



The Indian Society of International Law NEWSLETTER

July 2022 - March 2023

For members only

Editorial

Sharm Al Sheikh Climate Change Conference, 2022



The Sharm Al Sheikh Climate Change Conference also the 27th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was organized from 6th November to 20th November 2022 in the context of global average temperature already reaching 1.1 degree Celsius. The Conference was expected to be remembered for its implementation outcome. The UNFCCC Executive Secretary Simon Stiell called for aligning “every corner of human activity” with the 1.5 degrees Celsius goal, saying the “Paris gave us the agreement and Katowice and Glasgow gave us the plan, Sharm El-Sheikh is supposed to push us in the direction of implementation”.

The three agenda items which dominated the Conference were - loss and damage, finance, and mitigation. The loss and damage (L&D) could gain traction after two decades of climate change negotiations at Paris 2015. Article 8(1) of the Paris Agreement only makes the party recognize the importance of averting, minimizing, and addressing L&D associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including extreme weather events and slow onset events. One of the agenda items at the COP 27 was to respond to loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change. The main point of contention was a call for a new funding facility with dedicated resources for loss and damage. Developing countries, and especially Small Island States and Least Developed countries, urged for a firm decision and commitment at COP 27 that would establish and operationalize such a fund as soon as possible. A decision has been taken relating to setting up new funding arrangements focusing on L&D for those particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. The new funding arrangements would address L&D by providing and assisting in mobilizing new and additional resources, and these new arrangements complement and include sources, funds, processes, and initiatives under and outside the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement. The decision also includes setting up of a transitional committee to prepare elements relating to the operationalization of the new funding arrangements to be adopted at COP 28. The idea of setting up funding arrangements demonstrates the willingness of the developed countries to provide finance for loss and damage rather than being held liable for climate related adverse effects. The basis of the developed countries agreeing to contribute for the various funds is the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.

The COP 27 noted with deep regret that the commitment of the developed countries to mobilize 100 billion US dollar by 2020 has not been met. This was acknowledged by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) which said that finance had been missed by 17 billion US dollar and a pledge from Glasgow to double adaptation finance provision from 2019 levels by 2025. A point relating to finance was noted that climate finance flows in 2019-2020 were 12 % higher than in 2017-18, averaging US dollar 803 billion, which includes 40.1 billion US dollar in public financial support from Annex I parties and US dollar 45.9 billion from multilateral development banks. But finance is still very much inadequate to address the needs and priorities of developing countries. The Paris Agreement clearly says that finance flows have to be consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate resilient development. The Paris Outcome decision paragraph 53 states that a new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) shall be set prior to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA's) 2025 meeting, from a floor of US dollar 100 billion per year. The CMA decision reiterates that the NCQG would contribute to accelerating of holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2 degree Celsius above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degree Celsius.

The COP 27 underlines the need to limit global average temperature to 1.5 degree Celsius which in its turn requires, rapid, deep and sustained reductions in global greenhouse gas emissions of 43 percent by 2030 relative to 2019 level. The Conference reiterated that the impacts of climate change will be much lower at the temperature increase of 1.5 degree Celsius compared with 2 degree Celsius. Article 4 (1) of the Paris Agreement relating to achieving carbon neutrality by 2050 was also influencing the deliberations at the Conference. It was highlighted in the Conference that zero emissions by 2050 would require implementation of the plan involving spending of 4 trillion US dollar needs in renewable energy up to 2030. The growing urgency towards restricting global average temperature increase to 1.5 degree Celsius seems to be poised against the provision laid down in Article 4 (1) of the Paris Agreement, which says the Parties should aim to reach global peaking as soon as possible and then start rapid reductions in emissions of greenhouse gas thereafter on the basis of best available science. It can be concluded by saying that the Sharm El-Sheikh climate change conference has put the issues relating to climate finance and loss and damage aspects at the centre stage.

Pravin H. Parekh

President

Pravin H. Parekh

Executive President

Nilendra Kumar

Vice Presidents

Manoj Kumar Sinha

M. Gandhi

G.V. Rao

Treasurer

Anupam Jha

Secretary General

Narinder Singh

Research & Teaching Wing

Vinai Kumar Singh

Anwar Sadat

Parineet Kaur

Kanika Sharma

INSIDE

Recent Developments.....2-5

Recent Activities5-8

Forthcoming Events.....8

Published by:

The Indian Society of International Law

V.K. Krishna Menon Bhawan,

9, Bhagwan Das Road,

New Delhi - 110001 (INDIA)

Tel.: 23389524, 23384458-59

Fax: 23383783

E-mail: isil@isil-aca.org

Website: www.isil-aca.org

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Treaty on Biological Diversity beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ)

A Draft agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ) was finalized during the fifth Intergovernmental Conference relating to the BBNJ on 20th February-3rd March, 2023. This agreement applies to areas beyond national jurisdiction. The objective of this Agreement is to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction, for the present and in the long term, through effective implementation of the relevant provisions of the Convention and further international cooperation and coordination. In order to achieve the objective, the agreement shall be guided by the following principles and approaches; the polluter pays principle; the principle of the common heritage of mankind; precautionary principle or approach and principle of equity, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. In addition, the BBNJ deals with marine genetic resources, including questions on benefit sharing (MGR). Article 19 of the BBNJ lays down provision relating to the establishment of area-based management tools. The

Conference of the Parties, on the basis of the final proposal and the draft management plan, taking into account scientific advice and recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Body, shall take decisions on the establishment of area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, and related measures.

UN General Assembly Requests ICJ's Advisory Opinion on Climate Change

Climate change litigation has finally reached the world's highest court. On March 29, 2023, the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) adopted a resolution requesting an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the obligations of States with respect to climate change. The UNGA adopted resolution (A/77/L.58) by consensus. The Republic of Vanuatu Published the first draft of the resolution in late 2022. The draft was then altered through a series of consultations with UN delegates in the following months. The initiative gained traction. On March 1, 2023, Vanuatu announced overwhelming support for the draft resolution with 105 co-sponsor states. The ICJ request adds to two request requests for advisory opinions on climate change. The requests are pending at the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

Certain Iranian Assets (Islamic Republic of Iran v. United States of America) 30/03/23

The International Court of Justice made its judicial pronouncement in Certain Iranian Assets Case, the case between Islamic Republic of Iran v. United States of America, on 30th March, 2023. The Case, which was instituted by Iran ("Applicant") in 2016 against the United States ("Respondent"), relates to a dispute concerning alleged violations by the United States of the Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights. The Treaty of Amity signed by the two states on 15th August 1955 and entered into force on 16th June 1957 was denounced by the United States on 3rd October 2018.

In 1984, the United States designated Iran as a "State sponsor of terrorism", a designation which it has maintained ever since. In pursuance of that, the US adopted a set of legislative, executive and judicial measures which Iran claims are in breach of the Treaty of Amity and causing Iran and Iranian entities serious and ongoing harm. As regards the measures at issue, the Court recalls that, in 1996, the United States amended its Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (hereinafter the "FSIA") so as to remove the immunity from suit before its courts of States designated as "State sponsors of terrorism" in certain cases. Plaintiffs then began

to bring actions against Iran before United States courts for damages arising from deaths and injuries caused by acts allegedly supported, including financially, by Iran. In 2002, the United States enacted the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (hereinafter “TRIA”), which permitted certain enforcement measures for judgments entered pursuant to the 1996 amendment to the FSIA. The United States then further amended the FSIA and, in 2012, the President of the United States issued Executive Order 13599, which blocked all assets of the Government of Iran, including those of Bank Markazi (the Central Bank of Iran) and of other Iranian financial institutions, where such assets are within United States territory or “within the possession or control of any United States person, including any foreign branch”. The Court further recalls that, following the legislative and executive measures taken by the United States, many default judgments and substantial damages judgments have been entered by United States courts against the State of Iran and, in some cases, against Iranian State-owned entities. Further, the assets of Iran and certain Iranian entities, including Bank Markazi, are now subject to enforcement proceedings in various cases in the United States or abroad, or have already been distributed to judgment creditors.

The first objection concerns the

question whether Bank Markazi is a “company” within the meaning of the Treaty of Amity. The Court notes in this regard that the only activities on which Iran relies to found the characterization of Bank Markazi as a “company” consist in the purchase, between 2002 and 2007, of 22 security entitlements in dematerialized bonds issued on the United States financial market and in the management of proceeds deriving from those entitlements. In the opinion of the Court, these operations are not sufficient to establish that Bank Markazi was engaged, at the relevant time, in activities of a commercial character. Indeed, the operations in question were carried out within the framework and for the purposes of Bank Markazi's principal activity, from which they are inseparable. They are merely a way of exercising its sovereign function as a central bank, and not commercial activities performed by Bank Markazi “alongside [its] sovereign functions”. The Court concludes from this that Bank Markazi cannot be characterized as a “company” within the meaning of the Treaty of Amity. Consequently, the objection to jurisdiction raised by the United States with regard to Iran's claims relating to alleged violations of Articles III, IV and V of the Treaty of Amity predicated on treatment accorded to Bank Markazi must be upheld, and the Court finds that it has no jurisdiction to consider those claims.

Some Key Holdings

The ICJ did find, however, as follows:

1. There was no merit in the United States' defences based on the “clean hands doctrine,”¹⁶ alleged abuse of rights by Iran,¹⁷ the argument that the United States' action falls into an exception in relation to arms trafficking,¹⁸ or the argument that Executive Order 13599 was a measure necessary to protect its essential security interests (another exception to the substantive obligations allowed under the Treaty of Amity).
2. The United States breached its obligation under Article IV(1) of the Treaty of Amity to “refrain from applying unreasonable . . . measures” that would impair the “legally acquired rights and interests” of Iranian nationals and companies.
3. “[T]he United States has violated its obligation to recognize the juridical status of Iranian companies under Article III, paragraph 1” of the Treaty of Amity.
4. The United States breached its obligation under Article X(1) of the Treaty of Amity with respect to freedom of commerce and navigation.

On the Iran's request relating to violation of treaty obligations by

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

the United States, the Court, citing the International Law Commission (ILC) Articles on State Responsibility, noted that it could order a cessation of internationally wrongful acts “only if the violated obligation is still in force”. In 2018, the United States had terminated the Treaty by giving Iran advance notice of its withdrawal, and so the Court determined that the relevant obligations were no longer in force and it could not grant Iran's request for an order of cessation.

Finally, on the question of compensation for injury suffered, the Court recognized that the United States is obligated to compensate Iran for the violations it committed. If Iran and the United States are unable to reach on the amount within two years, the Court will determine the amount due in a subsequent phase of the proceedings.

(Source: <https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/164/164-20230330-SUM-01-00-EN.pdf>)

WTO Ruling on India-EU Dispute

On 17th April, 2023, the World Trade Organization (WTO) has ruled in favour of the EU in a major case challenging India's tariff on key information and communication technology (ICT) products. In its panel ruling, the WTO upheld all EU claims against India and found that India's tariffs of up to 20% on certain ICT products, such as mobile phones,

were not in line with its WTO commitments, and thus are illegal. The amount of EU exports of such technology affected by India's violations is up to €600 million annually. While this is already significant, the real impact on European companies, which also export from other countries to India, is considerably higher.

The panel confirmed that India's tariffs could not be justified by any of the reasons India brought forward in this case. India could not invoke the Information and Technology Agreement (ITA) to escape the commitments made in its WTO schedule, nor limit its zero-duty commitment to products that existed at the time of this commitment and exclude more recent technological products falling under the same tariff line. The panel also confirmed that no mistake was committed when determining India's tariff commitments, including when the tariff lines nomenclatures were updated, and refused to examine India's request to rectify its tariff commitments. Such changes would need to be negotiated among WTO Members.

India has since 2014 gradually introduced customs duties of up to 20% on products such as mobile phones, mobile phone components and accessories, line telephone handsets, base stations, static converters or electric wires and cables. The EU considered that these duties were in direct breach

of WTO rules since India is obliged under its WTO commitments to apply a zero-duty rate to such products. The EU initiated this WTO dispute settlement case in 2019. The panel issued its final report to all WTO Members on 17 April 2023.

Human Rights Council Periodic Review

The 42nd session of the Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review (UPR) Working Group was held in Geneva from 23rd January to 3rd February 2023. The States whose review were held in Geneva by the 42nd UPR Working Group are (in order of scheduled review): Czech Republic, Argentina, Gabon, Ghana, Peru, Guatemala, Benin, Korea (Republic), Switzerland, Pakistan, Zambia, Japan and Sri Lanka. Ukraine's UPR was postponed by the Human Rights Council due to the current situation in the country. For this reason, 13 countries – instead of 14 – will have their human rights records examined by their peers under this mechanism. The final outcome of the 42nd session will be adopted by the plenary of the Human Rights Council at its fifty-third regular session taking place in Geneva from 19th June to 14th July, 2023.



9th International Conference

The ISIL organized 9th international conference on the theme “International Law and the Changing Global Order on 2-4th March, 2023. The Conference commenced with inaugural session on 2nd March 2023 with a welcome address by the ISIL Executive President, Maj. Gen. Nilendra Kumar to be followed by a Presidential address by the ISIL President, Pravin Parekh and a vote of thanks by Sanjay Parikh, EC Member ISIL. In addition to inaugural, the Conference comprised four plenary sessions, eight parallel sessions and a valedictory session. The Conference also organized sessions for young scholars on 3rd and 4th March. The Conference had its first technical session also the first plenary session on 3rd March 2023 which focused the theme “Law of the Sea: New Dimensions

and Challenges”. The session was chaired by Dr. G. Venkatesh Rao, Vice President, ISIL, which included a keynote address by Dr. P. S. Rao, Member & Former President, Institut Droit International. The other distinguished speakers who presented their papers are Prof. Hyunsoo Kim, Inha University Law School, Incheon City, Republic of Korea, Dr. Park Young Kil, Director, Law of the Sea Research Division, KMI, Republic of Korea, Capt. S. S. Parmar, Senior Fellow, National Maritime Foundation, India, Dr. Sunil Agarwal, Life Member, ISIL, Dr. Utpal Kumar Raha, St. Xavier's University, Kolkata, India, Dr. Atul Alexander, Assistant Professor, The WB National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata and Dr. Ashutosh Acharaya, Senior Assistant Professor, Law Centre II,

University of Delhi. The plenary session was followed the First Parallel Session which addressed the theme “International Humanitarian Law”. The session was Chaired by Prof. Aftab Alam, Professor, Aligarh Muslim University and Member, Executive Council to be followed by a introductory remarks by Dr. George Dvaladze, RLA, ICRC Representative. The distinguished presenters in the session were Maj. Gen. Nilendra Kumar, Executive President, ISIL, Waad Abualrob, University of Westminster, London, Dr. Santosh Kumar Upadhyay, Assistant Professor, Law Centre II, Dr. Santosh Kumar, Assistant Professor, ICFAI University, Dehradun, Wg Cdr Praful Bakshi and Ms. Anjali, Assistant Professor, DME, GGSIPU. The Parallel Session II's theme was “Forced Migration and

RECENT ACTIVITIES

Statelessness". This session was chaired by Prof. B. C. Nirmal, Former VC, NUSRL, Ranchi to be followed by a keynote address by Dr. M. Gandhi, Former Joint Secretary, Legal and Treaties Division, MEA (online). The distinguished presenters during the session were Dr. Mirza Junaid Beg, Assistant Professor, Integral University, Lucknow, Mohd. Sufian Khan, LL.M Student and Dr. Kheinkor Lamarr, Assistant Professor, National Law University, Delhi.

The Parallel Session III focused "Climate Change and Sustainable Development". Dr. Luther Rangreji, Joint Secretary, L&T, Division, MEA, chaired the session. The first presentation in the session that set the tone of the discussion for the entire session was made by Dr. Anwar Sadat, a Senior Assistant Professor in International Law at the ISIL. The other presenters to be followed were Mr. Naveen S., Assistant professor, Legal Studies, Cochin University of Science and Technology, Dr. Swati, Assistant Professor, CUJ, Jharkhand and Smt. Brajesh Nainavi, Assistant Professor, V.S.S.D. College, Kanpur.

The Plenary Session II chaired by Prof. Rashmi Salpekar, Dean and Head, VIPS, addressed the theme of "Human Rights Law". The session commenced with introductory remarks by Prof. Manoj Kumar Sinha to be followed by a keynote address by Dr. Kishore Singh, Former UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education. The other distinguished panellists who

presented their papers are Dinesh Tripathi, Senior Advocate, Supreme Court of Nepal, Prof. Dr. Vaibhav Goel Bhartiya, Dean Faculty of Law, Subharti University, Meerut, Prof. Vijay Kumar Verma, Dayal Singh College, D U, Dr. Chiranjivi Panda, Adv Dr. Surepalli Prashanth, MBBS, LL.M. a practising lawyer, Ms. Sofia Khatun, Assistant Professor, School of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, Dr. Snehal Fadnavis, Principal, GWCL and Dr. Balaji Naik, Assistant Professor, DU.

The fourth Plenary Session began on 4th March, 2023, addressing the theme "Approaching Sustainability in the Changing Global Order". This session was coordinated by Centre for Trade and Investment Law, Ministry of Commerce, and Industry. The Chair of the session was Sumanta Chaudhuri, Principal Adviser, International Trade Policy Division, Confederation of Indian Industry (CII), India. The other distinguished panellists in the session were Prof. Kathleen Claussen, Professor of Law, Georgetown University, USA, Prof. James Nedumpara, Head and Professor, CTIL, India, Ms. Anuaradha R. V., Partner, Clarus Law Associates, India, Ms. Shiny Pradeep, Assistant Professor CTIL, India, Prof. Leila Choukroune, Professor of International Law, University of Portsmouth and Prof. Geraldo Vidigal, Faculty of Law, Public International Law, University of Amsterdam (virtual).

The Fifth parallel session focusing "WTO, Cross-Border

Investment and Insolvency Law" was chaired by Narinder Singh, Former ILC Member, which involved the following distinguished panellists: Prof. Dr. Vijay Kumar Singh, Dr. Komal, Professor, IILM Law School, Ms. Jyoti Singh, Ph.D. Scholar, D U and Dr. Rekha G Dhakar, Life Member, ISIL.

The Sixth Parallel session focusing "International Health Law" was chaired by Prof. S. K. Verma, Editor-in-Chief, IJIL. The session began with a keynote address by Dr. Manisha Sridhar, Regional Advisor, WHO, South East Asia Regional Office, India. The distinguished presenters in the session were Mr. Shem Ogang, Kenya, Health Equity and International Law, Dr. Ajay Bhupendra Jaiswal, Professor Department of Law, V. S. S. D. College, Kanpur, Abhishek Majumdar, Advocate, Dr. Arushi Batra, Assistant Professor, School of Law, UPES, Dehradun, Dr. Abhijit Ramkrishna Dhere, Assistant Professor, School of Law, Ms. Amrita Verma, Assistant Professor Department of Law, V. S. S. D. College, Kanpur, Dr. Mrinal Patnaik, Junior Resident Academic, Department of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, AIIMS, Bhopal and Dr. Sougata Talukdar, Assistant Professor, Goenka College of Commerce and Business Administration.

The seventh parallel session focused "India's Engagement in International Law with South Asian and European Nations". Apart from the Session Chair Prof. V. G. Hegde, JNU, New Delhi, other

distinguished panellists who spoke on the theme were Dr. Bhanu Pratap, Assistant Professor, University of Lucknow and Mr. Umang Modi, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda.

The eighth parallel session was devoted to India's State Practice in Public and Private International Law. The session was chaired Ms. Uma Shekhar, Addl. Secretary, Legal and Treaties Division, Ministry of External

Affairs (MEA). The resource persons who spoke on the theme were Anil Malhotra, Senior Advocate & Life Member, ISIL and Ankit Malhotra, Dr. Bhumika Nanda, Assistant Professor, Bennett University, Mr. Shashank P. Kumar, Dispute Settlement Lawyer, Mr. Kshtij Naikade, Assistant Professor, Symbiosis Law School, Pune, Dr. Gurpreet Singh, Assistant Professor, Law Centre I, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi and Mr. Sanjay Kumar,

Assistant Professor, Amity Law School, NOIDA.

The international conference concluded with a valedictory session on the 4th March, 2023 evening. The valedictory address was delivered by Prof. Bharat H. Desai, JNU, New Delhi, on the topic "Global Order in Perplexity: Making International Law Work". The valedictory session was chaired by Prof. Anupam Jha, Treasurer, ISIL.



12th Winter Course on Health Law

The ISIL organized its 12th winter course on Health Law from 2nd January 2023 to Friday, 6th January 2023. The course saw forty-one (41) participants which included mostly law students

coming from different parts of India and some early career academics, including others interested. The objective of this course is to impart the participants with the basic understanding of

some legal aspects of health law ranging from domestic and international spheres. The course commenced with an inaugural session which included an address by Maj. Gen. Nilendra Kumar and a

RECENT ACTIVITIES

formal inaugural address by Dr. R. K. Srivastava, Former Director General Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Dr. Shikhar Ranjan, the then Secretary General, proposed formal vote of thanks. The distinguished academicians from health services, legal practitioners, experts drawn on Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission and ISIL's academic staff who delivered lectures on a wide range of topics relating to public health are the following: Dr. R. K. Srivastava; Prof. Manoj Kumar Sinha, Director, Indian Law Institute; Ms. Urvashi Prasad, Director Development Monitoring & Evaluation Office, NITI Aayog; Dr. Shikhar Ranjan; Dr. Manisha Shridhar, Regional Advisor, WHO, SEARO; Dr. Parineet Kaur, Assistant Professor, ISIL; Dr. V. G. Hegde, Prof. Centre for International Legal Studies, School of International Studies, JNU; Dr. Shakuntala Kumar, MBBS, DGO, Fellow of Indian College of Obstetrics and Gynaecology; Dr. Girish Tyagi, Registrar, Delhi Medical Council; Dr. Rajib Majumdar, Prof. of Neurosurgery and Medico Legal Consultant; Ms. Kavita Narayan, Technical Advisor, HRH for Health Systems at Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, GOI; Dr. Rakesh Chaddha, Professor and Head of the Department of Psychiatry & Chief, National Drug Dependence Treatment Centre, AIIMS; Dr. Mohit Gupta, Professor Dept. of Forensic Medicine VMMC & Safdurjung Hospital; Dr. Rajib

Dasgupta, Centre of Social Medicine and Community Health, JNU; Mr. Amit Kumar, Senior Advocate and Advocate General State of Meghalaya; Hon'ble Dr. S. M. Kanitkar, Member, National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission; Dr. Anwar Sadat, Senior Assistant Professor in International Law & Environment, ISIL; Mr. Jeevan Prakash Sharma, PTI and Dr. Sangeeta Sharma, Professor & Head, Institute of Human Behaviour & Allied Sciences, Delhi. Before a valedictory session and certificate distribution, a panel discussion was organized on the topic "Towards a Pandemic Treaty". The discussion was Chaired by Dr. Manisha Sridhar, Dr. Rajib Dasgupta and Prof. Dr. Benarji Chakka, Dean and Professor of Law at VIT-AP School of Law.

21st Henry Dunant Moot Court Competition 2022

The ISIL and the International Committee of Red Cross (ICRC), New Delhi, jointly organized the 21st Henry Dunant Memorial Moot Court Competition (National Round) on 22nd – 25th September 2022 for law students coming from various parts of the country at the ISIL premises. The competition was inaugurated by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Kant, Judge, Supreme Court of India, on 22nd September. There were twenty-six teams who participated in the competition. The participants had to face various rounds including quarterfinal and seminal rounds. The participants were judged on

the basis of written memorials, appreciation of facts and law, advocacy skills, use of authorities, and citations, general impression and court manners. Eminent professors, legal officers and international law scholars judged the teams in preliminary, quarter-final and semi-final rounds. In the final, there two teams, National Law University Mumbai and Gujarat National Law University (GNLU). The former emerged winner, while the latter got the runners up. In addition, Pranav Chaudhury got the award of best speaker, while Amulya Kaushik from Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies, New Delhi and Prithvi Sreekanth from the Institute of Law, NIRMA University, Ahmedabad were adjudged best researchers. The best memorial ward went to Lloyd Law College, Greater NOIDA, represented by Arusa Kumari, Anshu Goel and Harsmita Gupta.

Forthcoming Events

1-3 September, 51st Annual Conference of the Indian Society of International Law.

21-24th September, 22nd Henry Dunant Moot Memorial Moot Court Competition 2023 (National Round)

(This issue of newsletter has covered the activities of ISIL for the period of July 2022 to March 2023).