

# Complaint Filed at International Criminal Court Over NATO Allies' Complicity in US Drone Strikes

By [Reprise](#)

Global Research, February 19, 2014

[Reprise](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [US NATO War](#)  
[Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [PAKISTAN](#)

Drone victims are today lodging a complaint with the International Criminal Court (ICC) accusing NATO member states of war crimes over their role in facilitating [the US' covert drone programme in Pakistan](#).

It has been revealed in recent months that [the UK](#), Germany, [Australia](#), and other NATO partners support US drone strikes through intelligence-sharing. Because all these countries are signatories to the Rome Statute, they fall under The ICC's jurisdiction and can therefore be investigated for war crimes. [Kareem Khan](#) – whose civilian brother and son were killed in a 2009 drone strike – is at The Hague with his lawyers from the [human rights charity Reprise](#) and the [Foundation for Fundamental Rights](#) who have filed the complaint on his behalf.

The CIA has launched more than 300 missiles at North Waziristan since its covert drone programme began and it is estimated that between 2004 and 2013, thousands of people have been killed, many of them civilians including children.

The US has immunised itself from legal accountability over drone strikes and the UK has closed its domestic courts to foreign drone victims. In a recent decision, the Court of Appeal in London ruled that it would not opine on the legality of British agents' involvement in the US drone war in Pakistan, for fear of causing embarrassment to its closest ally.

[Kat Craig](#), Reprise's legal director, said: "There can surely be no doubt that facilitating the deaths of thousands of civilians – as NATO allies are doing in a plethora of ways – constitutes war crimes. The International Criminal Court, established specifically to hold overwhelming state power to account, is in a unique position to offer some semblance of justice to individual drone victims with nowhere else to go. They must take this complaint seriously and investigate."

The original source of this article is [Reprise](#)

Copyright © [Reprise](#), [Reprise](#), 2014

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)