



**THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIET NAM  
PERMANENT MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

**STATEMENT  
by the Delegation of Viet Nam  
at the 79th Session of the General Assembly**

**Agenda item 85: “The scope and application of the principle of universal  
jurisdiction”**

*New York, 16 October 2024*

*Please check against delivery*

*Mr. Chair,*

We would like to thank the Secretary General for his report as contained in document A/79/269 on the basis of information and observations from Member States and relevant observers on the scope and application of universal jurisdiction.

Viet Nam aligns itself with the statement delivered by the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and would like to deliver the following remark in its national capacity.

*Mr. Chair,*

Viet Nam believes that impunity for the gravest forms of international crimes such as war crimes and genocide under international law should not be tolerated, individuals responsible for those crimes should not go unpunished. We acknowledge that Member States hold diverse opinions regarding the definition, scope, and limitations of universal jurisdiction. The absence of a clear and generally accepted answer to these issues may result in improper or selective applications of universal jurisdiction, potentially jeopardizing or undermining the international legal order based on international law.

*Mr. Chair,*

Viet Nam reaffirms its long-standing stance that universal jurisdiction must be interpreted and applied in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law, including respect for national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-interference in the domestic affairs of states. This must also include full recognition and respect for the immunity of state officials from foreign criminal jurisdiction under international law.

We are of the view that universal jurisdiction should be applied exclusively to the most serious international crimes. Any attempt to apply this principle to encompass crimes that are not among the most egregious may undermine its legitimacy.

Furthermore, universal jurisdiction should only be invoked as a last resort and should play a complementary role to other jurisdictions that have a closer connection to the crimes, including those based on territoriality and nationality. States should only exercise universal jurisdiction in instances where the alleged perpetrator is present in its territory and after consulting with the state where the crime occurred and the state of nationality of the person concerned about the possibility of extraditing the person to those states for prosecution, subject to the principle of dual criminality.

*I thank you, Mr. Chair./.*