Studying the Topical Problems of Universal Jurisdiction in Modern International Public Law

Gulnara Raifovna Shaihutdinova[1], Aleksandr Borisovich Mezyaev[2], Marsel Ilgamovich Garaev[3]

[1]Kazan Federal University
Doctor of Laws, Professor
Faculty of Law, Department of International and European Law
E-mail: Gulnara.Shajhutdinova@kpfu.ru

[2]University of Management "TISBI"
Doctor of Laws, Professor
E-mail: tisbi@tisbi.ru

[3]Kazan Federal University
PhD Law, Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Law, Department of International and European Law
E-mail: mgaraev77@gmail.com

Abstract

General global regulation is a part of worldwide regulation and it implies a bunch of enforceable principles and guidelines that emerge from worldwide relations, managing the relations between individuals from the global local area and the relations between states with one another or legislatures with worldwide associations, and its fundamental source is contracts. what's more, worldwide deals or custom and practice of global courts. Since legislatures are in the place of practicing power, the heads of states, political authorities are additionally the subject of public global regulation, addressing their particular state run administrations in worldwide relations. Among the principal subjects of general worldwide regulation, which is frequently alluded to as global regulation for short, are: people of global regulation, freedoms of worldwide associations and tranquil settlement of worldwide debates. This study is committed to the genuine issue of executing the alleged "general purview" (hereinafter alluded to as UJ). This applies not exclusively to logical hypothetical works, yet additionally to the act of States. The idea of widespread purview is straightforwardly inverse to the idea of regional ward. Assuming inside the system of regional ward, it is expected that the locale of a State reaches an out inside a specific area, then, at that point, all-inclusive purview infers the expansion of State ward likewise past the genuine state borders. Consequently, general purview implies the chance of carrying an individual to criminal obligation regarding perpetrating specific wrongdoings, whether or not there is an immediate connection between the spot of commission of the wrongdoing, the citizenship/home of the individual who carried out the wrongdoing, the object of the wrongdoing and the State an in whose area the individual is considered criminally mindful. This study gives a nitty gritty legitimate examination of doctrinal methodologies, as well as the act of worldwide legal bodies with regards to inclusion of general ward issues.

Keywords: universal jurisdiction, European Court of Human Rights, international law, International Court of Justice.

Introduction

There are different situations on this issue in the logical writing. In the previous hundreds of years, the topic of the extraterritorial impact of criminal regulation was talked about, such ideas as widespread ward, ability, use of an unfamiliar regulation on the area of the state, regional and individual matchless quality of the state showed up. Thus, for instance, F. F. Martens, as opposed to G. Grotius, dismissed the all inclusive or cosmopolitan guideline of criminal regulation in light of the fact that not all people groups are socialized. In the comprehension of F. F. Martens, just enlightened "people groups figure out the culpability of either activity similarly basically", and under this condition "there can be an issue of the right of the state to indict violations carried out on its domain, as well as the commitment to give others the important lawbreaker and legal help" [1]. Current methodologies interface the comprehension of general locale with the extraterritorial (or extraterritorial) impact of public regulation, or more all, criminal regulation. A creators believe regional purview to be a verifiable curio [2]. Nobody denies the legitimate limit of a State to practice extraterritorial ward.

Simultaneously, the inquiry emerges: what is the wellspring of general locale in both public and global regulation?

Methods

In this study, both general scientific and private scientific research methods were used. For example, the high methodological value of the dialectical method was expressed in the fact that it provided a comprehensive scientific reflection of issues related to the understanding of the term “universal jurisdiction”. In addition, the dialectical method has become decisive in substantiating the conclusions of this study, based on the practice of international judicial authorities.

Results and Discussion

Initial research focused on the question of whether a national law can have the property of extraterritorial effect, or, in other words, whether a State can attribute extraterritorial effect (action in time, space, and application of the law) to its laws. According to E. T. Usenko, the professor, no law has the property of extraterritorial effect: "The application of a foreign law on the territory of a state can take place only with its consent, expressed in the legal provisions sanctioned (prescribing or allowing) such application" [3]. Since the extraterritorial effect of a national law may affect the rights of other States, compliance with international law is a necessary condition. I. I. Lukashuk, the professor, writes: "If we are talking about extraterritorial jurisdiction, it also affects the interests of other states, and therefore cannot but be distinguished by international law" [4].

The topic of all inclusive locale and the extraterritorial impact of criminal regulation is more mind boggling. In the event that previous this applied exclusively to the arraignment of privateers [5], after WWII, states finished up multilateral shows to battle worldwide wrongdoing. "Another area of law enforcement" is being shaped [6]. A unique gathering is shaped by acts controlling participation in the battle against violations against the harmony and security of humanity and atrocities. In such manner, the teaching and legal practice started to perceive the general purview of States in the judgment and arraignment of violations against mankind and atrocities. The offenses accommodated in such shows are general. Subsequently, the four Geneva Shows of 1949 contain a typical article giving that each State Party "embraces to look for people blamed for having committed or requested the commission of any of the serious infringement referenced and, whatever their ethnicity, to deal with them".

Thus, the *principle of universality* was formed, according to which any State has the right to bring to criminal responsibility a person who has committed a crime under international law outside its territory. Along with this, the basis of extraterritorial criminal law was the protection principle, according to which the state is entitled to prosecute persons who are not its citizens, committed outside its territory of a crime if the crime was directed against the security of the state or other important interests [4, p. 118,119]. The extraterritorial nature of such criminal cases is increasingly recognized by international and national courts. At the same time, as E. David writes, the problem is whether "a state can endow itself with universal jurisdiction that is not provided for by international law. Will this not be an abuse of sovereignty on the part of this state? " [7].

The positions of States regarding universal jurisdiction are very different from each other. Even on such a seemingly consensual issue as the implementation of the UJ in relation to the crime of piracy, the State governments take a very vague position. For example, Malaysia, in its official submission to the UN on the issue of UJ, stated that it could not give "a clear answer to the question of whether the UJ principle or any other principle of criminal jurisdiction is the basis for jurisdiction in piracy cases" [8]. This response is even more unusual given the fact that Malaysian law does not criminalize piracy. As it is correctly noted in the Russian literature, according to the norms of a number of international treaties, the principle of universal jurisdiction applies to international crimes and a number of crimes of an international nature, since the relevant jurisdictional actions fall within the competence of any State on the territory of which the alleged criminal appeared, regardless of the place and other circumstances of the crime [9].

The laws of a number of States provide for the possibility of implementing UJ, but there is no uniformity in its regulation. The Spanish Law of 1985, in article 23.4, established that "Spanish courts have jurisdiction to hear cases related to the commission of crimes abroad, which constitute crimes of genocide, terrorism, piracy, counterfeiting, drug trafficking, and other crimes under international law..." [10]. Even among States whose legislation provides for the implementation of UJ, a number of countries emphasize its subsidiary nature. For example, Swiss law, although it excluded the mention of "close ties" with the State in 2011, nevertheless менееassumes that the UJ is of a subsidiary nature. That is, it is implemented only when such jurisdiction cannot be exercised by any other court with more serious jurisdictional grounds. The Swiss Government emphasizes that it understands UJ as "conditional" or "limited" [11]. The application of the Crimes against Humanity and War Crimes Act of Canada, adopted as an implementation of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court in 2000, is limited to the presence of a suspect in the country. At the same time, as practice shows, a "fleeting stay" is not considered as a "presence" on the territory of the country and proceeds from the need for a longer stay for the implementation of UJ. UK law also provides for the exercise of

jurisdiction over a number of crimes, including in cases where there is no "obvious link" to the United Kingdom. However, the Government emphasizes "that these crimes entail DISCRIMINATION in the application of international legal norms" [11, ibid.].

It is noteworthy that, despite the active promotion of UJ in various international organizations and the "promotion" of this principle in the legal systems of other States, activist States do not show the same enthusiasm in their own legal systems. So, for example, Canada, for twenty years of operation of its law providing for the implementation of UJ, was able to report to the UN only two cases of its actual application. Slovenia has also never applied the provisions of its Criminal Code, article 13 of which allows the use of UJ.

African States by and large perceive the UJ rule according to specific wrongdoings. Article 4h of the Establishing Demonstration of the African Association (AU) accommodates the guideline of UJ as a lawful instrument at the removal of the Part Conditions of the Association to battle decimation, atrocities and wrongdoings against humankind. The African Association has likewise embraced a model public law of the AU Part States on widespread locale over global violations. Various States have presented arrangements considering the execution of UJ in their public regulation. For instance, in the Republic of Mali, widespread locale is accommodated under articles 29 and 32 of the Crook Code and for the wrongdoing of dealing with people and sneaking of transients [12]. In 2007, revisions to the Senegalese Code of Criminal System were taken on, as per which Senegalese courts were offered the chance to execute the Lawbreaker Code of Criminal Method according to the wrongdoings of psychological oppression, slaughter, atrocities and violations against mankind. In 2018, the chance of applying the UJ rule was likewise reached out to the supporting of psychological oppression. Then again, the African States have taken a typical position in regards to the prohibition of mishandling the utilization of the UJ rule, which prompts infringement of different standards and standards of global settlement or standard worldwide regulation, specifically, the standards of power, non-impedance in the inside issues of States, as well as resistances [13].

Specific consideration ought to be paid to various cases connected with the execution of the UJ against previous and current heads of State and Government. Lately, various public wards have endeavored to bring criminal procedures against A. Pinochet, the previous Chilean President (whose removal was requested by four states immediately: Spain, Extraordinary England, France, and Switzerland), M. Gaddafi, the head of the Libyan transformation, R. Reagan, the previous US president (with respect to Libya) and M. Thatcher, the previous English State head (with respect to Argentina), D. Sassou Nguesso, the ongoing Leader of the Congo (from the French side). There were endeavors to look for the removal of other top heads of states, specifically, G. Kissinger, the US Secretary of State (from the Spanish and French appointed authorities).

Belgium is particularly active in trying to exercise universal jurisdiction over former and current senior government officials. As rightly noted, Belgium was the only State that invoked jurisdiction over international crimes during the last decade [14]. In recent years, various Belgian judicial authorities have attempted to prosecute H. Khabre, the former President of Chad, Saddam Hussein, the President of Iraqi, L. Gbagbo, the President of Côte d'Ivoir[1], Y. Arafat, the President of the Palestinian Authority[2], Ahmet Sharon, the Prime Minister of Israeli[3], and Hassan Rafsanjani, the Iranian President[4] and a number of other statesmen. In 1993, Belgium adopted a law on punishments for serious violations of International Humanitarian Law (title as amended in 1999), which gives the country's courts the right to exercise universal jurisdiction for a number of crimes[5] [15]. Article 7 of the law considers the activity of ward over these wrongdoings, no matter what the subject and spot of the wrongdoing, and article 5 specifies that the resistance appreciated by an authority isn't an obstruction to the use of this regulation" [16]. Capture warrant for Y. Ndombasi gave over by the adjudicator agent of the court of first occurrence of Brussels contained charges of or complicity in the Commission of

[1] The case was opened in June 2001 and concerns the October 2000 Yopougon massacre of the President. The case against L. Gbagbo was heard by the International Criminal Court and in 2020 the defendant was acquitted of all charges (including the Yopougon events).

[2] During the debate in the Brussels Court in November 2001, 33 victims of «terrorism» filed complaints against J. Arafat, and another complaint was filed a month later.

[3] Sharon is charged with crimes against humanity committed in the cities of Sabra and Shatila in 1982, when he served as Israel's Minister of Defense.

[4] In February 2000, an Iranian citizen filed a lawsuit against the Iranian President, charging him with torture and other crimes against humanity committed between 1983 and 1989 in some Iranian cities.

[5] Article 7 of the Act of 16 June 1993 confers universal jurisdiction on a Belgian judge to hear cases alleging grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and Additional Protocol 1. One of the features of Belgian law is that: that its scope extends to non-international armed conflicts, allowing it to be applied to the crimes of genocide in Rwanda. Another characteristic of the Act is that victims of war crimes have the right to institute criminal proceedings in the event of inaction on the part of the Public Prosecutor's Office by lodging a complaint with the investigating judge, thus becoming civil plaintiffs in criminal proceedings.

serious infringement of global regulation under the Geneva Shows of 1949 and Conventions I and II of 1977 (as per the law of Belgium 1993/1999-year, article 1.3) wrongdoings against humankind (article 1.2 of the demonstration). The premise of the arraignment in the warrant was affirmed to have been public talks made by the DRC Unfamiliar Clergyman in 1998, which affected racial contempt and prompted the populace to go after non-Tutsi individuals in Kinshasa. The warrant additionally expressed that the allures of Y. Ndombasi have brought about many passings, mass executions, unlawful captures, and unreasonable preliminaries. That's what the warrant expressed "right now involved by E. Ndombasi the place of Pastor of International concerns isn't a deterrent to the activity of criminal purview" and the execution of the warrant.

Summary

Prior, we thought about doctrinal methodologies, as well as the arrangements of administrative legitimate demonstrations of individual States, in which the rule of widespread locale was solidified. This piece of the review centers around the examination of the legal act of global legal bodies in the use of the guideline of widespread purview. Global and internationalized courts have given not many choices in which the activity of widespread locale has been focal or extremely critical. Among these arrangements, we can make reference to three. To start with, there is the choice of the Global Courtroom on account of the capture warrant against the Clergyman of International concerns of the Vote based Republic of the Congo, Y. Ndombasi. Second, the preliminary of H. Habre, the previous Leader of Chad, in the Extraordinary Offices of the Senegalese courts. Furthermore, third, the choice of the European Court of Basic liberties for the situation "Nait-Liman against Switzerland", concerning the supposed obligation of States to carry out UJ with regards to the arrangements of the European Show for the Security of Basic liberties and Major Opportunities. Allow us momentarily to think about the primary arrangements of these arrangements.

International Court of Justice.

In its choice working on it of "Capture warrant" (Popularity based Republic of the Congo against Belgium) dated February 14, 2002, the ICJ didn't survey the issue of widespread locale thusly. While the DRC's unique solicitations to the court incorporated a solicitation to consider widespread ward, the DRC pulled out this solicitation in its last demands. In any case, the Court, while possibly not straightforwardly, then, at that point, by implication, obviously, couldn't neglect to resolve this issue. The issue of widespread purview was continually assessed by implication by the Court, albeit officially the principal consideration was paid to the issue of the invulnerabilities of top State pioneers. During the oral discussion, the Congo set forward the proposition that the ongoing Unfamiliar Clergyman of a sovereign State has outright or complete (i.e., no exemptions) invulnerability and resistance from criminal purview. The DRC contended that no criminal arraignment in unfamiliar courts can be done against the ongoing Clergyman of International concerns of the State. The legitimate reason for this is that such resistance is solely practical, in light of the standards of standard global regulation, which furnish delegates of unfamiliar States with the amazing chance to carry out their roles unreservedly. The DRC likewise added that this insusceptibility of the ongoing Priest of International concerns covers every one of his activities, including those that were committed by him prior to getting down to business as a Pastor [17, para 47].

The lawful place of Belgium was that the acting Clergyman of International concerns is for the most part resistant from the locale of unfamiliar courts, yet this standard applies just to acts committed in the exhibition of true capabilities and can't act as a security for acts committed as a confidential individual or serious external the presentation of true capabilities. Belgium contended that the conditions of the current case showed that Y. Ndombasi didn't have resistance when the activities that led to the capture warrant were done, and there is no proof that he acted in the activity of some other authority. Belgium additionally presented that a capture warrant had been given for Y. Ndombasi by and by [17, para 49-50]. The Vote based Republic of the Congo dismissed this proposal, expressing that cutting edge global regulation accommodates no special cases for the rule of outright insusceptibility from criminal purview of the acting Priest of International concerns of a State, regardless of whether he is blamed for carrying out worldwide wrongdoings. On the side of this, the Congo alluded to State practice, and to similar instances of Gaddafi and Pinochet. Nonetheless, the DRC brought up that these cases didn't uphold the ends came to by Belgium. As opposed to the Belgian references of a few English rulers, the DRC gave references from talks of different masters (instance of Pinochet). The DRC likewise caused to notice the way that "global custom doesn't permit criminal indictment of the top of an unfamiliar state" (instance of Gaddafi). The DRC dismissed the materialness of references to worldwide criminal courts for this situation, stressing that their creation and resulting practice apply just to these councils and "no ends can be drawn from this that would connect with the criminal arraignment of people with insusceptibility under global regulation" [17, para 57]. It is intriguing to take note of that both Belgium and the DRC allude to State regulation and choices of public courts. Obviously, it is notable that in the Western study of worldwide regulation, the purported "state practice", "relationship of regulation" and choices of public courts are likewise perceived as wellsprings of global regulation. This, specifically, is affirmed in both logical and

instructive writing. Notwithstanding, among the wellsprings of regulation that the Global Official courtroom considers while choosing cases, there are no such sources, either as fundamental or helper. The Worldwide Official courtroom, nonetheless, "has painstakingly inspected State work on, including regulation and a few choices of the greatest public courts". Clearly, the Court did this just as a component of its prior errand to determine the case based on standard global regulation. Having thought about this training, the Worldwide Official courtroom concluded that it doesn't comprise justification for reasoning that there is any exemption in standard global regulation to the standard of resistance from criminal purview and sacredness of the acting Clergyman of International concerns assuming he is blamed for violations against humankind.

J. Guillaume, the Leader of the Worldwide Courtroom of the Unified Countries (France), as he would see it, noticed that the principal motivation behind general ward is to rebuff in every country the people who have carried out wrongdoings on their domain. Old style worldwide regulation doesn't prohibit the right of States now and again to practice their ward over wrongdoings perpetrated abroad, yet such purview has its restrictions, as was noted in the choice of the Long-lasting Court of Global Equity on account of Lotus (1927). In old style worldwide regulation, States generally practiced their purview over violations carried out abroad if the culprit or, in outrageous cases, the casualty is a public of that State, or the wrongdoing compromises the inner or outside security of the State. Moreover, States could practice ward in instances of robbery or in cases laid out by worldwide arrangements, and assuming the guilty party is a situated in the area of this State. But in these cases, worldwide regulation doesn't perceive widespread locale, and, surprisingly, more in absentia so in absentia). The Leader of the ICJ reasoned that assuming that the Court had considered these issues, it would have presumed that the Belgian appointed authority had no locale to bring a body of evidence against the Clergyman of International concerns of the Congo, conjuring general ward in repudiation of global regulation.

R. Ranjeva, the Adjudicator (Madagascar), in its statement joined to the Court's choice, noticed that standard worldwide regulation, arranged in the global law of the ocean, perceives just a single situation where general ward can be worked out: sea robbery. In a three-judge disagreeing assessment (Higgins, Koojimans and Burgenthal) takes note of that it is important to find out if States are qualified for practice widespread ward over people who are not at all associated with the State being referred to. The adjudicators found no settled work on showing the activity of such locale, however they additionally tracked down no proof of opinio juris that it was unlawful. Besides, the adjudicators compose further, there is a developing number of multilateral settlements on the discipline of serious worldwide wrongdoings, which ought to be thought of, in any event, as not forestalling the activity of general ward by public courts in such cases. The adjudicators noticed that none of the models refered to by the Belgian side shows widespread locale in its "unadulterated structure". In every one of these cases, to shifting degrees, there is a "public" component that joins it to a specific Express The appointed authorities likewise expressed that the activity of widespread ward in absentia is conceivable on a basic level, however for this situation the State should guarantee that specific circumstances are met. The principal one is to forestall the destabilization of worldwide relations. There can be no activity of widespread criminal locale assuming it disregards the sacredness of worldwide legitimate resistances.

Obviously, K. van cave Vangart, the Belgian appointed authority impromptu, as she would see it, contended that the Belgian regulation, which laid out the rule of all inclusive purview over violations against humankind and atrocities, didn't go against worldwide regulation. Also, it contended that worldwide regulation permits and even backings States to apply this type of purview to guarantee that the most serious violations are rebuffed. In any case, no serious avocation was accommodated this position and, as may be obvious, the outright greater part of the court disagreed with it.

A fascinating position is communicated by Sayeman Bula, impromptu Adjudicator (Majority rule Republic of the Congo), who trusts that the expression "general locale" isn't precise. As he would see it, Sayeman Bula recognizes three sorts of purview: regional, individual and ward practiced for a long term benefit. Maybe, he composes, the term has become regularly utilized regarding a comparative idea in criminal regulation, however it is not really reasonable for worldwide regulation. In worldwide regulation, the capability of States can't be completely general.

Special Chambers in the Courts of Senegal.

Notwithstanding the way that these chambers are officially state legal bodies, it ought to be borne as a primary concern that their not entirely set in stone by the case "Commitment to arraign or remove" (Belgium v. Senegal), as well as an ensuing choice of the African Association. In this manner, the internationalized idea of the preliminary against H. Habre, the previous Leader of Chad, is certain.

European Court of Human Rights.

In March 2015, the European Court of Basic freedoms governed on account of Nait-Liman against Switzerland [18]. The European Official courtroom has decided that the choice of the Swiss courts to dismiss the utilization of the ECJ for claims for pay for non-financial harm for torment supposedly serious in Tunisia doesn't comprise an infringement of article 6.1 of the ECHR. The European Courtroom (as a feature of the European Chamber)

supported this by saying that the States gatherings to the ECHR don't have worldwide lawful commitments to lay out UJ ("common locale") comparable to torment. The court noticed that its choice was not scrutinizing the "predominant in the global local area wide agreement that casualties of torment reserve a privilege to get suitable and successful method for execution of the right to pay, as well as the way that States are urged to guarantee that the activity of this right by giving its court's purview to hear claims for pay in such cases, remembering for situations where the cases depend on realities that happened external their geological limits.

Conclusion

In this way, we can presume that the issue of widespread ward is one of the most pressing and requires both systematization of State practice and profound logical exploration. The large number of conclusions communicated by judges of the Global Official courtroom, [19] other worldwide legal counselors, and delegates of States shows the need to take on a brought together way to deal with this issue. Characterizing and embracing general global lawful standards of widespread purview is enticing, albeit challenging to execute [20]. In 2006, the subject of extraterritorial ward was remembered for the work program of the UN Worldwide Regulation Commission [21]. Albeit this approach isn't upheld by a critical number of nations, for instance, the place of the African Association is to pass on the issue to the 6th Board of the UN General Gathering. The Web especially affects the jurisdictional system. Since anybody can see data on the Web, each nation has an interest in controlling it, and figuring out which nation has ward over a specific issue can fundamentally affect the result [22]. Issues of general purview are straightforwardly connected with the issues of jurisdictional resistances of States [23,24], security of basic freedoms [25], as well as allegations of predisposition with respect to public courts in the activity of widespread ward [26].

Acknowledgements

This paper has been supported by the Kazan Federal University Strategic Academic Leadership Program**.**

Références

[1] F. F. Martens, Modern international law of civilized peoples, vol 2, M., 1996, pp.
[2] Hildebrandt, M., 2017. The Virtuality of Territorial Borders. Utrecht Law Review, 13(2), C. 19.
[3] E. T. Usenko, The problem of extraterritorial effect of national law, // Moscow Journal of International Law, 1996, No. 2, p. 16.
[4] I. I. Lukashuk, Extraterritorial effect of the criminal law and international law, / / Russian Yearbook of International Law. 1993-1994, St. Petersburg, 1995, p. 108.
[5] T. Scovazzi, (2020). Piracy and the Origins of Universal Jurisdiction: On Stranger Tides? By Mark Chadwick. Leiden, Boston: Brill Nijhoff, 2018. Pp. xii, 278. American Journal of International Law, 114(3), 555-560.
[6] George T. Felkenes. Extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction: Its impact on criminal justice. - Journal of Criminal Justice. Volume 21, Issue 6, 1993, C. 583.
[7] E. David, Principles of the law of armed conflicts, translated from French, Moscow, ICRC, 2000, p. 579.
[8] Information received from the Government of Canada // Report of the UN Secretary-General on the scope and application of the principle of Universal Jurisdiction / / UN document: A / 75 / 51 of 9 July 2020, p. 3.
[9] International Law, ed. by G. V. Ignatenko, O. I. Tiunov, M., Norma-Infra * M, 1999, p. 427.
[10] Electronic resource/ Access mode: www.u-j.info, (accessed December 10, 2002)
[11] Information received from the Swiss Government // Report of the UN Secretary-General "Coverage and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction" / / UN document: A / 75 / 51 of July 9, 2020, p. 9.
[12] Information received from the Government of Mali // Report of the UN Secretary-General "Coverage and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction" / / UN document: A / 74 / 144 of 11 July 2019, p. 4.
[13] Speech by the representative of the Republic of Zambia in the 6th Committee ГАof the UN General Assembly//. Summary record of the 12th meeting of the GA Sixth Committee, held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 4 November 2020. UN document: A / C. 6 / 75 / SR. 12 Electronic resource. Access mode: //https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N20/299/76 /PDF/N2029976.pdf?openElement (accessed on 23.08.2021)
[14] K. Randall, (2005). Universal Jurisdiction: National Courts and the Prosecution of Serious Crimes Under International Law. Edited by Stephen Macedo. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004. Pp. vi, 383. American Journal of International Law, 99(1), C. 293.

[15] A. Andris, International criminal tribunals and foreign experience in the suppression of war crimes, //Seminar on problems of implementation of international humanitarian law in the Russian Federation, M., 1997, pp.
[16] Loi du 16 juin 1993, 10 fevrier 1999 relative a la repression des violations graves du droit international humanitaire. Electronic resource. Access mode: // https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl-nat.nsf/0/0b8c5c6decf785ebc12576cc004c6a2e/$FILE/Loi%20relative%20à%20la%20répression%20des%20violations%20graves%20de%20droit%20international%20humanitaire,%2010%20février%201999.pdf (accessed on 20.08.2021)
[17] Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Belgium) Electronic resource. Access mode:// https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/121 (accessed on 10.08.2021)
[18] International Court of Justice. Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v. Senegal). Judgment of 20 July 2012 Electronic resource. Access mode:// https://www.icj-cij.org/public/files/case-related/144/144-20120720-JUD-01-00-EN.pdf://www.icj-cij.org/public/files/case-related/144/144-20120720-JUD-01-00-EN.pdf (accessed on 10.07.2021)
[19] V. S. Vereshchagin, International Court of Justice at a new stage. Russian Yearbook of International Law, 2002, St. Petersburg, 2002, p. 31
[20] A. Petrig, 2013. The Expansion of Swiss Criminal Jurisdiction in Light of International Law. Utrecht Law Review, 9(4), P. 36.
[21] International Law Commission, 'Report of the International Law Commission: 58th Session (1 May-9 June and 3 July-11 August 2006)', UN Doc. A/61/10 (2006), Annex E – Extraterritorial Jurisdiction, Para. 3.
[22] Ireland-Piper, D., 2013. Prosecutions of Extraterritorial Criminal Conduct and the Abuse of Rights Doctrine. Utrecht Law Review, 9(4), P.72.
[23] Larocque, F. (2003). The Law of State Immunity. By Hazel Fox QC. [Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002. xxxii, 555, (Bibliography) 6, and (Index) 10 pp. Hardback £80.00. ISBN 0–19–829836–6.]. The Cambridge Law Journal, 62(2), 504-505;
[24] Blanke, H., & Falkenberg, L. (2013). Is There State Immunity in Cases of War Crimes Committed in the Forum State? On the Decision of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) of 3 February 2012 in Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece Intervening). German Law Journal, 14(9), 1817-1850.
[25] Kanalan, I. (2018). Extraterritorial State Obligations Beyond the Concept of Jurisdiction. German Law Journal, 19(1), 43-64.
[26] Lock, T., & Riem, J. (2005). Judging Nuremberg: The Laws, the Rallies, the Trials. German Law Journal, 6(12), 1819-1832.