference nearly replicate the interactions occurring in the physical (offline) environment (Lipsky & Avgar, 2006).

Notwithstanding of the academic debate mentioned earlier, it is argued that we are on the stage of a technological revolution where numerous companies have already introduced modern and sophisticated technologies, such as augmented reality (AR), virtual reality (VR), and 360-degree camera. These technologies represent a revolutionary change in current technologies. These technologies might help in observing the witness's body language, enhancing the cross-examination of witnesses, and finally, exemplifying a genuine innovation in the presentation of evidence, especially in situations where the graphic or verbal presentations are not enough to explain and describe the factual issues at stake.

Another logistical challenge affecting the credibility of e-hearing is the lack of security, confidentiality, and privacy. This argument is justified because a complete security in the online environment is something impossible (Chakraborty, 2020) (Jaberi, 2012) and science fiction. Mainly, e-hearing might be vulnerable to the risk of breach and infringement by anonymous individuals. As a result, the participants, such as arbitrators and parties, in e-hearing should be confident that their electronic communications are highly protected from interceptions, otherwise, they will be reluctant to conduct the oral hearings electronically. In the light of this, it is advocated that the participants in e-hearing should use highly sophisticated equipment, firewalls and security software. Doing so would essentially enable the disputants to access justice efficiently.

Finally, it is argued that although e-hearing can speed up and streamline the resolution processes, from a logical point of view, technical failures and breakdowns would also constitute another logistical challenge during the e-hearing. For instance, the participants in e-hearing may face technical difficulties or a slow internet connection. These challenges could obstruct the essence of e-hearing and cause disruptions that lead to unfair e-hearing. Contrariwise, these potential challenges might be eliminated or at least mitigated by adopting a strict set of precautionary measures, such as checking, in advance, the required equipment and the internet connection speed. Besides, the session of the e-hearing should contain a technical and experienced individual (third party) who can provide immediate advice and assistance to the participants in case any technical issue appears.

### **The Way Forward to Enhance Access to Justice in Malaysia During and After the Era of COVID-19 Pandemic: Establishing E-Arbitration is the Solution**

The resolution of disputes should not be obstructed, and there is a need to explore new options and mechanisms in order to achieve that (Bateson, 2020). E-arbitration could be the most



desired and suitable mechanism during and after the chaos of COVID-19 pandemic (Labanieh, Hussain & Mahdzir, 2020). This is because e-arbitration is entirely based on using the electronic communication technologies, unlike traditional arbitration (Liyanage, 2010). This means that all the processes of e-arbitration (starting from filing the case until issuing the e-arbitral award) are made electronically in the online environment. In view of this fact, e-arbitration can extend to the most considerable extent the advantage of using electronic communication technologies in the process of resolution. For this reason, e-arbitration is time-saving and cost-saving (Labanieh & Hussain, 2020).

The primary significance of e-arbitration appears in the ability to enforce the e-arbitral award by employing either the self-enforcement mechanisms (direct or indirect self-enforcement mechanisms) or the traditional enforcement mechanism (through the assistance of the enforcing national court). In the context of this article, the existence of the self-enforcement mechanisms increases the possibility of the voluntary compliance and facilitate the enforcement in the case of non-compliance (Patrikios, 2008). In this regard, self-enforcement mechanisms could bring two main advantages. Firstly, it would play a vital role in reducing the cost and burden on the winning party who wants to enforce his/her e-arbitral award. Secondly, it would pave the way to free e-arbitration from the control imposed by the national courts. For the reason that the e-arbitral award will be enforced without the assistance of the enforcing national court, and the winning party will not go through a long process in order to enforce his/her e-award, as applied to traditional arbitral award (section 38 of Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646)).

In the final analysis, even though traditional arbitration provides various key features (neutral forum, procedural flexibility, and global enforceability), compared with litigation, it is argued that the ongoing pandemic has demonstrated the necessity for swiftly responding to new challenges that affect the efficiency of traditional arbitration. For this reason, there is a need to rely entirely on electronic communication technologies in the Malaysian arbitration industry. This happens when the Malaysian authorities, including AIAC, implement e-arbitration and offer full-scale e-arbitration services.

## Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic remains to ebb and flow everywhere, including Malaysia. AIAC and other arbitration centres have put more efforts to facilitate the process of resolution through traditional arbitration. However, the conduct of e-hearing is indirectly valid according to Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646), compared with I-Arbitration Rules 2018, which directly allows the parties to use video conference. Furthermore, Arbitration Act 2005 (Act 646) and I-Arbitration Rules 2018 do not provide specific protocols and guidelines for conducting the e-hearing effectively.

Moreover, it is discovered that several logistical challenges might hinder the conduct of oral hearings electronically, including but not limited to the lack of security and the technical failures and breakdowns during the e-hearing. Also, there is an urgent need to ensure that the equal treatment right is not compromised during the e-hearing, otherwise, the arbitral award could not be enforced.

Finally, it is concluded that although traditional arbitration provides the disputing parties with a wide range of flexibility to carry out the arbitral proceedings in the manner as they wish (such as electronically), traditional arbitration is not sufficient because the role of electronic

communication technologies is limited and restricted on facilitating the process of resolution. Hence, the Malaysian authorities, including AIAC, should examine the possibility of implementing e-arbitration on a full scale. Doing so would take the arbitration industry in Malaysia to the next level and provide a suitable response to the “new normal” phenomenon.

## References

- Adolf, H. (2020). The Impact of Pandemic on Legal System: Impact on Arbitration Law. *Indonesian Law Journal*, 13(2), 137–150.
- Alam, S. (2014). Commercial Arbitration: Factors Making It Lose out against other Processes. *Middle East Journal of Business*, 9(2), 51-59. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2444342>.
- Amro, I. (2019). *Online Arbitration in Theory and Practice: A Comparative Study of Cross-Border Commercial Transactions in Common Law and Civil Law Countries*. United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Arsic, J. (1997). International Commercial Arbitration on the Internet: Has the Future Come Too Early ?. *Journal Of International Arbitration*, 14(3), 209–221.
- Arbitration Place. (2020). Arbitration Place Virtual. Arbitration Place. Retrieved from <https://www.arbitrationplace.com/arbitration-place-virtual-ehearings>.
- Asian International Arbitration Center. (2020). AIAC’S Revised Operating Hours and Access to the AIAC Premises. Asian International Arbitration Center. Retrieved from <https://www.aiac.world/news/305/aiac%E2%80%99s-revised-operating-hours-and-access-to-the-aiac-premises>
- Bateson, D. (2020). Virtual Arbitration: The Impact of COVID-19. *Indian Journal of Arbitration Law*, 9 (1), 159-169.
- Calvi, J. V., & Coleman, C. (2011). *American Law and Legal Systems*. (7 edition). United Kingdom: London, Pearson.
- Chakraborty, A. (2020). Online Arbitration Model: A Need of the Hour. *Social Science Research Network*. 1–16. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3536252>.
- Croagh, M., Gemma, T., & Rahul, T. (2017). Online Dispute Resolution and Electronic Hearings Arbitration in Motion. In *International Arbitration Report*. (pp. 5-8) . London, United Kingdom, Norton Rose Fulbright.
- Florescu, C. I. (2020). Emerging Tools to Attract and Increase The Use of International Arbitration. *Juridical Tribune*, 10(2), 255-278. Retrieved from <http://www.tribunajuridica.eu/arhiva/An10v2/6.%20Cristina%20Florescu.pdf>.
- Georgievna, G. N., & Evgenievna, V. V. (2017). Online Arbitration as A Means of Resolution of Transboundary Economic Disputes: Problems of Forced Execution of Online Arbitration Decisions. *Bulletin of Tomsk State Universit*, 24 (1), 133-147. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17223/22253513/24/15>.
- Hall, M. A., & Wright, F. R. (2008). Systematic Content Analysis of Judicial Opinions. *California Law Review*, 96(1), 63–122. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.15779/z38r99r>
- Hill, R. (1999). On-Line Arbitration: Issues and Solutions. *Arbitration International*, 15(2), 199–207. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/arbitration/15.2.199>.
- Hutchinson, T. C. (2008). Developing Legal Research Skills: Expanding the Paradigm. *Melbourne University Law Review*, 32(3), 1065–1095.
- Hutchinson, T. C., & Nigel, D. (2012). Defining and Describing What We Do: Doctrinal Legal Research. *Deakin Law Review*, 17(1), 83–119.

- Jaberi, M. S. (2012). Online Arbitration: A Vehicle for Dispute Resolution in Electronic Commerce. *Social Science Research Network*, 1–20. Retrieved from <http://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2128242>
- Labanieh, M. F., & Hussain, M. A. (2020). The Possibility of Using E-Arbitration in Malaysia. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(6), 505-507.
- Labanieh, M. F., Hussain, M. A., & Mahdzir, N. (2020). E-Arbitration: A Way Forward to Improve Quality and Service Delivery in Malaysian Dispute Resolution Industry. *Journal of International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 9(3), 136-141.
- Labanieh, M. F., Hussain, M. A., & Mahdzir, N. (2019). Arbitration as a Mechanism to Resolve Islamic Banking Disputes in Malaysia: Challenges and Drawbacks. *UUM Journal of Legal Studies*, 10(2), 19–44.
- Lipsky, D. B., & Avgar, C. A. (2006). Online Dispute Resolution through the Lens of Bargaining and Negotiation Theory: Toward an Integrated Model. *University of Toledo Law Review*, 38(1), 47–88.
- Liyanage, K. C. (2010). Online Arbitration Compared To Offline Arbitration and the Reception of Online Consumer Arbitration: An Overview of the Literature. *Sri Lanka Journal International Law*, 22(1)173–194.
- London Court of International Arbitration. (2020). LCIA Services Update: COVID-19. Retrieved from <https://www.lcia.org/lcia-services-update-covid-19.aspx>.
- Mohamed, A. M. T., Makhtar, M., Hamid, N. A., & Asari, K. N. (2015). Arbitration as a Method of Dispute Settlement in Islamic Banking and Finance: A Perspective from Malaysian Governing Law. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 23(si), 153–164.
- Collins Dictionary. (2020). “New Normal.” Collins Dictionary. Retrieved from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/the-new-normal>.
- Nevisandeh, M. (2015) The Nature of Arbitration Agreement. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 36 (1), 314-320. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1016/S22125671\(16\)30042-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S22125671(16)30042-9).
- Oraegbunam, L. K. E., & Okafor, C. (2013). Problems of litigation in settlement of maritime disputes for Nigeria today: The preference for arbitration. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence*, 4(1), 31–38.
- Ortiz, A. L. (2005). Arbitration and IT. *Arbitration International*, 21(3), 343–360. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/arbitration/21.3.343>.
- Oseni, U. A. (2016). Islamic Finance Arbitration: Integrating The Classical and Modern Legal Frameworks. In *Islamic Banking and Finance: Principles, Instruments and Operations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, edited by Hanifah, H. A. T., & Adnan, T. (pp.549–568). Malaysia: The Malaysian Current Law Journal Sdn Bhd.
- Patrikios, A. (2008). The Role of Transnational Online Arbitration in Regulating Cross-Border E-Business-Part II. *Computer Law & Security Report*, 24(2) 129-138.
- Rahman, A. A. (2019). Islamic Finance Arbitration: Enforceability under the New York Convention 1958 of Arbitration Awards Made Following a Reference to the Shariah Advisory Council under the Central Bank of Malaysia Act 2009. *Arbitration International*, 35(2), 245–261.
- Rashid, S. K. (2004). Alternative Dispute Resolution in the Context of Islamic Law. *The Vindobona Journal of International Commercial Law and Arbitration*, 8 (1), 95–118.
- Rashid, S. K. (2005). Some Contentious Issues In International Commercial Arbitration. *International Islamic University Malaysia Law Journal*, 13(2), 147–166.

- Redfern, A., & Hunter, M. (2004) *Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration*. (4 edition). London: Sweet and Maxwell.
- Singhal, A. K., & Malik, I. (2012). Doctrinal and Socio-Legal Methods of Research: Merits and Demerits. *Educational Research Journal*, 2(7), 252–256.
- Tiller, E. H., & Cross, B. F. (2006). What Is Legal Doctrine?. *North Western University Law Review*, 100 (1), 1–17.
- UNCITRAL. (1985). “Analytical Commentary on Draft Text of a Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration A/CN.9/264.” Retrieved from <https://undocs.org/en/A/CN.9/264>.
- Vibhute, K., & Aynalem, F. (2009). *Legal Research Methods Teaching Material*. United States of America: WordPress.
- Wang, F. F. (2018). *Online Arbitration*. New York: Informa Law from Routledge.
- World Meters. (2020). “COVID-19 Coronavirus Pandemic.” World Meters. Retrieved from <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus>.
- Zheng, J. (2017). The Recent Development of Online Arbitration Rules in China. *Information and Communications Technology Law*, 26(2), 135–145.