



Islamic Republic of Iran
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Will
International
Law Survive
the Fury-driven
Attacks!?**

**An Overview
of the Ongoing
Act of
Aggression
against the
Iranian Nation**

Weeks 2 & 1

(from 28 February until 13

March 2026)

**IN
THE NAME OF
GOD**

Contents

Preamble	3
I. Violation of the peremptory norm of the “prohibition of aggression”	5
II. Iran’s legitimate right to self-defense	10
III. Violations of international humanitarian law	14
A) Attacks targeting civilians or the civilian population	15
1. Attacks against children	16
2. Attacks against women	22
3. Attacks against medical personnel	24
B) Attacks intended to spread terror among the civilian population	26
C) Attacks against civilian objects	27
1. Attacks against residential areas	27
2. Attacks against schools	28
3. Attacks against sport complexes	31
4. Attacks against manufacturing and industrial units	33
D) Attacks targeting specially protected objects	36
1. Attacks against cultural heritage	36
2. Attacks against medical units and transports	40
3. Attacks against objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population	43
4. Attacks against the natural environment	44
E) Attacks against law enforcement centres	46
F) Attacks against civil defence organizations	48
G) Attacks against airports serving international civil aviation	48
IV. War crimes	50
<i>Directing attacks against “Shajar-e-Tayebeh” primary school in Minab, Hormozgan</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Directing attacks against oil depots</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Hegseth’s declaration that no quarter will be given</i>	<i>53</i>

<i>Directing attack on the Iranian frigate “Dena”</i>	54
V. Crimes against humanity	57
VI. Targeting the Head of State and high-level State officials	58
VII. Foreign interference	60
VIII. Violations of international human rights law	64
IX. International responsibility and reparation	67
Conclusion	71

Preamble

1. On the morning of 28 February 2028, the United States and the Israeli regime led by a warmonger criminal and a war criminal under arrest warrant of the International Criminal Court (ICC) launched a coordinated series of premeditated, unjustified and unprovoked act of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which continues at the time of writing.
2. This act of aggression was committed in blatant violation of Article 2 (4) of the United Nations (UN) Charter and fundamental principles of international law and continues as an ongoing violation of a peremptory norm of general international law (*jus cogens*).
3. While the ongoing aggression followed the unprovoked acts of aggression of the same in July 2025 that led to the martyrdom of hundreds of civilians and rampant destruction of civilian property and infrastructure including peaceful nuclear facilities in Iran, the ongoing aggression commenced by a heinous act of assassination of the highest official of the Islamic Republic of Iran as a sovereign member of the United Nations. In an outrageous criminal act, the United States and the Israeli regime deliberately targeted the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ayatollah Seyed Ali Khamene'ei. This cowardly criminal act constitutes a direct assault on the very core principles of international law, including the prohibition on the use of force, respect for sovereign equality, and the inviolability and immunity of Heads of State, and further represents a dangerous and unprecedented escalation that strikes at the most fundamental norms of statehood among nations.
4. Yet the above was just the beginning of a series of egregious crimes history has rarely witnessed. Military attacks have been directed against civilian objects, including residential areas, schools, hospitals, and relief equipment and personnel, leading to the martyrdom of dozens of innocent civilians, including women and children, with many more injured. The deliberate and wanton destruction of a primary school in Minab, a small town in Hormozgan Province, leading to the martyrdom of more than 170 innocent schoolgirls and schoolboys, targeting schools in eastern Tehran, Abyek in Qazvin Province, a sport hall in Lamerd, Fars Province, and a sport stadium in Tehran, launching



missiles against a densely populated area in Sanandaj, Kurdistan Province in western Iran, and directing attacks against hospitals, homes, Red Crescent buildings and civilian infrastructure are only part of the war crimes and crimes against humanity being committed on a daily basis.

5. The present report, to be complemented by further updates, aims at bringing into light these ongoing violations working as a reminder to the community of nations for urgent action to end the culture of impunity, and to act vigilantly to prevent setting a dangerous precedent that could further normalize serious breaches of international law.
6. Last but not least, given the vast scope of the crimes committed by the leadership as well as the agents of the United States and the Israeli regime, the facts and instances given are illustrative only, rather than exhaustive, and subject to further updates.

I. Violation of the peremptory norm of the “prohibition of aggression”

7. In 1945, the Charter of the United Nations was adopted in the aftermath of the Second World War, firmly rejecting the use of force as a means of settling international disputes. Article 2(4) of the Charter imposes a binding obligation on all Member States to refrain in their international relations from “the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations”. This, recognized as the peremptory norm of “prohibition of aggression”, has formed the cornerstone of international relations ever since.
8. The peremptory norm of “prohibition of aggression” is grounded in its universal acceptance and non-derogable character. The International Law Commission (ILC) has confirmed this in ARSIWA, noting in Article 40 that breaches of peremptory norms – such as prohibition of aggression constitute “serious breaches of obligations arising under peremptory norms of general international law”.¹ The International Court of Justice (ICJ), in *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua* (1986), affirmed that the prohibition of the use of force under Article 2(4) of the UN Charter is part of customary international law and applies independently of treaty obligations.² Similarly, in its *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory* advisory opinion (2004), the Court held that “the obligations violated by Israel include certain obligations *erga omnes*”³ and that these, in turn, include the prohibition of use of force which has been endorsed again by the Court in its 2024 Advisory opinion of 19 July 2024 on the *Legal Consequences arising from the Policies and Practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*.
9. The ILC’s 2022 Draft Conclusions on Peremptory Norms of General International Law (Jus Cogens) further confirm that the prohibition of

¹ Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifty-third session (23 April-1 June and 2 July-10 August 2001) UN Doc A/56/10 (2001).

² *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua* (*Nicaragua v. United States of America*), Merits, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14, at paras. 188–190.

³ *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*, Advisory Opinion, ICJ Reports 2004, p. 136, at para. 155-159.

aggression is a peremptory norm, and that serious breaches of such norms give rise to obligations on all States not to recognize as lawful a situation created by breach of this peremptory norm nor render aid or assistance in maintaining such a situation.⁴

10. The United Nations Security Council,⁵ the General Assembly(UNGA)⁶ and the ICJ,⁷ for their part, have addressed the unlawful use of force within the scope of their respective mandates.

⁴ Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its Seventy-third session (18 April–3 June and 4 July–5 August 2002) UN Doc A/77/10 (2001).

⁵ Including but not limited to S/RES 326 (02 February 1973), S/RES 386 (17 March 1976), S/RES 411 (30 June 1977), S/RES 423 (14 March 1978), S/RES 424 (17 March 1978), S/RES 445 (08 March 1979), and S/RES 455 (23 November 1979) in the situation of Southern Rhodesia, where the Security Council condemned military incursions and cross-border aggression by the illegal regime in Rhodesia; S/RES 418 (04 November 1977) in the situation of South Africa, where it condemned South Africa's acts of aggression and imposed a mandatory arms embargo; S/RES 405 (14 April 1977) and S/RES 419 (24 November 1977) in the situation of Benin, where it condemned the attempted mercenary coup as an act of armed aggression; S/RES 573 (04 October 1985) and S/RES 611 (25 April 1988) in the situation of Tunisia, where it condemned the Israeli regime's air strikes on Tunisia as acts of aggression; S/RES 487 (19 June 1981) in the situation of Iraq, where it condemned the Israeli regime's attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor as a violation of international law; S/RES 672 (12 October 1990), S/RES 673 (24 October 1990), S/RES 681 (20 December 1990), and S/RES 684 (28 January 1991) in the situation of Palestine, where the Council condemned the use of force by the Israeli regime in the occupied territories; S/RES 262 (31 December 1968), S/RES 265 (01 April 1969), and S/RES 273 (23 July 1969) regarding Middle East conflicts, where it condemned aggressive acts by the Israeli regime, including bombardments and military operations; and S/RES 178 (24 April 1963), S/RES 204 (19 May 1965), and S/RES 268 (28 July 1969) regarding African complaints (Senegal, Guinea, Zambia), where the Council condemned acts of aggression by Portugal and South Africa against neighboring African states.

⁶ Including but not limited to A/RES/ES-8/2 (14 September 1981) [Emergency Special Session], in the situation of Namibia, where the General Assembly declared South Africa's occupation of Namibia and its acts of aggression against neighboring states as illegal aggression; A/RES/40/97(A) (14 December 1985), in the situation of South Africa, where it condemned South Africa's persistent acts of aggression, including its occupation of Namibia and cross-border attacks; A/RES/2918 (XXVII) (22 November 1972), in the situation of Territories under Portuguese administration, where the Assembly, while referring to Security Council Resolution 322 (1972), urged Portugal to cease military repression in its colonies, denouncing aggressive colonial military action; A/RES/ES-10/2 (7 October 2000) and subsequent resolutions of the Tenth Emergency Special Session, in the context of the Middle East, where the Assembly demanded an immediate end to the Israeli regime military incursions and violence in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including condemnation of armed attacks by the Israeli regime; and A/RES/46/242 (14 August 1992), among other resolutions in 1992, in the situation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the General Assembly condemned Serbian forces' aggression and territorial violations during the Bosnian war, affirming support for Bosnia's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

⁷ Including but not limited to *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America)* (1986), where the Court held that the U.S. violated customary international law prohibiting the use of force and intervention, affirming Article 2(4) of the UN Charter and clarifying the criteria for self-defense; *Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda)* (2005), where Uganda was found to have committed acts of aggression and violated the territorial integrity of the DRC; *Oil Platforms (Islamic Republic of Iran v. United States of America)* (2003), where the Court ruled that the U.S. failed to justify its use of force under self-defense, reinforcing the principles of necessity and proportionality; *Legal*

11. The UNGA has elaborated the key principles in relation to the prohibition on the use of force in several resolutions such as “Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States” (A/RES/2131 (XX), 1965), the “Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations” (A/RES/2625 (XXV), 1970), and the “Definition of Aggression” (A/RES/3314 (XXIX), 1974), all of which have been adopted by consensus. For instance, Article 5 (2) of resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970 prohibits the threat or use of force and explicitly states that a war of aggression is a crime against international peace, for which there is responsibility under international law.⁸

12. More specifically, the unlawful use of force by the Israeli regime and the United States constitutes an egregious crime of aggression within the meaning of Article 3 of the Annex of the UN General Assembly Resolution 3314 (XXIX) on “Definition of Aggression”. Accordingly, the “invasion” of Iran “by the armed forces” of the Israeli regime and the United States; **“the bombardment” and “the use of weapons against the territory” of Iran; “attack” on its “land” and “air forces”**; as well as deployment of agents, “which carry out acts of armed force against” Iran “of such gravity as to amount to the acts listed above, or its substantial involvement therein”, all qualify as acts of aggression.⁹

Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (2004), where the ICJ found that the Israeli regime’s construction of the wall violated Article 2(4) and constituted an unlawful use of force in occupied territory; and the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* (1996), which reaffirmed the prohibition of the threat or use of force as a fundamental norm of international law.

⁸ See also: A/RES/37/10 (30 November 1982), the “*Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes*”, in which the General Assembly reaffirmed the prohibition on the use of force and emphasized the obligation of States to settle their disputes through peaceful means in accordance with the UN Charter; A/RES/42/22 (18 November 1987), the “*Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Refraining from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations*”, which strengthened the commitment to the non-use of force and reaffirmed that no consideration of any kind may be invoked to justify aggression; and A/RES/43/51 (5 December 1988), the “*Declaration on the Prevention and Removal of Disputes and Situations Which May Threaten International Peace and Security and on the Role of the United Nations in this Field*”, which urged States to take early preventive measures and emphasized the central role of the United Nations in resolving and removing threats to peace.

⁹ It must be emphasized that in accordance with Article 1 of this resolution, the use of the term “State” in the definition of “aggression” : is (1) “without prejudice to questions of recognition or to whether a State is a member of the United Nations”; and (2) “includes the concept of a ‘group of States’ where appropriate.” Hence, this terminology should neither be read as, nor construed to be, inconsistent with Iran’s longstanding stance regarding not recognizing the Zionist regime’s legitimacy as a State.

13. More considerable in the context of the ongoing imposed war against Iran is provision of territory to the aggressors by third States rendering them, by definition given by the above resolution in its Article 3(f) complicit in the act of aggression. According to the same, **“the action of a State in allowing its territory, which it has placed at the disposal of another State, to be used by that other State for perpetrating an act of aggression against a third State” is aggression itself!**
14. Article 5(1) of the above is also crystal clear in stipulating that “no consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military or otherwise, may serve as a justification for aggression”. This is echoed, as well, in Resolution 42/22 (1987), which reaffirms that States must refrain from the threat or use of force under any circumstances, and condemns attempts to justify aggression under the guise of self-defense or political necessity.¹⁰
15. In the same context, lame justifications for aggression against a State under any fabricated nomenclature, such as the so-called “preemptive self-defense”¹¹ or other excuses in terms of anticipatory attacks has no place in international law, and Article 51 of the UN Charter limits the right of self-defense to situations where an armed attack has occurred against another State. Likewise, deliberate targeting of Iran’s civilian nuclear infrastructure under the false pretense of preemptive self-defense threatens international peace and security and undermines the non-proliferation regime as a whole.
16. In this context, invocation of Article 51 is not only irrelevant, but also a gross distortion of international law and the UN Charter. Article 51 provides for the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense only if an armed attack has occurred. UNGA Resolution 3314 and the jurisprudence of ICJ in 1986 Nicaragua case (Nicaragua vs. United States of America) and 2003 Oil Platforms case (Islamic Republic of Iran vs. United States of America) affirm that the right of self-defense can only be invoked in response to an armed

¹⁰ UN General Assembly, *Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Refraining from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations*, GA Res 42/22, UN Doc A/RES/42/22 (18 November 1987).

¹¹ <<https://abcnews.go.com/International/israel-military-action-iran-coming-days-sources/story?id=122776202>

attack and may only be invoked when conditions of necessity and proportionality are met.¹²

17. It follows that on 28 February 2026, just like on 13 June 2025 and 24 June 2025, armed attacks by the Israeli terrorist regime and the United States constitute acts of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran in flagrant violation of Article 2(4) of the UN Charter.
18. Over the course of the attacks, the armed forces of the United States and the Israeli regime conducted deliberate strikes – by day and night – against densely populated civilian areas across multiple major cities in Iran. Alongside senior officials, they also targeted civilian population among them women and children (including infants and toddlers), and ordinary citizens from all walks of life. Civilian objects including schools, hospitals, residential areas, homes, law enforcement centres, public facilities, and critical infrastructure were directly targeted, damaged or destroyed. These assaults, which continue to date, have thus far claimed hundreds of civilian lives and left more than a thousand injured, inflicting severe harm on both the civilian population and civilian objects and infrastructure in clear defiance of fundamental principles of international humanitarian law.
19. Such brazen lawlessness does not surprise anyone as the United States and the Israeli regime have demonstrated a total animosity towards international law in every conceived aspect, including the Charter of the United Nations and the very principal organs of the United Nations, which is evident both in formal positions taken by their leadership as well as the mandates performed by their armed forces on the ground

¹² The Non-Aligned Movement – representing over half of the world’s States – explicitly rejected broad interpretations of Article 51, which would justify anticipatory armed attacks, at its 2019 ministerial meeting. See NAM Final Document no.2019/CoB/Doc.1, “Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement (CoB-NAM)”, paras. 39.2 & 40.6. (13 June 2025), <[https://www.namazerbaijan.org/pdf/Caracas-Final-Documen-\(2019\).pdf](https://www.namazerbaijan.org/pdf/Caracas-Final-Documen-(2019).pdf)>.

II. Iran's legitimate right to self-defense

20. In the exercise of its inherent right of self-defense, as enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Islamic Republic of Iran undertook a series of carefully calibrated defensive operations against military targets and infrastructure belonging to the Israeli regime and the US forces engaged in the aggression. These operations were conducted following the aggressive armed attacks by the latter two which commenced on 28 February 2026 and have so far resulted in extensive loss of civilian lives and severe damage to Iran's critical civilian infrastructure.
21. Iran's defensive measures are lawful and premised upon international law. These responses have been, and continue to be, carried out with the aim of deterring further aggression, protecting the civilian population, and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country. The actions were taken upon failure of the United Nations Security Council to fulfill its responsibility with respect to maintenance of international peace and security and to act decisively in response to the said aggressive armed attacks.
22. In his letter addressed to the UN Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, His Excellency Seyed Abbas Araghchi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, referred to the acts of aggression of the US and Israeli regime as a clear violation of Article 2(4) of the UN Charter and officially invoked Iran's inherent and lawful right of self-defense under Article 51, unequivocally declaring that "[t]he armed forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran will utilize all necessary defensive capabilities and means to confront this criminal aggression and deter the hostile acts. Accordingly, all bases, facilities, and assets of the hostile forces in the region shall be regarded as legitimate military objectives within the framework of Iran's lawful exercise of self-defense."¹³
23. The members of the Security Council were also urgently called upon "to convene, without delay, an emergency meeting of the Council to address the US and Israeli regime's acts of aggression, breach of peace which is a real and

¹³ UN Doc S/2026/106, dated 28 February 2026, "Letter dated 28 February 2026 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council".

serious threat to international peace and security, and to take the necessary and immediate measures to halt this unlawful use of force and to ensure accountability”.¹⁴

24. Once again, however, given the failure of the UN Security Council to take urgent decisive action to ensure international peace and security, the Islamic Republic of Iran exercised its inherent right to self-defense against the said coordinated acts of aggression, which includes resolute defensive action against all the facilities, equipment and military personnel of the aggressors in the region. This position was communicated in Iran’s official correspondence to the United Nations well in advance and has been held consistently to date.
25. It is noteworthy that the above chain of US-Israeli regime’s aggression and Iran’s self-defense came after the interventionist remarks and open threats of force by the President of the United States levied against Iran before the commencement of the present aggression, which had been communicated to the UN in due course. For instance, referring to its previous letters of 30 December 2025, and those of 2, 9, 13 and 22 January 2026, on 29 January 2026,¹⁵ H.E. Amir Saeid Iravani, the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations, drew the attention of the UN Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council to the latest explicit threat of force and military attack made by the US President. Meaningfully, he had made reference to his previous aggression in June 2025 as well:

“A massive Armada is heading to Iran. It is moving quickly, with great power, enthusiasm, and purpose. It is a larger fleet, headed by the great Aircraft Carrier Abraham Lincoln, than that sent to Venezuela. Like with Venezuela, it is, ready, willing, and able to rapidly fulfill its mission, with speed and violence, if necessary. Time is running out, it is truly of the essence! As I told Iran once before, MAKE A DEAL! They didn’t, and there was ‘Operation Midnight

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ UN Doc S/2026/51, dated 29 January 2026, “28 January 2026 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council”.

Hammer,’ a major destruction of Iran. The next attack will be far worse!”

26. One could not be clearer in admitting two barbaric aggressions against a sovereign member State of the United Nations in less than 8 months!
27. That said, Iran has never sought escalation, nor has it ever wished to expand the conflict in the region. However, it reaffirms its unwavering resolve to take defensive measures against any aggression directed against its sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the safety and security of its people.
28. It was in this background that Iran legitimately targeted, in its inherent right of self-defense, all the facilities, bases and personnel of the United States and the Israeli regime in the region notwithstanding their location, as previously declared in due manner and time.
29. In a formal communication to the UN Secretary-General and President of the Security Council,¹⁶ the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations, explicitly stated that Iran has directed, and is directing, proportionate defensive operations against the bases and facilities of the aggressors in the region, which “does not, in any manner, imply an encroachment upon the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States hosting such military bases, facilities, and equipment”.
30. Furthermore, as Iran had previously stated, including via letter No. S/2025/466 dated 15 July 2025), under the well-established principle of international law reflected in the legal maxim *sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas*, States are obliged to “use their territory in such a manner as to not cause injury to that of another”. States are therefore required to prevent the forces of foreign States present within their territory from carrying out, or otherwise facilitating or supporting, acts of aggression against another State.
31. The UN General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974 squarely qualifies, in its Article 3(f), as an act of aggression “the action of a

¹⁶ Letter No. 2840502, dated 3 March 2026, by the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations on the exercise of the right of self-defense by Iran.



State in allowing its territory, which it has placed at the disposal of another State, to be used by that other State for perpetrating an act of aggression against a third State.”

32. In this connection, certain actors in the region have attempted to divert the attention of the community of nations by carrying out false flag operations in Iran’s neighboring countries to trigger escalation and new tensions. While Iran remains committed to maintaining and strengthening friendly relations with the countries of the region based on mutual respect, the principle of good-neighborliness and respect for each other’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, nothing can blemish, or otherwise deny, Iran’s inherent right to defend its land and people against the aggressors.

III. Violations of international humanitarian law

33. The US and Israeli regime's armed forces have been committing grave breaches of international humanitarian law (IHL) on a daily basis in Iran since 28 February 2026. The principles of IHL prescribe prohibitions against directly targeting *civilians* (and to *spread terror* among them), directly targeting *civilian objects* (with rules protecting some *specially protected objects*) and *indiscriminate means and methods of warfare*.
34. Even if a lawful military target is attacked, the *proportionality principle* requires that civilians and civilian objects should be protected against the incidental effects of those attacks that may be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated. Certain *precautionary obligations* should also be taken in order to avoid or minimize such incidental effects and to ensure that only lawful targets are attacked.
35. To put the same into context, according to the fundamental *principle of distinction*, drawing from the 1907 Hague regulations, 1949 Geneva Conventions and Protocol I Additional to thereto and customary international law, parties to an armed conflict must distinguish between the civilian population and combatants as well as between civilian objects and military objectives. Only combatants and military objectives may be attacked.
36. The US and Israeli regime, however, violated this principle from day one of the aggression on 28 February 2026 well until the time of writing the present report, by directing attacks against civilians including women and children, as well as civilian objects amongst them schools, hospitals, cultural property and civilian infrastructure.
37. Therefore, the ongoing premeditated acts of aggression of the US and Israeli regime against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran, have bene accompanied by direct targeting of civilian population, and infrastructure of the Islamic Republic of Iran, beginning on 28 February 2026, in defiance of fundamental principles of IHL, some falling squarely within the definition of "war crime" under international law.

38. Civilian infrastructure, residential areas, relief facilities, and sport complexes, among others, have been directly targeted by the aggressors leaving significant loss of civilian lives and destruction of civilian objects, including objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population.
39. Even where military objects have been targeted, the fundamental principle of proportionality have been time and again neglected by the aggressors. In targeting military facilities in Iranian cities, for instance, deliberate disproportionate attacks have been launched with considerable damage to the neighboring civilians and civilian objects without any justification under IHL.
40. Likewise, the aggressors have neglected the fundamental principle of precautionary measures by launching attacks in densely populated areas, including, for instance, during peaceful demonstrations on Friday 13 March 2026 whereby bombardments were carried out in several cities adjacent to ordinary citizens in the streets commemorating the Quds Day. There have also been reports of over-reliance of the aggressors on lethal autonomous weapons systems in clear defiance of well-established principles of IHL, in particular the obligation to take precautionary measures in launching military attacks.
41. The present section provides a glimpse at some instances of such IHL violations by the US and Israeli regime with illustrative instances spanning the first two weeks of their ongoing aggression against the Iranian nation.

A) Attacks targeting civilians or the civilian population

42. Well-established IHL principles dictate that only military objects should be targeted by a party to an armed conflict. Owing from the 1907 Hague regulations, 1949 Geneva Conventions, Protocol I Additional thereto and customary international law, attacks against civilians and civilian population are prohibited.
43. The armed forces of the US and the Israeli regime, however, have targeted civilians from day one of their unprovoked and unjustified aggression against the Iranian nation on 28 February 2026. Children, women and ordinary citizens from all walks of life have not been spared from such attacks.

44. An overview is given at some of the instances of the same during the first two weeks of the aggression.

1. Attacks against children

45. Children remain particularly vulnerable to armed conflict and the US-Israeli regime's aggressors have a long history of targeting children in hostilities. In the first two weeks of their aggression against the Iranian nation in 2026, too, their armed forces have willfully and relentlessly attacked children.
46. As per official reports, 204 children have lost their lives at the hands of the aggressors, 13 of whom were below 5. Moreover, 1275 children have been injured, among whom 45 are under 2 years old!
47. In a brazen war crime, the US and Israeli regime launched a direct military attack against a girls' primary school called "Shajar-e-Tayebeh" in Minab, Hormozgan province. As a result of the attack, which was carried out at 11:15, during the busiest hour of the school time, over 170 innocent schoolgirls and schoolboys, from 7 to 12, were killed, and over 96 individuals were injured. Among the martyrs were some educational staff and students' parents. Many of the victims had their bodies collected after hours of relief operations in the rubbles, some remaining unidentifiable.



A demonstrator holding the pictures of a few martyred students of Shajare-e-Tayebeh primary school in Minab, Hormozgan province; from among over 170 innocent children brutally targeted by the aggressors at 11:15 during school time!

48. The spokesperson of the Ministry of Education clarified that the US and Israeli regime, in a brutal and inhumane act, attacked and bombed this elementary school two times with 264 students inside. The school was completely destroyed. The severity of the damage caused by the attack was such that debris removal operations continued until the next day.



The remnants of an American missile used to bomb the primary school.



The partial photoshoot of the body of one of the schoolgirls fallen victim to an American war

49. This school was located far from any military zone, with zero links with any military site, camp or whatsoever that could possibly raise any presumptions about the attacks being carried out without ill intent. Therefore, no doubt

remains about it being a war crime, as also proved by several official media in the following days.



Demonstrators holding the pictures of schoolgirls martyred by American bombs on the Shajar-e-Tayebe primary school in Minab, Hormozgan.

50. As early as 7 March 2026, UNICEF also confirmed the killing of 180 children in Iran and the injury of many more, including, as a result of direct targeting of 20 schools. According to the latest official figures, which have an unfortunately upward trend, until Friday 13 March 2026, 202 children under 18 years old have lost their lives at the hands of the aggressors, among whom 12 were under 5. The youngest martyr was an 8-month-old girl, and the youngest injured was a 4-month-old girl. 1190 children have further been injured.



Mournful gloomy aerial snapshot of the tombs to embrace the bodies of innocent schoolgirls killed by the direct attacks of American fighter jets.

51. On the very first day of the aggression, the aggressors directly attacked a sports hall in Lamerd county in Fars province by 4 missiles. Two 4th grade primary school students were among those athletes who lost their lives in the war crime.



Elham Za'eri and Helma Sadat Ahmadizadeh, the two 4th graders who were brutally targeted at the Lamerd sports hall in days supposed to be the most jubilant of their lifetime!





Left: Zahra Mohammadi Golpaygani, the 14-year-old grand-daughter of the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ayatollah Seyed Ali Khamene’ei, who lost her life on the first day of the aggression; middle: Zeinab Sahebi, a two-year-old girl losing her life under the rubbles of the aggressors’ missile at the mourning ceremony of Iran’s Supreme Leader; right: Ali Haghshenas, 14 years old, killed by a shrapnel from the aggressors’ missile in his hometown, Shiraz.

52. The international criminal responsibility of all those who have commanded, aided and abetted in the commission of the war crimes against children in Iran remain evident. Iran calls for an independent commission of inquiry to establish the details of these crimes and bring to justice the perpetrators including the President of the United States and the so-called Prime Minister of the Israeli regime.

2. Attacks against women

53. Women remain at the forefront of the Iranian society in terms of social activities as well as security within the family. During armed conflict, any damage to them reverberates with big repercussions in the community at large.
54. Iranian women have been targeted by the US and Israeli regime’s aggressors from day one on 28 February 2026 in grave breach of IHL principles; violations that have been repeated on a daily basis during the ongoing aggression.
55. By 11 March 2026 already, according to official reports, women comprise unfortunately 225 of the civilians who lost their lives at the hands of the US-Zionist aggressors. 2969 women have been wounded, many with lifetime injuries.



With rubbles in the background, a lady injured in the US-Zionist aggression in Tehran.



A lady injured by the indiscriminate attacks of the aggressors in Tehran being helped by the Red Crescent.


- 
56. The aggressors' direct attack by 4 missiles against a sports hall in Lamerd county in Fars province on 28 February 2026 claimed the lives of 18 young female athletes.
 57. The above are not just figures and pictures, but highlight the grave breach of IHL principles and rules by the US and Israeli regime's armed forces against Iranian women that cowardly continue at the time of the writing.

3. Attacks against medical personnel

58. Attacks by the US-Zionist aggressors have targeted, or led to destruction of, some 160 hospitals and healthcare units during the first two weeks of their heinous aggression against the Iranian nation, bringing about the loss of lives and injury of medical personnel.
59. Latest figures confirm the martyrdom of 17 and injury of 101 medical personnel in such wanton attacks.
60. By way of example, on Wednesday 4 March 2026 alone, three healthcare workers were killed by the US-Zionist missiles: Rabab Dehdashti, a radiology expert at Haj Mahmoud Haj Heydari Hospital in Lamerd, Ali Abbasi, an operational expert in the western emergency district of Tehran province, and Ali Aria, a third-year orthopedic assistant at Sina Hospital in Tehran.



In Shiraz, direct military attack against an emergency centre located in Zibashahr Park led to the loss of lives of 20 relief personnel, including medical staff. Satellite imagery confirms the appalling use of a precision-guided missile by the aggressors to target the relief unit!



Medical personnel in several cities have been killed by the US-Zionist aggressors in clear defiance of IHL principles.

61. No matter which standards to apply, these grave breaches of IHL have a single denomination: “war crime”!

B) Attacks intended to spread terror among the civilian population

62. In tandem with direct targeting of civilians and civilian objects, the US-Zionist aggressors carried out certain attacks with the aim of spreading terror among the civilian population. This is yet another breach of IHL principles, as codified in the 1907 Hague regulations, 1949 Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocol I thereto, and well established as a customary rule of IHL.

63. Under established jurisprudence, acts of violence the primary purpose of which is to spread terror among the civilian population only contravene IHL if, in addition to the terror itself, the attack is also directed at individual civilians or the civilian population or it is otherwise indiscriminate.¹⁷ This has been exactly the approach of the United States and the Israel regime during the first two weeks of their aggression against the Iranian nation in particular in their choice of means and methods of warfare.

64. The deliberate targeting of schools, hospitals, residential buildings, alongside attacks devoid of any definite military objectives, which have for instance resulted in the destruction of major highways, have been conducted with the mere intent of instilling fear and terror among the civilian population.

65. Using propaganda through a specific terror-instigating outlet called “Iran International” with a clear history of nexus with acts of terrorism in Iran, US-Zionist criminals have been going the extra mile to instigate terror among the civilian population in Iran. On Friday 13 March 2026, during the peaceful demonstrations held by civilians to commemorate the Quds day in the major streets of some cities in Iran, the US and Israeli jet fighters and drones carried out air raids in close vicinity to the civilian population only with the aim of spreading terror among them.

¹⁷ See Online Casebook, ICTY, *The Prosecutor v. Galić*: A. Trial Chamber, Judgement and Opinion, para 135, as reaffirmed and extended to indiscriminate attacks by *ibid.*, B. Appeals Chamber, Judgement, paras 99–102.

66. This is besides their routine flying of jets at low altitudes in urban areas even when no active air raid is being carried out with the sole purpose of spreading terror among citizens.
67. This is another clear instance of breach of IHL perpetrated by the armed forces of the aggressors during the ongoing aggression.

C) Attacks against civilian objects

68. In IHL, civilian objects are protected and attacks against them constitutes a breach entailing criminal responsibility of the perpetrators. Residential areas, schools, other public and private property should not, in principle, be targeted.
69. The US-Zionist aggressors, however, during the two weeks of their aggression, have directed attacks against thousands of civilian objects throughout Iran.
70. According to the latest reports, a total of 54,550 civilian objects have been destroyed or significantly damaged, of which 36,489 are residential, 6,179 commercial, and 120 schools have also been targeted as civilian objects contrary to IHL principles.
71. Residential areas, schools, sport complexes and industrial units have been particularly targeted by attacks, as briefly touched upon below.

1. Attacks against residential areas

72. Under IHL, residential areas should not generally be made object of attacks. Directing attacks against homes and residential complexes are therefore regarded as unlawful attacks against civilian objects and in grave breach of IHL.
73. According to the Iranian Red Crescent, during the two weeks of the ongoing aggression, a total of 54,550 homes have been totally or partially destroyed by the aggressor's missiles.

74. This figure translates into more than 3000 homes per day. Many of these are no longer livable. It speaks volumes about the level of respect for IHL by the aggressors: a total disdain for IHL principles, in particular distinction between civilian and military objects, the proportionality principle and precautionary measures.

2. Attacks against schools

75. Some 120 schools have been targeted by the armed forces of the US and Israeli regime during the first two weeks of their aggression against the Iranian nation, leading to the loss of lives of at least 195 students and teachers.

76. In a single brazen attack alone, the egregious raid upon the “Shajar-e-Tayebeh” girls’ primary school in Minab, Hormozgan province, led to the martyrdom of more than 170 student, as seen in sub-section III-A-1 above.


77. In another cowardly attack on 28 February 2026, another girls’ primary school in Khomein, a city in mid-Iran, 2 civilians lost their lives and 5 were injured. The school sustained significant damage.

78. In Parand, Tehran province, 3 schools were targeted by missiles leaving them seriously damaged.



Sayyah Moghaddam, Payambar Azam and Velayat were three schools damaged by the missiles of the armed forces of the US and Israeli regime.

79. In Urmia, another girls' school "Esmat" sustained considerable damage.



A snapshot of the rubbles of Esmat girls' school in Urmia, in north-western Iran, which was severely damaged by the US and Israeli regime's air raids.

80. In Abyek, Qazvin, the “Imam Reza” boys’ school was targeted by cowardly strikes of the aggressors leading to the martyrdom of a student and injury of some.



The Imam Reza boys’ school in Abyek, Qazvin, was seriously damaged. An innocent schoolboy was killed and 3 of his schoolmates were injured.

81. Schools in other cities have similarly sustained damage in disproportionate military attacks of the aggressors. In Kurdistan, Hijab girls’ high school sustained severe damage. In Tehran, Hedayat school in Square 72 in Narmak, the Al-Yasin school in district 4, Allameh-Helli school in district 6, Shahid Hamedani school in district 7, and Shahid Mahallati school in district 12 were partially destroyed.



Aftermath of a classroom damaged by US and Israeli regime's missiles. These cowardly attacks instill terror among innocent students.

3. Attacks against sport complexes

82. Even sports venues have not been spared from the aggressors' unlawful attacks against civilian objects.
83. Tehran's Azadi Stadium, which can hold 12,000 people, was targeted and destroyed on Thursday, 31 March 2026. According to the relevant authorities, the 12,000-seat Azadi Hall, located in the Azadi Complex in Tehran, was deliberately targeted and destroyed.
 1. Due to this direct attack, the dormitory complex of the Cycling Federation and the new building of the federation were destroyed. The office of the Azadi Sports Complex was also located on the ground floor of the 12,000-seat hall. The blast wave also caused serious damage to the championship pool of the Azadi Sports Complex, which is located opposite to the 12,000-seat hall, and parts of the Rowing Federation. The camp for national judo teams was targeted and destroyed in the same series of criminal air raids.

84. The massive explosion in one of the country's most iconic sports buildings created a scene that many Iranian sports enthusiasts found unbelievable; the building, which had hosted historic moments in the country's sports for decades, collapsed in smoke and fire, joining part of the collective memories of sports fans.



The 12000-seat Azadi Stadium, an icon of the collective memory of generations of athletes, ruined by 7 missiles in the deliberate attacks of the US and Israeli regime.

85. Apart from the Azadi complex, Be'sat Sports Complex, known as Mothers' Sports Hall, in south-eastern Tehran, was made the object of a cowardly attack by 7 missiles from the US and Israeli regime's fighter jets. Shahid Esma'eili Sports Complex and Eskandarlou Sports Hall were the other two civilian objects devoted to sports that were targeted by the criminals in broad daylight and in defiance of IHL principles.
86. In one of the most horrific of these crimes, the aggressors directed an attack on a Sport Hall in Lamerd, Fars province, which claimed the lives of 19 innocent people, some of them girl volleyball players and some boy footballers playing in Shahid Na'eimi Hall adjacent to the same.



The armed forces of the US and Israeli regime several sports complexes in Iran. Under IHL, such wanton attacks are grave breaches of provisions of Geneva Conventions and as such war crimes.

4. Attacks against manufacturing and industrial units

87. Manufacturing and industrial units throughout Iran have been targeted by attacks. For example, some units in the Abbas Abad Industrial Park in Pakdasht in Tehran Province were damaged in airstrikes by the US and the Israeli regime. The damages to manufacturing units have been heavy. For example, in a missile attack on a food production unit in the Ghazal Industrial

Park in Khoramdarreh in Zanjan Province, 9 employees of the complex were injured.



The aftermath of attacks on a densely populated area in Sanandaj, Kordestan province.

88. The above was just a glimpse at the heinous attacks carried out by the aggressors against residential areas, schools, sport complexes as well as industrial units. But there have been random attacks at other civilian objects as well. For instance, two points on the Zanjan-Qazvin freeway were hit by missiles, in which 30 innocent civilians present at Pasargad restaurant complex and the intersection bridge were martyred.



89. The attacks by the aggressors thus far have manifestly fallen short of meeting basic standards and principles of IHL including distinction between civilian and military objects, the principle of necessity as well as the principle of proportionality;
90. As a reminder, the proportionality principle protects civilian objects from the incidental effects of those attacks that may be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated from carrying out the attack. the result of such a heinous conduct bringing about significant damage to civilian objects including public and private property. Accountability and reparation remain pivotal in this respect.

D) Attacks targeting specially protected objects

91. While IHL prohibits attacks targeting civilian objects, as enshrined in 1907 Hague regulations, 1949 Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocol I and

The aftermath of direct attacks against civilian objects in Shahid Fakouri neighborhood, Tehran.

as a rule of customary international law, it also bans attacks against specially protected objects. These are subject to a particular protective regime and their targeting engages international criminal responsibility of the perpetrators as a war crime. This category of specially protected objects includes cultural heritage, medical units and transports, objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population, and the natural environment.

92. In this section, a snapshot of the IHL violations perpetrated by the armed forces of the US and the Israeli regime with respect to the said specially protected objects is provided.


1. Attacks against cultural heritage

93. While it includes tangible and intangible cultural heritage, cultural property protection during armed conflict is governed by the general IHL rules protecting civilians and civilian objects that comprise cultural heritage, as well as by specific rules contained in particular in the 1954 Hague Convention for

the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its two Protocols adopted in The Hague under the auspices of UNESCO, as well as in the Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions.

94. Cultural property is thus gradated according to each category's importance for a particular people or all of humanity. More specifically, while acts of hostility directed against "historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples" are prohibited under IHL (as codified in both 1977 Additional Protocols), the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage expressly prohibits damaging tangible cultural heritage it covers in an armed conflict.
95. Cultural property encompasses intangible aspects of cultural heritage that reflect the cultural and spiritual identity of a given group, such as rituals, traditions, beliefs, knowledge, language, music and theatre. Therefore, targeting cultural property not only constitutes a direct assault against a nation and its values but in some cases one against humanity.
96. The US-Israeli aggressors targeted Iranian cultural property in the first two weeks of their aggression against the Iranian nation. Throughout the country, 56 sites including museums, historical monuments and other cultural property sustained damage. In Tehran, Golestan Palace, the historical Arg citadel, Grand Bazaar, Marmar Palace, the historical municipality mansion, the old Senate building, Sepahsalar Mosque and Farahabad Palace-Museum were damaged. In Isfahan, Naqsh-e-Jahan complex, Chehel-Sotoun Palace, Grand Masjid-Shah Mosque and parts of the historical areas of the city were destroyed. In Kurdistan, Salar Sa'eid Mansion (Archaeological Museum of Sanandaj), Khosro Abad Museum, and Asef Vaziri Mansion were damaged. In Lorestan, the historical Falak-ol-Aflak Castle, in Kermanshah, Biglarbeigi Takiyah, historical Kazzazi High School, in Bushehr Sabzabad Mansion, the White House historical home in Siraf Port, and finally in Ilam, the Darreh-shahr Archaeological Museum sustained damage as a result of the attacks.
97. In Tehran, on 1 March 2026, Golestan Palace, a centuries-old landmark officially inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2013, sustained damage by the aggressors' missiles despite observance of protective protocols

such as installation of a Blue Shield on the rooftop, an international symbol of inviolability of cultural heritage in armed conflict under the Hague Convention.



The aftermath of attacks against Golestan Palace in Tehran. Considerable damage has been inflicted upon this invaluable cultural heritage of universal recognition.

98. According to official reports, the damage has been extensive and includes destruction of windows, arches, intricate designs, and damage to the Mirror Hall. The Mirror Hall is over 120 years old. The restoration of this hall had been completed recently. The most exquisite arches were behind the throne of Nasser-al-Din Shah, 80% of which were destroyed during the 1st March attacks.
99. Again in Tehran, a historic gallery-café next to the Azadi Square, which is a symbolic national heritage, has also sustained damage by the US-Israeli regime's war crimes.
100. Isfahan, in particular, has seen considerable damage to its historical sites. Iran's capital during three eras, the city is home to a collection of cultural heritage from Al Buyeh, Seljukian and Safavid posing as a living museum of different historic eras in Iran.

101. On the 9th day of the aggression, following attacks on Pasdaran Street near Naghsh-e Jahan Square, in Isfahan, some of the tiles of the northern and western iwans of the Shah Mosque suffered damage; and the following day on 8 March 2026, in the same historic city, the Chehel Sotoun Pavillion and Garden Museum in Isfahan, listed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, suffered severe damage in their Safavid-period decorations.
102. The heavy bombing of the city on the following day on 9 March 2026 brought about some damage to other invaluable historical sites in Isfahan including a collection of artifacts from the Safavid Palace located next to the Provincial Governorate building, including the Teimuri Hall, the Jobeh-Khane Mansion (Contemporary Art Museum), the Rakib-Khane Mansion (Isfahan Decorative Arts Museum), the Ashraf Hall, and the Chehel Sotoun Palace Museum.
103. Some window-panes and glass panels of the Ali Qapou Mansion in Naghsh-e Jahan Square were also damaged due to the intensity of the bombings.



During the unlawful attacks of the armed forces of the US and the Israeli regime against Masjid Shah in Isfahan, the invaluable decoration of the walls sustained significant damage.

104. In the attack on the arena and privacy of Falak-ol-Aflak historic castle in Khorramabad, a number of buildings and spaces of this historic complex were damaged. During the attacks, the construction of the Lorestan cultural heritage department was destroyed, and parts of the archaeological museum and the museum of anthropology stationed in the castle were severely damaged. In addition, structures such as barracks, regiment building and some surrounding historic spaces sustained damage. The attack was carried out while the international seal of the Blue Shield was installed as a symbol for the protection of cultural heritage in armed conflict on the roof of the complex.
105. Given the above wanton destruction of Iranian cultural heritage, the UNESCO has also expressed deep concern over the security of cultural, educational, and environmental sites and warned of threats against world heritage and educational infrastructure.

2. Attacks against medical units and transports

106. Medical units (including hospitals) and transports also benefit from special protection under IHL. These facilities, either fixed or mobile, include blood transfusion centres, medical depots and medical and pharmaceutical stores, as well as ambulances and must be respected and protected without distinction as to their being used for legitimate military or civilian purposes.
107. The US-Zionist aggressors, however, in the first two weeks of their heinous aggression against the Iranian nation, launched attacks, both directly and indirectly, against medical units and transports in different cities in Iran in grave breach of IHL. According to latest reports, 153 health centres, 36 clinics, and 46 emergency units have been partially destroyed, 13 ambulances totally ruined and 6 hospitals completely evacuated.
108. On the second day of the ongoing aggression on 1 March 2026, the aggressors targeted the Gandhi Hospital in Tehran. A 17-storey hospital with a 21-storey hotel, which was also home to an embryonic bank, turned into ruins at the hands of the war criminals.

109. On the same day, 7 other medical centers in the country were also targeted on the same day, i.e. Abuzar Hospital in Ahvaz, three emergency bases in Sarab, Chabahr, and Hamadan cities, Khatam-ol-Anbiya and Motahari hospitals in Tehran, as well as the Comprehensive Rehabilitation Center of the Red Crescent which provides specialized medical and rehabilitation services to patients and differently abled citizens. In similar coordinated attacks, the Artesh Hospital was severely damaged.
110. On 3 March 2026, too, projectiles fired by the Zionist-American aggressors on the “Shohadaye Sar-e-pol-e-Zahab” hospital caused damage to this medical center in the Kermanshah province. Moreover, a field hospital in Salas Babajani County in this province was completely destroyed around 10 a.m. on this date in the aftermath of a missile attack by both regimes. Since a large number of patients and civilians were injured, the patients, especially dialysis patients, were forced to evacuate the hospital. This medical unit had emergency, dialysis, and inpatient (internal and pediatric) sections, all of which were unfortunately completely destroyed.
111. On 6 March 2026, Imam Ali Hospital in Andimeshk, Khuzestan Province, was destroyed due to a wave of missile attacks. This occurred while the hospital’s health staff were providing service to patients. Razi Hospital in Ahvaz, Khuzestan Province, was also damaged due to the wave of projectile explosions.





An The Gandhi Hospital in Tehran sustained severe damage after the US-Israeli attacks on 1 March
Mε 2026.

112. On 11 March 2026, the sole marine emergency unit of the country in Hormuz Island, southern Iran, which was transferring patients from Hormuz Island to Bandar Abbas, was targeted and completely destroyed by the aggressors. Following the American-Zionist crimes, at noon of this day, the marine ambulance stationed at “Shahideh Fatemeh Nik” pier in Hormoz Island was hit by missiles.
113. On 7 March 2026, the Head of the Iranian Medical System Organization, in an interview with SNNTV stated that more than 20 hospitals were targeted in the recent war, and over 10 medical staff, including a nurse and three emergency technicians, were martyred. He emphasized that unfortunately, more than 30 percent of the civilian martyrs in the past week were children.
114. In sum, medical units and transports have been targeted by the armed forces of the US and Israeli regime during the past two weeks.
115. The above illustrates a clear pattern of willful targeting of medical units and transports by the US-Zionist aggressors, as well as lack of precaution in launching attacks, both of which constitute grave breaches of principles of IHL.

3. Attacks against objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population

116. Objects indispensable for the survival of the civilian population, such as energy infrastructure, drinking water, irrigation systems, and oil reserves are normally civilian objects that should not be attacked in the conduct of hostilities. The special protection regime protecting such objects prescribes additional considerations that must be accounted for in terms of distinction, proportionality and precautionary measures.
117. The US-Zionist aggressors, however, have directly attacked, and inflicted damage upon, certain objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population in Iran.
118. On 6 March 2026, the aggressors directly attacked water treatment and desalination facilities as well as some of the water and electricity facilities of MAPNA corporation in Qeshm, southern Iran. The facilities provided 12000 to 15000 litres of drinking water of the Qeshm Island. The egregious attack therefore deprived 30 villages from fresh water in clear disregard for fundamental IHL principles.



Targeting direct attacks on civilian objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population is forbidden under IHL. Water desalination facilities in Qeshm is a clear example of such objects which was cowardly targeted by the US and Israeli aggressors.

119. On 7 March 2026, the aggressors directed deliberate attacks against several oil storage and transport facilities in Shahrān, Aghdasiyeh and Ray, in Tehran province, as well as Fardis, in Alborz province. The attacks were launched with the knowledge that day-to-day petroleum consumption of the civilian population in Iran are dependent on the said facilities.
120. Furthermore, in another egregious attack against civilian infrastructure in Tehran, on 7 March 2026, direct attacks were made against electricity facilities which caused disruptions in daily lives of the civilian population in 130 to 140 areas.
121. Targeting such facilities and infrastructure not only contravene IHL principles, but undermine fundamental human rights of the civilian population and brings about the international criminal responsibility of the perpetrators.

4. Attacks against the natural environment

122. Specific IHL rules protect the natural environment against widespread, long-term and severe damage, as reflected in particular in Additional Protocol I and as a customary rule of IHL. In this context, not only deliberate attacks against the natural environment are prohibited but incidental effects of attacks should be weighed against proportionality and precautionary principles.
123. The Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (ENMOD) also provides specific protection to the environment. States parties to the ENMOD undertake not to “engage in military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage or injury to any State party”. The travaux préparatoires of the Convention clearly indicate that unlike Article 55 of Protocol I, these are not cumulative but alternative.¹⁸
124. It is also widely accepted that the precautionary principle requires that in case of a lack of scientific certainty the attacker is not absolved from the obligation

¹⁸ See ‘Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament’ in UNGA, Official Records of the 31st Session (1976) UN Doc A/31/27, 91–2.

to take all feasible precautionary measures in military operations for the benefit of the environment.

125. During the second week of their aggression, the US-Zionist aggressors directly attacked several oil storage facilities in some cities including Tehran, Alborz and Tabriz, which led to the release of a considerable volume of pollutants in the air. It was purely foreseeable that such a method of warfare would lead to damage to the natural environment. This is not only against the IHL principle of distinction, but is a direct crime against the natural environment. Due to the long-standing effects of the pollutants on oil, water and the ecology at large, such an egregious act is an act of ecocide undermining the rights of the present and future generations.
126. On 9 March 2026, the Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) warned of the consequences of attacks on Iran and Lebanon, stating that the escalation of tensions in the Middle East could pose serious risks to public health across the region. He emphasized that the damage to oil facilities in Iran may lead to food contamination, environmental impacts, and climate changes; particularly dangerous for children, the elderly, and those with health preconditions.



Unlawful targeting of oil reservoirs in Fardis, Alborz province, led to significant damage to the natural environment endangering human health and the integrity of the ecosystem.

127. On 12 March 2026, the Deputy for National Environment and Biodiversity of the Environmental Protection Organization voiced concern about the serious consequences of the ongoing aggression on the Iranian natural environment, in particular, the Zagros region; as one of the 32 global hotspots of biodiversity and endemism, from West Azerbaijan and Kurdistan to Fars Province, Zagros is under extensive bombing and this poses a serious threat to this valuable ecosystem which is home to 242 endemic plant species.
128. Damage to such a rich natural environment is not confined to Iran and will be borne by the international community, which is definitely an aggravating factor for the US-Zionist war criminals.

E) Attacks against law enforcement centres

129. IHL holds that civilian objects should not, in principle, be attacked in hostilities. An object failing to meet these two criteria cumulatively is not military objective and therefore cannot be attacked: first, the targeted object's 'nature, location, purpose or use' must contribute effectively to the enemy's military action at the time of the attack; second, the object's total or even partial destruction, capture or neutralization must also offer the attacking party a 'definite military advantage' under the 'circumstances ruling at the time'. Police and law enforcement centres, buildings, headquarters and facilities are therefore civilian objects and must not be made object of attacks.
130. In the course of their outrageous crimes of aggression against Iran, however, the US and the Israeli regime deliberately targeted law enforcement centres including, urban police stations and precincts, border posts, diplomatic police headquarters, the national Interpol office and other buildings and equipment devoted to maintaining law and order in many cities. This is in violation of IHL rules since such objects did not contribute to the military operation at the time of the attacks.
131. Such conduct also runs afoul of fundamental human rights of the Iranian people and undermines their security. It therefore engages international responsibility of the aggressors as well as criminal responsibility of all those involved in commission of the said grave breaches.



Wanton attacks by the US-Zionist aggressors against a diplomatic police centre in Tehran in pure defiance of IHL: targeting a civilian object with civilians present inside!



F) Attacks against civil defence organizations

132. Under IHL, personnel and material exclusively dedicated to civil defence tasks are protected, and such personnel must be allowed to pursue their tasks. Humanitarian tasks entrusted to civil defense organizations include protection of the civilian population against the dangers arising from hostilities or other disasters, to help it recover from their immediate effects and to provide the conditions necessary for its survival.
133. In Iran, such humanitarian tasks including warning, evacuation, management of shelters, management of blackout measures, rescue, medical services in disasters including first aid, firefighting, detection and marking of danger areas are entrusted to the Red Crescent movement, and national vigilant forces (Basij). Many buildings devoted to their work have been bombarded by the US and Israeli regime forces during the ongoing aggression in contravention of IHL principles.
134. On the first day of the aggression, in accordance with official reports, 13 Red Crescent bases in various counties, including Mahabad, Khomeyn, etc., were targeted and damaged leading to some of them running completely inactive. The Red Crescent building in Mahabad, Kurdistan Province, was also hit in missiles from the American-Zionist aerial attacks.
135. The above attacks are clearly violative of fundamental principles of IHL raising responsibility of the perpetrators.

G) Attacks against airports serving international civil aviation

136. IHL norms and principles as enshrined in the Geneva Conventions, Additional Protocol I, and as reflected in customary law, prohibit attacks on civilian infrastructures including airports and airplanes serving civil aviation. The US and Israeli regime's criminals, however, targeted Iranian airports and planes serving international civil aviation in sheer disregard for fundamental IHL principles.

137. On the March 7, the aggressors launched an attacked attack against Kish Airport, an airport with a very busy schedule of international civil aviation. Projectiles striking the airport caused damage to two Homa passenger planes, destroying part of the runway, and damaging its maritime radar equipment.
138. On March 3, in another heinous attack in Bushehr, the airport was made object of a military operation causing serious damage to part of the runway. An Airbus passenger plane was also completely destroyed.
139. In another unlawful armed attack, on 14 March 2026, a large part of the Khark Airport was destroyed and damaged.
140. The Mehrabad airport in the capital has not been spared from unlawful attacks by the aggressors. According to satellite images, at least seven passenger planes were completely destroyed in military operations of the aggressors carried out on 7 March 2026. A government ceremonial plane was also significantly damaged in the attack.

IV. War crimes

141. As clearly seen in the preceding chapter, leaders and armed forces of the US and Israeli regime have committed violations of IHL in countless instances on every single day since the onset of the ongoing aggression on 28 February 2026. While these continue at the time of writing, many of them constitute war crimes and engage international criminal responsibility of their perpetrators and the international responsibility of the States harboring these criminals.
142. War crimes are indeed denominations given to prohibited conduct in armed conflict as violations of IHL provisions including those enshrined in the Geneva Conventions or crystalized as custom.
143. Many of the IHL violations illustrated in the present report give rise to war crimes. Even attacks directed at legitimate military objectives in certain instances are war crimes since they are expected to cause clearly excessive incidental harm to civilians, and because they are launched reclessly.
144. Although to determine who is the responsible individual and to bring that individual before a court and prove their guilt beyond reasonable doubt is subject to jurisdictional and substantive limitations, the command responsibility of the US president and the so-called Prime Minister of the Israeli regime for the war crimes committed in the ongoing aggression is evident.
145. A few instances of these war crimes are given below.

Directing attacks against “Shajar-e-Tayebah” primary school in Minab, Hormozgan

146. While examples are regrettably manifold, the attack on the primary school in Minab, Hormozgan Province, on 28 February 2026 in broad daylight, is a clear instance of the war crime.
147. The attack led to the killing of more than 170 innocent civilians mainly children. It therefore fulfills the physical element of “willful killing” as a grave

breach of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, as also codified in Article 8(2)(a)(i) of the Rome Statute.

148. Apart from the above, intentionally directing attacks against the civilian population as such or against individual civilians not taking direct part in hostilities constitutes a war crime (under Article 8(2)(b)(i) of the Rome Statute).
149. Likewise, intentionally directing attacks against civilian objects, that is, objects which are not military objectives (as per Article 8 (2) (b) (ii) of the Rome Statute) also constitutes a war crime.



Credible media confirm as modus operandi of the war crime against the school being “double-tap strikes” leaving no doubt about the willful nature of the attack.



The high number of casualties in the war crime and its atrocity speaks volumes about the intentions of the criminals.

150. Targeting Shajar-e-Tayebe school as a civilian object holding a civilian population at the time of attack therefore fulfils all the elements required for a war crime under international law, including as criminalized under the Rome Statute.

Directing attacks against oil depots

151. Apart from the fact that directing attacks against civilian objects is a war crime (as per Article 8 (2) (b) (ii)), intentionally launching an attack in the knowledge that such attack will cause incidental loss of life or injury to civilians or damage to civilian objects or widespread, long-term and severe damage to the natural environment which would be clearly excessive in relation to the concrete and direct overall military advantage anticipated is another instance of war crime (Article 8 (2) (b) (iv) of the Rome Statute).
152. The US and Israeli regime's attacks against oil reserves in Iran have been premeditated and intentional.
153. Targeting three oil depots in Shahrān, Kouhak, Aqhdasieh/Souhanak, all in Tehran, and directly attacking fuel facilities in Fardis, Alborz, and other

related infrastructure for transfer and distribution of oil products in Tehran and Alborz are clear examples of war crimes in the abovesaid contexts.



Infrastructure for urban fuel transport and distribution are civilian objects by nature and prohibition of attacks against them is double-pronged: attacks against civilian objects and potential severe damage to the natural environment.

154. Launching attacks against oil depots and facilities further risks releasing chemicals detrimental to human health as well as the natural environment. Some of the repercussions of such releases are widespread, severe and long-term and therefore susceptible of crimes against the environment.
155. In Tehran, specifically, release of pollutants as a result of attacks on oil depots have inflicted everlasting and irreversible damage on centuries-old historical monuments.

Hegseth's declaration that no quarter will be given

156. Pete Hegseth, Secretary of War of the US stated at a Pentagon press briefing on Friday, 13 Mars 2026: "We will keep pressing. We will keep pushing, keep advancing, no quarter, no mercy for our enemies". This statement is a classic display of war crime (as under Article 8 (2) (b) (xii) of the Rome Statute).
157. Under international humanitarian law, ordering that no quarter will be given, threatening an adversary therewith or conducting hostilities on this basis is absolutely prohibited. This prohibition has long been codified in multiple

international instruments, among them Hague Convention IV to which the United States is a party. It has also gained an undisputable customary status, and a crime under international instruments and laws of many jurisdictions across the world.

158. Conduct of hostilities by the US and the Israeli regime clearly confirms the plausibility of the statement made by the US' Secretary of War. Repeating war crimes on a daily basis is astonishingly commensurate with his declaration of no quarter.

Directing attack on the Iranian frigate "Dena"

159. The Iranian frigate "Dena" set off on a student internship maritime mission with a number of students on board from Imam Khomeini University in Nowshahr, a small city in northern Iran. This mission was planned before the start of the criminal aggression of the US and the Israeli regime against the Islamic Republic of Iran, which commenced on 28 February 2026.
160. Before the start of this mission, Iran had been invited by India to participate in the MILAN exercise. In this mission, Dena departed for India to participate in the exercise and arrived in the Indian port of "Bishakhapatnam" in the Bay of Bengal on February 29th as planned. The exercise programs began on the February 27th and were followed in two coastal and sea phases respectively until February 26th and from 1 until 5 March 2026. On 6 March 2026, Dena left India for Sri Lanka to join the student fleet.
161. It was on this route that Dena was unfortunately subjected to a cowardly and terrorist attack by American forces. On 14 March 2026, a US Navy submarine targeted and sank the frigate in the Indian Ocean, about 40 nautical miles (about 74 km) off the southern coast of Sri Lanka, near the city of Galle.

162. In this attack, which was carried out with a torpedo, from the total of 140 crew members on board, at least 87 crew members were martyred and 32 more injured. The injured were then rescued by the Sri Lankan Navy. 20 are still missing though.



Directing deliberate attacks by the US armed forces against an Iranian frigate “Dena” far from the battlefield claimed the lives of at least 87 crew members.

163. While the frigate and the students on board were miles away from the battlefield, were on a training mission void of any contribution to military operation, its deliberate targeting by the US forces is an embarrassing cowardly war crime. More shocking was perhaps the shameful statement of the US President following the war crime who described the crime as “entertaining”!

164. War crimes should not go unpunished. The community of nations and relevant international organizations should act to end the cycle of such crimes and confront the culture of impunity by bringing the criminals to justice. Silence and inaction will only breed injustice and engender further crimes at the expense of continuous threats against international peace and security.



165. The stigmatizing effect of the US and Israeli regime's war crimes should end the vicious circle of atrocities against innocent people upon a decisive action by the community of nations.

V. Crimes against humanity

166. A crime against humanity involves the commission of certain inhumane acts against a civilian population, such as murder, when committed in the context of a widespread or systematic attack, backed by a State policy (Article 7 of the ICC Statute and “Elements of Crimes”).
167. Countless civilians have been systematically targeted by the US and the Israeli regime in, and in relation to, the Islamic Republic of Iran. These instances of “murder” constitute crimes against humanity once committed in the context of a widespread or systematic attack. Murdering members of the civilian population during a widespread and systematic international armed conflict does count as a crime against humanity since it is backed by a State policy.
168. In a series of heinous crimes against the members of the law enforcement of the Islamic Republic of Iran, co-perpetrated by the US and the Israeli regime in the ongoing aggression, members of the civilian population, who were non-combatants and not participating in armed conflict at the time of the attack, have been directly and willfully targeted. These crimes are similarly committed in the context of a widespread and systematic attack, within the framework of an international armed conflict, and are further directed against the civilian population; finally, the State policy behind them is more than evident given the official statements of the US-Zionist leaders to the effect that plans are put in place to directly attack law enforcement and security centres in Iran.
169. Many of the instances of attacks against civilians in the ongoing aggression are crimes against humanity in the sense of Article (7) (1) (a) with all the required elements. In this context, again, the international criminal responsibility of all those individuals who commanded, aided, instigated, abetted or otherwise encouraged the commission of these crimes is engaged.
170. While jurisdictional hurdles exist, there remains little option but to witness decisive action on the part of the community of nations to end the vicious cycle of such crimes and to bring the criminals to justice.

VI. Targeting the Head of State and high-level State officials

171. On 28 February 2026, in the course of the new series of unprovoked and unjustified acts of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran — in flagrant violation of Article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations — the United States and the Israeli regime deliberately targeted the Highest Official of a sovereign Member of the United Nations, i.e the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ayatollah Seyed Ali Khamene’ei, along with several other high-level State officials. This cowardly criminal act constitutes a direct assault on the very core principles of international law, including the prohibition on the use of force, the respect for sovereign equality, and the inviolability and immunity of Heads of State. It represents a dangerous and unprecedented escalation that strikes at the most fundamental norms of statehood and civilized conduct among nations.
172. Heads of State embody the sovereignty of their nations and, under international law, enjoy inviolability, respect, and immunity indispensable for the independent performance of their official functions. The deliberate targeting of the Highest Official of the Islamic Republic of Iran, therefore, constitutes a grave and unprecedented breach of the most fundamental norms governing relations among States. Such conduct does not merely violate established principles of international law; it recklessly opens a dangerous Pandora’s box, eroding the bedrock of sovereign equality and the stability of the international system. Moreover, the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ayatollah Seyed Ali Khamene’ei, is not only the Highest Official, but also a highly respected religious figure for tens of millions of Muslims in the region and around the world. Such an attack carries profound and far-reaching consequences, the full responsibility for which rests solely with the perpetrators. This is without prejudice to the inherent and unequivocal right of the Islamic Republic of Iran to defend its sovereignty, territorial integrity, and people, in full conformity with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.
173. The aforementioned act was carried out in manifest disregard of binding principles of international law and customary international law, including those reflected in the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of



Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons. It engages the international responsibility of the wrongdoing States concerned, as well as the individual criminal responsibility of the President of the United States, the so-called Prime Minister of the Israeli regime, and all individuals involved in planning, ordering, authorizing, committing, or otherwise aiding and abetting this criminal act. The foregoing is without prejudice to accountability for the ongoing war crimes, crimes against humanity, and the crime of aggression being committed by the United States and the Israeli regime.

174. All States should be alarmed by this crime since their inaction or silence could pave the grounds for further normalization of international law by terrorists.

VII. Foreign interference

175. The principle of non-intervention is a well-established principle of international law and a corollary of equal sovereignty of States. Emanating from the UN Charter, the principle has been further reaffirmed in several international instruments including UNGA Resolution 2625 (XXV) on Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations of 24 October 1970 and UNGA Resolution 2131 (XX) concerning Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, of 21 December 1965, as well as the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States of 9 December 1981, among others.
176. In the recent weeks, this principle has been seriously threatened with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran by interventionist statements made by certain figures concerning the recent protests in Iran which squarely fall within the scope of purely internal affairs of the country.
177. There is ample evidence concerning the active role of certain foreign intelligence agents igniting the unrest and mobilizing rioters in the field. This has been based on a pre-planned agenda initially disguised as peaceful protests and later acting with naked weapons in broad daylight. This has been also reaffirmed by certain public figures such as Turkish and Serb authorities and reported by numerous news outlets including Reuters and Wall Street Journal. Nonetheless, clear direct messages by certain present and former governmental authorities need no further evidence.
178. Under international law, the US and the Israeli regime bear international responsibility for use of force as well as intervention. Breach of Article 2 (4) of the UN Charter and Article 2 (7) give rise to this responsibility along with a duty to make compensation for all the damages incurred. Furthermore, under Article 8 of the ILC's draft Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, the conduct of a person or group of persons are considered an act of a State if such persons act on the instruction of, or under the direction or control of that State. The US, in particular, is under a duty to cease its wrongful acts and to effect the said compensation through apology

and reparation of all the moral and material damage incurred to the Iranian nation. This is particularly relevant considering the declared role of the US in instigation, encouragement and provision of aid or assistance, direction and control with respect to the acts of vandalism and terrorism in Iran.

179. Blatant intervention in domestic affairs and gross violation of, inter alia, the sovereign and inalienable right of Iran to choose its economic system, as well as its political, social, and cultural systems without outside interference, coercion, or threat, have been among the standard illegitimate policies of the United States.
180. In pursuance of this illegal interventionist policy against the people and government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the United States has employed various means and instrumentalities which encompass a broad range of unlawful acts including acts of aggression.
181. In January 2026 terrorist groups backed by the United States and the Israeli regime turned peaceful protests of people over economic conditions resulting from the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures imposed by the US, into violent and brutal terrorist activities ruthlessly killing innocent civilians and law enforcement forces. The United States and its child-killing accomplice have been explicit on their malicious intention to initiate aggression on the bases of fabricated pretexts.
182. Having supported the terrorist activities, Donald Trump on 2 January 2026 called these violent and organized criminal activities “peaceful protests” and clearly underlined his administration intention to intervene including by use of force stating that “we are locked and loaded and ready to go”.¹⁹
183. On 9 January 2026, Donald Trump, leveling false allegations against the Islamic Republic of Iran and supporting violence and destruction in Iran by organized criminal groups, once again threatened to use force against the Islamic Republic of Iran on the pretext of protests emphasizing that “you better not start shooting because we’ll start shooting too”.²⁰

¹⁹<https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/trump-says-us-will-intervene-if-iran-violently-suppresses-peaceful-protests-2026-01-02/>

²⁰ <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/iran-cut-off-world-supreme-leader-warns-protesters-2026-01-09/>

184. On 10 January 2026, Marco Rubio, the Secretary of States of the United States, expressed support to foreign-backed terrorist elements by calling them “brave people of Iran” while these individuals evidently as the behest of the United States had killed hundreds of innocent peaceful protestors and passersby as well as law enforcement personnel who were entrusted as per domestic law to ensure safety and security of people in the face of the growing violence of foreign-backed elements.²¹
185. On 13 January 2026, Donald Trump, once again, openly incited to terrorism and explicitly instigated terrorist elements to vandalize public institutions stating “take over your institutions” as a desperate means to provide a fertile ground for further intervention and use of force by the United States against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Trump later on confirmed this intention by stating that “help is on its way”.²²
186. In weeks that followed these statements, the United States continued and increased its threats to use force against the Islamic Republic of Iran under various concocted pretexts. The interventionist and belligerent rhetoric of the United States was exponentially accompanied by unlawful presence of US military forces in the region in preparation of its aggressions. For example, On 23 January 2026, Donald Trump referred to the US military buildup in the region in an exercise to escalate its threats to use force against the Islamic Republic of Iran and stated: “we have a lot of ships going that direction, just in case. I’d rather not see anything happen, but we’re watching them very closely ... we have an armada ... heading in that direction, and maybe we won’t have to use it.”²³
187. On 28 February 2026, the United States along with its genocidal ally launched premediated and unprovoked aggression against the Islamic Republic of Iran. On the same day, Donald Trump further exposed the United States’ long-entrenched policy and practice of intervention intermingled with aggression against the Islamic Republic of Iran stating, “when we are finished, take over

²¹ <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/rubio-expresses-us-support-iranian-people-amidst-anti-government-protests-2026-01-10/>

²² <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/trump-tells-iranians-keep-protesting-says-help-is-its-way-2026-01-13/>

²³ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/jan/23/trump-says-us-armada-heading-middle-east-iran-death-toll>

your government.” This statement clearly lays bare the aggression of the United States as part of its broader policy of coercion, intimidation and the use of force aimed at compelling people and their government, against their will, to submit to the illegitimate demands of the United States.

188. The hostile and interventionist statements continued even after the start of the aggression setting a dangerous precedent for further escalation. After initiating the act of aggression by cowardly targeting the Supreme Leader of Iran, the President of the US has outrageously confessed to this heinous crime, urging the IRGC and Police to seek immunity and join “Iranian Patriots” or face “death”. He then confessed to “obliterating” the country and expressed his plan to continuing his “heavy bombing” of Iran in the coming week²⁴.
189. Although this is not the first time that the United States has pursued such policy and self-serving objectives through intervention and use of force, the cowardly assassination of the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution on 28 February 2026, who had been elected as the leader of the country, remains as a stark instance of such deplorable unlawful policy of the United States.
190. The United States and its genocidal ally, have killed and injured thousands of Iranian civilians, including women and children while in one single attack on an elementary school in Minab, Hormozgan, they have killed more than one hundred and seventy children; amidst their atrocities, the United States continued to expose their intention to further intervene in domestic affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran stating on 7 March 2026 that “we’re going to have to choose that person along with Iran,” referring to the next leader of Iran.
191. The ongoing aggression against the Iranian nation is thus another desperate attempt at intervening in internal affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It should therefore alarm all other independent and peace-loving nations to confront such interventionist approaches and uphold respect for sovereignty of other States in accordance with the UN Charter.

²⁴ Truth Social, @realDonaldTrump post, 29 February 2026.

VIII. Violations of international human rights law

192. International human rights law (IHRL) protects human beings in all situations. Its applicability during armed conflicts has been reaffirmed time and again by the UN Security Council, the ICJ, regional human rights courts, the UN General Assembly and the UN Human Rights Council, including its Special Procedures.
193. The instances of violations by the US and Israeli aggressors against Iran also seriously violate a wide range of human rights of the Iranian people, including the right to life, the right to security of the person, the right to health, the right to protection of family and private life, and the right to a safe, clean, healthy, and sustainable environment. These rights are protected under numerous core international human rights instruments and widely accepted as fundamental human rights.
194. It is well established under international law that the obligations contained in human rights treaties do not cease in times of armed conflict. As reaffirmed by the ICJ in the Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (2004, para. 106), and reiterated in the Nuclear Weapons Advisory Opinion (1996, para. 25), human rights law continues to apply in parallel with IHL. This includes, inter alia, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which remains binding in its extraterritorial application along with exercise of jurisdiction or effective control over persons or territory (Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 31, para. 10).
195. The right to life under Article 6 of the ICCPR has been egregiously violated through indiscriminate and disproportionate missile attacks targeting civilians, as well as through premeditated assassinations of scientists and family members far removed from any battlefield. These acts constitute arbitrary deprivation of life, especially where lethal force was used outside situations of direct threat or necessity. The Human Rights Committee has repeatedly emphasized that the use of force must comply with the principles of necessity and proportionality (General Comment No. 36, para. 12). The systematic and widespread nature of these killings may also engage the threshold of crimes against humanity under customary international law.

196. Similarly, attacks on hospitals and medical staff, including children's hospitals and ambulances, amount not only to serious violations of IHL but also breaches of the right to health under Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has affirmed that destruction or disruption of medical facilities and infrastructure during armed conflict constitutes a violation of Article 12 (General Comment No. 14, paras. 34 and 50).
197. The targeting of journalists and media facilities, such as the Iranian State TV station during a live broadcast, violates freedom of expression and freedom of the press under Article 19 of the ICCPR. The Human Rights Committee has clarified that States must not target journalists under any circumstances, and that attacks on media infrastructure not only hinder the dissemination of information but also infringe upon the public's right to access information, particularly during times of conflict (General Comment No. 34, para. 23).
198. Furthermore, the deliberate attacks on critical civilian infrastructure – including water systems, energy installations, oil refineries, and airports – implicate the right to an adequate standard of living (Article 11, ICESCR) and the right to a healthy environment, which is increasingly recognized as a component of both Articles 12 and 6 of the ICCPR and ICESCR, and has been recognized by the UN General Assembly in Resolution 76/300 (2022) as a universal human right. These attacks also amount to collective punishment and infliction of terror upon the civilian population, prohibited under both IHL and IHRL.
199. The repeated attacks on civilian infrastructure, oil and gas installations, industrial facilities, and urban areas also constitute grave violations of customary international environmental law applicable both in times of peace and armed conflict. Under customary norms and treaty-based obligations, States are required to protect the environment from significant harm and to apply the principles of precaution and environmental impact assessment (EIA) when conducting military operations. These principles are codified in Principles 15 and 17 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development



(1992) and have attained customary status, as recognized by the ICJ in the Pulp Mills case (2010, para. 204).

200. Moreover, the ICJ in its Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons (1996, para. 30–33) affirmed that general obligations of environmental protection are applicable during armed conflict and form part of international law.

IX. International responsibility and reparation

201. Under international law, commission of an internationally wrongful act entails international responsibility and the wrongdoer is obliged to make reparation. Aggression by the United States and the United States is no exception and as such entails the international responsibility of these two to act responsibly and fulfil their obligation to make full reparation.
202. The egregious violations of international law committed by the US and the Israeli regimes and particularly aggression in defiance of Article 2(4) of the UN Charter, their coordinated attacks against civilians and protected objects in contravention of IHL, accompanied by their grave breaches of IHRL give rise to international responsibility under international law. These acts meet the threshold of internationally wrongful acts attributable to both of the aggressors, as articulated in the ARSIWA, adopted by the ILC and widely regarded as reflecting customary international law.
203. Under Article 1 of ARSIWA, every internationally wrongful act entails its international responsibility. The conduct of the US and Israeli regime's armed forces and agents are clearly attributable to the same under Article 4 thereof. These actions include not only armed intervention, but also enabling, directing, or facilitating commission of violations by the US and the Israeli regimes. The targeted assassination of Iranian officials and scientists, the deliberate attacks on civilians and civilian infrastructure, and the material and moral damage caused by these coordinated attacks constitute acts of aggression as well as war crimes.
204. These violations trigger the legal consequences laid out in Part Two of ARSIWA, which include the obligation to cease the internationally wrongful acts (Article 30(a)), to offer appropriate assurances and guarantees of non-repetition (Article 30(b)), and to make full reparation for the injury caused, whether material or moral (Article 31). The gravity and scale of the violations by both the US and Israeli regimes also justify the invocation of international accountability mechanisms, including inter alia international criminal proceedings and determining the aggressor by the Security Council.

205. Furthermore, several of the acts attributed to the US and Israeli regimes, particularly assassination of the highest official of the Islamic Republic of Iran and other high-ranking Iranian officials while outside active hostilities amount to acts of terrorism and or war crimes.
206. Deliberate targeting of civilians and civilian infrastructure and disproportionate attacks with damage to civilian objects and civilian population of Iran, in violation of well-established principles of IHL, constitute grave breaches thereof and entail criminal responsibility.
207. The US-Zionist unlawful conducts are of such a gravity that one can undeniably represent a systematic violation of IHL, IHRL, and the UN Charter, which must be subject to international accountability mechanisms.
208. Accountability mechanisms extend to international cooperation, particularly through the UN General Assembly under its “Uniting for Peace” procedure (Resolution 377 A (V)), where the Security Council fails to act due to political considerations, veto paralysis or silence. UN Member States are entitled to invoke the international responsibility of both the US and Israeli regimes under Article 42 of ARSIWA, as Iran is the victim of serious breaches of erga omnes obligations. The Islamic Republic of Iran therefore reserves all its rights to pursue justice through diplomatic, legal, and international judicial avenues, including through international courts and tribunals.
209. The obligation to ensure accountability for internationally wrongful acts - particularly those that violate peremptory norms of general international law (jus cogens) – arises independently of treaty obligations and binds all States under customary international law. Accordingly, aggression by the US and Israeli regimes entails heightened international responsibility, including legal consequences within the framework of State responsibility as well as international criminal law.
210. Pursuant to Article 40 of ARSIWA, serious breaches of obligations arising under peremptory norms, such as aggression, trigger specific legal consequences. As was described above, these include the obligation of all States to cooperate to bring the unlawful situation to an end (Article 41(1)),

the obligation not to recognize as lawful any situation created by such breaches (Article 41(2)), and the duty not to render aid or assistance in maintaining the situation.

211. It should be highlighted that the consistent position of the Islamic Republic of Iran– particularly during the deliberations of the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly on the ILC’s work concerning peremptory norms of general international law (jus cogens) – is that no organ of the United Nations, including the Security Council, is above the law or exempt from the constraints imposed by jus cogens norms. As stated during Iran’s official interventions at the UNGA Sixth Committee the binding nature of jus cogens applies equally to States and international organizations, including the Security Council, and therefore, any measure or inaction by the Council that would lead to or perpetuate violations of jus cogens is unlawful under international law.
212. The Security Council’s continued failure to identify and condemn unlawful use of force by the US and Israeli regimes as acts of aggression, the targeting of civilians, and the destruction of civilian infrastructure in the Islamic Republic of Iran by aggressors constitute not only a political failure but also a legal breach of its duties under the Charter of the United Nations. Inaction in the face of violations of jus cogens, i.e., prohibition of aggression, renders the Council complicit in maintaining an unlawful situation and undermines the authority of international law itself.
213. As affirmed in the ILC’s Draft Conclusions on Jus Cogens (2022), particularly Conclusion 11, “No derogation by organs of international organizations” is permitted from peremptory norms. The Council’s silence, under Chapter VII or otherwise, does not legitimize violations of peremptory norms nor suspend States’ obligations to respect and ensure respect for such norms.
214. The Islamic Republic of Iran therefore urges Member States to recall that jus cogens norms generate erga omnes obligations, and any breach or failure to act upon such obligations – whether by States or international institutions – invites legal and moral scrutiny. The failure of the Security Council to act in this case must not be viewed as legally neutral: it reflects a violation of its



Charter-based responsibility to maintain international peace and security in conformity with international law.

215. As further recognized in UN General Assembly Resolution 60/147 on the Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation, victims of gross violations of international law – including those stemming from acts of aggression – are entitled to access to justice, effective remedies, and reparations. The Islamic Republic of Iran and its people, as victims of these violations, possess the legal right to seek accountability and redress before competent international bodies and mechanisms, in order to restore international law, uphold justice, and prevent impunity.

Conclusion

216. Five rounds of negotiations aimed at resolving the so-described outstanding nuclear issues of Iran and lifting of unjust and unlawful sanctions were held with the United States in 2025. A sixth round was scheduled to be held on Sunday 15 June 2025. However, in blatant hypocrisy, the US and Israeli regime launched aggressive strikes against Iranian IAEA-safeguarded nuclear facilities amidst an all-out aggression against civilians and civilian infrastructure.
217. The unlawful use of force by the Israeli regime from 13 – 24 June 2025 against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran, coupled with the act of aggression of the United States on 24 June 2025 on the same constitute a blatant violation of Article 2 (4) of the UN Charter, both constitute crimes of aggression.
218. Following a period of stagnation, negotiations were held again in 2026 in Muscat, and Geneva. This time, too, in the middle of the ongoing negotiations, as expected from criminal pariahs, the US and Israeli regimes launched another series of aggressive attacks against Iran in defiance of the UN Charter and in violation of core principles of international law.
219. International law, including norms and principles enshrined in the UN Charter, jurisprudence of the ICJ as well as State practice does not approve lame justifications for aggression under pretexts of anticipatory self-defense.
220. The acts of aggression, by the US and Israeli regimes against Iran, both in June 2025 and February-March 2026, were initiated by targeting State officials outside hostilities and the highest official of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and was further accompanied by grave breaches of fundamental principles of international humanitarian law, including distinction between civilian and military objects, proportionality and necessity, among others. It led to the death and injury of thousands of civilians including women, children, scientists, university lecturers and medical staff as well as destruction of civilian buildings including hospitals and oil and gas reservoirs, among others, in blatant violation of international humanitarian law, tantamount to war crimes.

- 
221. In exercise of its inherent right of self-defense, the Islamic Republic of Iran has taken proportionate lawful military attacks against the military facilities and bases of the US-Zionist aggressors in the region irrespective of their location. While international law puts on a par a country that harbors the facilities of the aggressor with the aggressor itself (Article 3 (f) of UNGA Res 3314), Iran has not equated acts of its neighbors with aggression. Instead, Iran's unfettered resolve to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity against the aggressors has been confined to lawful defensive strikes against the facilities and capabilities of the aggressors.
222. Amidst the escalations, certain actors have attempted to cause further tension by shifting the blame on Iran through false flag operations aimed at undermining Iran's friendly ties with its neighbors. Iran has reiterated, and continues to stress, that it remains committed to maintaining and strengthening friendly relations with the countries of the region based on mutual respect, the principle of good-neighborliness and respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and that at the same time nothing can blemish, or otherwise deny, Iran's inherent right to defend its land and people against the aggressors.
223. In view of the facts and legal assessments set out in this report, the Islamic Republic of Iran once again urges the UN member States to extend support for upholding the values, norms and principles embodied in the UN Charter, and prevent further normalization of violations of international law by holding the aggressors accountable.

