

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner what sever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC-NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrish Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpna

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpna, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law,Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration.10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of

International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN- 2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

**“REFORMING THE GLOBAL GUARDIAN”: THE ICC’S
SHORTCOMINGS IN PROTECTING INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS
AND ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY FOR WAR CRIMES -
EXPLORING SOLUTIONS FOR GREATER
EFFECTIVENESS“**

AUTHORED BY - PRATHAMESH CHIKHALE & NIDHI TIWARI

“Criminal international law stands as the guardian of justice, transcending borders to hold individuals accountable for crimes that threaten humanity's collective conscience.”

INTRODUCTION

The International Criminal Court (ICC) is an international body that fosters the dignity of global justice and accountability. The ICC was created under the Rome Statute in 1998 and was established in the year 2002. The International Criminal Court is the only and first international court that deals with investigating and prosecuting individual crimes committed by individuals in the international arena. ‘Article 5’ of the Rome Statute mentions the crimes within the jurisdiction of the ICC, which involve crimes of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes of aggression. ICC is the last resort to prosecute the offenders for offences under Article 5 of the Rome Statute. The ICC has jurisdiction to prosecute the individuals who have committed the crime either in a state that has ratified the treaty or else a state that has ratified the treaty where the offence took place. To date, 124 countries have ratified the Rome Statutes and therefore are parties to the ICC.

The main aim of ICC is to deliver justice on the mark where the National Courts are unable to cover cases under their jurisdiction and fail to prosecute the individual due to the ambiguous nature of their crime. It acts as a guardian when the concerned states fail to be held accountable due to various legal loopholes and other political factors. Its role becomes key to establishing a ground of fear in the minds of habitual offenders who take undue advantage of the inability of the national court to prosecute them under the law of that state and therefore continue to commit heinous crimes against humanity. It highlights the principle that no one is above the law domestically or internationally, and its functioning contributes towards lasting peace and protecting human rights around the globe.

However, the functioning of ICC and its jurisdiction is complex and not binding to all, wrapped with issues like state sovereignty, geopolitics, international circumstances and lobbies. Even at present, ICC has to rely on cooperation from the member states for its functioning. Further, the world's Giants, such as the United States of America in the West, China in Asia, along with Russia, to date haven't ratified the Rome Statute, which ultimately limits the ICC's ambit to initiate criminal proceedings against the citizens of those nations. Besides procedural snags like gathering evidence and framing charges, jurisdiction has always been one of the ICC's biggest headaches. These issues have slowed down the Court's work and made it tougher to stand as the global guardian of peace and security. Debates about the ICC's future often zero in on jurisdiction worries and drawn-out trials, pushing for reforms to boost its impartiality and cut ties with powerful external influences. This essay dives into the Court's key limitations and the hurdles it faces in international law and human rights. It also proposes tweaks to strengthen the ICC's role in protecting individual rights and boosting its efficiency overall. In particular, this essay will explore six major flaws, each chipping away at the Court's power to hold people accountable for war crimes and preserve human dignity.

- Jurisdictional Limitations of the ICC
- Perception of regional Bias and Selective Justice
- Constraints of Complementary Jurisdiction
- Dependence on States for Cooperation and Biased Prosecution
- Prolonged Proceedings and High Costs
- Limited Scope of the Rome Statute

Jurisdictional Limitations of the ICC

The ICC's limited jurisdiction is one of the main issues that seriously impairs its ability to operate. When those in charge of horrible international crimes that violate human rights and are committed against humanity are not willing or able to be prosecuted by their own national authorities. However, the Rome Statute, which forms the basis of the ICC's establishment and operation, places restrictions on its jurisdiction. The Rome Statute only binds countries that have ratified it. The crimes covered by the ICC's jurisdiction, rules, and exercise of that jurisdiction are covered in Articles 5–14 of the Rome Statute. "Crimes of aggression," "crimes against humanity," "war crimes," and "genocides" are among these offences.

The problem arises when, as of today, major global powers of the world, including the United States, China, and Russia, have not ratified the Rome Statute. This non-ratification by these

countries safeguards a large number of the population residing in these countries from the jurisdiction of the ICC, limiting the scope of the ICC to prosecute these individuals. The ICC's limited jurisdiction means that it can only look into and prosecute crimes committed on member state territory or by member state citizens. But according to Article 13(b) of the Rome Statute, the ICC can only handle cases involving non-member nations and their citizens when the UNSC brings the subject to the court.¹ The five Veto Power holders in the UNSC play a crucial role in this referral mechanism. They can block any referrals of cases that may affect their citizens or their allies, and therefore, these political factors affect the free and independent practice of the ICC and undermine its credibility. These jurisdictional limitations create disparities in the ICC's reach and impact, as individuals responsible for atrocities in non-member states are effectively safeguarded from prosecution. This selective jurisdiction has led to criticism that the ICC is unable to address all international crimes equitably, thus weakening its position as a truly global guardian of justice.

Perception of Regional Bias and Selective Justice

One of the primary accusations made against the ICC is that it disproportionately prosecutes cases involving African nations while neglecting allegations of serious crimes involving powerful Western nations and cases in areas of their interest. Considering that the ICC has primarily targeted African leaders and officials since its inception.

Since the ICC has only found four defendants guilty to date, and they are all from African countries, many people believe that the court prefers to look into less politically significant areas. However, it is still inaccessible to nations with substantial global influence. This has sparked questions about the ICC's ability to actually fulfil its mandate as an unbiased international organisation.

The ICC's limited involvement in alleged war crimes associated with Western nations, like those reported during the Iraq War, is a well-known example of perceived selective justice. Numerous reports have detailed instances of abuse, torture, and unjustified civilian deaths involving Western military forces, prompting calls for accountability. Nevertheless, the ICC has been unable to formally pursue these cases due to political and jurisdictional limitations. In 2020, for instance, the ICC concluded a preliminary investigation into potential war crimes

¹ "Richard Dicker, *ICC: The Court of Last Resort* (2021)."

by British forces in Iraq, deciding not to advance the case due to insufficient grounds for formal charges. For many observers, this outcome seemed emblematic of the court's unwillingness or inability to pursue cases involving more powerful states.²

The court's consistent focus on cases from Africa, with its inaction on alleged crimes by influential Western actors, has reinforced a perception of double standards. Such perceptions weaken the ICC's legitimacy and raise difficult questions about its ability to administer justice universally. In this context, the ICC's mission to provide impartial justice on a global scale appears compromised, leading to widespread doubts about its effectiveness in ensuring accountability across all regions.³

Constraints of Complementary Jurisdiction

Article 17 of the Rome Statute outlines the "complementarity principle," which governs the ICC's jurisdictional framework and presents one of the main obstacles to its mandate. According to this theory, the ICC is intended to serve as an alternative or "court of last resort," taking over solely in cases when persons accused of significant international crimes cannot or will not be prosecuted by a national court system. While this approach respects state sovereignty, it often opens a path for powerful figures to avoid accountability by staying within their home country's legal system.

In cases where accused individuals wield significant political or social influence, they may be able to sway their country's authorities to retain jurisdiction over their case, even if that means avoiding impartial international oversight. By keeping proceedings at home, these individuals can sidestep prosecution by the ICC altogether, often leading to situations where trials lack transparency or the accused face minimal consequences. Unfortunately, this dynamic can seriously hinder the ICC's ability to fulfill its mandate as a global enforcer of justice.

This reliance on state cooperation can ultimately undermine the court's credibility. When states either refuse to extradite or conduct genuine trials for these individuals, the ICC's influence is significantly weakened. As a result, the constraints of complementary jurisdiction not only affect the court's ability to act but also present a fundamental obstacle to establishing global

² "Jo Adetunji, *International Criminal Court Is Not Just for Hunting Africans* (2013)."

³ "Mehari Tadella Maru, *The International Criminal Court and African Leaders: Deterrence and General Shift to Attitude*, ISPI (2014)."

accountability for serious crimes.⁴

Dependence on States for Cooperation and Biased Prosecution

As mentioned in the previous issue, ICC is not equipped with its own enforcement mechanism and it is heavily dependent on other authorities of States and the United Nations to enforce its mandates. This involves arresting suspects, surrendering the accused, gathering evidence, and other on-ground actions required. The challenge arises when many states refuse to cooperate with the directions of the ICC and prioritize their own interest this non-cooperation acts as a barricade in the functioning of the ICC. Article 86 of the Rome Statute deals with the State's responsibility to cooperate with the ICC. It states that "*States Parties shall, in accordance with the provisions of this Statute, cooperate fully with the Court in its investigation and prosecution of crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court*".

- In the case of "*Prosecutor v. Omar Hassan Ahmad Al-Bashir*" in 2009, the court gave rulings at two different stages of this matter. In addition to being accused of crimes against humanity and war crimes, the president of Sudan was additionally charged with genocide in 2010. All of the states that were parties to the Rome Statute were required to arrest Al-Bashir once the ICC issued a warrant for his arrest. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan was the target of several ICC cases as a result of several governments failing to detain Bashir during his country visits.
- **Pre-Trial Chamber II dated December 11, 2017:** The court held that Jordan failed to fulfil its obligations under the Rome Statute by not arresting Omar al-Bashir during his visit to Jordan on March 29, 2017, and referred this non-compliance to the ASP and UNSC.
- **Appeals Chamber dated May 6, 2019:** Confirmed that Jordan, as an ICC member state, was obligated to arrest al-Bashir despite his head-of-state status, ruling that head-of-state immunity does not apply in ICC cases. Additionally, the ICC has faced criticism for disproportionately targeting African nations that are less dominant powers in world politics, with most cases focused on African leaders and conflicts. This selective approach has led to accusations of bias in cases outside Africa, especially cases in Europe and America. Russian allies' countries have seen limited action, creating a perception of partiality. Herein, we can conclude that the functioning of the

⁴ "Aisha Khaira Latifa Syafii, 'The ICC's Dilemma: Balancing Justice and Perceived Bias in Africa' 2024"

ICC heavily depends on the cooperation of the state, which can vary with geopolitical factors and State politics.⁵

Prolonged Proceedings and High Costs

The general problem that has been faced by many other judicial bodies in the world is also faced by the ICC, which involves a long duration and high cost in judicial proceedings. The cases in ICC often take years, even decades, to reach a final judgment, which acts as an impediment to timely justice for victims. This long duration of the trial process and judgment hinders a lot of aspects of proceedings, such as witness memory, and fading of evidence, sometimes many witnesses and the accused themselves lose their lives which resulting in settling down the case without any remedy of justice for victims. For instance, in the case of “*The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*,” the ICC trial of Dyilo, the Congolese Militia leader, took around six years from warrant to verdict, highlighting the court’s lengthy procedures.

The issue is further escalated by the High operational cost of ICC trials. The ICC is an institution based in Hague, Netherlands but its operations and jurisdictions are spread over the world. ICC requires financial resources for investigations, protection of witnesses, gathering evidence, extraditing accused, collecting and translating documents and taking assistance from various legal jurists, and salaries of Staff and judges. The primary source of ICC funding is from its member states, but this funding is limited and sometimes inadequate. Therefore, in some instances, it has led to delays in proceedings due to financial limitations.⁶

These delayed trials and costly proceedings have been a key issue to be dealt with for the ICC as the court’s inefficiencies undermine its credibility and limit its impact on victims and affected communities. lengthy trials delay the delivery of justice and may lessen the ICC’s role as a deterrent against future crimes. This challenge underscores the need for reforms aimed at streamlining ICC procedures, optimising resource allocation, and balancing thorough investigation with the timely administration of justice.⁷

⁵ “Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, July 17, 1998, 2187 U.N.T.S. 3.”

⁶ Ismehen Melouka, *Report on “It’s About Time: Revisiting the Timing and Duration of Decision-Making at the International Criminal Court”* (2020).

⁷ “Tara Smith, *Why the International Criminal Court Is Right to Focus on the Environment* (2016).”

Limited Scope of the Rome Statute

The scope of the Rome Statute, which is the foundational principle of the International Criminal Court (ICC), is quite limited. Article 5 of the Rome Statute outlines the crimes within the Court's jurisdiction, specifying four core offences: genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression. While these categories address severe violations, they do not encompass all international crimes, resulting in significant gaps in accountability for other serious human rights violations.

For Instance, the Rome Statutes don't address large-scale environmental degradation on an individual level, as it has severe impacts on global communities and can lead to indirect violation of human rights by affecting ecological balance and flow of Basic natural resources for Human society. With the evolving global disparities, some of the emerging crimes like cyber-warfare or transitional organised crime, and mass hacking by terror outfits fall outside the reach of the ICC, limiting its ability to curb international crime.⁸ International crimes are frequently planned and carried out by networks comprising governments, businesses, or non-state entities, but the Rome Statute's fundamental purpose is to punish people, not any state or other organisation. This individual-focused approach restricts the ambit of the ICC, and often, the victims of such crimes committed by organised networks fail to seek justice.⁹

For example, the Rohingya Crisis in Myanmar in the year 2017, where widespread violence was carried out against the Rohingya Muslim community. The militancy and killings of innocents by militant groups in various parts of Africa, such as Sudan, Congo, Somalia, etc.

“Reforms are slow, but they never go backwards.”

REFORMS IN ICC

Established as a permanent institution to prosecute the world's most severe crimes, which are genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and aggression, the International Criminal Court holds a mandate that stands at the heart of global justice. The International Criminal Court was set up in 2002 through the Rome Statute with the aim of holding people accountable when national courts failed or refused to do so. While this vision was ambitious and necessary,

⁸ “Milena Sterio & Jennifer Trahan, *Cyber Operations as Crimes at the International Criminal Court*, Articles of War (2023).”

⁹ “D. Placzek, *Ecocide Before the International Criminal Court: Simplicity Is Better Than an Elaborate Embellishment*, 34 Crim. L. Forum 147 (2023).”

in practice, the Court has faced many difficulties over the past two decades. Complicated questions about jurisdiction, long trial durations, and limited resources have slowed its work and raised doubts about whether it can truly deliver justice on a global scale. The ICC also depends heavily on states to cooperate, but when governments refuse to arrest suspects or provide evidence, the Court has little power to act. This reliance, combined with criticism that the Court pays too much attention to Africa, has weakened its credibility. At the same time, the rise of new global threats such as environmental destruction and cyber warfare, issues not covered by the Rome Statute, makes the Court's mandate look incomplete. These challenges make it clear that reforms are urgently needed if the ICC is to remain effective and relevant in the future.

Addressing these limitations is crucial to ensuring that the ICC can uphold its mandate in an effective, credible, and equitable manner. In this context, the reforms explored below aim to tackle key limitations and reinforce the ICC's ability to function as an international guardian of justice in a changing world.

Expanding the Jurisdiction of ICC

The majority of the ICC's jurisdiction focuses on the prosecution of crimes that took place within the borders of its member states or are committed by its nationals. Although this was a sovereignty-inspired framework, given the possibility of impunity for serious international crimes not committed by states parties and their nationals, it leaves enormous justice gaps. Powerful states such as the United States, China and Russia, which never ratified the Rome Statute, are outside of its reach. This selective reach delegitimises the court and enables nationals of non-member states to escape accountability for crimes that comprise an affront to human dignity.¹⁰

Proposed Reforms

The ICC could also consider applying the effects doctrine, which would limit its jurisdiction to crimes that are large-scale and have widespread transnational impacts. For instance, offences committed in non-member states that directly affect member states or their citizens could fall under the Court's authority, ensuring that serious international harms do not go unaddressed.

¹⁰ "Frank B. Kellogg, *Limits of the Jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice*, 25 Am. J. Int'l L. 203 (1931)."

This would help close loopholes allowing perpetrators to escape justice by using jurisdictional gaps to their advantage.

Member states should work to encourage non-member states to ratify the Rome Statute, helping to expand the ICC's reach and ensure broader international participation in upholding justice. Thrusting diplomacy, technical assistance, and the court being even-handed in its proceedings may engender confidence amongst states reluctant to come into the ICC fold. Dealing with disputes between non-member states, Conflicts involving crimes between member and non-member states should be within the ICC's jurisdiction. Here, an ICC's ability to prosecute for crimes committed by any and all parties would enable full accountability and prohibit selective accountability.¹¹

Reforms in the UNSC referrals system to ICC: However, the UNSC has a crucial involvement in referring instances of outside states to the ICC. Reforms to rein in the veto power of permanent UNSC members where mass atrocities have occurred should make this process more effective. That would ensure that justice is not blocked due to political bias. Promoting the principle of International Law called Universal Jurisdiction: Instead, an international agreement establishing worldwide jurisdiction for these core crimes (including well-known examples like genocide and crimes against humanity) would allow the ICC to function without regard to territorial missions or national boundaries. That would reinforce the idea that no crime, however distant or politically sensitive, is out of reach for prosecution.

Problems with State Cooperation and Enforcement: The ICC faces huge problems when it comes to trial proceedings and enforcement. Unlike the National judicial systems of Countries, it lacks independent enforcement agencies and heavily relies on state cooperation for collecting evidence, decision-making, and extraditing the accused to the ICC's Jurisdiction. ICC don't have its own police or enforcement body or Police to perform the mentioned tasks; it's clearly not possible, and further, when the issues are interlinked with state politics and National interest of the accused individual's country, the state may be reluctant or unwilling to cooperate. Unless a stronger enforcement framework is put in place, the ICC faces the possibility of losing its capacity to fulfil its mandate of advancing global justice.

¹¹“Stephen Riley, *Expanding the Scope of International Criminal Law* (2018).”

The case for a global enforcement system. One suggested remedy for the ICC's enforcement gap is the creation of an international enforcement agency that has the authority to carry out arrest warrants and ensure compliance with the Court's orders. If such an organisation functioned independently but in cooperation with the ICC, it would reduce the ICC's dependence on national governments and make it much more difficult for individuals, whether state leaders or other powerful actors, to evade justice. Although creating such a body would require difficult political negotiations and broad member state support, it might be a big step toward resolving one of the ICC's primary issues.

Furthermore, the International Criminal Court may endeavour to strengthen its ties with regional organisations like the European Union or the African Union, which could play a pivotal role in convincing governments to comply with ICC decisions, especially in cases where direct cooperation with the Court is politically sensitive.

DELAYS IN ICC PROCEEDINGS

The length of the ICC's trials has often been criticised for placing a significant financial burden on victims, who must wait years for justice. The Court's intricate processes and administrative challenges are primarily to blame for this delay, which not only raises expenses but also hinders the general administration of justice. One of the best examples is *Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*,¹² which went on for nearly ten years under the current system. Trials that drag on for years run the risk of undermining the Court's reputation. Communities and victims may lose trust in the ICC, and prospective witnesses may be reluctant to testify if they anticipate a protracted procedure. To prevent these problems, the Court needs procedural reforms that maintain the essential protections of due process while also ensuring that justice is delivered in a more timely and efficient manner.

Proposed Reforms

Simplifying Procedural Rules To streamline case handling between courts and jurisdictions, the court's procedural framework should be revised to consolidate locations within multiple or lower-tiered governmental levels. **Announcing Timelines for Proceedings:** Define timelines for different trial stages to encourage progress and avoid delays.¹³ **Extending Through Technology Integration** Using digital to manage evidence, conduct hearings remotely, or analyse data with

¹² "Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo, ICC-01/04-01/06 (Int'l Crim. Ct.)."

¹³ "Kai Ambos, *Interests of Justice? The ICC Urgently Needs Reforms* (2019)."

AI-supported tools will accelerate the investigation and trial process. Resource Optimisation Task Force on National Judicial System: Prioritise urgent, serious cases; set up crime-specific chambers to reduce backlog.¹⁴

Perceived Regional Bias and Broader Range of Crimes

The ICC has often been accused of regional bias, with critics arguing that it disproportionately focuses on Africa while failing to address serious crimes committed elsewhere. This perception of selective justice undermines the Court's credibility and raises doubts about its impartiality as a truly global institution. In addition, the scope of crimes prosecutable under the Rome Statute remains narrow. Serious issues such as large-scale environmental destruction, economic exploitation, cybercrimes, systemic racism, and other harms that deeply affect communities worldwide are notably absent. These gaps reveal the pressing need for reforms that would allow the ICC to act in a more representative, impartial manner and expand its jurisdiction to address a broader spectrum of international crimes.

Proposed Reforms

The ICC is frequently criticised for its overemphasis on particular regions, particularly in Africa, which appears to be selectively fair. There is a strong need to establish clearer criteria for selecting cases, which takes into account the greater part of the globe, including the nations of Western Union and other leading global economies.

Further, as discussed earlier in this essay, there is a need to amend the Rome Statute to broaden its ambit to cover the newly emerged international crimes that have a cross-border reach. Crimes such as Cybercrimes, transnational corruption, and large-scale environmental destruction. To counter such offences and prosecute the offenders, the ICC could further establish special chambers or separate committees keeping a strict eye on them to ensure its unbiasedness.

It has become important for ICC to establish its jurisdiction over non-African Nations to justify its Global guardian status. Taking action against influential countries and global economies will not only justify its status but will also create a sense of equality and unbiased prosecution in the minds of smaller countries, who will further try to comply more with the ICC's practice.

¹⁴ “Jeremy Julian Sarkin, *Reforming the International Criminal Court (ICC): Progress, Perils and Pitfalls Post the ICC Review Process*, 21 Int’l Crim. L. Rev. 1 (2021).”

Additionally, diversifying the members of the Judicial bench, prosecutors, and staff, especially by adding members from smaller and vulnerable communities, will strengthen the organisation's legitimacy. Increased representation guarantees that the administration of justice reflects a more equitable and balanced global perspective and helps dispel notions of bias.

Complementarity and Its Limitations

The foundation of the Rome Statute is the complementarity principle, which gives states the authority to prosecute defendants in their own countries before the ICC intervenes. Although this framework supports the importance of state sovereignty, it frequently makes it more difficult to hold those responsible for the most serious international crimes accountable. Those in positions of authority can protect themselves from prosecution by using their national political clout, allowing for impunity. Furthermore, a number of new international crime categories that have emerged in the twenty-first century, such as cybercrimes, technologically driven conflicts, and other transnational threats, are not sufficiently covered by the Statute. To remain effective, the ICC must undergo reforms that close these gaps and expand its capacity to deliver justice on a truly global scale.¹⁵

Proposed Reforms

Expanding the ICC's Jurisdiction

- I. Broadening the Scope of Crimes – The ICC should broaden the range of crimes it can prosecute to include offences like ecocide, large-scale transnational corruption, and cyber warfare. These types of crimes pose serious threats to international peace and security and are becoming increasingly important in today's world.
- II. Adapting to Modern Realities – The Court must evolve to address crimes committed by non-state actors, including terrorist organisations and powerful corporate entities, whose actions can rival those of states in scale and impact.
- III. Refining Legal Definitions – Existing definitions of war crimes and crimes against humanity should be expanded to cover widespread oppression and cross-border economic exploitation, which increasingly affect communities on a global scale.

Promoting State Cooperation in the Context of Complementarity

Foster capacity-building efforts to empower national judicial systems, so states are equipped

¹⁵ "Sergey Sayapin et al., International Law, the Use of Force and the Crime of Aggression: From the Charter of the United Nations to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 15 Asian Y.B. Int'l L. 1 (2009)."

to effectively respond to serious international crimes.

Create inducements with respect to financial aid or technical assistance for states that can show, through actions, that they are serious about prosecuting international crimes.

Adding New Crimes to the Rome Statute

I. Broadening the Scope of Crimes – The ICC should incorporate offences such as ecocide, large-scale transnational corruption, and cyber warfare, all of which pose serious threats to international peace and security.

II. Adapting to Modern Realities – The Court must evolve to address crimes committed by non-state actors, including terrorist organisations and powerful corporate entities, whose actions can rival those of states in scale and impact.

III. Refining Legal Definitions – Existing definitions of war crimes and crimes against humanity should be expanded to cover widespread oppression and cross-border economic exploitation, which increasingly affect communities on a global scale.

Streamlining the Process for Amending: Change procedural requirements to alter the Rome Statute, which demands a very high degree of consensus among states, in order to make updates more practical and able to meet new challenges. Hold conferences to periodically review the relevance of provisions of the statute and advocate changes that are otherwise necessary.

CONCLUSION

The ICC faces challenges in protecting individual rights and ensuring accountability for war crimes due to limited resources, state non-cooperation, and perceived biases. To address these issues, reforms are necessary to improve investigations, guarantee fair trials, and foster trust. Increased state cooperation and stronger partnerships with international organizations are essential for the ICC to operate effectively. By making these changes, the ICC can better uphold justice, ensure accountability, and safeguard individual rights worldwide.