

BEYOND THE COURTROOM: ARBITRATION AND THE FUTURE OF JUSTICE

April, 2026



Promise Chiamaka Udochukwu
Associate Counsel

SYNTEGRAL LEGAL PRACTICE

Across many contemporary legal systems, the administration of justice increasingly stands at a moment that invites institutional reflection. Courts remain the constitutional guardians of rights and the primary fora through which disputes are formally resolved. Yet the operational realities of litigation today reveal persistent structural strain. Delays in adjudication, procedural congestion, rising litigation costs, and practical barriers to access have gradually weakened the confidence traditionally placed in conventional judicial mechanisms. While these developments do not diminish the authority of the courts, they do expose the limits of a justice architecture that relies almost exclusively on formal adjudication as its central dispute-resolution pathway.

It is within this context that arbitration has re-emerged with renewed significance. Rather than operating as a substitute for judicial authority, arbitration increasingly functions as a complementary institutional mechanism capable of preserving efficiency without compromising fairness. Its growing relevance reflects a broader recognition that modern justice systems require plural dispute-resolution pathways capable of responding to both commercial realities and institutional limitations. Arbitration therefore occupies a stabilising position within contemporary justice discourse as a mechanism that strengthens, rather than displaces, the adjudicatory role of courts.

Modern litigation is torn between safeguarding fairness and delivering timely, accessible justice. While procedural structure underpins the legitimacy of adjudication, its growing complexity often results in delays and rising costs that weaken its effectiveness as a practical remedy.

Court congestion remains one of the most visible indicators of this structural strain. Adjournments are frequent, interlocutory applications extend proceedings beyond anticipated timelines, and appellate processes though indispensable to legal accountability further prolong dispute resolution.

For commercial actors in particular, prolonged litigation weakens transactional certainty and complicates long-term planning. Even for non-commercial litigants, delay may significantly reduce the practical value of legal relief.

These realities reveal an institutional paradox within contemporary justice systems. Courts remain indispensable to constitutional governance, yet their operational capacity increasingly limits their ability to provide remedies within commercially and socially meaningful timelines. Arbitration emerges within this institutional space not as an alternative of convenience but as a functional response to a structural challenge.

Arbitration in Historical Perspective: From Practice to Legal Institution

Arbitration did not originate as a product of modern legal systems. It evolved gradually across societies as a practical alternative to formal court processes, particularly where courts were inaccessible, inflexible, or slow. In earlier communities, disputes were often resolved by trusted intermediaries whose authority depended on neutrality, reputation, and the confidence of the parties, rather than on formal enforcement powers.

By the twentieth century, arbitration had taken on a distinctly international dimension. The expansion of cross-border trade created the need for dependable dispute resolution mechanisms, leading to the development of institutional arbitration and global enforcement frameworks. This was further strengthened by the harmonisation of laws through international model legislation, which influenced domestic adoption, including in Nigeria.

In Nigeria, arbitration was formally introduced during the colonial period through the reception of English law, particularly the Arbitration Act 1914, which provided the first statutory basis for recognising and enforcing arbitration agreements and awards. Following independence, the legal framework was strengthened by the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, which drew significantly from the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration. This legislation entrenched key principles such as party autonomy, separability, competence-competence, and limited court intervention. More recently, the enactment of the Arbitration and Mediation Act 2023 (“Act”) has modernised Nigeria’s arbitration regime, aligning it with current international standards and reinforcing arbitration as an effective complement to the formal court system.

Arbitration as a Functional Response to the Limitations of Litigation

Delay represents one of the most persistent structural challenges confronting litigation systems. Where disputes extend across several years, the practical value of legal remedies may diminish substantially. Commercial relationships weaken, investment opportunities disappear, and reliance on institutional adjudication gradually declines. Arbitration responds to this challenge by offering a structured procedural environment within which disputes may be resolved within defined timelines, thereby restoring the practical effectiveness of adjudication.

Within Nigeria, arbitration now operates under the modern statutory framework established by the Act. The Act reflects contemporary international standards while strengthening domestic arbitral practice through clearer procedural guidance, enhanced integration of mediation within arbitration processes, and improved enforcement mechanisms. Its enactment represents an important institutional development in repositioning arbitration as a credible mechanism for resolving both domestic and international disputes within Nigeria's justice system.

Party autonomy remains one of the most defining strengths of arbitration and is expressly recognised under the recently enacted legislation. Section 1(2) affirms that parties are free to determine the means by which their disputes are resolved, while Section 6(1) permits them to agree on the number of arbitrators and Section 7(2) allows them to determine the procedure for appointing those arbitrators. In addition, Section 15(1) requires the tribunal to decide disputes in accordance with the rules of law chosen by the parties.

These provisions demonstrate that arbitration is structured around consensual procedural control rather than rigid court-directed processes. By enabling parties to shape the composition of the tribunal and select the governing law applicable to their dispute, arbitration strengthens confidence in both the neutrality of the process and the legitimacy of the outcome, thereby encouraging voluntary compliance with arbitral awards.

Confidentiality remains one of arbitration's most significant institutional advantages. Commercial disputes frequently involve proprietary information, financial arrangements, and reputational considerations that parties legitimately seek to protect from public exposure. Arbitration provides a private forum within which disputes may be resolved without unnecessary publicity, thereby enhancing its suitability for complex commercial relationships.

Although the Act provides express confidentiality protections for mediation (Section 76), its application to arbitration is derived from the foundational principle of party autonomy enshrined in Section 31. By granting parties the unfettered right to determine the "procedure to be followed by the arbitral tribunal," the Act effectively empowers them to contractually mandate confidentiality, which the tribunal is then statutorily bound to enforce.

Procedural flexibility in arbitration allows the resolution process to be tailored to the unique circumstances of each dispute without undermining the overarching principle of fairness. Unlike the inflexible, one-size-fits-all procedures characteristic of litigation, the Act provides a framework that accommodates bespoke adjudication. Section 31(1) underscores this adaptability by privileging party autonomy in determining the procedural rules; where parties fail to specify, the tribunal is entrusted with wide discretion to manage proceedings as it deems appropriate.

This adaptive ethos extends to the tribunal's control over linguistic and evidentiary dimensions. Section 35 empowers the parties to select the language of the proceedings, ensuring clarity and inclusivity, while Section 38 grants the tribunal the authority to determine whether oral hearings are necessary or if the dispute can be resolved solely on documentary submissions. By liberating the process from rigid formalities, the Act ensures that the procedure aligns with the nature of the dispute, fostering resolutions that are substantively just and tailored to the realities of the case.

Time is critical in resolving disputes, and arbitration makes sure it is not wasted. Section 1(4) of the Act puts a duty on parties, arbitrators, and courts to do everything necessary for the expeditious conduct of proceedings. Section 30(b) reinforces this by requiring tribunals to resolve disputes without unnecessary delay or expense, and Section 16 introduces the Emergency Arbitrator system, so urgent relief can be granted even before the main tribunal is set up. These rules show that arbitration is designed to move cases along quickly while keeping the process fair. By cutting down delays, arbitration protects the practical and financial value of legal remedies, making time a real, usable resource in dispute resolution.

Arbitration allows parties to appoint adjudicators with specialised knowledge directly relevant to the subject matter of the dispute, a feature that sets it apart from general judicial processes where judges must navigate diverse areas of law. This capacity for technical expertise enhances both the credibility and the accuracy of arbitral awards, particularly in disputes involving infrastructure, finance, construction, and international commerce. In alignment with this principle, Section 7(5)(b) of the Act mandates that appointing authorities give "due regard" to the qualifications required of an arbitrator as specified in the arbitration agreement. Further reinforcing this emphasis on precision, Section 42 empowers the tribunal itself to appoint experts to report on specific technical issues, ensuring that complex matters are assessed with the necessary depth and specialised insight.

Section 57 gives arbitral awards real teeth, as they are binding, not just suggestions. Section 60 connects Nigerian arbitration to the world through the New York Convention, so awards here are enforceable abroad. Section 64(1) keeps courts in check, allowing interference only in very specific cases, preserving finality. For investors, this matters. Confidence relies on knowing disputes can be resolved efficiently, neutrally, and predictably. Arbitration signals a mature, reliable legal environment, one that protects deals, supports infrastructure, and keeps cross-border investments on track.

Enforcement of Arbitral Awards: Bridging Domestic and International Justice Systems

One of arbitration's most significant institutional strengths lies in the enforceability of arbitral awards across jurisdictions through the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. The Convention facilitates cross-border recognition and enforcement of arbitral decisions, thereby strengthening arbitration's attractiveness for international commercial actors and reinforcing its role within global dispute-resolution systems.

Addressing the Critiques: Cost, Accessibility, Enforcement Limits, and Structural Boundaries of Arbitration

Despite its institutional advantages, arbitration is not without limitations. One of the most persistent criticisms relates to cost and accessibility. Although arbitration is frequently described as a faster dispute-resolution mechanism than litigation, it has increasingly become financially burdensome for many categories of disputants. Administrative charges of arbitral institutions, arbitrators' professional fees, venue expenses, and procedural logistics may collectively place arbitration beyond the reach of smaller commercial actors and individual litigants. In this respect, arbitration sometimes risks replicating the very accessibility concerns it seeks to address within conventional litigation systems.

Closely related to this concern is the practical reality that the effectiveness of arbitration ultimately depends on the willingness of parties to comply voluntarily with arbitral awards. While arbitral decisions are legally binding, experience demonstrates that parties do not always adhere to them. In such circumstances, successful parties are compelled to return to the courts for enforcement. This enforcement dependency illustrates an important institutional truth: arbitration cannot function entirely independently of litigation. Rather, its success remains structurally connected to the supervisory and enforcement authority of the judicial system.

Indeed, the continued relevance of litigation within arbitral practice demonstrates that arbitration should properly be understood as complementary rather than substitutionary. The durability of arbitral outcomes depends not only on procedural efficiency but also on the cooperative disposition of disputing parties. Where such cooperation is absent, litigation remains indispensable as the mechanism through which arbitral awards acquire coercive force.

A further structural limitation arises from the scope of matters capable of resolution through arbitration. Arbitration operates primarily within the domain of civil and commercial disputes and cannot extend to criminal adjudication. Criminal proceedings involve the enforcement of public law obligations and the protection of societal interests that cannot be subjected to private adjudicatory arrangements. For this reason, arbitration can relieve pressure on courts only within the civil justice sphere, leaving criminal justice administration squarely within the constitutional responsibility of the state.

This limitation carries important policy implications. Even where arbitration succeeds in reducing the volume of civil disputes before the courts, governments remain under a continuing obligation to strengthen institutional capacity for the timely and effective determination of criminal matters. The administration of criminal justice cannot be delegated to alternative dispute-resolution mechanisms. It therefore requires sustained investment in judicial infrastructure, including the appointment of additional judges, expansion of courtroom facilities, and provision of adequate technological and procedural resources capable of supporting efficient adjudication.

Recognising these boundaries does not diminish the value of arbitration. Rather, it situates arbitration within its proper institutional context as a mechanism designed to complement the justice system without displacing its constitutional foundations.

Conclusion

Arbitration serves as an important stabilising mechanism within modern dispute-resolution systems, particularly in civil and commercial matters where its flexibility, confidentiality, expertise, and efficiency enhance the delivery of justice. However, arbitration does not eliminate the necessity of litigation, since courts remain essential for the enforcement of arbitral awards and for maintaining the authority of the dispute-resolution framework. Its contemporary relevance therefore reflects a broader shift in legal thinking, one that recognises that effective justice systems must operate through complementary pathways rather than a single procedural channel.

Its scope is also structurally limited to civil disputes, as criminal adjudication remains a constitutional responsibility of the state. Consequently, while arbitration helps reduce pressure on civil court dockets, governments retain a continuing obligation to strengthen criminal justice administration through improved judicial infrastructure, increased judicial appointments, and expanded courtroom capacity.

In this context, arbitration should be understood not as a substitute for litigation, but as a complementary process that enhances efficiency while preserving the authority and legitimacy of the formal justice system.

Reference

• Adebayo T, Digital Platforms, Liability, and Consumer Protection in Nigeria (2021) 9 *Journal of African Law* 67.
• *Arbitration and Mediation Act 2023*.
• Born G.B, *International Commercial Arbitration* (3rd edition, Kluwer Law International 2021).
• Daniel C.E, *Arbitration and Dispute Resolution in Nigeria: Practice and Procedure* (LawLord Publishing Co Ltd 2015).
• Ezejiofor G.O, *The Law of Arbitration in Nigeria* (Longman Nigeria Plc 1997).
• UNCITRAL (United Nations Commission on International Trade Law) Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration 1985 (amended 2006).

www.syntegrallp.com
info@syntegrallp.com
+234 8025754547

© 2026 - Syntegral Legal Practice