
**THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL IN INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS:
NORMATIVE FOUNDATIONS, JURISPRUDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENTS, AND CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES**

***Vishal Kumar, Dr. Kunvar Dushyant Singh**

India.

Article Received: 30 January 2026, Article Revised: 19 February 2026, Published on: 11 March 2026

***Corresponding Author: Vishal Kumar**

India.

DOI: <https://doi-org/101555/ijrpa.9688>

ABSTRACT

The right to a fair trial constitutes a fundamental norm of international human rights law and a cornerstone of legitimacy for international criminal tribunals. This paper examines the evolution, normative content, and practical application of fair trial guarantees in international judicial bodies. It analyses the constitutive elements of the right including tribunal independence and impartiality, equality of arms, and specific defendant protections as developed through the jurisprudence of regional human rights courts and international criminal tribunals. The paper further explores contemporary challenges, including the tension between fairness and expedition in complex proceedings, the application of fair trial standards in arbitration contexts, and emerging issues such as proceedings in absentia. It concludes that while international tribunals have largely succeeded in operationalising fair trial norms, significant challenges remain in ensuring consistent application across different judicial contexts and in reconciling procedural efficiency with fundamental guarantees.

KEYWORDS: fair trial, international tribunals, due process, equality of arms, impartiality, international criminal law, human rights.

1. INTRODUCTION

The right to a fair trial occupies a unique position in the international legal order. It is simultaneously a human right in itself and a procedural mechanism for the protection of all other rights. As the European Court of Human Rights has consistently affirmed, "in a democratic society within the meaning of the Convention, the right to a fair administration of justice holds such a prominent place that a restrictive interpretation of Article 6(1) would not

correspond to the aim and the purpose of that provision". This recognition reflects the fundamental truth that substantive rights are meaningless without effective procedural mechanisms for their vindication.

In the context of international tribunals, the right to a fair trial assumes particular significance. These bodies operate beyond the framework of national legal systems, adjudicating matters of grave concern from international crimes to interstate disputes and their legitimacy depends critically upon the perceived fairness of their proceedings. Unlike domestic courts, which benefit from established constitutional traditions and institutional legitimacy, international tribunals must continuously demonstrate their adherence to the highest standards of procedural justice.

This paper undertakes a comprehensive examination of the right to a fair trial in international tribunals. Part 2 traces the normative foundations of the right, examining its articulation in major human rights instruments and its development through treaty body jurisprudence. Part 3 analyses the core structural requirements for a fair tribunal, including independence, impartiality, and equality of arms. Part 4 examines specific guarantees for defendants in criminal proceedings before international courts. Part 5 explores the unique challenges confronting international criminal tribunals in operationalising fair trial norms. Part 6 considers emerging issues, including the intersection of fair trial rights with international arbitration and recent jurisprudential developments regarding proceedings in absentia. The paper concludes with reflections on the achievements and ongoing challenges in this dynamic area of international law.

2. Normative Foundations of the Right to a Fair Trial in International Law

2.1 Universal Standards: The ICCPR Framework

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) provides the most authoritative universal statement of fair trial rights. Article 14 of the ICCPR articulates a comprehensive framework encompassing: equality before courts and tribunals; the right to a public hearing by a competent, independent, and impartial tribunal established by law; the presumption of innocence; and a catalogue of minimum guarantees in criminal proceedings. The Human Rights Committee's General Comment No. 32 elaborates extensively on these provisions, emphasising that "the right to equality before courts and tribunals and to a fair trial is a key element of human rights protection and serves as a procedural means to safeguard the rule of law"

The ICCPR framework has proven remarkably influential, serving as a template for regional human rights instruments and the constitutive documents of international criminal tribunals alike. Its provisions reflect a careful balance between the rights of the accused and the legitimate interests of justice, while recognising that certain guarantees may require adaptation to different legal traditions and procedural contexts.

2.2 Regional Human Rights Systems

Regional human rights treaties have both reinforced and refined the universal standards. Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) guarantees the right to a fair trial in terms that have generated an extraordinarily rich jurisprudence from the European Court of Human Rights. The Court has consistently held that the Convention is a "living instrument" to be interpreted in light of present-day conditions, allowing it to develop fair trial standards responsive to evolving challenges. Particularly significant has been the Court's elaboration of the implied right of access to courts, first recognised in *Golder v United Kingdom*, which established that Article 6 guarantees not merely procedural fairness in existing proceedings but the very right to bring disputes before judicial bodies.

The Inter-American system has contributed distinctive perspectives, particularly regarding the interconnection between fair trial rights and other fundamental guarantees. The Inter-American Court's Advisory Opinion No. 16 on the *Right to Information on Consular Assistance in the Framework of the Guarantees of the Due Process of Law* represented a landmark development, recognising that Article 36 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations confers individual rights that form part of the due process guarantees owed to foreign nationals facing criminal charges. As Judge Cancado Trindade later observed, this advisory opinion "advanced, for the first time, the proper hermeneutics of the key provision of Article 36(1)(b) of the VCCR" and "underlined the impact thereon of the *corpus juris* of the International Law of Human Rights".

The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, while less detailed in its articulation of fair trial guarantees, has been interpreted dynamically by the African Commission. In *Civil Liberties Organisation v Nigeria*, the Commission affirmed that even though the Charter does not explicitly mention public proceedings, this requirement is "necessary for a trial to be fair". This interpretive approach demonstrates the organic development of fair trial norms across diverse legal and cultural contexts.

2.3 International Humanitarian Law Parallels

International humanitarian law contains important fair trial guarantees applicable in armed conflict. Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions prohibits "the passing of sentences and the carrying out of executions without previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples". More detailed provisions appear in the Third and Fourth Geneva Conventions regarding the trial of prisoners of war and protected persons. Article 84 of Geneva Convention III requires that prisoners of war be tried by a military court offering "the essential guarantees of independence and impartiality". These humanitarian law standards have influenced the development of international criminal procedure and provide important safeguards in contexts where ordinary judicial institutions may be compromised.

3. Structural Requirements for a Fair Tribunal

3.1 Independence and Impartiality

The requirement that adjudicative bodies be both independent and impartial lies at the heart of the right to a fair trial. As the European Court articulated in *Findlay v United Kingdom*, a tribunal must possess "independence from the executive and also from the parties" and must offer "guarantees of a judicial procedure". The Court identified relevant factors including the manner of appointment of members, their term of office, the existence of guarantees against outside pressures, and whether the body presents an appearance of independence.

The objective dimension of impartiality requires that the tribunal be free from personal prejudice or bias, while the subjective dimension requires that it "offer guarantees sufficient to exclude any legitimate doubt" as to its impartiality. This dual aspect reflects recognition that justice must not only be done but must manifestly be seen to be done.

Military tribunals and special security courts have attracted particular scrutiny under these standards. The Human Rights Committee has emphasised that such bodies "must respect the same requirements, including independence and impartiality, as civilian tribunals". There is growing consensus that military tribunals should not try civilians, reflecting concern that such bodies may lack the structural independence necessary to guarantee fair proceedings.

3.2 Equality of Arms

The principle of equality of arms requires that each party be afforded a reasonable opportunity to present its case under conditions that do not place it at a substantial disadvantage vis-à-vis the opposing party. This principle applies across civil and criminal

proceedings and has been recognised as inherent in the very notion of a fair trial by human rights treaty bodies worldwide.

In criminal proceedings, equality of arms encompasses the right of the accused to adversarial proceedings, including the opportunity to comment on all evidence adduced and observations filed. The European Court has held that legal systems providing for a judicial officer to advise judges after parties' submissions are completed violate this requirement, as the defence lacks opportunity to respond.

A particularly sensitive aspect concerns the use of confidential information. The European Court has established that a trial will not be fair if the verdict is based solely, or to a decisive degree, on information withheld from the defence, even where such withholding is justified by witness protection concerns. This principle reflects the fundamental tension between competing legitimate interests and the necessity of ensuring that core fair trial guarantees are not sacrificed to other policy objectives.

3.3 Public Trial and Its Exceptions

The requirement of public proceedings serves multiple functions: it protects litigants against the administration of justice in secret with no public scrutiny; it maintains public confidence in the courts; and it enables the public to see that justice is done. As the African Commission recognised in *Media Rights Agenda v Nigeria*, the exceptions to public hearings enumerated in Article 14(1) of the ICCPR are exhaustive and may only be resorted to in exceptional circumstances.

Permissible exceptions include considerations of morals, public order, or national security in a democratic society, interests of juveniles, or protection of the private lives of the parties. Even where proceedings are properly held in camera, judgments must generally be pronounced publicly, ensuring that the outcome and essential reasoning remain accessible.

4. Guarantees for Defendants in Criminal Proceedings

4.1 The Presumption of Innocence

The presumption of innocence, enshrined in Article 14(2) of the ICCPR and mirrored in all regional instruments and international criminal tribunal statutes, requires that accused persons be treated as innocent until proven guilty according to law. This guarantee imposes obligations on judicial authorities and public officials to refrain from prejudging the outcome of proceedings and to avoid statements that could encourage public belief in guilt before conviction.

In international criminal proceedings, where accused often face charges of exceptional gravity and public attention is intense, the presumption of innocence assumes particular importance. Tribunals must carefully manage their public communications and ensure that procedural rulings do not improperly suggest a predetermined outcome on guilt.

4.2 Notice of Charges and Adequate Time for Defence

Article 14(3)(a) of the ICCPR guarantees the right of accused persons "to be informed promptly and in detail in a language which they understand of the nature and cause of the charge against them". The Human Rights Committee has specified that this information must include both the law and the alleged facts on which the charge is based, and must be provided when the person is first formally suspected or publicly named as an accused.

The right to adequate time and facilities for preparation of defence, guaranteed by Article 14(3)(b), requires early access to counsel. The Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers specify that access should be provided "not later than forty-eight hours from the time of arrest or detention". The European Court has emphasised the particular importance of legal assistance during initial police interrogation, given the risk of self-incriminating statements that may influence eventual conviction.

4.3 Legal Assistance and Self-Representation

The right to legal assistance of one's choosing constitutes a fundamental element of fair trial guarantees. The International Criminal Court's Rome Statute grants defendants the right to "conduct the defence in person or through legal assistance of the accused's choosing". The ICC's system includes an independent Office of Public Counsel for the Defence, ensuring that indigent accused receive effective representation.

The right to self-representation has generated significant jurisprudential debate. While the ad hoc tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda generously permitted self-representation most famously in the *Milošević* trial the European Court has adopted a more restrictive approach, recognising that limitations may be necessary in complex cases or where the accused's conduct disrupts proceedings. This divergence illustrates the different procedural traditions and practical constraints confronting international tribunals.

4.4 Examination of Witnesses and Disclosure Obligations

The right to examine witnesses against one's accusers and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on one's own behalf represents a crucial safeguard against wrongful conviction. Article 67(1)(e) of the Rome Statute guarantees the accused the right to "examine,

or have examined, the witnesses against him or her and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his or her behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him or her".

Complementing this right is the Prosecutor's disclosure obligation, which requires turning over to the defence any evidence that "shows or tends to show the innocence of the accused, or to mitigate the guilt of the accused". This duty recognises the asymmetry of resources between prosecution and defence in international proceedings and seeks to ensure that the truth-seeking function of trials is not compromised by adversarial advantage.

5. Fair Trial in International Criminal Tribunals: Challenges and Innovations

5.1 The ICTY and the Development of International Criminal Procedure

The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) served as a laboratory for the development of fair trial standards in international criminal law. Confronted with complex, multi-accused cases involving vast quantities of evidence and allegations of the most serious crimes, the Tribunal developed procedural mechanisms balancing fairness with expedition. As Gideon Boas has observed, "the ICTY, as the richest source for the development of these principles in international criminal law," provides invaluable insights into "what constitutes fairness and what constitutes expedition in complex international criminal trials, as well as explaining how these concepts interact and, on occasion, conflict".

The Tribunal's jurisprudence addressed numerous fair trial issues: the scope of self-representation, the appointment of standby counsel, protective measures for witnesses, and the management of voluminous disclosure. These innovations have profoundly influenced subsequent international criminal tribunals, though not without criticism regarding the length and complexity of proceedings.

5.2 The International Criminal Court's Institutional Framework

The Rome Statute represents the most comprehensive codification of fair trial rights in international criminal law. Article 67 enumerates minimum guarantees in terms closely tracking Article 14 of the ICCPR, while the Court's Rules of Procedure and Evidence elaborate detailed implementing provisions. The Statute's inclusion of victims' participation rights permitting victims to present their views and concerns at appropriate stages introduces a novel element requiring careful balancing with accused's rights.

The Court's institutional structure reinforces fair trial guarantees through the principle of "equality of arms" operationalised via the Registry's support for defence teams and the

independent Office of Public Counsel for the Defence. As the Court's official materials emphasise, "a strong defence is a vital component of a fair trial".

5.3 The Tension Between Fairness and Expedition

Lord Wright's observation regarding the post-World War II Belsen trials that "fairness was not generally compatible with expedition" remains pertinent to contemporary international criminal proceedings. Complex international trials inherently require substantial time for disclosure, witness preparation, and deliberation. Yet undue delay itself constitutes a violation of fair trial rights, specifically the right to trial without undue delay guaranteed by Article 14(3)(c) of the ICCPR.

International tribunals have developed various case management techniques to address this tension: pre-trial conferences, witness list reductions, admission of agreed facts, and written witness statements in lieu of oral testimony. The ICTY's Rules of Procedure and Evidence were amended multiple times to enhance judicial control over proceedings, reflecting ongoing efforts to reconcile fairness with expedition. However, as Boas notes, "the problem is not new to international criminal law" and continues to resist easy resolution.

6. Contemporary Developments and Emerging Issues

6.1 Fair Trial Standards and International Arbitration

The relationship between fair trial guarantees and international arbitration has attracted increasing attention as arbitration assumes greater importance in resolving transnational disputes. The European Court of Human Rights has developed a nuanced jurisprudence distinguishing between voluntary and compulsory arbitration. Where arbitration is freely undertaken, parties may waive certain Article 6 rights, but such waiver must be "free, lawful, and unequivocal". Crucially, fundamental guarantees including the right to an independent and impartial tribunal cannot be waived by implication and retain their normative force even in voluntary arbitration.

In *Beg S.p.a. v Italy*, the Court found a violation of Article 6 where Italian courts failed to respond adequately to requests to annul an award on grounds of arbitrator bias. The case illustrates that states may incur responsibility under the Convention where domestic courts enforce arbitral awards rendered in proceedings that failed to meet fundamental fair trial standards. As commentators have observed, the decision "elevated the right to a conflict-free arbitrator to part of the broader human right to a fair trial".

6.2 Proceedings in Absentia

The International Criminal Court's Appeals Chamber recently delivered an important judgment clarifying the circumstances in which confirmation of charges hearings may proceed in the absence of the suspect. In the *Kony* case, the Chamber confirmed that the Rome Statute permits such proceedings where the suspect "cannot be found," provided that "adequately robust safeguards" protect the suspect's fair trial rights.

This interpretation reflects the practical realities confronting international criminal justice: suspects may evade arrest for decades, yet proceedings cannot be indefinitely suspended. The Chamber emphasised that proceeding in absentia is compatible with fair trial rights only where sufficient protective measures exist, including the right to subsequently challenge the confirmation of charges should the accused later appear before the Court.

6.3 Consular Assistance and Due Process

The interconnection between consular assistance and fair trial rights has been progressively recognised in international jurisprudence. The Inter-American Court's Advisory Opinion No. 16 established that Article 36 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations confers individual rights forming part of the due process guarantees owed to foreign nationals. The International Court of Justice, in cases including *LaGrand* and *Avena*, has affirmed the justiciability of these rights, though Judge Cancado Trindade has criticised the Court's reasoning as "insufficient" for failing fully to recognise the human rights dimension of consular assistance.

The *Jadhav* case (India v Pakistan) before the International Court of Justice further developed this jurisprudence, with Judge Cancado Trindade emphasising the need for "transcending the strictly inter-State outlook" and recognising the right to consular information as "a true human right, with all legal consequences ensuing therefrom".

6.4 International Administrative Tribunals

Fair trial standards have also extended to international administrative justice. International administrative tribunals adjudicating disputes involving international civil servants must accord basic due process guarantees. However, scholarly analysis suggests that "significant deficits exist" in the compliance of leading international administrative tribunals with fair trial standards, particularly regarding independence and impartiality. This under-examined area merits greater attention, as thousands of international civil servants rely on these bodies for protection of their employment rights.

7. CONCLUSION

The right to a fair trial in international tribunals has evolved from a general principle of law into a detailed normative framework articulated in treaties, elaborated in jurisprudence, and operationalised in institutional practice. International criminal tribunals have contributed significantly to this development, adapting general human rights standards to the distinctive challenges of complex international proceedings. Regional human rights courts have provided authoritative interpretations that influence practice worldwide. The International Court of Justice has affirmed the interconnection between consular assistance and due process, while the European Court has extended fair trial scrutiny to arbitration proceedings implicating state responsibility.

Yet significant challenges remain. The tension between fairness and expedition continues to resist definitive resolution. The proliferation of international courts and tribunals raises questions of consistency in fair trial interpretation. The extension of fair trial standards to new contexts arbitration, administrative justice, proceedings in absentia requires careful calibration to ensure that core guarantees are not diluted. And the resource constraints confronting international tribunals threaten their capacity to deliver the high-quality justice that legitimacy demands.

These challenges notwithstanding, the trajectory of development is clear: the right to a fair trial has become an indispensable component of the international legal order, binding upon all institutions exercising adjudicative authority and essential to the protection of all other rights. As international tribunals continue to multiply and their jurisdictions expand, the fair trial guarantees examined in this paper will remain central to their legitimacy and effectiveness. The task ahead lies not in further elaboration of norms though that will undoubtedly continue but in ensuring their consistent and effective implementation across the diverse landscape of international adjudication.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Treaties and Instruments

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (adopted 16 December 1966, entered into force 23 March 1976) 999 UNTS 171

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (adopted 17 July 1998, entered into force 1 July 2002) 2187 UNTS 90

Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (adopted 12 August 1949, entered into force 21 October 1950) 75 UNTS 135

Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (adopted 12 August 1949, entered into force 21 October 1950) 75 UNTS 287

Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (adopted 24 April 1963, entered into force 19 March 1967) 596 UNTS 261

UN Documents

UN Human Rights Committee, 'General Comment No. 32: Article 14: Right to Equality Before Courts and Tribunals and to Fair Trial' (24 July 2007) UN Doc CCPR/C/GC/32

Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers, adopted by the Eighth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Havana, 27 August–7 September 1990

Cases

European Court of Human Rights

Golder v United Kingdom (1975) Series A No. 18

Findlay v United Kingdom (1997) Reports 1997-I

Belziuk v Poland (1998) Reports 1998-II

JJ v Netherlands (1998) Reports 1998-II

Jasper v United Kingdom (2000) Reports 2000-II

Stefanelli v San Marino (2000) Reports 2000-II

Salduz v Turkey (2008) Application No. 36391/02

Beg S.p.a. v Italy (2021) Application No. 5312/11

Inter-American Court of Human Rights

Advisory Opinion OC-16/99, 'The Right to Information on Consular Assistance in the Framework of the Guarantees of the Due Process of Law' (1 October 1999)

International Court of Justice

Jadhav (India v Pakistan), Judgment, ICJ Reports 2019

LaGrand (Germany v United States of America), Judgment, ICJ Reports 2001

Avena and Other Mexican Nationals (Mexico v United States of America), Judgment, ICJ Reports 2004

International Criminal Court

The Prosecutor v Joseph Kony, Judgment on the appeal against the decision on the criteria for holding confirmation of charges proceedings in absentia, ICC-02/04-01/05-494 (3 June 2025)

African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights

Civil Liberties Organisation v Nigeria, Communication No. 151/96 (15 November 1999)

Media Rights Agenda v Nigeria, Communication No. 224/98 (6 November 2000)

Secondary Sources

Boas G, 'FAIR AND EXPEDITIOUS INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIALS' in *The Milošević Trial: Lessons for the Conduct of Complex International Criminal Proceedings* (Cambridge University Press 2007) 13–78

Clooney A and Webb P, *The Right to a Fair Trial in International Law* (Oxford University Press 2020)

Trechsel S, *Human Rights in Criminal Proceedings* (Oxford University Press 2006)

Oxford Public International Law, 'Fair Trial, Right to, International Protection' (online)

Aceris Law, 'Fair Trial and Arbitration Under the ECHR' (28 June 2025)

REFERENCE

1. Research Scholar, Amity Law School, Lucknow, U.P.
2. Assistant Professor, Amity Law School, Lucknow, U.P.
3. *Delcourt v Belgium*, Application No. 2689/65, Judgment of 17 January 1970, Series A No. 11, para. 25.
4. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (adopted 16 December 1966, entered into force 23 March 1976) 999 UNTS 171, Art. 14.
5. *Tyrer v United Kingdom*, Application No. 5856/72, Judgment of 25 April 1978, Series A No. 26, para. 31.
6. *Golder v United Kingdom*, Application No. 4451/70, Judgment of 21 February 1975, Series A No. 18.
7. Inter-American Court of Human Rights, Advisory Opinion OC-16/99, 'The Right to Information on Consular Assistance in the Framework of the Guarantees of the Due Process of Law' (1 October 1999).
8. *Jadhav (India v Pakistan)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2019, Separate Opinion of Judge Cancado Trindade, para. 5 .
9. *Civil Liberties Organisation v Nigeria*, African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, Communication No. 151/96 (15 November 1999), paras. 36–38, cited in Oxford Public International Law, 'Fair Trial, Right to, International Protection' .

10. Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (adopted 12 August 1949, entered into force 21 October 1950) 75 UNTS 287, Common Article 3.
11. Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (adopted 12 August 1949, entered into force 21 October 1950) 75 UNTS 135, Art. 84(2).
12. *Findlay v United Kingdom*, Application No. 22107/93, Judgment of 25 February 1997, Reports 1997-I, para. 73.
13. *Ibid.*, para. 73.
14. *Ibid.*, para. 73.
15. UN Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 32, para. 22.
16. *Ibid.*, para. 22; *Ergin v Turkey*, Application No. 47533/99, Judgment of 4 May 2006, Reports 2006-VI, para. 47.
17. *Kaufmann v Switzerland*, Application No. 23525/05, Judgment of 19 February 2009, para. 43.
18. UN Human Rights Committee, 'Communication No. 779/1997, *Äärelä v Finland*' (24 October 2001) UN Doc CCPR/C/73/D/779/1997, para. 7.4
19. *Belziuk v Poland*, Application No. 23103/93, Judgment of 25 March 1998, Reports 1998-II, para. 37.
20. *JJ v Netherlands*, Application No. 21351/93, Judgment of 27 March 1998, Reports 1998-II, para. 43.
21. *Jasper v United Kingdom*, Application No. 27052/95, Judgment of 16 February 2000, Reports 2000-II, paras. 52, 56.
22. *Stefanelli v San Marino*, Application No. 35396/97, Judgment of 8 February 2000, Reports 2000-II, para. 19.
23. *Media Rights Agenda v Nigeria*, African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, Communication No. 224/98 (6 November 2000), para. 52.
24. UN Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 32, para. 29.
25. *Ibid.*, para. 31.
26. Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers, adopted by the Eighth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Havana, 27 August–7 September 1990, Principle 7.
27. *Salduz v Turkey*, Application No. 36391/02, Judgment of 27 November 2008, para. 57.
28. Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (adopted 17 July 1998, entered into force 1 July 2002) 2187 UNTS 90, Art. 67(1)(d).

29. International Criminal Court, 'Defence', <https://www.icc-cpi.int/about/defence>.
30. See generally Gideon Boas, 'FAIR AND EXPEDITIOUS INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIALS' in *The Milošević Trial: Lessons for the Conduct of Complex International Criminal Proceedings* (Cambridge University
31. Rome Statute, Art. 67(1)(e).
32. *Ibid.*, Art. 67(2).
33. Boas (n 30) 13–14
34. International Criminal Court, 'Defence'.
35. Lord Wright, Chairman of the UN War Crimes Commission, quoted in Boas (n 30) 13.
36. Boas (n 30) 14.
37. *Beg S.p.a. v Italy*, Application No. 5312/11, Judgment of 20 May 2021, para. 122, discussed in Aceris Law, 'Fair Trial and Arbitration Under the ECHR' (28 June 2025).
38. *Ibid.*
39. Aceris Law (n 38)
40. ICC Appeals Chamber, *The Prosecutor v Joseph Kony*, Judgment on the appeal against the decision on the criteria for holding confirmation of charges proceedings in absentia, ICC-02/04-01/05-494 (3 June 2025)
41. *Ibid.*
42. IACtHR Advisory Opinion OC-16/99 (n 6).
43. *Jadhav* (n 7), Separate Opinion of Judge Cancado Trindade, paras. 27–31.
44. *Ibid.*, para. 4.
45. 'An International Administrative Procedural Law of Fair Trial: Reality or Rhetoric?' (Stanford University, abstract)