



DOG 51

A FILM BY CÉDRIC JIMENEZ

CHI-FOU-MI PRODUCTIONS PRESENTS

GILLES
LELLOUCHE

ADÈLE
EXARCHOPOULOS

LOUIS
GARREL

ROMAIN
DURIS

VALERIA
BRUNI TEDESCHI

ARTUS

DOG 51

FROM THE DIRECTOR OF **NOVEMBER & THE STRONGHOLD**



A FILM BY **CÉDRIC JIMENEZ**

PRODUCED BY HUGO SÉLIGNAC SCREENPLAY BY OLIVIER DEMANGEL & CÉDRIC JIMENEZ BASED ON THE NOVEL BY LAURENT GAUDÉ PUBLISHED BY ACTES SUD



RUNTIME: 1H45

INTERNATIONAL PUBLICITY

Margaux Audouin

Margaux.audouin@canal-plus.com

INTERNATIONAL MARKETING

David Gauter

David.gauter@canal-plus.com

SYNOPSIS

IN THE NEAR FUTURE, PARIS IS SEGREGATED INTO THREE ZONES WHICH SEPARATE THE SOCIAL CLASSES, AND NO ONE CAN ESCAPE ALMA, A POWERFUL PREDICTIVE AI WHICH HAS REVOLUTIONISED THE POLICE SYSTEM. WHEN ALMA'S CREATOR IS ASSASSINATED, SALIA, AN ELITE AGENT FROM ZONE 2, AND ZEM, A DISILLUSIONED COP WHO LIVES AMONGST THE OUTCASTS IN ZONE 3, ARE FORCED TO TEAM UP TO LEAD THE INVESTIGATION.



INTERVIEW

CÉDRIC JIMENEZ

YOUR CINEMA HAS ALWAYS BEEN EXTREMELY REALISTIC. WHY DID YOU WANT TO MAKE A SCIENCE FICTION FILM?

Apart from my first feature film, *PARIS UNDER WATCH*, my films have always been inspired by real events. This time, I wanted to dive into pure fiction. And by definition there's nothing more fictional than science fiction. The future doesn't exist. Nothing is defined. You're forced to engage in an imaginative exercise, to project yourself into this future, however near it may be, with all the speculative aspects that entails. One might be tempted to compare the making of a futuristic film to the making of a period piece, but in a period piece

you're reconstructing the past. There's nothing to 'reconstruct' in the future, because it doesn't exist. When you're creating a futuristic world, you're entirely in the realm of speculation, which can be quite dizzying at times.

WHAT DID YOU LIKE ABOUT LAURENT GAUDÉ'S BOOK?

I love the novel. When working on the script with my co-writer Olivier Demangel, we ended up straying from it quite a bit. Not because there were things in the book we didn't like, but because literature and cinema aren't the same. You have to retain the fundamental elements

of the book, like the characters and certain themes, and rework them in a way that makes sense for a film, which is a very different medium. There were many things that motivated me to make *DOG 51*. In general, I love science fiction and genre cinema. I really wanted to play with the rules. Since I'm very attached to reality, I prefer to speak of an 'augmented present' rather than futurism. I tried to anchor the film and its universe in a real, contemporary society, but with augmentations.

SO YOU START WITH PRESENT REALITY...

Many of the things we explore in *DOG 51* exist today, but we augment them in a way that makes them dystopian. By definition, dystopia, the opposite of utopia, offers a critical version of the current world where the dials are turned up to amplify the worst aspects of the present. Take the checkpoints under the ring road. We already see today that people are finding it harder and harder to integrate. There's a polarization of social classes. By creating the checkpoints, we're simply amplifying something we can already observe in society. The bracelet, which resembles a handcuff, is a way of pushing the vision of a society where tracking is widely accepted. For an example of that





in our current reality, we buy smartphones and just accept that they can track and imprison us. Through dystopia, we tell the story of the society we live in.

YOU'VE ALREADY TACKLED THE THEME OF SURVEILLANCE IN YOUR FIRST FILM, PARIS UNDER WATCH. IS IT SOMETHING THAT PARTICULARLY FASCINATES YOU?

It's not so much surveillance that fascinates me, but anything that restricts freedom. I'm a great lover of liberty. Faced with certain societal fears, human beings are capable of quickly giving up some of their freedoms. Anything that can restrict freedom affects me, because it touches on injustice, on the human capacity for free will. In *DOG 51*, AI is an added factor in the justice system. When a judicial system is no longer necessarily governed by human free will, and therefore by conscience, it can create problems. There's always a desire in my work to talk about the individual confronted with the machine, whether it's judicial in *THE STRONGHOLD*, terrorist in *NOVEMBER*, or mafia related in *THE CONNECTION*. I keep returning to this theme from film to film, almost subconsciously, so I guess it's an obsession! Even in *THE MAN WITH THE IRON HEART*, where two young resistance fighters targeted the Third Reich through the assassination of Heydrich. This theme of the individual defending justice and freedom may be somewhat naïve, but it's very dear to me.

OLIVIER DEMANGEL WROTE NOVEMBER, YOUR PREVIOUS FILM. YOU WORKED WITH HIM AGAIN ON THE SCREENPLAY FOR DOG 51...

I loved the script for *NOVEMBER*, but I also loved the man and the screenwriter. We rewrote the script together because I needed to make it my own. From that moment on, we were connected.

WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT WORKING WITH OLIVIER?

Olivier has extraordinary talent and an incredible work ethic. He possesses rare intelligence and knows how to adapt to the person he's working with, putting himself at the service of the film from the first day of writing to the delivery of the final cut.

When we work together, we share a desire to make cinema that appeals to a broad audience while maintaining high narrative and thematic standards. Olivier also has a strong human and social sensitivity. As a screenwriter, he naturally explores more worlds than I do, but he wants to bring challenging ideas to popular films and tackle interesting, profound subjects that reflect society. The more we speak to audiences, the more we reach them. We want to speak to as many people as possible. When you want to tell a story, to express something about a topic or theme, the greater the number of people listening, the greater the impact. With Olivier, we also share a



similar worldview. He has many strings to his bow, but when we work together, we want to create complex characters who live in the grey area. A cinema that isn't black and white.

FRANCE DOESN'T HAVE A STRONG TRADITION OF SCIENCE FICTION CINEMA. IS IT INTIMIDATING TO TAKE IT ON?

I don't ask myself that kind of question. When I make a film, I don't watch any other films. I might not watch anything for six months. References tend to disturb me more than help me. I prefer to find my own path, even if it means making mistakes. I don't ask myself, 'Is this a science fiction film? A period film?' It's first and foremost 'a film I wanted to make.' This project was dizzying. Probably the most difficult of my career. But I never set out to make a science fiction film as a challenge, just because no one's done it in France for a long time. I decide I'm going to make the best film I can, put all my heart, guts and energy into it.

DO YOU CONSIDER THE BUDGET WHEN WRITING?

Of course. For two reasons. First, it would be a bit foolish to write something we can't actually afford to make. Second, if you don't set some limits from the start, you end up having to cut a lot of scenes and rewrite along the way. You're always forced to make choices, but if you're reworking the film into something it wasn't intended to be, and patching it together, that shows on screen. It's better to make realistic choices as early as possible. Producer Hugo Ségnac and I are very close. We always try to think about the film together from the first line on paper to the last day of production. We share a desire to make the most ambitious, most accomplished, and most successful film possible. It's an artistic relationship built on trust. The issue of budget and financing naturally plays a role in that approach. Like all great producers, Hugo does everything to ensure the quality of a film and allows the director to work in the best possible conditions. We try to anticipate the resources we'll have, so that when the financing

comes through we don't have to throw out the work we've done on the script or end up creating dramatic or narrative inconsistencies.

WERE YOU CONFIDENT YOUR URBAN AND RAW VISUAL STYLE WOULD SUIT SCIENCE FICTION?

My style isn't necessarily tied to genre. It's more a matter of sensory approach. I prefer to live and experience films rather than just watch them. For me, cinema connects to childhood. When you put a child in front of a cartoon, they believe everything. They're completely immersed. They don't watch it, they live it. Analysis comes after emotion. The experience is deeply immersive. I try to recreate that in my films, so they feel as organic as possible. I try to make the viewer almost more of a protagonist than a spectator, to have them physically live the film. I put as few barriers as possible between them and the story on screen. That grammar applies to a period film, a science fiction film, or a contemporary one. It's not the genre that dictates





that grammar. It's my conception of cinema, which is to live stories intensely.

SCIENCE FICTION RELIES ON AN ALMOST CHILDLIKE BELIEF IN THE STORY YOU'RE BEING TOLD...

With genre, you might feel a bit ridiculous taking certain positions or making certain choices. It can seem pretentious to impose your own vision of the future on an audience. But you have to play that game. Again, it's fiction and dystopia, something parallel to reality. That parallel is mine. It's simply the choices I made to tell this story and make it resonate as strongly and emotionally as possible. Of course, we asked ourselves whether we should address climate issues too. The spectrum of ways you could depict the future is so wide you can drown in it. You have to stick to focused choices that best tell the story of Zem and Salia. Because that's the story that needs to be told. The futuristic and dystopian elements, especially in art direction, have to serve the story.

IN DOG 51, YOU'RE NOT CONFINED BY THE 'REAL WORLD'...

Reality can help you, but it can also trap you. There's comfort in confinement. It's comforting to say, 'I'm allowed to do this, I'm not allowed to do that. This happened; that didn't happen. He said this; he never said that.' Facts can structure the narrative but can also limit you when you want your character to break free. That mix of comfort and frustration doesn't exist at all in a film like DOG 51. With that freedom comes a worry about making the right or wrong choice. Why are the ALMA reconstructions semi-transparent? Why not photorealistic? That's a real choice, motivated only by personal desire. Will people receive that personal desire as a choice that speaks to them and feels believable? I'll only know when I show the film! Until then, I'm alone with myself.

HOW DID YOU APPROACH PRESENTING THE WORLD OF DOG 51 AND HELPING AN AUDIENCE UNDERSTAND ITS RULES?

Olivier and I talked about it a lot. We know this world perfectly. We wrote it, digested it, repeated it. For us, it's obvious, very clear. But I've often had the experience of showing one of my films to people and realizing they didn't understand things that seemed obvious to me. For example, in DOG 51, we wanted to be clear from the start about the zone boundaries and the role of the bracelets. We worked hard to give the audience as many clues as possible so they wouldn't feel

lost. I also worked closely with Jean-Philippe Moreaux, the production designer. He thought a lot about the objects that mark the film as futuristic, so they would feel familiar while still feeling sufficiently different from our current world.

DO YOU HAVE TO THINK IN TERMS OF REAL-WORLD COMPARATORS TO HELP THE AUDIENCE UNDERSTAND THIS WORLD? FOR EXAMPLE, BREAKWALLS INSTANTLY EVOKES ANONYMOUS.

Yes, absolutely. For the character of Mafram and the Breakwalls group, I didn't want to depict them in any way that might resemble mid-20th-century revolutionaries, like Fidel Castro or the FARC. I wanted it to be more digital. So Anonymous, or someone like Julian Assange, seemed like fitting references for Louis Garrel's character. It's very important to have markers so the audience can latch onto something. Same for the checkpoints. They resemble an airport, a border. When we reach airport security, we check our pockets, make sure we don't have liquids, scissors, etc. We impose discipline on ourselves, discipline we never apply elsewhere. At the airport, we know the scanner will beep, there are police officers, we'll have to show documents. We use simple reflections of contemporary society so the viewer can project themselves into this futuristic world through a sense of familiarity and recognition.

YOU RELOCATED THE STORY FROM THE NOVEL FROM GREECE TO FRANCE. WHY PARIS?

It could have been New York or London. A capital city represents a country politically, sociologically, economically, demographically. Paris seemed the most logical place in which to set this dystopia in France. Also, it's true that in Paris the three zones already exist, without officially existing. We relied on Paris's lay-out rather choosing Paris for its lay-out. For example, we thought it would make sense for Zone I to be on Île de la Cité, separated by the Seine and its bridges, which would become checkpoints.

At the heart of DOG 51 is the relationship between Zem and Salia, played by Gilles Lellouche and Adèle Exarchopoulos. Was a great love story important to you?

Yes, I'd wanted to do that for a long time. My previous films hadn't allowed for it. But I really wanted, in addition to the fiction, to create a somewhat troubled love story between two characters who come to heal each other. The innocence in the relationship between Zem and Salia counterbalances the harshness of the world we developed; a

world where people accept their fate out of fear, giving up their freedom in the name of a pseudo-security. It's a natural but frightening reflex. We close ourselves off. We're afraid, so we agree not to go to restaurants, not to go to the movies, not to do anything. Within this world, this context, I thought the story of Zem and Salia, who have spent so long being closed off but come to free each other through their connection, added contrast between the big story and the small one.

DID YOU KNOW FROM THE WRITING STAGE THAT GILLES LELLOUCHE AND ADELE EXARCHOPOULOS WOULD PLAY ZEM AND SALIA?

Yes. Gilles is obviously a very dear partner to me. He's an extraordinary actor, someone I deeply love. There's trust between us and a mutual understanding that always leads us to experiment, to explore new places. So Gilles was an obvious choice. But Adèle was just as natural a choice. On THE STRONGHOLD, she only had four days of shooting, but I loved working with her. I absolutely wanted to do it again. Both roles were written for them. They knew we were writing for them before we even started the script.

DID YOU TAILOR THEIR CHARACTERS TO THEIR PERSONALITIES?

I take into account who they are. Especially in Gilles's case, because I know him really well. When I write, I naturally think about where I want him to go, and I adapt the character. But not to make him resemble Gilles. I adapt it based on our shared desires. Where can he go? Where has he never gone? Where is he comfortable or uncomfortable? I know him so well that as soon as I make him speak, as soon as I make him move, I know how it's going to play out or what could happen. I take that into account. With Adèle, it's different because I've only worked with her once and for a short time. I imagined a character she had never really played before, a bit cold, which we come to understand is just a protective shell. But again, we respected the book and our characters aren't that far from those in the novel.

YOU'RE WORKING AGAIN WITH LAURENT TANGY, YOUR DIRECTOR OF PHOTOGRAPHY ON THE CONNECTION, THE MAN WITH THE IRON HEART, AND THE STRONGHOLD, AND WITH COMPOSER GUILLAUME ROUSSEL, WHO'S SCORED ALL YOUR FILMS SINCE THE CONNECTION.

Some people like surprises. I like trust. I love team spirit. I love a family spirit. I love when people know me, and I love knowing people. I like knowing what the other person is thinking, and feeling like they

know what I'm thinking in the moment. Friendship, family, and work are quite closely linked for me because my job is my passion. So that sense of family, of teamwork, of shared intuition, is extremely important to me.

WHAT'S YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, WHICH PLAYS A CENTRAL ROLE IN THE FILM?

I'm not reactionary. I'm not against new technologies. We're only at the beginning, but artificial intelligence is a technology that seems extremely powerful and therefore raises questions. I'm not afraid of it. But the film touches on justice. I have great faith in human beings, even if they can be very disappointing at times. I feel like human conscience has saved us from many evils throughout history. When we lose a sense of morality, it can be worrying. A machine could be a million times smarter than us, but also completely devoid of conscience. On the other hand, in medicine it could lead to extraordinary progress that saves countless lives. So I don't have a fixed position on AI. To tell the story of DOG 51, I used it in a critical way. But that doesn't mean I have a generally negative view of AI.

YOU MAKE FILMS WITH CONCISE RUNTIMES. SINCE THE STRONGHOLD, YOU HAVEN'T MADE A FILM LONGER THAN 110 MINUTES. IS EDITING AN IMPORTANT PHASE?

Always, in every film. I get bored very quickly and it stresses me out. It's true that I have a natural tendency to get to the point and to leave no room for boredom. Even in life, I hate being bored. I move around a lot, I'm very active, rather restless. Something has to be happening all the time. That definitely translates into my films. But it's not about duration for me. It's more about rhythm and that idea of immersion. I want to grab the viewer, bring them with me and never let them go, to keep their attention and the tension. I can easily tell if there's one or two frames too many. I'm obsessed with rhythm and narrative fluidity because I feel the sequence of shots like musical notes. It has to be very smooth, the cuts invisible, the film flowing. I'm very obsessed with fluidity, but not in the technical sense. In the narrative sense.



BIOGRAPHY

CÉDRIC JIMENEZ

Cédric Jimenez is a French director and screenwriter born in Marseille. After several years living in New York and London, he began his film career in Paris in 2003 as an independent producer.

In 2011, he directed and produced **PARIS UNDER WATCH**. The thriller toured several Festivals including Beaunes, Cognac, and Naples, where it received the award for Best Film.

THE CONNECTION, produced by Ilan Goldman, starring Jean Dujardin and Gilles Lellouche was his second film.

Reuniting with Ilan Goldman, Jimenez boarded the adaptation of the historical novel by Laurent Binet **THE MAN WITH THE IRON HEART**. This was an international co-production, in the English language starring Jason Clarke, Rosamund Pike.

In 2019, he shot the feature film **THE STRONGHOLD** in Marseille, starring Gilles Lellouche, François Civil, Karim Leklou and Adèle Exarchopoulos. A huge commercial success, **THE STRONGHOLD** marks the beginning of Cédric's collaboration with Hugo Ségnac and CHI-FOU-MI productions who will be reunited again for his latest project **NOVEMBER** co-written by Olivier Demangel. This breath-taking thriller based on the true story of the investigation into the 2015 Paris attacks, has been released in 2022, starring an A-list cast including Jean Dujardin, Sandrine Kiberlain, Anais Demoustier, Jérémie Renier and Lyna Khoudri.

In 2025, Cédric Jimenez continues his collaboration with CHI-FOU-MI Productions and Olivier Demangel with **DOG 51**, one of the most anticipated French films of the year. Set in a dystopian Paris, the film stars Gilles Lellouche, Adèle Exarchopoulos, Louis Garrel, Romain Duris, Valeria Bruni Tedeschi and Artus. The film will be released in France on October 15, 2025, and had its World Premiere at the Venice Film Festival.

SELECTED FILMOGRAPHY

2025	DOG 51
2022	NOVEMBER
2020	THE STRONGHOLD
2017	THE MAN WITH AN IRON HEART
2014	THE CONNECTION
2012	PARIS UNDER WATCH
2003	WHO'S THE BOSS: BOSS OF SCANDALZ



INTERVIEW

OLIVIER DEMANGEL

YOU WORKED WITH CÉDRIC JIMENEZ ON NOVEMBER, WHICH CAME OUT IN 2022. WHEN DID YOU FIRST DISCUSS DOG 51?

Shortly after the release of *NOVEMBER*, Cédric read *DOG 51*, which had just been published. He sent it to me the same day saying, "I think there's a great film to be made from this, tell me what you think." We immediately decided to adapt it. We began writing in early 2023 and continued almost right up to the start of filming. We have a highly complementary way of working. We adapt very quickly to each other's ideas. Cédric trusts the way I tell a story, and I trust the way he will direct. Sometimes, he suggests ideas that I can't quite picture in my mind. He'll say, "Don't worry, I know how I'll do it." And in the end, it works! The combination of our two skill sets is exciting; almost magical at times.

DOG 51 IS YOUR FIRST SCIENCE-FICTION, OR MAYBE 'FUTURE-ANTICIPATING' SCREENPLAY...

"Anticipating" indeed, because I don't think it's science fiction. There's less science fiction in this screenplay than in the novel. There are two reasons for that. First, science fiction is such an American genre that I wouldn't have known how to truly make it work. And second, it would require a far greater budget than we had, even though *DOG 51* is already a big production compared to what's usually made in France. That doesn't mean that writing a 'futuristic' screenplay was any simpler! The anticipatory narrative carries its own constraints and, it seems to me, lays traps. For example, one mustn't confuse the future with futurism. Everything one says about the future can quickly make us look like we're trying to be prophets. But we're not meant to guess how events will unfold in the future, what inventions will emerge, which political parties will take power! It's necessary to introduce a dialogue, a bridge between the future and the present. That's why there are recognizable things in the film. For example technological elements that belong to our time, but are skewed, expanded or used differently. The thing we want to avoid is anything that can paradoxically date the film, by creating too contrived a vi-

sion of the future that will inevitably become obsolete. Great sci-fi films like *BLADE RUNNER* or *MINORITY REPORT* hardly age at all because they are very close to our world, while being distinctly different. They're projections. Visions.

Philip K. Dick remains the undisputed master of the genre. On our more modest scale, by choosing to put artificial intelligence at the heart of the narrative, we sought to build that bridge between future and present, since the AI-related issues in the movie are already those our era is grappling with, at different scales. China, for instance, already uses facial recognition. The military has tools at least as powerful as Alma in *DOG 51*. So we are both in the near future and the present. It's this link between present and future that creates the right dystopia.

WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY "NOT CONFUSING FUTURE WITH FUTURISM"?

We could have imagined flying cars, robotics everywhere – things that may or may not be plausible. But Cédric and I eliminated any elements that might be too technical or too technological – too 'of the future' in a certain sense. That's what I call 'futurism', even if it doesn't entirely carry that meaning. A 'geeky' vision of the future that could risk looking silly. We tried to stay as close as possible to today's world and its technologies. We consulted AI experts, for example. I even went to Dubai, to the Museum of the Future, among other places, because it seemed to me that Dubai could be a good example of tomorrow's cities, in their technological and social functioning. It's almost a 'company city', with the segregation and societal mechanisms that come with it. I had a minor car incident there. The driver texted the police via WhatsApp, the police viewed road surveillance footage, and ended up penalizing my driver, who had to pay a fine. They already have a very different view of the world and relationship with law enforcement! Also, it seemed important to me to stay as close as possible to reality to avoid the potential ridiculousness of 'futurism' and to say something powerful about what could happen tomorrow. Cédric took the same approach in his direction.

DOES THE FILM EXPRESS PERSONAL FEARS ABOUT THE FUTURE?

They are more questions than fears. But technology has always engendered fear. That doesn't necessarily imply conservatism or a desire to live in the past, but rather a necessary interrogation of the possible consequences of progress. In *DOG 51*, we tried to examine the connection between spatial and social segregation (embodied by the zones) and the question of surveillance. I have the idea that the more compartmentalized a society is, the more surveillance tools it requires. Look at South Africa, China, or even Argentina. The more unequal societies are, the more complex security devices they have, to segregate social classes. That visually interested us and felt like a strong question about the evolution of our societies. To what extent should we entrust security to technologies we don't entirely understand? If you look at how wars are fought today, they already rely heavily on artificial intelligence. Where will that lead us? That is truly the political core of the narrative.

HOW DOES THE FILM DIFFER FROM THE NOVEL? WHAT ASPECTS DID YOU CHANGE?

The very first versions of the script were very close to the book. That's natural. At the start, we were very conservative with our approach to the novel, because when you've read and loved something you tell yourself it's perfect. But then we have to adapt it, not only to our vision but also to what is feasible. For example, in the novel, the city is protected by a dome because of acid rain. It's very poetic, but we very quickly realized we wouldn't be able to cover Paris with a dome! Another significant change: the novel takes place in Greece, but we brought the story back to France so French audiences could identify with it more. Fundamentally, artificial intelligence doesn't exist at all in the novel, which speaks about medical transplants against a backdrop of a political campaign. But we didn't want to make a political film, and medical transplants seemed cinematically weaker. By introducing artificial intelligence into the screenplay, we gradually shifted away from the novel's narrative. Yet many emotional core elements from the book remain, including that meeting between two loners. That fragile, tenuous bond formed between two characters seemingly at odds. Like a connection rebuilding in the darkness. That's a very strong concept that perfectly aligns with Cédric's cinema.

WHY WAS PARIS THE RIGHT SETTING FOR THIS STORY?

It's interesting to imagine the future in Paris. Paris is not Shanghai or Dubai. It's not an ultra-modern city. Modernizing it makes the film, I find, more striking. You recognize Paris in the film, certainly, but it's a different Paris. What felt powerful as well, is that in Paris, 'zones'





already exist. Of course there are no checkpoints, but the Périphérique (a ring-road that surrounds Paris) is almost a natural border between rich and poor. It's more porous but, in a sense, that system is already in place. We extrapolated, as I said earlier, bridging present and future, by introducing checkpoints, reinforcing the city's military protection, particularly with drones. It was crucial to link zones and surveillance because the investigation relies on a forced team-up between a detective from Zone 2 and a policeman from Zone 3.

WHAT WAS THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE IN CREATING THE WORLD OF DOG 51?

The biggest challenge for us was how to make the viewer understand, within ten minutes, without us explaining it head-on, that we are in a world where zones have been created to separate citizens and that there is this super-powerful artificial intelligence that helps the police with investigations. How do you explain that without lengthy exposition? It works a lot through visuals and captions, but above all through the characters and what we experience with them. Cédric and I are convinced that pace and narration themselves are meaningful. When you're immersed in a story, you ask far fewer questions about the world you're in. You accept its reality much more easily. Cédric likes to start his films 'in medias res'. He dives straight into the action and we understand the story as the narrative moves forward. He handles the stakes of the narrative with great finesse, never explaining too much nor being incomprehensible. That struck me greatly in *NOVEMBER*. He takes the viewer by the hand and shows them everything they need to know, but no more. He leads them into his world from the first to the very last image of the film.

ARE YOUR CINEMATIC INSPIRATIONS AMERICAN?

With Cédric, we discussed *BLADE RUNNER*, *MINORITY REPORT*, or *CHILDREN OF MEN*, but we wanted to make this a French futuristic film. Personally, I refrained from rewatching all the American science-fiction films. *DOG 51* is definitively a film by Cédric Jimenez. It doesn't look like *BLADE RUNNER* or *MINORITY REPORT*. We remain very real and human. Cédric films very close to his characters. The emotion we feel at the end of the story, in my opinion, comes more from the bond that forms between Zem and Salia than from the investigation itself. *DOG 51* is of course a crime thriller, but a human one, and it's that human dimension we're most interested in.

DO YOU ADAPT YOUR WRITING TO CÉDRIC'S CINEMA?

Of course. Cédric has a very strong vision and firm sense of his own cinematic identity. There's continuity between *THE STRONGHOLD*, *NOVEMBER* and *DOG 51*. They're three films with completely different natures but a truly common identity. Of course it's the screenwriter's job to adapt to the director's vision, but the way we work is very instinctive. We speak the same language, we quickly envision the same thing. In my work, I know – or at least I think I know – how to help him bring his film to life. We trust each other greatly. I think we share the same ambition for our films. We want to make cinemas that is both popular and challenging, that poses important questions without sacrificing spectacle.

BIOGRAPHY

OLIVIER DEMANGEL

Olivier Demangel graduated from the renowned schools, Ecole Normale Supérieure de Paris (ENS) and the Femis, after studying screenwriting. From 2013 to 2019 Olivier has collaborated on several award-winning projects including LEARN BY HEART from Mathieu Vadepied, which was selected at The International Critics' Week in Cannes, and Simon Bouisson's WEI OR DIE which won the FIPA d'or in Biarritz. He also co-wrote the screenplays for TOWARDS THE BATTLE, directed by Aurélien Vernhes-Lermusiaux, which won the Louis-Delluc prize for Best First Film, and ATLANTICS with Mati Diop, which won the Cannes' Grand Prix award in 2019.

Additionally, Olivier has worked on several TV series, including the Canal+ original BARON NOIR, where he became one of the main screenwriters for the last season. He collaborated with Netflix on WONDER MAN (CLASS ACT), a short series dedicated to Bernard Tapie's life which won a BAFTA Award for best international show in 2024.

Most recently, Olivier has worked with Mathieu Vadepied and Cédric Jimenez on their latest feature films. He co-wrote NOVEMBER's screenplay (starring Jean Dujardin, Anais Demoustier and Sandrine Kiberlain) and FATHER AND SOLDIER (with Omar Sy). Both feature films were selected for Cannes Film Festival in 2022, NOVEMBER screening Out of Competition, and FATHER AND SOLDIER in UN CERTAIN REGARD's official selection.

In 2025, He co-wrote NO ONE WILL KNOW, directed by Vincent Maël Cardona, and MERCATO, a dramatic comedy directed by Tristan Séguéla and starring Jamel Debbouze

Olivier has just finished writing DOG 51, Cédric Jimenez's latest project, which had its world premiere at the Venice Film Festival. DOG 51 is a dystopian thriller set in a futuristic Paris divided by zones and controlled by an AI named Alma.

SELECTED FILMOGRAPHY

2025	DOG 51	Cédric JIMENEZ
	NO ONE WILL KNOW	Vincent Maël CARDONA
2022	NOVEMBER	Cédric JIMENEZ
2019	ATLANTICS	Mati DIOP
	TOWARDS THE BATTLE	Aurélien VERNHES LERMUSIAUX
	REPUBLIQUE: THE INTERACTIVE	Simon BOUISSON
2017	RATTRAPAGE	Tristan SEGUELA
2015	LEARN BY HEART	Mathieu VADEPIED
	WEI OR DIE	Simon BOUISSON
2013	9 MONTH STRETCH	Albert DUPONTEL
2011	RÊVE BEBE RÊVE	Christophe NANGA-OLY



CAST LIST

ZEM	GILLES LELLOUCHE
SALIA	ADÈLE EXARCHOPOULOS
JOHN MAFRAM	LOUIS GARREL
THÉO RIMARVAL	ROMAIN DURIS
IRINA	VALERIA BRUNI TEDESCHI
MALIK BOUZID	ARTUS
CAL	STÉPHANE BAK
CHARLINE	LALA & CE
LUC	HUGO DILLON
LE RECELEUR	CYRIL LECOMTE
AMEL	DAPHNÉ PATAKIA
KESSEL	THOMAS BANGALTER
TOBO	AGATHE MOUGIN
LUCY MONK	JEANNE HERRY

TECHNICAL LIST

DIRECTOR	CÉDRIC JIMENEZ
FIRST ASSISTANT DIRECTOR	FABIEN VERGEZ
SCREENPLAY	OLIVIER DEMANGEL & CÉDRIC JIMENEZ
BASED ON THE NOVEL FROM	LAURENT GAUDE
PRODUCTION	CHI-FOU-MI PRODUCTION (HUGO SELIGNAC)
CO-PRODUCTION	ARTEMIS PRODUCTION (STÉPHANE QUINET)
PRODUCTION MANAGER	TERRY PFORTNER
ORIGINAL MUSIC	GUILLAUME ROUSSEL
SOUND MIXER	CÉDRIC DELOCHE
CINEMATOGRAPHY	LAURENT TANGY
SET DESIGN	JEAN-PHILIPPE MOREAUX
COSTUMES	STÉPHANIE WATRIGANT
POST-PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR	PAULINE GILBERT
EDITING	LAURE GARDETTE & STAN COLLET
ASSOCIATE PRODUCERS	NICOLAS DUMONT & ANTOINE LAFON