



From Precedent to Practice: Case Studies Unveiling the International Court's Defense of Humanitarian Law

Dr. Neelam Seam

Associate Professor
Gitaratn International Business School

Khushi Sharma

B.A.LL. B-08 Sem
Gitaratn International Business School

Date of Submission: 08-06-2024

Date of Acceptance: 21-06-2024

Abstract

This research paper explores the power of precedent in shaping the jurisprudence of international courts, with a focus on its defense of humanitarian law. Precedent, defined as past judicial decisions that establish legal principles, serves as a guiding principle for consistency, predictability, and coherence in the interpretation and application of international law. Through a comprehensive overview, this paper examines the historical development of precedent in international law, its various types, and sources of legal authority. It delves into the importance of precedent in promoting legal certainty and stability and the challenges and limitations it faces in the context of evolving norms and conflicting precedents. Drawing on case studies from international courts such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and international criminal tribunals, the paper analyzes the practical application and impact of precedent in defending humanitarian law. Through this exploration, the paper aims to provide insights into the role of precedent in advancing the rule of law and promoting justice in the international community.

Keywords: Precedent, International Court of Justice, International Law and Judicial System.

I. INTRODUCTION

Precedent in international court jurisprudence serves as a guiding principle for decision-making, providing a framework for consistency, predictability, and coherence in the interpretation and application of international law. At its core, precedent refers to past judicial decisions that establish legal principles and serve as authoritative interpretations of legal norms. Historically, the concept of precedent has roots in common law systems, where judicial decisions are binding on lower courts and serve as authoritative interpretations of legal principles. In the context of international law, precedent plays a similar role in guiding the decisions of international courts and

tribunals. While international law lacks a centralized judicial system akin to domestic legal systems, various international courts, such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and international criminal tribunals, contribute to the development of precedent through their rulings. There are different types of precedent recognized in international court jurisprudence. Binding precedent refers to decisions that must be followed by lower courts or tribunals, either because they are issued by a higher court or because they establish a rule of law that is binding on all parties.¹ Persuasive precedent, on the other hand, may influence the decision-making of international courts but is not binding. Customary international law, which derives from consistent state practice and *opinio juris* (the belief that a certain practice is legally required), also serves as a form of precedent in international law. The sources of legal authority for precedent in international courts include treaties, customary international law, general principles of law recognized by civilized nations, and judicial decisions of international tribunals. Treaties may establish binding precedents through their interpretation and application by International Courts. Similarly, decisions of international tribunals, such as the judgments of the ICJ and the jurisprudence of international criminal tribunals like the International Criminal Court (ICC), contribute to the development of precedent in international law. The importance of precedent in international court jurisprudence cannot be overstated. Precedent promotes consistency and predictability in legal outcomes, ensuring that similar cases are decided similarly over time. It also enhances coherence in the interpretation and application of international law, fostering a sense of certainty and stability in the international legal order. By relying on precedent, international courts

¹International Red Cross, <https://international-review.icrc.org/articles/the-view-of-the-past-in-ihl-920> (last visited May,02,2024)



can build upon existing legal principles and contribute to the progressive development of international law. However, the role of precedent in international court jurisprudence is not without challenges and limitations. Conflicting precedents, divergent legal cultures, and evolving norms pose challenges to the application of precedent in international law. Moreover, the perceived rigidity of precedent may sometimes constrain legal innovation and flexibility, leading to debates about its proper role in international court decision-making.² While it has its challenges and limitations, precedent remains an essential tool for advancing the rule of law and promoting justice in the international community.

Landmark Cases in International Humanitarian Law: Precedents and Their Impact

Landmark cases in international humanitarian law serve as pivotal moments in the development and application of legal principles governing armed conflict and the protection of civilians. One of the most iconic case in international humanitarian law is the Nuremberg Trials³ following World War II. These trials, held by the Allied powers, established the principle that individuals could be held criminally responsible for atrocities committed during times of war, laying the groundwork for the prosecution of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. The principles articulated during the Nuremberg Trials, including the notion of individual criminal responsibility and the prohibition of aggressive war, have since become foundational principles of international law. Another landmark case is the International Court of Justice's (ICJ) advisory opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons.⁴ In this case, the ICJ ruled that while the use of nuclear weapons may be lawful in certain extreme circumstances of self-defense, the

threat or use of nuclear weapons must comply with the principles of international humanitarian law, including the principles of distinction, proportionality, and necessity. This advisory opinion reaffirmed the applicability of humanitarian law to nuclear weapons and contributed to the development of norms governing their use. Establishing international criminal tribunals, such as the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY)⁵ and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR)⁶, also marked significant milestones in applying humanitarian law. These tribunals prosecuted individuals responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law, including genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, setting important precedents regarding individual criminal responsibility and the protection of victims in armed conflicts. More recently, the International Criminal Court (ICC) has played a key role in advancing humanitarian law enforcement. The ICC's investigations and prosecutions have addressed a wide range of crimes, including war crimes, crimes against humanity, and the crime of aggression. Notable cases before the ICC have contributed to the clarification and development of legal principles governing the conduct of hostilities, the protection of civilians, and the prosecution of perpetrators of international crimes.⁷ The impact of landmark cases in international humanitarian law extends beyond the courtroom, influencing the development of customary international law and shaping state practice. These cases serve as authoritative interpretations of legal norms, guiding states, international organizations, and non-state actors in their conduct during armed conflicts. Moreover, they contribute to the prevention of future atrocities by establishing clear standards of behavior and accountability for violations of humanitarian law.

²Skubiszewski, "Use of Force, p. 745; and L. Henkin, R. C. Pugh, O. Schachter and H. S. Firmational Law

Cases and Materials, 3rd ed., St Paul, 1993 893. See also the Third US Restatement of Foreign Relations Law, St

Paul, 1987, p. 27; Cot et al., Charte, p. 437 (N. Schrijver); and SimmaTharter, p. 203, boting that this constitutes

³ Nuremberg Trials, 41 Int'l L. Rep. 1 (1947).

⁴ Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons (Advisory Opinion), 1996 I.C.J. Rep. 226 (July 8, 1996).

⁵ 1 International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Case No. IT-94-1-A, Prosecutor v. Tadić, Judgment, 15 July 1999, available at <http://www.icty.org/x/cases/tadic/acjug/en/tad-aj990715e.pdf>.

⁶ International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, Case No. ICTR-96-4-T, Prosecutor v. Akayesu, Judgment, 2 September 1998, available at <http://unictr.irmct.org/sites/unictr.org/files/case-documents/ict96-4/trial-judgements/en/980902.pdf>.

⁷United Nations, https://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/rs/other_resources/manu_el_en.pdf (last visited May,02,2024)



In conclusion, landmark cases in international humanitarian law play a crucial role in establishing precedents and shaping the jurisprudence of international courts. By clarifying legal principles, holding perpetrators accountable, and promoting compliance with humanitarian norms, these cases contribute to the protection of civilians and the advancement of justice in times of armed conflict.

Analyzing the Evolution of Humanitarian Law through Precedent: Case Studies from the International Court

The evolution of humanitarian law through precedent offers valuable insights into the dynamic nature of international legal norms and their adaptation to contemporary challenges. One significant aspect of the evolution of humanitarian law is the expansion of the scope of protection afforded to civilians and non-combatants during armed conflict. Case studies such as the ICJ's advisory opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons have contributed to clarifying the applicability of humanitarian law principles to new technologies and forms of warfare. Similarly, rulings from international criminal tribunals, have advanced the protection of vulnerable groups, including women and children, by recognizing sexual violence and child recruitment as war crimes and crimes against humanity. Another aspect of the evolution of humanitarian law is the clarification of the legal obligations of states and non-state actors in situations of armed conflict. Case studies such as the ICJ's judgment in the Nicaragua case⁸ and the ICTY's judgments in the Tadić⁹ and Šainović cases¹⁰ have contributed to establishing principles of state responsibility for violations of humanitarian law, including the obligation to prevent, investigate, and punish war crimes and crimes against humanity. These precedents have reinforced the idea that states bear primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with humanitarian norms within their territories and jurisdictions. Furthermore, the evolution of humanitarian law through precedent has led to the recognition of individual criminal responsibility for

serious violations of international law.¹¹ Landmark cases before international criminal tribunals, such as the ICTY's prosecution of high-ranking military and political leaders for atrocities committed during the Yugoslav Wars, have established the principle that individuals can be held accountable for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide, regardless of their official status or affiliation. These precedents have contributed to combating impunity for international crimes and promoting the rule of law in post-conflict societies. Moreover, the evolution of humanitarian law through precedent reflects broader shifts in international legal norms and standards. Case studies such as the ICJ's advisory opinions on the Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory¹² and accordance with International Law of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in Respect of Kosovo illustrate the evolving interpretation and application of humanitarian law principles in the context of contemporary conflicts and disputes.¹³ These precedents demonstrate the ongoing dialogue between International Courts, States, and civil society actors in shaping the legal framework for the protection of human rights and humanitarian principles. In conclusion, analyzing the evolution of humanitarian law through precedent provides valuable insights into the dynamic nature of international legal norms and their adaptation to contemporary challenges. By examining case studies from the International Court of Justice and other international tribunals, we can better understand how precedent has shaped the development of humanitarian law and contributed to promoting justice, accountability, and the protection of human rights in times of armed conflict.

⁸ Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicar. v. U.S.), Merits, Judgment, 1986 I.C.J. Rep. 14 (June 27).

⁹ Prosecutor v. Tadić, Case No. IT-94-1-A, Judgment, Appeals Chamber, 15 July 1999.

¹⁰ Prosecutor v. Šainović et al., Case No. IT-05-87-A, Judgment, Appeals Chamber, 23 January 2014.

¹¹ Oppenheim's International Law United Nations (ed. R. Higgins), Oxford, 2017; La Charte des Nations Unies: Commentaire Article par Article (ed. J. P. Cot, A. Pellet and M. Forteau), 3rd ed., Paris 2005, and The Charter of the United Nations (ed. B. Simma, D.-E. Khan, G. Nolte and A. Paulus), 3rd ed. Oxford, 2012.

¹² Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Advisory Opinion, 2004 I.C.J. Rep. 136 (July 9).

¹³ British red cross, <https://www.redcross.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/protecting-people-in-armed-conflict/international-humanitarian-law> (last visited 2.May,2024)



Importance of Precedent in Promoting Legal Certainty and Stability

Precedent plays a pivotal role in promoting legal certainty and stability in the interpretation and application of international humanitarian law. At its core, legal certainty refers to the predictability of legal outcomes, providing individuals, states, and organizations with confidence in the application of legal norms. Precedent contributes to legal certainty by establishing clear and consistent interpretations of humanitarian law principles, thereby guiding the behavior of actors involved in armed conflicts. For example, landmark cases such as the ICJ's advisory opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons have clarified the legal parameters governing the use of certain weapons in warfare, offering guidance to states and military commanders on their obligations under international law. Moreover, precedent promotes stability by providing a foundation for the progressive development of international humanitarian law. By building upon existing legal principles and interpretations, international courts and tribunals contribute to the evolution of humanitarian norms in response to changing circumstances and challenges. For instance, rulings from international criminal tribunals, such as the ICTY's judgments in the *Čelebići*¹⁴ and *Furundžija*¹⁵ cases, have expanded the definition of war crimes to encompass new forms of criminal conduct, such as torture and sexual violence, thereby strengthening the protection afforded to victims in armed conflicts. Furthermore, precedent enhances coherence in the interpretation and application of humanitarian law by fostering consistency across different legal forums and jurisdictions. As international courts and tribunals rely on previous decisions to guide their own rulings, a body of consistent jurisprudence emerges, contributing to the development of a coherent legal framework for the protection of human rights and humanitarian principles. For example, decisions from the ICJ, ICTY, and ICC regarding the prohibition of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes have established a common understanding of these grave international crimes, reinforcing the universal norms that underpin humanitarian law. Additionally, precedent serves as a mechanism for

promoting compliance with humanitarian norms and holding perpetrators accountable for violations of international law. By referencing past decisions in their rulings, international courts and tribunals signal the importance of upholding established legal principles and deter future violations through the threat of legal consequences. For instance, judgments from the ICC, such as the *Lubanga*¹⁶ and *Katanga*¹⁷ cases, have underscored the individual criminal responsibility of military commanders and armed group leaders for recruiting and using child soldiers, sending a clear message that such actions will not go unpunished under international law. Thereby, the importance of precedent in promoting legal certainty and stability in the interpretation and application of international humanitarian law cannot be overstated. By providing clarity, consistency, and coherence within the international legal framework, precedent contributes to the progressive development of humanitarian norms and the advancement of justice, accountability, and the protection of human rights in times of armed conflict.

Judicial Activism vs. Restraint: The Role of Precedent in International Court Decision-Making

Judicial activism and judicial restraint represent two contrasting approaches to the role of courts in interpreting and applying the law. While judicial activism advocates for a more assertive and expansive role for courts in shaping legal principles and addressing societal issues, judicial restraint emphasizes deference to other branches of government and a more limited role for courts in policymaking. This section delves into the dynamic interplay between judicial activism, judicial restraint, and the role of precedent in international court decision-making.

Judicial Activism:

Judicial activism manifests when courts take an active role in interpreting and applying the law to address societal problems, promote justice, and protect fundamental rights. In the context of international courts, judicial activism often involves expansive interpretations of international legal principles to address pressing humanitarian concerns or to advance the protection of human rights. International courts may engage in judicial

¹⁴ Prosecutor v. Delalić et al., Case No. IT-96-21-A, Judgment, Appeals Chamber, 20 February 2001.

¹⁵ Prosecutor v. Furundžija, Case No. IT-95-17/1-A, Judgment, Appeals Chamber, 21 July 2000.

¹⁶ Prosecutor v. Lubanga, Case No. ICC-01/04-01/06, Judgment, Trial Chamber I, 14 March 2012.

¹⁷ Prosecutor v. Katanga, Case No. ICC-01/04-01/07, Judgment, Trial Chamber II, 7 March 2014



activism by rendering bold decisions that depart from established precedents or by adopting innovative legal interpretations to respond to evolving challenges.

One notable example of judicial activism in international law is the landmark decision of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in the Nuclear Weapons Advisory Opinion (1996).¹⁸ Despite the absence of explicit treaty provisions prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, the ICJ, through an activist interpretation of customary international law and principles of humanitarian law, concluded that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the principles and rules of humanitarian law.¹⁹

Judicial Restraint:

In contrast, judicial restraint advocates for a more cautious and deferential approach, whereby courts exercise restraint in intervening in matters best left to the political branches of government. Proponents of judicial restraint argue that courts should refrain from engaging in policymaking or decision-making that goes beyond the text and original intent of legal provisions. Instead, courts should adhere closely to precedent and exercise self-restraint to avoid judicial overreach. International courts may exhibit judicial restraint by interpreting legal provisions narrowly, deferring to the decisions of national governments or international organizations, or adhering strictly to established precedents. For instance, in cases involving sensitive political or diplomatic issues, international courts may adopt a more restrained approach to avoid overstepping their jurisdiction or undermining the principle of state sovereignty.

The Role of Precedent:

The tension between judicial activism and judicial restraint is often mediated by the role of precedent in international court decision-making. Precedent serves as a crucial factor in guiding judicial decision-making, providing a framework for consistency, predictability, and coherence in legal outcomes. In cases where precedent is well-established and directly applicable, international courts may demonstrate judicial restraint by

adhering closely to precedent and avoiding departures that could disrupt legal stability.

However, in situations where existing precedent is insufficient or inadequate to address novel legal issues or evolving societal concerns, international courts may engage in judicial activism by departing from precedent or by interpreting legal provisions expansively to achieve justice or protect fundamental rights. Thus, the role of precedent in international court decision-making serves as a balancing mechanism between the competing imperatives of judicial activism and judicial restraint.

Future Directions: Harnessing Precedent for Advancing Humanitarian Objectives in International Law

As the international community continues to grapple with complex humanitarian challenges, the role of precedent in international law becomes increasingly significant. This section explores potential future directions for leveraging precedent to advance humanitarian objectives within the framework of international law. By examining emerging trends, challenges, and opportunities, this discussion aims to provide insights into how precedent can be harnessed as a powerful tool for promoting human rights, protecting civilians, and enhancing accountability for violations of international humanitarian law.

1. Strengthening Legal Frameworks

One future direction involves the strengthening of legal frameworks to enhance the protection of humanitarian principles through precedent. International courts and tribunals can play a pivotal role in clarifying and expanding the scope of humanitarian norms through landmark decisions that establish precedent. By issuing rulings that uphold the principles of proportionality, distinction, and necessity in armed conflict, international courts can contribute to the development of a robust legal framework that safeguards civilian lives and promotes compliance with international humanitarian law.²⁰

¹⁸ Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, 1996 I.C.J. Rep. 226 (July 8).

¹⁹The guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/law/international-court-of-justice> (last visited May,02,2024)

²⁰Y. Dinstein, war, Aggression and self defence, 6th edition, Cambridge, 2017; also the international law of war, New Haven, 1994; P. Daillier, M. Forteau and A. pellet, Droit International Public, 8th edition, paris 2009, and Malcolm N. Shaw, International law, 9th edition... India



2. Promoting Accountability

Precedent can also be instrumental in promoting accountability for violations of humanitarian law. International courts have the authority to adjudicate cases involving war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide, thereby holding perpetrators accountable for their actions. By building upon precedent set by previous rulings, international courts can ensure consistency in the prosecution and punishment of individuals responsible for serious violations of humanitarian law. Moreover, precedent can serve as a deterrent against future atrocities by sending a clear message that impunity will not be tolerated.

3. Addressing Emerging Challenges

As new challenges emerge in the realm of humanitarian law, precedent can help guide responses to evolving threats and crises. For example, advancements in technology, such as the use of drones and cyber warfare, present novel legal questions that may require innovative interpretations of existing legal principles²¹. By drawing upon precedent from analogous cases and adapting legal frameworks to address emerging challenges, international courts can provide timely and effective responses to humanitarian crises in the modern world.

4. Enhancing Access to Justice

Precedent can also play a crucial role in enhancing access to justice for victims of humanitarian violations. By establishing clear legal standards and procedural mechanisms, international courts can empower individuals and communities affected by armed conflict to seek redress for their grievances. Through precedent-setting rulings that affirm the rights of victims to truth, justice, and reparations, international courts can contribute to the healing process and promote reconciliation in societies ravaged by violence and conflict.

5. Fostering International Cooperation

Finally, precedent can serve as a catalyst for fostering international cooperation and solidarity in addressing humanitarian crises. By recognizing and affirming common principles and values shared by the international community, precedent-setting

²¹Ibid., chapter 3. But note Hague Convention II of 1907, which provided that the parties would not have recourse to armed forces for the recovery of contract debts claimed from the government of one country by the government of another as being due to its nationals

decisions by international courts can help bridge divides and build consensus around collective responses to humanitarian challenges. Through dialogue, collaboration, and mutual respect for legal norms established by precedent, states can work together to uphold humanitarian principles and protect the most vulnerable populations in times of crisis.

6. Strengthening Legal Instruments Through Precedent

Precedents can be instrumental in strengthening and expanding existing legal instruments. For example, the Rome Statute of the ICC can be interpreted and applied in light of previous decisions to address emerging challenges in international criminal law. Future amendments or protocols to international treaties could incorporate lessons learned from landmark cases, ensuring that legal instruments evolve to meet contemporary humanitarian needs.

7. Promoting Consistency and Predictability

Harnessing precedent promotes consistency and predictability in the application of international law. This is crucial for ensuring that similar cases are treated similarly, thereby upholding the principles of fairness and justice. For instance, the consistent application of principles established in cases like *Prosecutor v. Lubanga*, regarding the recruitment of child soldiers, can ensure that future cases are adjudicated in a manner that respects established legal standards, thus advancing the protection of vulnerable populations.

8. Encouraging State Compliance and Cooperation

Precedents can also be used to encourage state compliance with international law. By demonstrating the consequences of violations through established case law, international bodies can persuade states to adhere to legal norms. Future directions might include more robust mechanisms for monitoring and enforcing compliance, drawing on successful enforcement actions from past cases to design effective strategies for ensuring that states fulfill their international obligations.

9. Advocacy and Education

Legal precedents serve as powerful tools for advocacy and education. NGOs, legal practitioners, and academics can utilize these precedents to educate the public and policymakers about international legal standards and the importance of upholding humanitarian principles. Future efforts could focus on disseminating knowledge about key cases and advisory opinions to a broader audience,



thereby fostering a culture of respect for international law and human rights.

10. Developing Norms Through Advisory Opinions

Advisory opinions from the ICJ, like the Nuclear Weapons Advisory Opinion (1996) and the Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (2004), contribute significantly to the development of international norms. These opinions, although not legally binding, provide authoritative interpretations of international law that can influence state behavior and international policy-making. Future directions could involve leveraging these advisory opinions to advocate for disarmament and the protection of human rights in conflict zones, thereby advancing humanitarian objectives.

In conclusion, harnessing precedent for advancing humanitarian objectives in international law holds immense potential for promoting human rights, protecting civilians, and enhancing accountability in armed conflict. By strengthening legal frameworks, promoting accountability, addressing emerging challenges, enhancing access to justice, and fostering international cooperation, international courts can leverage precedent as a powerful tool for upholding humanitarian principles and advancing the cause of peace and justice in the world. As we look to the future, the role of precedent will continue to evolve and shape the trajectory of international humanitarian law, guiding efforts to build a more just and humane world for all.

References

- [1]. Y. Dinstein, war, Aggression and self defence, 6th edition, Cambridge, 2017; also the international law of war, New Haven, 1994; P. Daillier, M. Forteau and A. Pellet, Droit International Public, 8th edition, Paris 2009, and Malcolm N. Shaw, International law, 9th edition... India
- [2]. The guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/law/international-court-of-justice> (last visited May,02,2024)
- [3]. British red cross, <https://www.redcross.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/protecting-people-in-armed-conflict/international-humanitarian-law> (last visited 2.May,2024)
- [4]. Oppenheim's International Law United Nations (ed. R. Higgins), Oxford, 2017; La Charte des Nations Unies: Commentaire Article par Article (ed. J. P. Cot, A. Pellet and M. Forteau), 3rd ed., Paris 2005, and The Charter of the United Nations (ed. B. Simma, D.-E. Khan, G. Nolte and A. Paulus), 3rd ed. Oxford, 2012
- [5]. United Nations, https://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/rs/other_resource_s/manuel_en.pdf (last visited May,02,2024)
- [6]. Skubiszewski, "Use of Force, p. 745; and L. Henkin, R. C. Pugh, O. Schachter and H. S. Firmational Law Cases and Materials, 3rd ed., St Paul, 1993 893. See also the Third US Restatement of Foreign Relations Law, St Paul, 1987, p. 27; Cot et al., Charte, p. 437 (N. Schrijver); and Simma Tharter, p. 203, noting that this constitutes
- [7]. British red cross, <https://www.redcross.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/protecting-people-in-armed-conflict/international-humanitarian-law> (last visited 2.May,2024)

Case Laws:

- [8]. International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Case No. IT-94-1-A, Prosecutor v. Tadić, Nuremberg Trials, 41 Int'l L. Rep. 1 (1947). Judgment, 15 July 1999, available at <http://www.icty.org/x/cases/tadic/acjug/en/tad-aj990715e.pdf>
- [9]. International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, Case No. ICTR-96-4-T, Prosecutor v. Akayesu, Judgment, 2 September 1998, available at <http://unictr.irmct.org/sites/unictr.org/files/case-documents/ict96-4/trial-judgements/en/980902.pdf>.
- [10]. Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons (Advisory Opinion), 1996 I.C.J. Rep. 226 (July 8, 1996)..
- [11]. Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicar. v. U.S.), Merits, Judgment, 1986 I.C.J. Rep. 14 (June 27).
- [12]. Prosecutor v. Delalić et al., Case No. IT-96-21-A, Judgment, Appeals Chamber, 20 February 2001.
- [13]. Prosecutor v. Furundžija, Case No. IT-95-17/1-A, Judgment, Appeals Chamber, 21 July 2000.
- [14]. Prosecutor v. Katanga, Case No. ICC-01/04-01/07, Judgment, Trial Chamber II, 7 March 2014



- [15]. Prosecutor v. Lubanga, Case No. ICC-01/04-01/06, Judgment, Trial Chamber I, 14 March 2012.
- [16]. Prosecutor v. Tadić, Case No. IT-94-1-A, Judgment, Appeals Chamber, 15 July 1999.
- [17]. Prosecutor v. Šainović et al., Case No. IT-05-87-A, Judgment, Appeals Chamber, 23 January 2014.