

**FILED**  
**United States Court of Appeals**  
**Tenth Circuit**

**PUBLISH**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

**January 10, 2023**

**Christopher M. Wolpert**  
**Clerk of Court**

COMPAÑÍA DE INVERSIONES  
MERCANTILES S.A.,

Petitioner - Appellee,

v.

No. 21-1196

GRUPO CEMENTOS DE CHIHUAHUA  
S.A.B. DE C.V.; GCC  
LATINOAMERICA, S.A. DE C.V.,

Respondents - Appellants.

COMPAÑÍA DE INVERSIONES  
MERCANTILES S.A.,

Petitioner - Appellee,

v.

No. 21-1324

GRUPO CEMENTOS DE CHIHUAHUA  
S.A.B. DE C.V.; GCC  
LATINOAMERICA, S.A. DE C.V.,

Respondents - Appellants.

**Appeal from the United States District Court**  
**for the District of Colorado**  
**(D.C. No. 1:15-CV-02120-JLK)**

David M. Cooper, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, New York, New York  
(Alex H. Loomis, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, Boston, Massachusetts;

Juan P. Morillo, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, Washington, D. C.; David G. Palmer, Greenberg Traurig LLP, Denver, Colorado; and Daniel Pulecio-Boek, Greenberg Traurig, LLP, Washington, D. C., with him on the briefs) for Respondents – Appellants.

Eliot Lauer (Gabriel Hertzberg, Juan O. Perla, Sylvi Sareva with him on the briefs) Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP, New York, New York for Petitioner – Appellee.

---

Before **HOLMES**, Chief Judge, **MATHESON**, and **ROSSMAN**, Circuit Judges.

---

**MATHESON**, Circuit Judge.

---

A Bolivian arbitration tribunal awarded \$36 million in damages to Compañía de Inversiones Mercantiles S.A. (“CIMSA”) against Grupo Cementos de Chihuahua S.A.B. de C.V. (“GCC”). GCC fought the award in the Bolivian courts, losing before a chamber of Bolivia’s highest constitutional court in 2016.<sup>1</sup> In 2019, CIMSA obtained an order from the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado confirming the award. In 2020, GCC convinced a different chamber of Bolivia’s highest constitutional court to invalidate its prior decision, and a Bolivian trial judge subsequently annulled the award. GCC then moved the U.S. district court to vacate the confirmation order. The district court (1) denied GCC’s motion and (2) ordered GCC to turn over assets located in Mexico to satisfy the award. GCC brought

---

<sup>1</sup> As we discuss below, Bolivia’s highest constitutional court is comprised of groups of judges, known as “chambers.” 21-1196, App., Vol. IV at 879 n.2; 21-1196, App., Vol. V at 1056-57, 1201 n.1.

separate appeals from these two rulings. Exercising jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, we affirm in both appeals.

## I. BACKGROUND

### A. *Shareholder Agreement to Arbitration – 2005-2015*<sup>2</sup>

#### 1. The Parties' Shareholder Agreement – 2005

In 2005, GCC, a set of related Mexican companies, sought to acquire an interest in Bolivia's largest cement company, Sociedad Boliviana de Cemento, S.A. ("SOBOCE"). *Compañía I*, 970 F.3d at 1276-77. At that time, CIMSA, a Bolivian company, was SOBOCE's controlling shareholder. GCC offered CIMSA approximately \$59 million to purchase a 47 percent interest in SOBOCE. *Id.* at 1276-77. CIMSA accepted, and on September 22, 2005, the parties entered into a shareholder agreement as SOBOCE's two principal shareholders (the "Shareholder Agreement"). *Id.* at 1277.

The Shareholder Agreement allowed each party to sell its shares in SOBOCE to a third party after a period of five years, so long as the selling party gave notice to the other party and provided it an opportunity to purchase the shares on the same or better terms within 30 days. *Id.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Our opinion in *Compañía de Inversiones Mercantiles, S.A. v. Grupo Cementos de Chihuahua S.A.B. de C.V.*, 970 F.3d 1269 (10th Cir. 2020), *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct. 2793 (2021) ("*Compañía I*"), set forth the facts underlying these cases. We draw facts from that opinion unless otherwise indicated.

Under the Shareholder Agreement, (1) the parties would submit any disputes regarding a breach to international arbitration for final resolution and (2) the rules and regulations of the Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commission (“IACAC”) would govern. *See* 21-1196, Suppl. App. at 2. The “national chapter of the [IACAC] in Bolivia” would conduct the arbitration, three arbitrators would preside, and Bolivian law would apply. *Id.*; *Compañía I*, 970 F.3d at 1278, 1291. The parties agreed that “[a]ny awards or orders issued by the Arbitration Court shall be final and of mandatory compliance” and “expressly waive[d] all actions for annulment, objection, or appeal against the award.” 21-1196, Suppl. App. at 2.

## **2. The Parties’ Commercial Dispute – 2009-2011**

In 2009, GCC informed CIMSA that it intended to sell its SOBOCE shares after the five-year holding period. *Compañía I*, 970 F.3d at 1277. Between 2009 and 2011, the parties attempted to reach a deal for CIMSA to purchase those shares, but they failed to reach an agreement. *Id.*

In July 2011, GCC notified CIMSA that a Peruvian company had tendered a firm offer to buy GCC’s SOBOCE shares. *Id.* CIMSA reiterated its desire to purchase the shares. This time GCC said it would accept CIMSA’s proposed payment terms. *Id.* In August 2011, GCC sent CIMSA a draft purchase agreement. *Id.*

But “[r]ight before the transaction was set to close, GCC demanded an increase in the number of SOBOCE shares CIMSA would place in trust, from 4% to 27%, allegedly to ensure CIMSA’s compliance with a longer payment schedule.” *Id.*

In response, “CIMSA attempted to exercise its right of first refusal under the terms . . . that had been negotiated by the parties.” *Id.* GCC said CIMSA’s attempt to exercise that right was invalid and sold its SOBOCE shares to the Peruvian company. *Id.*

### 3. Arbitration – 2011-2015

In November 2011, CIMSA invoked the Shareholder Agreement’s arbitration clause and initiated arbitration proceedings, claiming that GCC violated the Shareholder Agreement by failing to honor the right of first refusal. *Id.* at 1278. A three-member tribunal (the “Arbitral Tribunal”) presided over the arbitration in Bolivia. *Id.* The parties agreed to bifurcate the proceedings into a merits phase and a damages phase. *Id.*

In September 2013, the Arbitral Tribunal issued a merits ruling, holding that GCC breached the right of first refusal in the Shareholder Agreement (the “Merits Award”). *Id.* In April 2015, the Arbitral Tribunal awarded CIMSA approximately \$34 million in damages and \$2 million in fees and costs, with interest accruing at 6 percent annually on those amounts (the “Damages Award”). *Id.* at 1280.

#### B. Court Proceedings – 2015-2021

Post-arbitration court proceedings primarily occurred in Bolivia and the United States, often simultaneously.<sup>3</sup> GCC attempted to annul the Merits and Damages

---

<sup>3</sup> Court proceedings also occurred in Mexico, but those are primarily relevant to Case No. 21-1324, so we defer our discussion of those proceedings until we turn to that appeal.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.