

University of Bologna Law Review

<https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.2531-6133/26271>

Article published: 17 Aug. 2026 | Correction published: 01 Sept. 2026

Correction to: Denial of Justice at the Intersection of Human Rights and International Investment Law: A Case Law Analysis

Eleni Gavriil

Eleni Gavriil, *Denial of Justice at the Intersection of Human Rights and International Investment Law: A Case Law Analysis*, 11 UNIVERSITY OF BOLOGNA LAW REVIEW 51 (2026), <https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.2531-6133/21749>, published 17 August 2026.

A corrected version of record has been issued. The corrections are set out below by origin.

Erratum

Footnotes 42 and 44 cited *Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Corporation v. Ecuador (II)*, PCA Case No. 2009-23, Fourth Partial Award on Track III (17 November 2025), an award on the quantification of costs which does not contain the reasoning attributed to it; footnotes 74 to 77 carried the same reference through their cross-references. The correct authority is *Chevron Corporation and Texaco Petroleum Company v. The Republic of Ecuador (I)*, PCA Case No. 2007-02/AA277, Partial Award on the Merits (30 March 2010), already cited at footnote 3. The second claimant is Texaco Petroleum Company, not Corporation. These references arose during editorial processing and are not those of the accepted manuscript. Six pinpoint citations not carried through the conversion of the citation apparatus have been restored, at footnotes 6, 38, 55, 69, 70 and 72.

Corrigendum

The Introduction and two passages in Section 2.2 stated that the ICCPR and the UDHR were invoked in *Chevron v. Ecuador*. Neither instrument appears in the Partial Award on the Merits; those relied upon are the American Convention on Human Rights, at paragraph 166, and the European and Inter-American jurisprudence at paragraph 170, both within the Claimants' submissions. A sentence in Section 2.2 attributing to the tribunal a finding that the court lacked independence and impartiality has been deleted: the Tribunal decided the claim under Article II(7) for undue delay and made no such finding. Two further sentences attributing to the tribunal material appearing in the Claimants' submissions have been reattributed. The pinpoint at footnote 3 is corrected from paragraphs 166 and 244 to paragraphs 166 and 170. In the Introduction, the tribunal in *Loewen v. United States* was stated to have referenced Article 6 ECHR jurisprudence; at paragraph 165 it cites the Finnish Ships Arbitration Award and *Nielsen v. Denmark*, a decision of the European Commission of Human Rights, on the exhaustion of adequate and effective remedies.

Minor citational inaccuracies elsewhere in the footnote apparatus, and the relocation of three abbreviation definitions consequent on the above, have also been corrected. The substance of the analysis and its conclusions are unaffected. Several of the points above were identified by the author on returning to the sources, and she has approved this notice.

The Editorial Office regrets the error.