

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910163909203321
Autore	Miles Cameron A. <1984->
Titolo	Provisional measures before international courts and tribunals // Cameron A. Miles, Gray's Inn [[electronic resource]]
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Cambridge : , : Cambridge University Press, , 2017
ISBN	1-316-77602-6 1-316-77756-1 1-316-77734-0 1-316-41081-1 1-316-77778-2 1-316-77866-5 1-316-77800-2
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (lxiii, 517 pages) : digital, PDF file(s)
Collana	Cambridge studies in international and comparative law ; ; 128
Disciplina	341.5/5
Soggetti	Civil procedure (International law) Provisional remedies
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Title from publisher's bibliographic system (viewed on 28 Feb 2017).
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Machine generated contents note: 1. Introduction; Part I. Preliminary Matters: 2. Origins of provisional measures; 3. Constituent instruments and procedural rules; Part II. Provisional Measures in General: 4. Power to order provisional measures; 5. Purpose of provisional measures; 6. Prejudice and urgency; 7. Content and enforcement; Part III. Specific Aspects of Provisional Measures: 8. Questions of substance and procedure; 9. Litigation strategy and provincial measures; 10. Conclusions.
Sommario/riassunto	Since the decision of the International Court of Justice in LaGrand (Germany v United States of America), the law of provisional measures has expanded dramatically both in terms of the volume of relevant decisions and the complexity of their reasoning. Provisional Measures before International Courts and Tribunals seeks to describe and evaluate this expansion, and to undertake a comparative analysis of provisional measures jurisprudence in a range of significant international courts and tribunals so as to situate interim relief in the

wider procedure of those adjudicative bodies. The result is the first comprehensive examination of the law of provisional measures in over a decade, and the first to compare investor-state arbitration jurisprudence with more traditional inter-state courts and tribunals.

---