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Abbreviations used in the index


AA (Arbitration Act)

AG (Attorney General)

AQO (Al-Qaida and Taliban (UN Measures) Order 2006 (UK))

ARHG (Extradition and Mutual Assistance Act) (Austria)

ATA (Anti-Terrorism Act (USA))

ATS (Alien Tort Statute 1789 (28 USC 1350))

BIT (bilateral investment treaty)

CERD (UN Committee/Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (1965))

CESCR (UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights)

CHIPS (Clearing House Interbank Payments System)

CIL (customary international law)

CJA (Criminal Justice Act)

CJEU (Court of Justice of the European Union)

CMP (closed material procedure)

DES (Defence Engagement Sudan)

EA (Enforcement of Foreign Civil Judgments Act (South Africa))

EA (Extradition Act)

ECA (European Communities Act (1972))

ECE (European Convention on Extradition (1957))

ECHR (European Convention on Human Rights (1950))

ECtHR (European Court of Human Rights)

EEZ (exclusive economic zone)

EP (Extradition Protocol)

FATF (Financial Action Task Force)

FRCP (US Federal Rules of Civil Procedure)

FSIA (Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (US/South Africa))

FTC (International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (1999))

FTT (First Tier Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum) (UK))

HoA (Heads of Agreement)

IA (Immigration Act)

IC/Intervention Convention (International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties (1969))

ICC (International Criminal Court/ICC Statute)

ICCPR (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966))

ICESCR (International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966))

ICJ (International Court of Justice/ICJ Statute)

IHL (international humanitarian law)

INSLM (Independent National Security Legislation Monitor) (Australia)

JSA (Justice and Security Act 2013)
KRG (Kurdistan Regional Government of Iraq)
KRI (Kurdistan Region of Iraq)
LCIA (London Court of International Arbitration)
LSSA (Law Society of South Africa)
MARPOL (International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (1973) and Protocol (1978))
NIAC (non-international armed conflict)
NYC (New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958))
OSJA (Overseas Security and Justice Assistance Human Rights Guidance)
RC (Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951))
ROC (Rules of Court)
SADC (Southern African Development Community/SADC Treaty)
SADCT (Southern African Development Community Tribunal)
SAF (Sudanese Armed Forces)
SARFU (South African Rugby Football Union)
SIA (State Immunity Act)
SoS (Secretary of State)
TBC (Terrorist Bombings Convention (1997))
TEU (Lisbon Treaty on the European Union (2007))
TFEU (Lisbon Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (2007))
TVPA (Torture Victim Protection Act 1991 (US))
UNC (United Nations Charter (1945))
UNCAT (UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984))
UNCLOS (UN Law of the Sea Convention (1982))
UNGA (United Nations General Assembly)
UNPIC (UN Privileges and Immunities Convention (1946))
UNSC (UN Security Council)
UNSCR (UN Security Council resolution)
UT (Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) (UK))
WC (Warsaw Convention on International Carriage by Air (1929))
WTO (World Trade Organization)

**AA-R (Iran)** (complicity in commission of international crime as impediment to asylum)
background (factual)
- appellant’s concessions 409-10
- Basij, definition 406
- exclusion decision, justification 408-9
background (procedural)
- appellant’s arguments 411
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FTT findings 410
UT findings 411
Court’s findings 411-12
grounds of appeal
  ground 1: error in assessing AA-R’s role in the Basij as a “significant contribution” 405
  ground 2: want of proper, adequate and clear reasons 405
legal framework
  QD 12(2)(a) (serious non-political crime) 406-8
  QD 12(3) (application of QD 12 to “persons who instigate or otherwise participate in the commission of the crimes or acts”) 408
jurisprudence
  JS (Sri Lanka) 406, 408
  SK (Zimbabwe) 407
treaties
  ICC 7(1) (“crimes against humanity”) 406-7
  ICC 7(1)(k) (“other inhumane acts of a similar character”) 407
  ICC 25(3) (individual criminal responsibility: criteria) 407
  ICC 28 (command responsibility) 407-8
  RC 1F(a) (non-application of Convention on grounds of crime against peace, war crime or crime against humanity) 406-8
“accident” (WC 17/MC 17.1)
  “event” or “happening” requirement 424
jurisprudence
  Abramson 426-7
  Barclay 421, 425, 427
  Deep Vein Thrombosis 418, 421, 424-7
  Ford 415-27
  Morris 421
  Paterson 427
  Saks 418, 421, 424, 425, 427
  Thornton 424
as reference to the cause of the accident 424
“unexpected or unusual event” requirement (Saks) 421-2
distinguishability 424
  “external to the passenger” requirement 425
  “event causing injury occurred independently of anything done or omitted by the passenger” 427
  “peculiar internal condition” as immediate cause of “bodily injury” 425
  “as some link in the chain” leading to the “bodily injury” 425
  “unusual” 426-7
  victim’s perception as test 416-17, 424-5
act of State (foreign State acts), definition/characteristics, jurisprudence
  Buttes Gaz 472-3
  Kuwait Airways (Nos 4 and 5) 472-3
admissibility of evidence obtained by torture/confession
jurisprudence
  A (No 2) 597, 601-2
  Yousef 596-602
Sanctions Committee Consolidated List, obligation to inquire into allegations of the use of evidence obtained through torture 587-91, 596-602
Alien Tort Statute 1789 (28 USC 1350) (ATS) (federal jurisdiction in cases of suit by alien for tort in violation of international law or treaty)

- applicability to suits between foreign plaintiffs and foreign defendants 652, 660-5, 677-8
- evolutionary nature of customary international law 676-7
- extraterritorial application, presumption against, as means of avoiding diplomatic friction 678-81
- as jurisdictional statute 636, 652
- jurisprudence
  - Exxon 635, 675
  - Filártiga 637-8, 667-8, 683-4
  - Flomo 635
- Jesner: see Jesner (ATS, corporate liability under)
- Kiobel 634-5, 638, 640, 644, 645-9, 654, 668-70, 675-81, 686-8
- Nestle 635
- legislative history 635-7, 660-5
- TVPA, applicability of principles on liability to ATS 645-6, 683-5
- “in violation of the law of nations or a treaty of the US”
- corporate liability under ATS for human rights violations
  - Court’s authority in ATS suit to determine: see corporate liability under ATS for human rights violations, Court’s authority in ATS suit to determine below
  - FTC 5(1) ("measures to enable a legal entity . . . to be held liable"), relevance 642, 672-3
  - international criminal tribunals’ limitation to natural persons 641-3, 670-3
  - potential liability of corporations in tort, support for in the text, history and purpose of ATS 674-6
- State practice 673
- as unresolved issue (Kiobel) 634-5
- whether meeting specific, universal and obligatory test 640-3
- corporate liability under ATS for human rights violations, Court’s authority in ATS suit to determine 638-9, 644-9
- creation of new causes of action as responsibility of the political branches 657-60, 681-2
- non-essential nature of corporate liability for purposes of ATS goals/availability of alternative remedies 647-8, 685-6
- risk of retaliation and diplomatic discord 648-56, 657-60, 678-81, 686-8
- TVPA limitation of liability to natural persons as precedent 644-7
- specific, universal and obligatory norm requirement (Sosa) 638-40, 643-5, 649-50, 652-70, 676-8, 680-4
- inappropriateness to current international law enforcement 666-70

Animal Science Products (foreign law) (US Supreme Court)

- background
  - District Court proceedings (In re Vitamin C Antitrust Litigation), Court’s decisions 694-5
  - parties’ positions (Court of Appeals proceedings (In re Vitamin C Antitrust Litigation)) 693-6
  - petitioner’s statements to the District Court 693-5
- Court’s analysis (determination of foreign law under FRCP 44.1)
  - Court of Appeals’ errors
    - failure to consider problems identified by the District Court 700
    - failure to consider respondent’s WTO statement of relevant law 698
failure to recognize courts’ right to consider “any relevant material or source” 698
inconsistency with Supreme Court’s treatment of analogous submissions from US States 698
misreading of reciprocity requirement 699
misunderstanding of Pink 698-9
FRCP 44.1, objectives
change of approach from common law treatment as question of fact to treatment as question of law 696-7
harmonization of the determination of foreign law and domestic law 696-7
international comity, role 697-8
issue before the Court 692, 696
weight to be given to views of foreign government
absence of statutory guidance 697
conflicting statements/statements made in the context of litigation, need for caution 697-8
jurisprudence 697
“may consider any relevant material or source” 696-8
relevant factors 697-8
 treaties establishing mechanisms for obtaining of official statements on foreign law
699-700
Court’s decision 692, 700
Austria (1955- (Second Republic))
Criminal Procedure Code (StPO) by section
292 (last sentence) (Court’s options in case of a finding of nullity) 192
292 (nullity complaint procedure) 192
363a(1) (rehearing of criminal proceedings in case of ECtHR judgment) 189
extradition to country where risk of human rights breaches, assurances/measures to guarantee protection 186-93
Extradition and Mutual Assistance Act (ARHG) by section 191
1 (priority of international agreements) 189-91
20(1) (prohibition of extradition in absence of guarantee that the death sentence will not be imposed) 192
33(1) (extradition request: closed proceedings) 186-7
33(3) (requirements for extradition including provisions of international agreements) 186-7, 189-91
34(1) (first and second sentences (refusal of extradition for political or international law reasons)) 189-90
34(1) (judicial decision on impermissibility of extradition: binding effect on Minister of Justice) 189-90

autrefois convict 493-5
burden of proof 495-7

Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6)): see Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6)) (background); Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6)) (judgment of the Court (Third Chamber)); Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6)) (Opinion (AG Wahl))

Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6)) (background)
facts (including proceedings in Finnish courts) 135-7, 166-70
issues raised 139
request for preliminary ruling 137-9, 158, 168-70
relevant EU law (Directive 2005/35 (ship-source pollution)) 133-5, 164-5
Recitals

1 (incorporation of international standards into EU law/possibility of more stringent Member State measures) 134, 165
1-4 and 12 164
3(1) (applicability of Directive) 134, 165
7 (coastal State enforcement measures on ships in transit) 134-5, 165
relevant Finnish law (Law on environmental protection in maritime transport 1672/2009, Ch 3 para. 24) 135, 165-6
relevant international law
Intervention Convention (1969)
coastal State powers, UNCLOS 220 as addition to 144
conclusion (following Torrey Canyon disaster) 130-1, 144
parties to 158
UNCLOS 220/UNCLOS 221, influence on 144
Intervention Convention (1969) by article
I(1) (right to take measures necessary to prevent, mitigate or eliminate grave and imminent danger) 130-1, 158
II(4) ("related interests") 130-1, 158-9
MARPOL 131, 159-60
4(2) (prohibition of infringements/sanctions) 131
Annex I, Reg 1(11) (Baltic Sea as "special area") 131, 159
Annex I, Reg 15(A) (prohibition on discharge of oil) 131, 159-60
Annex I, Reg 15(B) (prohibition on discharge of oil: special areas) 131, 159-60
UNCLOS, Part I (introduction)
1(1) ("Area") 132, 160
1(4) ("pollution of the marine environment") 132, 160
UNCLOS, Part V (EEZ)
56(1)(a) (coastal State’s sovereign rights in EEZ) 132, 160
56(1)(b)(iii) (coastal State’s EEZ jurisdiction: protection and preservation of the marine environment) 132, 160
58 (rights and duties of non-coastal States in the EEZ) 132, 161
61(1)-(4) 161
UNCLOS, Part XII (protection and preservation of the marine environment) 132
192 (obligation to protect and preserve the marine environment) 132
194(5) (measures to protect fragile ecosystems and the habitat of endangered species) 161
211(1) (pollution from vessels: establishment of international rules and standards) 162
211(7) (international rules and standards: prompt notification) 162
217 (enforcement by flag States) 132-3
220 (enforcement by coastal States) 133
220(2)-(6) (grounds for coastal State jurisdiction) 133, 162-3
221 (measures to avoid pollution arising from maritime casualties) 163
237 (obligations under other conventions) 156, 163
VCLT
31(1) (interpretation in good faith, ordinary meaning, context and object and purpose) 163-4
32 (supplementary means including travaux préparatoires) 164
Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6)) (judgment of the Court (Third Chamber)) 158-84
costs 182
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Court’s decision
“any resources” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 183
“clear objective evidence” requirement (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 182
“coastline or related interests” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 182
evidence to be taken into account in assessing the consequences of a violation under 2005/35/EC 183
Member States’ right to take more stringent measures “in conformity with international law” (2005/35/EC 1(2)) 184
“threat of major damage” (UNCLOS 220(6)/2005/35/EC 7(2)), assessment of “significant pollution” (UNCLOS 220(5)), relevance 183
special area status, relevance in assessing 183
Court’s jurisdiction to interpret provisions of international law agreements between some Member States and non-Member States (Intervention Convention) 170-1
as source of inspiration 170-1
agreements subscribed to by Member States (MARPOL) 170
instruments forming part of the EU legal order 170
interpretation of Directive 2005/35/EC in accordance with UNCLOS 220(6) 171
Questions 1 and 3 (“coastline or related interests” (2005/35/EC 7(2))) 174-6
applicability of customary international law as reflected in VCLT 31 174
“coastline or related interests” (UNCLOS 220(6)), absence of definition 174
Court’s conclusion 176
Intervention Convention, influence on UNCLOS 220/UNCLOS 221 175-6
“related interests” (IC II(4)) 174-6
Question 4 (“any resources” (UNCLOS 220(6)/2005/35/EC 7(2))) 176-7
“any” as indication of broad interpretation 176-7
Court’s conclusion 177
harvested species/species associated with (UNCLOS 61), inclusion of 176-7
Questions 5-7 and last two sentences of Question 10: evidence to be taken into account in assessing the consequences of a violation under UNCLOS 220(6)/2005/35/EC 178-80
Court’s conclusion 179-80
dependence on specific circumstances/concrete circumstantial assessment 178-9
Question 6 (relevance of “significant pollution” (UNCLOS 220(5))) 177-8
Court’s conclusion 178
“pollution” 177
“related interests” (Intervention Convention II(4)) and 177-8
Question 8: Member States’ right to take more stringent measures “in conformity with international law” (2005/35/EC 1(2)) 181-2
Court’s conclusion 182
Question 9: special area status, relevance in assessing “threat of major damage” (UNCLOS 220(6)/2005/35/EC 7(2)) 180-1
Court’s conclusion 180-1
Question 10, first sentence (“clear objective evidence”) 171-4
Court’s conclusion 174
graded approach to rights of intervention (UNCLOS 220(3)/UNCLOS 220(5)/UNCLOS 220(6)) 172
“threat of major damage” (UNCLOS 220(6)) and “threat of significant pollution” (UNCLOS 220(5)) distinguished 173
UNCLOS as balance between coastal States and other States 173-4
Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6)) (Opinion (AG Wahl))

AG’s conclusion/recommendation to the Court 157
Court’s jurisdiction to interpret provisions of international law 140-2
agreements between some Member States and non-Member States (Intervention Convention) 140-2
as source of inspiration 141-2, 146-8
agreements subscribed to by Member States (MARPOL) 140
instruments forming part of the EU legal order (UNCLOS) 140
UNCLOS, MARPOL and Intervention Convention distinguished 140-2
principles governing the enforcement jurisdiction of coastal States 142-6
as addition to flag States’ jurisdiction 144-5
coastal State’s limited jurisdiction in EEZ (UNCLOS 56)/other States’ obligation to comply with coastal States’ rules and regulations (UNCLOS 58) 143
enforcement by flag States as default (UNCLOS 217) 132-3, 142-3, 145-6
right to take over coastal State proceedings (UNCLOS 228(1)) 145
freedom of navigation as a fundamental principle 142-3
limitation of powers to “infringement of applicable international rules and standards” (UNCLOS 220(3)) 144-5
proximity principle 145

Questions 1-4: interests covered by UNCLOS 220(6) 146-9

AG’s conclusion/recommendation to the Court 157
Court’s jurisdiction to interpret provisions of international law 140-2
agreements between some Member States and non-Member States (Intervention Convention) 140-2
as source of inspiration 141-2, 146-8
agreements subscribed to by Member States (MARPOL) 140
instruments forming part of the EU legal order (UNCLOS) 140
UNCLOS, MARPOL and Intervention Convention distinguished 140-2
principles governing the enforcement jurisdiction of coastal States 142-6
as addition to flag States’ jurisdiction 144-5
coastal State’s limited jurisdiction in EEZ (UNCLOS 56)/other States’ obligation to comply with coastal States’ rules and regulations (UNCLOS 58) 143
enforcement by flag States as default (UNCLOS 217) 132-3, 142-3, 145-6
right to take over coastal State proceedings (UNCLOS 228(1)) 145
freedom of navigation as a fundamental principle 142-3
limitation of powers to “infringement of applicable international rules and standards” (UNCLOS 220(3)) 144-5
proximity principle 145

Questions 1-4: interests covered by UNCLOS 220(6) 146-9

enforcement by coastal States with respect to ships in transit (2005/35/EC 7) “in accordance with international law” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) (including UNCLOS 220(6)) 146
Member States’ right to take more stringent measures “in conformity with international law” (2005/35/EC 1(2)) (including UNCLOS 220(6)) 146
standards stricter than UNCLOS, exclusion 146
enforcement by coastal States (UNCLOS 220(6)) “any” as indication of broad interpretation 148
“any resources of its territorial sea or EEZ” 148-9
“coastline or related interests” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 146-9
ecosystem-based approach 148-9
effective protection of the environment as a whole as objective 149
“related interests” (IC II(4)) 146-8

Questions 5-7 and 9-10: evidence required under UNCLOS 220(6) to justify coastal State enforcement measures 149-55
costal State measures as exception in clearly defined circumstances 153-4
conclusion 155
evidential requirements for measures under UNCLOS 220(6) as matter of national law (MARPOL 4(2)) 152
graded approach to rights of intervention (UNCLOS 220(3)/UNCLOS 220(5)/UNCLOS 220(6)) 150-2
obligation to impose effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties for discharges of polluting substances (2005/35/EC 8(1)) 152
“threat of major damage” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 151-2, 155
special area status, relevance in assessing 154
“threat of major damage” (UNCLOS 220(6)) 152-5
“clear objective evidence” requirement (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 153
dependency on specific circumstances/concrete circumstantial assessment 153-5
right to instigate proceedings 152
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special area status, relevance in assessing 154
“threat of significant pollution” (UNCLOS 220(5)) distinguished 152-3
Question 8: discretion of Member States to take more stringent measures under Directive 2005/13/EC 7(2) 155-7
conclusion 156-7

Botswana
Constitution (1966) by section, 53 (President’s right to substitute prison sentence for death penalty) 260
Criminal Code by section, 203 (death penalty for murder) 254
death penalty 254: see also Tsebe

CERD (1965)
dispute settlement provisions (CERD 22)
“dispute with respect to the interpretation or application of this Convention”
“not settled by negotiation” as precondition 23-4, 27-9
“procedures expressly provided for [in CERD 11-16]” 29
“not settled by negotiation” 23-4, 27-9
modalities
“discrimination” (CERD 1) 114-16
obligations (CERD 2 and CERD 5), respect for individual rights, the obligations of States parties under CERD and the right of States parties to seek compliance, interrelationship 38

choice of law/choice of law clause
law of State party “supplemented by rules of international business activities generally accepted” 357-8
“rules of international business activities”, definition/sources 358

CJEU competence (TEU 19(1)/TFEU 19(3))
interpretation of provisions of international law
agreements between some Member States and non-Member States 140-2
as source of inspiration 141-2
agreements subscribed to by Member States (MARPOL) 140
instruments forming part of the EU legal order 140, 170
jurisprudence
Bosphorus Queen Shipping 140-2: see also Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6))
Haegeman 140
IATTO 140
International Fruit Company 141
Lesocharanérske zoskupenie 140
Manzi 141
Opinion 2/15 (EU–Singapore Free Trade Agreement) 141
Peralta 141
Qurbani 141
TNT Express Nederland 140-1

combatant immunity, participants in NIAC, exclusion 445-6

contracts
applicable law, choice of law clause: see choice of law/choice of law clause interpretation, contracts governed by foreign law 356-7

customary international law (CIL)
obligation not to defeat object and purpose of treaty prior to entry into force (VCLT 18) 326-9
“as part of” municipal law (Trendtex) 590
death penalty, jurisprudence

Makwanyane 255-6
Mohamed 246-7, 249-51, 254-68, 270-6
Tsebe 243-76; see also Tsebe (extradition/risk of death penalty)

ECHR (1950)
compliance obligation (ECHR 1) in case of conflicting international obligations/primacy of UNC 103
Al-Jedda 572, 585
MB 585
existing rights safeguard/Member States’ right to set higher standards (ECHR 53)
223-5, 227-32
subsequent changes, need to reflect ("living-tree" principle) (VCLT 31(3)(c)), risk of conflict with parties’ constitutional principles 226-7

ECtHR judgments, binding force and execution (ECHR 46 [ECHR 53/ECHR 54])
jurisprudence
Anchugov 231-2
Case B267/86 of 14 October 1987 230
Görgül 228-9
Hirst 230
Jahn 222-3
Maggio 229-30
Musayeva 222-3
Russian ECHR Ratification Law Case 219-40; see also Russian ECHR Ratification Law Case Sordino 222-3
Scozzari and Giunta 222-3
Umarov 222-3
responsibility of State organs for compliance with constitutional principles, effect 223-7
judgments based on an interpretation contrary to VCLT 31 225-7

ECtHR jurisdiction/role and powers (including ECHR 19 and ECHR 32), primacy of municipal courts’ role in determining compliance with Convention/subsidiarity principle 223, 236-7, 239

EEZ
UNCLOS 56 (rights, jurisdiction and duties of coastal State), marine environment protection: see marine environment, protection and preservation (UNCLOS Part XII)
UNCLOS 58 (rights and duties of other States)
Bosphorus Queen Shipping; see Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6))
due regard to the rights and duties of the coastal State obligation (UNCLOS 58(3)) 143

Effective remedy before national authority, need for (ECHR 13/ICCPR 2(3)), jurisprudence
Kudła 215
Kurić 215

Estonia (1991-)
Administrative Court Procedure Code 1999 by section, 32(5) (participation of appellant in Court proceedings) 196-7
Constitution 1992 by article, 123(2) (primacy of treaty) 197-8
ICECSR, as international treaty ratified by Estonia/obligation to implement maximum measures to ensure compliance 197-8
treaties and municipal law (including implementing legislation/incorporation)
conflict with legislation 197-8
direct effect in the absence of need for implementing measures 197-8
ICSER as example of 197-8
treaty as aid to interpretation of law 197-8

EU legal order, customary international law as part of 174
EU treaties with third parties (“international agreements” (TFEU 216-19))
interpretation, applicable law (customary international law as reflected in the VCLT) 174

Inter tanko 170
as part of the EU legal order 140, 170
UNCLOS, status as 140, 170

exhaustion of local remedies
ECHR 35(1) (including effectiveness of remedy)
Mostacciolo 223
Sakhnowský 223
SADCTP (2000) 15(2) 295-6

expropriation/nationalization, taking of property of own nationals, legality 619, 623-4

extradition: see extradition in case of death penalty (assurances that death penalty will not be carried out); extradition to country where risk of human rights breaches (assurances/measures to guarantee protection); extradition to country where risk of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment (including ECHR 3/ICCPR 7/ UNCAT 3)

extradition in case of death penalty (assurances that death penalty will not be carried out): see also death penalty
abolition of death penalty in extraditing State/non-applicability to extradited persons, relevance 187, 192
depth penalty reservation in extradition agreement, relevance Botswana–South Africa Extradition Treaty (1969) 253
ECE 11 (capital punishment) 192
SADC Extradition Protocol (2002) 253-4, 266
jurisprudence
Ananyev 188
Khaydarov 191-2
Obihan 191-3
Russian National Extradition Case 186-93
Soering 190-1
WK 190
State practice
Austria 186-93
South Africa 243-76

extradition to country where risk of human rights breaches (assurances/measures to guarantee protection)
conditions imposed by requested State
non-observance of conditions leading to refusal of future extraditions, relevance 192
sufficiency 191
evaluation obligation, relevant factors
binding effect of government assurance [on local authorities] 191-3
effective verification/monitoring mechanisms 188
objective evidence of practices contrary to ECHR principles 191-2
extradition to country where risk of human rights breaches (assurances/measures to guarantee protection) (cont.)
  fair trial/prompt hearing, right to (ECHR 5(4) and ECHR 6(1)), flagrant denial of justice test 190-1
extradition to country where risk of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment (including ECHR 3/ICCPR 7/UNCAT 3)
  burden/standard of proof
    “conclusively prove” 190
    “considerable likelihood” 190
  “real risk”/“substantial grounds for believing” test (including UNCAT 3(1)) 190, 257
  State responsibility of extraditing State for exposure of an individual to proscribed ill-treatment, in absence of effective legal protection in requesting country 190
extraterritorial jurisdiction, anti-terrorism legislation 447-8

fair and public hearing, entitlement (ECHR 6(1)) “flagrant denial of justice” test, Soering 190-1
Fick (South African Constitutional Court): see also LSSA; SADC Treaty (1992); SADC Tribunal (SADCT)
  background (SADC legal instruments) 281-3
  binding effect of Treaty/Protocol on South Africa and Zimbabwe 280, 283-4
  background (SADC proceedings) (Tribunal’s decision), Zimbabwe’s non-compliance with Tribunal decision/Summit’s costs order 280-1, 284
  background (South African court proceedings)
    Constitutional Court 286
    High Court (registration of costs order) 280-1, 284-5
    dismissal of appeal 281, 285-6
    waiver of State immunity, acceptance of SADC Treaty and SADCT Protocol as 285-6
    Supreme Court (validity of SADCT Protocol) 285-6
  Court’s conclusion
  Court’s Order 303
  dismissal of appeal 303
  non-retroactive effect of decision 303
  satisfaction of common law requirements for enforcement of Tribunal judgment 303
  Zimbabwe’s obligation to cooperate with the Tribunal (SADC 6(6)) 303
  issue 1 (rescission of registration order) 287-8
    good cause/bona fide defence requirements, dismissal for want of explanation from Zimbabwe 287-8
    prospects of success requirement/dependence on outcome of jurisdictional challenge 287-8
  issue 2 (binding effect on South Africa of Amended SADC Treaty) 288-9
    alleged failure to ratify SADCT Protocol 288-9
    obligation to take measures necessary to ensure execution (SADCTP (2000) 32(2)) 288-90
  issue 3 (State immunity) (acceptance of SADC Treaty and SADCT Protocol as waiver of immunity) 289-90
  issue 4 (jurisdiction of SADC Tribunal) 292-6
    binding effect of SADC Treaty and SADCT Protocol 295
    correlation between grounds for objection raised before Tribunal and before enforcing court, need for 294-5
    Zimbabwe’s objections 292-3
    arguments before the Tribunal distinguished 293-4
Court’s rejection of 294
as submission to the jurisdiction/waiver of immunity 295-6
issue 5 (applicability of Enforcement of Foreign Civil Judgments Act (EA 2(1)))
“any country” as impediment to judgments of international tribunals 291
designated judgments, limitation to 291
Magistrates’ Courts proceedings, limitation to 291
issue 6 (common law requirements for enforcement)
consistency with public policy 291-2
domicile/residence “within the State in which the foreign court exercised jurisdiction”
(Purser v. Sales) 291-2, 296-7
final and binding judgment 291-2
jurisdiction of court pronouncing judgment 292-6
non-enforcement of a penal or revenue law of the foreign State 291-2
issue 7 (development of common law in relation to enforcement of judgment of
international tribunal: relevant factors) 297-302
absence of legislative provision/non-applicability of Enforcement of Foreign Civil
Judgments Act 291, 300-1
comity/reciprocity principles 298-9
Court’s decision 302
need to avoid evasion of lawful judgments 297-8
obligations
application/development of common law (Constitution 231) 300-2
consideration of international law when interpreting Bill of Rights (Constitution
39(1)(b)) 301-2
honouring international agreements (Constitution 8(3)) 298-301
measures necessary to ensure execution of SADC Tribunal decisions (SADCTP
(2000) 32(2)) 298-302
preference for any reasonable interpretation consistent with international law 302
promotion of the spirit, purport and objects of the Bill of Rights (Constitution
39(2)) 301-2
rule of law/access to the courts (SADC 4(c)/Constitution 1(c)) 299-301
leave to appeal, grounds (“constitutional matter”) 286, 303, 304
separate opinions
Jafta J (dissenting) (grounds for appeal: “constitutional matter”/interests of justice)
304-12
Zondo J (concurring) (Court’s finding on Tribunal’s jurisdiction as answer to
ratification challenge) 303
Financing of Terrorism Convention/CERD Case (Ukraine v. Russia) (Provisional
Measures), background
facts 15-16
procedural history
Application (Ukraine)
claims (CERD) 11-12
claims (FTC) 9-11
appointment of ad hoc judges 13-14
basis of jurisdiction (FTC 24(1)/CERD 22) 12
request for provisional measures 12
CERD-related 13, 15
FTC-related 12-15
Russia’s response 15
separate opinions/declarations
Bhandari J (separate opinion) 88-113
Financing of Terrorism Convention/CERD Case (Ukraine v. Russia) (Provisional Measures), background (cont.)

Cançado Trindade J (review of the concept and attributes of provisional measures) 57-88
Crawford J (declaration) 113-16
Owada J (separate opinion) 45-52
Pocar, Judge ad hoc (separate opinion) 116-20
Skotnikov, Judge ad hoc (separate opinion) 120-2
Tomka J (declaration) 52-7

Financing of Terrorism Convention/CERD Case (Ukraine v. Russia) (Provisional Measures), prima facie jurisdiction (FTC 24(1)/CERD 22) 16-29

Court’s conclusion/recommended measures 42-4
Court’s right to indicate measures other than those requested (ROC 75(2)) 42-3
decision not to indicate provisional measures in respect of FTC-based claims 35
Bhandari J dissenting 88-113
Pocar, Judge ad hoc dissenting 116-20
obligation of both parties to avoid aggravation or extension of dispute, call to parties to work for implementation of the Package of Measures for the Implementation of the Minsk Agreements 43-4
obligations of Russia to comply with CERD in respect of education in the Ukrainian language 43-4
limitations on Crimean Tatar community’s ability to conserve its representative institutions including the Mejlis 43-4
obligations of Russia to comply with CERD in respect of the Mejlis, separate opinions
Crawford J (concurring) 114-16
Skotnikov, Judge ad hoc (dissenting) 120-2
Tomka J (dissenting) 52-7

Court’s decision 44
existence of a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention (FTC 24(1)/CERD 22) 17-23

CERD
Court’s conclusion 22-3
parties’ arguments (Russia) 21-2
parties’ arguments (Ukraine) 21

FTC
Court’s conclusion 20-1
parties’ arguments (Russia) 19-20
parties’ arguments (Ukraine) 18-19

negotiations precondition (FTC 24(1)/CERD 22) 23-9
CERD (Court’s analysis)
Application of CERD (Georgia v. Russia) 28-9
conclusion 29
“procedures expressly provided for [in CERD 11-16]” 29
CERD (parties’ arguments) 27-8
Russia 28

FTC (Court’s analysis)
conclusion 27
evidence of “negotiations” 26-7
submission of dispute to arbitration 26-7

FTC (parties’ arguments)
Russia 25-6, 95
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Ukraine 24-5, 93-5
overview 23-4
“negotiations” 23-4
submission of dispute to arbitration 24
separate opinion, Bhandari J (dissenting) 92-6
plausibility of rights to be protected 29-39
CERD 2/CERD 5 (Court’s analysis) 36-9
connection of requested measures with dispute before the Court 38-9
Court’s conclusions 38-9
respect for individual rights, the obligations of States parties under CERD and the
right of States parties to seek compliance, interrelationship 38
CERD 2/CERD 5 (parties’ arguments)
Russia 36
Ukraine 35-6
FTC 18 (cooperation in the prevention of terrorism) (Court’s analysis) 32-5
Court’s conclusion 32-5
dependence on FTC 2 (definition of Convention offence including elements of
intention/knowledge (FTC 2(1))) 34-5
overview 29-30
FTC 18 (cooperation in the prevention of terrorism) (parties’ arguments)
Russia 31-2
Ukraine 30-1
separate opinions
Bhandari J 97, 111-13
Cançado Trindade 57-73, 86-8
Owada J 47-51
Pocar, Judge ad hoc 116-19
risk of irreparable prejudice/urgency 39-42
Court’s analysis (serious/imminent risk test) 41-2
Court’s conclusion 42
parties’ arguments (Russia) 40-1
parties’ arguments (Ukraine) 40
separate opinions
Bhandari J 107-11
Tomka J 56
vulnerability of population (Cançado Trindade) 57-73
Finland: see Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6))
flag State, duties (UNCLOS 94) including enforcement of international rules and
standards regarding ship-source pollution (UNCLOS 217) 142-3
Ford (“accident”)
background
facts 419-21
interpretation of MC, desirability of uniformity/international jurisprudence as aid 418
preliminary issue proceedings (Owen J) 415-16, 421-2
“unexpected or unusual event” requirement (Saki) 421-2
relevant jurisprudence: see “accident” (WC 17/MC 17.1), jurisprudence
relevant terms of Montreal Convention 416-18
MC 17 (death and injury of passengers: damage to baggage) 417
MC 17.1 (death and injury of passengers: “accident which caused the death or
injury”) 417-18
MC 18 (destruction or loss of or damage to cargo) 417
MC 19 (delay of passengers, baggage or cargo) 417
MC 20 (exoneration) 417-18
Ford ("accident") (cont.)
MC 21 (compensation in case of death or injury of passengers) 417
MC 21.2 (compensation: exclusion or limitation of liability) 417
summary of the issue 415-16
Court’s analysis ("accident")
appellant’s “peculiar internal condition” as immediate cause of “bodily injury” 425
as reference to the cause of injury 424
“unexpected or unusual event” requirement (Saks)
distinguishability 424
“event causing injury occurred independently of anything done or omitted by the passenger” 427
“external to the passenger” requirement 425
“as some link in the chain” leading to the “bodily injury” 425
“unusual” 426-7
victim’s perception as test 424-5, 426-7
Court’s decision 427
jurisprudence
Abramson 426-7
Barclay 421, 425, 427
Deep Vein Thrombosis 418, 421, 424-7
Morris 421
Paterson 427
Saks 418, 421, 424, 425, 427
Thornton 424
parties’ arguments
appellant 422-3
respondent 423-4
foreign law
interpretation/determination of
dereference to foreign State, absolute rule, whether 692-700
jurisprudence
American Booksellers 698
Amoco Cadiz Oil Spill 692-700
Animal Science Products 692-700: see also Animal Science Products
Arizonans for Official English 698
Bodum 697
McKesson 696
McNab 696-7
Pink 698-9
Société Nationale Industrielle Aérospatiale 697
United States – Section 129(c)(1) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act 699
Wainwright v. Goode 698
as question of fact vs law (US change of approach (FRCP 44.1 (1966))) 692-700
treaties establishing mechanisms for obtaining official statements on 699-700
European Convention on Information on Foreign Law (1968) 699-700
Inter-American Convention on Proof of and Information on Foreign Law (1979) 699-700
foreign relations, responsibility for
Rahmatullah 590
Trendtex 590
freedom of navigation/commerce 142-6
fundamental principle of international law 142-3
protection of the environment and 142-6: see also Bosphorus Queen Shipping
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FSIA 1976 (USA) by section
28 USC 1331 (federal jurisdiction) 624-5
28 USC 1605(a)(3) (taking of property exception) jurisprudence (Helmerich and Payne) 616-27
“taken in violation of international law”, non-frivolous but unsuccessful argument, sufficiency to establish jurisdiction 616-27
FSIA 1976 (USA), jurisdiction merits distinguished 620-1
as preliminary issue/desirability of determination at early stage 617, 621, 627
FSIA 1981 (South Africa) by section, 3(1) (waiver), acceptance of SADC/SADCT Protocol as 285-6, 289-90

General Comments (CESCR), 3 (States Parties’ obligations (ICESCR 2(1))) 197-8
Gulf (terrorism during non-international armed conflict) (UK Supreme Court) background
facts (finding of videos in appellant’s possession) 430
parties’ arguments
appellant 431, 437-9, 443-4
prosecution 431, 437
procedural history
Central Criminal Court proceedings 431-2
Court of Appeal proceedings 432
Court of Appeal proceedings/issue certificed as a point of general public importance 432, 437-8
relevant legislation
Terrorism Act 2000 (as amended by Terrorism Act 2006 and Counter-Terrorism Act 2008) 432-5: see also Terrorism Act 2000 (UK)
Terrorism Act 2006 435-6
Court’s decision 448
terrorism during NIAC under international law 443-6
absence of agreed international definition of “terrorism” 443-6
absence of consensus as barrier to conclusion of comprehensive UN Treaty on Terrorism (UNGA Resolution 51/210) 444-5
“actions contrary to the purposes and principles of the UN” (RC 1F(c)), classification as 445
non-availability of combat immunity to participants in NIAC 445-6
State practice 446, 448-9
TBC/FTC, applicability 446
treaty provisions, State’s right to go further than (“gold-plating”) 446-7
terrorism legislation, reviews of
Anderson Review (2012) 440, 448-9
Anderson Review (2013) 440, 448-9
Carlile Reviews (2006 and 2007) 440
Inquiry into the Legislation against Terrorism (Lord Lloyd of Berwick) (1996) 439
“terrorism” (TA (2000) 1)
acts aimed at or affecting countries other than the UK (TA (2000) 1(4)) 438-40
applicability to activity approved by UK Government 439
applicability to acts of armed insurgency constituting lawful hostilities under international humanitarian law 438-9
applicability to military attacks by a non-State armed group against State or inter-governmental organization armed forces in the context of NIAC 437-42
Gul (terrorism during non-international armed conflict) (UK Supreme Court) (cont.)
issue certified by the Court of Appeal as a point of general public importance 432, 437-8
as a broad concept 438-42
consent to prosecution (TA (2000) 117), effect/risk to the rule of law 441-2, 448-9
“creates a serious risk to public safety or health” (TA (2000) 1(2)(d)) 438-40
extension to acts committed abroad, permissibility under international law 447-8
intrusive powers of police and immigration officers 449
“serious damage to property” (TA (2000) 1(2)(d)) 438-40
“serious violence against a person” (TA (2000) 1(2)(a)) 438-40
“use or threat . . . designed to influence the government . . . or to intimidate the public” (TA (2000) 1(1)(b)) 438-40

head of State (former), immunity from jurisdiction (official acts in exercise of functions), Pinochet (No 3) 463-71

Helmerich and Payne (FSIA 1605(a)(3) (expropriation of “rights in property taken in violation of international law”)/sufficiency of unsuccessful non-frivolous claim to establish jurisdiction)
background
parties’ positions
appellant 618
respondent 617-18, 624-7
procedural history
Court of Appeals proceedings 619
District Court proceedings 618-19
summary of the issue 616-17
Court’s conclusion (insufficiency of unsuccessful non-frivolous claim)/reasons 620, 627
“arising under” statute (federal jurisdiction) (28 USC 1331) 624-5
clarity, need for 624
consistency with FSIA text 621
consistency with international law 623-4
jurisdiction (kind of rights in issue) and merits (existence of rights) distinguished 620-1
jurisdiction as preliminary issue/desirability of determination at early stage 617, 621, 627
legislative history/object and purpose 621-3
precedent (Permanent Mission) 621
risk of reciprocal action 624
taking of property of own nationals as sovereign act 619, 623-4
scope for applicability of non-frivolous argument approach 625-7

human rights obligations
corporate liability under international law, possibility of 640-3: see also Jesner
FTC 5(1) (“measures to enable a legal entity . . . to be held liable”), relevance 642, 672-3
international criminal tribunals’ limitation to natural persons 641-3, 670-3

ICESCR (1966), CESCR General Comments as aid to interpretation 197-8

ICJ Rules of Court (1978 as variously amended) by rule
37(1) (right to choose ad hoc judge) 13-14
73(2) (request: required information) 13
74(3) (interim protection: date for oral hearing) 14
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75(2) (provisional measures: Court’s right to prescribe measures other than those requested) 42-3

ICJ status and functions (ICJ 36(1)), appeal court distinguished (LaGrand) 54
individual in international law (international tribunals): see LSSA; SADC Tribunal (SADCT)

inhuman or degrading treatment (ECHR 3/ICCPR 7), detention conditions as (Kalashnikov) 190

international law (including customary international law), breach, resolution of municipal law conflict by civil action 215

Intervention Convention (1969): see also Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6))

CJEU jurisdiction in respect of 140-2, 146-7
as source of inspiration 141-2, 146-8
coastal State powers
“measures necessary to prevent, mitigate or eliminate grave and imminent danger” (IC I(1)) 130-1
UNCLOS 220 as addition to 144
conclusion (following Torrey Canyon disaster) 130-1, 144
“related interests” (IC I(1)) 130-1, 146-8
“related interests” (IC II(4)) 130-1, 146-8, 177-8
UNCLOS 220/UNCLOS 221, influence on 144, 146-7, 175-6

Jesner (ATS, corporate liability under)
background (ATS)
as jurisdictional statute 636
legislative history 635-7
review of the jurisprudence
Kiobel 634-5, 638
other than Kiobel 635-8
background (procedural) issues
corporate liability under international law for human rights violations committed by employees 632
Court’s authority in ATS suit to determine responsibility of corporation for terrorist act 632
petitioners’ claim 632-4
CHIPS transactions 633-4
money-laundering 634
presumptions (infliction of death or injury by terrorism/facilitation of terrorist acts as violation of international law prohibition of terrorism) 632
background (TVPA), torture and extrajudicial killing in violation of international law, express cause of action for victims of 637-8
Court’s analysis
corporate liability under ATS for human rights violations FTC 5(1) (“measures to enable a legal entity . . . to be held liable”), relevance 642
international criminal tribunals’ limitation to natural persons 641-3
specific, universal and obligatory test 640-3
as unresolved issue (Kiobel) 634-5
corporate liability under ATS for human rights violations, Court’s authority in ATS suit to determine 638-9, 644-9
ATA provision for suit of corporate entities, relevance 646-7
Jesner (ATS, corporate liability under) (cont.)
non-essential nature of corporate liability for purposes of ATS goals/availability of alternative remedies 647-8
risk of retaliation and diplomatic discord 648-51
TVPA limitation of liability to natural persons, relevance 644-7
recognition of ATS cause of action (Sosa test (specific, universal and obligatory norm requirement)) 638-40, 643-5, 649-50
separate opinions
Alito J (part concurring, part dissenting) 652-6
ATS as jurisdictional statute 652
risk of retaliation and diplomatic discord 652-6
specific, universal and obligatory test 652-6
Gorsuch J (part concurring, part dissenting) 657-65
applicability of ATS to suits between foreign plaintiffs and foreign defendants 660-5
ATS, legislative history/object and purpose 660-5
creation of new causes of action/resolving foreign policy issues as matter for the political branch 657-60
Sotomayor J (Ginsburg, Breyer and Kagan JJ joining) (dissenting) 666-89
applicability of ATS to suits between foreign plaintiffs and foreign defendants 667-8
barring of ATS suits against foreign corporations as immunization from responsibility for even the most serious of human rights abuses 688-9
creation of new causes of action as responsibility of the political branches 681-2
FTC 5(1) (‘measures to enable a legal entity...to be held liable’), relevance 672-3
international criminal tribunals’ limitation to natural persons, reasons for 670-3
non-essential nature of corporate liability for purposes of ATS goals/availability of alternative remedies, relevance 685-6
potential liability of corporations in tort, support for in the text, history and purpose of ATS 674-6
risk of retaliation and diplomatic discord/presumption against extraterritoriality as solution 678-81, 686-8
specific, universal and obligatory test, inappropriateness to current international law enforcement 666-70
State practice 673
TVPA, applicability of principles on liability to ATS 683-5
Thomas J (concurring) 652
applicability of ATS to suits between foreign plaintiffs and foreign defendants 652
Corporate liability under ATS for human rights violations, Court’s authority in ATS suit to determine 652
judicial review/justiciability (foreign relations decisions/prerogative power of forum State)
acts considered for training and assistance programmes for foreign armed forces 508-22
UNSCR resolution, decision based on decision of international body responsible for implementation of 599
jurisprudence
Abbasi 599-600
Carlile 517
CCSU 599-600
Everett 599-600
Nour 508-22
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Sandiford 599-600
Shah 517
Youssef: see Youssef

scope/standard of review
assessment of political or reputational risk 517
common law judicial review as regulator of the separation of powers 585-6
common law standards as applicable law in prerogative cases 578, 585, 599-600
conformity with legal obligations including UN SCRs 578-81
“reasonable and credible basis” (UN Ombudsman’s report (2011)) 570-2, 581, 605, 609-10
reasonableness/rationality (Wednesbury principle) 517-22
fairness 578
“no reasonable person” test 520-1
procedural rationality requirement 334-7
reasonable grounds for suspicion vs balance of probabilities text 577-83
reasonableness/rationality (Wednesbury principle), proportionality test (ECHR/EU law) compared/proposed move to
Bank Mellat 612-13
Keya 611-12
Pham 611-12
Youssef 611-14

second-guessing, exclusion 517

standing/private right of action, sufficient interest/directly affected requirement 509

jus cogens/peremptory norm (VCLT 53) including torture/inhuman treatment (State/head of State/diplomatic immunity considerations), jurisprudence

A (No 2) 590
Al-Rau'i 590-1
Parundzića 467-8, 590
Jones (Saudi Arabia cases) 467-8
Lama 467-8
Pinchet (No 3) 467-8
Youssef 567-8, 587-91

Kurdistan (KRI): see also Pearl
status 526

Lama (State immunity: acts of torture)
background (factual) in chronological order
complaint by Karam Hussein (2005-6) 456-7
complaint by Janak Bahadur Raut (Kapilivastu District Court) (29 November 2007) 452-6
judgment (torture as an offence/right to compensation) 454-6
commencement of UK criminal proceedings (3 January 2013) 457-8
charge (alleged breach of CJA 134 (torture)) (4 January 2013) 452, 457-8
appellant’s submissions 452
waiver of immunity by UN Secretary General (8 January 2013) 458
decision of the Central Criminal Court (29 October 2013) 451

background (relevant law) (text)
CJA 134 (torture) 461-2
CJA 135 (AG’s consent for prosecutions) 461-2
UNCAT 1 (“torture”) 459
Lama (State immunity: acts of torture) (cont.)

UNCAT 2 (obligation to take effective measures) 459
UNCAT 4 (obligation to create offence) 459
UNCAT 5 (obligation to take measures to establish jurisdiction) 459-60
UNCAT 6 (taking into custody: measures consequent on) 460
UNCAT 7 (aut dedere aut punire/judicare) 460
UNCAT 9(1) (judicial assistance obligation in case of criminal proceedings) 461
UNCAT 12 (prompt and impartial investigation) 461
UNCAT 13 (individual’s right to prompt and impartial examination of complaint by competent authority) 461
UNCAT 14 (civil remedy obligation) 461

Court’s conclusion 505

ground 1: immunity ratione materiae (functional immunity)

alleged breach of UNCAT 6(4) procedural obligations, effect 474-83

effect of breach on Nepal’s waiver of immunity (appellant’s arguments) 480-1

existence of breach (appellant’s arguments) 475-80
existence of breach (Court’s analysis and conclusion) 478-80

Nepal’s right to suspend UNCAT as between itself and the UK 483-4

Court’s conclusion 483-4

customary international law rule, whether 468

generally jus cogens considerations 467-8

justiciability of unincorporated treaty 472-4

Pinochet (No 3) 463-71

UNCAT exclusion of 464-71

limitation of exclusion to cases of systematic or widespread torture constituting international crimes 468-71

ground 2: UN immunity (UNPIC VI(2) (entitlement of expert to functional immunity)) 484-93

Court’s conclusion 493

UN and ICJ (Immunities and Privileges) Order 1974
express waiver, need for 492

“including the time spent on journeys in connection with service on such missions” 486-8

retroactive waiver 487-8, 491-3

UN and ICJ (Immunities and Privileges) Order 1974 by section
17 (expert on a mission: entitlement to functional immunity) 485-6

17(b) (expert on a mission: immunity from arrest as accorded to a diplomatic agent) 485-6

32 (waiver of immunity) 486-8

ground 3: autrefois convict 493-5

burden of proof 495-7

Court’s conclusion 505

Court’s evaluation of the evidence relating to the civil/criminal nature of Nepalese proceedings against the appellant

Army Act 2006 504-5

Torture Compensation Act 1996 proceedings 502-4

Nepalese legal provisions on torture

Army Act 2006 499-501

Constitution 1990 14(4) 497

legal system in general 496-7

Torture Compensation Act 1996 498-9

LCIA, Rule 25 (interim and conservatory measures) 529-31, 540
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legal certainty/legality principle
Affordable Medicines 330
LSSA 330-3
Youssef 578-81, 583

legal dispute, need for
classification as/requirements (including ICJ 36) (Mavrommatis principle)
FTC/CERD Case 17-23
Interpretation of Peace Treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania 17-18
South West Africa cases 17-18
Sovereign Rights and Maritime Spaces in the Caribbean Sea 17-18
obligation to indicate subject matter (Immunities and Criminal Proceedings (Equatorial Guinea v. France)) 17-18, 92

legality principle: see legal certainty/legality principle; rule of law

legislation, interpretation (conformity with international obligations including customary international law)
Fick 300-2
LSSA 317

Lithuania (1990-) (Republic of): see Svenska
LSSA (SADCTP (2014)) (South African Constitutional Court)

background
international law
importance to South Africa 317
obligation to consider international law when interpreting legislation 317
presidential powers and responsibilities 316-17
legal challenge to 317-18
legality principle 317-18
procedural history
Campbell (SADCT proceedings)/Zimbabwe’s non-compliance 319
High Court proceedings (2018) (declaration of constitutional invalidity of President’s conduct) 318
relevant law (treaty provisions)
SADC 6(1) (compliance obligation) 282, 319, 331-2
SADC 16(5) (final and binding effect of decisions) 319, 331-2
VCLT, applicability as customary international law 325-9
suspension of Tribunal/conclusion of SADCTP (2014) 319-20
Zimbabwe’s responsibility for 329-30
Zimbabwe’s changes to land and agrarian reform programme 318
costs 344
Court’s Order 344-5
jurisdiction/admissibility 320-9
prematurity 321-9
absence of ratification by legislature (Constitution 231(2)) 325
completion of National Executive’s role (Constitution 231(1)) 324
Doctors for Life 321-4
effect of signature 324-5
Geuking 324
obligation not to defeat the object and purpose prior to entry of treaty into force (VCLT 18/VCLT 26) 326-9, 332-3
treaties and legislation distinguished 323-4
merits (constitutionality of President’s conduct) (Court’s analysis)
applicable law for determining, Constitution as 329-30
diplomatic relations/comity, need to build on basis of respect for Bill of Rights and international law 343
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LSSA (SADCTP (2014)) (South African Constitutional Court) (cont.)
jurisdiction over disputes between natural or legal persons and States (SADCTP
(2000) 15(1))
appeal from decisions of the highest national court on same issue between same
parties, possibility of 333-4
signature of SADCTP (2014) removing provision as unlawful, irrational and
unconstitutional 319-20
legality principle 330-3
approval of treaty in breach of Bill of Rights and international law, exclusion 340
conclusion of SADCTP (2014) as breach of SADC Treaty 331-3
means of expressing consent to be bound by treaty (VCLT 11) 326
obligation to act in conformity with Bill of Rights and international law 337-41
obligation not to defeat the object and purpose prior to entry of treaty into force
(VCLT 18/VCLT 26) 340
procedural rationality requirement/rational relationship between amendment and
purpose for which power to amend was exercised 334-7
public participation 342
treaty obligations as obligations of State 329-30
merits (constitutionality of President’s conduct) (concurring opinion (Cameron and
Froneman JJ (Mhlantla J and Petse AJ concurring)) (Constitution vs
international law as basis)) 345-7
remedy (direction to President to withdraw signature from SADCTP (2014)) 343-4

marine environment, protection and preservation (UNCLOS Part XII: Section 6:
enforcement): see also Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS
220(6))
enforcement by coastal States (UNCLOS 220)
as addition to flag States’ jurisdiction 144-5
“any resources of its territorial sea or EEZ” (UNCLOS 220(6)) 148-9
“any” as indication of broad interpretation 148, 176-7
ecosystem-based approach 148-9
effective protection of the environment as a whole as objective 149
evidential requirements for measures under UNCLOS 220(6) as matter of national
law (MARPOL 4(2)) 152
harvested species/species associated with (UNCLOS 61), inclusion of 176-7
“clear objective evidence” (UNCLOS 220(6)) 171-4
“coastline or related interests” (UNCLOS 220(6)) 146-8
Intervention Convention as source 146-8, 175-6
“related interests” (IC II(4)) compared 177-8
graded approach to rights of intervention (UNCLOS 220(3)/UNCLOS 220(5)/
UNCLOS 220(6)) 150-2, 172
“pollution” (UNCLOS 220(5)) 172
limitation of powers to “infringement of applicable international rules and standards”
(UNCLOS 220(3)) 144-5
MARPOL as source of rules governing oil pollution 144-5, 153
proximity principle 145
“threat of major damage” (UNCLOS 220(6)) 152-5, 178-80
dependence on specific circumstances/concrete circumstantial assessment 153-5, 178-9
right to instigate proceedings 152
special area status, relevance in assessing 154, 180-1, 183
“threat of significant pollution” (UNCLOS 220(5)) distinguished 152-3, 173, 177-8
enforcement by flag States (UNCLOS 217) 132-3, 142-3, 145-6
coastal State measures as exception in clearly defined circumstances 153-4
recognition of insufficiency on its own/UNCLOS 220 addition of coastal State powers 144
right to take over coastal State proceedings (UNCLOS 228(1)) 145
measures to avoid pollution arising from maritime casualties (UNCLOS 221) 144

marine pollution: see MARPOL 73/78

MARPOL 73/78
as “applicable international rules and standards regarding ship-source pollution” (UNCLOS 220(3)) 144-5
EU, whether binding on Directive 2005/35/EC (MARPOL as source of international rules and standards) 153
good faith/sincere cooperation obligation (TEU 4(3)) to take into account 170

Martinson (direct applicability of treaties) 196-8
Court’s analysis 196-8
ICESCR, Estonia’s implementation obligation 197-8
participation of appellant in Court proceedings 196-7
treaties and municipal law
applicability of treaty in absence of conflict 197-8
conflict with [implementing] legislation 197-8
direct effect, requirements 197-8
treaty as aid to interpretation of law 197-8
Court’s decision 196, 198

Montreal Convention (1999) (MC)
interpretation
“accident” (MC 17.1) 415-27: see also “accident” (WC 17/MC 17.1); Ford desirability of uniformity/international jurisprudence as aid 418
object and purpose (unification of laws of contracting parties) 416-17
as sole source of remedy for injury (MC 29) 413-16
summary of provisions 416-18

negotiation as means of dispute settlement
Financing of Terrorism Case 23-9, 92-6
genuine attempt to engage in discussions to resolve dispute requirement 23-4, 92-6

Nepal: see also Lama
Army Act 2006 by section
37 (offences) 499-501
62 (corruption, theft, torture and disappearance) 499-501, 504-5
68 (exclusion of s 62 offences from Courts Martial jurisdiction) 499-501
70 (double jeopardy) 499-501
101 (penalties) 499-501
105(1) (departmental action) 499-501
autrefois convict 493-7, 503
Constitution (Kingdom of Nepal) 2047 (1990) by article, 14(4) (torture) 497
Country Code (combined civil/criminal code), torture, provisions relating to 497
Torture Compensation Act 1996 by section
Preamble 498-9
3 (prohibition of torture/examination of the detained) 498-9
4 (compensation) 498-9
7 (prosecution of the perpetrator) 498-9, 502-4
non-discrimination obligation (ECHR 14) (Markin) 231

Norway

Court of Justice Act by section, 6(2) (referral to a Grand Chamber) 204
Criminal Code 2005 by section
1(2) (limitations derived from treaty or general international law) 205, 207, 211, 214-16
167 (operating without required permit/authorization) 212-14
Marine Resources Act 2008 (updated 2013) by section
1 (purpose) 206
6 (applicability subject to international law) 207, 210-11, 214-16
16(c) (adoption of regulations: prohibition in certain areas of certain species/using certain types of gear) 202, 206
61 (contravention of provisions on harvesting operations) 207
Norwegian Snow Crab Regulations: see Norwegian Snow Crab Case
treaties and municipal law, primacy in case of inconsistency/conflict, resolution by civil action 215
UNCLOS, interpretation in accordance with VCLT as expression of customary international law 208

Norwegian Snow Crab Case 201-16

background
Court’s task (equal rights under the Spitzbergen Treaty) 201
facts 201-2, 205-6
description of the snow crab 208-9
parties’ arguments
appellants 204-5
Public Prosecution Authority 204-5
procedural history
Eastern Finnmark District Court 202-3
Grand Chamber, referral to 204
Hålogaland Court of Appeal 203
Supreme Court’s leave to appeal 204
Court’s analysis 205-16
interpretation of UNCLOS (VCLT 31 and VCLT 32) 208
Norway’s right to impose penalties 211-16
civil action as appropriate means for resolving dispute on international obligations 215
civil action as effective remedy (ECHR 13) 215
Criminal Code, s 167 (operating without required permit/authorization) 212-14
equal treatment obligations (Svalbard (Spitsbergen) Treaty provisions) 211-12, 214-16
regulatory system, Norway’s right to enforce 212
status of snow crab as sedentary species (UNCLOS 77(4)) 204-5, 207-11
Court’s decision 216
relevant Norwegian law
Coastguard Act by section, 36(1)(a) (penalty notice: disrespect of order to remove pots) 202
Criminal Code 2005
1(2) (limitations derived from treaty or general international law) 205, 207, 211, 214-16
167 (operating without required permit/authorization) 212-13
Marine Resources Act 2008/13 by section
1 (purpose) 206
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6 (applicability subject to international law) 207, 210-11, 214-16
16(c) (adoption of regulations: prohibition in certain areas of certain species/using certain types of gear) 202, 206
61 (contravention of provisions on harvesting operations) 207
Snow Crab Regulations by section
1 (prohibition of snow crab fishing in marine territories, internal waters and on the Norwegian continental shelf) 206-7
2(1) (exemptions) 201, 206-7, 211
5 (limitation of licences to Norwegian citizens) 206-7
5(1) (penalty notices) 202
relevant treaties
Svalbard (Spitsbergen) Treaty (1920)
1 (Norway’s sovereignty over archipelago) 211-12
2 (equal treatment obligation (fishing and hunting rights)) 201, 211-12
3 (equal treatment obligation (access and entry)) 211-12
applicability beyond 12 nautical miles 203
UNCLOS 77 (coastal States’ rights over the continental shelf) 203, 207
compatibility of the Snow Crab Regulations 203

Nour (OSJA Guidance)
background (factual)
DES programme 514-15
OSJA assessment process 509-12
OSJA assessment under review (third) 515-16
SAF human rights/IHL record 512-13
background (law on justiciability) 517
assessment of political or reputational risk, non-justiciability 517
reasonableness/rationality (Wednesbury principle) 517-22
second-guessing, exclusion 517
background (procedural)
the issue (rationality of “amber” decision) 512
parties’ arguments
claimant 508-9
defendant 509
sufficiency of applicant’s interest 509
claim 1: failure of defendant to gather information about the effects of past training and assistance 518-19
Court’s conclusion 519
claim 2: irrationality of third OSJA assessment 519-20
Court’s conclusions 519-20
claim 3: irrationality of third OSJA assessment/“no reasonable person” test 520-1
Court’s conclusion 521
claim 4: change from “military operations” to “lethal operations” as illegal change of policy 521-2
Court’s conclusion 522
Court’s conclusion 522

Nuremberg Charter (1945), limitation of individual responsibility to natural persons 637-8, 641-3, 670-3

pacta sunt servanda/good faith observance of treaties (VCLT 26)
customary international law (CIL) and 326-9, 332-3, 340
obligation not to frustrate object and purpose 326-9, 332-3, 340
Pearl (State immunity of a separate entity)

background (factual)
contract for the exploitation of KRI gasfields (Heads of Agreement (HoA))
conclusion (4 April 2007) 526
key provisions 527-8
Kurdistan’s status as separate entity (SIA 14) 526
absence of SIA 14(5) order of immunity as if it were a State 526

background (procedural history in chronological order)
mediation/arbitration proceedings (HoA 16) 528-9
cessation of payments by respondents 528-9
application for interim measures order (LCIA Rule 25)
claimants’ contentions 529-31
claimants’ reply 532-3
respondent’s response 531-2

Arbitrators’ Ruling on Interim Measures (10 July 2014) 533-4
claimants’ application for peremptory order for payment 534
Arbitrators’ peremptory order (17 October 2014) 534-7

Tribunal’s permission to make application for enforcement of peremptory order
(AA 42(2)(b)) 537
Partial Final Award (30 June 2015) 537
respondent’s letter notifying claimants of the termination of arrangements for local sales 537-8
respondent’s letter rejecting claimants’ entitlement to payments for lifted petroleum products 537-8
respondent’s letter to Arbitrators asking for determination of respondent’s counterclaims prior to enforceable final payment award 538
application/counter-application 526

Court’s decision 563

issue 1: Arbitrators’ jurisdiction (AA 41/LCIA Rule 25) to make peremptory order (AA 42) 538-45

non-compliance with order made for the proper and expeditious conduct of the arbitral proceedings (AA 40(1)/AA 41(1)), whether limited to 540-4
AA 39 (power to make provisional award), applicability to interim measures 540
AA 39(2) (provisional award for payment of money) 541-2
arbitrators’ power to make a peremptory order (AA 41(5)) 540
Court’s conclusions 542-4
requirement for arbitrators to spell out the purpose of their award 543-4
respondent’s arguments 540-2
opportunity for respondent to show sufficient cause for non-compliance (AA 41(5)) 544-5

issue 2: immunity of respondent (SIA 14) 539, 545-59
relevant SIA sections
1(1) (immunity from jurisdiction) 547
2(1) (submission to the jurisdiction) 547
9(1) (arbitrations: waiver of immunity) 546
13(2) (specific performance; enforcement process) 546-7
13(3) (waiver of enforcement measures) 546-7
14 (States entitled to immunities and privileges) (text) 546
SIA 9(1) (agreement to arbitration as preclusion of immunity in proceedings “which relate to the arbitration”) 554-5
SIA 13(2)(a) (relief by way of injunction, exclusion)
applicability in case of an AA 42 order for enforcement of peremptory orders 555-7
“waives . . . any claim to immunity for itself and assets”, whether extending to SIA 13(2) forms of relief 557-9
SIA 14(2)(a) (“anything done in the exercise of sovereign authority”)
long-term grant of oil rights as acta imperii 547-53
as reference to the authority of the sovereign State 553-4
SIA 14(3) (submission to the jurisdiction by separate entity, whether exclusion of separate entity from SIA 13 protection) 555

issue 3: due exercise of Court’s discretionary power 540
factors to be taken into account 559-63

preliminary ruling (CJEU) (TFEU 267)
interpretation of mixed agreement (“integral part of EU legal order” requirement) 140, 170
Bosphorus Queen Shipping 140

provisional measures: see provisional measures (ICJ 41); provisional measures (including ICJ 41), jurisprudence; provisional measures, purpose/requirements

provisional measures (ICJ 41) as autonomous regime 83-6
binding force/compliance obligation 83-6
non-compliance, reparation in case of 85-6
prompt determination of breach/non-compliance, need for 84-5
State responsibility and 84
Court’s power to act “if it considers that circumstances so require” (ICJ 41(1)) (inherent power/discretionary nature), non-discretionary powers distinguished 47
Court’s right to indicate measures other than those requested (ROC 75(2)) 42-3
interlocutory injunction compared 46
measures requested/ordered
compliance with treaty 43-4
measures to ensure the availability of education in the Ukrainian language 43-4, 88-113, 120-2
retraining from action which might prejudice rights/aggravate or extend dispute 44
retraining from limitations on Crimean Tatar community’s ability to conserve its representative institutions 43-4, 88-113, 120-2

provisional measures (including ICJ 41), jurisprudence: see also Financing of Terrorism Convention/CERD Case (Ukraine v. Russia) (Provisional Measures)
Certain Activities Carried Out by Nicaragua in the Border Area 50
Fisheries Jurisdiction 54-5
Immunities and Criminal Proceedings (Equatorial Guinea v. France) 29-30, 39, 42-3, 46, 107-8, 116
Maritime Boundary in the Atlantic Ocean (Ghana/Côte d’Ivoire) 54-5
Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite 49-50
Passage through the Great Belt 49-50, 54-5
Pulp Mills 54-5
Temple of Preah Vihear 43
Timor-Leste Case 54-5

provisional measures, purpose/requirements
balance of parties’ rights/respect for 54-5
connection with dispute before Court 38-9, 111-13
plausibility of rights to be protected 29-38, 47-51, 57-73
prevention of aggravation or extension of dispute 43
prevention of irreparable damage or prejudice, serious/imminent risk test 41-2, 51-2, 107-11
respect for individual rights, the obligations of States parties and the right of States parties to seek compliance, interrelationship 38, 86-8
provisional measures, purpose/requirements (cont.)
urgency
jurisprudence
Financing of Terrorism Convention/CERD Case 41-2, 56
Timor-Leste Case 56
real and imminent risk of irreparable prejudice requirement 41-2, 51-2, 107-11
vulnerability of the population 57-73

recognition/enforcement of foreign arbitral award
grounds for refusal (NYC 5), NYC 5(1)(e) (absence of final binding award/“has been set aside or suspended”) 389-90
res judicata/issue estoppel
interim judgment as basis for 392
Svenska 355-6, 385-93

recognition/enforcement of foreign judgment or arbitral award against State (including State immunity considerations), jurisprudence
Fick 279-303: see also Fick
Svenska 355-6, 385-93: see also Svenska

recognition/enforcement of foreign judgment (including State immunity considerations)
comity 298
judgment of SADC Tribunal 279-303: see also Fick
requirements
consistency with public policy 291-2
final and binding judgment 291-2
jurisdiction of court pronouncing judgment 292-6
non-enforcement of a penal or revenue law of the foreign State 291-2
correlation between grounds for objection raised before tribunal pronouncing judgment and before enforcing court 294-5
reciprocity 298
treaty obligation to give effect to judgment, SADCT Protocol 32 (enforcement and execution) 289-90

Refugee Convention (1951)
non-application on grounds of “actions contrary to the purposes and principles of the UN” (RC 1F(c))
Al-Sirri 445
terrorism as 445
non-application on grounds of crime against peace, war crime or crime against humanity (RC 1F(a))
“as defined in the international instruments”, QD 12(2)(a) 406-8
jurisprudence
AA-R (Iran) 406-8
JS (Sri Lanka) 406, 408
non-application to “persons who instigate or otherwise participate in the commission of the crimes or acts” (QD 12(3)) 408
(RC 1F(a)) 406-8

rule of law (Entick principle) 578-81, 583, 602-3: see also legal certainty/legality principle
Russian ECHR Ratification Law Case (ECtHR judgments, compliance obligation (ECHR 46))
admissibility 221
Court’s analysis
Constitutional Court as authority for review of constitutionality of legislative provisions censored by the ECtHR 236-7
ECtHR complementarity to Russian courts 223
as integral part of Russia’s legal system (Constitution 15(4)) 221-5
individual’s right of appeal to international courts 221-2
judgments based on an interpretation contrary to VCLT 31 225-7
judicial protection, constitutional provisions providing for 222 jurisprudence (Austria), Case B267/86 of 14 October 1987 230 jurisprudence (ECtHR) Görgül 228-9 Hirst 230 Maggio 229-30 jurisprudence (Russia)
Judgment No 4-P of 26 February 2010 222, 232-4 Judgment No 10-P of 7 June 2000 223-5 Judgment No 27-P of 6 December 2013 222, 232-5, 237-8 “manifest” (VCLT 46(2)) 226-7 Member States’ right to set higher standards (ECHR 53) 223-5, 227-32 subsidiarity principle/exhaustion of local remedies requirement (ECHR 35) 223 subsidiarity principle/margin of appreciation, importance 236-7 treaties in violation of internal law, effect (VCLT 46(1)) 225-7 treaty obligations, primacy in case of conflict with constitutional principles 223-7 Court’s decision
Constitutional Court as authority for review of constitutionality of legislative provisions censored by the ECtHR 239 non-execution of ECtHR judgment deemed by Constitutional Court to conflict with Russian constitutional principles 239-40 possibility of a new special mechanism to decide on implementation of ECtHR judgments 240 recognition of interrelationship between ECHR Ratification Law and other legislative provisions 238-9 right of President/Government to seek opinion of Constitutional Court in case of ambiguity 240 subsidiarity principle/exhaustion of local remedies 239 procedural history 219-20 relevant law Administrative Procedure Code by article 15(1) (applicable law in administrative cases) 219-21, 232-6 15(4) (applicable law in administrative cases: primacy of treaty) 219-21, 232-6 Civil Procedure Code by article 11(1) (applicable law in civil cases) 219-21, 232-6 11(4) (applicable law in civil cases: primacy of treaty) 219-21, 232-6 392(4)(4) (review of judicial decisions on grounds of new facts: ECtHR finding of breach of ECHR) 220-1, 232-6 Commercial Procedure Code 2002 by article 311(3) (grounds for revision of judicial acts: criminal actions of party to case or judge) 219-21, 232-6 311(4) (grounds for revision of judicial acts: repeal of judicial act) 219-21, 232-6 Constitution 1993 (including 1999 amendments) by article 2 (protection of fundamental rights) 222-3
Russian ECHR Ratification Law Case (ECtHR judgments, compliance obligation (ECHR 46)) (cont.)
15(4) (generally recognized principles and norms of international law including treaties as part of the law of/primacy) 221-3, 225-7
46(3) (judicial protection: appeal to international courts) 221-3
79 (transfer of powers to intergovernmental organizations) 221-5
Criminal Procedure Code 2001 (CCrP) by article, 413(4)(2) (reopening of proceedings because of new circumstances: breach of ECHR established by ECtHR) 219-20, 232-6
ECtHR Ratification Law by article 1 (ECtHR jurisdiction) 220-1
32(1) (responsibility for execution of treaties: President and Government) 219-21, 232-6
ECtHR judgments, compliance obligation (ECHR 46) 222-3
jurisprudence (Russia) 222

Russian Federation (1991-)
Administrative Procedure Code by article
15(1) (applicable law in administrative cases) 219-21, 232-6
15(4) (applicable law in administrative cases: primacy of treaty) 219-21, 232-6
Civil Procedure Code (2002) by article
11(1) (applicable law in civil cases) 219-21, 232-6
11(4) (applicable law in civil cases: primacy of treaty) 219-21, 232-6
392(4)(4) (review of judicial decisions on grounds of new facts: ECtHR finding of breach of ECHR) 220-1, 232-6
Commercial Procedure Code 2002 by article
311(3) (grounds for revision of judicial acts: criminal actions of party to case or judge) 219-21, 232-6
Note: also known as the Arbitration Procedural Code.
311(4) (grounds for revision of judicial acts: repeal of judicial act) 219-21, 232-6
Constitution 1993 (including 1999 amendments) by article
Preamble 223-5
2 (fundamental rights and freedoms: supreme importance/obligation to protect) 222-3, 227-32
4(1) (sovereignty of Russian Federation) 223-5
15(1) (Constitution: primacy) 223-7
15(4) (generally recognized principles and norms of international law including treaties as part of the law of/primacy) 221-3, 225-7
17(1) (protection of fundamental rights under international law and the Constitution) 223-5
17(3) (fundamental rights: non-interference with rights and freedoms of others) 228
46(1) (judicial protection) 223
46(3) (judicial protection: appeal to international courts) 221-3
79 (transfer of powers to intergovernmental organizations) 221-7
120(1) (judicial independence) 223, 232-6
125(2) (Constitutional Court: competence) 223
125(5) (Constitutional Court: interpretation of the Constitution) 235-6
125(6) (invalidity of unconstitutional acts) 225-7
126 (Supreme Court) 223
Criminal Code (CC) (1996 as amended 2012) by article
59(1) (death penalty: exclusion other than for exceptionally grave offences) 187, 192
59(2)(1) (death penalty: exclusion in case of extradited persons) 192
Criminal Procedure Code 2001 (CCrP) by article, 413(4)(2) (reopening of proceeding because of new circumstances: breach of ECHR established by ECtHR) 219-21, 232-6
ECtHR Ratification Law, 1 (ECtHR jurisdiction) 220-1
ECtHR judgments, binding force/compliance obligation (ECtHR 46) 219-40
treaties
32(2) (responsibility for execution of treaties: federal executive bodies) 219-21, 232-6
primony 219-20
Russian National Extradition Case (Austrian Supreme Court) 186-93
Court’s analysis 189-93
abolition of death penalty in extraditing State/non-applicability to extradited persons, relevance 192
comprehensive examination of permissibility of the extradition in light of requirements for and obstacles to/criteria 189-93
binding effect of government assurance [on local authorities] 191-3
objective evidence of practices contrary to ECHR principles 191-2
conditions imposed by requested State effective monitoring system, need for 188
non-observance of conditions leading to refusal of future extraditions, relevance 192
sufficiency 191
Court’s decision 186-7
procedural history
Appeal Court (conditions/acceptance of assurances) 188
Higher Regional Court (conditions/acceptance of assurances) 187-8
Vienna Regional Criminal Court 187

SADC Extradition Protocol (2002), extradition, assurances on death penalty (EP 5(c)) 253-4, 266
SADC Treaty (1992)
amendment procedure (SADC 36) 282-3
rational relationship between amendment and purpose for which power to amend was exercised 334-7
compliance obligation (SADC 6(1)) 282, 319, 331-2
cooperation with SADC institutions obligation (SADC 6(5)) 282, 303
human rights, democracy and the rule of law (SADC 4(c)) 281-2, 331-2
access to the courts/judicial protection 299-301
incorporation with “the force of national law” obligation (SADC 6(5)) 282
object and purpose (achievement of regional developmental goals) 281-2
SADC Tribunal (SADCT): see also Fick; LSSA
enforcement and execution of decisions (SADCTP (2000) 32)
binding effect on parties (SADCTP (2000) 32(3)) 295-6, 299
SADC Tribunal (SADCT) (cont.)
final and binding effect of decisions (SADC 16(5)) 295-6, 319, 331-2
“law and rules . . . in force in the . . . State in which the judgment is to be enforced” (SADCTP (2000) 32(1)) 298-9
non-compliance, referral to Summit (SADCTP (2000) 32(5)) 284
obligation to take measures necessary to ensure execution (SADCTP (2000) 32(2)) 288-90, 298-302
State immunity considerations 289-90
exhaustion of local and administrative remedies (SADCTP (2000) 15(2)) 295-6, 333-4
jurisdiction (SADCTP (2000) 14-22)
dispute relating to human rights, democracy and the rule of law (SADC 4(c)) 281-2
dispute relating to interpretation and application of SADC Treaty (SADCTP (2000) 14(a)) 295-6
disputes between natural or legal persons and States (SADCTP (2000) 15(1)) 295-6: see also LSSA
appeal from decisions of the highest national court on same issue between same parties: possibility of 333-4
omission of provision (SADCTP (2014)) limitation of jurisdiction to disputes between Member States (SADCTP (2014) 33) 319-20
submission to acceptance of Treaty/Protocol as 285-6, 296
objections to the jurisdiction as 295-6
role (guardians of adherence to and proper interpretation of SADC Treaty/dispute settlement) (SADC 16(1)) 282, 331-2
SADCTP (2000)
failure to pass ratification hurdle/amendment of SADC Treaty to resolve problem 282-3, 295
as integral part of SADC Treaty (SADC 16(2)) (SADC Amending Agreement (2001)) 282-3, 285-6, 296
SADCTP (2014), conclusion as breach of SADC Treaty 319-20, 331-3
suspension of Tribunal 319-20
Zimbabwe’s responsibility for 329-30
sanctions (Al-Qaida/Taliban), UNSCRs relating to
1267 (1999) (asset freeze (para. 4(b))) 568
1617 (2005)
text (para. 2) 568-9
“associated with” 568-9
1822 (2008) (“narrative summary of reasons” requirement) 596
1904 (2009) (Sanctions Committee: list/Ombudsperson) 570-2, 581, 592-4
2083 (2012) 572, 581, 605
Sanctions Committee (1267 Committee), listing, consequences of, economic effect on the individual 567
Sanctions Committee (1267 Committee), listing procedure
designation (standard of proof)
“reasonable and credible” (Ombudsperson’s report (2011)) 570-2, 581, 605, 609-10
“reasonable grounds for suspicion” vs balance of probabilities 567-8, 577-83, 595-6, 603-10
“reasonable grounds”/“reasonable basis”
FATF Recommendations 582, 608-10
UNSCR 2083 (2012) 581, 605
“reasonable suspicion” (UNSCR 1617) (in light of object and purpose) 581-2
evidence possibly based on torture, obligation of individual Member States to inquire into 587-91
INDEX 735

“narrative summary of reasons” requirement (UNSCR 1822) 596
unanimity requirement 567, 569, 589

Security Council resolutions (UNSCRs)
judicial review of decision based on decision of international body responsible for implementation 599, 613
judicial review/justiciability/compliance obligation, jurisprudence
Ahmed 569, 572-3, 580, 584-5, 592, 604-10, 613
Yousef; see Yousef

Security Council resolutions (UNSCRs) by number and year
1822 (2008) (terrorist acts) 596
1904 (2009) (Sanctions Committee: list/Ombudsperson) 570-2, 581
2202 (2015) (Package of Measures for the Implementation of the Minsk Agreements) 43-4

sedentary fisheries, rights to
continental shelf (UNCLOS 77), Norwegian Snow Crab Case 201-16
“sedentary species” (UNCLOS 77(4)) 207-11

separation of powers, common law judicial review as regulator of 585-6

ship-source pollution and the introduction of penalties for infringements, Directive 2005/35/EC: see also Bosphorus Queen Shipping (interpretation of UNCLOS 220(6))
apPLICability (2005/35/EC 3(1)) 134
enforcement by coastal States with respect to ships in transit (2005/35/EC 7) 134-5
“in accordance with international law” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) (including UNCLOS 220(6)) 134, 146, 155-7, 171
“any resources” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 176-7, 183
harvested species/species associated with (UNCLOS 61), inclusion of 176-7
“clear objective evidence” requirement (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 153, 157, 171-4, 182
“coastline or related interests” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 149, 157, 174-6, 182
evidence to be taken into account in assessing the consequences of a violation under 2005/35/EC 178-80, 183
as reinforcement of flag States’ responsibility for 144
“threat of major damage” (2005/35/EC 7(2)) 151-2, 155
“significant pollution” (UNCLOS 220(5)), relevance 177-8, 183
special area status, relevance in assessing 154, 180-1, 183
MARPOL and
good faith/sincere cooperation obligation (TEU 4(3)) to take into account 170
harmonization of Member State implementation of as objective (2005/35/EC rectials 2 and 3) 133-5
penalties (2005/35/EC 8), “effective, proportionate and dissuasive” requirement (2005/35/EC 8(1)) 152
standards stricter than UNCLOS, exclusion, Member States’ right to take more stringent measures “in conformity with international law” (2005/35/EC 1(2)) (including UNCLOS 220(6)) 134, 146, 155-7, 181-2, 184
text (extracts) 133-5, 157

South Africa
comity, respect for Bill of Rights and international law as basis 343
Constitution Act 200 of 1993 (Interim Constitution) by section, Chapter 3 (fundamental rights)
9 (right to life) 255
10 (respect for dignity) 255
39(1)(c) (interpretation of Bill of Rights: consideration of foreign law) 298
Constitution Act 200 of 1993 (Interim Constitution) by section, Chapter 4 (Parliament), 59 (public access to and involvement in National Assembly) 342
South Africa (cont.)
Constitution Act 200 of 1993 (Interim Constitution) by section, Chapter 15 (general and transitional provisions) by section, 231(2) (international agreements: approval by legislature) 330-1
Constitution Act 108 of 1996 (including amendments) by section, Chapter 1 (Founding Provisions)
1(a) (human dignity, equality and advancement of human rights as underlying values) 251-3
1(c) (supremacy of the Constitution and rule of law) 286, 299-301
2 (supremacy of the Constitution) 251-3
Constitution Act 108 of 1996 (including amendments) by section, Chapter 2 (Bill of Rights)
7(1) (Bill of Rights as cornerstone of democracy) 251-3, 338-9
7(2) (obligation to respect, protect, promote and fulfil Bill of Rights) 249-53, 338-9, 345-7
7(2) (obligation to respect, protect, promote and fulfil Bill of Rights), jurisprudence, Carmichele 262, 307-8, 311
7(3) (limitations on rights in Bill of Rights) 251-3
8(1) (application to State organs) 251-3, 299-301, 338-9, 345-7
Glenister 300
SARFU 300
8(3) (development of the common law) 300-1
9(1) (equality before the law) 251-3
10 (human dignity) 251-3
11 (life) 251-3
12 (freedom and security of person) 251-3
34 (access to courts/fair trial) 286, 299-301
Fick 299-301
Mjeni 299-301
39(1)(b) (interpretation: “must consider international law”) 288-9, 298, 301-2, 317
Constitution Act 108 of 1996 (including amendments) by section, Chapter 4 (Parliament)
59 (public access to and involvement in National Assembly) 342
59(1) (public access to and involvement in National Assembly), text 342
59(1) (public access to and involvement in National Assembly), jurisprudence, LSSA 342
72 (public access to and involvement in National Council) 342
Constitution Act 108 of 1996 (including amendments) by section, Chapter 5 (President and National Executive)
legal challenge to exercise of 317-18: see also LSSA
legality principle 317-18, 330-3
Constitution Act 108 of 1996 (including amendments) by section, Chapter 6 (Provinces), 18(1) (public access to and involvement in provincial legislatures) 342
Constitution Act 108 of 1996 (including amendments) by section, Chapter 14 (general provisions)
231 (international agreements): see also Fick
Albutt 337-8
Fick 288-9, 337-40
Glenister 288-9, 299, 301-2, 338
LSSA 324, 337-41
231(1) (negotiation and signing of treaties as responsibility of national executive) 324
obligation to act in conformity with Bill of Rights and international law 337-41
INDEX

231(2) (international agreements: approval by legislature) 323, 325, 327-9
  approval of treaty in breach of Bill of Rights and international law, exclusion 340
232 (customary international law as law in the Republic) 317, 327-8
233 (interpretation of law: consistency with international law) 302, 317, 338-9
Constitution Act 108 of 1996 (including amendments) by section, Schedule 6
  (transitional arrangements), 3(1)(b) (replacement of Senate by National Council of Provinces (NCOP)) 281
Constitutional Court
  jurisdiction/admissibility, jurisprudence
  Doctors for Life 321-4
  Fick 286, 303, 304
  Geuking 324
  prematurity 321-9
“constitutional matter”
  Constitutional Court’s jurisdiction, limitation to 286, 303, 304
  human rights/rule of law issues 286, 303, 304
Extradition Act of 1962 by section
  11(b)(iii) (rejection of extradition request: grounds) 254-5
  as long-standing provision 262-3
  text 246-7
extradition in case of death penalty
  death penalty reservation in extradition agreement, relevance 253-4
  jurisprudence
    Makwanyane 255-6
    Mohamed 246-7, 249-51, 254-68, 270-6
    Tsebe 243-76: see also Tsebe
  overriding importance of Constitution 7(2) obligations 266-8
extraterritorial jurisdiction including extraterritorial enforcement of legislation by legislating State
  applicability/examples of
Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act 2004 264
Foreign States Immunities Act 1981: see FSIA 1981 (South Africa)
Immigration Act 13 of 2002 by section
  32(2) (deportation of illegal foreigner) 247
  “deport” 263-4
  need to read consistently with the Constitution 262-3
  49(1)(b) (failure of illegal foreigner to depart when ordered to do so) 263-4
  inhuman or degrading treatment (Constitution Act 3) 255
  judicial review/justiciability, standard of review/grounds (procedural rationality requirement) 334-7
Affordable Medicines 334-5
Albutt 334-5
Democratic Alliance 334-5
LSSA 334-7
Masetha 335-6
Simelane 335-6
Traub 335-6
Zenzile 335-6
legislation, interpretation
  conformity with the Constitution 262-4
South Africa (cont.)
consistency with international law (Constitution 233) 302, 317, 338-9
recognition/enforcement of foreign judgment [against State]
common law as applicable law 298-9
need for development in relation to judgment of international tribunal 297-302
Enforcement of Foreign Civil Judgments Act (EA), applicability (EA 2(1))
“any country” as impediment to judgments of international tribunals 291
designated judgments, limitation to 291
Magistrates’ Courts proceedings, limitation to 291
international tribunal judgments, applicability to 286
non-applicability 298-9
recognition/enforcement of foreign judgment [against State], requirements
consistency with public policy 291-2
domicile/residence “within the State in which the foreign court exercised jurisdiction”
(Purser v. Sales) 291-2, 296-7
final and binding judgment 291-2
jurisdiction of tribunal pronouncing judgment 292-6
correlation between grounds of objection before tribunal pronouncing judgment
and before enforcing court 294-5
non-enforcement of a penal or revenue law of the foreign State 291-2
SADC Treaty (1992), non-ratification of: see Fick; LSSA
State immunity, waiver
acceptance of SADC Treaty/SADCT Protocol as 285-6, 289-90, 296
implied/submission to the jurisdiction, challenge to jurisdiction/assertion of
immunity 295-6
treaties
amendment (VCLT 39-41) (rational relationship between amendment and purpose
for which power to amend was exercised) 334-7
conclusion (VCLT 6-18)
means of expressing consent to be bound (VCLT 11) 326
obligation not to defeat the object and purpose prior to entry into force (VCLT
18) 326-9, 332-3, 340
VCLT (1969)
applicability as customary international law 325-9
Fick 325-6
Glenister 325-6
Goodwin 325-6
Harken 325-6
LSSA 325-9
Makwanyane 325-6
Quaglioni 325-6
Van Rooyen 325-6
speciality (extradition), assurances by requesting State 188-9
Spitsbergen: see Svalbard (Spitsbergen) Treaty (1920)
State immunity
classification of act as jure imperii or jure gestionis 547-53
entitlement of individual/official acting in official capacity, Pinochet (No 3) 463-71
entitlement of State agency/State-owned corporation/State entity, act in exercise of
sovereign authority, of the sovereign State 553-4
as preliminary issue/desirability of determination at early stage 617, 621, 627
treatment/doctrine (Pinochet (No 3)) 463-71
waiver
acceptance of ICC Rules of Arbitration as 393-402
acceptance of SADC/SADCT Protocol as 285-6, 289-90
express/clear and unequivocal waiver, need for 557-9
implied/submission to the jurisdiction: see State Immunity Act 1978 (UK) (SIA) by section (Part I (proceedings in the UK by or against other States)), 2(1) (submission to the jurisdiction)
implied/submission to the jurisdiction, challenge to jurisdiction/assertion of immunity 295-6
Svenska 393-402
waiver of immunity from execution and from jurisdiction, relationship 557-9
State Immunity Act 1978 (UK) (SIA) by section (Part I (proceedings in the UK by or against other States))
2(1) (submission to the jurisdiction) 547
2(2) (submission after dispute has arisen or by prior written agreement) 547
3(1) (exceptions to immunity in proceedings relating to), “relating to” 401-2
3(1)(a) (commercial transaction exception) 399-402
3(3) (“commercial transaction”) 399-401
9(1) (waiver: arbitration agreement) 393-7, 546
“proceedings ... which relate to the arbitration” 554-5
enforcement proceedings, whether 395-7, 554-5
13(2) (specific performance; enforcement process) 546-7
application for injunction (Arbitration Act 44(2)(e)) distinguished 555-7
13(3) (waiver of enforcement measures) 546-7
“provision merely submitting to the jurisdiction of the courts is not to be regarded as a consent [to relief]” 557-9
14 (States entitled to immunities and privileges) 546
14(2)(a) (separate entity in exercise of sovereign authority)
“sovereign authority” 547-53
of the sovereign State 553-4
14(3) (submission to the jurisdiction by separate entity other than central bank or other monetary authority), whether exclusion of separate entity from SIA 13 protection 555
subsidiarity principle (ECtHR/municipal courts) 223, 236-7, 239
Sudan, human rights/IHL record: see Nour
Svalbard (Spitsbergen) Treaty (1920)
equal treatment obligation (Svalbard 2 and Svalbard 3), Norwegian Snow Crab Case 201-16
territorial applicability 203
Svenska: see Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (background); Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (finality of first award/issue estoppel); Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (interpretation of the Agreement) (applicable law (Agreement 35.2)); Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (interpretation of the Agreement) (common intention to submit disputes between Svenska and the Government to arbitration) (Court’s analysis); Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (interpretation of the Agreement) (common intention to submit disputes between Svenska and the Government to arbitration) (Court’s conclusions based on the available evidence); Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (State immunity)
Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (background)
Agreement by article (text)
9 (settlement of disputes) 352-3
35 (governing law and sovereign immunity) 353
Agreement (Government’s signature/rubric) (text) 352
Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (background) (cont.)
arbitration proceedings
jurisdiction (“first award”) 353
merits (“second award”) 354
enforcement proceedings (in date order)
order of 7 April 2004 (Morrison J) giving Svenska permission to enforce the award 354
Lithuania’s application of 31 August 2004 to have Morrison J’s order set aside 354
Svenska’s application of 24 November 2004 to Lithuania’s action struck out 354
Deputy Judge Teare’s dismissal (11 January 2005) of Svenska application 354
hearing before Gloster J (4–9 July 2005)/issues considered 354–5
judgment of Gloster J (4 November 2005) 355–6
summary of appeal issues 356
summary of dispute 351–2
Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (finality of first award/issue estopped) 385–93
admission of expert evidence on Danish law, propriety 387–9
Court’s finding that the Government had agreed to submit to arbitration as resolution of issue 385–6
right to challenge first award under Danish law (as applicable law) 386–7
finality of first award, reasons 389
interim judgment as basis for issue estoppel 392
proceedings before the Deputy Judge, effect 390–3
Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (interpretation of the Agreement) (applicable law (Agreement 35.2)) 356–85
applicability of the laws of Lithuania
Gloster J’s summary of the principles of the applicable Lithuanian law/parties’ subjective intention 358–9
“parties’ subjective intention”, parties’ problems with 358–9
applicability of “rules of international business activities generally accepted” 357–8
Court’s decision 358
Gloster J’s view 357
parties’ positions 357
“rules of international business activities”, definition/sources 358
interpretation of contract governed by foreign law, approach to 356–7
Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (interpretation of the Agreement) (common intention to submit disputes between Svenska and the Government to arbitration) (Court’s analysis)
appellants’ position (signature as administrative matter not incurring obligations) 360–1
development of the text during the negotiations (in chronological order)
Letter of Intent and Addendum 363–6
Court’s conclusion 365–6
Gloster J’s conclusion 364–5
first draft agreement 366–9
Court’s conclusion 368–9
Gloster J’s conclusion 368
second draft agreement, Gloster J’s conclusion 369
third draft agreement 369–70
Art. XXIII (consultation, arbitration and governing law) (text) 370–1
fourth draft agreement 369–72
choice of ICC over ICSID arbitration rules 372
Lithuania’s refusal to accept primacy of the rules of international business activities generally accepted 372
major changes introduced by 369–70
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replacement of Art. XXIII of third draft by Art. 35 (Governing Law and Sovereign
Immunity) and Art. 9 (Settlement of Disputes) 371
fifth draft agreement 372
sixth draft agreement 372-4
absence of explanation for omission of arbitration from Art. 35 373
addition of arbitration to Art. 9 372-3
omission of reference to arbitration from Art. 35 372-3
final version of Agreement Arts. 9 and 35, interpretation of Agreement Art. 9 to
include the Government, exclusion 374
“Disputes between the Founders” (Agreement Art. 9.1), applicability to Government
evidence derived from the negotiations 362-3
interpretation of “Founders” by reference to Agreement 362
“legally and contractually bound as if it were a signatory to the Agreement” (rubric to
signature)
constitutional and economic changes in Lithuania during negotiations, relevance 361
as evidence of intention to undertake obligations 361
Lithuanian decisions on arbitrability, relevance 382-5
“signed”/“became party to”, relevance of any distinction 360-1
intention as determining factor 360-1

Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (interpretation of the Agreement) (common intention
to submit disputes between Svenska and the Government to arbitration)
(Court’s conclusions based on the available evidence) 374
conclusion of Lithuania–Sweden BIT (1992), relevance 376-7
draft no 1: provision for ICSID arbitration 375
draft no 2: retention of provision for ICSID arbitration/addition of waiver of State
immunity 375
draft no 4: retention of provision for ICSID arbitration and waiver of State immunity
375-6
draft no 6: omission of Art. 35 reference to arbitration, absence of reasons for 376-7
rubric, conclusiveness 374-5
absence of objective evidence prior to addition of rubric 374-5
waiver of sovereign immunity (Agreement Art. 35), implications 377-8

Svenska (UK Court of Appeal) (State immunity)
SIA 2(1) (submission to the jurisdiction), submission to ICC arbitration as 397-9
SIA 3(1) (exceptions to immunity in proceedings “relating to”) 401-2
SIA 3(1)(a) (commercial transaction exception) 399-402
“commercial transaction” 399-401
SIA 9(1) (agreement to arbitration as preclusion of immunity in proceedings “which
relate to the arbitration”) 393-7
Court’s conclusion 397
enforcement proceedings, applicability to 395-7

Terrorism Act 2000 (UK) (as amended by Terrorism Act 2006 and Counter-Terrorism
Act 2008): see also Gul: Terrorism Act 2006
extension to acts committed abroad, permissibility under international law 447-8
intrusive powers of police and immigration officers 449
Terrorism Act 2000 (UK) (as amended by Terrorism Act 2006 and Counter-Terrorism
Act 2008) by section
Part I (introducory)
1 (“terrorism”) 432-3
applicability to activity approved by UK Government 439
as a broad concept 438-42
Terrorism Act 2000 (UK) (as amended by Terrorism Act 2006 and Counter-Terrorism Act 2008) by section (cont.)

1(1) ("terrorism")
applicability to acts of armed insurgency constituting lawful hostilities under international humanitarian law 438-9
Gul 430-49
R v. F 438
1(1)(b) ("use or threat ... designed to influence the government ... or to intimidate the public") 438-40
1(2)(a) ("serious violence against a person") 438-40
1(2)(b) ("serious damage to property") 438-40
1(2)(d) ("creates a serious risk to public safety or health") 438-40
1(4) (acts aimed at or affecting countries other than the UK) 438-40
Part II (proscribed organizations) 433
Part III (terrorist property)
15 (fundraising) 433
16 (use and possession) 433
17 (funding arrangements) 433
18 (money laundering) 433
Part IV (terrorist investigations) 433
Part V (counter-terrorist powers)
42-3 (search of individuals and premises) 433
44-7 (stop and search powers) 433
53 and Schedule 7 (port and border controls) 433
Part VI (miscellaneous)
54 (weapons training) 433
56 (directing terrorist organizations) 433
57 (possession for terrorist purposes) 433
58 (collecting information for terrorist purposes) 433
59 (inciting terrorism abroad) 433
62(1) (terrorist bombing: jurisdiction: actions outside the UK) 434
62(2) (terrorist bombing: jurisdiction: actions outside the UK: offences under s 62(1) (b)) 434
63 (terrorist finance: jurisdiction) 434
63A-63E (other terrorist offences under the Act: jurisdiction) 434
64 (extradition) 434
Part VII (Northern Ireland) 434
Part VIII (general)
114-16 (police powers) 434
116 (powers to stop and search) 434
117 (consent to prosecution) 434-5, 441-2
as risk to the rule of law 441-2, 448-9
Terrorism Act 2006 (UK) by section
Part 1 (offences)
1 (encouragement of terrorism) 435
1(1)(b) (addition of "or an international governmental organisation") 435
2 (dissemination of terrorist publications) 435-6
Part 2 (miscellaneous provisions) 436
Part 3 (supplemental provisions). 36 (review of terrorism legislation) 436
terrorism, definition/elements
as act contrary to purposes and principles of UN (RC 1F(c)): see Refugee Convention (1951), non-application on grounds of “actions contrary to the purposes and principles of the UN” (RC 1F(c))
acts by non-State armed force/insurgents against armed forces of a State (non-international armed conflict): see also Gul

absence of consensus as barrier to conclusion of comprehensive UN Treaty on Terrorism (UNGA Resolution 51/210) 444-5

State practice 446
Australia 448-9
Canada 448-9
South Africa 448-9
difficulty of 438-40
absence of agreed international definition 443-6
Financing of Terrorism Convention (1999) (FTC 2(1)) 34-5, 97-106
jurisprudence
Al-Sirri 443, 445
Gul 430-49
R v. F 438
reviews of legislation
Anderson Review (UK) (2012) 440, 448-9
Anderson Review (UK) (2013) 440, 448-9
Carlile Reviews (UK) (2006 and 2007) 440
Inquiry into the Legislation against Terrorism (Lord Lloyd of Berwick) (UK) (1996) 439
INSLM Report (2012) (Australia) 448-9

terrorism, jurisdiction, extension of anti-terrorism legislation to acts committed abroad 447-8

terrorism, treaties and other international instruments relating to

Financing of Terrorism Convention (1999) (FTC)
applicability during NIAC 446
cooperation obligation (FTC 18) 32-5
definition/elements of terrorism (FTC 2(1)) 34-5, 97-106
dispute settlement/submission to arbitration (FTC 24(1)) 23-7, 92-6
implementing legislation, State’s right to go further than provisions of the Treaty (“gold-plating”) 446-7
list of UN anti-terrorism Conventions as of October 2013 444-5
Terrorist Bombings Convention (1997) (TBC), activities of armed forces during NIAC, applicability to 446
torture

criminal jurisdiction (including UNCAT obligations), obligation to notify States concerned that a person has been taken into custody/prompt report on preliminary enquiry findings (UNCAT 6(4)) 474-83
customary international law (CIL), State immunity from jurisdiction 468
evidence obtained by: see admissibility of evidence obtained by torture/confession as function of head of State, Pinochet (No 3) 463-71
State immunity and

customary international law (CIL) 468
jus cogens/peremptory norm considerations (VCLT 53) 467-8
officials, entitlement to immunity ratione materiae/functional immunity
customary international law rule, whether 468
Lama 463-71
UNCAT 1, effect/exclusion of 430-49

Torture Victim Protection Act 1991 (TVPA)
interpretation, “individual”, limitation to natural persons 645-6
Torture Victim Protection Act 1991 (TVPA) (cont.)

jurisprudence

Jesner 645-6
Mohamad 645-6, 683-4
torture and extrajudicial killing in violation of international law, express cause of action for victims of 637-8

Treaties

amendment (VCLT 39-41) (rational relationship between amendment and purpose for which power to amend was exercised) 334-7

conclusion (VCLT 6-18)
means of expressing consent to be bound (VCLT 11) 326
obligation not to defeat the object and purpose prior to entry into force (VCLT 18) 326-9, 340

definition/form/classification as (VCLT 2(1)(a)) (“concluded between States”) 345-6

direct effect/self-executing
absence of need for implementing measures requirement 197-8
ICESCR (1966), whether 196-8

Martinson 196-8

invalidity (VCLT 46-53)
violation of internal law, effect (VCLT 46(1)) 225-7

“manifest” (VCLT 46(2)) 226-7

municipal law and constitutionality of treaty, conflict with constitutional principles 223-7
jurisprudence

A (FC) 473-4
Dallal v. Bank Mellat 473-4
European Roma Rights Centre 473-4
Glenister 299
McKerr 473-4

Nissan 473-4
Pinochet (No 3) 474
Rayner (Tin Council) 473-4
Zoernsch v. Waldock 473-4

legislative approval/domestic law “ratification”, need for, as constitutional requirement (South Africa) 323, 325, 327-9

primacy in case of inconsistency/conflict, conflict with [implementing] legislation 197-8

applicability of treaty in absence of conflict 197-8
Constitution/domestic legislative provisions as first option 198

Tsebe (extradition/risk of death penalty)

background
facts 245-9, 272
Botswana’s refusal to give assurance 244, 246, 248-51
issues for determination

correctness of High Court’s conclusion on Government’s power to extradite in absence of assurance on death penalty 250-1
distinguishability of Mohamed 250-1
procedural history 244-5
High Court decision 249, 270-1
High Court orders 245, 271-2

Court’s analysis (applicability of Mohamed principle)
constitutional human rights provisions, central importance of 258-9
Court’s decision/application of principle to the facts 268-70
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distinguishability of Mohamed 259-68
Carmichele, relevance 262
parties' positions (Home Affairs Minister) 259, 261-2
parties' positions (Justice Minister) 259-62
extraterritorial jurisdiction option 264-6
practical difficulties 265
safe haven risk 265-6
jurisprudence considered in Mohamed 257-8
legislation addressed by the parties
EA 11(b)(iii) (rejection of extradition request) as long-standing option 262-3
IA 32(2) (deportation of illegal foreigner), need to read consistently with the Constitution 262-3
Mohamed principle defined 256-8
Makwanyane finding of unconstitutionality of death penalty, effect on Mohamed 255-6
overriding importance of Constitution 7(2) obligations 266-8
real risk test 257
rejection of extradition request, compatibility with treaty obligations 266
in case of refusal of request for assurance (SADC EP 5(c)) 266
Court's jurisdiction 249-50
leave to appeal
Court's decision 270
dissenting opinion (Yacoob ADCJ) 270-6
justification for 250
relevant law (Botswana), Criminal Code, s 203 (death penalty for murder) 254
relevant law (international)
Botswana–South Africa Extradition Treaty (1969), Art. 6 (capital punishment) 253
SADC Extradition Protocol (2002), EP 5(c) (assurances on death penalty) 253-4
relevant law (South Africa)
Constitution by section
1(a) (human dignity, equality and advancement of human rights as underlying values) 251-3
2 (supremacy of the Constitution) 251-3
7(1) (Bill of Rights as cornerstone of democracy) 251-3
7(2) (obligation to respect Bill of Rights) 249-53
7(3) (limitations on rights in Bill of Rights) 251-3
8(1) (application to State organs) 251-3
9(1) (equality before the law) 251-3
10 (human dignity) 251-3
11 (life) 251-3
12 (freedom and security of person) 251-3
Extradition Act 1962 (EA), s 11(b)(iii) (rejection of extradition request: grounds) 254-5, 262-3
text 246-7
Immigration Act 13 of 2002 (IA) by section
32(2) (deportation of illegal foreigner) 247, 262-3
49(1)(b) (failure of illegal foreigner to depart when ordered to do so) 263-4

Ukraine: see Financing of Terrorism Convention/CERD Case (Ukraine v. Russia) (Provisional Measures)
UN Privileges and Immunities Convention (1946) (UNPIC), assertion of entitlement to immunity as responsibility of Secretary General 488-9
UN privileges and immunities (experts on mission (UNPIC VI))

entitlement to functional immunity (UNPIC VI (22)) 484-93
- applicability “during time spent on journeys in connection with their missions” 486, 488-91
- waiver (UNPIC VI (23)) 485-8
- express waiver, need for 492
- retroactive waiver 487-8, 491-3

jurisprudence
- Cumaraswamy 488-9
- Lama 484-93
- Mazilu 489-90

UNCLOS (1982)
- as balance between coastal States and freedom of navigation 142
- coastal States and other States 173-4
- jurisprudence, IAIITO 142
- freedom of navigation and protection of the environment 142-6
- interpretation, Intervention Convention (1969) as aid 146-8, 175-6
- as legal framework for law of the sea activity 144-5
- other agreements, relationship with (UNCLOS 311), other agreements on the marine environment, effect on obligation under (UNCLOS 237) 156, 170-1

United Kingdom
- admissibility of evidence obtained by torture/confession, Sanctions Committee Consolidated List, obligation to inquire into allegations of the use of evidence obtained through torture 587-91
- Arbitration Act 1996 by section
  - 39 (provisional awards), applicability to order for interim measures 540
  - 39(2) (provisional award for payment of money) 541-2
  - 40(1) (general duty of parties to do all things necessary for the proper and expeditious conduct of the arbitral proceedings) 540-1
  - 41(2) (“unless otherwise agreed by the parties”) 541
  - 41(5) (powers of tribunal in case of party’s default) (peremptory order) 540-1
    - “without showing sufficient cause” 544-5
  - 42 (enforcement of peremptory orders of tribunal) 540-5
  - 42(2)(b) (enforcement of tribunal’s peremptory orders: application with permission of the tribunal) 537
  - 103(2)(f) (recognition/enforcement: refusal: absence of final and binding award) 389-90
- autrefois convict, burden of proof 495-6
- EU law, direct effect of regulations, obligations conflicting with fundamental rights of the individual 579-81
- European Communities Act 1972 (including amendments) (ECA) as authority/conduit for the direct effect of EU law 579-81
- Yousef 579-81
- head of State (former), immunity from jurisdiction ratione materiae (Pinochet (No 3)) 463-71
- International Organizations Act 1968 by section, 1(3)(c) (privileges and immunities of experts on a UN mission) 485
- judicial review/justiciability (foreign relations decisions/prerogative power of forum State)
  - assessment of political or reputational risk, non-justiciability 517
INDEX 747

scope/standard of review
“no reasonable person” test 520-1
reasonableness/rationality (Wednesbury principle) 517-22
second-guessing, exclusion 517
standing/private right of action, sufficient interest/directly affected requirement 509
training and assistance programmes for foreign armed forces 508-22
Justice and Security Act 2013 (JSA) by section, 6(1) (declaration of proceedings as
proceedings in which a CMP may be made to the court) 586-7
Montreal Convention (1999) (MC)
“accident” (WC 17/MC 17.1) 415-27: see also “accident” (WC 17/MC 17.1); Ford
incorporation into UK law 416
interpretation, desirability of uniformity/international jurisprudence as aid 418
as sole source of remedy for injury (MC 29) 415-16
OSJA assessment process 508-22: see also Nour
Refugee Convention (1951), non-application (QD 12(2)(a) (serious non-political
crime)) 406-8
terrorism
acts by non-State armed force/insurgents against armed forces of a State (NIAC)
430-49
absence of consensus as barrier to conclusion of comprehensive UN Treaty on
Terrorism (UNGA Resolution 51/210) 444-5
definition/elements, absence of agreed international definition 443-6
reviews of the legislation
Anderson Review (2012) 440, 448-9
Anderson Review (UK) (2013) 440, 448-9
Carlile Reviews (2006 and 2007) 440
Inquiry into the Legislation against Terrorism (Lord Lloyd of Berwick) (1996)
439
Terrorism Acts: see Terrorism Act 2000 (UK) (as amended by Terrorism Act 2006 and
Counter-Terrorism Act 2008); Terrorism Act 2006 (UK) by section
torture, State immunity and
jus cogens/peremptory norm considerations 467-8
officials, entitlement to immunity ratione materiae/functional immunity
452-505: see also Lama (State immunity: acts of torture)
custody international law rule, whether 468
jus cogens considerations 467-8
UNCAT 1, effect/exclusion of 464-71
UN and ICJ (Immunities and Privileges Order 1974/1261) by section
17 (expert on a mission: entitlement to functional immunity) 485
17(b) (expert on a mission: immunity from arrest as accorded to a diplomatic agent)
485-6
“including the time spent on journeys in connection with service on such
missions” 486-8
32 (waiver of immunity) 486-8
retroactive waiver 486-8, 491-3
United States of America (USA)
Alien Tort Statute 1789 (28 USC 1350) (ATS): see Alien Tort Statute 1789 (28 USC
1350) (ATS) (federal jurisdiction in cases of suit by alien for tort in violation of
international law or treaty); Jesner (ATS, corporate liability under)
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP), 44.1 (determination of foreign law as question
of fact) 692-700: see also Animal Science Products (foreign law)
United States of America (USA) (cont.)
foreign law
  deference to foreign State, absolute rule, whether 692-700: see also Animal Science Products (foreign law)
  as question of law (FRCP 44.1) 692-700
  FRCP 44.1 (1966) as change of approach 696-7
FSIA: see FSIA 1976 (USA)
terrorism, legislation relating to, Anti-Terrorism Act (18 USC 2331-9) (ATA), corporate entities, suit against 646-7

customary international law (CIL) and 174, 208
  Fick 325-6
  Fisheries jurisdiction 326-7
  Gabčíkovo–Nagymaros 326-7
  Glenister 325-6
  Goodwin 325-6
  Harken 325-6
  Kasikili/Sedudu Island 326-7
  LSSA 325-9
  Makwayane 325-6
  Namibia 326-7
  Quagliani 325-6
  Van Rooyen 325-6

Warsaw Convention (1929) (WC)
  object and purpose, unification of laws of contracting parties 416-17
  as sole source of remedy for injury 415-16

Youssef (Sanctions Committee Consolidated List) (background)
facts (general)
  appellant’s immigration status 594
  effect of listing on appellant 567
facts (in chronological order)
  arrival of appellant in UK (5 May 1994)/asylum claim 574
  detention under the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1989 (23 September 1998) 574
  release and re-arrest under Special Immigration Appeals Act 1997, s 3(2)(a) (26 September 1998) 574
  refusal of bail (3 December 1998) 574
  rejection of asylum claim on RC 1F(c) grounds of terrorist activity (23 December 1998) 574, 594
  sentence by Egyptian Military Court in absentia to life imprisonment/evidence obtained by torture (18 April 1999) 574-5, 596
  release from custody in absence of satisfactory assurances permitting removal to Egypt (19 July 1999) 575
  exceptional leave to enter the UK for one year (29 November 1999) 575
  Egypt’s request to add appellant to the Consolidated List/SoS’s hold on designation (29 March 2005) 575-6, 596
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SoS’s decision to release hold on designation/addition of appellant to the List on basis of Security Services’ assessment (14 September 2005) 575-6, 596
High Court claim for damages for false imprisonment (30 July 2007) 573-5
UNSCR 1822 narrative summary of reasons for listing requirement (June 2008) 596
UK decision to seek delisting (13 May 2009) on basis of Security Services’ assessment of May 2000 576-7, 596
appellant’s witness statement denying involvement in terrorism (3 December 2010) 593-4
Divisional Court’s dismissal of claim for judicial review of listing (23 July 2012) 572
appellant’s request to Ombudsperson for delisting (April 2013) 592-3
Ombudsperson’s report to 1267 Committee recommending appellant’s retention on the list (February 2014) 592-3
CJEU dismissal of claim that retention on the List was irrational (21 March 2014) 594
Ombudsperson’s letter to appellant informing him of her recommendation and reasons (30 July 2014) 592-3
SoS’s report to appellant of his agreement with the Ombudsperson and termination of support for delisting (10 September 2014) 593
1267 Committee’s updated summary of reasons for appellant’s retention on the List (30 September 2014) 593
appellant’s denial of Commission’s allegations/application for legal aid 594
SoS’s decision not to extend request for delisting to include torture-tainted evidence issue (14 October 2014) 595
claim for judicial review (December 2014) 595
European Commission’s notification to appellant of updated reasons for retention on the List (17 December 2014) 594
UN sanctions regime
“associated with” 567-9
Consolidated List 568
listing procedure 567, 569
unanimity requirement 567, 569, 589
Member States’ obligation to “accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council” (UNC 25) 568, 572, 585
UNSCR 1267
freezing obligation (para. 4(b)) 568
Sanctions Committee 568
UNSCR 1617
acts or activities indicating “association” with (para. 2) 568-9
obligation to take UNSCR 1267 para. 4(b) measures (para. 1) 568-9
role 570
UNSCR 2083 (2012) 572
UN sanctions regime, implementation (EC)
EC Regulation 881/2002 569-70
freezing of assets of persons or groups listed in Annex I (Art. 2.1) 570
Annex list, designation by UNSC or the Sanctions Committee as being associated with Al-Qaida 570
right to request reasons for Annex I listing (Art. 7(c)) 570
UN sanctions regime, implementation (UK)
Youssef (Sanctions Committee Consolidated List) (background) (cont.)

Al-Qaida and Taliban (Asset-Freezing) Regulations 2010 569
Al-Qaida and Taliban (United Nations Measures) Order 2002 569

UN sanctions regime, jurisprudence

*Ahmed* 572-3
Al-Jeddah 572, 585
Kadi I 594
Kadi II 594

Youssef (Sanctions Committee Consolidated List) (Court of Appeal)

Court’s conclusion 591

ground 1: standard of review (review on the merits vs *Wednesbury* rationality test) 567-8, 583-7

*Ahmed* distinguished 584-5
CMP (JSA 6(1)), relevance 586-7

ground 2: alleged use of evidence obtained by torture as basis for designation/obligation to inquire into 567-8, 587-91

Divisional Court findings 588-9

*jus cogens* prohibition of torture, relevance 589-91

ground 3: standard of proof (“reasonable grounds for suspicion” vs balance of probabilities test) 567-8, 577-83

*Ahmed* 572-3, 580, 584-5

common law judicial review as regulator of the separation of powers 585-6

common law standards as applicable law 578, 585

conformity with Consolidated List regime 578-81

*Entick* principle 578-81, 583

ECA/EC 881/2002 as legal authority 579-81

legality principle 578-81

lifting of hold as exercise of prerogative power 578

“reasonable and credible” (Ombudsperson’s report (2011)) 570-2

Youssef (Sanctions Committee Consolidated List) (Supreme Court)

ground 1: torture-tainted evidence 595-6

background 596

Court’s analysis

1267 Committee’s decision, challengeability under international law, limitation to 599

common law standards as applicable law in prerogative cases 599-600

judicial review of foreign policy decisions under prerogative powers, cautious approach to 599-600

legal principles

*A (No 2)* 597

obligation to inquire into (Court of Appeal) 597-8

parties’ arguments

appellant 598

respondent 598-9

ground 2: absence of power (*Entick* principle) 595-6, 602-3

Court of Appeal’s findings 602

ECA/EC 881/2002 as legal authority 603

parties’ arguments

appellant 602-3

respondent 602
INDEX 751

ground 3: standard of proof (“reasonable grounds for suspicion” vs balance of probabilities test) 595-6, 603-10
   Court of Appeal’s findings 604-8
   Court’s analysis
      ‘Ahmed’ 605-10
      FATF Recommendations 608-10
      “reasonable and credible” (Ombudsperson’s report (2011)) 609-10
      Court’s findings 609-10
      parties’ arguments
         appellant 604-5
         respondent 603-4
   ground 4: standard of review (review on the merits vs ‘Wednesbury’ rationality test) 595-6, 610-14
   Court of Appeal’s findings 610
   Court’s analysis (proportionality test (ECHR/EU law) compared/proposed move to)
      611-14
      applying the proportionality test, effect 613-14
      ‘Bank Mellat’ 612-13
      ‘Keyu’ 611-12
      ‘Pham’ 611-12
   Divisional Court’s findings 610
   parties’ arguments
      appellant 610-11
      defendant 611

Zimbabwe: see also Fick
   Constitution 1980 (with amendments prior to 2013)
      Amendment (No 11) (1990) 318
      Amendment (No 12) (1993) 318
      Amendment (No 14) (1994) 318
   Constitution 1980 (with amendments prior to 2013) by section (Chapter XII: Miscellaneous Provisions), 111B(1) (international conventions: incorporation) 292-6
   Land Acquisition Act 1992, Chapter 20:10, ss 1612-15, 17-19 and 23 (compensation for appropriation) (repeal) 318
   SADC Treaty (1992): see Fick