

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

**APPLICATION
INSTITUTING PROCEEDINGS**

filed in the Registry of the Court
on 16 May 2025

KOHLER AND PARIS

(FRANCE v. ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Note Verbale dated 16 May 2025 from the Embassy of France in the Netherlands to the Registry of the International Court of Justice	4
Application instituting proceedings	5
List of Annexes	13



NOTE VERBALE DATED 16 MAY 2025 FROM THE EMBASSY
OF FRANCE IN THE NETHERLANDS TO THE REGISTRY
OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

[Translation]

No. 2025-0198833

The Embassy of France in the Netherlands presents its compliments to the International Court of Justice (Office of the Registrar) and has the honour to file this day an application of the French Republic instituting proceedings against the Islamic Republic of Iran on the basis of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna on 24 April 1963.

The Application enclosed herewith (in two copies and in electronic format) is signed by the Agent appointed by the French Government, Mr Diégo Colas, Director of Legal Affairs at the Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, who will file it in person today.

The Embassy of France in the Netherlands avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the International Court of Justice (Office of the Registrar) the assurances of its highest consideration.

APPLICATION INSTITUTING PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

I. INTRODUCTION

To the Registrar of the International Court of Justice, the undersigned being duly authorized by the French Government and acting on its behalf:

1. In accordance with Article 36 and Article 40, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice (hereinafter the “Court”) and Article 38 of the Rules of Court, read in conjunction with Article I of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes done at Vienna on 24 April 1963 (hereinafter the “Protocol”), I have the honour to submit to the Court the present Application instituting proceedings against the Islamic Republic of Iran (hereinafter “Iran”).

2. This Application relates to a dispute between Iran and France regarding the application of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963 (hereinafter the “1963 Vienna Convention”). As France will explain herein, this Application concerns serious and repeated breaches by Iran of its obligations under that Convention, in the context of the arrest, detention and trial of several French nationals in Iran.

II. FACTS

3. France is filing this Application in view of the violation by Iran of the rights of France and of French nationals Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris deriving from the 1963 Vienna Convention. This violation is taking place in a broader context of disagreement between the Parties, the facts of which are important to note.

4. The context in which this Application is being filed is that of the hostage policy pursued by Iran against French nationals since May 2022, which has been and continues to be consistently condemned by France. This deliberate policy of taking Westerners hostage targets French nationals travelling in or visiting Iran by accusing them of various offences relating to Iranian national security. As a result of this policy, several French nationals continue to be held in Iranian prisons, in abject conditions.

5. This hostage policy is being implemented with the specific aim of compelling France to do or abstain from doing certain acts. To paraphrase the terms of the 1979 International Convention against the Taking of Hostages¹, the objective is to obtain a real or perceived *quid pro quo* as an “explicit or implicit condition” for the release of the individuals concerned. This policy, the very principle of which is highly reprehensible, is evident from the posture of the Iranian authorities as indicated by the detainees. For example, on 30 October 2023, Mr Jacques Paris stated in a message to his daughter that he had been “instructed to tell [her] that the Iranian Government [was] prepared to release [them] if France hand[ed] over terrorists to Iran”². On 8 January 2024, Ms Cécile Kohler recalled to her sister that “the Iranian Government

¹ International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, United Nations, *Treaty Series*, Vol. 1316, p. 205, Art. I, para. 1.

² Note Verbale No. 2025-0008473 of 12 January 2025 (Ann. 37).

[was] prepared to release [them] tomorrow, or in a week, if the French Government accept[ed] the Iranian Government's conditions; they ha[d] said so 15 times"³.

6. In this context, France's efforts have led to the release of (in alphabetical order) Ms Fariba Adelkhah, Mr Louis Arnaud, Mr Benjamin Brière, Mr Olivier Grondeau and Mr Bernard Phelan. However, as of the date of filing of this Application, two French nationals are still being held hostage by the Iranian authorities, despite the numerous steps taken by France to obtain their release.

7. While visiting Iran as tourists, Ms Cécile Kohler, a teacher of modern literature, and her partner, Mr Jacques Paris, a retired mathematics teacher, were arrested by the Iranian law enforcement authorities on 8 May 2022 and have been imprisoned ever since. On 11 May 2022, France requested confirmation of their arrest from the Iranian authorities⁴. This request was reiterated in a Note Verbale of 12 June 2022⁵. It was not until 18 June 2022 that Iran officially informed France that two of its nationals had been arrested⁶.

8. Since 11 May 2022, by numerous Notes Verbales sent at regular intervals, France has requested permission to visit Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris. However, in over three years of detention, these two individuals have been allowed to converse with the French consular authorities on only four occasions, during individual visits lasting an average of ten minutes per authorized visit, which took place under very close surveillance and restrictive conditions. These consular visits were carried out on 23 November 2022⁷, 14 June 2023⁸, 18 February 2024⁹ and 15 April 2025¹⁰. Moreover, although the Iranian authorities had agreed that a visit could take place on 22 February 2023¹¹, it was cancelled without reason that very morning.

9. As shown by the Notes Verbales transmitted to this effect, each of the four consular visits was secured only following repeated requests made by France over several months:

- For the visit on 23 November 2022: Note Verbale No. 2022-0217780 of 11 May 2022 (Ann. 1), Note Verbale No. 2022-0269142 of 12 June 2022 (Ann. 2), Note Verbale No. 2022-0348459 of 2 August 2022 (Ann. 4), Note Verbale No. 2022-0356885 of 8 August 2022 (Ann. 5), Note Verbale No. 2022-0399226 of 8 September 2022 (Ann. 6), and Note Verbale No. 2022-0505866 of 8 November 2022 (Ann. 9).
- For the visit on 14 June 2023: Note Verbale No. 2022-0537328 of 28 November 2022 (Ann. 11), Note Verbale No. 2023-0009906 of 9 January 2023 (Ann. 12), Note Verbale No. 2023-0025996 of 18 January 2023 (Ann. 13), Note Verbale No. 2023-0051962 of 5 February 2023 (Ann. 14), Note Verbale No. 2023-0162587 of 11 April 2023 (Ann. 18), and Note Verbale No. 2023-0213562 of 15 May 2023 (Ann. 20).
- For the visit on 18 February 2024: Note Verbale No. 2023-0396263 of 18 September 2023 (Ann. 25), Note Verbale No. 2023-0418012 of 27 September 2023 (Ann. 26), and Note Verbale No. 2023-0505251 of 19 November 2023 (Ann. 27).
- For the visit on 15 April 2025: Note Verbale No. 2024-0087747 of 26 February 2024 (Ann. 29), Note Verbale No. 2024-0291474 of 10 July 2024 (Ann. 32), and Note Verbale No. 2024-0479256 of 18 November 2024 (Ann. 34).

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Note Verbale No. 2022-0217780 of 11 May 2022 (Ann. 1).

⁵ Note Verbale No. 2022-0269142 of 12 June 2022 (Ann. 2).

⁶ Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1216818 of 18 June 2022 (Ann. 3).

⁷ Visit authorized by Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1405056 of 23 November 2022 (Ann. 10).

⁸ Visit authorized by Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1631527 of 13 June 2023 (Ann. 22).

⁹ Visit authorized by Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1940618 of 14 February 2024 (Ann. 28).

¹⁰ Visit authorized by Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/2436775 of 6 April 2025 (Ann. 40) and Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/2447678 of 13 April 2025 (Ann. 41).

¹¹ Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1506981 of 20 February 2023 (Ann. 17).

10. Moreover, from the moment the Iranian authorities opened an investigation against Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris, France sought to arrange adequate and effective legal representation for them. However, the French authorities have never been able to obtain the information necessary to arrange such representation, nor have they been able to ensure that representation is provided by independent, disinterested, competent and diligent lawyers. These two points will be discussed in turn.

11. Regarding the first point, despite its repeated requests to this effect, France has never been able to obtain any substantive information on the ongoing legal proceedings concerning its two nationals who continue to be detained in Iran. Three factors in particular account for this lack of information.

12. First, France has never had the opportunity to discuss the ongoing legal proceedings with Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris directly, the Iranian authorities having forbidden the subject from being raised during the few consular visits that have been granted. France has nonetheless repeatedly requested that “a consular visit be arranged which would allow the status of the legal proceedings to be discussed freely with the individuals concerned”¹², to no avail.

13. Second, France requested permission to attend the trial of Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris, by way of numerous Notes Verbales transmitted both before¹³ and after¹⁴ the date of the only hearing concerning these individuals had been fixed for 24 November 2024. As of the date of this Application, Iran has never responded to those requests.

14. Third, in addition to the impossibility of discussing the criminal proceedings during the very few consular visits that have been granted, and the absence of any response to the question of whether the French consular authorities may attend the various stages of the legal proceedings, the Iranian authorities have consistently denied France any direct and official information about the legal proceedings against its nationals. The only information transmitted by the Iranian authorities in this respect — at France’s express and repeated request¹⁵ — has been the ground for the arrest and prosecution of Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris, namely and according to Iran: “assembly and collusion with a view to committing offences against the country’s security”¹⁶. France has vigorously and repeatedly protested against Iran’s continued failure to respond in this regard¹⁷, recalling in particular that the information requested is indispensable for the arrangement of effective legal representation for its nationals. In a Note Verbale, which the Iranian authorities have not contradicted, France thus notes that

“[n]o information has ever been communicated to the French consular authorities, by any means or through any official government channel, on the status of the legal proceedings instituted against our two compatriots . . . The public

¹² Note Verbale No. 2024-0495469 of 27 November 2024 (Ann. 35). See also Note Verbale No. 2023-0263397 of 18 June 2023 (Ann. 23), Note Verbale No. 2024-0463848 of 6 November 2024 (Ann. 33), and Note Verbale No. 2025-0008473 of 12 January 2025 (Ann. 37).

¹³ Note Verbale No. 2023-0391985 of 13 September 2023 (Ann. 24), Note Verbale No. 2023-0396263 of 18 September 2023 (Ann. 25), and Note Verbale No. 2023-0505251 of 19 November 2023 (Ann. 27).

¹⁴ Note Verbale No. 2024-0463848 of 6 November 2024 (Ann. 33) and Note Verbale No. 2024-0495469 of 27 November 2024 (Ann. 35).

¹⁵ Note Verbale No. 2022-0269142 of 12 June 2022 (Ann. 2) and Note Verbale No. 2022-0484440 of 26 October 2022 (Ann. 8).

¹⁶ Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1216818 of 18 June 2022 (Ann. 3) and Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1501041 of 15 February 2023 (Ann. 15).

¹⁷ Note Verbale No. 2024-0463848 of 6 November 2024 (Ann. 33), Note Verbale No. 2024-0495469 of 27 November 2024 (Ann. 35), and Note Verbale No. 2024-0538005 of 26 December 2024 (Ann. 36).

statement by the spokesperson for the judiciary on 5 November 2024 is the only official source of information available to the French consular authorities which mentions the holding of court hearings”¹⁸.

15. Turning to the second point, because of the conduct of the Iranian authorities, France has never been able to arrange effective legal representation for Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris by independent, disinterested, competent and diligent lawyers.

16. On 24 October 2022, France requested that the lawyers freely chosen by Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris, i.e. Mr Hossein Taj and Mr Hojjat Kermani, be allowed to meet their clients and access their case file¹⁹. Although this request has been repeated — multiple times²⁰ — Iran has never replied.

17. Furthermore, despite their assurances to the contrary in a Note Verbale of 2 March 2025²¹, the Iranian authorities have never proposed any realistic alternatives to Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris being represented by their freely chosen lawyers. As France observed in a Note Verbale of 25 March 2025, there is nothing to show that the lawyers by the names of “Seyed Massoud Olamaei” and “Assadollah Tohidlou” were freely chosen by Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris. There is no evidence to this effect, nor any corresponding contract or terms of reference. The individuals presented as the lawyers for Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris have moreover — in an unobliging, disagreeable and provocative manner that runs counter to the ethics of the legal profession and infringes the rights guaranteed by the 1963 Convention — “refused to discuss the legal proceedings and the defence” of the two French nationals with the French authorities and have “systematically focused the discussion solely on the matter of their fees”²².

III. JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

18. France and Iran have been parties to the 1963 Vienna Convention and its Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes since 31 December 1970 and 5 June 1975, respectively. Neither France nor Iran has entered any reservations to these instruments.

19. According to Article I of the Protocol,

“[d]isputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention shall lie within the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and may accordingly be brought before the Court by an application made by any party to the dispute being a Party to the present Protocol”.

20. The facts set out in this Application amply demonstrate the diametrically opposed points of view held by France and Iran in interpreting and applying Article 36 of the 1963 Vienna Convention. Moreover, there is no question that Iran was aware of this disagreement before these proceedings were instituted: the many Notes Verbales annexed to the present Application all explicitly refer to the provision at issue or its

¹⁸ Note Verbale No. 2025-0008473 of 12 January 2025 (Ann. 37).

¹⁹ Note Verbale No. 2022-0481327 of 24 October 2022 (Ann. 7).

²⁰ Note Verbale No. 2023-0051962 of 5 February 2023 (Ann. 14), Note Verbale No. 2023-0200696 of 8 May 2023 (Ann. 19), Note Verbale No. 2023-0249254 of 6 June 2023 (Ann. 21), Note Verbale No. 2024-0145947 of 3 April 2024 (Ann. 30), Note Verbale No. 2023-0396263 of 18 September 2023 (Ann. 25), Note Verbale No. 2023-0505251 of 19 November 2023 (Ann. 27), Note Verbale No. 2024-0413405 (formerly No. 2024-0200414) of 4 July 2024 (Ann. 31), Note Verbale No. 2024-0495469 of 27 November 2024 (Ann. 35), Note Verbale No. 2024-0538005 of 26 December 2024 (Ann. 36), Note Verbale No. 2025-0008473 of 12 January 2025 (Ann. 37).

²¹ Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/2402250 of 2 March 2025 (Ann. 38).

²² Note Verbale No. 2025-0125659 of 25 March 2025 (Ann. 39).

content, indicate that Iran has failed to comply with it and call upon Iran to bring itself into compliance.

21. The French Note Verbale addressed to Iran on 8 November 2022 recalls, for example, that after six months, Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris still had received no consular visits, and states that France “protests once more against what the French authorities consider a flagrant violation of international law”²³.

22. In addition, on 20 February 2023, France and a number of other States sent Iran a Note Verbale in which they “protest against the Iranian authorities’ failure to meet their obligations under international law [and] ask the Iranian authorities to immediately fulfil their obligations pursuant [to] the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations”²⁴.

23. By a Note Verbale of 7 July 2024, France observed that “[a]ccording to Article 36 of the *Vienna Convention on Consular Relations*, to which Iran is a party, . . . consular authorities have the right to visit nationals of their country who are held in detention”, and consequently requested that its nationals “have routine access to consular services, including the possibility to meet with their consular authorities on a regular basis”²⁵.

24. In another Note Verbale, addressed to Iran on 12 January 2025,

“France strongly condemns . . . the clear violations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963 constituted by this Embassy’s lack of effective consular access to its nationals. More generally, it condemns the violations of human rights, and in particular the right to a fair trial, to which our nationals have been subjected . . . Accordingly, France calls upon the competent authorities of the Islamic Republic of Iran to bring an immediate end to these practices constituting serious violations of international law. It reserves the right to bring any action, domestic or international, against those responsible for these acts.”²⁶

25. There is thus no question that a dispute relating to the application of the 1963 Vienna Convention exists between France and Iran on the date of filing of the present Application.

26. Therefore, the Court has jurisdiction to examine this Application.

IV. THE BREACHES BY IRAN OF ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE 1963 VIENNA CONVENTION

27. The breaches by Iran of its international obligations in its relations with France concern the application of Article 36 of the 1963 Vienna Convention, which is reproduced below:

“1. With a view to facilitating the exercise of consular functions relating to nationals of the sending State:

- (a) consular officers shall be free to communicate with nationals of the sending State and to have access to them. Nationals of the sending State shall have the same freedom with respect to communication with and access to consular officers of the sending State;
- (b) if he so requests, the competent authorities of the receiving State shall, without delay, inform the consular post of the sending State if, within its consular district, a national of that State is arrested or committed to prison or to

²³ Note Verbale No. 2022-0505866 of 8 November 2022 (Ann. 9).

²⁴ Joint Note Verbale No. 2023-0081105 of 20 February 2023 (Ann. 16).

²⁵ Note Verbale No. 2024-0205734 of 7 July 2024 (Ann. 31*bis*).

²⁶ Note Verbale No. 2025-0008473 of 12 January 2025 (Ann. 37).

custody pending trial or is detained in any other manner. Any communication addressed to the consular post by the person arrested, in prison, custody or detention shall be forwarded by the said authorities without delay. The said authorities shall inform the person concerned without delay of his rights under this subparagraph;

- (c) consular officers shall have the right to visit a national of the sending State who is in prison, custody or detention, to converse and correspond with him and to arrange for his legal representation. They shall also have the right to visit any national of the sending State who is in prison, custody or detention in their district in pursuance of a judgement. Nevertheless, consular officers shall refrain from taking action on behalf of a national who is in prison, custody or detention if he expressly opposes such action.

2. The rights referred to in paragraph 1 of this article shall be exercised in conformity with the laws and regulations of the receiving State, subject to the proviso, however, that the said laws and regulations must enable full effect to be given to the purposes for which the rights accorded under this article are intended.”

28. The purpose of this provision is to guarantee the sending State’s right to effectively provide consular protection for its nationals and to establish the latter’s individual rights to receive such protection. Indeed, as the Court has recalled, Article 36 institutes “an interrelated régime designed to facilitate the implementation of the system of consular protection”²⁷. In this context, as the Court has observed, “violations of the rights of the individual under Article 36 may entail a violation of the rights of the sending State, and . . . violations of the rights of the latter may entail a violation of the rights of the individual”²⁸.

29. As the Court moreover recalled in the *Diallo* case, these guarantees apply “to any deprivation of liberty of whatever kind”²⁹. They are all the more imperative in situations of arbitrary detention.

30. The present Application is based on several breaches by Iran of its obligations under Article 36, including but not limited to the following:

- (a) to inform France without delay of the detention of its nationals in Iran, as required by Article 36, paragraph 1, subparagraph (b), of the 1963 Vienna Convention;
- (b) to allow French consular officials to communicate with French nationals imprisoned in Iran, and vice versa, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) and (b), of the 1963 Vienna Convention;
- (c) to allow French consular officials to have access to French nationals imprisoned in Iran, and vice versa, pursuant to Article 36, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) and (c), of the 1963 Vienna Convention;
- (d) to allow French consular officials to arrange for the legal representation of French nationals imprisoned in Iran, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 1, subparagraph (c), of the 1963 Vienna Convention.

31. Article 36, paragraph 1, establishes, *inter alia*, the obligation for the receiving State to inform without delay the consular post of the sending State, if the detained person so requests. In these circumstances, the fact that notification of the detention of two French nationals was given to the French consular authorities more than two

²⁷ *LaGrand (Germany v. United States of America)*, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2001, p. 492, para. 74.

²⁸ *Avena and Other Mexican Nationals (Mexico v. United States of America)*, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2004 (I), p. [36], para. 40.

²⁹ *Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo)*, Merits, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2010 (II), p. 672, para. 91.

months after they were arrested clearly constitutes a breach of the obligation provided for by Article 36, paragraph 1, subparagraph (b).

32. Although administrative procedures may give rise to a certain lag between the placement in detention and the notification of the sending State, it bears emphasis that such notification must not be unduly delayed, especially when the sending State itself requests information from the receiving State. The due diligence and good faith with which this obligation should be implemented moreover clearly emerges from a statement of conclusions of the consular consultations held between France and Iran on 3 and 4 March 1999, which notes that

“[i]n accordance with Article 36, paragraph 1, of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, the two parties agreed to mutually communicate, without delay and through official channels, the names of any nationals of the other party who were arrested, placed in detention or expelled from their territory”.

33. However, as mentioned above³⁰, even though France itself had contacted the Iranian authorities on 11 May 2022 for an explanation regarding the disappearance of Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris (and reiterated this request on [12] June 2022), it received no official confirmation of their detention until 18 June 2022.

34. With regard to consular visits, France recalls that it has made repeated attempts to exercise its right under Article 36, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) and (c), of the 1963 Vienna Convention but has faced obstacles imposed by the Iranian authorities. These attempts have met with a policy of systematic obstruction by Iran, to such an extent that only four short consular visits have been arranged over the course of more than 1,100 days of detention.

35. In this respect, France recalls that in order for the obligations established in Article 36 to be fulfilled, not only must a consular visit be formally authorized, but it must be authorized in such a way as to enable the sending State to exercise this right to visit, and its nationals to effectively enjoy it. Thus, strategies involving last-minute, arbitrary cancellations of visits, unreasonable restrictions on the duration of visits³¹, and the surveillance and intimidation of detained persons during visits are all acts that are contrary to Article 36 of the 1963 Vienna Convention.

36. In addition, France considers that, on account of its practices and repeated obstructions, Iran has failed to respect the right of consular officers to arrange for the legal representation of imprisoned nationals of the sending State, as provided for by Article 36, paragraph 1, subparagraph (c), of the 1963 Vienna Convention. Indeed, as this Court has recalled,

“consular officers have the right to arrange legal representation for a detained national of the sending State. The provision presupposes that consular officers can arrange legal representation based on conversation and correspondence with the detained person”³².

37. Because of systematic practices that are clearly contrary to the 1963 Vienna Convention — such as the withholding of information on the ongoing proceedings, the prohibition for the detained persons to discuss their trial with the sending State, and the circumstances surrounding the appointment of lawyers who are reluctant to communicate with the sending State — French consular officials have never been put in a position to effectively arrange for the legal representation of Ms Cécile Kohler and Mr Jacques Paris³³.

³⁰ See above, para. 7.

³¹ For each of the French nationals imprisoned in Iran, the visits lasted 10 minutes on 23 November 2022, 20 minutes on 14 June 2023, 20 minutes on 18 February 2024 and 10 minutes on 15 April 2025.

³² *Jadhav (India v. Pakistan), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2019 (II)*, p. 451, para. 118.

³³ Note Verbale No. 2025-0156661 of 24 April 2025 (Ann. 42).

38. It follows from these considerations that Iran has breached and continues to breach its international obligations under the 1963 Vienna Convention. These breaches engage its responsibility under international law, entailing various consequences, chief among them the obligation to make full reparation.

V. RELIEF SOUGHT

39. In light of the considerations set forth in this Application, France requests the International Court of Justice to find that Iran has breached and continues to breach its obligations under Article 36 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963.

40. France also requests the Court to order Iran to immediately take all necessary steps to bring an end to these breaches and to make reparation for all the consequences thereof.

41. France further requests that Iran be ordered to refrain from taking any new measures that would constitute a breach of its obligations, and to provide assurances and guarantees of non-repetition of its wrongful conduct.

VI. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

42. France reserves the right to supplement or amend the present Application.

VII. APPOINTMENT OF AN AGENT

43. For the purposes of the present case, the French Republic appoints as Agent Mr Diégo Colas, Legal Adviser, Director of Legal Affairs at the Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs of France.

44. The French Republic requests that all communications concerning this case be transmitted to it at the following address:

Embassy of the French Republic in the Netherlands
Anna Paulownastraat 76
2518 BJ The Hague
Netherlands

(Signed for) Diégo COLAS,
Agent of the French Republic,
Legal Adviser, Director of Legal Affairs
at the Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs
of the French Republic.

LIST OF ANNEXES*
(in chronological order)

- Annex 1.* Note Verbale No. 2022-0217780 of 11 May 2022.
Annex 2. Note Verbale No. 2022-0269142 of 12 June 2022.
Annex 3. Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1216818 of 18 June 2022.
Annex 4. Note Verbale No. 2022-0348459 of 2 August 2022.
Annex 5. Note Verbale No. 2022-0356885 of 8 August 2022.
Annex 6. Note Verbale No. 2022-0399226 of 8 September 2022.
Annex 7. Note Verbale No. 2022-0481327 of 24 October 2022.
Annex 8. Note Verbale No. 2022-0484440 of 26 October 2022.
Annex 9. Note Verbale No. 2022-0505866 of 8 November 2022.
Annex 10. Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1405056 of 23 November 2022.
Annex 11. Note Verbale No. 2022-0537328 of 28 November 2022.
Annex 12. Note Verbale No. 2023-0009906 of 9 January 2023.
Annex 13. Note Verbale No. 2023-0025996 of 18 January 2023.
Annex 14. Note Verbale No. 2023-0051962 of 5 February 2023.
Annex 15. Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1501041 of 15 February 2023.
Annex 16. Joint Note Verbale No. 2023-0081105 of 20 February 2023.
Annex 17. Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1506981 of 20 February 2023.
Annex 18. Note Verbale No. 2023-0162587 of 11 April 2023.
Annex 19. Note Verbale No. 2023-0200696 of 8 May 2023.
Annex 20. Note Verbale No. 2023-0213562 of 15 May 2023.
Annex 21. Note Verbale No. 2023-0249254 of 6 June 2023.
Annex 22. Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1631527 of 13 June 2023.
Annex 23. Note Verbale No. 2023-0263397 of 18 June 2023.
Annex 24. Note Verbale No. 2023-0391985 of 13 September 2023.
Annex 25. Note Verbale No. 2023-0396263 of 18 September 2023.
Annex 26. Note Verbale No. 2023-0418012 of 27 September 2023.
Annex 27. Note Verbale No. 2023-0505251 of 19 November 2023.
Annex 28. Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/1940618 of 14 February 2024.
Annex 29. Note Verbale No. 2024-0087747 of 26 February 2024.
Annex 30. Note Verbale No. 2024-0145947 of 3 April 2024.
Annex 31. Note Verbale No. 2024-0413405 (formerly No. 2024-0200414) of 4 July 2024.
Annex 31bis. Note Verbale No. 2024-0205734 of 7 July 2024.
Annex 32. Note Verbale No. 2024-0291474 of 10 July 2024.

* The Annexes are not reproduced in the print version, but are available in electronic version on the Court's website (<http://www.icj-cij.org>, under "Cases").

- Annex 33.* Note Verbale No. 2024-0463848 of 6 November 2024.
 - Annex 34.* Note Verbale No. 2024-0479256 of 18 November 2024.
 - Annex 35.* Note Verbale No. 2024-0495469 of 27 November 2024.
 - Annex 36.* Note Verbale No. 2024-0538005 of 26 December 2024.
 - Annex 37.* Note Verbale No. 2025-0008473 of 12 January 2025.
 - Annex 38.* Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/2402250 of 2 March 2025.
 - Annex 39.* Note Verbale No. 2025-0125659 of 25 March 2025.
 - Annex 40.* Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/2436775 of 6 April 2025.
 - Annex 41.* Iranian Note Verbale No. 725/2447678 of 13 April 2025.
 - Annex 42.* Note Verbale No. 2025-0156661 of 24 April 2025.
-

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS