

the alien tort statute

international law and accountability

The Alien Tort Statute (ATS), also known as the Alien Tort Claims Act (ATCA), is a powerful legal tool that allows foreign victims of human rights abuse to seek civil remedies in U.S. courts. It has been used to bring claims against government officials and non-state actors, including multinational corporations.

how does the ats hold human rights abusers accountable?

Victims of the most serious human rights abuses often have no way to seek justice in their home countries. The country where the abuse took place may be unable to hold the accused accountable for a variety of reasons, including a corrupt judicial system, a government still dominated by those responsible for the abuse, inadequate resources or the fact that the perpetrators have left that country. The ATS provides a way to hold human rights abusers accountable when they are found in the United States.

When persons who are in the U.S. or corporations doing significant business here have committed gross human rights violations abroad, the law requires U.S. courts to hold them accountable.

how has the ats been used in defense of human rights?

The ATS was enacted in 1789 but was little-used until 1979, when the Center for Constitutional Rights filed claims in *Filártiga v. Peña-Irala*. In *Filártiga*, a Paraguayan police officer had tortured a young man to death and later moved to the U.S. When the victim's family found the torturer in the U.S., CCR brought suit under the ATS. The Second Circuit ruled in favor of the Filártigas in a historic moment for human rights litigation that paved the way for the modern use of the ATS.

Throughout the 1980s, the majority of cases brought under the ATS were against officials of recognized governments. Then, in 1993, CCR brought a lawsuit against Radovan Karadžic for genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity committed in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Second Circuit held that Karadžic, a non-state actor, could be held liable under ATS for his complicity in these crimes.

Over the past decade, CCR and our allies have successfully expanded the application of the ATS to cases involving human rights violations committed directly by or with the complicity of multinational corporations. CCR and our allies won a significant victory in Doe v. Unocal on behalf of the victims of forced labor, rape and murder committed as part of a natural gas pipeline project in Burma. A groundbreaking 1997 ruling allowed corporations to be sued in U.S. courts for human rights violations. This led the way for very important cases brought in US courts by victims of corporate abuse. For example, CCR is now using the ATS to hold accountable government-hired private military contractors who tortured or were complicit in the torture of Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghraib and other detention centers throughout Iraq.

However, recent court rulings have threatened to turn back this critical progress in corporate accountability. In September 2010, in *Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Shell*, a case against Shell regarding human rights abuse in Nigeria, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit decided that corporations could not be sued at all under the ATS. This decision is being challenged. But if allowed to stand it means that corporations can profit from torture and killing, but they cannot be held liable for those international human rights abuses in federal court in New York.

CCR has also brought ATS cases against the former president and minister of defense of Bolivia for the extrajudicial execution of indigenous villagers; against U.S. officials for torture and other international law violations in U.S. detention facilities (including Guantanamo); against Royal Dutch Shell for human rights abuses against the Ogoni people in Nigeria (in a separate case from the one mentioned above), and against the former Haitian paramilitary leader Emmanuel Constant for crimes against humanity.

Sign up to receive action alerts and learn more about CCR's ATS cases by visiting

www.ccrjustice.org