Extract from:

UNITED NATIONS JURIDICAL YEARBOOK

2015

Part Three. Judicial decisions on questions relating the United Nations and related intergovernmental organizations

Chapter VIII. Decisions of national tribunals



CONTENTS XiX

			Page
1	D.	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia	388
		1. Judgements delivered by the Appeals Chamber	388
		2. Judgements delivered by the Trial Chambers	388
		3. Pending cases and proceedings as at 31 December 2015	388
I	Ε.	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda	389
		Judgements delivered by the Appeals Chamber	389
]	F.	MECHANISM FOR INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNALS	389
		Pending cases and proceedings as at 31 December 2015	389
(G.	Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia	390
		Pending cases and proceedings as at 31 December 2015	390
I	Η.	Special Tribunal for Lebanon	390
		1. Judgements delivered by the Contempt Judge	390
		2. Pending cases and proceedings as at 31 December 2015	391
I	[.	RESIDUAL SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE	391
Сн.	ΑP	TER VIII. DECISIONS OF NATIONAL TRIBUNALS	393
		United States of America.	393
1	1.	Decision of the Superior Court for the District of Columbia	393
		•	393
		Part Four. Bibliography	
1	A.	International organizations in general	397
		1. General	397
		2. Particular questions	398
		3. Responsibility of International Organizations	399
]	В.	United Nations	400
		1. General	400
		2. Principal organs and subsidiary bodies	400
		General Assembly	400
		International Court of Justice	401
		Secretariat	402
,		Security Council	402
(Ů.	Intergovernmental organizations related to the United Nations	404
		1. General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade	404
		2. International Atomic Energy Agency	404
		3. International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes	404
		4. International Civil Aviation Organization ICAO	404
		5. International Labour Organization	404
		6. International Maritime Organization	405

Chapter VIII

DECISIONS OF NATIONAL TRIBUNALS

A. United States of America

Decision of the Superior Court for the District of Columbia

In 2009, the DC Office of Tax and Revenue (OTR) began applying a restrictive interpretation of domicile to individuals who sought a property tax deduction for residing in a home in Washington, DC. The DC government's interpretation disqualified virtually all G-4 visa holders from this valuable property tax deduction. The International Monetary Fund viewed this as legally incorrect and supported a lawsuit brought by individual Fund staff against the DC government. In September 26, 2014, the Superior Court for the District of Columbia ruled that G-4 visa holders can form the intent to be domiciled in the District and are therefore eligible for the homestead deduction. The DC government chose not to appeal the decision, and it became final in 2015.