

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: **English**

No.: **ICC-RoR56-03/25**
Date: **18 September 2025**

THE PRESIDENCY

Before: Judge Tomoko Akane, President
Judge Rosario Salvatore Aitala, First Vice-President
Judge Reine Alapini-Gansou, Second Vice-President

Public

**Decision on the Application to review the decision of the Registrar denying admission of
Ms Laure Singla to the list of experts**

Decision to be notified in accordance with regulation 31 of the *Regulations of the Court* to:

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ The Office of the Prosecutor | ☐ Counsel for the Defence |
| ☐ Legal Representatives of the Victims | ☐ Legal Representatives of the Applicants |
| ☐ Unrepresented Victims | ☐ Unrepresented Applicants
(Participation/Reparation) |
| ☐ The Office of Public Counsel for
Victims | ☐ The Office of Public Counsel for the
Defence |
| ☐ States' Representatives | ☐ Amicus Curiae |

REGISTRY

Registrar
Mr Zavala Giler, Osvaldo

☐ **Counsel Support Section**

☐ **Victims and Witnesses Unit**

☐ **Detention Section**

☐ **Victims Participation and Reparations
Section**

☒ **Other
Applicant**

The Presidency of the International Criminal Court (the ‘Court’) has before it the application of Ms Laure Singla (the ‘Applicant’) received by the Court on 14 August 2025 seeking judicial review of a decision issued on 7 August 2025, denying the Applicant inclusion in the list of experts created and maintained by the Registrar pursuant to regulation 44 of the Regulations of the Court (the ‘Application’).¹

The Application is rejected for the reasons set out below.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On 30 July 2025, the Registry received from the Applicant a request for inclusion in the list of experts (the ‘Request for Inclusion’), together with supporting documentation.²
2. The same day, the Registry transmitted the Applicant’s Request for Inclusion to an independent expert tasked with assessing the expertise of applicants to the list of experts.³
3. On 5 August 2025, the Registry received the assessment of the expert which suggested not retaining the Applicant’s Request for Inclusion on the basis that her expertise in environmental forensics was not sought by the Court and her experience in the field of reparations could not be assessed.⁴
4. On 8 August 2025, the Registry decided to reject the Request for Inclusion and informed the Applicant, *inter alia*, of the 15-day time limit to apply for review before the Presidency (the ‘Impugned Decision’).⁵
5. On 14 August 2025, the Registry received the present Application for judicial review pursuant to regulation 56(2) of the Regulations of the Registry (the ‘Regulations’).⁶

¹ Registry, Annex V, 26 August 2025, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxV, *annexed to* Registry, Registry Transmission of an Application for Review of the Registrar’s Decision Denying Inclusion in the List of Experts, 25 August 2025, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1 (the ‘Registry Transmission’).

² Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1, para. 3; Registry, Annex I, 25 August 2025, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxI, *annexed to* Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1; Registry, Annex II, 25 August 2025, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxII, *annexed to* Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1.

³ Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1, para. 4.

⁴ Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1, para. 5; Registry, Annex III, 25 August 2025, ICC-RoR56-02/25-1-Conf-AnxIII, *annexed to* Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1.

⁵ Registry, Annex IV, 25 August 2025, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxIV, *annexed to* Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1.

⁶ Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1, para. 7; Application, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxV.

6. On 25 August 2025, the Registry transmitted the Application to the Presidency, attaching thereto all the above mentioned documents.⁷

II. MERITS

A. Impugned Decision

7. In the Impugned Decision, the Registry informs the Applicant that, following careful consideration, her Request for Inclusion in the list of experts is denied because the Applicant's expertise in environmental forensics is not being sought by the Court and the Request for Inclusion does not specify how such expertise is relevant to the Court's proceedings.⁸ The Impugned Decision notes that the Applicant's expertise also includes reparations, but considers that it is not possible, from the information provided, to assess the nature and extent of experience of the Applicant in this area.⁹ The Impugned Decision further informs the Applicant of the standard of review of this decision before the Presidency, and of the 15-day time limit to apply for such review.¹⁰

B. Submissions

8. The Applicant seeks judicial review of the Impugned Decision and to be added to the list of experts in the fields of politics and geopolitics, as well as reparations.¹¹ In support, the Applicant reiterates the arguments she had put forward in the Request for Inclusion and refers to the supporting documents in support of the Request for Inclusion.¹²

C. Determination of the Presidency

9. The Presidency recalls that the judicial review of decisions of the Registrar concerns the propriety of the procedure by which the latter reached a particular decision and the outcome of that decision. It involves a consideration of whether the Registrar has: acted without jurisdiction, committed an error of law, failed to act with procedural fairness, acted in a disproportionate manner, taken into account irrelevant factors, failed to take into account relevant factors, or reached a conclusion which no reasonable person who

⁷ Registry Transmission, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1.

⁸ Impugned Decision, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxIV, p. 2.

⁹ Impugned Decision, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxIV, p. 2.

¹⁰ Impugned Decision, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxIV, pp. 2-3.

¹¹ Application, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxV, pp. 2-3.

¹² Application, ICC-RoR56-03/25-1-Conf-AnxV, pp. 2-3.

has properly applied his or her mind to the issue could have reached.¹³ In order to enable a meaningful judicial review process, any application for judicial review should provide arguments as to why the applicant considers that the decision of the Registrar may warrant review in accordance with this standard.¹⁴ The Presidency further recalls that review by the Presidency is a formal judicial process, which requires a fully reasoned application.¹⁵

10. The Impugned Decision clearly informed the Applicant of the judicial review process contemplated by regulation 56(2) of the Regulations, including the applicable standard of review applied by the Presidency and the need for the Applicant to provide a fully reasoned application. Nonetheless, the Application does not develop any arguments capable of supporting an application for judicial review. The Application, essentially identical to the Request for Inclusion, merely elaborates on the experience of the Applicant. It fails to identify any error in the Impugned Decision with respect to the Registrar's determination that the Applicant's expertise in environmental forensics is not being sought by the Court, and that the nature and scope of her expertise in reparations cannot be assessed.

11. Accordingly, it is the Presidency's view that the Applicant fails to demonstrate that judicial review of the Impugned Decision is warranted.

The Application is rejected.

Done in both English and French, the English version being authoritative.

¹³ The standard of judicial review was defined by the Presidency in its [Decision on the Application to Review the Registrar's Decision Denying the Admission of Mr Ernest Midagu Bahati to the list of Counsel](#), 20 December 2005, ICC-RoC72-02/05 (the 'Decision of 20 December 2005'), para. 16; and supplemented in its Decision on the application to review the decision of the Registrar denying [REDACTED] privileged visits with Mr Lubanga Dyilo, under regulation 221 of the Regulations of the Registry, 27 November 2006, ICC-01/04-01/06-731-Conf, para. 24. See also Presidency, [Reasons for the 'Decision on the "Application for Review of Decision of the Registrar's Division of Victims and Counsel dated 2 January 2008 not to Admit Prof. Dr. Sluiter to the List of Counsel"'](#), 10 July 2008, ICC-RoC72-01/08-10, para. 20; Presidency, [Decision on the application to review the decision of the Registrar denying the admission of Ms Magdalena Ayoade to the list of experts](#), 6 August 2009, ICC-RoR56-01/09-2 (the 'Decision of 6 August 2009'), para. 11.

¹⁴ Presidency, [Decision on the Application to review the decision of the Registrar denying admission of Mr Jean-Jacques Aernout to the list of experts](#), 13 March 2023, ICC-RoR56-01/23-2, para. 11 (the 'Presidency Decision of 13 March 2023').

¹⁵ [Presidency Decision of 13 March 2023](#), ICC-RoR56-01/23-2, para. 10.

赤根 智子

Judge Tomoko Akane
President



Judge Rosario Salvatore Aitala
First Vice-President



Judge Reine Alapini-Gansou
Second Vice-President

Dated this 18 September 2025

At The Hague, The Netherlands