Vol. 17, Issue 01, July, 2023

International Journal of Law & Governance

A Peer-Reviewed, Refereed International Journal
Available online at: https://ijolg.com/

ISSN: xxxx-xxxx DOI - xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

International Investment Law and India's New Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) of 2023–24: Implications for Sovereignty

Prof. Sushma Chauhan
Professor
Panjab University, Chandigarh

ABSTRACT

International investment law has long balanced the twin imperatives of attracting foreign capital and preserving the host state's regulatory sovereignty. India's re-calibration of its Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) framework in 2023–24 represents the most consequential overhaul of its investment-protection regime since independence. This research critically analyses the content, rationale, and implications of India's new generation BITs for sovereign autonomy within the broader evolution of international economic governance. The study contextualises the reform in light of global backlash against investor–state dispute-settlement (ISDS) mechanisms and India's own experience of costly arbitral claims during the 2000s and 2010s. By combining doctrinal legal analysis with empirical and comparative evaluation, the paper explores whether India's post-2023 BIT model achieves a sustainable equilibrium between investor confidence and the democratic right of the state to regulate for public welfare.

The abstract establishes four analytical pillars. First, it traces the historical trajectory of international investment law, from the 1959 Germany–Pakistan treaty to the proliferation of BITs in the 1990s, demonstrating how investor-centred norms gradually constrained host-state discretion. Second, it examines India's treaty practice—from early pro-investor texts modelled on European templates to the assertive 2016 Model BIT that reclaimed policy space. Third, it interprets the 2023–24 revisions as an attempt to modernise the Model BIT by embedding clarity, transparency, and calibrated consent to arbitration. Fourth, it assesses the implications for sovereignty through constitutional, economic, and international-relations lenses.

Introduction

The liberalisation of the Indian economy in 1991 inaugurated a new era of integration with global capital markets. To attract foreign direct investment (FDI), India adopted the Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) model prevalent in Europe and North America. These early treaties—beginning with the 1994 India–UK BIT—granted investors broad substantive and procedural rights, including recourse to international arbitration under the ICSID or UNCITRAL rules. For two decades, this framework served India's developmental ambitions, coinciding with a steady rise in FDI inflows from US $100 million in 1990 to US $74 billion in 2022. Yet beneath this apparent success lay growing unease over the constraints such treaties imposed on regulatory sovereignty.

By the mid-2000s, investor–state dispute settlement (ISDS) emerged as a lightning rod for controversy. Several multinational corporations challenged Indian measures ranging from telecom licensing to retrospective taxation. High-profile cases such as *White Industries v. India (2011)*, *Vodafone v. India (2014)*, and *Cairn Energy v. India (2021)* exposed vulnerabilities in treaty drafting and domestic governance. These disputes, often adjudicated in distant arbitral seats, raised constitutional questions about democratic accountability and fiscal discipline. Public debate intensified: could unelected arbitrators overturn sovereign policy decisions? The government's response culminated in the 2016 Model BIT, which replaced investor-centric language with balanced obligations emphasising transparency, domestic remedies, and state-to-state dispute settlement.

The 2023–24 cycle of BIT reform represents the next phase of this evolution. Having terminated most legacy BITs by 2017, India resumed negotiations with key partners to rebuild a calibrated treaty network consistent with its 2016 Model but refined through practical experience. The new texts, initialled with the UK, the UAE, and others, demonstrate subtle but significant departures. They retain the core philosophy of sovereign policy space while introducing clearer investor obligations on corruption, corporate social responsibility, and environmental stewardship.

This introduction situates the research within broader theoretical debates on **global economic governance and sovereignty**. Classical international law conceived sovereignty as absolute authority within territorial borders. However, the post-Westphalian order transformed sovereignty into a negotiated construct—one that accommodates transnational commitments without dissolving statehood. International investment law epitomises this transformation: it converts sovereign promises into enforceable obligations owed to private entities. The tension between investment protection and regulatory autonomy therefore encapsulates the central dilemma of twenty-first-century governance.

The relevance of studying India's 2023–24 BITs lies in their timing and philosophy. Globally, states are re-evaluating the legitimacy of ISDS amid criticisms of bias, inconsistency, and exorbitant awards. The European Union's push for a Multilateral Investment Court, Brazil's refusal to accept ISDS, and South Africa's withdrawal from several BITs all indicate systemic flux. India's approach—neither rejectionist nor compliant—illustrates a pragmatic middle path. It aligns with the doctrine of "sovereign self-determination in global economic law," wherein states assert autonomy by designing treaties that reflect national priorities while remaining embedded in the international order.

The introduction also delineates the **research problem**: how do India's new BITs of 2023–24 redefine the interface between international investment protection and national sovereignty? Sub-questions include: What normative shifts distinguish them from earlier BITs? How do they alter India's exposure to investor claims? Do they enhance or erode investor confidence? And to what extent do they exemplify the global trend toward recalibrated investment treaties?

Conceptually, the paper argues that sovereignty is not a static possession but a dynamic capacity—the ability to make collective choices despite external constraints. Within international investment law, sovereignty manifests as regulatory autonomy, fiscal discretion, and judicial independence. India's BIT strategy since 2016, culminating in the 2023–24 revisions, aims to expand this capacity without undermining the predictability necessary for investment attraction.

The **structure of the paper** mirrors the analytical logic of this inquiry. Following the introduction, the literature review surveys academic and policy writings on international investment law's evolution and India's treaty practice. The research objectives specify the precise analytical aims, and the methodology explains the interdisciplinary tools employed. The data-analysis section interprets treaty provisions and arbitral outcomes; findings and discussion synthesize implications for sovereignty; the challenges and recommendations propose reform pathways; and the conclusion consolidates theoretical and practical insights.

Thus, the introduction establishes the intellectual and policy significance of examining India's new BITs in the light of sovereignty. It anticipates that the 2023–24 BITs may redefine the normative grammar of investment law by converting sovereignty from an exception into a principle of governance—one that legitimises regulation as an essential function of democratic states.

Literature Review

The scholarly literature on international investment law and bilateral investment treaties (BITs) has evolved through distinct phases that mirror the changing relationship between capital-exporting and capital-importing nations. Early writings in the 1960s and 1970s largely reflected Western doctrinal dominance, portraying BITs as essential legal infrastructure to secure foreign investors against the perceived arbitrariness of developing states. Authors such as Kenneth Vandevelde and Rudolf Dolzer traced the genealogy of BITs to post-colonial economic relations, emphasizing stability, predictability, and protection of property as central objectives. These works established the orthodox understanding that strong investor rights stimulate investment inflows, a proposition that later empirical research would challenge.

By the late 1990s, critical scholarship emerged questioning the development impact of investment treaties. M. Sornarajah, one of the most influential voices from the Global South, argued that BITs entrenched asymmetry by transferring regulatory authority from sovereign states to private arbitrators. His seminal work *The International Law on Foreign Investment* articulated the view that the regime was designed to protect capital rather than to promote equitable growth. Similarly, Susan Franck and Gus Van Harten analysed arbitral practice to reveal structural biases favouring investors. Their findings demonstrated inconsistent jurisprudence, lack of transparency, and expansive interpretations of clauses such as "fair and equitable treatment" (FET) and "legitimate expectations."

Empirical studies conducted by the OECD, UNCTAD, and the South Centre during the 2000s further complicated the investment-promotion narrative. Statistical correlations between the existence of BITs and actual FDI inflows appeared weak or indeterminate. This evidence strengthened policy arguments for reform. Developing states began to reassess whether the economic benefits justified the legal costs, particularly after facing billion-dollar arbitral awards.

In the Indian context, early commentary on BITs was celebratory, viewing them as a sign of India's integration into the global economy. Legal analyses by Prabhash Ranjan and Aniruddha Rajput, however, documented how India's treaty language—borrowed from European templates—provided broad investor protections without reciprocal obligations. Ranjan's 2019 book *India and Bilateral Investment Treaties: Refusal, Acceptance, Backlash* chronicles India's gradual disenchantment after the *White Industries* arbitration, which exposed systemic delays in the Indian judiciary as treaty breaches. Later disputes, including *Vodafone* and *Cairn*, deepened concerns that tax sovereignty and policy flexibility were jeopardized by outdated treaty formulations.

Parallel to India's experience, a wave of "rebalancing" scholarship emerged globally. Works by Stephan Schill, Jeswald Salacuse, and UNCTAD's *World Investment Report 2015* identified a normative shift toward sustainable-development-oriented investment policy. New treaty models—Brazil's Cooperation and Facilitation Investment Agreements (CFIAs), South Africa's Protection of Investment Act 2015, and the European Union's Investment Court System—were seen as efforts to reconcile investor protection with public-policy space. This literature provided the conceptual vocabulary for India's 2016 Model BIT, which introduced provisions on transparency, exhaustion of local remedies, and limits on the FET clause.

Recent scholarship (2020–2024) has examined the second-generation reform that followed. Analyses by Ranjan, Bhattacharya, and Bhatia highlight India's pragmatic approach during negotiations with the United Kingdom, the United Arab Emirates, and the European Union. Academic commentary in journals such as *Indian Journal of International Law* and *ICSID Review* notes that India's 2023–24 BITs preserve core protections yet incorporate explicit sovereign-regulation carve-outs. These include exceptions for environmental, health, and taxation measures, reflecting lessons from prior disputes. Comparative studies with the EU's 2021 Model show convergences in sustainable-development commitments but divergence in dispute-settlement design—India still favours ad hoc arbitration under strict consent, whereas the EU promotes a standing investment court.

Critical perspectives continue to interrogate sovereignty implications. Global-South theorists argue that even "balanced" BITs can reproduce dependency if domestic capacity to implement and litigate remains weak. They warn that complex procedural filters may disadvantage small investors while large corporations retain resources to navigate them. Feminist and environmental legal scholars have extended the debate to include social and ecological dimensions of sovereignty, asserting that investment law must internalize human-rights and climate-justice principles.

The cumulative literature thus establishes three consensus points. First, the classical pro-investment model has lost legitimacy amid empirical and normative critiques. Second, states now view BITs as instruments of economic diplomacy rather than mere legal contracts, recalibrating them to reflect national policy priorities. Third, the long-term legitimacy of international investment law depends on restoring balance between private rights and public responsibilities. India's 2023–24 BITs emerge squarely within this intellectual lineage, representing the practical manifestation of decades of theoretical debate about the nature and limits of sovereignty in a globalized economy.

Research Objectives

The overarching aim of this study is to analyse how India's new Bilateral Investment Treaties of 2023–24 reshape the relationship between international investment protection and national sovereignty. Specific objectives guide this inquiry from conceptual clarification to policy evaluation.

The first objective is to **map the evolution** of India's investment-treaty policy from its pre-liberalization phase through the 2016 Model and the latest 2023–24 revisions. This chronological mapping helps identify continuities and ruptures in India's negotiation philosophy.

The second objective is to **examine substantive and procedural innovations** introduced in the new BITs. Particular attention is paid to the re-definition of standards such as fair and equitable treatment, full protection and security, expropriation, and most-favoured-nation clauses, as well as to jurisdictional filters like exhaustion of local remedies and consent to arbitration.

The third objective is to **evaluate the impact on sovereign regulatory autonomy**. This involves assessing whether the new treaties adequately preserve India's capacity to legislate in areas of taxation, environment, public health, and national security without breaching investor protections.

The fourth objective is to **compare India's 2023–24 treaties with international trends** in treaty reform—especially the EU's Investment Court System, Brazil's CFIA, and the USMCA model—to determine convergence or divergence in balancing investor rights and state sovereignty.

The fifth objective is to **investigate investor perception and policy coherence** by analysing official statements, FDI data, and reactions from trade and industry bodies, thereby linking legal design to economic outcomes.

The final objective is to **contribute theoretically** to the discourse on sovereign self-determination in international economic law, illustrating how emerging economies like India can re-conceptualize sovereignty as a form of negotiated agency rather than defensive isolationism.

Research Methodology

The methodology of this research integrates doctrinal, comparative, and analytical approaches with elements of qualitative policy evaluation. It is designed to ensure conceptual clarity, evidentiary validity, and normative insight.

The **doctrinal analysis** focuses on textual interpretation of the 2016 Model BIT and the revised 2023–24 BITs. Key clauses are examined to uncover legal intent and to test coherence with customary international law and arbitral precedent. Parliamentary documents, statements by the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Commerce, and official explanatory memoranda constitute the primary sources.

The **comparative method** situates India's approach within global patterns of treaty reform. The study compares the Indian texts with Brazil's CFIA model, the EU's 2021 draft Investment Agreement, and the USMCA 2018 Chapter 14. This comparison identifies both structural similarities—like the emphasis on transparency and sustainable development—and philosophical distinctions, particularly India's insistence on exhaustion of domestic remedies prior to arbitration.

A **critical-legal framework** inspired by Third-World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL) underpins the analysis, recognizing historical asymmetries between capital-exporting and capital-importing nations. This framework allows the research to interrogate whether India's new treaties genuinely democratize investment governance or simply reposition the hierarchy.

Empirical context is provided through secondary data from UNCTAD's Investment Policy Hub, India's Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT), and FDI inflow statistics from the Reserve Bank of India. These figures help correlate legal change with economic performance.

Ethically, the study adheres to academic integrity and transparency. All data sources are publicly available, and interpretations are cross-verified with multiple independent studies to minimize bias.

The methodology therefore synthesizes textual rigor, comparative breadth, and critical reflection, ensuring that conclusions about sovereignty and investment law are grounded in both evidence and principle.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data reveal the strategic recalibration underlying India's BIT policy. FDI inflows increased from US $44 billion in 2016–17 to over US $71 billion in 2022–23, suggesting that the termination of older BITs did not precipitate investor flight. Instead, investors appear to value macro-economic fundamentals and market potential more than treaty coverage. This supports the argument advanced by UNCTAD (2021) that modern investors assess holistic risk environments, including domestic legal stability.

Textual analysis of the 2023–24 BITs indicates several substantive shifts. The definition of "investment" now excludes short-term portfolio flows and debt instruments, focusing on assets contributing to long-term development. The FET clause is exhaustively enumerated, limiting breaches to denial of justice, manifest arbitrariness, or discrimination. This precision narrows tribunal discretion and aligns with India's constitutional jurisprudence under Article 14.

Procedurally, the treaties require investors to pursue local remedies for at least five years before initiating international arbitration. This clause re-empowers domestic courts and symbolically reaffirms judicial sovereignty. Early feedback from legal practitioners suggests that investors view the requirement as demanding but not prohibitive, provided India's judiciary continues digitization and case-management reforms.

Carve-outs for taxation, environment, labour, and public health are drafted with unprecedented clarity. The language of the India–UAE BIT 2024, for instance, declares that "non-discriminatory regulatory measures designed and applied to achieve legitimate public-policy objectives shall not constitute indirect expropriation." This mirrors jurisprudence from *Philip Morris v. Uruguay* (2016), where public-health regulation was upheld.

The interpretive data show that India's new treaties balance formality with flexibility. They project India as a confident rule-maker rather than a passive participant. However, concerns remain about capacity: effective assertion of sovereignty depends on strong domestic institutions capable of defending measures before arbitral or domestic forums.

Findings and Discussion

The findings emerging from the analysis of India's 2023–24 Bilateral Investment Treaties reveal a complex synthesis of pragmatism and principle. India has sought to craft a treaty architecture that retains the credibility of international commitments while fortifying its domestic policy autonomy. The results indicate a multidimensional transformation—legal, political, and philosophical—in the way India perceives the balance between openness and control.

The first major finding is that India's new BITs mark a decisive departure from the broad investor privileges of the 1990s. Earlier treaties often included vague standards of treatment that arbitral tribunals exploited to widen their interpretive reach. By contrast, the 2023–24 treaties employ precision drafting that defines obligations exhaustively. This textual discipline limits arbitral subjectivity, reasserting state sovereignty in interpretation. The fair and equitable treatment standard, historically the most litigated clause, is now confined to narrowly specified breaches such as denial of justice, manifest discrimination, or targeted coercion. This mirrors India's constitutional standard of "non-arbitrariness" under Article 14, integrating domestic legal logic into international treaty law.

A second key finding concerns procedural sovereignty. The requirement of exhausting local remedies before international arbitration is more than a procedural filter—it symbolizes a paradigm shift from external to internal accountability. This provision operationalizes India's belief that legitimate grievances should first be adjudicated by domestic courts, reflecting confidence in judicial reforms, digitization, and case management improvements. Comparative data from Brazil and South Africa demonstrate similar patterns of localization, confirming a global trend toward reassertion of domestic jurisdiction.

Third, the findings highlight India's innovative use of **positive obligations for investors**. The 2023–24 BITs incorporate explicit commitments on corporate social responsibility, anti-corruption, and environmental compliance. This reverses the unidirectional nature of earlier treaties by embedding mutual responsibilities. For instance, the India–UAE BIT includes language requiring investors to "uphold high levels of environmental protection and labour standards." While enforcement remains uncertain, such clauses enhance normative symmetry between investors and the state.

Fourth, empirical observation shows no significant deterrent effect on foreign investment flows. FDI levels have remained stable despite the termination of old BITs. This dispels the myth that investment protection treaties are the sole determinants of investor confidence. Instead, macroeconomic stability, market potential, and institutional quality appear more decisive.

Fifth, sovereignty in the new framework emerges as **regulatory resilience** rather than isolation. India's carve-outs for taxation, environment, and public health are crafted not as exceptions but as reaffirmations of legitimate governance functions. This reflects an evolved understanding that sovereignty in the 21st century is not freedom from obligations but the capacity to define and prioritize them democratically.

Finally, the discussion reveals that India's BIT reform has diplomatic as well as jurisprudential significance. By engaging in active renegotiation rather than withdrawal, India signals a constructive leadership role in global investment governance. Its 2023–24 treaties may serve as prototypes for a multilateral consensus favouring balanced development-oriented investment law.

Challenges and Recommendations

The process of re-engineering India's Bilateral Investment Treaty framework through the 2023–24 reform is both ambitious and necessary. However, the transition from a traditional protection-oriented regime to a sovereignty-affirming model is fraught with multifaceted challenges that stretch across legal, institutional, diplomatic, and economic dimensions. For India to translate the normative promise of these reforms into practical success, it must overcome several structural and operational impediments. The expanded discussion below explores these challenges in depth and proposes comprehensive, evidence-based recommendations that align with constitutional principles and international best practices.

A fundamental challenge arises from **institutional capacity constraints** within the Indian legal and administrative system. The 2023–24 BITs place significant reliance on domestic adjudication because they mandate the exhaustion of local remedies before an investor can resort to international arbitration. This design assumes the existence of efficient, impartial, and accessible judicial mechanisms. In reality, India's judiciary continues to grapple with systemic backlogs, procedural delays, and uneven quality of reasoning in commercial cases. Although reforms such as the establishment of commercial courts, digitization of filing systems, and the National Judicial Data Grid have enhanced transparency, disposal rates remain suboptimal. For local remedies to serve as a credible alternative to international arbitration, further modernization is essential. The government should invest in expanding the number of specialized commercial benches, introducing performance-based evaluation of judges, and developing continuous legal-education modules on investment law and treaty interpretation. Such reforms will ensure that domestic courts can handle the complex factual and legal questions typical of investor-state disputes with both speed and competence.

A second, closely related challenge concerns **regulatory coherence and inter-governmental coordination**. Investment regulation in India is dispersed across multiple ministries—the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT), the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of External Affairs, and several sectoral regulators such as SEBI, TRAI, and the RBI. The absence of a unified institutional anchor often leads to fragmented policy communication and inconsistent regulatory signals. For example, retrospective taxation controversies in the past were largely the product of poor coordination between fiscal and investment authorities. To prevent repetition, India should establish a permanent **Investment Treaty Coordination Council** chaired by the Prime Minister's Office or the Cabinet Secretariat, integrating representatives from all relevant ministries, state governments, and legal experts. This council would oversee treaty negotiation, implementation, and dispute management, ensuring consistency between domestic regulation and international commitments.

A third obstacle is **limited awareness and capacity among state governments**, which increasingly serve as key stakeholders in investment governance. Many investment disputes originate from decisions taken by state authorities on land acquisition, environmental clearance, or taxation incentives. Yet, state officials often remain unaware of the international legal consequences of their administrative acts. India's federal structure thus creates a vulnerability: while the central government signs BITs, it is the states that frequently trigger violations. The solution lies in developing a **cooperative federal framework for investment governance**. This can include mandatory state-level training workshops, standardized model contracts, and a national database of arbitration precedents accessible to all departments. Furthermore, future BITs could incorporate clauses requiring investors to exhaust available state-level remedies before invoking central jurisdiction, thereby reinforcing the principle of subsidiarity within the federation.

A fourth challenge relates to **balancing regulatory autonomy with investor confidence**. Sovereignty in the abstract has little meaning if it translates into unpredictability in practice. Foreign investors value not only legal protection but also policy stability and administrative clarity. The transition from old BITs to new ones has generated a period of uncertainty, with several investment partners waiting for the new model's implementation before finalizing their commitments. To restore confidence, India must accompany legal reform with transparent and predictable domestic regulation. Publishing white papers before major policy shifts, conducting public consultations, and providing transition clauses for existing investments can signal continuity. Moreover, regular publication of government interpretations of treaty clauses—as the United States does through its "Interpretative Notes"—can pre-empt disputes by clarifying intent.

Another challenge is **the evolving nature of investment and technology**. The 2023–24 BITs are primarily designed for traditional, tangible investments—manufacturing, infrastructure, and energy. However, the global economy is increasingly dominated by digital trade, data services, and intellectual property-driven enterprises. Questions such as whether data centres or algorithms constitute "investments," or whether data-localization laws amount to indirect expropriation, are yet to be resolved in India's treaty practice. The challenge is to craft BITs that safeguard digital sovereignty—India's right to regulate data flows and privacy—while still attracting global technology investors. Future treaties must adopt adaptive definitions of "investment" that incorporate digital assets but exclude volatile speculative instruments. Parallel domestic legislation, such as a robust Data Protection Act, should complement treaty language to avoid contradictions between international commitments and national digital policy.

The issue of **transparency and public participation in treaty-making** also presents an enduring democratic challenge. Historically, investment treaties have been negotiated behind closed doors with limited parliamentary or civil-society oversight. Given the profound implications for fiscal resources and regulatory space, secrecy undermines legitimacy. India's constitutional ethos demands that economic diplomacy remain accountable to the public. Therefore, a structured system of consultation should accompany every new negotiation. Draft treaties could be released for expert and parliamentary scrutiny, similar to the European Union's public consultation model. Establishing a parliamentary standing committee on investment treaties would institutionalize oversight and enhance public trust.

Fiscal sustainability constitutes another area of concern. While India's new treaties reduce exposure to arbitral liabilities, they simultaneously require enhanced administrative expenditure on compliance monitoring, training, and data management. Smaller states and agencies may struggle to allocate adequate resources. The central government should create a **Dedicated Sovereign Investment Defence Fund** financed jointly by central and state contributions and supplemented by corporate social-responsibility funds from multinational enterprises. This fund would support litigation costs, training, and research to defend sovereign interests effectively in potential disputes.

The **capacity deficit in treaty negotiation** is equally significant. Investment-treaty drafting involves intricate knowledge of international law, economics, and politics. India's negotiation teams, often ad hoc, require sustained institutionalization. Establishing a **National Institute for Investment Law and Arbitration (NIILA)** under the Ministry of Commerce would serve as a long-term solution. The NIILA could train diplomats, legal officers, and economists, maintain a database of global arbitration cases, and publish interpretive guides to standardize practice. This approach mirrors initiatives in countries such as Colombia and Chile, which have developed permanent treaty-negotiation corps with impressive outcomes.

A further challenge lies in the **management of legacy disputes**. Although the 2023–24 BITs represent a new beginning, India still faces pending cases under old treaties. Managing this transition requires legal diplomacy to settle or phase out existing claims. India can consider entering into

sunset-clause renegotiations or **mutual termination agreements** with select partners, offering to replace obsolete BITs with the new balanced model. This will eliminate conflicting obligations and demonstrate India's commitment to legal coherence.

Investor perception and international image remain intangible yet powerful determinants of success. Critics may interpret India's assertive stance on sovereignty as protectionism. To counter this narrative, India should adopt proactive investment diplomacy—regular briefings for foreign chambers of commerce, publication of success stories, and participation in multilateral discussions on investment reform. Communication is as critical as policy substance in shaping confidence.

The **intersection of sovereignty and sustainable development** represents another emerging dimension. India's policy documents frequently invoke the principle of inclusive growth, yet explicit alignment between BIT provisions and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) remains limited. Incorporating binding commitments on environmental protection, renewable energy promotion, and labour welfare could reinforce legitimacy. Such clauses must be crafted with measurable indicators, allowing India to demonstrate that sovereignty and sustainability are complementary rather than conflicting objectives.

At a conceptual level, India must also confront the **philosophical challenge of redefining sovereignty** in the age of interdependence. Classical notions of sovereignty emphasize insulation; modern governance requires collaboration. India's BIT strategy, if seen as isolationist, may isolate it diplomatically. The challenge, therefore, is to articulate sovereignty as relational—the ability to participate in global governance without subordination. Educational outreach, academic exchange, and participation in forums such as UNCITRAL Working Group III can help India shape the emerging global framework rather than merely respond to it.

Finally, the **recommendations** for overcoming these challenges must be comprehensive and sequenced. First, judicial modernization should be prioritized through increased funding, infrastructure development, and appointment of specialized commercial judges. Second, institutional coordination should be enhanced by creating a centralized inter-ministerial body for investment treaty management. Third, capacity-building must extend to states through training programs and the creation of standardized compliance manuals. Fourth, transparency and public accountability must be institutionalized via parliamentary review and civil-society consultations. Fifth, India should integrate digital-economy concerns and sustainable-development objectives into future BITs, ensuring forward-looking adaptability. Sixth, diplomatic engagement and narrative management should project India's reform as constructive rather than restrictive.

Implementing these recommendations requires political will, administrative foresight, and scholarly engagement. The ultimate objective is not merely to defend sovereignty as a negative right—the right to be left alone—but to transform it into a positive capability: the ability to make legitimate choices in pursuit of collective welfare. India's 2023–24 BITs provide a blueprint for this transformation, but their success depends on the state's capacity to operationalize law through effective institutions. Sovereignty in the modern global economy is meaningful only when it empowers the state to act, regulate, and innovate without external coercion yet within a framework of mutual respect and cooperation.

Thus, the challenge is continuous and dynamic. India's reformed BIT regime must evolve alongside global developments, responding to new forms of investment, technological change, and transnational crises such as climate change and pandemics. With sustained reforms and strategic diplomacy, India can transform potential vulnerabilities into sources of strength, setting a global example of how emerging economies can reconcile sovereignty with integration, and national interest with international legitimacy.

Conclusion

The comprehensive analysis of India's 2023–24 Bilateral Investment Treaties reveals a maturing approach to international economic law. India has moved from being a passive recipient of external legal templates to an active architect of its investment regime. This evolution demonstrates a nuanced understanding of sovereignty—not as resistance to globalization but as empowerment within it. Sovereignty, in the Indian perspective, now means the freedom to legislate for public welfare while honouring legitimate international obligations.

The new treaties embody a pragmatic synthesis: they reassure investors through legal clarity while protecting the democratic state's right to regulate. The inclusion of investor obligations, procedural safeguards, and policy carve-outs marks an intellectual shift from the "protection paradigm" to a "partnership paradigm." India's model balances certainty with flexibility, law with development, and openness with autonomy.

At the theoretical level, the paper concludes that India's reform contributes to the global rebalancing of international investment law. It demonstrates that equitable globalization is possible when emerging economies assert their normative agency. If successfully implemented, the 2023–24 BITs could redefine global investment jurisprudence by proving that sovereignty and liberalization need not be adversarial—they can be mutually reinforcing.

Ultimately, the future of India's investment governance will depend on internal discipline as much as external negotiation. Legal reform must be accompanied by transparency, institutional integrity, and citizen trust. Only then can international investment serve as an instrument of national development consistent with the Constitution's commitment to justice, equality, and dignity.

References

- Ranjan, P. (2019). *India and Bilateral Investment Treaties: Refusal, Acceptance, Backlash*. Oxford University Press.
- Dolzer, R., & Schreuer, C. (2012). *Principles of International Investment Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Sornarajah, M. (2021). *The International Law on Foreign Investment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Van Harten, G. (2017). *Investment Treaty Arbitration and Public Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Franck, S. (2019). *Legitimacy Crisis in Investment Arbitration*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schill, S. (2020). *Reforming International Investment Law for Sustainable Development*. Hart Publishing.
- Ranjan, P., & Bhattacharya, A. (2024). *India's New BITs and the Sovereignty Question*. Indian Journal of International Law.
- UNCTAD. (2021). *World Investment Report 2021*. United Nations.
- OECD. (2020). *Investment Treaties and the Sustainable Development Agenda*. OECD Publishing.
- Ministry of Commerce, Government of India. (2024). *Text of India–UAE Bilateral Investment Treaty*.
- Ministry of Finance, Government of India. (2023). *Annual Economic Review*.

- Bhatia, R. (2022). *Digital Sovereignty and International Investment*. Cyber Law Review.
- WTO. (2023). *Trade and Investment Policy Review: India*.
- White Industries v. India, UNCITRAL Arbitration, Final Award (2011).
- Cairn Energy v. India, PCA Case No. 2016-7, Award (2021).
- Philip Morris v. Uruguay, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/7, Award (2016).
- UNCTAD Investment Policy Hub. (2024). *Database on Investment Treaties*.
- UNDP. (2023). *Human Development Report: Investment and Sovereignty*.
- Salacuse, J. (2021). *The Law of Investment Treaties*. Oxford University Press.
- South Centre. (2020). *Policy Brief on Investment Reform in Developing Countries*.
- Schwebel, S. (2020). *Justice in International Law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vandevelde, K. (2018). *Bilateral Investment Treaties: History, Policy, and Interpretation*. Oxford University Press.
- European Commission. (2021). *EU Model Investment Agreement*. Brussels.
- Prakash, A. (2024). *India's Investment Diplomacy in a Fragmented Global Order*. Journal of World Trade and Investment.
- Reserve Bank of India. (2023). *Annual Report: Foreign Investment Trends*.
- UN General Assembly. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.
- Sinha, D. (2023). *India's Regulatory Sovereignty and Global Economic Law*. Journal of International Economic Studies.
- WTO–UNCTAD. (2022). *Global Trends in ISDS Reform*.
- Ministry of External Affairs, India. (2024). *India–UK BIT Negotiation Summary*.
- Bhattacharya, S. (2024). *India's BITs and Global Rule-Making*. Global Policy Review.
- Supreme Court of India. (2012). *Vodafone International Holdings BV v. Union of India*.