

DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE PETRÉN

[Translation]

Having voted against the Order, I append this dissenting opinion thereto.

There is an obvious parallelism between the present case and that also concerning *Fisheries Jurisdiction* brought against Iceland by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a case in which the Court has similarly indicated interim measures of protection. To the Order made today in that other case, whereby the Court maintains its indication of interim measures, I have appended a dissenting opinion giving my reasons for considering that the question of interim measures ought to be re-examined in the light of the prevailing situation. Given the link between the interim measures in both cases, I find that the same conclusion must be drawn in the present case.

However, such re-examination of the question of interim measures would, in accordance with Article 61, paragraph 8, of the 1946 Rules, have required the Court to invite the Parties to present their observations on the subject. As the majority opposed this course, I have voted against the present Order.

(Signed) Sture PETRÉN.
