

*Lauterpacht Centre for International Law
University of Cambridge*

INTERNATIONAL LAW REPORTS

VOLUME
141

Edited by

SIR ELIHU LAUTERPACHT, CBE QC
*Honorary Professor of International Law, University of Cambridge
Bencher of Gray's Inn*

SIR CHRISTOPHER GREENWOOD, CMG QC
*Judge of the International Court of Justice
Bencher of Middle Temple*

and

KAREN LEE
*Assistant Editor
Fellow of the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law, University of Cambridge
Fellow of Girton College, Cambridge*

GROTIUS PUBLICATIONS



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521766371

© Sir Elihu Lauterpacht 2011

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2011

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-76637-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

PREFACE

The present volume contains international decisions from the International Court of Justice (the 1998-2002 judgments in *Cameroon v. Nigeria*) and the European Court of Human Rights (*Al-Moayad v. Germany*) as well as decisions from the courts of Australia (*Zhang*), England (*Mechan*), Germany (*Lisbon Treaty Constitutionality Case*), New Zealand (*Fang*) and Spain (*Peruvian Genocide Case*).

As usual this volume has been the work of many, to all of whom the Editors wish to express their gratitude. Ms Karen Lee, Assistant Editor, wrote the summaries of the decisions of *Cameroon v. Nigeria* and *Al-Moayad v. Germany* and saw the volume through the press. Ms Nicole Betz summarized the *Lisbon Treaty Constitutionality Case* and Ms Charlotte Peevers prepared the summaries of the cases from England and New Zealand. The Australian and Spanish cases were summarized by Dr Chester Brown and Mr Enrique Boone respectively. Dr Markus Gehring provided the texts of the German and Spanish cases. Thanks are also due to the German Constitutional Court for permitting us to use its translation of the *Lisbon Treaty Constitutionality Case* and to Mr Jesse Clarke, Assistant Legal Adviser, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, for supplying the text of *Mechan*. Ms Tara Grant prepared the Tables of Cases and Digest and provided general and secretarial assistance. Miss Maureen MacGlashan, CMG compiled the Table of Treaties and the Index. Mrs Diane Illott checked the copy and Ms Jenny Macgregor read the proofs.

In addition, our thanks go to all the others who have worked to complete this volume, particularly our publishers, Cambridge University Press, and typesetters, Aptara, and their staff.

E. LAUTERPACHT

LAUTERPACHT CENTRE
FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW,
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

C. J. GREENWOOD

THE PEACE PALACE,
THE HAGUE

March 2011

EDITORIAL NOTE

The *International Law Reports* endeavour to provide within a single series of volumes comprehensive access in English to judicial materials bearing on public international law. On certain topics it is not always easy to draw a clear line between cases which are essentially ones of public international law interest and those which are primarily applications of special domestic rules. For example, in relation to extradition, the *Reports* will include cases which bear on the exception of "political offences" or the rule of double criminality, but will restrict the number of cases dealing with purely procedural aspects of extradition. Similarly, while the general rules relating to the admission and exclusion of aliens, especially of refugees, are of international legal interest, cases on the procedure of admission usually are not. In such borderline areas, and sometimes also where there is a series of domestic decisions all dealing with a single point in essentially the same manner, only one illustrative decision will be printed and references to the remainder will be given in an accompanying note.

DECISIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS

The *Reports* seek to include so far as possible the available decisions of every international tribunal, e.g. the International Court of Justice, or *ad hoc* arbitrations between States. There are, however, some jurisdictions to which full coverage cannot be given, either because of the large number of decisions (e.g. the Administrative Tribunal of the United Nations) or because not all the decisions bear on questions of public international law (e.g. the Court of Justice of the European Union). In these instances, those decisions are selected which appear to have the greatest long-term value.

Human rights cases. The number of decisions on questions of international protection of human rights has increased considerably in recent years and it is now impossible for the *Reports* to cover them all. As far as decisions of international jurisdictions are concerned, the *Reports* will continue to publish decisions of the European Court of Human Rights and of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, as well as "views" of the United Nations Committee on Human Rights. Decisions of national courts on the application of conventions on human rights will not be published unless they deal with a major point of substantive human rights law or a matter of wider interest to public international

lawyers such as the relationship of international law and national law, the extent of the right of derogation or the principles of the interpretation of treaties.

International arbitrations. The *Reports* of course include arbitral awards rendered in cases between States which involve an application of public international law. Beyond this, however, the selection of arbitral decisions is more open to debate. As these *Reports* are principally concerned with matters of public international law, they will not include purely private law commercial arbitrations even if they are international in the sense that they arise between parties of different nationality and even if one of them is a State. (For reports of a number of such awards, see *Yearbook Commercial Arbitration* (ed. Albert Jan van den Berg, under the auspices of the International Council for Commercial Arbitration).) But where there is a sufficient point of contact with public international law then the relevant parts of the award will be reported. Examples of such points of contact are cases in which the character of a State as a party has some relevance (e.g. State immunity, stabilization clauses, *force majeure*) or where there is a choice of law problem involving discussion of international law or general principles of law as possible applicable laws. The same criteria will determine the selection of decisions of national courts regarding the enforcement of arbitral awards.

DECISIONS OF NATIONAL TRIBUNALS

A systematic effort is made to collect from all national jurisdictions those judicial decisions which have some bearing on international law.

EDITORIAL TREATMENT OF MATERIALS

The basic policy of the Editors is, so far as possible, to present the material in its original form. It is no part of the editorial function to impose on the decisions printed in these volumes a uniformity of approach or style which they do not possess. Editorial intervention is limited to the introduction of the summary and of the bold-letter rubric at the head of each case. This is followed by the full text of the original decision or of its translation. Normally, the only passages which will be omitted are those which contain either statements of fact having no bearing on the points of international law involved in the case or discussion of matters of domestic law unrelated to the points of international legal interest. The omission of material is usually indicated either by a series of dots or by the insertion of a sentence in square brackets noting the passages which have been left out.

PRESENTATION OF MATERIALS

The material in the volume has been typeset for this volume. The source of all such material is indicated by the reference to the "Report" in square brackets at the end of the case. The language of the original decision is also mentioned there. The bold figures in square brackets in the body of the text in non-English cases indicate the pagination of the original report.

NOTES

Footnotes. Footnotes enclosed in square brackets are editorial insertions. All other footnotes are part of the original report.

Other notes. References to cases deemed not to be sufficiently substantial to warrant reporting will occasionally be found in editorial notes either at the end of a report of a case on a similar point or under an independent heading.

DIGEST OF CASES

With effect from Volume 75 the decisions contained in the *Reports* are no longer arranged according to the traditional classification scheme. Instead a Digest of Cases is published at the beginning of each volume. The main headings of the Digest are arranged alphabetically. Under each heading brief details are given of those cases reported in that volume which contain points covered by that heading. Each entry in the Digest gives the name of the case concerned and the page reference, the name of the tribunal which gave the decision and an indication of the main points raised in the case which relate to that particular heading of the Digest. Where a case raises points which concern several different areas of international law, entries relating to that case will appear under each of the relevant headings in the Digest. A list of the main headings used in the Digest is set out at p. xvii.

CONSOLIDATED INDEX AND TABLES

A Consolidated Index and a Consolidated Tables of Cases and Treaties for volumes 1-80 were published in two volumes in 1990 and 1991. A further volume containing the Consolidated Index and Consolidated Tables of Cases and Treaties for volumes 81-100 was published in 1996. A Consolidated Index, a Consolidated Tables of Cases and a Consolidated Table of Treaties for volumes 1-125 were published in 2004. Volume 140 contains Consolidated Tables of Cases for volumes 126-140.

DIGEST OF CASES

List of Main Headings

(Those headings for which there are entries in the present volume are printed in italics. For a guide to the Digest, see the Editorial Note at p. xi.)

Air	International Tribunals
Aliens	<i>Jurisdiction</i>
Arbitration	Lakes and Landlocked Seas
Canals	Nationality
<i>Claims</i>	Recognition
Comity	<i>Relationship of International Law and Municipal Law</i>
Conciliation	Reprisals and Countermeasures
<i>Consular Relations</i>	Rivers
Damages	<i>Sea</i>
<i>Diplomatic Relations</i>	<i>Sources of International Law</i>
Economics, Trade and Finance	Space
Environment	<i>State Immunity</i>
Expropriation	<i>State Responsibility</i>
<i>Extradition</i>	State Succession
Governments	States
<i>Human Rights</i>	<i>Territory</i>
<i>International Court of Justice</i>	<i>Terrorism</i>
<i>International Criminal Law</i>	<i>Treaties</i>
<i>International Organizations</i>	<i>War and Armed Conflict</i>

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
PREFACE	vii
EDITORIAL NOTE	ix
TABLE OF CASES (alphabetical)	xiii
TABLE OF CASES (according to courts and countries)	xv
DIGEST (main headings)	xvii
DIGEST OF CASES REPORTED IN VOLUME 141	xix
TABLE OF TREATIES	xxxi
REPORTS OF CASES	1
INDEX	739

DIGEST OF CASES REPORTED IN VOLUME 141

Page

Claims

Diplomatic protection — Whether United Kingdom under a duty to bring proceedings against foreign State for alleged human rights violation against United Kingdom national — England, High Court, Queen's Bench Division

Mechan v. Foreign and Commonwealth Office

727

Consular Relations

Protection of nationals — Limitations — Whether United Kingdom consul under a duty to provide consular assistance to United Kingdom national awaiting trial in foreign State — Limits of what consul can be expected to do — England, High Court, Queen's Bench Division

Mechan v. Foreign and Commonwealth Office

727

Diplomatic Relations

Protection of nationals — Limitations — Whether Foreign and Commonwealth Office under a duty to afford protection to United Kingdom national awaiting trial in foreign State — Whether enforceable — Scope of discretion in conduct of diplomatic relations — Whether requirement that Foreign and Commonwealth Office demand release of national rather than request clemency — England, High Court, Queen's Bench Division

Mechan v. Foreign and Commonwealth Office

727

Extradition

Extradition Treaty between Federal Republic of Germany and United States, 1978 — Applicant extradited from Germany to United States — Applicant detained in United States — United States assurance to German authorities that applicant would not be detained in facility outside United States — Whether

Extradition (cont.)

binding — Whether applicant's extradition violating Articles 3, 5(1), 6(1) and 34 of European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 — Whether applicant's application admissible — European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section)

Al-Moayad v. Germany (Application No 35865/03)
(Admissibility)

507

Human Rights

Due process — United Kingdom national convicted of criminal offence in foreign State — Whether Foreign and Commonwealth Office under a duty to ensure that trial fairly conducted — Diplomatic protection — Whether United Kingdom under a duty to bring proceedings against foreign State for alleged human rights violation against United Kingdom national — England, High Court, Queen's Bench Division

Mechan v. Foreign and Commonwealth Office

727

Prohibition of torture — Absolute right — Article 3 of European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 — Whether substantial grounds for believing applicant facing real risk of treatment contrary to Article 3 if extradited to United States — Assurance obtained from United States by German authorities — Effectiveness of assurance to avert risk of applicant being ill-treated — European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section)

Al-Moayad v. Germany (Application No 35865/03)
(Admissibility)

507

Right not to be hindered in exercise of right of application — Article 34 of European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 — Whether German authorities breaching Article 34 — Request for interim measure — Court Rule 39 — European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section)

Al-Moayad v. Germany (Application No 35865/03)
(Admissibility)

507

Right to a fair trial — Article 6 of European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 — Applicability to applicant's complaint of unfair trial in German courts — Whether applicant at risk of suffering flagrant denial of fair trial in United States — Assurance — Terms of 1978 Extradition Treaty — Importance of right to fair trial in

criminal proceedings in democratic society — European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section)

Al-Moayad v. Germany (Application No 35865/03)
(Admissibility)

507

Right to liberty and security of person — Article 5 of European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 — Whether applicant's detention pending extradition unlawful — Whether compatible with German law — Whether arrest and detention of applicant in Germany giving rise to problem under Article 5 — European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section)

Al-Moayad v. Germany (Application No 35865/03)
(Admissibility)

507

International Court of Justice

Intervention — Equatorial Guinea requesting permission to intervene in maritime aspects of case — Whether Equatorial Guinea sufficiently establishing interest of legal nature which could be affected by Court judgment — Admissibility of Equatorial Guinea's request — Article 62 of Statute of Court — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Judgment — *Res judicata* — Request for Interpretation — Nigeria requesting Court to interpret Judgment on Preliminary Objections — Whether Court having jurisdiction to entertain Nigeria's request — Article 60 of Statute of Court — Admissibility of Nigeria's request — Article 60 of Statute of Court — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Jurisdiction — Whether Cameroon's Application fulfilling requirements of Statute of Court — Cameroon invoking declarations made by two States under Article 36(2) of Statute of Court as basis for jurisdiction — Nigeria raising eight preliminary objections to jurisdiction of Court — Whether Court having jurisdiction

International Court of Justice (cont.)

to adjudicate on merits of dispute — Whether Parties bound to settle all boundary disputes through existing bilateral machinery — Whether settlement of boundaries within Lake Chad region within exclusive competence of Lake Chad Basin Commission — Whether Court should determine boundary in Lake Chad to extent that boundary constituted or was constituted by the tripoint in the Lake — Whether any dispute concerning boundary delimitation as such throughout whole length of boundary from tripoint in Lake Chad to sea — Whether any basis for judicial determination that Nigeria bearing international responsibility for alleged frontier incursions — Whether any legal dispute concerning delimitation of maritime boundary between two Parties appropriate for resolution by Court — Whether question of maritime delimitation inadmissible where necessarily involving rights and interests of third States — Admissibility of Cameroon's Application — Judgment on Preliminary Objections — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Merits — Boundary dispute — Delimitation of land and maritime boundaries between Parties — Title to territory — Cameroon claiming legal title — Nigeria's submissions based on historical consolidation and *effectivités* — Long-standing land boundary dispute — Sector of land boundary in Lake Chad area — Sector of land boundary from Lake Chad to Bakassi Peninsula — Sector of land boundary in Bakassi and sovereignty over Bakassi Peninsula — Boundary of maritime areas — Issues of State responsibility — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

International Criminal Law

Universal jurisdiction — Genocide — Crimes against humanity — Spain, Supreme Court, Criminal Division

Peruvian Genocide Case (Decision No 712/2003)

720

International Organizations

European Community — Institutions — European Parliament — Council — Commission — Whether fundamental principle of democratic legitimacy in Federal Republic undermined by Treaty of Lisbon — Democratic legitimacy of community institutions — Method of election by citizens of Member State — Federal Republic of Germany, Federal Constitutional Court (*BVerfG*)

Lisbon Treaty Constitutionality Case (Case Nos 2 BvE 2/08, 2 BvE 5/08, 2 BvR 1010/08, 2 BvR 1022/08, 2 BvR 1259/08 and 2 BvR 182/09)

554

European Union — Powers — Extension of powers by Treaty — Lisbon Treaty — Whether European Union developing into federal State — Loss of statehood of Federal Republic — Member States as masters of the treaties — Principle of conferral — Whether Treaty of Lisbon granting Union competence to determine or extend its own powers — Principle of subsidiarity — Association of sovereign national States — Whether membership in EU irreversible — Federal Republic of Germany, Federal Constitutional Court (*BVerfG*)

Lisbon Treaty Constitutionality Case (Case Nos 2 BvE 2/08, 2 BvE 5/08, 2 BvR 1010/08, 2 BvR 1022/08, 2 BvR 1259/08 and 2 BvR 182/09)

554

Jurisdiction

Universal jurisdiction — Subsidiarity — Courts of Spain possessing jurisdiction only if courts of the State where alleged offences took place and International Criminal Court do not act — Genocide — Crimes against humanity — Spain, Supreme Court, Criminal Division

Peruvian Genocide Case (Decision No 712/2003)

720

Whether Acts of community institutions are subject to national constitutional review to ensure that their powers are not exceeded — *Ultra vires* review — Review of core of identity of national constitution — No absolute primacy of application of EU law — Application by virtue of national empowerment — Federal Republic of Germany, Federal Constitutional Court (*BVerfG*)

Lisbon Treaty Constitutionality Case (Case Nos 2 BvE 2/08, 2 BvE 5/08, 2 BvR 1010/08, 2 BvR 1022/08, 2 BvR 1259/08 and 2 BvR 182/09)

554

Relationship of International Law and Municipal Law

Conduct of foreign relations — Treaty-making power — Federal Republic of Germany — Constitutional review of the exercise of treaty-making power — Treaty on European Union (Treaty of Lisbon) — Compatibility with Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany — Federal Republic of Germany, Federal Constitutional Court (*BVerfG*)

Lisbon Treaty Constitutionality Case (Case Nos 2 BvE 2/08, 2 BvE 5/08, 2 BvR 1010/08, 2 BvR 1022/08, 2 BvR 1259/08 and 2 BvR 182/09)

554

Sea

Delimitation of maritime boundary between Parties — Whether Court having jurisdiction over maritime delimitation — Whether Cameroon's claims admissible — Rights and interests of third States — Whether rights of Equatorial Guinea and São Tomé and Príncipe affected — Role of negotiations — Articles 74 and 83 of United Nations Law of the Sea Convention, 1982 — Applicability of Anglo-German Agreement of 11 March 1913 — Whether Maroua Declaration 1975 a treaty — Whether Yaoundé II Declaration 1971 binding upon Parties — Cameroon and Nigeria both parties to United Nations Law of the Sea Convention, 1982 — Articles 74(1) and 83(1) — Applicable law — Delimitation of continental shelf and exclusive economic zone between States with adjacent coasts — Whether equidistance line achieving equitable result — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Sources of International Law

Domestic law — Principles of development and evolution of international legal norms — State immunity — Whether national courts free to develop new exception to State immunity — New Zealand, High Court

Fang and Others v. Jiang Zemin and Others

702

State Immunity

Jurisdictional immunity — Torture — Alleged acts of torture committed by officials of the People's Republic of China against Falun Gong practitioner — Whether State immunity applicable

in cases of alleged torture — Whether immunity applicable to individual officials — Whether officials of the Communist Party of China entitled to same immunity as government officials — Proof of official status — Australia, Supreme Court of New South Wales

Zhang v. Jiang Zemin and Others 542

Jurisdictional immunity — Torture — Whether State immunity applicable in cases of alleged torture — Convention against Torture, 1984 — United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities, 2004 — Whether any torture or *jus cogens* exception to State immunity — New Zealand, High Court

Fang and Others v. Jiang Zemin and Others 702

State Responsibility

Cameroon accusing Nigeria of invading and occupying its territory — Whether Nigeria violating obligations under conventional and customary international law — Principle of non-use of force — Principle of non-intervention — Territorial sovereignty — Whether guarantees of non-repetition necessary — Whether necessary to ascertain whether and to what extent Nigeria's international responsibility engaged by its occupation — Whether reparation due for material and moral injury — Compliance with Provisional Measures Order — Whether Nigeria responsible for repeated incursions along boundary length 1970-2001 — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Territory

Sovereignty — Delimitation of land boundary between Parties — Land boundary sector from Lake Chad to Bakassi Peninsula — Delimited by 1929-30 Thomson-Marchand Declaration as incorporated in 1931 Henderson-Fleuriau Exchange of Notes — 1946 British Order in Council — Anglo-German Agreements of 11 March and 12 April 1913 — Court's task — Whether instruments binding and applicable — Interpretation and application of provisions — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Territory (cont.)

Sovereignty — Delimitation of land boundary between Parties — Land boundary sector in Lake Chad area — 1919 Milner–Simon Declaration — 1929–30 Thomson–Marchand Declaration — 1931 Henderson–Fleury Exchange of Notes — Whether instruments having international agreement status — Whether delimiting boundary in Lake Chad area — Role of work of Lake Chad Basin Commission — Theory of historical consolidation of title — Whether valid mode of acquisition of title under international law — Role of *effectivités* — Whether Cameroon acquiescing — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Sovereignty — Delimitation of land boundary between Parties — Sector of land boundary in Bakassi and sovereignty over Bakassi Peninsula — Colonial history — League of Nations Mandate — United Nations Trusteeship — Independence — Anglo-German Agreement of 11 March 1913 — Whether defective — Whether effective — Whether Great Britain having legal capacity to transfer sovereignty over Bakassi Peninsula under Anglo-German Agreement of 11 March 1913 — 1884 “Treaty of Protection” between Great Britain and Kings and Chiefs of Old Calabar — Status — Agreements with local rulers — Inter-temporal law principle — *Pacta sunt servanda* rule — Whether Nigeria recognizing Cameroonian sovereignty — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Terrorism

Applicant suspected terrorist — Reports of ill-treatment of suspected terrorists during interrogation in facilities outside United States — Whether applicant at risk of treatment contrary to Article 3 of European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 if extradited to United States — German authorities obtaining assurance from United States that applicant would not be detained in facility outside United States — Effectiveness of assurance — Human

rights in democratic society in context of international terrorism
— European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section)

Al-Moayad v. Germany (Application No 35865/03)
(Admissibility)

507

Treaties

Conclusion and operation — Constitutional limitations — Extension of powers of European Union — Compatibility with Basic Law of the Federal Republic following enactment of Act amending Basic Law of 8 October 2008 — Accompanying laws — Right to vote as concretization of principle of democracy — Whether providing satisfactory constitutional basis for ratification of Federal Republic of Treaty of Lisbon — Whether membership in EU violating Articles 20, 23, 38 and 79(1) of Basic Law — Scope of permissible transfer of sovereignty to community institutions — Requirement that Member States must retain sufficient space for the political formation of the economic, cultural and social living conditions — Condition that national parliaments should retain substantial level of authority — Openness to integration in EU — Responsibility for integration — Federal Republic of Germany, Federal Constitutional Court (*BVerfG*)

Lisbon Treaty Constitutionality Case (Case Nos 2 BvE 2/08, 2 BvE 5/08, 2 BvR 1010/08, 2 BvR 1022/08, 2 BvR 1259/08 and 2 BvR 182/09)

554

Land boundary delimitation — 1919 Milner–Simon Declaration — 1929–30 Thomson–Marchand Declaration — 1931 Henderson–Fleuriau Exchange of Notes — Whether instruments having international agreement status — Whether instruments delimiting boundary in Lake Chad area — International Court of Justice

Case Concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria) (Preliminary Objections) (Request for Interpretation of Judgment) (Application for Permission to Intervene) (Merits)

1

Land boundary delimitation — 1929–30 Thomson–Marchand Declaration — 1946 British Order in Council — Anglo-German Agreements of 11 March and 12 April 1913 — Whether instruments binding and applicable in delimitation of land boundary