

*Lauterpacht Centre for International Law
University of Cambridge*

INTERNATIONAL LAW REPORTS

VOLUME
145

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/9780521769945

© Sir Elihu Lauterpacht 2012

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 2012

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

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

ISBN 978-0-521-76994-5 Hardback

PREFACE

The present volume contains the important 2011 Interlocutory Decision on the Applicable Law: Terrorism, Conspiracy, Homicide, Perpetration, Cumulative Charging of the Appeals Chamber of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon. It also contains the 2010 award on jurisdiction, arbitrability and suspension in *Eureka v. Slovak Republic*, which considers the relationship between bilateral investment treaties and the law of the European Union, as well as the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights in *Görgülü v. Germany*, *Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia* and *Kiyutin v. Russia*. National jurisprudence is reflected in decisions from the courts of England (*B*, *Bici*, *Mullen*, *Montgomery (No 2)* and *Alamieyeseigha*), Germany (*Turkish Citizen G*), Israel (*Adalah* and *Public Committee against Torture*), the Netherlands (*The “Cygnus” Case (Somali Pirates)*), Northern Ireland (*McFarland*) and Scotland (*Al Fayed*).

We are very grateful to those whose work has made this volume possible. Ms Karen Lee, Assistant Editor, wrote the summaries of *Görgülü*, *Bici*, *McFarland* and *Al Fayed*, as well as seeing the volume through the press. Mr Sergey A. Golubok, LL.M. prepared the summaries of *Rantsev* and *Kiyutin*. Mr Avidan Kent summarized the Israeli cases and we would like to thank Ms Alexandra Harrington and Dr Markus Gehring for the German case. Ms Anna Medvinskaja wrote the summaries of *B* and *Mullen* and Ms Tara Grant wrote the summaries of *Montgomery (No 2)* and *Alamieyeseigha*. Dr Douglas Guilfoyle summarized the case from the Netherlands; its English translation was supplied to us by Mr Karel-de Vey Mestdagh with kind permission to reproduce from the Rotterdam District Court. Thanks are also due to the German Constitutional Court for permitting us to use its translation of the *Turkish Citizen G* case. The translations in *Adalah* and *Public Committee against Torture* are reprinted by permission of the Friends of the Library of the Supreme Court of Israel Inc. and William S. Hein & Co. Inc. Ms Tara Grant prepared the Tables of Cases, the Consolidated 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 Ann Ridgway read the proofs.

In addition, we would like to extend our thanks 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

August 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 145 contains Consolidated Tables of Cases for volumes 126-145.

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	<i>International Tribunals</i>
Aliens	<i>Jurisdiction</i>
<i>Arbitration</i>	Lakes and Landlocked Seas
Canals	Nationality
Claims	Recognition
Comity	<i>Relationship of International Law and Municipal Law</i>
Conciliation	Reprisals and Countermeasures
Consular Relations	Rivers
<i>Damages</i>	<i>Sea</i>
<i>Diplomatic Relations</i>	<i>Sources of International Law</i>
Economics, Trade and Finance	Space
Environment	<i>State Immunity</i>
<i>Expropriation</i>	State Responsibility
Extradition	State Succession
Governments	States
<i>Human Rights</i>	Territory
International Court of Justice	<i>Terrorism</i>
<i>International Criminal Law</i>	<i>Treaties</i>
International Organizations	<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 145	xix
TABLE OF TREATIES	xxxi
REPORTS OF CASES	1
INDEX	689
CONSOLIDATED TABLES OF CASES, VOLUMES 126-145	757

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

ALPHABETICAL

(Cases which are reported only in a note are distinguished from cases which are reported in full by the insertion of the word “note” in parentheses after the page number of the report.)

Adalah (Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel) and Others v. GOC Central Command, IDF and Others (HCJ 3799/02) 407	Kiyutin v. Russia (Application No 2700/10) (Merits) 201
Al Fayed v. France (Application No 38501/02) (Admissibility) 686 (note)	McFarland, <i>In re</i> 637
Al Fayed v. Lord Advocate and Advocate General 656	Montgomery Case (No 2) 602
Alamieyeseigha Case 619	Mullen Case 564
B (a Child) (Care Proceedings: Diplomatic Immunity), <i>In re</i> 516	Public Committee against Torture in Israel and Another v. Government of Israel and Others (HCJ 769/02) 429
Barnette Case 602	R (Alamieyeseigha) v. Crown Prosecution Service 619
Bici and Bici v. Ministry of Defence 529	R (Mullen) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department 564
The “Cygnus” Case (Somali Pirates) 491	Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia (Application No 25965/04) (Merits) 106
Early Warning Procedure Case 407	Somali Pirates Case 491
Eureko BV v. Slovak Republic (PCA Case No 2008-13) (Award on Jurisdiction, Arbitrability and Suspension) 1	Targeted Killings Case 429
Görgülü v. Germany (Application No 74969/01) (Merits) 85	Turkish Citizen G v. Naumburg Higher Regional Court (Case No 2 BvR 1481/04) 384
Interlocutory Decision on the Applicable Law: Terrorism, Conspiracy, Homicide, Perpetration, Cumulative Charging (Case No STL-11-01/I) (Appeals Chamber) 232	United States of America v. Barnette and Another 602
	United States of America v. Montgomery (No 2) 602

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

ARRANGED ACCORDING TO COURTS AND
TRIBUNALS (INTERNATIONAL CASES) AND
COUNTRIES (MUNICIPAL CASES)

(Cases which are reported only in a note are distinguished from cases which are reported in full by the insertion of the word “note” in parentheses after the page number of the report.)

I. DECISIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS

<i>Arbitration Tribunal</i>	2010
Eureko BV v. Slovak Republic (PCA Case No 2008-13) (Award on Jurisdiction, Arbitrability and Suspension) 1	Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia (Application No 25965/04) (Merits) 106
<i>European Court of Human Rights</i>	2011
Görgülü v. Germany (Application No 74969/01) (Merits) 85	Kiyutin v. Russia (Application No 2700/10) (Merits) 201
Al Fayed v. France (Application No 38501/02) (Admissibility) 686 (note)	<i>Special Tribunal for Lebanon</i>
	2011
	Interlocutory Decision on the Applicable Law: Terrorism, Conspiracy, Homicide, Perpetration, Cumulative Charging (Case No STL-11-01/I) (Appeals Chamber) 232

II. DECISIONS OF MUNICIPAL COURTS

<i>Germany, Federal Republic of</i>	2006
Turkish Citizen G v. Naumburg Higher Regional Court (Case No 2 BvR 1481/04) 384	Public Committee against Torture in Israel and Another v. Government of Israel and Others (HCJ 769/02) 429
<i>Israel</i>	<i>The Netherlands</i>
Adalah (Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel) and Others v. GOC Central Command, IDF and Others (HCJ 3799/02) 407	2010
	The “Cygnus” Case (Somali Pirates) 491
	<i>United Kingdom, England</i>
	2002
	<i>In re B (a Child)</i> (Care Proceedings: Diplomatic Immunity) 516

2004	<i>United Kingdom, Northern Ireland</i>
Bici and Bici v. Ministry of Defence 529	
Government of the United States of America	2004
v. Barnette and Another 602	<i>In re McFarland</i> 637
Government of the United States of America	<i>United Kingdom, Scotland</i>
v. Montgomery (No 2) 602	2004
Regina (Mullen) v. Secretary of State for the	Al Fayed v. Lord Advocate and Advocate
Home Department 564	General 656
2005	
Regina (Alamieyeseigha) v. Crown Prosecu-	
tion Service 619	

DIGEST OF CASES REPORTED IN VOLUME 145

Page

Arbitration

Applicable law — Investment arbitration — Proceedings instituted by investor incorporated in one European Union State against another European Union State — Bilateral investment treaty between two European Union States — Whether compatible with European Union law — Whether European Union law forming part of the law to be applied by the tribunal — Seat of arbitration in a third European Union State — Jurisdiction of the arbitration tribunal — Arbitration Tribunal

Eureko BV v. Slovak Republic (PCA Case No 2008-13) (Award on Jurisdiction, Arbitrability and Suspension)

1

Damages

Human rights — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 41 — Just satisfaction — Anguish and distress — Costs and expenses — European Court of Human Rights (First Section)

Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia (Application No 25965/04) (Merits)

106

Just satisfaction — Distress and frustration — Costs and expenses — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 41 — European Court of Human Rights (First Section)

Kiyutin v. Russia (Application No 2700/10) (Merits)

201

Diplomatic Relations

Immunities and privileges — Member of technical and administrative staff — Extent of immunity — Member of technical and administrative staff accused of child abuse — Proceedings to protect child — Whether barred by immunity — England, High Court, Family Division

In re B (a Child) (Care Proceedings: Diplomatic Immunity)

516

Expropriation

Investment — Bilateral investment treaty — Protection against expropriation — Provisions on fair and equitable treatment and full protection and security — Compatibility with European Union law — Arbitration Tribunal

Eureko BV v. Slovak Republic (PCA Case No 2008-13) (Award on Jurisdiction, Arbitrability and Suspension)

1

Human Rights

Access to justice — External confiscation order — Confiscation order of US court issued against appellant resident in England — Right of appeal against order — Fugitive disentitlement doctrine — Denial by US Court of Appeals of right of appeal to terms of order under fugitive disentitlement doctrine — Enforcement of external confiscation order in England — Criminal Justice Act 1988, Section 97 — Whether enforcement of order contrary to interests of justice — Whether operation of fugitive disentitlement doctrine by Convention State would constitute a violation of Article 6 of the Convention — Territorial limitations — Whether Article 6 of Convention capable of being directly or indirectly engaged in respect of a non-contracting State — Exceptional nature of circumstances required for indirect engagement of Article 6 rights — Whether giving effect to provisions of external confiscation order by enforcement in English court a breach of Article 6 of the Convention — England, House of Lords

Government of the United States of America v. Montgomery (No 2); Government of the United States of America v. Barnette and Another

602

Detention before charge — Piracy — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 5 — Application in high seas maritime law enforcement — Application when suspect transferred between jurisdictions — Violation of the right to be brought promptly before a judicial authority — Joint State responsibility — Whether violation sufficiently grave to be a bar to prosecution — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 6 — Application when suspect transferred between jurisdictions — No violation of the right to legal assistance — Legal assistance provided at the time of legal procedures requiring assistance — The Netherlands, Rotterdam District Court

The "Cygnus" Case (Somali Pirates)

491

Discrimination — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 14 — Right to respect for one's family life — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 8 — Whether facts of case falling "within the ambit" of Article 8 — Whether applicant's health status "other status" within meaning of Article 14 — Disability, health status — HIV infection — Family ties — Residency permit — Whether applicant in analogous position to other aliens — Whether objective and reasonable justification for difference in treatment — Margin of appreciation, wide or narrow — Scope of the margin of appreciation — Whether people living with HIV particularly vulnerable group — European consensus — Whether particularly compelling justification for differential treatment — Whether applicant victim of discrimination on account of his health status in violation of Article 14 of Convention taken together with Article 8 — European Court of Human Rights (First Section)

Kiyutin v. Russia (Application No 2700/10) (Merits) 201

Prohibition of discrimination — Blanket and indiscriminate nature of restriction — Need for individualized assessment on facts of particular case — Whether Government overstepping narrow margin of appreciation — Whether Government violating applicant's rights under Article 14 of Convention taken together with Article 8 — European Court of Human Rights (First Section)

Kiyutin v. Russia (Application No 2700/10) (Merits) 201

Prohibition of discrimination — Differential treatment — Unanimous view of international bodies and experts — Relevant international documents and reports — Whether particularly compelling justification for differential treatment — HIV transmission, unsafe behaviours — Generalized assumptions — Differential treatment between long-term settlers and short-term visitors — Potential burden on publicly funded healthcare system — Whether travel and residence restrictions on persons living with HIV effective in preventing spread of disease — Whether harmful to public health of country — Whether applicant's exclusion from residence attaining legitimate aim of protection of public health — Whether violation of applicant's rights under Article 14 of Convention taken together with Article 8 — European Court of Human Rights (First Section)

Kiyutin v. Russia (Application No 2700/10) (Merits) 201

Prohibition of slavery and forced or compulsory labour — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 4 — Palermo

Human Rights (*cont.*)

Protocol — Trafficking in human beings — Human dignity, democratic values — Protection of human rights of victims and potential victims of trafficking — Obligation to protect from trafficking and exploitation — Obligation to punish traffickers — Obligation to investigate situations of potential trafficking — Duty to cooperate with other States — European Court of Human Rights (First Section)

Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia (Application No 25965/04) (*Merits*) 106

Remedies — Detention — Persons wrongfully convicted — Compensation — Criminal Justice Act 1988, Section 133 — International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, Article 14(6) — Meaning of miscarriage of justice — Presumption of innocence — Whether right to compensation extending to person whose conviction was quashed because of Executive misconduct in bringing him to trial — England, House of Lords

Regina (Mullen) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department 564

Remedies — Persons wrongfully convicted — Compensation — Applicant imprisoned following conviction — Subsequent quashing of conviction — 1976 and 1985 ministerial policy statements concerning payments of compensation from public funds — 1985 statement referring to Article 14(6) of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966 (“ICCPR”) and ex gratia payment of compensation — Whether applicant having right to compensation under Article 14(6) of ICCPR or Section 133 of Criminal Justice Act 1988 — Whether ex gratia payment of compensation appropriate — Whether magistrate public authority — Whether serious default on part of member of public authority — Whether Secretary of State acting unlawfully by refusing applicant compensation — Northern Ireland, House of Lords

In re McFarland 637

Right to fair trial — Whether German court proceedings unfair — Duty of European Court of Human Rights — Ensuring observance of undertakings of Contracting States to European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 — Whether examination of same facts under Articles 6(1) and 8 justified — Whether Germany violating Article 6(1) of European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 — European Court of Human Rights (Third Section)

Görgülü v. Germany (Application No 74969/01) (*Merits*) 85

Right to family life — Father of illegitimate child — Right of access to child — Balance between rights of the father and best interests of the child — Decision of European Court of Human Rights — Effect on proceedings in German courts — Federal Republic of Germany, Federal Constitutional Court (*BVerfG*) (Second Chamber, First Section)

Turkish Citizen G v. Naumburg Higher Regional Court (Case No 2 BvR 1481/04) 384

Right to liberty and security of person — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 5 — Unacknowledged detention — Confinement by private individuals — No basis in domestic law — Arbitrary and unlawful deprivation of liberty — European Court of Human Rights (First Section)

Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia (Application No 25965/04) (Merits) 106

Right to life — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 2 — Failure to take measures to protect against a risk to life — Obligation to safeguard the lives of those within State's jurisdiction — Obligation to carry out an effective investigation into the circumstances of suspicious death — European Court of Human Rights (First Section)

Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia (Application No 25965/04) (Merits) 106

Right to life — Right of next-of-kin to effective official public investigation when arguable that person killed as result of use of force — Next-of-kin having derivative right based on deceased's own right to life — European Convention on Human Rights, 1950, Article 2 — Whether Scottish Ministers including Lord Advocate contravening petitioner's rights under Article 2 of Convention — Scotland, Court of Session, Outer House

Al Fayed v. Lord Advocate and Advocate General 656

Right to respect for family life — Interference with applicant's right — Whether interference justified — Whether refusal of custody and access "necessary in a democratic society" — Margin of appreciation — Balancing interests of parent and child — State's obligations — Decision-making process — Whether applicant's involvement to degree sufficient to protect his interests — Whether Germany violating Article 8 of European Convention on Human Rights, 1950 — European Court of Human Rights (Third Section)

Görgülü v. Germany (Application No 74969/01) (Merits) 85