

JUDICIAL AND SIMILAR PROCEEDINGS

1. **Cyprus v. Turkey (ECHR May 12, 2014)**

<http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-144151>

On May 12, 2014, the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights (the Court) in *Cyprus v. Turkey* ordered Turkey to pay Cyprus €90,000,000 (approximately \$123,400,000) in relation to breaches of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Turkey committed such violations in the context of “military operations it had conducted in northern Cyprus in July and August 1974, the continuing division of the territory of Cyprus and the activities of the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.’” Although the Court identified those breaches in its judgment of May 10, 2001, the Court held that Cyprus’s claim for just satisfaction was not time-barred in light of the fact that “no time-limits had been fixed for the parties to submit their just satisfaction claims.” In relation to the applicability of Article 41 of the ECHR (just satisfaction) to an inter-State claim, the Court held that “the overall logic of Article 41 of the Convention was not substantially different from the logic of reparations in public international law” and thus just satisfaction could be awarded “for the benefit of individual victims.” Accordingly, the awarded amounts were “to be distributed by the Cypriot Government to the individual victims under the supervision of the Committee of Ministers.

2. **Bond v. United States (U.S. Supreme Court June 2, 2014)**

http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/13pdf/12-158_6579.pdf

On June 2, 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Bond v. United States* that the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act of 1998 (the Act), which implements the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction and makes a federal crime the use or possession of a chemical weapon, did not apply to a “purely local” assault involving the use of chemicals in Pennsylvania. Petitioner Carol Anne Bond, a microbiologist, had spread toxic chemicals on the property of her husband’s mistress and subsequently pled guilty to, *inter alia*, two counts of possessing and using a chemical weapon in violation of § 229 of the Act. The Court ruled that the Act, which contains no clear indication that it should intrude on State responsibility over local criminal activity, “does not cover the unremarkable local offense at issue.”

3. **Augustin Bizimungu v. The Prosecutor (ICTR June 30, 2014)**

<http://www.unicttr.org/Portals/0/Case/English/Bizimungu/judgement/140630.pdf>

On June 30, 2014, the Appeals Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (the Court) delivered its judgment on the appeals lodged by Augustin Bizimungu, a former Chief of Staff of the Rwandan army, and the Prosecution against Trial Chamber II’s judgment in *Augustin Bizimungu v. The Prosecutor*. The Court “affirmed, in part, Bizimungu’s convictions for genocide, extermination, murder, and rape,” in relation to certain incidents but reversed in relation to others where “the Trial Chamber erred in its assessment of evidence.” The Court nonetheless affirmed the sentence of thirty years of imprisonment, “in view of the serious nature of the remaining convictions.”

4. **Case A15 (IV) and A24 (Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal July 2, 2014)**

[http://www.iusct.net/General%20Documents/AWARD/I-A-AWARD%20NO.%20602-A15%20\(IV\)A24-FT-EN.pdf](http://www.iusct.net/General%20Documents/AWARD/I-A-AWARD%20NO.%20602-A15%20(IV)A24-FT-EN.pdf)

On July 2, 2014, the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal (the Tribunal) issued Award No. 602 in Cases A15 (IV) and A24. The Tribunal awarded \$842,468.14 to Iran to compensate for legal expenses that Iran incurred when it was “reasonably compelled in the prudent defense of its interests to make appearances or file documents in United States courts.” The Tribunal held that the United States had not complied with its obligations under General Principle B of the General Declaration to “terminate all litigation as between the government of [Iran and the United States] and to bring about the settlement and termination of all such claims through binding arbitration,” or its obligations under Article VII, paragraph 2, of the Claims Settlement Declaration,

which provides, *inter alia*, that “[c]laims referred to the arbitration Tribunal shall . . . be considered exclude from the jurisdiction of the courts of Iran, or of the United States, or of any other court.”

RESOLUTIONS, DECLARATIONS, AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

1. Policy Paper on Sexual and Gender-Based Crimes (ICC June 5, 2014)

<<http://www.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/otp/OTP-Policy-Paper-on-Sexual-and-Gender-Based-Crimes-June-2014.pdf>>

On June 5, 2014, the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court, Fatou Bensouda, published a Policy Paper on Sexual and Gender-Based Crimes. The comprehensive policy paper will “guide the Office of the Prosecutor in its work in fighting against impunity for sexual and gender-based crimes, and promote transparency and clarity, as well as predictability in the application of the legal framework of the Rome Statute to such crimes.” The Policy Paper was promulgated following “a process of extensive consultations, gathering input from staff in the Office, the Prosecutor’s Special Gender Advisor, as well as a wide-range of other sources, including States Parties, international organisations, civil society, academia and individual experts.”

2. UN Report on International Legal Crimes in South Sudan (UN May 8, 2014)

<<http://www.unmiss.unmissions.org/Portals/unmiss/Human%20Rights%20Reports/UNMISS%20Conflict%20in%20South%20Sudan%20-%20A%20Human%20Rights%20Report.pdf>>

On May 8, 2014, the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS) issued a report, entitled “Conflict in Southern Sudan: A Human Rights Report,” documenting international legal crimes committed by both sides during the country’s civil war. The report, drawing on more than 900 interviews with victims and witnesses, states that there are reasonable grounds to believe that “gross violations of human rights and serious violations of humanitarian law . . . have been perpetrated in the context of the on-going conflict” in South Sudan. Such crimes may include “extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, rape and other acts of sexual violence, arbitrary arrests and detention, targeted attacks against civilians not taking part in hostilities, violence aimed at spreading terror among the civilian population, and attacks on hospitals as well as personnel and objects involved in a peacekeeping mission.”

3. Intergovernmental World Nature Organization Treaty (May 1, 2014)

<<http://www.wno.org/wno-treaty>>

On May 1, 2014, the Intergovernmental World Nature Organization (WNO) treaty entered into force. The treaty establishes the World Nature Organization, an intergovernmental organization with the core objective of “promot[ing] sustainable development, information and knowledge transfer among states, organizations and the economic sector, as regards preserving the natural environment, environmentally-friendly technologies, green economies, renewable energies, protection of resources, protection of water, forest, air, oceans and climate.” The WNO founding countries hope “to create a permanent, global and effective negotiation platform.”