Overview of the Proposed 2026 DIFC Arbitration and Mediation Law

Boris Lazic[1] & Arran Dowling-Hussey[2]

As of late August 2026, the Dubai International Financial Centre ('DIFC') has brought its public consultation process regarding the draft Arbitration and Mediation Law of 2026, which is set to replace the long-standing 2008 Arbitration Law [DIFC Consultation Paper], to a conclusion. This holistic legislative update aims to accelerate the resolution of business disputes, clarify complex legal procedural boundaries, and align Dubai's financial free zone with international common law benchmarks found in other global centres such as London and Singapore [Legal Reform Briefing]. By addressing historic gaps in multi-party litigation and post-award enforcement tactics, the new law continues the region's push to offer comprehensive dispute frameworks.

Concurrently, recent landmark rulings from the **Dubai Conflicts of Jurisdiction Tribunal (CJT)** have established strict boundaries in terms of the separation of the jurisdiction of the offshore DIFC Courts from the execution role of the onshore mainland Dubai Civil Courts [Judicial Tribunal Decision]. Taking, these legislative adaptations and judicial precedents together lead to a move in how multinational corporations handle local asset-tracing, litigation strategies, and contract enforcement throughout the region [Regional Dispute Resolution Review]. For legal practitioners and international investors alike, managing this dual-judicial landscape requires a clear understanding of how the modified code interacts with mainland enforcement mechanisms.

Shorter Timelines to Challenge Awards

The most immediate practical change for companies is a steep reduction in the post-award litigation window permitted for challenging arbitral results [Legal Reform Briefing]. Under the previous regime, the extended timelines, on some commentators' accounts,

[1] Boris Lazic is a barrister practising from 4-5 Gray's Inn Square, he can be contacted at blazic@lawlibrary.ie

[2] Arran Dowling-Hussey is a barrister and arbitrator practising from 4-5 Gray's Inn Square he can be contacted at adhussey@4-5.co.uk

frequently led to dilatory court skirmishes that effectively froze a winning party's access to assets whilst often unpersuasive litigation ground its way through the system.

Under the 2008 framework, parties retained a three-month window to petition the court to set aside an award. The 2026 draft statute compresses this legal window down to an absolute limit of 30 days [Legal Reform Briefing].

It is suggested that this change prevents losing parties from waiting out long statutory simply to delay execution payouts and potentially disburse and/or disguise their resources. Company legal teams must now coordinate immediately following an adverse award to finalize any challenges they will bring. The expedition that would be required under the new 30-day framework places a premium on readiness and active, pre-drafted appeal applications.

Furthermore, this rapid timeline brings the DIFC into alignment with the accelerated approach seen in commercial jurisdictions globally, minimizing the historical "limbo" period where international awards remained vulnerable to tactical delay and disruption. Losing parties can no longer treat the challenge period as a phase during which they can take steps to complicate enforcement.

Expanded Power for Arbitrators

The 2026 framework shifts procedural oversight away from supervisory court involvement by providing tribunals with expanded, independent statutory authority [Legal Reform Briefing]. Under the modern provisions, active tribunals are granted clear, robust powers designed to prevent bad-faith delays and weed out tactical clutter.

Arbitrators may summarily dismiss groundless claims, defences, or counterclaims that lack genuine legal or factual merit, saving significant time and administrative cost [DIFC Consultation Paper]. This mechanism mimics the early dismissal procedures used in major common-law litigation centres worldwide.

If an entity acts disruptively or ignores instructions, the tribunal can issue binding peremptory orders, levy cost sanctions, adjust final expense distributions, or block noncompliant evidentiary trails [DIFC Consultation Paper]. This ensures the panel can ‘control the room’ without constantly relying on external judicial enforcement.

Tribunals gain explicit leverage to order a claimant to post financial security upfront if their capitalization indicates they could evade paying the defendant's legal fees upon dismissal [DIFC Consultation Paper]. This targeted tool directly neutralizes any scenario where use may be made of shell companies to file speculative, high-stakes claims.

3. Clear Rules for Funding and Mediation

As outside commercial financing expands across high-stakes corporate disputes, the 2026 law formalizes rules for Third-Party Funding (TPF) [DIFC Consultation Paper]. Parties backed by external capital must declare the arrangement at the outset of legal actions to prevent conflicts of interest among active arbitrators [Legal Reform Briefing]. This transparency is to be welcomed as it protects the baseline integrity of regional proceedings, ensuring institutional funds operate within clearly defined ethical guardrails.

Furthermore, the integration of dedicated statutory mediation systems redefines local dispute avenues [DIFC Consultation Paper]. Settled agreements achieved under formalized mediation now bear immediate enforcement weight via the DIFC Courts, bringing the financial hub into alignment with the structural principles of the international Singapore Mediation Convention [Global Enforcement Accord]. By converting mediation from a voluntary, non-binding negotiation step into a rigorous statutory tool, the new law gives commercial entities a clear alternative path to finality without the need to run up the extensive costs often associated with standard multi-year global arbitrations.

Enforcement: DIFC vs. Mainland Dubai

To manage regional risk, corporate counsels must analyse the new statute alongside recent constitutional decisions from the **Dubai Conflicts of Jurisdiction Tribunal (CJT)** [Judicial Tribunal Decision]. Historically, international businesses treated the common-law courts as a "conduit" system to process international awards and seamlessly target onshore physical assets on the mainland.

Through significant test rulings in cases like *Application No. 01/2026* and *Application No. 005/2026*, the CJT split court competencies:

DIFC: The common-law courts possess complete jurisdiction to evaluate, recognize, and freeze assets sitting physically inside the boundaries of the financial zone [Judicial Tribunal Decision].

If targeted assets (bank accounts, corporate real estate, or stock) sit outside the free zone, the DIFC's aggressive investigative mechanisms—including Part 50 disclosure orders—cannot bypass mainland frameworks [Judicial Tribunal Decision]. Creditors must transfer their recognized arbitral awards over to the onshore Arabic-language Dubai Civil Courts for physical execution [Judicial Tribunal Decision].

This separation eliminates procedural clashes and is apt allowing for the dual judicial structure of Dubai. Creditors can use the DIFC for the quick processing of complex, multi-currency international claims, but they must respect the role just set out in relation to the onshore courts.

Summary

Legal Target	**Old Framework (2008 Law)**	**New 2026 Framework**
Award Challenge Window	Three months to file set-aside claims.	Reduced to a strict 30-day timeline [Legal Reform Briefing].
Meritless Claims	Required extensive full-hearing tracks.	Dismissed early via summary tribunal determination [DIFC Consultation Paper].
Third-Party Funding	Handled via loosely defined common law practice.	Mandatory early disclosure required to avoid panel conflicts [DIFC Consultation Paper].

Mainland Execution Path	Pursued directly via common-law court orders.	Transferred to onshore Arabic civil courts for physical attachment [Judicial Tribunal Decision].

Practical Steps for Contract Drafting

These changes bear on how contracts should be granted.

Enforcement Strategy: Selecting a DIFC seat yields a faster path to a highly durable award, but asset recovery on the mainland requires budgeting for additional onshore civil enforcement procedures [Judicial Tribunal Decision]. General counsels should ensure local onshore representation is ready to act simultaneously when an award is handed down.

Multi-Tiered Resolution Clauses: Because the 2026 update makes mediated agreements legally binding, contracts can incorporate mandatory pre-arbitration mediation checkpoints with reliable legal finality [DIFC Consultation Paper, Global Enforcement Accord]. Drafting clean paths from mediation to arbitration keeps your contracts secure under the new rules.

Ultimately, these updates clean up the regional litigation landscape by eliminating long, unnecessary delays and setting clear, consistent logical boundaries between the free zone and mainland systems. By implementing these practices, it is suggested businesses can trade with greater legal certainty throughout Dubai.

Members of 4-5 Gray's Inn Square practice as barristers and arbitrators in the UAE and wider GCC region. For queries as to professional availability please email dubai@4-5.co.uk