



Original: **English**

No.: **ICC-01/14-01/18**

Date: **9 October 2023**

TRIAL CHAMBER V

Before: Judge Bertram Schmitt, Presiding Judge
Judge Péter Kovács
Judge Chang-ho Chung

**SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC II
IN THE CASE OF *PROSECUTOR v. ALFRED YEKATOM AND PATRICE-
EDOUARD NGAÏSSONA***

Public

**Public redacted version of “Prosecution’s Request for Submission of the Prior
Recorded Testimony of P-2269 pursuant to Rule 68(2)(c)”,
ICC-01/14-01/18-1957-Conf, 4 July 2023**

Source: Office of the Prosecutor

Document to be notified in accordance with regulation 31 of the *Regulations of the Court* to:

The Office of the Prosecutor

Mr Karim A. A. Khan KC
Mr Mame Mandiaye Niang
Mr Kweku Vanderpuye

Counsel for Alfred Yekatom

Ms Mylène Dimitri
Mr Thomas Hannis
Ms Anta Guissé
Ms Sarah Bafadhel

Counsel for Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona

Mr Geert-Jan Alexander Knoops
Mr Richard Omissé-Namkeamai
Ms Marie-Hélène Proulx

Legal Representatives of Victims

Mr Dmytro Suprun
Mr Abdou Dangabo Moussa
Ms Elisabeth Rabesandratana
Mr Yaré Fall
Ms Marie-Edith Douzima-Lawson
Ms Paolina Massidda

Legal Representatives of Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

**Unrepresented Applicants
(Participation/Reparation)**

States Representatives

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar

Mr Osvaldo Zavala Giler

Counsel Support Section

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Mr Nigel Verrill

Detention Section

**Victims Participation and Reparations
Section**

Other

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”) requests the formal submission of P-2269’s prior recorded testimony pursuant to rule 68(2)(c) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”), the “Initial Directions on the Conduct of the Proceedings” (“Initial Directions”)¹ and the “Further Directions on the Conduct of the Proceedings (Presentation of Evidence by the CLRV and the Defence)” (“Further Directions”).² P-2269’s prior recorded testimony (“Prior Statement”) comprises his 8 June 2019 statement³ to the Prosecution, together with four associated exhibits.⁴

2. The Prior Statement may be introduced under rule 68(2)(c) because (i) P-2269 was unavailable to testify due to obstacles that could not be overcome with reasonable diligence, and is now presumed dead; (ii) the Prosecution could not anticipate the need for article 56 measures to obtain his evidence; (iii) the evidence has sufficient indicia of reliability; (iii) the evidence is relevant and probative; and (iv) there is no undue prejudice to either Accused from its submission.⁵

3. P-2269 is an insider witness and former member of the *Forces Armées Centrafricaines* (“FACA”). Upon the Seleka’s arrival, the witness fled first to [REDACTED], and then to [REDACTED], where he joined the Anti-Balaka. He went on to participate in the Anti-Balaka’s 5 December 2013 attack on BANGUI. P-2269’s Prior Statement provides important evidence on (i) the formation of the Anti-Balaka in GOBERE; (ii) NGAISSONA’s financial support for the GOBERE Group; (iii) the planning and execution of the BANGUI attack including the role of YEKATOM’s Group; and (iv) the Anti-Balaka’s targeting of the Muslim civilian population. The

¹ ICC-01/14-01/18-631, para. 33.

² ICC-01/14-01/18-1892, paras.3-4.

³ CAR-OTP-2111-0336, and its translation CAR-OTP-2118-2197.

⁴ CAR-OTP-2111-0362, CAR-OTP-2111-0364, CAR-OTP-2111-0365, and CAR-OTP-2111-0367. Note that while the witness comments upon additional documents in his Prior Statement, all are already recognised as submitted. The Prosecution therefore considers that their resubmission here is unnecessary.

⁵ ICC-01/14-01/21-506-Conf, para. 9.

Prior Statement is thus *prima facie* relevant to, and probative of, material issues at trial. Moreover, it is cumulative to and corroborated by other evidence in the case.

4. The relevance and probative value of the Prior Statement is set out in more detail below, along with other sources of corroborative evidence. *Confidential* Annex A (a Summary Chart) lists P-2269's Prior Statement and its four associated exhibits.⁶ It also identifies the relevant paragraphs of the Confirmation Decision to which P-2269's evidence relates.

5. Although the Prior Statement bears substantially on the acts and conduct of the Accused NGAISSONA, recognition of its formal submission is essential to the Chamber's statutory truth-finding obligation.

II. CONFIDENTIALITY

6. Pursuant to regulation 23*bis*(1) of the Regulations of the Court ("RoC"), this Request and its annex are filed as "Confidential", as they contain information concerning a witness which should not be made public. A "Public Redacted" version of the Request will be filed as soon as practicable.

III. SUBMISSIONS

7. Rule 68(2)(c) empowers the Chamber to recognise the formal submission of the prior recorded testimony of a witness "who has subsequently died, must be presumed dead, or is, due to obstacles that cannot be overcome with reasonable diligence, unavailable to testify orally" when: (i) the necessity of measures under article 56 of the Statute could not be anticipated; (ii) the prior recorded testimony has sufficient indicia

⁶ CAR-OTP-2111-0362, CAR-OTP-2111-0364, CAR-OTP-2111-0365, and CAR-OTP-2111-0367. Note that while the witness comments upon additional documents in his Prior Statement, all are already recognised as submitted. The Prosecution therefore considers that their resubmission here is unnecessary.

of reliability;⁷ (iii) the evidence is relevant and probative; and (iv) the submission is not prejudicial to or inconsistent with the rights of the accused.⁸ As detailed below, P-2269's Prior Statement meets all of these criteria.

a. P-2269 is unavailable to testify

8. Witness unavailability under rule 68(2)(c) is to be interpreted broadly,⁹ and includes the inability to trace the witness after all reasonable steps have been taken, such as the request for and issuance of a summons to appear.¹⁰ In this case, witness P-2269 is unable to testify because he is either dead, to be presumed dead, or otherwise unavailable based on the withdrawal of his cooperation with the Court. As detailed directly below, the Prosecution and the Court itself have exhausted all reasonable measures to secure his attendance.

9. The Prosecution last had direct contact with the witness in October 2021, in the context of arranging his travel to BANGUI from [REDACTED] to obtain his passport so that he could testify. On 27 October 2021, the witness told the Prosecution that he would call three days later to keep the Prosecution informed about his journey, but did not do so. Since then, the Prosecution's repeated attempts to contact the witness directly, as well as through family members and other intermediaries, have been unsuccessful.

10. In a 7 February 2022 filing, the NGAISSONA Defence noted that [REDACTED].¹¹ In February 2022, following inquiries, the CAR police in [REDACTED] advised the Prosecution that this information was incorrect, and that the witness's wife indicated that he had gone to [REDACTED].

⁷ ICC-01/04-02/06-1029, para. 12 ; ICC-01/14-01/21-506-Conf, para. 15.

⁸ ICC-01/12-01/18-1111-Conf, para. 7; ICC-01/05-01/08-1386, para. 78.

⁹ ICC-01/05-01/13-1481, para. 16.

¹⁰ See ICC-01/12-01/18-2114, para. 24-26.

¹¹ ICC-01/14-01/18-1273-Conf, para. 9.

11. On 1 August 2022, a Prosecution investigator spoke on the phone to a woman who introduced herself as the witness's daughter. She told the investigator that the witness was not with her at the time (thereby intimating that the witness was alive).

12. On 10 August 2022, a Prosecution investigator spoke on the phone to a man who introduced himself as the witness's son. He told the investigator that the witness was deceased.

13. Between 16 and 18 August 2022, the Prosecution searched the register of deaths recorded between 1 August 2021 and 1 August 2022 at both the morgue of the Regional Hospital of [REDACTED] and the townhall in [REDACTED]. The witness's name did not appear on either. Also at this time, at the Prosecution's request, the CAR police spoke to the witness's wife over his phone number. The witness's wife told them that she had "faked his [the witness's] death so that a white woman would stop calling him".¹²

14. On 15 December 2022, following further attempts to contact the witness, including through continued calls to known and potential contact numbers, searches of social media, and the use of intermediaries, the Prosecution requested that a summons be issued to compel P-2269's appearance, on the basis that he appeared to be faking his death to avoid testifying.¹³

15. [REDACTED].¹⁴ [REDACTED]¹⁵ [REDACTED].

16. [REDACTED]¹⁶

¹² See CAR-OTP-00000017 at 000002 (presumably, referring to a Prosecution representative).

¹³ See ICC-01/14-01/18-1701-Conf-Red2 ("Summons Request").

¹⁴ See ICC-01/14-01/18-1738-Conf.

¹⁵ ICC-01/14-01/18-1738-Conf, para. 15.

¹⁶ [REDACTED].

17. [REDACTED],¹⁷ [REDACTED].¹⁸ [REDACTED].

18. [REDACTED], the Prosecution considers that the Chamber may appropriately rely on a presumption of his death for the purposes of this application.

b. Article 56 measures could not be anticipated

19. P-2269 was interviewed between [REDACTED] 2019. At the time of the interview, the witness was [REDACTED] years old and did not report any serious health issues or voice any reluctance to cooperate with the Prosecution. Further, he remained in contact with the Prosecution immediately following his interview and did not express any concerns when informed that he was on the witness list to testify. Moreover, it appeared that he had taken affirmative steps to arrange for his travel to do so before suddenly disengaging with the Prosecution. Under these circumstances, the Prosecution had no information within its possession that would prompt consideration of evidence preserving measures under article 56.

c. The tendered evidence is reliable

20. P-2269's Prior Statement is *prima facie* reliable. The Prosecution obtained P-2269's Prior Statement in the ordinary course of its investigation.¹⁹ In accordance with rule 111, the witness's factual account was provided voluntarily and signed by him, as well as the investigators conducting the interview.²⁰ The witness read the Prior Statement in a language he fully understood before signing it.²¹ It further contains an express acknowledgement attesting to its voluntariness and the truth of its contents, to the

¹⁷ [REDACTED].

¹⁸ [REDACTED].

¹⁹ See ICC-01/09-01/11-1938-Red-Corr, para. 66; see also ICC-01/05-01/13-1481-Red-Corr, para. 20.

²⁰ ICC-01/05-01/13-1481-Red-Corr, para. 20 See also ICC-01/14-01/21-506-Conf, para. 11; ICC-02/04-01/15-596-Red, para. 9; ICC; ICC-01/09-01/11-1938-Corr-Red2, para. 32; ICC-01/05-01/13-1478-Red-Corr, paras. 29-31.

²¹ CAR-OTP-2111-0336 at 0337, para. 5, at 0360-0361.

best of the witness's knowledge and recollection.²² Where the witness chose not to divulge certain information, he indicated as much,²³ underscoring the voluntary nature of his statement. Further, the Prior Statement is internally consistent, and sufficiently corroborated by other evidence in the case.²⁴

21. As noted, the Prior Statement is limited to information within the witness's knowledge and experience. He was forthcoming in his interview about his lack of knowledge or lack of memory of certain events.²⁵ Further, P-2269 gave reasonable and logical explanations in his narrative of events without embellishment or speculation, stating for example, in relation to a document: "(i)t refers to something that happened in YEKATOM's area so I don't know what happened, I don't know any details".²⁶

22. In sum, the Prior Statement is reliable in that it (i) is signed; (ii) was given in a language the witness fully understands; (iii) contains an acknowledgement that it is accurate; (iv) is internally consistent; and (v) is predicated on information within the witness's actual knowledge, in that the witness readily admitted when he did not know certain information.²⁷

d. P-2269's Prior Statement is relevant and probative

23. P-2269's Prior Statement is relevant and probative. It comprises 26 pages. There are no agreements as to the facts contained in the charges, documents, the expected testimony of witnesses, or other evidence pursuant to article 69 which bear on the Prior Statement.

²² CAR-OTP-2111-0336 at 0337, para. 6, at 0360.

²³ CAR-OTP-2111-0336 at 0342, para. 41; at 0343, para. 52.

²⁴ See para. 29-33 below.

²⁵ CAR-OTP-2111-0336 at 0338, para. 18; at 0343, para. 54; at 0348, para. 93; at 0353, para. 130; at 0357, para. 157.

²⁶ CAR-OTP-2111-0336 at 0355, para. 144.

²⁷ CAR-OTP-2082-1058, at 1062, para. 24, at 1063, para. 27, and at 1064, para. 37.

24. The witness's Prior Statement describes the following:

- The witness's flight to [REDACTED] after the Seleka's coup of 24 March 2013, along with [REDACTED];
- The gathering of the Anti-Balaka at GOBERE in order to prepare for the overthrow of DJOTODIA and the Seleka. The witness describes how there, traditional rituals were administered, the men were trained in weaponry and were divided into 14 groups, each with a leader;
- The Anti-Balaka's planning of an offensive against the Seleka in BANGUI and other locations such as BOSSANGO and BERBERATI, on the same day. According to this plan, the various groups from GOBERE would converge upon BANGUI along different routes. ANDJILO's group attacked BOUCA on the way down to BANGUI, whereas the witness's group attacked [REDACTED]. Some groups would remain behind to attack BOSSANGO;
- The coordinated nature of this offensive, as evident from [REDACTED];
- NGAISSONA's financing of the Anti-Balaka in GOBERE, by sending CFA 1,000,000 on three occasions through an intermediary ([REDACTED]);
- The coordination and execution of the Anti-Balaka's 5 December attack on BANGUI, in which YEKATOM's Group and groups from GOBERE converged on the city from different directions. The witness describes the different routes taken by the groups;
- The establishment and structure of the Anti-Balaka's National Coordination in early 2014, including the roles of NGAISSONA as the General / National

Coordinator and of YEKATOM, who was “under NGAISSONA, he was a subordinate”;²⁸

- The nature of the Anti-Balaka’s attack on the Muslim population, for which they considered civilians and the Seleka “all the same.”²⁹

e. Balance of interests

25. Granting the Request advances the interests of justice. By its terms, rule 68(2)(c) does not *per se* unfairly prejudice the Defence in permitting the submission of uncross-examined evidence unrelated to the acts and conduct of the Accused.³⁰ On the contrary, although rule 68 is an exception to the principle of orality³¹ and publicity,³² its application “is *per se* generally considered *compatible* with the rights of the accused”³³ and indeed all statutory rights because it is express in the Court’s procedural framework.

26. Additionally, the Chamber’s appropriate exercise of discretion in determining the evaluative criteria as defined in the Rules, among others, serves as a sufficient procedural safeguard against potential prejudice. Similarly, the fact that the Parties can avail themselves of the provision further underscores its inherent neutrality.³⁴ Thus, any claim of prejudice should only be entertained in light of the particular circumstances of the specific witness, their evidence, and the case — not presumptively, nor in the abstract.

27. P-2269’s evidence is manifestly relevant to the proper adjudication of salient issues in this case and in the search for and establishment of the truth. Importantly, its

²⁸ CAR-OTP-2111-0336 at 0353, para. 132.

²⁹ CAR-OTP-2111-0336 at 0357, para. 161.

³⁰ ICC-01/05-01/13-1478-Red-Corr, para. 38-39.

³¹ ICC-01/05-01/08-1386, para. 78.

³² ICC-01/14-01/18-685, para. 25 (referencing articles 64(7) and 67(1)).

³³ ICC-01/14-01/18-685, para. 26.

³⁴ ICC-01/09-01/11-1938-Red-Corr, para. 25.

formal submission does not cause any unfair prejudice to the Accused either in respect of the nature of rule 68(2) itself, or as applied in these circumstances.³⁵

28. Importantly, P-2269's proposed evidence is cumulative to and corroborated by other evidence in the case. Further, his identity is confirmed by witness testimony already led from [REDACTED],³⁶ [REDACTED]³⁷ [REDACTED].³⁸

29. P-2269's proposed evidence on the Anti-Balaka's gathering and organisation at GOBERE in preparation to overthrow the Seleka is cumulative to, and corroborated by witness testimony and documentary evidence already submitted in the case. This includes the testimony of Prosecution witnesses whom the Defence have cross-examined on the topic of GOBERE, or have had a full opportunity to do so, including, *inter alia*, P-0966,³⁹ P-2251,⁴⁰ P-2658,⁴¹ P-1521,⁴² P-2232,⁴³ P-0889,⁴⁴ and P-0884.⁴⁵ It further includes the statement of P-2602,⁴⁶ also sought to be introduced under rule 68(2)(c). Corroborative documentary evidence includes interviews with Anti-Balaka leaders

³⁵ ICC-01/09-01/11-1938-Red-Corr, para. 27.

³⁶ [REDACTED].

³⁷ [REDACTED].

³⁸ [REDACTED].

³⁹ P-0966: CAR-OTP-2031-0241 at 0246, para. 28-39, also extensively covered at T-116 and T-117. *See* Defence cross-examination at T-117, p. 4-26, 34-45; T-118, p. 56-61.

⁴⁰ P-2251: CAR-OTP-2093-0045 at 0050-0052, para. 30-43, T-043, p. 12, l. 18-p. 21, l. 6; T-044, p. 29, l. 25-p. 31, l. 25. *See* Defence cross-examination at T-044, p. 25, l. 1-p. 32, l. 21.

⁴¹ P-2658: CAR-OTP-2126-0012 at 0024-0028, para. 78-104; also extensively covered at T-134. *See* extensive Defence cross-examination at T-135, from p. 18 onwards.

⁴² P-1521: T-081, p. 10, l. 21-p. 12, l. 1. *See* Defence cross-examination at T-082, p. 57, l. 8-p. 58, l. 1.

⁴³ P-2232: T-076, p. 2, l. 13-p. 7, l. 2. *See* Defence cross-examination at T-078, p. 47, l. 18-p. 48, l. 5.

⁴⁴ P-0889: CAR-OTP-2027-2290 at 2297, para. 38.

⁴⁵ P-0884: T-055, p. 22, l. 17-p. 34, l. 8.

⁴⁶ P-2602: CAR-OTP-2118-9579 at 9580-9597, l. 1-597; CAR-OTP-2118-9598 at 9599-9616, l. 1-631; CAR-OTP-2118-9617 at 9618-9623, l. 1-191.

such as Dieudonné HOURONTI⁴⁷ and Sylvestre YAGOUZOU,⁴⁸ and a speech of Sébastien WENEZOU.⁴⁹

30. P-2269's evidence on the coordinated planning and execution of the attack on BANGUI by groups from GOBERE together with YEKATOM's Group is corroborated by the witness testimony of P-0954⁵⁰ and P-0446,⁵¹ whom the Defence also cross-examined upon that topic.⁵² This is further supported by the existence of multiple calls in late November and the first days of December 2013 between numbers attributed to YEKATOM and Maxime MOKOM.⁵³

31. P-2269's proposed evidence on NGAISSONA's financing of the Anti-Balaka prior to the 5 December 2013 attacks is corroborated by P-2673⁵⁴ and P-2843,⁵⁵ whom the Defence also cross-examined upon that topic.⁵⁶ This is further corroborated by the statements of P-1847,⁵⁷ to be tendered under rule 68(2)(d). While these witnesses may give different details of the precise manner in which NGAISSONA financed the Anti-Balaka, it is sufficient for the purposes of corroboration that their testimony goes to the similar facts of his financing prior to 5 December 2013.⁵⁸

⁴⁷ CAR-OTP-2084-1263 from [00:02:29] to [00:03:54] and its transcript CAR-OTP-2107-1565 at 1567-1568, l. 61-91 (in which HOURONTI speaks of the establishment of an Anti-Balaka base in GOBERE). *See also* CAR-OTP-2081-1769 from [00:04:00] to [00:04:15] and its transcript CAR-OTP-2107-6939 at 6942-6943, l. 100-111 (in which HOURONTI says he was in BOSSANGO with the Anti-Balaka from the beginning).

⁴⁸ CAR-OTP-2065-5470 from [00:00:39] to [00:01:14] and its transcript CAR-OTP-2107-1559 at 1560, l. 16-21 (in which YAGOUZOU says that the Anti-Balaka came from GOBERE).

⁴⁹ CAR-OTP-2084-1331 from [00:02:37] to [00:03:00] and its transcript CAR-OTP-2107-1586 at 1587, l. 30-33 (in which WENEZOU speaks of 16 officers forming the hard pillar of the Anti-Balaka around BOSSANGO).

⁵⁰ P-0954: CAR-OTP-2048-0171 at 0176, para. 34; T-166, p. 24, l. 8-p. 28, l. 3.

⁵¹ P-0446: CAR-OTP-2059-1672 at 1688, l. 613-p. 1693, l. 768; T-096, p. 45, l. 8-p. 49, l. 18.

⁵² *See* Defence cross examination at T-167, p. 48, l. 12, p. 49, l. 2; T-168, p. 49, l. 11-p. 50, l. 10; T-169, p. 21, l. 1-23 (P-0954); and at T-099, P. 25, l. 12-p. 26, l. 25 (P-0446).

⁵³ *See* Call Sequence Table 9 in the Prosecution's CDR bar table motion at ICC-01/14-01/18-1296-Conf-AnxA-Corr, p. 244-248.

⁵⁴ P-2673: CAR-OTP-2127-6435 at 6443-6444, 6451, para. 52-56, 100; T-041, p. 18, l. 20-p. 20, l. 12.

⁵⁵ P-2841: CAR-OTP-2127-4238 at 4253-4254, 4263, 4264 para. 87-89, 139, 141, 146, commenting on CAR-OTP-2101-9735 at 9805.

⁵⁶ *See* Defence cross-examination at T-042, p. 25-40 (P-2673); and at T-043, p. 21, l. 22-p. 22, l. 7, p. 24, l. 4-p. 26, l. 6 (P-2841).

⁵⁷ P-1847: CAR-OTP-2061-1534 at 1552, 1555, 1562, para. 115-116, 132-135, 179; CAR-OTP-2122-8251 at 8263, 8264 para. 115, 121-123.

⁵⁸ *See* ICC-01/12-01/2114-Conf, para. 39.

32. Finally, P-2269's proposed evidence on the Anti-Balaka's attack on the Muslim civilian population, particularly in their disregard of the principle of distinction vis-à-vis the Seleka, is cumulative to, and corroborated by witness testimony and documentary evidence already submitted in the case. This includes the testimony of Prosecution witnesses whom the Defence have cross-examined on this topic, or otherwise have had a full opportunity to do so, including, *inter alia*, P-0884,⁵⁹ P-0876,⁶⁰ P-0291,⁶¹ P-0808,⁶² P-0965⁶³ and P-0287.⁶⁴ Corroborative documentary evidence includes an interview conducted with NGAISSONA in September 2014 in which he acknowledged that Anti-Balaka elements targeted civilians, including women and children,⁶⁵ and a press release of February 2014 issued in NGAISSONA's name which refers to the Anti-Balaka's spirit of revenge against the Seleka and the Muslims who supported them as well as the "*dérapages*" noted within the Anti-Balaka.⁶⁶ In addition to corroborating the Anti-Balaka's failure to respect the principle of distinction, these statements also display NGAISSONA's awareness of that failure.

33. Any potential prejudice to the Accused is moreover averted, since the Chamber may not enter a conviction on any charge founded to a 'decisive extent' on P-2269's Prior Statement. Moreover, the Chamber will undoubtedly consider the appropriate *weight* to be accorded the Prior Statement at the end of trial, as foreseen by the Chamber's adoption of the submission regime,⁶⁷ bearing in mind its probative value, extrinsic and

⁵⁹ P-0884: T-054, p. 52, l. 4-p. 63, l. 13, including commentary on video CAR-OTP-2049-1679 from [00:01:43] to [00:06:12] with its transcript CAR-OTP-2107-1530-1536 at 1532, l. 67-214. See Defence cross-examination at T-057, p. 9, l. 7-21; T-058, p. 18, l. 24-p. 21, l. 23.

⁶⁰ P-0876: CAR-OTP-2046-0473 at 0484-0485, l. 420-446; T-085, p. 46, l. 3-p. 47, l. 15. See Defence cross-examination at T-086, p. 42, l. 6-12; T-088, p. 11, l. 10-p. 12, l. 9.

⁶¹ P-0291: T-051, p. 29, l. 10-p. 30, l. 12, p. 67, l. 8-19, p. 68, l. 13-p. 69, l. 2. See Defence cross-examination at T-052, p. 17, l. 12-p. 18, l. 2, p. 34, l. 17-p. 39, l. 14.

⁶² P-0808: CAR-OTP-2093-0010 at 0017-0018, para. 37, 39-40.

⁶³ P-0965: CAR-OTP-2046-0182 0186-0187, l. 117-153; CAR-OTP-2046-0195 at 0203, l. 271-280; T-061, p. 37, l. 17-p. 38, l. 12.

⁶⁴ P-0287: CAR-OTP-2115-0239 at 0265-0266, para. 132; T-020, p. 27, l. 12-p. 28, l. 13.

⁶⁵ CAR-OTP-2122-5902 from [00:15:41] to [00:20:56] with its transcript CAR-OTP-2122-9457 at 9464-9466, l. 233-324.

⁶⁶ CAR-OTP-2025-0372 at 0374.

⁶⁷ See ICC-01/14-01/18-631, para. 52-53.

intrinsic reliability, as well as the fact that it is corroborative of other documentary evidence and cross-examined testimony.

34. P-2269's Prior Statement should thus be recognised as formally submitted and the Chamber shall consider to what extent a conviction on any of the charges supported by P-2269's evidence is appropriate on the basis of *all* relevant evidence at the end of the trial.

IV. CONCLUSION

35. For the foregoing reasons, the Prosecution requests the Chamber recognise as formally submitted the Prior Statement of P-2269, together with its associated exhibits, pursuant to rule 68(2)(c).



Karim A. A. Khan KC, Prosecutor

Dated this 9th day of October 2023
At The Hague, The Netherlands