

194

812-194

ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS IN SAFECase No. 812Date of filing: 10 June '93

** AWARD - Type of Award _____
- Date of Award _____
_____ pages in English _____ pages in Farsi

** DECISION - Date of Decision _____
_____ pages in English _____ pages in Farsi

** CONCURRING OPINION of _____

- Date _____
_____ pages in English _____ pages in Farsi

Correction to English
** SEPARATE OPINION of Allison

- Date 10 June '93
2 pages in English _____ pages in Farsi

** DISSENTING OPINION of _____

- Date _____
_____ pages in English _____ pages in Farsi

** OTHER; Nature of document: _____

- Date _____
_____ pages in English _____ pages in Farsi



CASE NO. 812
CHAMBER THREE
AWARD NO. 546-812-3

ABRAHIM RAHMAN GOLSHANI,
Claimant,

and

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE ISLAMIC
REPUBLIC OF IRAN,
Respondent.

IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL	دیوان دآوری دعاوی ایران - ایالات متحدہ
FILED	ثبت شد
DATE	10 JUN 1993
	تاریخ ۱۳۷۲ / ۲ / ۲۰

CORRECTION TO THE
SEPARATE CONCURRING AND DISSENTING
OPINION OF RICHARD C. ALLISON

The following correction is hereby made to the Separate Concurring and Dissenting Opinion of Richard C. Allison, filed 2 March 1993.

1. The caption identifies the Respondent as "The Ministry of National Defence of the Islamic Republic of Iran." It is hereby corrected to read "The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran."

A copy of the corrected page is attached.

Dated, The Hague
10 June 1993

Richard C. Allison

CASE NO. 812

CHAMBER THREE

AWARD NO. 546-812-3

ABRAHIM RAHMAN GOLSHANI,
Claimant,

and

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE ISLAMIC
REPUBLIC OF IRAN,
Respondent.

SEPARATE CONCURRING AND DISSENTING
OPINION OF RICHARD C. ALLISON

1. I concur in the conclusion that the Claim must be dismissed by reason of the Claimant's inability to make out a prima facie case for the authenticity of the deed of conveyance dated 15 August 1978 (the "Deed") upon which he relies as the basis for his ownership of the Claim. While this determination renders moot any definitive pronouncement concerning the Respondent's defense that the Deed was forged, this is not to say that we must ignore the voluminous and exhaustive pleadings presented on this subject. Nor are we required to expunge from our minds the testimony and arguments offered at three lengthy days of hearings on the forgery allegation. I deem it appropriate, therefore, to address certain elements of the Case that occupied the time and attention of the Tribunal in the course of its very thorough consideration of this Claim. Reference is made to the Tribunal's Award, in which I concur with the exception stated below, for a more complete recitation of the facts and contentions of the Parties.