

OXFORD

THE LAW OF STATE IMMUNITY

THIRD EDITION

HAZEL FOX CMG QC AND PHILIPPA WEBB

THE OXFORD INTERNATIONAL LAW LIBRARY

THE OXFORD INTERNATIONAL LAW LIBRARY

The Law of State Immunity

Third Edition

THE OXFORD INTERNATIONAL LAW LIBRARY

General editor: SIR FRANK BERMAN KCMG QC

This series features works on substantial topics in international law which provide authoritative statements of the chosen areas. Taken together they map out the whole of international law in a set of scholarly reference works and treatises intended to be of use to scholars, practitioners, and students.

The Law of State Immunity

Third Edition

HAZEL FOX CMG QC
PHILIPPA WEBB

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Hazel Fox CMG QC and Philippa Webb 2013

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2008

Third Edition published in 2013

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013943483

ISBN 978-0-19-964706-4

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Foreword

This, the third edition of a work which in just a decade has received renown throughout the world of international lawyers and beyond, presents a clash between two principles and attempts to show how that clash can be resolved. On the one side is the sovereign authority of the forum State in which a legal proceeding is being brought to decide the case through its Courts. Running with that sovereign authority, as a manifestation of territorial sovereignty, is the right, now well recognized, of the individual to have access to the courts to enforce their rights against the alleged wrongdoer. On the other side, if that alleged wrongdoer is a foreign state, it claims the benefit of its sovereign equality: it is juridically equal to all other States including the forum State.

In the common law, that second absolute view for long prevailed, although with limited exceptions, for instance, in respect of litigation concerning real property in the forum State. But, particularly as the functions of the State broadened and it came to be seen not only as a Prince but also as a trader in the marketplace, that absolute position came increasingly under attack. That attack, notably in respect of commercial activities, gave rise to litigation in many countries and to real challenges for national judges (cases from 18 jurisdictions are mentioned in the recent judgment of the International Court of Justice in *Germany v Italy*), to national legislation (11 enactments are mentioned in that case), the preparation of which also presents challenges to national law makers; to two multilateral treaties (the UN Convention on State Immunity and the European Convention; along with draft Inter-American Convention); to resolutions of the Institut de Droit International; and to much commentary including the two earlier editions of this splendid work.

The preparation of this new edition is more than justified by the volume of new material and by continuing uncertainties in, and debates about, basic issues such as the essence and extent of the commercial exception and the local tort exception, and the significance of the jurisdictional character of the immunity, especially where the allegedly unlawful act is a breach of a peremptory norm.

This book once again has wider values. It provides an excellent account of the law in development over two or more centuries and especially over the last half century. That account also highlights the interactions in this area of law between the sources of international law already mentioned. That is to say, although the book is essential for the specialists or those who have to address this area of law as counsel, judges, advisers, or national law-makers, it also provides much of interest and value to international lawyers generally. I must say that the careful and compelling arguments of Hazel Fox QC, now joined by Philippa Webb, an excellent young scholar and practitioner, make this judge, thinking also of his earlier national judging role, pause and reconsider. That is one of the things good scholarship should do.

Kenneth Keith
International Court of Justice

This page intentionally left blank

Preface and Acknowledgments

The objectives of this work are to provide a guide to relevant material, to set out a general balanced view of the present state of the law and to put government lawyers and policy-makers in a position to make appropriate decisions as to its future direction.

The book is divided into five parts: structure and general concepts; sources; the current international law; other immunities; conclusions. Some readers, particularly those seeking an answer to a specific application of immunity, may prefer first to consult Part III which sets out article by article the provisions of the UN Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property (UNCSI) and discusses their application by reference to existing State practice, particularly English and US law. For them, having identified the particular problem, reference to Part I may help to place it in perspective with regard to the general concepts which govern the subject.

This third edition of *The Law of State Immunity* seeks not only to address recent developments at the national and international levels, but also to try to explain the evolution in the law. Thus, the previous edition's chapter on 'The Concept of the State: Theory and the Justification for State Immunity' has been replaced in this edition by Chapter 2: 'The Three Models of the Concept of State Immunity'. Our analysis of the third model, Immunity as a Procedural Plea, has been inspired in large part by the 2012 *Jurisdictional Immunities* Judgment of the ICJ. In the light of that judgment, we use the three models throughout the book to identify and explain trends in the development of the law.

As regards the substantive law on State immunity, we have identified areas that have undergone major developments and deserve closer attention. An increasing proportion of claims made in national courts relating to State immunity concern labour disputes involving a foreign State or an international organization. We have introduced a new Chapter 14: 'Immunity from Adjudication: The Employment Exception in respect of (1) A Foreign State and (2) An International Organization' that explores this aspect of the law of State immunity, including the influence of European human rights law. Secondly, we have introduced a separate chapter on the 'Territorial Tort Exception' (Chapter 15); the legality validity of this exception has been challenged by the *Jurisdictional Immunities* Judgment. Thirdly, Chapters 16 and 17 on 'State Immunity from Enforcement' has been elaborated in more detail as to the nature of the property and the relationship between immunity from adjudication and immunity from enforcement. In Part IV there is an expanded discussion of developments as regards other immunities: the immunities of individuals acting on behalf of the State (Chapter 18) and the immunities of international organizations and those covered by so-called special regimes (Chapter 19).

Since the publication of the second edition, UNCSI has gained further ratifications, though it has yet to enter into force. Its provisions have nonetheless been cited by national and international courts as evidence of customary international law. We have expanded Chapter 9 to address the legislative and judicial implementation of UNCSI by a number of the States Parties; the advisability of UK ratification is discussed in Chapter 7.

Chapter 4 (Jurisdiction), Chapter 10 (The Definition of the Foreign State) and Chapter 8 (US law) have been substantially revised and updated. At the time of writing, the *Jones v UK* and *Mitchell & Ors v UK* cases were still pending before the European Court of Human Rights.

In researching and writing Part IV and the related sections in the chapters on UK law and US law, we have been struck by an increasingly disaggregated or fragmented view of immunity (see Chapter 20).

In this edition Hazel Fox, the sole author of the previous two editions has been joined by Philippa Webb. With an LLB from the University of New South Wales, Australia, an LLM and JSD from Yale, legal practice with Baker & Mackenzie, the UN Secretariat and the ICC Prosecutor's Office, and service as the legal officer and special assistant for three years to Rosalyn Higgins DBE, QC when President of the ICJ, Philippa was amply qualified to share the considerable labour in revising and accommodating the changes in law required in this new edition. Although only five years having passed since the publication of the second edition, there has been extensive activity—judicial, legislative, and academic—on the law of State immunity, not least in taking due account of the major decision of the International Court of Justice in the 2012 *Jurisdictional Immunities* case. Whilst it is for the reader to judge its quality, we confidently assert that the editorial partnership derived from Philippa's wide experience, Hazel's accumulated knowledge from teaching and practice of State immunity from the UK State Immunity Act 1978 onwards, and the intellectual stimulus and deeper legal analysis resulting from our joint activity provides greater clarity, thoroughness, and readability in this latest edition.

This Preface sets out what is new in this third edition. We are indebted to a number of people who have helped and encouraged us in updating, amending, and reshaping this book. We thank John Louth and Sir Frank Berman for early conversations on the purpose of the new edition and for their encouragement throughout the drafting process. We are grateful to Merel Alstein for her professional assistance and good advice at every stage. Professors Chimène Keitner and David P Stewart provided invaluable assistance with revising the chapter on US law; their contributions have been precise, insightful, and always timely. Alison Macdonald of Matrix Chambers has kindly updated and revised the section on procedure in the chapter on UK law. Peter Quayle of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development provided (in his personal capacity) excellent comments on the new chapter on the employment exception, especially as it relates to international organizations. Thanks are also due to those who provided comments and information on specific sections of the book: Professor Andrea Biondi, Dr M Baldegger, Professor Lori Damrosch, Professor Carlos Espósito, Professor Keith Ewing, Dr Filippo Fontanelli, Christopher Keith Hall, Katerina Kappos, Professor Mizushima, Dr Roger O'Keefe, Sam Wordsworth, and Nout van Woudenberg. We are grateful for the editorial assistance of Katarzyna Lasinska, whose work was funded by a grant from the Centre for European Law at King's College London. Finally, we express our sincere gratitude to Judge Sir Kenneth Keith ONZ KBE QC for writing the Foreword to this edition.

Hazel Fox and Philippa Webb
April 2013

Summary Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	v
<i>Preface and Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xvii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xix
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxxix
<i>Table of UNCSI Articles</i>	xlvi

Introduction	1
--------------	---

PART I GENERAL CONCEPTS

1. The Institution of Proceedings and the Nature of the Plea of State Immunity	11
2. The Three Models of the Concept of State Immunity	25
3. The Plea of State Immunity distinguished from Act of State and Non-justiciability	49
4. State Immunity and Jurisdiction: Immunity from the Civil and Criminal Jurisdiction of National Courts	73

PART II THE SOURCES OF THE LAW OF STATE IMMUNITY

5. A Review of the Sources: Treaties and Projects for Codification	99
6. The Restrictive Doctrine of State Immunity: Its recognition in State Practice	131
7. English Law: The UK State Immunity Act 1978	165
8. US Law: The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 1976	238
9. The 2004 UN Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property: General Aspects	284

PART III THE CURRENT INTERNATIONAL LAW OF STATE IMMUNITY

10. The Definition of the Foreign State	335
11. The Consent of the Foreign State: Waiver and the Arbitration Exception	373
12. The Concept of Commerciality	395
13. Immunity from Adjudication: the Proceedings in which Immunity cannot be invoked, the Commercial and Other Exceptions	413

14. Immunity from Adjudication: The Employment Exception in respect of (1) A Foreign State and (2) An International Organization	435
15. Immunity from Adjudication: The Territorial Tort Exception	463
16. State Immunity from Enforcement: General Aspects	479
17. The Three Exceptions to Immunity from Enforcement and the Five Categories of State Property listed as Immune	509

PART IV OTHER IMMUNITIES

18. Immunity of Individuals acting on behalf of the State	537
19. International Organizations and Special Regimes	570

PART V CONCLUSIONS

20. Taking Stock	611
------------------	-----

<i>Appendix: The United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property</i>	615
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	625
<i>Index</i>	629

Contents

<i>Foreword by Judge Sir Kenneth Keith</i>	v
<i>Preface and Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xvii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xix
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxxix
<i>Table of UNCSI Articles</i>	xlv

Introduction	1
The plea as one of mixed international and municipal law	1
The functions which State immunity serves	1
The sources of the law of State immunity	2
The recent development of the law of State immunity	3
The three models on which immunity is based	3
Structure of the book	5
State immunity as a case study of the structure of international law	7

PART I GENERAL CONCEPTS

1. The Institution of Proceedings and the Nature of the Plea of State Immunity	11
The institution of proceedings	11
Immunity as a rule of international law	13
The role of national law	17
Outline of the plea of State immunity	18
Proceedings in court: criminal and civil	21
2. The Three Models of the Concept of State Immunity	25
The changing role of the independence and equality of the State	25
The First Model, the absolute doctrine: the independence of the State	26
The inability of the national court to enforce its judgments against a foreign State	31
The Second Model: the restrictive doctrine	32
The distinction into public and private law acts used as legal device in other areas of regulation	34
The merits and faults of the distinction into public and private law acts	35
The Third Model: immunity as a procedural exclusionary plea	38
From bilateralism of rights to a vertical hierarchy?	39
Assessment of the Third Model	44
3. The Plea of State Immunity Distinguished from Act of State and Non-justiciability	49
Proceedings in national courts where a foreign State affects the court's exercise of jurisdiction	49
Special features of proceedings where the State is party	51
State Practice relating to pleas of Act of State and Non-justiciability: US law	53
English law	59

Act of a foreign State	60
The plea of non-justiciability	63
Modification where 'a foothold in domestic law'	65
Modification where a procedural right of access	68
Pleas of Act of State, non-justiciability and State immunity compared	70
4. State Immunity and Jurisdiction: Immunity from the Civil and Criminal Jurisdiction of National Courts	73
The competing principle of sovereign territoriality	75
The extraterritorial extension of the State's jurisdiction	76
Universal jurisdiction	81
The relationship of immunity to jurisdiction	82
The distinction into civil and criminal jurisdiction	85
Additional jurisdictional links in civil proceedings against a State	87
The exercise of criminal jurisdiction over a foreign State	89
 PART II THE SOURCES OF THE LAW OF STATE IMMUNITY 	
5. A Review of the Sources: Treaties and Projects for Codification	99
International conventions relating solely to State immunity	99
The resolutions of international bodies	99
Decisions of international tribunals	100
Decisions of national courts	102
Treaty practice as a source	106
The 1926 Brussels Convention and the 1934 Protocol	114
The 1972 European Convention on State Immunity	116
Projects for codification by governmental and non-governmental bodies	123
6. The Restrictive Doctrine of State Immunity: Its Recognition in State Practice	131
Early development	131
The formulation of a general rule of immunity of the State	134
Common law jurisdictions: UK law	135
US law	143
Other common law jurisdictions	146
The development of the restrictive doctrine in civil law countries	150
Russia and other East European Countries	159
African and Asian States	161
7. English Law: The UK State Immunity Act 1978	165
Status	165
General structure of the UK State Immunity Act 1978	172
Definition of the foreign State	174
Waiver	184
The exceptions to immunity: non-immune commercial activities	189
English law: immunity from enforcement	209
Recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments given against foreign States	215
English law: procedure	222
The Civil Procedure Rules	222
Proof of the status of a foreign State or government	223

Commencement of proceedings against a foreign State	227
Service of Process	230
Burden of proof	234
8. US Law: The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 1976	238
Immunity from adjudication	238
General structure of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act	
1976 Jurisdiction	242
Definition of the Foreign State	249
Waiver	255
Exceptions to immunity from adjudication	259
The Alien Tort Act 1789 and the Torture Victim Protection Act 1991	271
The Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act 1996, the Seventh Amendment to the FSIA	278
Immunity from execution of the State and its property	278
Amendment of the FSIA relating to execution against State property	281
9. The 2004 UN Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property: General Aspects	284
Legislative history: the ILC's work and its consideration in the United Nations	285
Status of the Convention	289
Interpretation of the Convention	295
Structure of the Convention	297
The general rule of immunity in the Convention	303
Exclusions	310
A general assessment of the Convention	319
Implementation by States which have ratified the Convention	322

PART III THE CURRENT INTERNATIONAL LAW OF STATE IMMUNITY

10. The Definition of the Foreign State	335
External attributes as an independent and sovereign State	336
Recognition of a State or government	340
Internal attributes of the State	345
Head of State	347
Constituent units and political subdivisions	348
State agencies	352
Representatives of the State: Individuals	364
Central banks	369
11. The Consent of the Foreign State: Waiver and the Arbitration Exception	373
The nature of consent of a foreign State in proceedings in national courts	373
Consent under the UN Convention	378
Consent of the State to the exercise of jurisdiction by the court of the forum State	383
Consent by choice of jurisdiction as constituting waiver	385
Counterclaims: matters covered by waiver	387
Waiver and the arbitration exception	388
UNCSI Article 17 arbitration exception: limitations	391

12. The Concept of Commerciality	395
The Three requirements for an exception to immunity	396
<i>Acta jure imperii</i>	399
<i>Acta jure gestionis</i>	402
Techniques for determination of the commerciality of the act	404
Evaluation of the restrictive doctrine	411
13. Immunity from Adjudication: the Proceedings in which Immunity Cannot be Invoked, the Commercial and Other Exceptions	413
The exception for commercial transactions	413
The exception for ownership, possession and use of property	422
The taking of property in violation of international law	426
The exception for infringement of intellectual property rights	427
Participation in companies or other collective bodies	429
The exception for ships owned or operated by a State	431
14. Immunity from Adjudication: The Employment Exception in respect of (1) A Foreign State and (2) An International Organization	435
(1) A foreign State's immunity and the exception for employment contracts	437
The three Models of employment contracts with a Foreign State	439
The exception for employment contracts in UNCSI Article 11(2)	443
Circumstances where the rule of immunity still prevails UNCSI Article 11(2)	446
(2) An international organization's immunity and the exception to immunity for employment contracts	455
Allocation of responsibility in respect of employees of an international organization	460
Employment contracts of the international organization and of the foreign State compared	462
15. Immunity from Adjudication: The Territorial Tort Exception	463
Part One: UN Convention Article 12	465
Legislative history	465
Jurisdictional connection	466
Applicable law to determine cause of action	469
Types of tortious conduct	470
Exclusions	474
Part Two: impact of the <i>Jurisdictional Immunities</i> Judgment	475
Three controversial types of loss	476
16. State Immunity from Enforcement: General Aspects	479
The reasons underlying no enforcement against State property	480
State Practice: the general rule and modifications	482
Immunity from enforcement in the UN Convention	490
State immunity from measures of constraint in connection with proceedings before a court	494
The distinction into pre- and post-judgment	495
Types of coercive measures	497
Coercive measures against the State representative	500
Subject-matter of coercive measures	502

17. The Three Exceptions to Immunity from Enforcement and the Five Categories of State Property listed as Immune	509
The three exceptions to the General Rule of Immunity from enforcement	509
Consent of the State	510
Allocation of State property by the State	510
Use or intended use for commercial purposes	511
The five categories of State property listed as immune	512
Diplomatic property	515
Military property	520
Central bank property	522
Cultural heritage of the State	525
State property forming part of an exhibition	527
Conclusions with regard to Chapters 16 and 17	530

PART IV OTHER IMMUNITIES

18. Immunity of Individuals Acting on Behalf of the State	537
The head of State	538
Immunities of other high-ranking officials	558
Special missions	561
Immunity <i>ratione materiae</i> of State Officials	564
19. International Organizations and Special Regimes	570
International organizations	570
Diplomats and the diplomatic mission	579
Consular immunity	592
Visiting armed forces	593
Other issues: private military and security companies and policing and law enforcement	604

PART V CONCLUSIONS

20. Taking Stock	611
<i>Appendix: The United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property</i>	615
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	625
<i>Index</i>	629

This page intentionally left blank

List of Abbreviations

AALCO	Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization
ACJFS	Japanese Act on Civil Jurisdiction over Foreign States 2010
AEDPA	Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act 1996
AFP	Australian Federal Police
ASI	Agreement on Succession Issues
ATS	Alien Tort Statute 1789
CAVV	Dutch Advisory Committee on Issues of Public International Law
CFA	Court of Final Appeal
CJJA	Civil Jurisdiction and Judgments Act 1982
COE	Council of Europe
CPIUN	Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations
CPR	Civil Procedure Rules 1998
DARIO	ILC Draft Articles on the Responsibility of International Organizations
DPP	Director of Public Prosecutions
ECB	European Central Bank
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
ECSI	European Convention on State Immunity
ELDO	European Launcher Development Organization
EMBL	European Molecular Biology Laboratory
ESA	European Space Agency
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
ESRO	European Space Research Organization
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
FRY	Former Republic of Yugoslavia
FSIA	Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 1976
HKSAR	Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
HRA	Human Rights Act 1998
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICTR	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
ICSID	International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes
ILA	International Law Association
ILC	International Law Commission
ILOAT	Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization
IOIA	International Organizations Immunities Act 1945
ITC	International Tin Council
ITLOS	UN International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea
NTC	National Transitional Council
NYC	New York Convention 1958
PRC	People's Republic of China
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
RICO	Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act
SAR	Special Administrative Region
SFRY	States to the former Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia
SIA	State Immunity Act 1978
SCSL	Special Court for Sierra Leone
SOI	suggestion of interest
SOFA	Status of Forces Agreement
SOMA	Status of Mission Agreement

TRIA	Terrorism Risk Insurance Act 2002
TRNC	Turkish Republic of North Cyprus
TVPA	Torture Victim Protection Act 1991
UNCLOS	UN Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNMEE	UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea
UNSCI	UN Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property
VCCR	Vienna Convention on Consular Relations 1964
VCDR	Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations

Table of Cases

INTERNATIONAL CASES

European Court of Human Rights

Al Adsani v United Kingdom, ECHR App 35753/97; (2002) 34 EHRR 111; 123 ILR 23	3, 13, 27, 40, 42–3, 68, 69–70, 199, 202, 294, 331, 467–8, 515
Al-Jedda v UK App No 27021/08, judgment of 7 July 2011	79
Association SOS Attentats and Anr v France, App No 76642/01/04	547
ECtHR Bankovic and Ors v Belgium and Ors App No 52207/99, [2001] ECHR 89, 123 ILR 94	74, 77, 78, 80
Bosphorus v Ireland Appl No 4036/98 (2006) 42 EHRR 1	456
Bramelid v Sweden (1982) 29 DR 64	70, 383
Cudak v Lithuania App No 15869/0 ECtHR, 23 March 2010	161, 199, 443
Demopoulos v Turkey (Admissibility) ECHR Grand Chamber (2010) 104 AJIL 628–31	29
Deweere v Belgium (1980) 2 EHRR 439, 460	70, 383
Fayed v United Kingdom (1994) 18 EHRR 393, Series A No 294	43, 46, 456
Fogarty v UK App No 37112/97; (2001) 34 EHRR 302	68, 170, 198, 199, 331, 443, 452, 474
Frydlender v France (App No 30979/96), Judgment (Grand Chamber), 27 June 2000, ECHR 2000-VII	442
Gasparini v Italy and Belgium, European Court of Human Rights, App No 10750/03, decision of 12 May 2009	460, 578, 579
Golder v UK, Ser A No 18 (1975) 1 EHRR 524, paras 33–5	68
Grosz v France	42
Gusinskiy v Russia 70276/01 (First Section) 19 May 2004	71
Issa and Ors v Turkey App No 31821/96, 16 November 2004	78
Hirschhorn v Romania 29294/02 ECtHR (Third Section) 26 July 2007	425
Kalogeropoulos v Greece and Germany, ECHR No 0059021/00 Judgment on Admissibility, 12 December 2002	3, 43
Manoilescu and Dobrescu v Romania and Russia (dec) no 60861/00, ECHR 2005-VI	425
McElhinney v Ireland and UK App No 31253/96, Judgment of 21 November 2001; (2002) 34 EHRR 5; 123 ILR 73	42, 68, 69, 331, 474
McElhinney v Ireland App No 31253/96, Judgment of 21 November 2001, para 38	474
Medvedev and Ors v France [GC], App No 3394/03, § 67, ECHR 2010	78
Nada v Switzerland, ECtHR (App no 10593/08) 12 September 2012	47, 67
Öcalan v Turkey [GC], App No 46221/99, § 91, ECHR 2005 IV	78
Oleynikov v Russia ECtHR App No 36703/04, 1st Section, 14 March 2013	160, 292, 321, 613
Osman v UK ECHR 87/1997/871/1083, Judgment of 28 October 1998	42, 68
Pellegrin v France 1999	449
Pauger v Austria (1998) 25 EHRR 105	68
Ringeisen v Austria, Ser A No 13 (1971) 1 EHRR 504	68
Sabeh el Leil v France App No 34869/05 [2011] ECHR 1055	292, 443
Z v UK	42, 68
Schmidt v Home Secretary of Government of UK, Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, and Jones [1995] 1 ILRM 3301; 103 ILR 322	184
Soering	47
Sporrong and Lönnroth v Sweden, Judgment of 23 September 1982, Ser A No 52, 26	68
Vilho Eskelinen v Finland (Grand Chamber) 63235/00, 19/04/2007	443, 449
Wallishauser v Austria (App No 156/04) Judgment 17 July 2012	443, 447, 591

European Court of Justice (ECJ)

Commission v Bleis, Case 4/91 [1991] ECR 5627	447
Commission v France, Case 307/84; [1986] ECR 1725; Reyners [1984] ECR at 664	441
Elefantan Schuh GmbH H v Jacqmain (No. 150/80) ECR 1671; [1982] 3 CMLR 1	229
Foster v British Gas, Case C-188/89 [1991] 2 AC 306, [1990] 3 CJEK 897	34
Hungary v Slovakia, 16 October 2012\ [2012] ECJ C-364/10 (06 March 2012)	541
LTU Luft transportunternehmen GmbH & Co KG v Eurocontrol (Case 29/76) [1976] ECR 1541	294
Marguerite Johnston v Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (Case 222/84, § 18, [1986] ECR 1651)	442, 453

R v Secretary of State for Transport, ex parte Factortame (No 2) [1991] AC 603.	30
Sayag v Le Duc ECJ (1969) 329	90
The Netherlands v Reinhold Rüffer (Case 814/79) [1980] ECR 3807.	294
USA v Nolan C-538/10 ECJ (2012)	496
Waite and Kennedy v Germany (1999) 30 EHRR 261, 118 ILR 121	68, 70, 460, 578
Yukos v Russian Federation [2009] ECHR 287.	71
 France-New Zealand Arbitration Tribunal	
Rainbow Warrior (New Zealand v France) France-New Zealand Arbitration Tribunal, 30 April 1990, 82 ILR 500.	95
 International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) Tribunal	
Del Favero SpA v Republic of Cameroon, Mitchell J, 10 February 1999	232
 International Court of Justice (ICJ)	
Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v Democratic Republic of the Congo), ICJ Reports 2007	29
Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Serbia), Judgment, ICJ Reports 2007.	91
Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v Rwanda) ICJ Reports 2006	40, 83–4, 585
Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v Uganda), ICJ Reports 2005.	542, 559, 585, 589
Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of Congo v Belgium) Judgment Preliminary Objections and Merits, ICJ Reports 2002,	3, 15–16, 20, 22, 82, 83, 85, 96, 100, 102, 105, 295, 500–1
Certain Criminal Proceedings in France (Republic of the Congo v France)	100
Certain Questions of Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (Djibouti v France) ICJ Reports 2008	100, 105, 546, 549, 559–60, 562, 611, 625
Elettronica Sicula S.p.A. (ELSI) (United States of America v. Italy), ICJ Reports 1989	29
Interhandel (Switzerland v. United States of America), ICJ Reports 1959.	29
Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v Italy, Greece Intervening), Judgment, ICJ Reports 2012	2, 3, 5, 12, 14, 15–16, 20, 21, 22, 23–4, 31, 38–9, 41–2, 44–5, 47–8, 52, 67, 76, 83–5, 94, 100–2, 105–6, 121–2, 128, 129, 147, 157, 171, 173, 219, 220, 249, 291, 297, 304, 315, 316, 317, 321, 322, 324, 331–2, 345, 395, 399, 445, 454, 461, 463–4, 472–6, 478, 482, 504, 537, 562, 566, 569, 570, 576, 579, 595, 603, 611–13
Legal Consequences for States of the presence of S.Africa (SW Africa), Advisory Opinion, ICJ Reports 1971	29
Questions relating to the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v Senegal) ICJ Reports 2012	3, 44, 81, 100, 102, 567, 611
The Cumaswaramy Case, para 61.	576
 International Criminal Court (ICC)	
Prosecutor v Omar Al Bashir (Decision on the Prosecution's Application for a Warrant of Arrest against Omar Hassan Ahmad Al Bashir) ICC-02/05-01/09, P-T Ch I(4 March 2009)	558
 International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia (ICTY)	
Prosecutor v Furundzija, IT-95-17/1-T (10 December 1998), 121ILR 213.	40, 42, 69
 International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS)	
Fragata Libertad Case (Argentina v Ghana) ITLOS Order 15 December 2012, Case No 20.	497
 Iran/US Claims Tribunal	
Iran v United States Case	503
 Netherlands/United States Arbitration	
Island of Palmas (Or Miangas) case (Netherlands v USA) RIAA II 829 at 838 (1928)	74

JURISDICTIONS

Australia

Chow Hung Ching v R (1948) 77 CLR 449 at 482	594
De Andrade v De Andrade 118 ILR 299 (1984-87) 11 Aust YBIL 472	586
Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade v Magno (1992-3) 112 ALR 529	589
Petrotimor Companhia de Petroleos SARL v Commonwealth of Australia [2003] 126 FCR 354	59
Spycatcher case, Attorney-General (UK) v Heinemann Publishers Australia Pty Ltd (1988)	
165 CLR 30	64
Thor Shipping A/S v The Ship 'Al Duhail' (2009) 58 ICLQ 702	433, 625
Thor Shipping A/S v The Ship 'Al Duhail' [2008] FCA 1842	206, 433
Victoria Aircraft Leasing Ltd v United States (2005) 218 ALR 640	59, 419
Wright v McQualter (1970) 17 FLR 305 at 321	589
Zhang v Zemin (2008) 251 ALR 707	342
Zhang v Zemin [2010] NSW CA 255, 141 ILR 542	22

Austria

A W v J(H) F v L (Head of State), Austria Supreme Ct, 15 February 2001	547
Dralle v Republic of Czechoslovakia (1950) 17 ILR 156, Case No 41; UN Legal Materials, 183, 10 May 1950, Austrian Supreme Court	156, 158, 203, 399, 429
Firma Baumeister Ing Richard L v O, Austrian Supreme Court, 10 Ob 53/04 Y, ILDC 362 (2004)	575
French Consular Employee v France, 14 June 1989; 86 ILR 583	450
Holubek v Government of USA, Austrian Supreme Court, 10 February 1961, UN Legal Materials 203; 40 ILR 73	156, 407, 465, 471
Leasing West Gulf v People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Austrian Sup Ct, 30 April 1986, 116 ILR 527	519
Municipality v Deutsche, (1981) 86 ILR 542	467
Republic of 'A' Embassy Account case, Austrian Sup Ct, 3 April 1986, 77 ILR 489	519
Republic of Croatia v Girocredit Bank AG der Sparkassen (1997) Austrian Supreme Court; 36 ILM 1520	66, 338
Seidenschmidt v USA, Austrian Sup Ct, 8 July 1992; 116 ILR 530	454
X v Govt of Czechoslovakia Austrian Supreme Court 19 May 1950, Materialson Jurisdictional Immunities (1982) ST/Leg/Ser.B/20	27

Belgium

Biocare v Gecamines and Republic of Zaire, Belgian Civil Ct of Brussels (2nd Chamber) 1989; 115 ILR 415	401
Burundi v Landau, Belgium Ct of Appeal, Brussels, 21 June 2002, 127 ILR 98	519
General Secretariat of the ACP Group v BD, ILDC 1576 (BE 2009)	459
General Secretariat of the ACP Group v Lutchmaya, ILDC 1573 (BE 2009)	459
Iraq v Vinci Construction, 4 October 2002, Brussels Ct of Appeal, Jo des Trib (2003), 318; 127 ILR 101	153, 519
League of Arab States v T, Belgium Ct of Cassation, 12 March 2001; 127 ILR 94	572
Leica AG v Central Bank of Iraq, 15 February 2000, Brussels Ct of Appeal, J des trib (2001) 6	519
Lutchmaya v ACP, JTDE (2003) 684	153
SA Biocare v Gécamines (Zaire) and Republic of Zaire, Belgium Civil Ct of Brussels, 16 March 1989; 115 ILR 415	427
Scimet v African Development Bank, Belgium Ct of First Instance, Brussels, 14 February 1997; 128 ILR 582	572, 575
Sharon and Yaron, Re, Final Appeal No p 02 1139 F/1 (Belgium Ct of Cassation 12 February 2003)	550
Western European Union v Siedler, Cour de Cassation of Belgium (third chamber), Cass No S 04 0129 F, ILDC 1625 (BE 2009)	459
Zaire v d'Hoop, Belgium, 9 March 1995, 106 ILR 294	499

Botswana

Republic of Angola v Springbok Investment (Pty) Ltd [2005] BLR 159	147
--	-----

Brazil

Arab Republic of Syria v Arab Republic of Egypt, Brazil Supreme Court, 14 April 1982; 91 ILR 288	147
--	-----

Canada

- Amnesty International Canada and British Columbia Association for Liberties v Civil Chief of Defence Staff for the Canadian Forces, Ministry of National Defence and Attorney General of Canada, Canadian Federal Court, 12 March 2008 79
- Bouzari v Islamic Republic of Iran, 30 June 2004, Canada:Ontario Ct of Appeal; 128 ILR 586 478
- Carrato v USA [1982] 141 DLR 3d 456; 90 ILR 229 606
- Chateau Gai Wines Ltd v Le Gouvernement et La République Française, Canada, Exch Ct; 612 2d DLR 709; 53 ILR 284 429
- Jaffe v Miller (Ontario Ct of Appeal, 17 June); [1993] 13 OR (3d) 745; 95 ILR 446. 606
- Kazemi (estate of) v Islamic Republic of Iran (2011) QCCS 196, 25 January 2011; 147 ILR 318, paras 92–3 468
- Liquidators of the Maritime Bank of Canada v Receiver-General of New Brunswick [1892] AC 437 342, 350
- Parent et al v Singapore Airlines Ltd and Civil Aeronautics Administration, Superior Ct of Quebec, Decision of 22 October 2003 (2008) 161, 342
- R v Hape (2007) 46 ILM 813 79
- R v Medvid 2010 SCQB 22, para 27 179
- Schreiber v Canada (Attorney General) [2002] 3 SCR 269; 2002 SCC 62; 147 ILR 276. 475
- Schreiber v Germany [2002] 3 SCR 269; 147 ILR 276, para 80 473
- Schreiber v Germany 216 DLR (4th) 513. 471
- Schreiber v Germany and Canada (Attorney General) [2002] 3 SCR 269; 2002 SCC 62; 147 ILR 276, paras 13–18 472
- Venne v Democratic Republic of the Congo [1971] 22 DLR 3d 169; 64 ILR 24 195
- Walker v Baird [1993] 15 OR (3d) 596 (Ontario Ct General Division); (1994) 16 OR (3d) 504 606

China

- Rizaef Frères v The Soviet Mercantile Fleet, Provisional Ct of Shanghai, 30 September 1927 162

Czech Republic

- Roith v Embassy of the Republic of South Africa Czech Republic, Superior Ct in Prague, decision of 31 August 1995, No 10 Cmo 418/95-16 160
- The Immunity in labour matters Case, Czech Republic, Sup Ct 25 June 2008; 142 ILR 206 448

Dakar

- Habré, Senegal, Court of Appeal of Dakar, 4 July 2000; Cour de Cassation, Dakar, 20 March 2001; 125 ILR 569 22

Egypt*Mixed courts of Egypt*

- Borg v Caisse Nationale d'Épargne, AD, 1925-26, Case No 122 154
- Capt Hall (Ministry of Shipping v Capt Bengoa and Admin Des Ports et Phares, SS Sumatra v SS Mercedes), MCA, 24 November 1920. 154
- Commandant P Saglietto v Mohamed Tawill Effendi, Mansourah District Court, 15 January 1929 154
- Saglietto v Mohamed Tawill Effendi, Mansourah District Court, 15 January 1929 154

Finland

- Hanna Heusal v Republic of Turkey, 30 September 1993. 450, 454

France

- Administration des Chemins de Fer du Gouvernement Iranien v Société Levant Express Transport Cass, 1e Civ, 25 February 1969, RGDIP (1970) 98–114 154
- Allianz Via Insurance v USA French Ct of Appeal, Aix en Provence, 3 September 1999; 127 ILR 148 433
- Banque Africaine de Développement v Degboe, Paris Ct of Appeal, 7 October 2003, Rev Crit DIP (2004) 409. 155
- Banque Camerounaise de Développement v Société des Etablissement Rolber, Cour de Cassation, 1st ch, civ, 18 November 1986, RCDIP 76 (1987) 773. 408
- Benvenuti & Bonfant Co v Government of People's Republic of Congo (1981) Paris Ct of Appeal, 65 ILR 88 106, 388
- Bernet v Herran, Dreyfus-Scheyer, French Ct of Appeal (1886) DP 1886-I-393 365

Capital Ltd v République Argentine, France Cour de Cassation I civ 28 September 2011, JDI 139 (2012) 668	588
Clerget v Banque Commerciale pour l'Europe du Nord, French Ct of Appeal, 7 June 1969, 52 ILR 310, Cour de Cassation, 2 November 1971, 65 ILR 54	19, 341
Creighton Ltd v Government of Qatar, France, Ct of Cassation, 1st ch, civ, 6 July 2000 JDI (2000); note Pingel, JDI (2004) 1054	387, 389, 487, 488, 489, 496
Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, Slovenia v Republic of Former Yugoslavia (RFY), 12 October 1999, French Cour de Cassation, JDI (2000) 1036	338
De Fallois v Piatakoff, Cour de Cassation, 26 February 1937; 8 ILR 223	403
Dumez v Iraq, French Cour de Cassation, 15 July 1999, 27 ILR 144	519
ECOWAS v BCCI, French Ct of Appeal, Paris, 13 January 1993; 113 ILR 473	573
Elmiilik v Bey di Tunii, Clunet 15 (1888) 289	547
Emperor of Austria v Le Maître, Paris, Ct of Appeal, 15 March 1872, JDI (1874) 32	404
Englander v Satri Banka Csekoslovenska, French Cour de Cassation, 11 February 1969, 52 ILR 335 . . .	485
Erika case, Judicial Agent of the Treasury v Malta Maritime Authority GP (2005) 1160: The Cour d'Appel de Paris	92
Ex King Farouk v Christian Dior, French Ct of Appeal, 11 April 1957; JDI (1957) 716; 24 ILR (1957) 228	404, 544, 547
Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and National Bank of Yugoslavia v Republics of Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, French, Cour de Cassation, 12 October 1999, 128 ILR 627, JDI 2000	66
Gaddafi, sub nom SOS Attentat and Castelnau d'Esnauld v Khadafi, Head of State of the State of Libya, France, Cour de Cassation, Crim Chamber, 13 March 2000, No 1414; 124 ILR 508	22
Gamen Humbert v Etat Russe, Paris, Ct of Appeal, 30 April 1912, (1919) RGDIP 493	404
Gouvernement Espagnol v Casaux (1849) D 1849 1, 9; S (1849) 1, 93	154
Guggengeim v State of Vietnam, French Cour de Cassation, 19 December 1961; (62) 66 RGDIP 654; 44 ILR 74	405
Héritiers de L'Empereur Maximilien de Mexique v Lemaître, French Ct of Appeal, 15 March 1972, Clunet I (1974) 32; Dalloz II (1873) 24, 15, 4, 1872	547
Hintermann v Western European Union, French Cour de Cassation, 14 November 1995; 113 ILR 487	457
Islamic Republic of Iran v Eurodif, Cour de Cassation 14 March 1984, submissions made to the Court by Advocate General Gulphe, JDO (1984) 598, UN Legal Materials (1984) 1062, 77 ILR 513 at 520–1	508
Islamic Republic of Iran v Eurodif, Cour de Cassation, 20 March 1989, 28 June 1989, JDI 4 (1990) 1005, note Ouakrat, 89 ILR 37	485
Islamic Republic of Iran v Eurodif, Court of Appeal, Paris, 21 April 1982; 65 ILR 93; Cour de Cassation, 14 March 1984; 77 ILR 513	387, 389, 401, 485, 486, 496
Joola, 19 January 2010, Fr Cass crim RGDIP 115 (2011) Court of Cassation, Chambre Criminelle	92
Judicial agent of Treasury v Malta Maritime Authority GP (2005)	154
Laurans v Government of Morocco and Maspero, French Cour de Cassation, 20 November 1934; RC DIP 1935 795, note Suzanne Basdevant, 796; 7 ILR 171	340
Mellerio v Isabelle de Bourbon, ex-Reine d'Espagne, Paris, Ct of Appeal, 3 June 1872, JDI (1874) 3	404, 547
Ministre des relations extérieures v Tizon et Millet, 1 June 1984 (1985) 31 AFDI 928	589
Mme Naria X v Saudi School in Paris, France, Cour de Cassation (ch mixte) 20 June 2003 Rev crit DIP (2003) 647	354, 436
Mobutu Ses Seko v Société Logrine, Clunet, 1995, 641, note Mahiou; Mobutu and Zaire v Société Logrine, 31 May 1994, French Ct of Appeal, 113 ILR 481	547
Neger v Land of Hesse Tribunal de grande instance Paris, 15 January 1969, Rev crit DIP 1070 99–101 . .	349
NML v Argentina, Cour de Cassation, Judgments No 394	515, 612
NOGA v State of Russia; NOGA v Murmansk State Technical University and Association Brest 10 August 2000, Court of Appeal, Paris, 127 ILR 156	52, 155, 530
Procureur de la République v Ipitrade, Paris, Trib de Grande Instance, 12 September 1978 JDI (1979), 857	388
Procureur de la République v Lliamco, France Trib de Grande Instance, 5 March 1979, JDI (1979) 857; 65 ILR 78	389
Republic of Estonia, 30 June 1993, 113 ILR 478	12
Réunion Aérienne v Libyan People's Socialist Jamahiri ya, Cour de Cassation 1e civ, Clunet 138 (2011) 953	47, 69

Ruperas v EUTELSAT, French Ct of Appeal Paris, 20 May 1999; 127 ILR 139	575
Senhor v International Bank for West Africa and the Republic of Senegal (1990) French Cour de Cassation; 113 ILR 461	410
Sieur Mourcade v Arab Republic of Yemen, Trib de Grande Instance, Paris, 20 February 1991, 118 (1992) JDI 397; 113 ILR 462	406
Societe Levant Express Transport v Chemin de Fer du gouvernement Iranien, Cour de Cassation, civ 1 ^{re} , 25 February 1969	418
Société Nationale Algérienne du Gaz v Société Pipeline Service, French Cour de Cassation, 1 Civ, 2 May 1990, Rev crit dr int pri (1991) 140	504
Société Prony habitations v Guinée Bissau, French, Cour de Cassation civ 1 ^{ère} , 20 September 2006, RGDIP 110 (2006) 971	149
Société Sonatrach v Migeon, French Cour de Cassation, 1 October 1985, rev crit (1986) 526, (1987) 26 ILM 998, 77 ILR 525	505
Solon v Egyptian Government Trib Civ, Seine, 16 April 1847, Dalloz (1949) 17	340
SOS Attentat and Castelnau d'Esnault v Qadaffi, Head of State of the State of Libya, Cour de Cassation, Criminal Chamber, 13 March 2000, No 1414, ILR 490	102
Spain v Société Anonyme de l'Hotel George, Cour de Cassation, civ I, 17 January 1973, JDI (1973), 725	35, 403, 406
Spanish Government v Casaux (Lambege and Pujot), French Cour de Cassation 22 January 1849, Sirey 1830 I, 81 at 93; Dalloz, 1848 I, 5	83
Spanish Government v Lambège and Pujol, 22 January 1849, Sirey 1830, I, 81 at 93; Dalloz, 1848, I, 5	27, 150
Syndicat des copropriétaires de 14/16 Boulevard Flandrin, Paris Appeal Court (Third Chamber) 1992, 113 ILR 470–2	590
Union des Républiques Socialistes Soviétiques v Association France Export, Cass Req, 19 February 1928, D 1929, I, 73	154
USA (Director of US Foreign Service) v Perignon, Paris, Ct of Appeal, 89 (1962) JDI 1017; 44 ILR 76	406
Ville de Genève v Consorts de Civry, French Ct of Appeal, 11 June 1894; Cas req 1 July 1895, S 1896, I, 225	351
Yugoslavia v Croatia [2000] 1 L Pr 59, JDI (2000) 1936	12
Yugoslavia v Croatia [2000] ILR 59	230
Yugoslavia v SEE, 6 July 1970, France, Trib de Grande Instance, 65 ILR 47 at 49; Court of Appeal, Paris, 21 April 1982, JDI (1983) 145	386

Germany

Empire of Iran case, German Federal Constitutional Court, 30 April 1963, UN Legal Materials, 282; 45 ILR 57 at 80	27, 17–18, 19, 399, 407
Nada (Youssef M) Establishment v Central Bank of Nigeria [1976] Die Aktiengesellschaft 47, 25 August 1976, Frankfurt District Court	192
Re Prejudgment Garnishment against National Iranian Oil Co, German Federal Constitutional Court, 12 April 1983; ILM 22 (1984) 1279	401
Non-Resident Petitioner v Central Bank of Nigeria (1977) UN Legal Materials 290	488
Prejudgment Garnishment against National Iranian Oil Co, Re, (1984) 22 ILM 1279	487, 508
Sedelmayer v Russian Federation, German Federal Supreme Court, Order VII ZB 9/05, 4 October 2005, NJW-RR 2006, 198	158
The Philippine Embassy case, 46 BverfGE, 342, 65 ILR 140, UN Legal Materials 297, 13 December 1977, at 395	484

Greece

Distomo	95, 103
Margellos v Federal Republic of Germany (Case No 6/2002) (ILR vol 129, p 525)	332
Prefecture of Voiotia v Federal Republic of Germany, Case No 11/2000, Aveios Pagos (Hellenic Supreme Court), 4 May 2000, 123 ILR 513	32, 41, 483

Hong Kong

Democratic Republic of Congo and Ors v FG Hemisphere Associates LLC, Hong Kong Ct of Final Appeal, 8 June 2011 [2011]	98, 162, 184, 310, 321, 375, 490
FG Hemisphere Case	164

Hungary

Romania, GM & TI v Embassy of P in Bucharest, 9 March 2001, Bucharest Tribunal, Hafner RO/2, 520	149
--	-----

India

- Harbhajan Singh Dhalla v Union of India, Indian Supreme Ct, 5 November 1986, AIR (1987) SC 992. 147

Ireland

- Canada v Employment Appeals Tribunal and Burke [1992] 2 ILRM 325, Irish Sup Ct; 95 ILR 467. 147, 450
- Fusco v O'Dea, Ireland Supreme Ct (1994) 2 ILRM 389, 103 ILR 318 499

Israel

- Israel v Eichmann (1962) 36 ILR 5 50
- Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada v Edelson, Final Appeal, PLA 7092/94; ILDC 577 (IL 1997) 148
- Yosefov v Egypt 13 February 2011 ILDC 1771 (IL 2011) 148

Italy

- Banamar-Capizzi v Embassy of Republic of Algeria, Italian Cour de Cassation, 4 May 1989, 87 ILR 56. 484
- Borri v Argentina, Request for a ruling on jurisdiction, No 11225; ILDC 296 (IT 2005) 88 Rivista di diritto internazionale 856 (2005) 261
- Campione v Pet-Nitrogenmuver NV and Hungarian Republic, Italian Cour de Cassation, 14 November 1972; 65 ILR 287, 292 152
- Condor and Filvem v Minister of Justice Italy, Case No 329, 101 ILR 394. 152, 484, 486, 496
- Ferrini v Federal Republic of Germany Italian Cour de Cassation, Judgment No 5044 of 11 March 2004, registered 11 March 2005, 128 ILR 658, 87 Rivista diritto internazionale (2004) 539. 41, 95, 103
- Gutierrez v Elmilik (1886), Foro It. 1886-I, 913. 152
- Hungarian People's Republic v Onori, 24 May 1956. 152
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs v Federici and Japanese State (1984) 65 ILR 268, 278 474
- Paver v Hungarian People's Republic, 17 October 1956. 152
- President of the Council of Ministers v Markovic, Italian Ct of Cassation, 5 June 2002; 128 ILR 652 597
- Romanian Government v Trutta, Italian Cour de Cassation, 14 February 1926, 3 ILR 176 483
- Royal Embassy of Norway v Quattri Monika, Italian Cour de Cassation, No 2521/90, L/12771, 13 December 1990. 454
- Sassetti v Multinational Force and Observers Italy Examining Magistrate, 14 March 1994; 128 ILR 640 575
- Toglia v British Consulate in Naples, Cour de Cassation, 15th May 1989, Rivista di diritto internazionale (1989), 891 439
- USA v Soc IRSA, 1963 Foro It 1405; 47 Revista de DI 484. 250
- USA v Soc IRSA 1963 Foro It 1405; 47 Revista de DI 484, RT (3rd) § 205. 342

Japan

- Matsuyama and Sano v The Republic of China, Japan, Great Ct of Judicature, 28 December 1928 163
- A v Japan, Turkish Airlines et al, Tokyo District Court, 14 October 2004 HJ (1902) 77 (2005) 327
- X Ltd v Saudi Arabia Judgment 27 December 2005, HJ (1928) 85 [2006]\Tokyo 327

Kenya

- Kenya, Ministry of Defence of the Government of the UK v Ndegna, Kenya Ct of Appeal, 17 March 1983; 103 ILR 235. 147

Malaysia

- Philippines v Maler Foundation and Ors, ILDC 966 (SG 2008) 161

Mexico

- Extradición Ricardo Miguel Cavallo, Suprema Corte de Justicia de la Nación (Mexico), Amparo en Revisión 140/2002, 10 June 2003. 81

Netherlands

- Arias v Venezuela, Netherlands District Ct, The Hague, 4 February 1998; 128 ILR 684 454
- C Van der Linden v Government of USA (Department of Navy, Military Sea Command) 18 April 1996, Rotterdam DC, NYIL (1997) 344. 116

Chili Komitee Nederland v Public Prosecutor Netherlands, Appeal Ct, Amsterdam, 4 January 1995; (1997) 28 Netherlands YBIL 363	550
EF Vriesde v The State of the Netherlands and the National Investment Bank for Developing Countries, Netherlands Sup Ct, 3 May 1985; (1986) 17 NYIL 307	401
EF Vriesde v The State of the Netherlands and the National Investment Bank for Developing Countries, Netherlands Sup Ct, 3 May 1985, NYIL (1986)	418
Hendrik Resodikromo v OPCW, District Court of The Hague, 7 November 2005	458
JAM v Public Prosecutor, Netherlands Sup Ct, 21 January 1969, (1970) YBIL 222–73	546
Loltmans v The Republic of Surinam, Netherlands Sup Ct, 28 September 1990, (1992) NYBIL 442 at 447	499
M KB van der Hulst v USA, 22 December 1989, NYIL (1991) 379; Hafner, NL/10, 480–2	453
N V Exploitatie-Maatschappij Bengkalis v Bank of Indonesia Netherlands, Ct of Appeal, Amsterdam, 25 October 1963; 65 ILR 348	400
Netherlands v Azeta BV, District Court of Rotterdam, 14 May 1998, 128 ILR 688	519
N V Cabolent v National Iranian Oil Co (1968) Court of Appeal, The Hague, 28 November 1968, 47 ILR 138, UN Legal Materials 344	401, 484, 508
Pichon-Duverger v PCA, District Court of The Hague, 27 June 2002	458
The Hague City Party and Ors v Netherlands and Ors, Interlocutory proceedings, KG 05/432; ILDC 849 (NL 2005)	550
USSR v ICC Handel Maatschappij 10 September 1981, 19 March 1987, Netherlands Ct of Appeal, 87 ILR 103	52, 116
Van Heynigen v Netherlands Indies Government	349
Wijismuller Salvage BV v ADM Naval Services, District Ct of Amsterdam, 19 November 1987 (1989) 16 NYIL 294	521
New Zealand	
Controller and Auditor General v Davison [1996] 2 NZLR 278 at 289; (1997) 36 ILM 721	64, 402
Controller and Auditor General v Sir Ronald Davidson [1996] NZLR 517	356
Fang and Ors v Jiang and Ors, New Zealand High Court, 21 December 2006, HC AK CIV 2004-404-5843, para 65	147, 183, 292
Governor of Pitcairn v Sutton [1995] 1 NZLR 426	453
L v The Crown 68 ILR 175	593
Marine Steel Ltd v Government of Marshall Islands [1981] 2 NZLR 1	339
New Zealand, Governor of Pitcairn and Associated Islands v Sutton [1995] 1 NZLR 426	147
Winebox Inquiry, Re: Controller and Auditor-General v Davison KPMG Peat Marwick v Davison Brannigan v Davison [1996] NZAR 145	128, 499
Nigeria	
Kramer v Government of Kingdom of Belgium and Embassy of Belgium [1989] 1 CLRQ 126; 103 ILR 299	147
Poland	
Aldona S v Royaume Uni, Poland Supreme Ct, 14 December 1948, JDI (1963) 191	590
Marciej K v Embassy of a Foreign State, Poland, Supreme Ct, 11 January 2000	161
Maria B v Austrian Cultural Institute in Warsaw Poland Supreme Ct, 25 March 1987; 82 ILR 1	590
Natoniewski v Federal Republic of Germany Poland Supreme Ct (Civil Chamber) 29 October 2010	161
Polish Citizens v Embassy of Foreign State, 26 September 1990, Poland Supreme Ct, Hafner PL/1, 499	149, 160
Portugal	
Arroja v Bolivia, Portuguese Supreme Ct, Boletim do Ministerio da Justica 1997 No 464	155
Brazilian Embassy Case (Case No 706), Portugal Supreme Ct, 11 May 1984; 116 ILR 625	155
Portugal, Silva v Spanish Institute, Spanish Embassy and Spain, 9 November 1988, Lisbon District Ct, Hafner P/6, 509	149
Romania	
Bragadireanu v Romania, Romania, Ct of Appeal, Bucharest, 29 May 2003	160
GM and TI v The Embassy of Bucharest, Romania, Bucharest Tribunal, Vth Civil and Administrative Division, 9 March 2001	161

Russia

- Kalashnikova v United States Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, 2 November 2000 159
- Russian Co v Embassy of State X, 18 January 2001, Russian Federation High Arbitration Ct,
Hafner RUS/5, 526 149
- Russian Federation v Pied Rich Netherlands, Supreme Court 28 May 1993 (1994) 41 NILR 116 507
- Sedelmayer v Russian Federation Supreme Ct Sweden, 1 July 2011, Pal Wrangle (2012) 106 AJIL 347 160

Singapore

- Civil Aeronautics Administration v Singapore Airlines [2004] SGCA 3; 133 ILR 371. 342

South Africa

- Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe v Fick and Ors [2012] ZASCA 122, para 44 (SA (SC) 2012) 380
- Kaffraria Property Co (Pty) Ltd v Government of Zambia [1980] SA LR No 2 495
- KJ International v MV Jupiter (Compania de Navigatie Maritime 'Romline' SA intervening)
South Africa Supreme Ct, 8 July 1997, 131 ILR 529. 432
- The Akademie Fyodorov S Africa Sup Ct, 19 April 1996, 131 ILR 460. 432
- The Akademik Fyodoro v South Africa, Supreme Court 19 April 1996, 145 ILR 459 507

Spain

- Abbott v Republic of South Africa, Spain Supreme Ct, 1 December 1986, Hafner E/4, 536 155
- Abbott v Republic of South Africa, Spain Const Ct (2nd Chamber) 1 July 1992, 113 ILR 412 328, 450,
474, 484, 485
- Emilio MB v Embassy of Guinea Equatorial, Spanish Supreme Ct, 10 February 1986, Hafner E/3, 536 . . . 155
- Maite GZ v Consulado General de Francia, Spain Const Trib [1997] Aranzadi No 176, BOE,
19 October 2001, No 251 519
- Maite GZ v Consulado General de Francia, Spain, Const Ct, 17 September 2001; Hafner E/8, 540. 155
- Rigopoulos v Spain, Const Ct, 10 February 1997, Hafner E/7, 539. 155
- State Marine Corp and Currence v USA, Spain Provincial Ct of Cadiz, 25 June 1999, 128 ILR 701 520

Sweden

- Lliamco v Socialist People's Republic of Libya, Svea Ct of Appeals, 18 June 1980; 62 ILR 225 388
- Local Authority of Västerås v Republic of Iceland, 30 December 1999 385
- Local Authority of Vasteras v Republic of Iceland, Sup Ct of Sweden, 30 December 1999, reported by
Said Mahmoudi (2001) 95 AJIL 192 400
- Sedelmayer v Russian Federation, Sweden Sup Ct, 1 July 2011 Pal Wrangle (2012) 106
AJIL 347. 517, 530
- The Charente [1942] Jurisdisk Archiv 1, Supreme Court of Sweden 115

Switzerland

- A v B, Final appeal judgment, Case No 4C 187/2003, BGE 130 III 136, 21 November 2003,
ILDC 342 (CH 2003). 159, 347
- Arab Republic of Egypt v Cinetelevision Trust, 65 ILR 425. 122
- Banque Centrale de la République de Turquie v Weston Compagnie de Finance et d'Investissement,
Swiss Federal Tribunal, 15 November 1978, 65 ILR 417. 122
- Consortium X v Swiss Federal Government (Conseil Federal), ILDC 344 (CH 2004), Swiss
Federal Supreme Court (First Civil Law Chamber) 458
- Evgeny Adamov v Federal Office of Justice, Switzerland Federal Tribunal, First Public
Law Chamber, No 1A.288/2005, Judgment of 22 December 2005, para 3.4.2 560, 565
- Griessen, Swiss Federal Tribunal, 23 December 1982, 82 ILR 5 508
- Kingdom of Greece v Julius Bar and Co, Swiss Federal Tribunal, 6 June 1956; ATF 82 (1956) 75, 23
ILR 195 487
- Kingdom of Spain v Societé X, Switzerland Federal Tribunal, 30 April 1986, 2 ILR 38 504
- Kuwait v X, 24 January 1994, Swiss Federal Tribunal Rev Suisse D int Eur 5 (1995) 593. 354
- M v Egypt, 16 November 1994, Swiss Federal Tribunal, 116 ILR 656. 122
- Nicoud v USA, Switzerland, Labour Ct of Geneva, 27 April 1994; 116 ILR 650 452
- Republic of Kazakhstan, Federal Swiss Court, 8 December 2000. 524
- Republique Arabe d'Egypte v Cinetel ASDI 1981, 206; 65 ILR 425 158
- Republique X v Office fédéral de la justice 25 June 2001 158
- S v Republic of India (1984) 82 ILR13 (Swiss Federal Tribunal). 450
- S v Socialist Republic of Romania (1990) 82 ILR 45, 48) 474

Société Générale de surveillance Holding SA v Pastan, 23 November 2000, Fed Trib RSDIE 4 (2001)	
589, 129 ILR 393	401
Spain v Xcanton debt office, 30 April 1986, Fed Trib Rev SDIE (1986) 158 Hafner, CH/10	590
X v USA, Switzerland, Labour Ct of Geneva, 16 February 1995; 116 ILR 668.	450, 452
United Kingdom	
A Company v Republic of X [1990] 2 Lloyd's Rep 520	188, 187, 210, 211, 386, 588
A Ltd v B Bank [1993] 1 April 1993	188
A Y Bank Ltd v Bosnia & Herzegovina and Ors [2006] EWHC 830 (Ch); [2006] 2 All ER (Comm) 463	338
AB v SW Water Services Ltd [1993] 2 WLR 507	34–5
ABCI v Banque Franco-Tunisienne and Ors [2003] EWCA Civ 205; [2003] 2 Lloyd's Rep 146	230, 232, 234
Abusabib & Anor v Taddese, UKEAT/0424/11/ZT (2012)	587
Ahmed and others v HM Treasury [2012] UKSC2, 2 WLR 378	47
Ahmed v Government of Saudi Arabia [1996] ICR 25; [1996] 2 All ER 248, CA; [1996]	
104 ILR 629	199, 378, 381
AIC Ltd v Federal Government of Nigeria and Attorney-General of Federation of Nigeria [2003]	
EWHC 1357 (QB), 13 June 2003, 129 ILR 871	174, 231
AIC Ltd v Nigeria [2003] EWHC 1357 (QB) (13 June 2003); 129 ILR 871	194, 206, 212, 228
AIG Capital Partners Inc & Anr v Kazakhstan (National Bank of Kazakhstan intervening) [2005]	
EWHC 2239 (Comm), [2006] 1 WLR 1420, [2006] 1 All ER (Comm) 11, 129	
ILR 589 at para 92	70, 171, 182, 292, 369, 515, 524, 578
AIG Capital Partners Inc & Anr v Kazakhstan [2006] 1 WLR 142	511
AK Investment CJSC v Kyrgyz Mobil Tel Ltd [2011] UKPC 7, [2011] 4 All ER 1027	71
Al-Adsani v Government of Kuwait and Ors (1994) CA; 100 ILR 465 at 469	235, 236
Al-Adsani v Government of Kuwait and Ors, CA, 12 March 1996; 107 ILR 536	467
Al-Adsani v Government of Kuwait and Others, CA, 12 March 1996; 107 ILR 536	201
Al-Adsani v Government of Kuwait and Others, 100 ILR 465; CA 21 January 1994	201
Al-Adsani v Government of Kuwait, CA, 12 March 1996 107 ILR 536 at 542, 549	173
Alameyeseighe [2005] EWHC 2704	141
Alcom Ltd v Republic of Colombia [1984] AC 580; [1984] 2 WLR 750; [1984] 2 All ER 6 at 10, HL	15,
166, 173, 175, 193, 209, 213, 411, 519	
Al-Haq, R (on the application of) v Secretary of State for Foreign & Commonwealth Affairs [2009]	
EWHC 1910 (Admin)	67
Amalgamated Metal Trading Ltd and Ors v Department of Trade and Industry and Ors	461, 579
AN International Bank v Republic of Zambia, English High Ct, QBD (Comm), Moore-Bick J,	
23 May 1997; 118 ILR 602.	232
Apex Global Management Ltd v Fi Call Ltd [2013] WLR(D)	13
Apex Global v Fi Call Ltd & Ors [2013] EWHC 587	541, 548
Arab Banking Corp'n v The International	174, 185, 188
Tin Council [1986] transcript 15 January 1986	174, 185, 188
Arab Monetary Fund v Hashim (No 3) [1991] 1 All ER 871	572
Arab Republic of Egypt v Gamal Eldin and Another [1996] 2 All ER 237, Employment Appeals	
Tribunal	174, 186, 188, 195, 198, 200, 230, 378
Assange v Swedish Prosecution Authority [2012] 2 WLR 1275	166
Aston Contlow v Wallbank [2004] 1 AC 546, [2003] 3 WLR 283, [2003] 3	
All ER 1213, HL(E)	34
Attorney General of New Zealand v Ortiz [1983] 2 All ER 83	526
Australia & New Zealand Banking Group Ltd and Ors v Commonwealth of Australia and 23	
Others, 21 February 1989	168, 194, 461, 579
Axa General Insurance Ltd v Lord Advocate [2011] UKSC 46; [2011] 3 WLR 871	180
AY Bank Ltd (in liquidation) v Bosnia and Herzegovina and Others [2006] EWHC 830, [2006] 2 All ER	
(Comm) 463	65–6
Aziz v Aziz & Sultan of Brunei [2007] EWCA Civ 712 (11 July 2007)	13, 546, 589
Aziz v Aziz and Sultan of Brunei [2007] EWCA Civ 712; [2008] 2 All ER 501	223
Aziz v Republic of Yemen [2005] All ER (D) 188, para 54	185, 230
Baccus SRL v Servicio Nacional del Trigo [1957] 1 QB 438 at 455; 28 ILR 160	140–1, 175, 184, 344
Banai v Canadian High Commission and Others [1990] EAT/65/90, 12 December 1990,	
Employment Appeals Tribunal	198
Banca Carige SpA Cassa di Risparmio di Genova e Imperio v Banco Nacional de Cuba [2001]	
3 All ER 923	182, 235, 370, 371
Banco Nacional de Cuba, Re [2001] 1 WLR 2039	61

Bank of Credit and Commerce International SA v Al Kaylain [1999] ILPr 278	229
BCCI (Overseas) Ltd v Price Waterhouse (No 1) [1997] 4 All ER 108 at 114	170, 174, 180, 340, 347, 350, 539
Berliner Bank v Karageorgis [1996] 1 Lloyd's Rep 426	228
Bo Xilai, Re, 8 November 2005, England Bow Street Magistrates' Court; 128 ILR 709 and 713	560
Bridge Oil Ltd v Owners and/or Demise Charterers of the Ship 'Giuseppedi Vittorio' [1998] 2 CLC 165; [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 136	210
British Arab Commercial Bank Plc v The National Transitional Council of the State of Libya [2011] EWHC 2274 (Comm), para 25	224, 227, 344
British Wagon Co Ltd v Gray [1896] 1 QB 35	376
Bryant v Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Judgment, UKEAT, 10 March 2003	454
Buttes Gas and Oil Co v Hammer [1975] 2 All ER 51	59, 60, 71, 400
C Czarnikow Ltd v Centrala Handlu Zagranicznego 'Rolimpex' [1978] 2 All ER 1043, 64 ILR 195	51, 52, 410
Camdex International Ltd v Bank of Zambia (No 2) [1997] 1 All ER 728	182, 371, 524
Camdex International Ltd v Bank of Zambia [1996] 3 All ER 431	211
Canada Trust Co v Stolzenberg [1997] 1 WLR 1582	228
Cardinal Financial Investment Corp v Central Bank of Yemen, 12 April 2000, Longmore J; 1999 Folio No 1195 QBD (Comm Ct)	182, 371
Central Bank of Yemen v Cardinal Financial Investment Corp (No 1) [2001] Lloyd's Rep Bank 1, CA	178, 182, 198, 371
Civil Air Transport Inc v Central Air Transport Corp [1953] AC 70	15, 61
Continental Transfert Technique Ltd v Government of Nigeria & Ors [2009] EWHC 2898 (Comm)	178
Coreck v Maritime GmbH v Sevrybokholodflot 1994 SLT 893; 107 ILR 659, Scotland, Ct of Session, Outer House, Lord Cameron of Lochbroom	177
Crescent Oil & Shipping Services Ltd v Banco Nacional de Angola, 28 May 1999, Cresswell J, unreported	182, 231, 232, 371
Crescent Oil and Shipping Services Ltd v Importing UEE [1998] 1 WLR 919	229
Czarnikow Ltd v Rolimpex [1979] AC 351	179
Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Co v The Ministry of Religious Affairs, Government of Pakistan [2010] UKSC 46; [2011] 1 AC 763	379
De Haber v Queen of Portugal [1851] 17 QB 171 at 206–7	548
Demirel v Fonu [2006] EWHC 3354 (Ch), [2007] 2 All ER 815, aff'd [2007] EWCA Civ 799 (26 July 2007)	64
Dickinson v Del Solar [1930] 1 KB 376	21, 585
Donegal International Ltd v Zambia and Aner [2007] EWHC 197 (Comm)	197, 378, 385
Duff Development Co v Government of Kelantan [1924] AC 797	184, 375, 340, 386
Duke of Brunswick v King of Hanover (1848) 2 HL, Cas 1	133, 138
Eagle Star Insurance Co Ltd v Yuval Insurance Co Ltd [1978] 1 Lloyd's Rep 357 at 361	188
Ecuador v Occidental Exploration and Production Co [2005] EWHC 774 (Comm)	66
El Diwany v Hansen, the Ministry of Justice and the Police, Norway and Anor [2011] EWHC 2077	200
Emperor of Austria v Day (1861) 2 Giff 628	228
Empson v Smith [1966] 1 QB 426	585
ENTICO v UNESCO and Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs [2008] EWHC 531 (Comm)	171, 384, 457
Equatorial Guinea v Bank of Scotland International [2006] UKPC 7	64
Estate of Marcos Human Rights Litig (Hilao v Marcos) 25 F.3d 1467, 1471–2 (9th Cir 1994)	277
ETI Euro Telecom International NV v Republic of Bolivia and Anor [2008] EWCA Civ 880, [2009] 1 WLR 665	497
Ex parte O'Brien [1923] 2 KB 361, 391	67
Ex parte Pinochet R v Bow Street Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate, ex parte Pinochet Ugarte (Amnesty International Intervening), (No 3) [2000] 1 AC 147 [1999] 2 All ER 97 at 113, 192; 119 ILR	166
Fayed v El Tajir [1987] 2 All ER 396	174, 188
Febder v St John Mildmay [1938] AC 1 at 12	60
Fonu v Demirel and Another [2006] EWHC 3354 (Ch), [2007] 2 All ER 815 [2007] EWCA Civ 799, [2007] 1 WLR 2508	63
Forth Tugs v Wilmington Trust Co 1987 3 SLT 153, 107 ILR 641	87, 90, 495
G UR Corp v Trust Bank of Africa [1997] QB 559; [1986] 3 All ER 449	225
Gecamines v Hemisphere Associates LLC (Jersey)	353
Générale des Carrières et des Mines ('Gécamines') v FG Hemisphere Associates LLC [2012] UKPC 27	179
Gerber Products Co v Gerber Foods International Ltd [2002] EWHC 428 (Ch)	203
Government of India v Taylor [1955] AC 491, [1955] 1 All ER 292	63

Grovit v De Nederlandsche Bank NV [2005] EWHC 2994 (QB), [2006] 1 WLR 3323	70, 169, 171, 235, 294, 470, 578
GUR Corpn v Trust Bank of Africa [1987] 1 QB 599, [1986] 3 All ER 449, 75 ILR 675	19, 174, 227, 344
Habib Bank Ltd v Central Bank of Sudan [2006] EWHC 1767 (Comm); [2007] 1 WLR 470	228, 233, 235
Harb v King Fahd Abdul Aziz [2005] EWCA Civ 632; [2005] 2 FLR 1108	223, 546, 548
Harb v King Fahd Bin Abdul Aziz [2005] 2 FLR 1108	13
Harding v Wealands [2007] AC 1	396
Helbert Wagg & Co Ltd, Re, [1956] 1 Ch 323	61
Hirsch v State of Israel and State of Germany 962 F.Supp.377 (SDNY 1997); 113 ILR 543	400
Hispano Americana Mercantil SA v Central Bank of Nigeria [1979] 2 Lloyd's Rep 277	182, 212, 291, 371
Holland v Lampen-Wolfe [1998] 1 WLR 188, CA, [2000] 1 WLR 827, HL	42, 69, 167, 194, 196, 408, 601, 602, 626
I Congreso del Partido [1978] 1 All ER 1171	115, 410
I Congreso del Partido [1983] 1 AC 244 at 262, [1981] 2 All ER 1062 at 1070, HL, 64 ILR 307	36, 167, 195, 408, 409, 602
IG Capital Partners Inc and Anr v Kazakhstan [2005] EWHC 2239 (Comm), [2006] 1 All ER (Comm) 1 at para 45, noted O'Keefe (2005) 76 BYIL 593	503
Il Congreso del Partido [1978] 1 QB 500; [1978] 1 All ER 1169 at 1198–200	234
Imperial Tobacco v The Lord Advocate [2012] CSIH 9	180
Inpro Properties (UK) Ltd v Sauvel and Others [1983] 1 All ER 658, Bristow J; [1983] 2 All ER 495	189
Iran v The Barakat Galleries Ltd [2007] EWCA Civ 1374 (21 December 2007)	64, 527
Jayetilleke v High Commissioner to the Bahamas, Employment Appeal Tribunal, 14 December 1994, EAT/741/94; 107 ILR 623454	
J H Rayner (Mincing Lane) Ltd and Ors v Department of Trade and Industry [1987]; BCLC 667 Staughton J.	189, 200, 203, 234, 461
J H Rayner(Mincing Lane) Ltd v Department of Trade and Industry [1989] Ch 72, CA, 196–203, 252–3	234, 571
JH Rayner (Mincing Lane) Ltd v Department of Trade and Industry and Ors, ILR, vol 80, 109.	579
JH Rayner (Mincing Lane) Ltd v Dept of Trade and Industry [1990] 2 AC 418	570, 572
Jones v Minister of Interior of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia & Ors [2006] UKHL 26, [2006] 2 WLR 1424	13
Jones v Minister of Interior of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia [2004] EWCA Civ 1394; [2007] 1 AC 270; [2005] 2 WLR 808; 129 ILR 629 at 713	183
Jones v Minister of Interior of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia [2006] UKHL 26; [2006]	40, 43, 171, 183, 292, 367, 467, 554
Jones v Saudi Arabia [2006] UKHL 26; [2007] AC 270; 129 ILR 713; [2006] 2 WLR 70	69, 103, 175
Jones v Saudi Arabia [2007] 1 AC 270; [2006] 2 WLR 1424, HL(E), para 19.	176, 189, 201, 368
Juan Ismael & Co Inc v Government of the Republic of Indonesia [1955] AC 72; [1954] 3 All ER 236; 21 ILR 95	202, 212, 486
Kahan v Federation of Pakistan [1951] 2 KB 200	184, 375, 376
Kensington International Ltd v Republic of the Congo [2005] EWHC 2684 (Comm), paras 53–5	178
Khurts Bat v Investigating Judge of the Federal Court of Germany [2011] EWHC 2029 (Admin)	96, 568
Khurts Bat v The Investigating Judge of the German Federal Court [2011] EWHC 2029 (Admin); (2012) 147 ILR 633, paras 55–62 (Moses LJ)	560, 563
King of the Hellenes v Brostrom (1923) 16 Ll L Rep 193. Cf.	63
Koo Golden East Mongolia v Bank of Nova Scotia, Scotia Capital (Europe) Ltd, Mongol Bank (2007) CA (Civ Div) 19 December 2007.	499
Korea National Insurance Corpn v Allianz Global Corporate and Speciality AG [2008] EWCA Civ 1355.	223
Krajina v Tass Agency [1949]	2
All ER 274 at 280; 16 ILR 129	139–40, 344, 470
Kuddus v Chief Constable of Leicestershire [2002] 2 AC 122, [2001] 2 WLR 1789, [2001] 3 All ER 193, HL(E)	34
Kuwait Airlines v Iraqi Airways and Republic of Iraq (No 2), 3 July 1992, Evans J, aff'd [1995] 3 All ER 694	233
Kuwait Airways Corpn v Iraqi Airways Co (No 2)[1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 25 at 32, 37–8, affirmed by the House of Lords [2007] 1 AC 270; 129 ILR 713; [1995] 3 All ER 694	51, 59, 119, 178, 188, 196, 225, 234, 376
Kuwait Airways Corpn v Iraqi Airways Co (No 2)[2001] 1 All ER (Comm) 557, para 388, CA	61
Kuwait Airways Corpn v Iraqi Airways Co (Nos 4 and 5)[2001] 1 Lloyd's Rep 161 [2001] 2 Comm 557, 125 ILR 608, CA, para 369 [2002] UKHL 19, [2002] 2 AC 883 at 1075, [2002]	

2 WLR 1353, [2002] 3 All ER 209, [2002] 1 All ER (Comm) 843, 125	
ILR 677	54, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 71, 72, 177, 224, 226, 343
Kuwait Airways Corp v Iraqi Airways Co, Judgment 16 April 1992	198
Kuwait Airways Corp v Iraqi Airways Co [1995] 1 Lloyd's Rep 25, CA at 31, 37	185
Kuwait Airways Corp v Iraqi Airways Co [1995] 1 WLR 1147	229
Kuwait Airways Corp v Iraqi Airways Co [1995] 3 All ER 694, HL; 103 ILR 340	410
Lchouritou v Dimosio, ECJ Case C-292/05 [2007] 1 L Pr 216, [2007] 2 All ER 57	34, 169, 294, 476, 483
Le Parlement Belge [1880] 5 Prob Div 197	28
Littrell v USA (No 2) [1994] 4 All ER 203 at 209–11; [1995] 1 WLR 82; 100 ILR	167, 196, 594, 597, 601, 602, 603
Luther v Sagor [1921] 3 KB 532	50, 61, 62
M v Home Office [1992] QB 270	30
Maclaine Watson & Co Ltd v Department of Trade and Industry	461, 579
Maclaine Watson & Co Ltd v International Tin Council, ILM, vol 29 (1990), 675	461
Maclaine Watson v Dept of Trade and Industry [1988] 3 All ER 257 at 315, 336	189, 197, 198, 234, 400, 406,
Magdalena Steam Navigating Co v Martin (1859) 2 El & 2 El 94	132
Mashate v Kaguta [2011] EWHC 3111 (QB)	228
Matthews v Ministry of Defence [2003] 1 AC 1163, [2003] 1 All ER 689	46, 69, 603
Mbasogo, President of the State of Equatorial Guinea and Another v Logo Ltd and Others	
[2005] EWHC 2034 (QB), [2006] EWCA Civ 1370, [2007] 2 WLR 1062	61, 64, 65, 66
Mellenger v New Brunswick Development Corp [1971] 2 All ER 593; 1 WLR 604	141, 350
Mighell v Sultan of Johore [1894] 1 QB 149	137–8, 174, 184, 375, 376, 546–8
Ministry of Trade of Republic of Iran v Salvage (International) Ltd (The 'ALTAIR') [2008]	
EWHC 612 Comm; [2008]	178, 206, 433
Mitchell and Ors v Al-Dali [2006] UKHL 26; [2006] 2 WLR 1424 at para 87	554
Mofaz, Re, 12 February 2004	560
MRG (Japan) Ltd v Engelhard Metals Japan Ltd [2003] EWHC 3418; [2004] 1 Lloyd's Rep 731	234
NML Capital v Argentina [2010] EWCA; [2010] 1 CLC 38	219
NML Capital v Argentina [2011] UKSC 31; 3 WLR 273	174, 184, 191, 204, 206, 218, 228, 233, 374, 385, 394, 478
Norsk Hydro v State Property of Ukraine [2002] EWHC 2120 (Comm)	231, 364
Occidental Exploration and Production Co v Republic of Ecuador [2005] EWCA Civ 1116	
(9 September 2005)	66
Oppenheimer v Cattermole [1976] AC 279	62, 63, 64
Orascom Telecom Holding SAE v Republic of Chad & Ors [2008] EWHC 1841 (Comm); [2008]	194, 195, 215, 387, 490, 511
Orient Mineral Co v Bank of China 506 F.3d 1232, 1237 (10th Cir 2007)	264
Parker v Schuller (1901) 17 TLR 299	234
Peer International Corp v Termidor Musical Publishers [2003] EWCA Civ 1156	61
Pemberton v Hughes [1899] 1 Ch 781	72
Petroleum Exploration AB v Government of the Republic of Lithuania [2006] EWCA Civ 1529;	
[2007] 2 WLR 876	418
Philipp Bros v Sierra Leone and the Commission of the European Communities [1995] 1 Lloyd's	
Rep 289, CA; 107 ILR 517	418
Pinochet (No 3) [1999] 2 All ER 97, per Lord Browne-Wilkinson at 112	41–2, 43, 69, 95, 587
Pinochet (No 3) [2000] 1 AC 147; [1999] 2 All ER 97; 119 ILR 111	168
Piracy Jure Gentium, Re, [1934] AC 586	74
Pocket Kings Ltd v Safenames Ltd & Anor [2009] EWHC 2529 (Ch); [2010] 2 WLR 1110	179
Poplar Housing and Regeneration Community Assn v Donoghue [2002] QB 48, [2001] 3 WLR 183,	
[2001] 4 All ER 604	34
Princess Paley Olga v Weisz [1929] 1 KB 718 at 736	61
Propend Finance Party Ltd v Sing [1997] 111 ILR 611, CA, 2 May 1997	175, 183, 195, 222, 366, 435, 469, 605,
R (Noor Khan) v Secretary of State for Foreign & Commonwealth Affairs [2012] EWHC 3728	
(Admin) (21 December 2012)	66–7
R (on application of Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament) v Prime Minister [2002] EWHC 2777	
(Admin), 2003 3 LRC 335, DC, 126 ILR 727	65, 66
R (on the application of Abbasi) v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs	
[2002] EWCA Civ 1598	66
R (on the application of Alamieyeseigha) v Crown Prosecution Service [2005]	
EWHC 2704 (Admin)	168, 170, 180, 224, 340, 342, 350

R (on the application of Gentle and Another) v Prime Minister and Others [2006] EWCA Civ 1690	66
R (on the application of HRH Sultan of Pahang) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2011] EWCA Civ 616	179, 180, 224, 225, 227, 342, 344, 350
R v Bow Street Magistrates court, ex parte Pinochet (No 1) [2000] 1 AC 61; 119 ILR, 106G	22, 60, 102, 176, 543
R v Disciplinary Committee of the Jockey Club, ex parte Aga Khan [1993] 2 All ER 853	34
R v Guildhall Magistrates' Court, Ex p Jarrett-Thorpe, The Times, 6 October 1977. Dicey, para 10-071.	591
R v Inland Revenue Commissioners, ex parte Camacq Corpn and Anr [1990] 1 All ER 173, Kennedy J; [1990] 1 All ER 184, CA per Dillon LJ at 186	207
R v Ministry of Defence ex parte Walker [2002] 2 All ER 917	603
R v Ministry of Defence, ex parte Smith [1996] QB 517	224
R v Panel of Takeovers and Mergers, ex parte Datafin plc [1987] QB 815 at 847, [1987] 1 All ER 564	34
R v Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, ex parte Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament [2002] EWHC 2777	66
R v Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, ex parte Trawnik, The Times, 18 April 1985, Div Ct; 21 February 1986	224
R v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Ex p Samuel, The Times, 17 August 1989; (1989) 83 ILR 232, CA	223, 586
R v Secretary of State for Home Department, ex parte Launder [1997] 3 All ER 61	224
R v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport, and the Regions, ex parte Spath Holme Ltd [2001] 1 All ER 195	166
Radwan v Radwan (No 2) [1972] 3 WLR 939; [1972] 3 All ER 1926; [1972] 3 WLR 735	132, 581
Rafidain Bank v Consarq Corpn (1996) 106 ILR 274	362
Rahimtoola v Nizam of Hyderabad [1958] AC 379	31, 141, 202, 367, 426
Republic of Peru v Peruvian Guano Co (1887) 36 ChD 489	228
Republic of Serbia v Imageset [2009] EWHC 2853 (Comm) Beatson J [2010] 1 Lloyd's Rep 324	340
Republic of Somalia v Woodhouse Drake & Carey (Suisse) SA, The Mary [1993] 1 QB 53; 94 ILR 199	224, 226, 343
Rookes v Barnard [1964] AC 1129, [1964] 1 All ER 367	34
Sabah Shipyard (Pakistan) Ltd v Islamic Republic of Pakistan [2002] EWCA Civ 1643; [2002] All ER (D) 201	174, 210, 211, 386
Saudi Arabia v Ahmed [1996] ICR 25; [1996] 2 All ER 248, CA; 104 ILR 629	186
Sayce v Ameer Ruler of Bahawalpur [1952] 2 QB 390, CA	547
Sawyer v Atari Interactive Inc [2005] EWHC 2351 (Ch), paras 42-8	228
Seaconsar Far East Ltd v Bank Markazi Jomhouri Islam Iran [1994] 1 AC 438	234, 235
Secretary of State for Defence v Al-Skeini and Ors [2007] UKHL, [2008] 1 AC 153	78
Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs v Rahmatullah UKSC 48, [2012] 3 WLR 1087	67
Sengupta v Republic of India [1983] ICR 221; 64 ILR 352	167, 199
SerVaas Inc v Rafi dain Bank & Ors [2012] UKSC 40	525, 612
Settebello v BancoTotta and Acores [1985] 2 All ER 1025	61
Shaw v Shaw [1979] 3 All ER 1	584
Shearson Lehman Bros Inc v Maclaine Watson & Co Ltd [1988] 1 WLR 16; [1988] 1 All ER 116, HL	168
Sierra Leone Telecommunications Co Ltd v Barclays Bank plc [1998] All ER 821	226
Spiliada Maritime Corpn v Cansulex Ltd [1987] AC 460	234
SRL v Servicio Nacional del Trigo [1957] 1 QB 438	186
Stretford v Football Association [2006] EWHC 479 (Ch)	70, 383
Sultan of Johore v Abubakar Tunku Aris Bendahar [1952] AC 318; 19 ILR 192	139, 340
Svenska Petroleum Exploration AB v Government of the Republic of Lithuania [2005] EWHC 9 (Comm); [2005] 1 All ER 515	166
Svenska Petroleum Exploration AB v Lithuania and Another [2006] EWCA Civ 1529; [2007] 2 WLR 876; confirming [2005] EWHC 2437 (Comm); [2006] 1 All ER 731	174, 187, 204, 205, 385, 386, 392, 393, 490
Swiss-Israel Trade Bank v Government of Salta [1972] 1 Lloyd's Rep 497 at 503	136, 142
Tajik Aluminium Plant v Abdukadir Ganievich Ermatov and Ors [2006] EWHC 2374 (Comm) (28 July 2006)	59, 382
Taylor v Best (1854) 14 CB 487 at 519	132
The Federal Republic of Nigeria v Ogbonna (Jurisdictional Points: State immunity) [2011] UKEAT; [2012] WLR 139, para 12	446
Thai-Europe Tapioca Service Ltd [1975] 1 WLR 1485; 64 ILR 81	141

Thai-Europe Tapioca Service v Government of Pakistan [1975] 1 WLR 1285 at 1491; [1979] 3 All ER 961 at 966–7; 64 ILR 81	190
The Arantzazu Mendi [1939] AC 256	224
The Charkieh (1873) LR A&E 59	36, 340
The Cristina [1938] AC 485 at 491	137
<i>The Guiseppe di Vittorio</i> [1998] 1 Lloyd's Rep 136	110
The Jupiter [1924]	138
The Parlement Belge (1878–79) IV Prob Div 129, Sir Robert Phillimore (1879) (1879–90) V Prob Div 197, CA	134–6, 137–9
The Philippine Admiral [1977] AC 373; [1976] 1 All ER 78; 64 ILR 90	142
The Porto Alexandre [1920]	138, 548
Trendtex Trading Corp v Central Bank of Nigeria [1977] 1 All ER 881; 64 ILR 111; [1977] QB 529 at 559–60	141, 142–3, 177, 182, 291, 602
Triquet v Bath [1764] 3 Burr 1478	132
Twycross v Dreyfus (1877) 5 Ch D 605	367, 565
United States of America v Nolan [2010] EWCA Civ 1223	441
USA v Wagner (1867) 2 Ch 582	228
Walker International Holdings Ltd v Republique\Populaire Du Congo and Others [2005] EWHC 2813 (Comm)	178
Westminster City Council v Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran [1986] 3 All ER 284; 108 ILR 557	231
Wilhelm Finance Inc v Ente Administrador del Astillero Rio Santiago [2009] EWHC 1074 (Comm)	228
Williams and Humbert v W & H Trade Marks (Jersey) Ltd [1986] 1 AC 368	61
Wokuri v Kassam [2012] EWHC 105 (Ch)	587
<i>X v Bedfordshire County Council</i> [1995] 2 AC 633	45
Yendall v Commonwealth of Australia, Employment Appeals Tribunal, 11 October 1984, 107 ILR, 590	377
YL v Birmingham City Council [2007] UKHL 27, [2007] 3 WLR 112	34
Zoernsch v Waldock [1964] 2 All ER 256; [1964] 2 QB 352	365, 590

United States

Abdullahi v Pfizer 562 F.3d 163 (2nd Cir 2009), cert denied 130 S Ct 3541\ (2010)	273
Hughes Aircraft Co v United States ex rel Schumer 520 US 939, 951 (1997)	247
NML Capital Ltd et al v Republic of Argentina (2nd Cir) 12-150L, 26 October 2012, ILIB 3 November 2012	63, 497
Abelesz v Magyar Nemzeti Bank 692 F.3d 661 (2012)	268
Adam II of Liechtenstein v Fed Republic of Germany 2 B v R 1981/97, Fed Const Ct, 28 January 1998	527
Adler v Federal Republic of Nigeria 219 F.3d 869 (9th Cir 2000)	241, 265
Af-Cap Inc v Republic of Congo 463 F.3d 417 (5th Cir 2006)	256
Agudas Chasidei Chabad of US v Russian Federation 528 F.3d 934 (DC Cir 2008)	268
Alberti v Empresa Nicaraguense de la Carne 705 F.2d 250 (7th Cir 1983); 92 ILR 392	252
Alejandre v Cuba 996 F.Supp.1239 (SD Fa 1997)	282
Alejandre v Telefonica Larga Distancia de Puerto Rico 183 F.3d (11th Cir 1999) 1277	282
Alfred Dunhill of London Inc v Republic of Cuba 425 US 682 (1976)	55, 261
Alicog v Kingdom of Saudi Arabia 860\ F.Supp.379, 382 (SD Texas 1994) aff'd 79 F.3d 1145 (5th Cir 1996)	545
Alicog v Kingdom of Saudi Arabia 860 F.Supp.379, 382 (SD Texas 1994) aff'd 79 F.3d 1145 (5th Cir 1996)	250, 348
Alperin v Vatican Bank 410 F 3d (532) at 560 (9th Cir 2005)	58
Altmann v Republic of Austria 142 F.Supp.2d 1187	269
Altmann v Republic of Austria 317 F.3d 954 (9th Cir 2002) at 965	247
Amerada Hess Shipping Corp v 488 US 428 at 434 (1989); 81 ILR 658	245, 246
Anonymous v Anonymous, NYS 2d 777 (AD1 Dept 1992)	13
Antares Aircraft v Federal Republic of Nigeria 948 F.2d 90 at 95 (2nd Cir 1991); 92 ILR 225	265
Arango v Guzman Travel Advisors 621 F.2d 1371 (5th Cir 1986); 63 ILR 467	252, 262, 377, 409
Argentine Republic v Amerada Hess Shipping Corp 488 US 428, 434 (1989); 81 ILR 658	241, 276, 379
Atkinson v IADB 156 F.3d 1335, 1341 (DC Cir 1998)	241, 242
Attwood Turnkey Drilling v Petroleum Brasileiro, 875 F.2d 1174 (5th Cir)	499
Austria v Altmann 327 F.3d 1246 (2004); US (2004); ILM 43 (2004) 1421	247
Austria v Altmann 541 US 677, 694 (2004)	248

Baglab Ltd v Johnson Matthey Bankers Ltd, 665 F.Supp.289, 297 (SDNY 1987)	363
<i>Baker v Carr</i> 369 US 186 (1962)	54, 57
Banco Nacional de Cuba v Sabbatino 376 US 398, 428 (1964)	53–4, 55, 277
Baoanan v Baja 627 F.Supp.2d 155 (SDNY 2009)	587
Behring International Inc v Imperial Iranian Air Force 475 F.Supp.383 (DNJ 1979); 63 ILR 261	521
Behring Intern'l Inc v Imperial Iranian Air Force Civ No 79 675 (DNJ.1983)	503
Belhas v Ya'alon 515 F.3d 1279.	41
Belhas v Ya'Alon 466 F.Supp.2d 127	249
Belhas v Ya'alon 515 F.3d 1279, 1286–9	256
Bennett v Islamic Republic of Iran (DC Cir) 10 September 2010 5 ILM	517
Berizzi Bros Co v SS Pesaro 271 US 562, 574 (1925) (The Pesaro) (Van Devanter J)	144
Berizzi Bros v SS Pesaro 271 US 562 (1925)	406
Berizzi Brothers Co v Steamship Pesaro 255 US 216 (1921)	144
Berkovitz v Islamic Republic of Iran 735 F.2d 329, 331 (9th Cir 1983); 81 ILR 552	241, 265
Bernstein v NV Nederlandichre-Amerkaanische Stoomvaart Maatschappij 210 F 2d 375 (2d Cir 1954), 20 ILR 24	54
Birch v Shipping Corpn v Embassy of United Republic of Tanzania 507 F.Supp.311 (DDC 1990); 63 ILR 524.	257, 388, 520
Boos v Barry 485 US 312 (1988)	589
Braka v Bancomer S N C762 F 2d 222 (2nd Cir 1985)	55, 56
Briggs v The Lightships, 11 Allen, Mass 157	514
Burnett v Al Baraka Inv & Development Corpn 292 F.Supp 2d 9 (DDC 1003).	270
Butter v Vance International 225 F.3d.462 (4th Cir 2000)	440, 449
Cist v Republic of Turkey and the Army of the Republic of Turkey 107 F.3d 922 (DC Cir 1997).	269
Cabiri v Ghana, 165 3d 1943 (2nd Cir 1999)	256
Cabiri v Government of the Republic of Ghana 165 F.3d 193, 196 (2nd Cir 1999)	240
Callejo v Bancomer SA 764 F.2d 1101 (5th Cir 1985)	265
Capital Ventures Int'l v Republic of Argentina F.3d 293 (2nd Cir 2009)	255
Carey v National Oil Corpn 592 F.2d 673, 676, n 1 (2nd Cir 1979)	252
Cargill Int SA v M/T Pavel Dvbenko 991 F.2d 1012 (2nd Cir 1993)	258, 392
Carpenter v Republic of Chile 610 F.3d 766 (2nd Cir 2010)	255
Cassirer v Kingdom of Spain and Thyssen-Nornemisza Collection 626 F.3d 1019 (9th Cir 2010)	268
Cassirer v Kingdom of Spain etal US 461 F.Supp.2d 1157 (CD Calif 2006)	267
Chabad v Russian Federation No 05-01548 (DDC 27 October 2009)	528
Chromoloy Aero Service v Arab Republic of Egypt DDC 31 July 1996; (1996) 35 ILM 1359	259
Cicippio v Islamic Republic of Iran 30 F.3d 165 (Col Cir 1995); 107 ILR 296	409
Community Finance Group v Republic of Kenya 663 F.3d 977 (8th Cir 2011)	268
Coyle v PT Garuda Indonesia 363 F.3d 979, 984 (9th Cir 2004)	255
Creighton Ltd v Government of State of Qatar 161 F.3d 118 (DDC 1999); (2000) 39 ILM 149. .	257, 259, 392
Crist v Republic of Turkey and the Army of the Republic of Turkey 107 F.3d 922 (DC Cir 1997)	249
Crist v Turkey 995 F.Supp 5 (DDC 1998)	267
de Letelier v. Republic of Chile, 502 F Supp 259 (DDC 1980)	362
De Los Santos Mora v NewYork 524 F.3d 183 (2nd Cir 2008)	274
De Sanchez v Banco Central de Nicaragua 770 F.2d 1385 (5th Cir 1985)	371
Doe Iv Liu Qi, 349 F.Supp 2d 1258, 1295 (ND Cal 2004)	277
Doe Iv State of Israel 400 F Supp 2d 86, 105 (DDC 2005)	41, 256
Doe v Exxon Mobil, 654 F.3d 11, 57 (DC Cir 2011)	276
Dole Food Co v Patrickson, 538 US 468, 479 (2003)	14
EAL (Delaware) Corpn Electra Aviation In etal v Eurocontrol US DC Del 2 August 1994; 107 ILR 318.	356
Eckhart International Inc v Government of Fiji 32 F.3d 77 (4th Cir 1994); 107 ILR 347	257
Edlow International Co v Nuklearna Elektrarna Krsko 441 F.Supp 627 (DC Cir 1977); 63 ILR 508	252
El Hadad v United Arab Emirates 469 F.3d 658 (DC Cir 2007)	440
El-Shifa Pharmaceutical Industries Co v United States 607 F 3d 836, 856 and n 3 (DC Cir 2010)	57
EM Ltd v Republic of Argentina 473 F.3d 463 (2nd Cir 2007)	215
EM Ltd v Republic of Argentina 695 F.3d 201 (2nd Cir 2012)	280
Enahoro v Abubakar 408 F.3d 877 (7th Cir 2005); 44 ILM 1264.	253
Erie Railroad Co v Tompkins 304 US 64 (1938)	246
Estate of Domingo v Republic of the Philippines 694 F.Supp.782, 786 (WD Wash 1988)	251
Export Group v Reef Industries Ltd Inc v Mexican Coffee Institute 54 F.3d 1466 (9th Cir 1995); 107 ILR 393	269
Fagot v Rodriguez v Costa Rica 139 F.Supp.2d 173 (DPR 2001)	270

Fickling v Commonwealth of Australia 755 F.Supp.66 (EDNY 1991); 103 ILR 149	400
Figueiredo v Republic of Peru 665 F.3d 384 (2nd Cir 2011)	257
First American Corp'n v Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan Al-Nahyan 948 F.Supp.1107, 1119 (DDC 1996), 121 ILR 577	250, 348, 545
First National City Bank v Banco Nacional de Cuba US 750 (1072)	54
First National City Bank v Banco Para el Comercio Exterior de Cuba 462 US 611 (1983) 80 ILR 566	243, 251, 362
Flatow v Islamic Republic of Iran 67 F.Supp.2d 535, 537–8, 7 September 1999	281
Flatow v Islamic Republic of Iran 74 F.2d Supp.18 (DDC) 19 December 1999	281
Flatow v Islamic Republic of Iran 76 F.Supp.2d 16 (DD Cir 1999)	281
Flatow v Republic of Iran 999 F.Supp.1 (DDC 1998)	281
Flomo v Firestone 643 F.3d 1013, 1020 (7th Cir 2011)	276
Flota Maritime Browning de Cuba SA v SS Canadian Conqueror and the Republic of Cuba (1962) DLR 598, 42 ILR 125	507
Foremost-McKesson Inc v Islamic Republic of Iran 905 F.2d 438 (DC Cir 1990); 101 ILR 536	262
Foxworth v Permanent Mission of the Republic of Uganda to the UN 796 F.Supp.761 (SDNY 1992), 99 ILR 139	520
Freund v Societe National 391 Fed Appx 939 (2nd Cir 2010)	268
Freund v Societe Nationale des Chemins de fer Francais, 391 Fed App 939, 940 (2d Cir 2010)	268
Frontera Res Azer Corp'n v State Oil Co of Azerbaijan 582 F.3d 393 (2nd Cir 2009)	243
Frontera Resources Azerbaijan Corp'n v State Oil Corp'n of Azerbaijan 582 F.3d 393, 396–8 (2nd Cir 2009) at 397	393
Gabay v Mostazafan Foundation (SDNY 1993); 107 ILR 242	363
Garb v Poland 440 F.3d 579 (2nd Cir 2006)	269
Gerritsen v de la Madrid Hurtado, 819 F.2d 1511 (9th Cir 1987); 101 ILR 175	593
Gibson v Republic of Ireland, 532 F Supp 668, 670 (DDC 1982)	362
Global Index Inc v Mkapa 290 F.Supp.2d 108 114–15 (DDC 2003)	265
Grand Jury Proceedings 817 F.2d 1108, 1110–11 (4th Cir 1987)	251
Greylock Global v Province of Mendoza, No 04 Civ 7643 (HB) 2005 US Dist LEXIS 1742, at 18 (SDNY 8 February 2005)	421
GSS Group Ltd v National Port Authority 680 F.3d 805 (DC Cir 2012)	244
Guevara v Republic of Peru (11th Cir 1 November 2006) noted (2007) 101 AJIL 202	263
Habyarimana v Kagame (10th Cir 2012)	251, 550
Harris v Intourist 481 F.Supp.1056 (EDNY 1979); 63 ILR 318	271
Harris v VAO Tourist 481 F.Supp.1056 (EDNY 1979)	264
Haven v Rzeczpospolita Polska 215 3d 727 (7th Cir) 2000	255
Hercaire International Inc v Argentina 821 F.2d 559 (11th Cir 1987); 98 ILR 48	252
Hercaire v Argentina 821 F.2d 559 (11th Cir 1987)	363
Hester International Corp'n v Nigeria 879 F.2d 170, 181 (5th Cir 1989); 90 ILR 604	252
Hijazi v Permanent Mission of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations 2010 WL 5174946 (2nd Cir 2010)	260
Holocaust Victims Assets Litigation, 13 April 2005; (2005) 44 ILM 1307	247
Hyundai Corp'n v Republic of Iraq and Central Bank of Iraq (794 NYS 2d 327 (App Div 2005))	240
International Association of Machinist and Aerospace Workers v OPEC 477 F Supp 553 (CD Cal 1979); 63 ILR 284649 F 2d 1354 (9th Cir 1981), 66 ILR 4, 13	56, 262, 401
International Housing Ltd Rafidain Bank 983 F.2d 8 (2nd Cir 1989)	265
Ipirtrade International Inc v Federal Republic of Nigeria 465 F.Supp.824 (DDC 1978); 63 ILR 196	257, 388, 389
Isbrandtsen Tankers, Inc v President of India 446 F.2d 1198, 1201 (2nd Cir 1971)	251
Jackson v People's Republic of China, 550 F Supp 869 (ND Ala 1982)	15, 250
Jimenez v Aristeguieta; U S v Noriega 746 F.Supp.1506 (Fla 1990); 99 ILR 143	550
Jimenez v Aristeguieta 311 Fed Rep 2nd Ser 547 (1962) (Ct of Apps 5th Cir); 33 ILR 353	549
Jogi v Voges 480 F.3d 822 (7th Cir 2007)	274
John Doe v Holy See 557 F.3d 1066 (9th Cir 2009)	271
Joo v Japan 332 F.3d 679, 686 (DC Cir 2004)	41, 247, 256
Jungquist v Shaikh Sultan 940 F.Supp (DC 1996); 113 ILR 522	548
Kadic v Karadic 70 F.3d 232 (2nd Cir 2004)	341
Kadic v Karadzic 70 F.3d 232, 250 (2nd Cir 1995), citing Filartiga 630 F.2d at 889	57, 58, 277
Kalamazoo Spice Extraction Co v Provisional Military Govt of Socialist Ethiopia 729 F.2d 422 (6th Cir 1984)	54, 267, 268
Kato v Ishihara 360 F.3d 106 (2nd Cir 2004)	440, 448
Kawanakao v Polyblank 205 US 349, 353 (1907) (Holmes CJ)	143

Keller v Central Bank of Nigeria 277 F.3d 811 at 818–20 (2002) (6th Cir)	90, 240, 241, 311
Kendall v Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (1977) Digest of US Practice in Int Law, 1053 (SDNY 1965)	539
Kiobel v Royal Dutch Petroleum Co, No 10-1491, slip op, USSC, 17 April 2013	80–1, 86, 243, 246, 272, 274, 468, 611
Kiobel v Royal Dutch Petroleum Co. 132 SCt 1738 (2012)	273
Kirkpatrick case	56, 71, 72
Knab v Republic of Georgia (DDC 29 May 1998)	588
Landgraf v USI Film Products 5211 US 244, 280 (1994)	247
Leonard Malewicz v City of Amsterdam 362 F.Supp.2d 299 (DCD 2005)	268
Letelier v Republic of Chile (1980) F.Supp, vol 488, 665; 63 ILR 378 (District Court, District of Columbia)	604
Letelier v Republic of Chile 488 F.Supp.665 (DDC 1980)	271, 473
Letelier v Republic of Chile 748 F.2d 790, 797 (2nd Cir 1984); 79 ILR 561; 88 ILR 747	241, 251, 362
Li Weixum v Bo Xilai DCC Civ No 04-0649 (RJL)	564
Liberian Eastern Timber v Government of Republic of Liberia 659 F.Supp 606 (DDC 1987); 650 F.Supp 73 (SDNY 1986); 89 ILR 360	106, 520, 525
Libra Bank Ltd v Banco Nacional de Costa Rica 676 F.2d 47, 49–50 (2nd Cir 1982)	278
Libyan American Oil Co v Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamarhirya 482 F.Supp.1175 (DDC 1980)	250, 257
Liu v Republic of China 892 F.2d 1419 (9th Cir 1989); 101 ILR 919	271
Lliamco v Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamarhirya 482 F.Supp.1175 (DDC 1980); 62 ILR 220, vacated 684 F.2d 1032 (DD Cir 1981)	388
Lutcher SA Celulose e Papel v Inter-American Development Bank 382 F.2d 454 (DC Cir 1967)	576
Lyon v Agusta SPA 252 F.3d 1078, 1081–85 (9th Cir 2001)	266
MacArthur Area Citizens Ass'n v Peru 809 F.2d 918 (DC Cir 1987); 107 ILR 196	270
Magness v Russian Federation 247 F.3d 609 (5th Cir)	244
Malewicz v City of Amsterdam 362 F.Supp.2d2298 (DDC 2005)	248, 268, 528
Manoharan v Rajapaksa F.Supp.2d 2012 WL 642446 (DDC 2012)	251
Maria Altman and Dr Nell Auersperg v Republic of Austria (15 January 2006)reported ILIB February 2006	247
Marlowe v Argentine Naval Commissioners 604 F.Supp.703 at 708 (DDC 1985)	257
Martin v South Africa 836 F.2d 91 (2nd Cir 1987); 19 ILR 202	265
Matar v Dichter, No 07-2579-cv (19 December 2007)	19, 366
Matar v Dichter 563 F.3d 9, 14 (2nd Cir 2009)	254, 256
McDonnell Douglas Corp v Islamic Republic of Iran 758 F.2d 341 (8th Cir 1985)	260
MCI Telecommunications Corp v Alhadhood 82 F.3d 658, 664 (5th Cir 1996)	241, 263
McKesson HBOC v Iran (DC Cir 16 November 2001)	266
McKesson Inc v Islamic Republic of Iran 905 F.2d 438 (DC Cir 1990); 101 ILR 536	255
Medellin v Texas 552 US 491 (2008)	274
Mexico v Hoffman, 324 US 30 (1945)	144–5,
Mohamad v Palestinian Authority 132 S Ct 1702 (2012)	277
Mol Inc v People's Republic of Bangladesh 736 F.2d 1326 (9th Cir 1984)	262, 418
Moore v United Kingdom, US 9th Cir No 01–36146, 23 September 2004.	597
Morgan Guaranty Trust Co v Republic of Palau 924 F.2d 1237 (2nd Cir 1991); 87 ILR 590 at 654.	339
Mumtaz v Ershad, NY Supreme Court unpublished Digest of US Practice 1989/89, 314–19.	546
National City Bank v Republic of China 348 US 356 (1955)	256, 388
Nemariam v Ethiopia 491 F.3d 470 at 479–80 (DC Cir 2007)	268
NML Capital Ltd v Argentina and Banco Central de la Republica Argentina, 473 F.3d 463 (2nd Cir, 2007)	507
NML Capital Ltd v Banco Central de la Republica Argentina 473 F.3d 463 (2nd Cir 2007)	363
Nordmann v Thai Airways International 112 F.3d 517 (9th Cir Cal 1997)	265
O'Connell Machinery Co v MV Americana and Italia di Navigazione SpA, 734 F.2d 115 (2nd Cir 1984); 81 ILR 539.	108
O'Bryan v Holy See 471 F.Supp.2d 784; 2007 US Dist LEXIS 3147	271
O'Hair v Wotjyla (1979) Digest US Practice in IL, 897, Civ No 79–2463.	539
Occidental Petroleum Corp v Buttes Gas and Oil Co 331 F.Supp.92 (1971), aff'd 461 F.2d 1261 (9th Cir 1971), cert denied, 409 US 950	400
Oetgen v Central Leather Co 246 US 297 (1918)	53
Olsen ex Rel Sheldon v Govt of Mexico 729 F.2d 641 (9th Cir 1984)	270
OSS Nokalva Inc v European Space Agency 617 F.3d 756 (3rd Cir 2010)	241
Paul v Avril 812 F.Supp.207 (SD Fl 1993)	251

Pavex Bank v Russian Savings Bank 116 F.Supp.2d 415 (SDNY 2000)	265
Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations v NewYork 551 US 207 (2007)	266, 318, 425, 525
Peterson v Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and General Organisation of Social Insurance (9th Cir 9 May 2005)	268
Presbyterian Church of Sudan v Talisman Energy 582 F.3d 244, 258 (2nd Cir 2009), cert denied 131 S Ct 79 (2010)	275
Price v Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya 294 F.3d 82, 96–8 (2002)	243
Principality of Monaco v Mississippi 292 US 313, 322–3 (1934) (Hughes CJ)	144, 339
Prinz v Federal Republic of Germany 26 F 3d 1166 at 1174 (DC Cir 1994), 33 ILM 1483 (1994), 103 ILR 594	41, 256
Procter & Gamble Cellulose Co v Viskoza-Loznica, 33 F.Supp.2d 644 (WD Tenn 1998)	250, 252
Republic of Argentina v Weltover 504 US 607 (1992); 100 ILR 509	407, 409, 440, 612
Republic of Austria v Altmann, US Supreme Ct, 327 F 3d 1246 (2004); (2004) 43 ILM 1421	2, 14, 269, 291, 427, 528
Ricaud v American Metal Co 246 US 304 (1918)	53
Rich v Naviera Vacuba SA, 295 F.2d 24 (4th Cir 1961)	146
Richard AWeek v Cayman Islands 987 F.2d 1074 (7th Cir 1992)	263
Riggs National Corpn v IRS163 F 3d 163 (DCC Cir 1999)	56
Risk v Halvorsen 936 F.2d 383 (9th Cir 1991)	271
Roeder v Islamic Republic of Iran 333 F.3d 228 (DC Cir 2003)	249
Rubin v Iran 349 F.Supp.2d 1108 (ND ILL 2004); Rubin v Iran 465 F.Supp.2d 228 (D Ct Mass)	528
Rush-Presbyterian-St Luke's Medical Center v Hellenic Republic 877 F.2d 574 (7th Cir 1989)	260, 261, 418
S Davis International Inc v Republic of Yemen 218 F.3d 1292 (11th Cir 2000)	389
S&S Davis International 218 F.3d 1292 (11th Cir 2000)	257
S&S Machinery Co v Masinexportimport 706 F.2d 411 (2nd Cir 1983)	252, 278
Saleh v Titan, 11 September 2009, Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia	605
Saltany v Reagan 886 F.2d 438 (DC Cir 1989); 80 ILR 19	540
Samantar v Yousuf 130 S Ct 2278 (2010); 560 US 2010	250, 253, 367, 545, 565, 613
Sanchez v Banco Central de Nicaragua 770 F.2d 1385 (5th Cir 1985)	182
Sarei v Rio Tinto 671 F.3d 756 (9th Cir 2011)	276
Sarei v Rio Tinto plc (7 August 2006), 487 F 3d 1193; 456 F 3d 1069 (9th Cir Cal, 2006)	55, 58
Saudi Arabia v Nelson 123 L Ed 2d 47; 113 S Ct 1471 (1993); 88 ILR 189	262, 440
Saudi Basic Indus Corpn v Mobil Yambu Petrochemical Co 866 A.2d 1 (Del 2005)	246
Scott v People's Republic of China, No CA3–79-0836-D (ND Tex, filed 29 June 1979)	161
Segni v Commercial Office of Spain 835 F.2d 160 (7th Cir 1987)	440
Sharon v Time Inc 599 F Supp 538 (SDNY 1984)	56
Shih v Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office 693 F.Supp.2d 805 (ND.Ill 2010)	440
Siderman de Blake v Republic of Argentina 965 F 2d 688 (9th Cir 1992), 103 ILR 454	41, 255, 267, 426
SK Innovation v Finpol 2012 WL 1259108 (DDC 16 April 2012)	255
Sosa v Alvarez-Machain 542 US 692, 697–8 (2004)	15–16, 58, 272, 276
Southway v Central Bank of Nigeria 198 F.3d 1210 at 1214–15 (1999) (10th Cir)	90, 240, 241, 311
Spaans v Iran-US Claims Tribunal, NJ 1986/438, ILDC 1759 (NL 1985)	573
Spacil v Crowe, 489 F.2d 614 (5th Cir 1974)	146, 251
SS Hellenic Lines v Moore, 345 F.2d 978; 41 ILR 239	232
SS Machinery Co v Masinexportimport 802 F.Supp.1109 (1992); 107 ILR 239	280, 517
Stato di Romania v.Trutta [1926] Foro It I584, 585–6, 589 (Corte di Cass del Regno, Italy, translated and reprinted in part in 26 AJIL 626–9, Supp.1932) (at 504 US 607, 614–5 (1992))	261
Straub v Green Inc 38 F.3d 448 (9th Cir 1994)	244
Sugarman v Aeromexico Inc 626 F.2d 270 (3rd Cir 1980); 63 ILR 446	260, 264
Swarna v Al-Awadi 622 F.3d 123 (2nd Cir 2010)	271, 587
Tabion v Mufti, 63 LW 2537 (1995)	587
Tai v USA, 10 December 1986, Industrial Tribunal, Col T/1812/67	198
Tel Oren v Libyan Arab Republic, PLO and Ors 726 F.2d 774\ (1984) cert denied 195 SC 1354 (1985); 77 ILR 191 at 220	337
Tel Oren v Libyan Arab Republic, PLO and Others, 726 F.2d 774 (1994); SC 1354; 77 ILR 19	250, 342
Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001 471 F.Supp.2d 444; 2007 US Dist LEXIS 4943	271
Texas Trading and Milling Corpn v Federal Republic of Nigeria 647 F.2d 300, 311 (2nd Cir 1981); 63 ILR 552, cert denied 102 S Ct 1012 (1982)	265
Thai-Lao Lignite (Thailand) Co etal v Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic 10 Civ 5256 (SDNY August 2011)	393

Third Avenue Associates v Permanent Mission of the Republic of Zaire to the United Nations, 805 F Supp 701 (2d Cir. 1992); 99 ILR 194	266, 517
TMR Energy Ltd v State Property Fund of Ukraine 366 US App DC 320, 411 F.3d 296, 303 (DC Cir 2005)	243
Transaero Inc v La Fuerza Aerea Boliviana 30 F.3d 148 (DC Cir 1984); 107 ILR 308	243, 244, 249, 253, 265, 267, 347, 353
TransChemical Ltd v China National Machinery Import and Export Corpn 978 F.Supp 286 at 290 (DS Texas 1997) aff'd 161 F.3d, 314 (5th Cir 1998)	252, 258
Tritt v United States of America [1989] 68 OR (2d) 284; 94 ILR260	606
Tuck v Pan American Health Organisation 668 F.2d 547 (DC Cir 1981)	242
Tuli v Republic of Iraq (In re Tuli), 172 F.3d 707, 711 (9th Cir 1999)	239
Underhill v Hernandez 168 US 250 at 252 (1897)	53, 60
Underwood v United Republic of Tanzania F.Supp.2d 248, 250	249
Ungar v PLO 402 F.3d 274 (1st Cir 2005), noted (2005) 99 AJIL 696	337
United States v Noriega 117 F.3d 1206 (11th Cir 1997)	550
United States v Paul Slough et al (DC Cir 22 April 2011)	605
United States v Slough 677 F.Supp.2d 112 (DDC 2009)	605
Upton v The Empire of Iran 4559 F.Supp.264\ (DDC 1976); 63 ILR 211, aff'd 607 F.2d 494 (DC Cir 1979)	271
US v Noriega 117, F.3d 1206 (11th Cir 1997) cert den 118 S Ct 1389; 121 ILR 591	241
US v Noriega 746 F.Supp 1506 (Fla 1990); 97 ILR 143	250
USA v Belfast (11th Cir 15 July 2010)	241
USA v Noriega 746 F.Supp.1506 (Fla 1990); 99 ILR 143	342, 545
USAA Casualty Insurance Co v Permanent Mission of Republic of Namibia Docket No 10-4892-cv (2nd Cir 2012)	270
Venus Lines Agency v CVG Industria Venezolana de Alumnio 210 F.3d 1309 (11th Cir 2000)	255
Verlinden BV v Central Bank of Nigeria 461 US 480 at 497; 79 ILR 549 at 559	245
Verlinden BV v Central Bank of Nigeria 488 F.Supp.1284 (SDNY 1980)	257
Virtual Countries Inc v Republic of S Africa 300 F.3d 230 (2nd Cir 2000)	265
Virtual Countries v South Africa 148 F.Supp.2d 256 (SDNY 2001)	429
Virtual Countries, Inc v Republic of South Africa 300 F.3d 230, 241-2 (2nd Cir 2003)	240
Virtual Defence and Development International v Moldova 133 F.Supp 2d 9 at 15 (DDC 2001)	246
Virtual Defence v Moldova 133 F Supp 2d 1, 8 (DDC 2001)	55
Week v Cayman Islands 983 F.2d 1074 (7th Cir Wis)	267
Wei Ye v Jiang Zemin 383 F.3d 620 (7th Cir 8 September 2004)	251, 545, 550
Weilemann and McCloskey v The Chase Manhattan Bank, 21 Musc, 2d 1086, 192 NYS 2d (NY Sup Ct (1959)), 28 ILR 165	146
Weinstein v Iran 274 F.Supp.2d 53, 58 (DDC 22 July 2003)	281
West v Multibanco Comermex SA 807 F.2d 820 (9th Cir 1987)	267, 268
WS Kirkpatrick & Co v Environmental Tectonics, 493 US 400 at 405 (1990)	55-6, 277
Wye Oak Technology Inc v Republic of Iraq 666 F.3d 285 (4th Cir 2011)	249
Yessenin-Volpin v Novosti Press Agency 443 F.Supp.849 (SDNY 1978); 63 ILR 127	252, 470, 471
Yukos Capital SARL v OJSC RosneOil Co [2012] WLR(D) 186	56, 71, 72
Zappia Middle East Construction v Emirate of Abu Dhabi 215 F.3d 247 (2nd Cir 2000)	268
Zedan v Kingdom of Saudi Arabia 849 F.2d 1511 (DC Cir 1988); 92 ILR 462	262, 265
Zernicek v Pemex 614 F.Supp 407 (D Texas 1985)	255, 265
Zernicek v Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex) 614 F.Supp.407 (SD Texas 1985)	375
Victory Transport Inc v Comisaria General 336 F.2d 354 (2nd Cir 1964); 35 ILR 110	295, 388
Zimbabwe	
Baker McCormac (Private) Ltd v Government of Kenya [1986] CR Comm (Const) 21	147
International Committee of the Red Cross v Sibanda (2007) 28 ILJ 738 (ZS)	147, 575

Table of Legislation

Australia

Foreign States Immunities Act 1985	3, 90, 146, 355, 356, 418, 603
s3(1)	90
s3(2)	506
s3(3)	356, 360, 366, 538, 544
s3(4)(b)	544
s11(2)(b)	411
s11(3)	418
s12(6)(1)(a)	450
s12(6)(1)(b)	450
s17(i)	393
s31(4)	515
s32(3)(a)	506, 516
s32(3)(b)	506
s34	499
s56(3)	538, 544
Seas and Submerged Lands Act 1973	59

Canada

Safe Streets and Communities Act 2012	146
State Immunity Act 1982	90, 146–7, 168, 355, 332, 418, 538, 603
s6	146–7, 468, 471
s17	90
Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act 2012	16, 146
s4(2)	146

China

Law of Judicial Immunity 2005 Art 2	369
---	-----

India

Indian Code of Civil Procedure 1908	147
s86	147

Israel

Foreign State Immunity Law 2008	148, 603
s2	148
s20	148

Japan

Japanese Act on Civil Jurisdiction over Foreign States 2010	324–7, 604
Art 1	311, 325
Art 2(ii)	325
Art 2(iii)	325
Art 4	311, 325, 326
Art 5	326
Art 6	326
Art 7	326
Art 8	326
Art 15	326
Art 16	326

Malaysia

Immunities and Privileges Act 1984	146
--	-----

Malawi

Immunities and Privileges Act 1984 (No. 16 of 1984)	146
--	-----

Pakistan

State Immunity Ordinance 1981	90, 146, 160, 355, 418, 538
s17(2)(b)	90

South Africa

Foreign State Immunities Act 1981	90, 146, 168, 355, 418, 538
s2(3)	90

Singapore

State Immunity Act 1985	90, 168, 355, 418, 538, 603
s19(2)(6)	90
State Immunity Act 1979	146

United Kingdom (UK)

Administration of Justice Act 1920	173, 215, 216, 217, 221, 231
Arms Control and Disarmament (Privileges and Immunities) Act 1988	365
Carriage of Goods by Air Act 1961	111
Civil Jurisdiction and Judgements Act 1982	171, 206, 215
s31	215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 221, 222
s31(1)	206
s31(2)	221
Consular Relations Act 1968	106, 583, 593
Corporate Manslaughter and Homicide Act 2007	91, 92
Criminal Justice Act 1988 s134	201
Crown Proceedings Act 1947	30, 46, 69, 183, 547
Crown Proceedings (Armed Forces) Act 1987	603
Dealing in Cultural Objects (Offences) Act 2003	529
Diplomatic and Consular Premises Act 1987	106, 583, 586, 594
Diplomatic Privileges Act 1708	132
Diplomatic Privileges Act 1964	106, 223, 583
s2	208
Divorce and Legal Separation Act 1971	132
Foreign Corporations Act 1991	572
Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act 1933	215, 216, 217, 231
s4(3)(c)	221
Human Rights Act 1998	230, 454
s4	230
s5	230
s7	34
International Criminal Court Act 2001	181

International Criminal Court (Scotland)	s6(4)	202, 212, 426
Act 2001 ASP 13.	s6(4)(b)	207
International Organisations Act 1968	s7	190, 203, 429
Magistrates' Courts Act 1980	s7(b)	203
Nuclear Installations Act 1965	s7(c)	429
s17(6)	s8	190, 203–4, 430
Police Reform and Social Responsibility	s9	168, 186, 189–90, 204–6, 217, 220, 391–3, 429
Act 2011	s9(1)	204, 206, 393
Protection of Cultural Objects on Loan	s9(2)	206, 399
(Publication and Provision of Information)	s10	116, 192, 206–7, 431, 433, 487
Regulations 2008	s10(5)	207
Rules of the Supreme Court (Amendment	s11	207–8
No 2)1983.	s11(1)(a)	207
State Immunity Act 1978	s11(1)(b)	207
2, 6, 19, 24, 88,	s12	174, 218, 222, 228, 233
98, 110, 115, 131, 139, 140, 141, 143, 146,	s12(1)	217, 230–3, 235
165–237, 290, 303, 304, 308, 344, 356, 360,	s12(2)	230, 232
366, 371, 377, 383, 404, 408, 418, 420,	s12(4)	230–2
421, 440, 450, 469, 477, 503, 544, 611	s12(5)	230–1
s1	s12(6)	230, 232
40–1, 167, 170, 174, 189,	s12(7)	191, 217
200, 205, 209, 215–16, 217, 218	s12–s14	173
s1(1)	s13	205–6, 209, 484, 503
172, 175, 207, 220, 229–30, 338	s13(1)	499
s1(2)	s13(1)(a)	210
174, 235	s13(1)(b)	210
s2	s13(1)–s13(4)	185, 209–10, 215
185–9, 219, 588	s13(2)	213, 499
s2(1)	s13(2)(a)	210
12, 374, 376, 385	s13(2)(b)	210, 214
s2(2)	s13(2)–s13(6)	173
184, 185, 186, 211, 375, 376, 419	s13(3)	173, 188, 211
s2–s11	s13(4)	168, 211–13, 214, 511, 519, 525
222	s13(5)	211, 212, 214, 506
s2–s11	s14	141, 503
173	s14(1)	119, 175, 177, 178, 182, 183, 221, 222, 351, 367, 548, 565
s2–s17	s14(1)(a)	133, 168, 175, 176, 178, 347, 538, 544
172–3	s14(1)(b)	175, 178, 347
s2(3)	s14(1)(c)	347
185, 186, 187, 382	s14(2)	70, 175, 177–8, 179, 183, 215, 355, 367, 370, 376
s2(3)(b)	s14(2)(a)	119, 178, 180
187	s14(2)(b)	119
s2(4)	s14(3)	173, 185, 209, 376
186, 188	s14(4)	70, 173, 182, 209, 213
s2(4)(a)	s14(5)	180, 213, 221, 222, 350
187	s15	173
s2(6)	s16	167, 209
388	s16(1)	167, 168, 516
s2(7)	s16(1)(a)	199, 446, 450, 451, 591
185, 378, 381	s16(1)(b)	202–3, 213, 214, 425
s3	s16(2)	167, 213, 521, 601–2, 603
122, 168, 178, 189, 190,	s16(4)	90, 168, 311
192, 193–5, 196, 521	s16(5)	207
s3(1)	s17	211
193, 197, 217	s17(1)	209, 214
s3(1)(a)	s18	221
174, 191, 193, 198, 219, 406, 601	s20	175, 176, 223, 312, 344, 348, 548
s3(1)(b)	s20(1)	175–6, 541, 552
122, 173, 190, 193, 197, 198		
s3(2)		
193, 197–8, 200, 220, 399, 402, 406		
s3(3)		
173, 193, 211, 214, 235, 413, 418		
s3(3)(a)		
194–6		
s3(3)(b)		
194–6, 219, 401		
s3(3)(c)		
189, 194–7, 200, 407, 419		
s3–s10		
185		
s4		
189, 190, 198, 199, 206, 441, 446		
s4(1)		
198		
s4(2)		
199		
s4(2)(a)		
198		
s4(2)(b)		
198, 454		
s4(3)		
198		
s4(4)		
199		
s5		
173, 189, 190, 197, 199, 200, 201, 235, 446, 467		
s5–s10		
189		
s6		
189, 202–3, 423, 426		
s6(1)		
202–3, 425		
s6(1)(a)		
424		
s6(1)(b)		
424		
s6(2)		
202		
s6(3)		
202–3		

s20(5)	175, 348, 538, 544, 548	s1605(a)(7)	239, 246, 271, 278, 281
s21	174, 223, 225, 235, 303, 350, 369	s1605A	239, 246, 266, 278
s21(1)	224, 342	s1605A(1)	392
s22(1)	166	s1605A(6)	271
s22(2)	231	s1605A(7)	55
s31	171	s1605A(a)	240, 271, 311
State Immunity (Federal States)		s1605(b)	239, 245, 432
Order 1993	169	s1605B(3)	527
State Immunity (Merchant Shipping)		s1605(6)(c)	259
(Revocation) Order 1999	110, 207	s1606	500
State Immunity Act (Merchant Shipping)		s1607	256–7, 388
(Union of Soviet Socialist States)		s1608(a)	244
Order 1978	207	s1608(b)	244
State Immunities (Overseas Territories)		s1608	240
Order 1979	166	s1609	239, 278, 484
Supreme Court Act 1981	110	s1610	239, 240, 279, 280, 484, 514
Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement		s1610(a)	279, 531
Act 2007	528–9	s1610(a)(1)	255, 279, 375, 377
Visiting Forces Act 1952	596, 597, 601–2	s1610(a)(2)	279, 280
Visiting Forces Order 1965	596	s1610(a)(3)	279, 280
United States of America (USA)		s1610(a)(4)	279, 280
Alien Tort Claims Act 1789	36–7, 80, 146, 244, 271–7, 283	s1610(a)(5)	279
Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty		s1610(a)(7)	281
Act 1996	55, 80, 246, 278, 281, 283, 466, 468	s1610(A)	507
s1189	250	S1610(b)	505, 531
Diplomatic Relations Act 1978	106, 240, 583	s1610(d)	108
Emergency Wartime Supplemental		s1610(f)	281, 517
Appropriations Act 2003	278	s1610(1)(4)(B)	517
Extradition Act 2003	166	s1611	240, 279, 280, 484
Federal Torts Claim Act 1946	270	s1611(b)(2)	520
Federal Tort Claim Act 1948	597	Immunity Seizure Act 1966	527
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 1976	2, 6, 19, 20, 41, 50, 56–7, 87–90, 98, 112, 131, 146, 189, 192, 238–3, 304, 311, 332, 338, 342, 344, 356, 366, 375, 377, 378, 383, 403, 404, 418, 429, 430, 458, 466, 469, 470, 472, 477, 481, 485, 499, 503, 528, 538, 544, 548, 565, 611	International Agreement Claims Act 1954	597
s1303(a)	90	International Organizations Immunities	
s1330(a)	245	Act 1945	241–2, 458, 572
s1601	495	Judiciary Act 1789	272
s1602	239, 250	Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt	
s1603	251, 347, 351	Organizations Act 1970	311
s1603(a)	249, 251, 253, 355, 366	Terrorism Victims' Access to Compensation	
s1603(b)	251, 370	Act 2002	278, 281, 282
s1603(d)	259, 261, 407	Terrorism Risk Insurance Act 2002	282
s1603(e)	264	Torture Victim Protection Act 1991	57, 271, 277–8
s1604	239, 245, 338, 597	Victims of Trafficking and Violence	
s1604(a)(4)	525	Prevention Act 2000	282
s1605	239, 257, 375	International Conventions	
s1605(a)	258, 269	Beijing Convention on the Suppression of	
s1605(a)(1)	239, 255, 257, 259, 375, 377, 389	Unlawful Acts Related to International	
s1605(a)(2)	88, 239, 260, 263, 265, 269, 409, 418	Civil Aviation 2010	112
s1605(a)(3)	54, 239, 247, 267, 332, 363, 426, 427, 528	Brussels Convention for the Unification of	
s1605(a)(4)	239, 266, 423, 425	Certain Rules relating to the Immunity	
s1605(a)(5)	239, 246, 269, 468, 514, 597, 604	of State Owned Vessels 1926	114–16, 118, 138, 139, 142, 157, 165, 172, 191, 192, 207, 292–3, 303, 309, 320, 404, 431, 432, 434, 514, 521
s1605(a)(5)(A)	604, 473	Art 1	115, 431, 483
s1605(a)(6)	239, 246, 258, 389–90, 391–2	Art 2	115, 431, 434, 483
		Art 4	115, 434
		Art 5	212
		Art 6	309

Brussels Convention on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters 1968	34, 86, 88, 117, 169, 215, 218, 221, 294, 383, 390, 467
Brussels Convention on the Arrest of Seagoing Ships 1952	110, 192
Brussels Convention relating to Civil Liability in field of Maritime Carriage of Nuclear Material 1971	110
Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation 1944	111
Art 1	112
Art 3(a)	111
Art 3(c)	112
Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aircraft, Montreal, 1971	112
Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to the Precautionary Attachment of Aircraft of 1933	111
Convention on International Liability for Damage caused by Space Objects 1972	113
Convention on the International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft, Geneva, 1948	112
Convention on Offences and certain other Acts committed on board Aircraft, Tokyo, 1963	112
Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage 1997	110
Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide 1948	102
Art 6(2)	102
Art 7(2)	102
Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States 1965	106
Convention on Special Missions 1969	518, 535, 542, 558, 559, 561–2, 564, 582, 542, 558, 562
Convention on Specially Protected Persons 1972	542
Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations 1946	242, 572, 575
Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space 1975	113
European Convention on Human Rights	3, 34, 47, 71, 77, 80, 170, 293–3, 412, 441, 456, 460, 462, 578–80, 591, 606
Art 1	77, 78, 79
Art 2	77, 78
Art 5	79
Art 6(1)	42–3, 45–6, 68–70, 153, 161, 168, 170–1, 173, 201, 293–4, 383, 442–3, 447, 451, 454, 456, 457, 458, 468, 529
Art 10	77
Art 12	204
Art 13	77
European Convention on State Immunity 1972	2, 27, 33, 41, 87–8, 99, 106, 116–23, 142, 143, 148, 149, 155, 160, 165, 167–9, 179, 185, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 215, 218, 221, 246, 293, 306, 321, 338, 344, 356,
	360, 377, 378, 383, 386, 413, 421, 423, 440–41, 450, 454, 465, 469, 472, 532, 536, 538, 570
Art 1	119
Art 2	119
Art 3	119
Art 3(2)	381
Art 4	33, 121, 122, 192, 403, 440
Art 4(1)	406, 418
Art 4(2)(a)	420
Art 4(2)(b)	420
Art 5	440, 447
Art 5(2)(a)	454
Art 5–Art 14	119–20
Art 6	139, 354, 430
Art 7	121, 122, 192, 374, 418, 403, 440
Art 8	429
Art 10	425, 426
Art 11	403, 463, 465, 467, 471
Art 14	426
Art 15	117, 167, 304
Art 16	117
Art 17	117
Art 18	117
Art 19	117
Art 19(2)	169
Art 20(3)	424
Art 21	121
Art 21(4)	169
Art 22	121
Art 23	484
Art 24	117, 118, 120, 213, 484
Art 24(1)	117, 169
Art 25	118
Art 26	117, 118, 121, 484
Art 27	177, 355
Art 27(1)	118, 119, 179, 350
Art 27(2)	118, 119
Art 27(3)	119
Art 28	169–70, 351
Art 28(1)	349
Art 28(2)	169, 180, 350
Art 29	118
Art 31	118, 167, 601, 603
Art 32	118
Art 33	118
Art 37	116
Geneva Convention 1949	81
Geneva Convention on the High Seas 1958	106–7, 245
Art 8(1)	108
Geneva Convention on the protection of War Victims 1949	128
Hague Choice of Court Agreement Convention 2005	87
Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict 1954	526
Hague Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgements in Civil and Commercial Matters 1971	467

International Covenant on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination	77	United Nations Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civilian Aircraft 1971	81
International Convention on Intervention on the High Seas in cases of Oil Pollution Damage 1969	108	United Nations Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft 1979	81
International Convention on the Arrest of Ships 1999	110	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Convention 1970	526
Lugano Convention 1988	86, 221	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage 2001	109
London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter 1972 Art 7(4)	108–9	Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage 1963	110
MARPOL Convention for the Prevention of Pollution From Ships, 1973	109	Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961	18, 106, 176, 208, 223, 270, 313, 326, 328, 338, 535, 541, 544, 548, 570, 580–1, 583, 584, 585, 589, 592, 593, 600
Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States 1933	337	Art 1	199
Art 1	25	Art 3	203, 214, 518, 588
Montreal Convention on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Relating to International Civil Aviation 1971	112	Art 4	580
Paris Air Navigation Convention for State Aircraft 1919	111	Art 5	583
Postal Convention 1876 Art VI	135–6	Art 7	583
Paris Convention on Third Party Liabilities in the Field of Nuclear Energy 1960	110	Art 8	585
Rome Convention on Damage caused by Foreign Aircraft to Third Parties on the Surface, Rome 1952	111	Art 9	583
Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court 1998	17	Art 11	583
Art 5	553	Art 20	593
Art 27	556	Art 22	111, 593
Art 27(1)	22, 557	Art 22(3)	516, 517, 589, 593
Art 27(2)	555, 588	Art 23	518, 593
Art 98	22, 556–7, 588	Art 24	593
Statute of the International Court of Justice 1946 Art. 38(1)(b)	13	Art 25	520
Art. 38(1)(c)	13	Art 26	593
Art. 38(1)(d)	2, 13, 97	Art 27	593
Torture Convention 1984	44, 81, 128, 176, 201, 277, 551, 553, 567	Art 29	546, 558, 584, 585
Art 5 (2)	81	Art 30	584, 585
United Nations Charter	31, 36, 43, 47	Art 31	558
Ch VII	31, 59, 92	Art 31(1)	132, 593
Art 2(7)	31, 76	Art 31(3)	516, 584, 585, 593
Art 25	558	Art 31(20)	506
Art 92	97	Art 32(1)	184
Art 94	324	Art 32(2)	588
Art 94(1)	97	Art 33	584, 585
Art 103	558	Art 34	584, 585
United Nations Convention Against the Taking of Hostages 1979	81	Art 36	584, 585
United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea 1982	58	Art 35	584, 585
Art 29–31	108	Art 37(2)	585
Art 27	108	Art 37(3)	585
Art 95	108	Art 38	452
Art 376	109	Art 38(2)	585
		Art 39(2)	549, 587, 593
		Art 40	591
		Art 41	452, 506
		Art 41(1)	207
		Vienna Convention on Consular Relations 1963	106, 326, 589, 593
		Art 3(2)	594
		Art 17(10)	594
		Art 22	11
		Art 31(4)	111
		Art 43	593

Art 55	452	Art 31	295
Art 70(1)	594	Art 53	39
Art 71	452	Art 64	39
Vienna Convention on the Law of		Art 67(2)	542
Treaties 1969	39–40, 290, 305, 583	Vienna Convention on the Representation of	
Art 7(2)	442, 540	States in their Relations with International	
Art 7(2)(a)	378	Organizations of a Universal Character	
Art 18	309	1975	575
Art 28	290	Warsaw Convention on Carriage of Goods by	
Art 30	582	Air 1929	111

Table of UNCSI Articles

Articles of the United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property

Article	Page references
1	179, 310, 318, 615
2	4, 18, 175, 194, 295, 297, 298, 302, 303, 310, 311, 313, 320–1, 325, 329, 335, 336–40, 346, 348–9, 352, 353, 356–8, 363, 364–5, 366, 367–8, 371, 407, 413, 414–15, 416, 417–19, 421, 426, 431, 434, 538–9, 544, 547, 565, 615
3	19, 111, 112, 311–13, 314, 321, 325, 328, 335, 346, 348, 367, 369, 422, 424, 434, 449–50, 474, 521–2, 538–40, 561, 570, 581–2, 584, 590, 616
4	290–1, 297, 309, 616
5	49, 301, 304–6, 373–4, 445, 616
6	12, 49–50, 202, 291, 301, 306–7, 309, 340, 374, 422, 616
7	294–5, 307, 309, 373–4, 376–7, 378–80, 384, 386, 491, 510, 616, 620
8	381–2, 617
9	387–8, 617
10	197, 299–301, 307, 321, 346, 354, 357, 358–63, 371, 372, 413–14, 417–22, 428, 434, 444, 477, 617, 623
11	147, 199, 292, 295, 296, 300, 308, 321, 400, 434, 437–9, 441, 443–55, 462, 590–1, 617, 623
12	124, 300, 314–16, 317–18, 320, 329, 414, 445, 463–4, 465–78, 603, 618
13	109, 300, 307, 312, 422–6, 428, 434, 589, 618
14	300, 427–9, 618
15	300, 314, 326, 429–30, 570, 619
16	116, 191, 207, 290, 292–3, 300, 303, 307, 314, 320–1, 326, 431–4, 511, 619
17	204, 300–1, 307, 390–1, 393, 420, 619, 623
18	126, 172, 298, 328, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495–7, 504, 509–11, 513, 515, 619, 620
19	109, 172, 291, 292, 298, 299, 301, 320, 321, 354, 360, 361, 363–4, 387, 421, 491, 492–3, 494, 495, 502–5, 509, 510–12, 513, 515, 519, 520, 522, 525–6, 528, 620, 623
20	386, 394, 491, 493, 510, 620
21	109, 213, 298, 310, 312, 314, 322, 372, 491–3, 507, 512–3, 515, 517, 520, 522–3, 527–8, 570, 589, 620
22	53, 323, 326, 620–1
23	531, 621
24	53, 304, 498, 621
25	295, 298, 621
26	19, 122, 292, 293, 298, 306, 582, 621
27	171, 298, 306–7, 530, 532, 621
28	298, 622
29	298, 622
30	2, 289, 298, 622
31	289, 298, 306, 622
32	289, 298, 622
33	295–6, 298, 302, 622
Annex	172, 199, 289, 295, 298, 310–11, 321, 361–2, 390, 391, 439, 452, 494, 621, 623

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

The law of State immunity relates to the grant in conformity with international law of immunities to States to enable them to carry out their public functions effectively and to the representatives of States to secure the orderly conduct of international relations. Although modern international law does not require the courts of one State to refrain from deciding a case merely because a foreign State is an unwilling defendant, there remains today a hard core of situations where a foreign State is entitled to immunity. When disputes arise a State or a State agency may prevent their adjudication in another State's court by pleading State immunity. From a purely practical point of view it is therefore important to know when and how a plea of State immunity may be made and to what type of dispute it applies. At this point the complexities of the subject begin and the topic becomes one of international law.

The plea as one of mixed international and municipal law

Immunity is a plea relating to the adjudicative and enforcement jurisdiction of national courts which bars the national court of one State from adjudicating the disputes of another State. As such, it is a doctrine of international law which is applied in accordance with national law in local courts. Its requirements are governed by international law but the individual national law of the State before whose courts a claim against another State is made determines the precise extent and manner of application. As Hess writes 'it is the special feature of State immunity that it is at the point of intersection of international law and national procedural law'.¹

Consequently, the law of State immunity is a mix of international and national law. This interaction complicates the law relating to State immunity and creates considerable tensions.

The functions which State immunity serves

State immunity serves three main functions:

- (i) as a method to ensure a 'stand-off' between States where private parties seek to enlist the assistance of the courts of one State to determine their claims made against another State;
- (ii) as a method of distinguishing between matters relating to public administration of a State and private law claims;
- (iii) as a method of allocating jurisdiction between States in disputes brought in national courts relating to State activities in the absence of any international agreement by which to resolve conflicting claims to the exercise of such jurisdiction.

¹ Hess, 'The International Law Commission's Draft Convention on the Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property' (1993) 4 EJIL 269 at 271.

The sources of the law of State immunity

From the 1970s onwards, many jurisdictions by their national legislation or the decisions of national courts adopted a restrictive doctrine of immunity, in particular the Council of Europe adopted the European Convention on State Immunity (ECSI) and the US and the UK national legislation, the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 1976 and the State Immunity Act 1978 respectively: but the absence of a multilateral instrument setting out the rules of State immunity has remained a long-standing obstacle to any uniform law. In 1991, after some 20 years' work, the International Law Commission (ILC), a specialized agency of the General Assembly of the United Nations, finalized its Draft Articles on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property. Based on these Draft Articles and, after lengthy debate and further revision, an international convention as the first authoritative written text of the international law of State immunity was adopted by resolution 53/38 of 16 December 2004 by the UN General Assembly; it was entitled the UN Convention on the Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property (UNCIS).

The UNCIS is not yet in effect as treaty law: 30 ratifications are required to bring it into force (Article 30); 28 States, including China, India, and the UK signed the Convention and, as at 1 June 2013, 14 States have deposited ratifications.² Sweden and Japan have enacted legislation giving effect to the provisions of the Convention in their national systems. Until this UN Convention comes into force, State immunity continues to derive its legal authority from customary international law.

Despite the claim of some US courts that immunity is merely 'a privilege granted by the forum State to foreign States... as a gesture of comity',³ the ICJ has now confirmed, by reference to an extensive survey of State practice carried out by the ILC in preparing the above Draft Articles, that State immunity had been adopted as 'a general rule of customary international law rooted in the current practice of States'.⁴ The International Court has further identified of particular significance as the relevant State practice 'the judgments of national courts faced with the question whether a foreign State is immune, the legislation of those States which have enacted statutes dealing with immunity, the claims to immunity advanced by States before foreign courts and the statements made by States, first in the course of the extensive study of the subject by the International Law Commission and then in the context of the adoption of the United Nations Convention',⁵ all of which material is referred to in this book.⁶

Article 38(1)(d) of the ICJ Statute recognizes 'the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations' as a subsidiary means for the determination of the rules of law. In this connection, the writing on State immunity is prolific. At one time or another, any international lawyer worth his or her salt has seen fit to express views on some aspect of the law of State immunity, often to castigate some national court for preserving immunity. This book builds on the monographs and writings of these numerous jurists,⁷ the invaluable

² Austria, France, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland.

³ *Republic of Austria v Altmann*, US Supreme Ct, 327 F 3d 1246 (2004); (2004) 43 ILM 1421.

⁴ *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v Italy, Greece Intervening)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2012 (hereafter *Jurisdictional Immunities*), para 56.

⁵ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 55. Of equal significance in support of this State practice is *opinio juris*, which the ICJ stated is 'reflected in particular in the assertion by States claiming immunity that international law accords them a right to such immunity from the jurisdiction of other States; in the acknowledgment, by States granting immunity, that international law imposes upon them an obligation to do so; and, conversely, in the assertion by States in other cases of a right to exercise jurisdiction over foreign States'.

⁶ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 55.

⁷ One may mention Akande, Badr, Bankas, Crawford, Cosnard, Dessedjian, Lalive, Schreuer, Synvet, and Trooboff. A fuller list appears in the bibliography.

historical accounts of Sucharitkul and Sinclair, and the report of the Australian Law Reform Commission preparatory to the introduction of the Foreign States Immunities Act 1985. With the adoption of the UNCSI, one hopes that it may now be possible to set aside much of the earlier writing and focus on the proper interpretation of its provisions. But in the present interim stage prior to the Convention coming into force and of aligning national laws with its provisions to permit ratification, it seems advisable to continue to present earlier solutions and to seek out current State practice regarding controversial points; here *State Immunity: Selected Materials and Commentary* edited by Dickinson, Lindsay, and Loonam (hereafter Dickinson et al, *Selected Materials*) has been found to be particularly useful.

The recent development of the law of State immunity

The law of State immunity is not static. The last 100 years have seen enormous changes in the doctrine and practice, and indeed in the last decade there have been important decisions by international and national courts that have clarified and developed the law further.

In 2001 the relationship of State immunity to the protection of human rights came before the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR); in deciding three cases relating to a foreign State's violation of a litigant's right of access to court the Strasbourg Court stated that 'the European Convention on Human Rights cannot be interpreted in a vacuum' and that State immunity is a concept of international law and a part of the body of relevant international law which the Convention as a human rights treaty must take into account.⁸

Until 2002 no issue relating to State immunity had come before the International Court of Justice, but in that year in the case concerning the *Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of the Congo v Belgium)* the International Court made a ruling as to the immunity from criminal jurisdiction of an incumbent Minister for Foreign Affairs,⁹ and in 2012 in the *Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v Senegal)* the same Court examined the extent to which a delay in a treaty obligation to exercise universal jurisdiction over a former Head of State accused of torture constitutes a breach of international law.¹⁰ Also in 2012 the International Court reviewed the law of State immunity in the *Jurisdictional Immunities* case concerning a claim brought by Germany against Italy (with Greece intervening) for the disregard of its immunity by Italian courts in proceedings relating to war damage caused by Nazi Germany during the Second World War.¹¹ Although in this third case the Court restricted its judgment to declaring that State immunity applied to acts committed by the armed forces of one State during international armed conflict on the territory of another State, it also ruled that State immunity was of a procedural nature (see below).¹²

There have also been cases on State immunity in the courts of national jurisdictions, in particular the UK, US, France, Italy, Germany, and Greece.

The development of State immunity can be divided into three models, as described below.

The three models on which immunity is based

State immunity has, to date, demonstrated three different models on which it has been based: the First Model, the absolute doctrine, where the relationship is between two States,

⁸ *Al-Adsani v UK* App No 35753/97 (ECHR, 21 November 2001), (2002) 34 EHRR 111, para 54, 123 ILR 23; *Kalogeropoulos v Greece and Germany*, ECHR No 0059021/00, Judgment on Admissibility, 12 December 2002; 129 ILR 537.

⁹ *Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of Congo/Belgium)* Judgment, Merits, ICJ Reports 2002, p 3, 128 ILR 1, 41 ILM 536 (2002).

¹⁰ *Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v Senegal)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2012.

¹¹ *Jurisdictional Immunities*.

¹² *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 93.

the foreign State and the State of the forum; the Second Model, the restrictive doctrine, where a distinction between the State's exercise of public powers as opposed to engagement in private relations restricts immunity to the former allowing proceedings relating to commercial matters against a foreign State in national courts by private individuals; and the Third Model, immunity as a procedural plea, where a procedural/substantive distinction is used to restrict the scope of immunity and its impact on questions of substantive law. These three models do not strictly describe a historical progression—indeed they overlap and infiltrate each other. Thus, as regards the First and Second models, some States continue to adhere to the absolute doctrine while others have adopted the restrictive approach. And the Second and Third models may be seen as swings of a pendulum; while the restrictive doctrine has limited the application of immunity through, *inter alia*, the narrowing of which acts are considered 'in exercise of sovereign authority', the procedural/substantive distinction allows immunity to be retained regardless of the lawfulness of the act of a foreign State. All three models can help to understand the changes in purpose which the plea of State immunity serves. A full description is contained in Chapter 2. A brief overview is provided here.

The First Model: the absolute doctrine, the independence of the State

In the First Model, international society is treated as made up of competing sovereign States in bilateral relations with each other, each enjoying internal exclusive competence coupled with external equality with and independence from other States. The plea of State immunity in the First Model acts as a bar against one State from sitting in judgment on another State; it excludes one State from even addressing, let alone deciding or enforcing, a claim brought in its local courts against another State, unless the consent of that State was obtained.

The Second Model: the restrictive doctrine

In the Second Model a distinction is drawn between the public and private law acts of the State, with immunity confined to public acts. The doctrine makes a distinction between acts performed in exercise of sovereign authority which remain immune and acts of a private or commercial nature in respect of which proceedings in national courts may be brought. This distinction has in the main proved workable but the absence of objective criteria on which to base the distinction for the two types of act has left it open to criticism and inconsistent application. The overall focus in respect of immunity from adjudication under this restrictive doctrine is more on the act than the actor as the determinant of issues of immunity. As such, it has similarities with the pleas raised by the doctrines of act of State and non-justiciability which also observe a policy of restraint towards the acts of foreign States (Chapter 3). Nonetheless the personal nature of the plea of State immunity produces different consequences from these related doctrines (Chapter 1).

Although the UNCSI now provides the first authoritative written codification of the international law relating to State immunity based on such a restrictive doctrine (Chapter 9), the five problem areas identified by the UNGA Legal Committee and its working party have not been entirely resolved; in particular the criterion for the distinction between immune and non-immune acts upon which the whole restrictive doctrine depends has not been satisfactorily solved in the definition of 'commercial transaction' set out in Article 2(2) of the Convention (Chapter 12); nor has it been determined whether primacy is to be given to forum law or to that of the law of the State seeking immunity in defining the agencies or other 'emanations' of the State (Chapter 10). Given the intensive diplomatic effort to achieve the adoption of the 2004 UN Convention, it is not surprising that the precise extent of its application—particularly

to activities of armed forces of a foreign State and to the exercise of criminal jurisdiction—was not spelt out with complete clarity.

The Third Model: Immunity as a Procedural Plea

Contrary to expectations raised by the Second Model of further restriction of the bar of immunity consequent on the revision of the structure of international law, the Third Model describes a more exclusionary phase focusing on the technical procedural nature of the plea of immunity. This procedural limitation has recently been confirmed in the ruling in *Jurisdictional Immunities of States (Germany v Italy, Greece intervening)*. In that 2012 judgment the ICJ rejected Italy's claim against Germany in respect of war damage committed by German armed forces in 1943–45 declaring that in customary international law the territorial tort exception does not extend to acts 'committed by the armed forces and other organs of the State in the conduct of armed conflict, even if the relevant acts take place on the territory of the forum State' (paragraph 77). In addition, the Court made a general ruling that State immunity is a procedural plea.¹³ In consequence of this procedural character, the plea of State immunity excludes questions as to the lawfulness of the act of a foreign State.

The ICJ made clear that the limitation of immunity as applied by the restrictive doctrine provides no easy route by which reparation can be obtained in national courts for all non-contractual delictual or other types of injury resulting from injury committed by a foreign State. These trends and changes are discussed more fully in subsequent chapters of the book, including Chapter 10 (the definition of the foreign State), Chapter 14 (the exception to immunity for employment contracts made by 1) the foreign State and 2) an International Organization), Chapters 16 and 17 (immunity from enforcement), Chapter 18 (immunities of individuals), and Chapter 19 (special regimes).

Structure of the book

Part I of this book deals with general aspects of the law relating to State immunity. Chapter 1 provides a basic account of the elements of State immunity covering the institution of proceedings and the nature of the plea. Chapter 2 elaborates the development of the concept of State immunity, dividing it into the three models. Chapter 3 compares the plea of state immunity, where the personal status of a foreign State or the sovereign nature of its acts is treated as depriving the national court of another State of jurisdiction, to the related but different pleas of 'act of State' and 'non-justiciability' which may also be raised in proceedings against private individuals.¹⁴ Chapter 4 examines in closer detail the concept of jurisdiction in its relation to the plea of State immunity.

Part II summarizes the sources of the law of State immunity, which, in the absence until 2002 of any decision of an international tribunal, was largely determined by reference to State practice in the major industrial developed nations. This Part contains summaries of relevant treaty law and codification projects (Chapter 5), a historical overview of the development of the restrictive doctrine of State immunity (Chapter 6), an account of English and US law (Chapters 7 and 8), with a shorter outline covering the law of State immunity in certain of the

¹³ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 93.

¹⁴ The common law plea of 'act of State' relates to a governmental public act of a foreign State which the forum court recognizes as valid and effective in the forum State whereas a plea of non justiciability concerns relations between foreign States, to which international law applies and where 'no judicial or manageable standards by which to judge these issues' are applicable to enable a national court to determine the claim.

main civil jurisdictions. Part II concludes with a chapter dealing with the general aspects of the UN Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property, its legislative history, status, structure, exclusions, and implementation by the States who have ratified UNCIS (Chapter 9).

Part III covers in detail the substantive and procedural rules relating to the application of State immunity with particular reference to the provisions of UNCIS, and of the 1976 US Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) and the 1978 UK State Immunity Act (SIA). It would seem likely that the provisions of the UN Convention will be construed by reference to such State practice, and in particular the decisions of national courts which have worked out the detailed application of the law. Particularly relevant in this context is likely to be the practice of the UK since the UN Convention's provisions are formulated in many respects in a manner similar to those in the UK SIA.

Thus Part III examines first the definition of the State enjoying immunity, with its external and internal attributes, with detailed discussion of the position of constituent units, State entities, and representatives of the State (Chapter 10). This is followed by an examination of exceptions to immunity from adjudication under the heads of waiver of immunity by consent of the State (Chapter 11), the commerciality or private law nature of the acts on which the restrictive doctrine is based (Chapter 12), and the proceedings in which immunity cannot be invoked, the commercial and related exceptions (Chapter 13). Whilst initially it was hoped to follow with a chapter setting out the extent to which protection of fundamental human rights and prohibition of international crimes contrary to norms of *jus cogens* had extended the exceptions to State immunity, it became apparent that the Third Model emphasizing the procedural nature of immunity excluded such a treatment. In consequence, Chapter 14 deals with the exception to immunity for employment contracts made by (1) the foreign State and (2) an international organization, which charts how increased protection of human rights, particularly of migrant and foreign workers, have been taken into account by national courts in their application of this exception. The territorial tort exception is examined in Chapter 15. In Chapters 16 and 17 an account is provided of the immunity of the foreign State from coercive measures of execution, both pre- and post-judgment, imposed by national courts or administrative agencies of the forum State. These rules are discussed by reference to Part IV of the UNCIS, the 1991 ILC Commentary, the ECSI, and national legislation and decisions of courts of the UK, the US, and other jurisdictions. The debates of the ILC and the working group set up by UNGA Sixth Committee are summarized, the outstanding problem areas discussed, and a final section reviews possible ways forward. These chapters on enforcement demonstrate that further restriction of State immunity does not merely turn on expanding exceptions to or abandoning completely immunity from adjudication. It highlights the continued political significance of a plea of immunity and the unsatisfactory 'half a loaf' position of restricting immunity from adjudication without parallel restriction of immunity from enforcement.

Part IV addresses in detail different types of immunities including those relating to international organizations. These immunities interact with State immunity, each influencing the scope and development of the other. Chapter 18 looks at the immunities of individuals in the service of the State, including the head of State, head of government, foreign minister, officials when on special mission, and other personnel to whom immunity is accorded. Chapter 19 addresses the special regimes that apply to international organizations, diplomats, consuls, and visiting armed forces.

Conclusions and considerations regarding the future prospects of the international law relating to State immunity will be found in Part V.

State immunity as a case study of the structure of international law

In concluding this Introduction, it should also be noted that, quite apart from the elucidation of the applicable rules of State immunity, the doctrine provides a valuable case study of the present nature of the international community and in particular the interaction of international law and national law, and of the formation of customary international law from national law sources. Ultimately the extent to which international law requires, and national legislations and courts afford, immunity to a foreign State as a defendant before another State's courts depends on the underlying structure of the international community and the degree to which one State may adjudicate the disputes of another State. In order to understand the structure of international law, theory must be tested against reality, and the significance of trends and patterns must be discerned. A study of State immunity directs attention to the central issues of the international legal system.

This page intentionally left blank

PART I

GENERAL CONCEPTS

This part discusses the role of the plea of State immunity in proceedings before national courts, its relationship to other pleas and defences, and the underlying concepts in international law on which it is based.

The first chapter examines the nature of the plea of immunity and locates it as a preliminary procedural plea in relation to other preliminary pleas in national proceedings. The second chapter analyses the evolution of the concept of State immunity during the last 200 years using three models: the absolute doctrine; the restrictive doctrine; and immunity as a procedural plea. Chapter 3 distinguishes the plea of State immunity from the related but different concepts of act of State and non-justiciability, focusing on the approaches taken in the UK and the US. Allocation of jurisdiction discussed in Chapter 4 serves as the means by which the ambit of each State's exercise of authority and power is defined with State immunity in respect of other States forming one of the restrictions on that exercise.

This page intentionally left blank

1

The Institution of Proceedings and the Nature of the Plea of State Immunity

Introduction

The plea of State immunity prevents a foreign State being made party to proceedings in the national court of another State directly, or indirectly by the bringing of proceedings against its property, and thereby prevents the subjection of an independent State to proceedings in another country relating to a dispute about its activities. Two other pleas, Act of State and non-justiciability may also be relevant in the common law in proceedings where as with State immunity the facts pleaded relate to a foreign State and its transactions (see Chapter 3).

The institution of proceedings

The making of a plea of immunity is only one of many matters that may fall to be considered on the institution of proceedings. A first stage is service of process by which the defendant is made aware of the claim, of the proposed court to adjudicate it, and of his required presence to answer the claim. Service of process requiring attendance in court of a person as representative of the State or on the premises of a diplomatic mission located in the forum State may constitute a breach of inviolability and is prohibited by diplomatic law.¹

Service of process in relation to proceedings against a State will therefore necessarily be made through diplomatic channels out of the jurisdiction.² Other procedures relate to preservation of property which may be the subject-matter of the proceedings or which may be required to satisfy any judgment obtained. The party when served may wish to challenge the jurisdiction of the court, make application for a stay of proceedings, or seek an order for the case to be tried elsewhere. Where there is no appearance, the claimant may seek a judgment in default of appearance; where no defence is filed, summary judgment may be obtained.

Service of process

Service of process is a first stage in the institution of proceedings. Civil courts have fixed criteria for the exercise of their competence. Common law courts in proceedings *in personam* base jurisdiction on the presence of the defendant within the territory of the forum State. Where individuals have residence or domicile, or a corporation its place of registration or centre of business within the jurisdiction, the institution of proceedings between private parties by service of process should be reasonably straightforward.

¹ Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961, Art 22; Denza, *Diplomatic Law* (3rd edn, 2008), 268–9 (on diplomats), 151–3 (on mission premises). The prohibition would seem to extend even to service by post.

² For particulars of English law, see Ch 7 on English law, procedure. See, generally, Collins (gen ed), *Dicey, Morris and Collins on the Conflict of Laws* (16th edn, 2012), Chs 5, 10, and 12 (hereafter *Dicey*); Collier, *Conflict of Laws* (3rd edn, 2001), 72–83; Fawcett (ed), *Declining Jurisdiction in Private International Law* (1995) General Report, 1–70.

Whilst the provision of information to a State as to the court and the proceedings which are to be instituted against it may be in order, service of process requiring attendance in court of a person as representative of the State or on the premises of a diplomatic mission located in the forum State may constitute a breach of inviolability and is prohibited by diplomatic law.³ Service of process in relation to proceedings against a State will therefore necessarily be made through diplomatic channels out of the jurisdiction.⁴

Where process has been served, a party may seek to obtain an order from the court enabling trial of the claim in the most appropriate court. Pleas of anti suit litigation, *lis alibi pendens* and *forum non conveniens* may be raised regarding the choice of the appropriate forum between two or more courts in different States.

State immunity to be taken as a preliminary plea

The order in which these pleas are taken varies from one national jurisdiction to another. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) in a decision relating to immunities of the United Nations (the immunity from legal process of an expert) declared that the national court is under an 'obligation to deal with the question of immunity from legal process as a preliminary issue to be decided expeditiously *ex limine litis*.'⁵ It confirmed this position in its 2012 judgment in *Jurisdictional Immunities*: 'a national court is required to determine whether or not a foreign State is entitled to immunity as a matter of international law before it can hear the merits of the case brought before it and before the facts have been established ...' (paragraph 82).⁶ Once satisfied that the defendant is a foreign State, the forum court will dismiss the proceedings, unless satisfied that the foreign State has waived its immunity or that the proceedings fall within an exception to State immunity.

The formulation of immunity as a general rule of immunity with exceptions has the consequential effect that the court is itself required to give effect to immunity. The 2004 UN Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property (UNCIS) requires a State to 'ensure that its courts determine on their own initiative' that a foreign State's immunity is respected (Article 6(1)). In the common law, and as enacted by statute in section 2(1) of the State Immunity Act 1978 (SIA), English law requires the court to give effect to immunity even though the State does not appear. In US law, although immunity is taken at a preliminary stage, the plea is treated as a defence with the burden to establish status as a foreign State placed upon the defendant.⁷

³ Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961, Art 22; Denza, *Diplomatic Law* (3rd edn, 2008), 268–9 (on diplomats), 151–3 (on mission premises). The prohibition would seem to extend even to service by post.

⁴ For particulars of English law, see Ch 7 on English law, procedure. See, generally, Dicey; Collier, *Conflict of Laws*, 72–83; Fawcett (ed), *Declining Jurisdiction in Private International Law* 1–70.

⁵ *Difference relating to Immunity from Legal Process of a Special Rapporteur of the Commission of Human Rights*, Advisory Opinion of 29 April 1999, ICJ Reports 1999, p 62, para 67 (the *Cumaraswamy* case). See Hazel Fox, 'Commentary: The Advisory Opinion on the Difference Relating to Immunity from Legal Process of a Special Rapporteur of the Commission of Human Rights: Who Has the Last Word on Judicial Independence?' (1999) 12 *Leiden JIL* 889.

⁶ See the Index for specific references to this judgment throughout the book. The preliminary nature of the plea of immunity was indeed central to the Court's reasoning as to why the availability of State immunity was *not* dependent upon the gravity of the alleged unlawful act: 'If immunity were to be dependent upon the State actually having committed a serious violation of international human rights law or the law of armed conflict, then it would become necessary for the national court to hold an enquiry into the merits in order to determine whether it had jurisdiction. If, on the other hand, the mere allegation that the State had committed such wrongful acts were to be sufficient to deprive the State of its entitlement to immunity, immunity could, in effect be negated simply by skilful construction of the claim' (para 82).

⁷ Dellapenna *Suing Foreign Governments and their Corporations* (2nd edn, 2002) 644, (1994) 88 *AJIL* 528, 644. Cf *Yugoslavia v Croatia* [2000] 1 L Pr 59, JDI (2000) 1936; and *Republic of Estonia*, 30 June 1993, 113 *ILR* 478 where the French Cour de Cassation held that, in the absence of an international treaty on the matter, the court was not required of its own motion to ascertain whether the State was entitled to immunity; immunity was not absolute and had to be claimed by the purported possessor.

A claim to State immunity is a public claim and it is arguable that it demands open litigation.⁸

Immunity as a rule of international law

Unlike the preliminary pleas referred to above, the entitlement of a foreign State before national courts to immunity is recognized not merely as a prescription with the force of law but also as a rule of international law.⁹ The practice of civil law courts and common law jurisdictions (and indeed many US courts) recognize the international character of the rule of immunity. The European Court of Human Rights in *Al-Adsani* has noted that ‘sovereign immunity is a concept of international law, developed out of the principle *par in parem non habet imperium*, by virtue of which one State shall not be subject to the jurisdiction of another State.’¹⁰ For UK law Lord Hoffmann in *Jones v Minister of Interior of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia* stressed the international law source of State immunity:

As Lord Millett said in *Holland v Lampen-Wolfe* [2000] 1 WLR 1573, 1588, state immunity is not a ‘self-imposed restriction on the jurisdiction of its courts which the United Kingdom has chosen to adopt’ and which it can, as a matter of discretion, relax or abandon. It is imposed by international law without any discrimination between one state and another.¹¹

The rule of State immunity ranks within a number of the sources of international law listed in the ICJ Statute, Article 38(1). Judicial decisions of national courts acknowledging the immunity of a foreign State rank under Article 38(1)(d) as ‘a subsidiary means of determination of rules of law’ and when put into effect qualify under Article 38(1)(b) as ‘evidence of a general practice accepted as law’ and thus of customary international law. Whilst Article 38(1)(c) identifies ‘the general principles of law recognized by civilized states’ as a source of international law, this source is now little relied upon—in part by its discredited reference to ‘civilized states’.¹² Lauterpacht’s explanation that the intention of this source was ‘to authorize the International Court to apply the general principles of jurisprudence, in so far as they are applicable to relations of states’¹³ is a particularly apt description of the doctrine of immunity which is formed by an amalgam of international and national law. Whilst the diversity and contradictions to be found relating to the treatment of State immunity in such judicial decisions calls for interpretative and comparative skills to detect the common international law rule which they uphold, a subject more fully discussed below and in Chapter 5, there can be little doubt that there is a general acceptance, both as a general principle of law

⁸ In a claim made by an alleged wife of the King of Saudi Arabia for maintenance, the English Court of Appeal held the identity of the sovereign was relevant to any public debate of the issues raised by a plea of immunity and gave leave to the applicant for a public hearing as to the applicability of a plea of State immunity to the applicant’s claim for maintenance, though it might well have retained such restrictions with regard to the subsequent investigation of the entitlement to and extent of such maintenance. *Harb v King Fahd Bin Abdul Aziz* [2005] 2 FLR 1108 at para 40. By reason of the King’s death further proceedings in the English court were discontinued; thus the immunity point was not finally determined. *Aziz v Aziz & Sultan of Brunei* [2007] EWCA Civ 712 (11 July 2007) per Lawrence Collins, paras 93, 137, Sedley LJ paras 131–2. Cf *Anonymous v Anonymous*, NYS 2d 777 (AD1 Dept 1992) where reporting restrictions were imposed in divorce proceedings of a head of state; see also *Global Torch Management v Apex Global Management Ltd* [2013] EWCA Civ, Paras 13–15.

⁹ Finke, ‘Sovereign Immunity: Rule, Comity or Something Else?’ (2010) 21(4) EJIL 853 (State immunity is a legally binding principle not a rule of international law, so States may differ in their rules relating to State immunity so long as they observe the boundaries set by other principles of international law).

¹⁰ *Al-Adsani v UK* (2002) 34 EHRR 111, ECHR, para 56; 107 ILR 536.

¹¹ *Jones v Minister of Interior of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia & Ors* [2006] UKHL 26, [2006] 2 WLR 1424.

¹² Gaja, *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*; Bin Cheng, *General Principles of Law as Applied by International Courts and Tribunals* (2006).

¹³ Jennings and Watts, *Oppenheim’s International Law* (9th edn, 1992), 37 and fn 2.

and as a rule of customary international law, of immunity as a legal bar in international law to certain national court proceedings being taken against a foreign State. The International Law Commission, in the preparation of its draft articles on the jurisdictional immunities of States and their property, after an extensive survey, concluded that the rule of State immunity had been 'adopted as a general rule of customary international law solidly rooted in the current practice of States'.¹⁴ And finally the ICJ recently confirmed, with regard to 'the record of national legislation, judicial decisions, assertions of a right to immunity and the comments of States on what became the United Nations Convention' that the current practice of States

shows that whether in claiming immunity for themselves or according it to others, States generally proceed on the basis that there is a right to immunity under international law, together with a corresponding obligation on the part of other States to respect and give effect to that immunity.¹⁵

Immunity granted on terms of reciprocity or as a matter of discretion

The ICJ's ruling in *Jurisdictional Immunities* that immunity is a rule of law, as with the enactment of rules of State immunity in UNCIS and other international conventions or national legislation, directly restricts the extent to which the executive branch of a State may enlarge or reduce immunity (see further discussion under waiver in Chapter 11). Indeed, a foreign State denied immunity by a US court following the Supreme Court's direction in *Republic of Austria v Altmann* that immunity merely provides 'some *present* protection from the inconvenience of suit as a gesture of comity',¹⁶ would now seem entitled to claim a breach of the international obligation to afford immunity. The effect in law of the practice of China¹⁷ and Russia¹⁸ along with other States to legislate on a basis of reciprocity would thus seem rendered uncertain. Arguably, in the future the grant of immunity on terms of reciprocity or as

¹⁴ *Yearbook of the International Law Commission* (1980), vol II(2), p 147, para 26. But note in its 1991 Draft Articles on the Jurisdictional Immunities of States and their Property the ILC states: 'There is common agreement that for acts performed in the exercise of the "*prérogatives de la puissance publique*" or "sovereign authority of the State" there is undisputed immunity. Beyond or around the hard core of immunity, there appears to be a grey zone in which opinions and existing case law and indeed legislation still vary.' See Ch 12.

¹⁵ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 56; see also para 106. As regards the immunity of State officials the ILC, in its report of the 60th Session, similarly agreed with the Special Rapporteur Kolodkin that 'the immunity of State officials from foreign criminal jurisdiction was based on international law, particularly customary international law, and not merely on international comity' UN Doc A/63/10 (2008) para 281. The 9th edition of Oppenheim's *International Law*, whilst noting that grant of immunity from suit may be a denial of a legal remedy in respect of what may be a valid claim, confirms this position: 'State practice is sufficiently established and generally consistent to allow the conclusion that, whatever the doctrinal basis may be, customary international law admits the general rule, to which there are important exceptions that foreign states cannot be sued, Jennings and Watts, *Oppenheim's International Law I* (9th edn, 1992), 342–3.

¹⁶ *Republic of Austria v Altmann*, US Supreme Ct 327 F 3d 1246 (2004), (2004) 43 ILM 1421, citing *Dole Food Co v Patrickson*, 538 US 468, 479 (2003) (emphasis added).

¹⁷ Article 3 of the Chinese Law of Judicial Immunity of 2005 stipulates that for countries that do not provide property of the central bank of the PRC and the financial administration organs of the Special Administration Regions of Hong Kong and Macao with immunity, or provide immunity at a level below this Law, the PRC will deal in line with the principle of reciprocity. Lijiang Zhu, 'State Immunity from Measures of Constraint for the Property of Foreign Central Banks: The Chinese Perspective' (2007) Chinese J Int Law 67 at 80 comments that the PRC's attachment to the principle of reciprocity is readily understandable since 'equality of state sovereignty does not come easily. It took China more than a hundred years' struggle to completely abolish the "unequal treaties" imposed by western powers'.

¹⁸ Article 61 of the 1961 Fundamentals of Civil Procedure of the USSR provided: 'When a foreign State does not accord to the Soviet State its representatives or its property the same judicial immunities which, in accordance with the present Article, is accorded to foreign States, their representatives and their property in the USSR... the USSR... may impose retaliatory measures in regard of that State its representatives and that property in the USSR'. Arguably when a foreign State does not accord to the Soviet State the same judicial immunities accorded to foreign States, the USSR may impose retaliatory measures.

a matter of discretion will constitute a breach of the forum State's obligation to afford immunity; at most it can only be treated as evidence of the forum State's view, or *opinio juris*, that the facts of the case do not come within the entitlement to State immunity.

Protest

Express protest to a forum State's refusal of immunity may now become more frequent. State practice in the past shows that, rather than express protest, response to a refusal of immunity has resulted in non-appearance by a foreign State when summoned to appear or an appeal to the forum State to intercede on its behalf.¹⁹ Formal protests have rarely been made; and when made, such representations more often object to the execution than to the giving of a judgment. A State has tended to ignore a refusal of immunity unless its property is jeopardized. Germany's decision to bring proceedings against Italy at the ICJ was motivated, at least in part, by the measures of constraint taken against Villa Vigoni, a property of the German State near Lake Como.²⁰ When the English Court of Appeal in *Alcom*²¹ allowed attachment of the account of the Colombian diplomatic mission in London in execution of a default judgment relating to a commercial transaction, Colombia protested to the Foreign Office and cancelled a ministerial visit to Bogota. There were also wider repercussions, with several diplomatic missions moving their accounts out of the jurisdiction of English courts and considering action against the accounts of British missions abroad.²² In consequence, the Attorney-General was briefed by Her Majesty's Government to act as *amicus curiae* on appeal, the outcome of which was the Lords' reversal of the decision of the lower court.

Acquiescence in the practice of another State considered to be contrary to international law cannot necessarily be deduced from the absence of diplomatic protest. In a critique of the *Arrest Warrant* case, Cassese refers to the assertion for many years of universal civil jurisdiction by US courts over serious violations of international law perpetrated by foreigners abroad and claims 'whether or not this trend of US courts is objectionable as a matter of policy or on legal grounds, it is a fact that it has not been challenged, or in other words has been acquiesced in, by other states.'²³ Yet, in an *amicus curiae* brief to the US Supreme Court in the *Sosa v Alvarez-Machain* proceedings, the European Commission challenged the application of the Alien Tort Claims Act to conduct undertaken outside the US by foreigners. It submitted in strong terms that the US Congress and US courts were obliged in determining when the immunity of a foreign State may be set aside to apply the substantive standards and jurisdictional limits imposed by international

¹⁹ Lauterpacht, 'The Problem of Jurisdictional Immunities of Foreign States' (1952) 28 BYIL 220 at 227. A State's protest is made by refusal to appear.

²⁰ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 35. See also the protest by the People's Republic of China (PRC) to the UK government at the enactment legislation applicable to Hong Kong declaring State immunity to be no bar to proceedings brought in Hong Kong regarding aircraft located there which the Chinese Communist government claimed as its property and to the US government during the proceedings brought against the PRC by bondholders of Chinese railway stock (1951) 1 ICLQ 159–77, (1953) 3 ICLQ 136–43; Huang Jin and Ma Jingsheng, 'The Immunities of States and their Property: The Practice of the People's Republic of China' (1988) 1 Hague YBIL 163 at 168–9 and also referring to the Chinese government's protest in the 'Yonghao' Oil tanker case at 169–70. Jin and Jingsheng, 'The Immunities of States and their Property' 168–9, 176–80; *Civil Air Transport Inc v Central Air Transport Corp'n* [1953] AC 70; *Jackson v People's Republic of China*, 550 F Supp 869 (ND Ala 1982), dismissed on appeal on the ground that the FSIA was not retroactive: 794 F 2d 1490 (11th Cir 1986), 22 (1983) ILM 76. See also a third State's representations in the *Socobelge* case, in Ch 16.

²¹ *Alcom Ltd v Republic of Colombia and Others* [1984] AC 580, [1983] 3 WLR 906, [1984] 1 All ER 1.

²² Mrs E Denza, Legal Counsellor, FCO to ML Saunders, Law Officers' Department, 11 November 1983. Attachment of an aircraft of the visiting Yemen head of State also provoked protest.

²³ Cassese, 'When May Senior State Officials be Tried for International Crimes? Some Comments on *Congo v. Belgium Case*' (2002) 4 EJIL 853 at 859.

law.²⁴ Given that the consequences of national courts' decision have at most indirect impact on the overall foreign relations of one State with another, representations made by way of *amicus* brief to the supreme court of another State as well as by diplomatic note may surely qualify as a protest. It is to be noted that while Judges Higgins, Kooijmans, and Buerghenthal in their joint opinion in the *Arrest Warrant* case noted in the Alien Tort Claims Act 'the beginnings of a very broad extraterritorial jurisdiction' in the civil sphere, they commented that '[w]hile this unilateral exercise of the function of guardian of international values has been much commented on, it has not attracted the approbation of States.'²⁵

Countermeasures

Whether the law of countermeasures may be of relevance now that State immunity is a rule of international law seems questionable; namely, whether a forum State may invoke the law of countermeasures to justify a failure of its national court to accord such immunity by reason of the defendant State's violation towards the forum State of an international obligation.²⁶

The concept of countermeasures was alluded to by Italy in its oral pleadings in the *Jurisdictional Immunities* case.²⁷ Italy contended that, by reason of Germany's breach of its international obligation to make reparations to Italian victims for violations of international humanitarian law by the German Reich during the Second World War, Italy was entitled to deny Germany immunity in its courts, even if this was a breach of Italy's own international obligation to grant immunity to Germany in civil proceedings brought in its national courts.²⁸ But the Court's dismissal of Italy's counterclaim asserting Germany's violation of its obligation owed to the Italian victims of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by the German Reich left it without jurisdiction 'to rule on those questions' (paragraph 48). Although the Court considered 'it a matter of surprise—and regret—that Germany decided to deny compensation to a group of victims... [and] the legal protection to which [their] status entitled them' (paragraph 99), it made no ruling as to the responsibility of Germany for such denial of compensation and had no jurisdiction to do so.²⁹ Accordingly, there was no breach of an obligation owed to the forum State to justify the latter's withdrawal of immunity as a countermeasure.

The ICJ did not address the issue of countermeasures in its final judgment. Italy's consistent view had been that denying immunity to Germany was justified under international law on the basis of an exception to State immunity for grave human rights violations, and not that it was invoking a countermeasure in breach of its obligation to grant immunity.³⁰

²⁴ US Supreme Court, *Sosa v Alvarez-Machain*, brief of *amicus curiae* of the European Commission in support of neither party, 23 January 2004, pp 5, 14, 26–7.

²⁵ At para 48. But see the Canadian Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act 2012 which amends the Canadian SIA to remove the immunity of a foreign State that has been listed by the Government in Council as a 'sponsor of terrorism' and creates a civil cause of action in Canada for damage or loss related to a terrorist act if the plaintiff is a Canadian citizen or permanent resident or there is a 'real and substantial connection' to Canada.

²⁶ See Arts 22 and 49 of ILC Articles on State Responsibility.

²⁷ CR 2011/18, Palchetti (47–50) and Dupuy (50–6).

²⁸ Tomuschat, CR 2011/21, para 27 (calling this 'the very strange new theory of countermeasures').

²⁹ In any event, it seems that Italy did not fulfil several of the requirements relating to resort to countermeasures set out in Art 52 of the ILC Articles, including notifying Germany of its decision to take countermeasures.

³⁰ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 101. Tomuschat, CR 2011/21, paras 26–7 (also referring to Italy's waiver of Italy of claims on its own behalf and on behalf of Italian nationals in the Peace Treaty of 1947).

The role of national law

During the twentieth century, national legislation, national decisions, and the reaction (or inaction) of States to a forum State's refusal of immunity potentially constituted evidence of the customary international law relating to State immunity. Further, by reason of the subject-matter, and by the exercise or refusal of jurisdiction over a party to a proceeding in a national court, its reasoning and conclusion may be said to contribute to the formulation of the law relating to State immunity; as such, a national court may both create the law as well as implement an existing international rule. Chapter 5 on Sources discusses the justifications for this law creation by national legislation and national courts and further discusses their role as a source of the customary international law of State immunity. As more particularly described in that chapter, recent international conventions and decisions of international tribunals addressing aspects of State immunity—UNCSI and the ICC Statute and three judgments of the ICJ in the last decade—make probable a reduction in any recourse to the proceedings of national courts for a first articulation of the relevant rule of international law. For issues of civil jurisdiction, UNCSI, however ambiguous in its terms, will provide parameters for the interpretation of the relevant international law of State immunity: in consequence national courts' role may now be less one of novel law creation but rather of interpretation, a reformulation of the relevant international rule as it applies to the particular facts in the national proceeding. For the exercise of criminal jurisdiction and the prosecution of international crimes committed by State officials, national courts' role alongside international criminal tribunals may continue to be one more of experimentation and tentative rulings. But whatever the nature of the issue, civil or criminal, the lasting impact of all national courts' decisions will be dependent on their imitation or rejection in the practice of other States and by the wider international community.

The requirements of the plea of immunity are governed by international law, but, given its lack of particularity, the individual national law of the State before whose court a claim against another State is made (the forum law) determines the precise extent and manner of application. As the phases of the development of the rule of immunity show (see Chapter 2), there has been a steady elucidation of the details of the rule initially with considerable input from national law but throughout moderated by overriding considerations of respect for the independent status of the State. This process is shown in the solutions achieved with regard to the definition of the act of the foreign State entitled to immunity and to the extension of the concept of a foreign State to an entity enjoying independent legal personality.

When this question was addressed as early as 1891, in discussion on the applicable law of State immunity in the Institut de Droit International, several members queried whether the topic fell outside international law. This view was rejected by a large majority.³¹ In its 1954 resolution the Institut declared that the law of the forum State is to be applied to identify the private/commercial nature of an act and its application to particular types of transaction, whilst international law defines acts in exercise of sovereign authority.³²

The Institut's approach was confirmed and elaborated by the Constitutional Court of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1963 in the *Empire of Iran* case. The Court addressed the issue of the applicable law as follows: Accepting that the 'qualification of State activity as sovereign or non-sovereign must in principle be made by national (municipal) law, since international law, at least usually, contains no criteria for this distinction', the court found this

³¹ ADI vol II (1885–91) 1166, 1186.

³² 1954 Aix-en-Provence resolution on Immunity from adjudication and enforcement of foreign States, Art 3.

qualification by national law to be subject to 'international law restrictions': 'National law can only be employed to distinguish between a sovereign and non-sovereign activity of a foreign State insofar as it cannot exclude from the sovereign sphere, and thus from immunity, such State dealings as belong to its field of State authority in the narrow and proper sense, according to the predominantly held view of States.'³³

On the facts of the case, a contract for the repair of embassy premises of Iran was held not to fall within the essential sphere of State authority and hence proceedings in respect of its breach were not barred by that State's immunity. The purpose of the function, the improvement of premises in order to carry out diplomatic functions which the State was pursuing, was held not to be relevant. The court accordingly concluded that: 'The distinction of sovereign functions according to the nature of the transaction and the qualification of the transaction according to national law, may not yet have found the comprehensive recognition which is indispensable for a general rule of international law; it is however so widespread that a grant of immunity going beyond it can no longer be seen as being required by international law'. Accordingly, the exercise of German jurisdiction over the dispute relating to the Iranian embassy was confirmed.

Less clarity has been achieved in respect of the entitlement of separately incorporated entities to State immunity. As the discussion in Chapter 10 on Definition of the Foreign State in Part III reveals, given the absence of any clear guidance in international law, national courts have differed on whether the inclusion of such 'State' entities within the immunity enjoyed by the foreign State is a matter for the determination of the law of the forum State or the consent of the foreign State or by its national law. The current solution adopted by UNCSI authorizes a reference to both forum State and foreign State law; in Article 2(2)(b)(iii) 'agencies or instrumentalities' come within the convention's definition of the State 'to the extent that they are entitled to perform and are actually performing acts in the exercise of sovereign authority of the State' ie entitled to perform according to the law of the foreign State and actually performing according to the law of the forum State.

The setting out in treaty form of rules relating to State immunity in the 2004 UNCSI, particularly after its coming into force, will greatly strengthen the international law content of the rules of immunity and reduce the frequency of the determination of issues by reference to national law. It is to be hoped that the status of such rules will then be equated to those relating to the immunities of diplomats and consuls which are set out in the 1961 and 1963 Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations and which have received almost universal recognition. It is significant that such codification in treaty form accelerated their recognition as general international law.

Outline of the plea of State immunity

The recognizable attributes of a plea of State immunity are:

- (i) a plea;
- (ii) proceedings brought in a court;
- (iii) against a foreign State; and
- (iv) which by law results in the refusal of the forum court to hear the case.

Each of these attributes may be considered in turn.

³³ *Empire of Iran* case, German Federal Constitutional Court, 30 April 1963; UN Legal Materials 282; 45 ILR 57 at 81.

Who may raise the plea?

The plea of immunity is only available to a defendant which is an independent and sovereign State under international law. In common law jurisdictions, a State is treated as a foreign State only where it is recognized as such by the forum State.³⁴ Common law courts will usually take judicial notice of the status of a State defendant but in case of doubt may seek advice from the forum State's executive. In the UK on the request of the parties to the Foreign Office, or sometimes at the instance of the court, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will issue a certificate which under the SIA 1978 is conclusive as to the status of the State or its government. In other jurisdictions, proof of the essential attributes of a State—territory, population, government capacity to enter foreign relations—may be sufficient, though usually some recognition by diplomatic or treaty relation with the forum State will be present.³⁵ No specific guidance on this issue is provided by UNCSI, see further Chapter 10.

For the purposes of immunity the central government, its departments, and organs are treated as within the protected status of a foreign State; national courts may extend State immunity to other agencies established by the State dependent on their relationship or function. The acts of individuals performed on behalf of the State for whom they act as representatives may also be imputed to the State (see Chapter 10) so as to render the immunity which they enjoy co-extensive with the immunity of the State. Historically, so far as the immunities of heads of State and of the diplomatic agent and the diplomatic mission are concerned, the immunities of individuals acting on behalf of the State evolved independently of State immunity, particularly in respect of the immunity extending to private acts while they were in office. Immunities accorded to the visiting armed forces of a foreign State have also been treated as a separate regime in international law. Following the 2010 decision in *Samantar*, the US Supreme Court seems to favour a similar form of independent treatment as applicable to all State officials stating that 'the immunity of individual officials is governed not by the FSIA but by the common law of foreign official immunity as recognized by the Executive' (see further Chapter 8).³⁶ By reason of these differences, the immunities enjoyed by Heads of State and high ranking officials, diplomats, the visiting armed forces of a foreign State, and officials of international organizations are examined separately in Chapters 18 and 19 and are to be regarded broadly as a subject to be regulated, though with some considerable overlap, by regimes separate from that of State immunity.³⁷

The personal nature of the plea and consent

In contrast to non-justiciability where nature of the subject-matter of the claim may render it non-justiciable in a national court,³⁸ the plea of immunity is a bar based on the status of

³⁴ In English law, foreign sovereigns and States recognized by the UK government have *locus standi* as a proper party to institute proceedings and hence to defend them when they consent and waive immunity. An unrecognized foreign State and any of its authorities cannot sue or be sued in the English court but it will have *locus standi* in the English court if it is a subordinate body set up by a recognized State to act on its behalf: *GUR Corp'n v Trust Bank of Africa* [1987] 1 QB 599, [1986] 3 All ER 449, 75 ILR 675. In some countries a foreign State is not considered to have capacity to initiate litigation.

³⁵ *Clerget v Banque Commerciale pour l'Europe du Nord*, French Ct of Appeal, 7 June 1969, 52 ILR 310, Cour de Cassation, 2 November 1971, 65 ILR 54.

³⁶ Brief for the US as *Amicus Curiae* in Support of Affirmance, *Matar v Dichter*, No 07-2579-cv (19 December 2007).

³⁷ UNCSI Art 26 provides that nothing in the Convention shall affect the rights and obligations of States parties under existing international agreements which relate to matters dealt with in the Convention as between the parties to those agreements; and Art 3 provides that UNCSI is without prejudice to the privileges and immunities of diplomatic missions, Heads of State *ratione personae*, and aircraft or space objects owned or operated by a State.

³⁸ See Ch 3.

the defendant as a sovereign State and is hence described as immunity *ratione personae*. As the ICJ has commented, ‘immunity [by reason of this personal status of a foreign State] may represent a departure from the principle of territorial sovereignty and the [territorial] jurisdiction which flows from it.’³⁹ But for immunity, that jurisdiction would be validly based on the presence of the foreign State and its agencies or its property or on the commission of acts on its part within the territory of the forum State. The plea of immunity acts as a personal bar. On this account as a beneficiary enjoying a personal immunity, the defendant State can consent to its removal. Such consent to the proceedings in the national court of another State may now be given prior to or after the initiation of proceedings, provided the foreign State’s intention to accept the jurisdiction of the forum State’s court is made clear.⁴⁰

The plea as a bar to jurisdiction of the court

State immunity may act as a bar to proceedings before an international tribunal as well as a national court, but its main significance relates to its effect upon the jurisdiction of a national court.

Jurisdiction and immunity are two separate concepts. ‘Jurisdiction relates to the power of a State to affect the rights of a person or persons by legislative, executive or judicial means, whereas immunity represents the independence and exemption from the jurisdiction or competence of the courts and tribunals of a foreign State and is an essential characteristic of a State.’⁴¹ Logically the existence of jurisdiction precedes the question of immunity from such jurisdiction but the two are ‘inextricably linked’ (see Chapter 4).⁴²

The plea concerns immunity from the judicial power of another State, although the enforcement of that power may also involve the executive power and the administrative authorities of the State. It does not relate to the legislative power of the State, its jurisdiction to prescribe which goes more to substantive liability (see Chapter 4).⁴³

Such court proceedings include all manifestations of the judicial power within the forum State territory, and accordingly can be raised in any tribunal exercising judicial or quasi-judicial powers, whether in criminal, civil, family, or other matters. The plea is available to bar proceedings before administrative tribunals. The position as to arbitration tribunals is different. In so far as an arbitration tribunal derives its authority to determine a dispute from the consent of the parties, the foreign State’s consent may constitute a waiver of any immunity; but in so far as the tribunal looks to the forum State and its courts to enforce the arbitral award, the plea of State immunity may have relevance (see Chapter 11).

Application of the forum State’s choice of law rules relating to the alleged activity will usually result in the forum State’s court applying its own law or the law of the place where the acts complained of took place, which may often be the same. In US cases the FSIA provides a basis for US federal court jurisdiction but substantive law will be determined by the law of the particular State in which the federal court has its seat.

³⁹ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 57.

⁴⁰ See Ch 11.

⁴¹ *Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of Congo/Belgium)*, ICJ Reports 2002, Judge Koroma, Separate Opinion, para 5.

⁴² *Arrest Warrant*, Judge Koroma, Separate Opinion, para 5, Joint Separate Opinion of Judges Higgins, Kooijmans, and Buergenthal, para 3.

⁴³ Privileges, though restricted by some authors to matters of comity relating to status, prestige, honour, protocol, or courtesy, may result from the exercise of such a jurisdiction to prescribe which may vary the substantive law in favour of the foreign State. A State may claim and enjoy other privileges and immunities from the forum State, such as immunity for its nationals from military conscription or the privilege of not paying import duties or having preferential rates on petroleum, fuel, or alcoholic drinks, but these are not the direct concern of the plea of State immunity before a court. Reinisch, *International Organisations before National Courts* (2000), 13–15.

A procedural plea not an exemption from liability

The plea of immunity is one of immunity from suit, not of exemption from law. This is shown clearly by the fact that immunity can be waived and then the case can be decided by the application of the law in the ordinary way.⁴⁴ The ICJ has held that

[t]he rules of State immunity are procedural in character and are confined to determining whether or not the courts of one State may exercise jurisdiction in respect of another. ... It regulates the exercise of jurisdiction in respect of particular conduct and is thus entirely distinct from the substantive law which determines whether that conduct is lawful or unlawful.⁴⁵

The underlying substantive law relating to private law liability or State responsibility of the defendant State is unaffected by the plea, as the ICJ noted in confirming Germany's entitlement to immunity.⁴⁶ The entitlement to immunity is in no way dependent upon the existence of alternative means of securing redress⁴⁷ although, as can be seen from recent challenges to the rule, a plea of immunity from suit may undoubtedly assist a foreign State in the avoidance of substantive liability.

Proceedings in court: criminal and civil

The degree to which immunity of the foreign State prevails against the exercise of local jurisdiction varies according to whether the proceedings relate to the exercise of the criminal or civil jurisdiction of the national court. The exercise of criminal jurisdiction of national courts relates to proceedings where the forum State prosecutes a private party for an offence prohibited by national penal codes, and the exercise of civil jurisdiction, whether of the courts of common law or civil law countries, relates to proceedings between two parties as applicant and defendant on an equal footing.

Immunity of a foreign State from criminal proceedings

A foreign State is not subject to the criminal proceedings of a national court of another State more by reason of substantive law than procedural immunity. In criminal proceedings the substantive penal code of the forum State defines acts constituting criminal offences and on conviction provides punishment by imposition of fines and other penalties including imprisonment. By reason of its independent status, the foreign State cannot be subjected to such prosecution by the forum State or its officials nor punished by way of fine, penalty, or imprisonment (see Chapter 4).

⁴⁴ This is well illustrated by the analogous case of diplomatic immunity where in *Dickinson v Del Solar* [1930] KB 376 the court held the company who insured the driver involved in a motor accident liable under the policy to pay damages for injuries caused, notwithstanding that the driver as secretary of the Peruvian delegation enjoyed diplomatic immunity.

⁴⁵ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, paras 58, 93.

⁴⁶ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 100. For a discussion of the relationship of attribution to immunity, see Fox, 'Imputability and Immunity as Separate Concepts: The Removal of Immunity from Civil Proceedings Relating to the Commission of an International Crime' in Kaikobad and Bohlander (eds), *Essays in Honour of Colin Warbrick* (2009), Ch IV.

⁴⁷ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 101.

Immunity of State officials from criminal proceedings

However, the recognition that there is no impunity by reason of official status for the commission of international crimes by individuals⁴⁸ and the prosecution of high-ranking State officials before international criminal tribunals for such crimes has led to pressure for the removal of the immunity enjoyed by such State officials in respect of criminal proceedings in national courts. In 1999 in *Pinochet (No 3)*⁴⁹ the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords declared that a former head of State present in England had no immunity from extradition proceedings, brought at the request of the State of the nationality of some of the victims, relating to the alleged offence of State torture under the 1984 UN Torture Convention, that is proceedings relating to an international crime involving violation of a fundamental human right, even though committed while in office and for the purposes of the State. This decision, which was followed by proceedings being initiated in the national courts of other countries against serving⁵⁰ as well as former heads of State,⁵¹ marked a significant change by introducing an exception for international crimes including torture to the absolute rule of immunity in respect of the criminal prosecution of individuals who represent the State.

However, it is to be noted that the Lords in *Pinochet* expressly stated that the immunity of the State and a serving Head of State in respect of criminal proceedings remained absolute and was unchanged,⁵² and in the *Arrest Warrant* case the ICJ ruled that a serving Minister for Foreign Affairs enjoys personal inviolability and immunity from criminal jurisdiction in respect of alleged crimes against humanity and found that the issuance and international circulation of an arrest warrant for international crimes against such a high ranking official when in office was a breach of international law.⁵³ The subordination in recent national legislation of the initiation of criminal prosecution in national courts of serving foreign high-ranking officials to the political decision of the forum State indicates State practice in support of this ruling of the Court.⁵⁴ Whether such a Minister when he vacates office loses immunity for heinous international crimes committed in the course of official functions, however, would seem undecided; the ICJ was of the view that immunity was retained even in respect of the commission of grave international crimes, but this opinion was strictly *obiter*.⁵⁵

⁴⁸ See the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Arts 27(1) and 98(1) and Ch 18.

⁴⁹ *R v Bow Street Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate, ex parte Pinochet Ugarte (Amnesty International Intervening)* (No 3) [2000] AC 147, [1999] 2 All ER 97 (cited as *Pinochet (No 3)*); 119 ILR 135. See Fox, 'The Pinochet Case No. 3' (1999) 48 ICLQ 687.

⁵⁰ *Gaddafi, sub nom SOS Attentat and Castelnau d'Esnault v Khadafi, Head of State of the State of Libya*, France, Cour de Cassation, Crim Chamber, 13 March 2000, No 1414; 124 ILR 508; the court quashed a ruling of the Paris Court of Appeal that absolute criminal immunity of a serving head of State was subject to an exception in respect of a terrorist offence of use of explosives causing the destruction of an aircraft in flight and loss of life to French nationals.

⁵¹ *Habré*, Senegal, Court of Appeal of Dakar, 4 July 2000; Cour de Cassation, Dakar, 20 March 2001; 125 ILR 569; the court annulled a prosecution initiated against the former President of the State of Chad for alleged complicity in acts of torture.

⁵² The distinction between the immunity of the official and that of the State was emphasized by the ICJ in *Jurisdictional Immunities* when it stated '*Pinochet* concerned the immunity of a former Head of State from the criminal jurisdiction of another State, not the immunity of the State itself in proceedings designed to establish its liability to damages' para 89.

⁵³ ICJ Reports 2002.

⁵⁴ Langer 'The Diplomacy of Universal Jurisdiction: The Political Branches and the Transnational Prosecution of International Crimes' (2011) 105 AJIL 1, 45–7. See UK Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, clause 153 (requiring private individuals to obtain the consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions before being granted a warrant for the arrest of anyone suspected of committing grave breaches of the Geneva conventions outside the UK).

⁵⁵ *Arrest Warrant*, ICJ Reports 2002, para 61; Joint Separate Opinion of Judges Higgins, Kooijmans, and Buergenthal, paras 85, 89; *Zhang v Zemin* [2010] NSW CA 255, 141 ILR 542, former head of State of PRC immune from prosecution for torture; see Ch 17.

Immunity of a foreign State from civil proceedings

Adjudication jurisdiction relates to the court's inquiry into the claim and adjudication by means of a judgment or declaration of rights and obligations; it extends to interlocutory proceedings, appeal, and recognition (the grant of *exequatur*) of foreign judgments given against States. Enforcement jurisdiction relates to the making and execution of mandatory orders or injunctions against the State in respect of, for example, restitution, damages, penalties, production of documents or witnesses, and accounts. The UNCSI, national legislation and State practice observes this distinction between immunity from adjudication and immunity from enforcement (see further Chapters 9, 16 and 17).

Immunity from adjudication: exceptions

When first recognized by the common law, the plea of immunity was treated as a general bar to all types of civil claim.⁵⁶ Under the restrictive doctrine, however, immunity is given for acts performed in the exercise of sovereign power but withdrawn in respect of acts of a commercial or private law nature. This distinction between *acta de jure imperii*, acts in exercise of the public or sovereign powers of a State, and *acta de jure gestionis*, acts performed as a private person or trader, is crucial to the present law of State immunity; it is relevant to determining whether or not a State is entitled to immunity from the jurisdiction of another State's courts in respect of a particular act, and accordingly has, as the ICJ has stated, to be applied before that jurisdiction can be exercised. As such, it is to be contrasted with the legality of the act, which is to be determined only in the exercise of that jurisdiction.⁵⁷ Chapter 12 examines the general notion of commerciality upon which many of the exceptions to state immunity are based and in the following Chapter 13 the nature of each exception and the extent to which it permits proceedings against a foreign State are discussed.⁵⁸

Immunity from enforcement

Immunity of the foreign State from adjudication jurisdiction and the delivery of judgments against a foreign State may properly be restricted by exceptions, whereas immunity from enforcement jurisdiction in respect of such proceedings remains largely absolute. The application of coercive measures to a State and its property involves different and more directly intrusive mechanisms than the ruling of a national court as to liability. In consequence, the bar against coercive measures against a foreign State remains largely absolute, subject at the present time to the State's consent. As the ICJ observed in *Jurisdictional Immunities*:

... the immunity from enforcement enjoyed by States in regard to their property situated on foreign territory goes further than the jurisdictional immunity enjoyed by those same States before foreign courts. Even if a judgment has been lawfully rendered against a foreign State, in circumstances such that the latter could not claim immunity from jurisdiction, it does not follow *ipso*

⁵⁶ As regards both immunity from adjudication and enforcement, an exception to such civil jurisdiction was long accorded to claims such as property claims and succession which by reason of the location and immovable nature of the property within the territory of the forum State result in the inevitable exercise of the latter's jurisdiction. See Ch 13 property and succession claims.

⁵⁷ *Jurisdictional Immunities*, para 60.

⁵⁸ As a procedural plea, it is to be contrasted with the legality of the act, which is to be determined only on the exercise of the forum State's jurisdiction.