

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: English

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

Date: 8 November 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
*THE PROSECUTOR v. ALFRED YEKATOM AND PATRICE-EDOUARD
NGAÏSSONA***

**Public
With confidential Annexes 1 and 2**

**Public Redacted Version of the 'Defence Request to deviate from the "Protocol on the handling of confidential information during investigations and contact between a party or a participant and witnesses of the opposing party or participant"',
(ICC-01/14-01/18-2128), filed 22 September 2023**

Source: Defence of Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona

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 the Defence of Mr Ngaïssona

Mr Geert-Jan Alexander Knoops
Mr Richard Omissé-Namkeamaï
Ms Marie-Hélène Proulx
Ms Antonina Dyk

Counsel for the Defence of Mr Yekatom

Ms Mylène Dimitri
Mr Thomas Hannis
Ms Anta Guissé

Legal Representatives of the Victims

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

Legal Representatives of the Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

**Unrepresented Applicants
(Participation/Reparation)**

The Office of Public Counsel for Victims

**The Office of Public Counsel for the
Defence**

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. Pursuant to paragraph 3 of the “Protocol on the handling of confidential information during investigations and contact between a party or a participant and witnesses of the opposing party or participant” (‘the Protocol’),¹ the Defence for Mr Patrice-Édouard Ngaïssona (‘the Defence’) requests authorization from Trial Chamber V (‘the Chamber’) to deviate from the Protocol with respect to the timing of the contact and the potential interviews the Prosecution would have with Defence witnesses.
2. Under paragraph 31 of the Protocol, when a non-calling party has informed the calling party that it wishes to interview the calling party’s witnesses, the calling party must ask its witnesses whether they agree to be interviewed within five days. The Prosecution informed the Defence on Thursday, 14 September 2023, that it wished to contact and interview 17 of the 30 witnesses on the Defence’s provisional witness list (‘the Prosecution Request’).² Within the five-day limit set by paragraph 31 of the Protocol, the Defence requested on 15 September 2023, whether the Prosecution would agree to deviate from the protocol pursuant to paragraph 3, and postpone its request until 20 November 2023,³ which corresponds to the first working day after which the Defence will have filed its Final List of Witnesses.
3. The Prosecution responded on 19 September 2023,⁴ that it could not agree to the Defence’s request to deviate from the Protocol. Due to the lack of mutual agreement, the Defence hereby seeks authorization from the Chamber under paragraph 3 of the Protocol to postpone the applicability of the procedure for

¹ ICC-01/14-01/18-156-AnxA.

² Annex 1, Email from the Prosecution to the Defence re: Interview with Defence witnesses-ICC-01/14-01/18-2055-Conf-Anx1, dated September 14, 2023, 9:16AM.

³ Annex 1, Email from the Defence to the Prosecution re: Interview with Defence witnesses-ICC-01/14-01/18-2055-Conf-Anx1, dated September 15, 2023, 5:35PM. There is a typo in Annex 1, which contains the original email sent to the Prosecution. The Defence indicated paragraph 1 of the protocol whereas the relevant provision is found in paragraph 3.

⁴ Annex 2, Scan of the response of the Prosecution to the Defence request to deviate from the Protocol, dated 19 September 2023.

contacting a non-calling party's witness for a potential interview for the following two reasons. First, at this stage of the proceedings, the Prosecution Request will endanger the integrity of the Defence's investigations, and second it will prejudice the Defence in its preparations to present evidence.

II. CONFIDENTIALITY

4. Pursuant to Regulation 23*bis* of the Regulations of the Court, the Defence makes this request *ex parte* only available to Trial Chamber V and the Registry because it provides details as to the state of Defence investigations, [REDEACTED]. [REDACTED]. A Confidential Redacted version, available only to the Prosecution, will be filed simultaneously, or immediately thereafter with the present request along with the two annexes, which are copies of the Defence's exchanges with the Prosecution.

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

5. On 14 September 2023, the Prosecution informed the Defence *via* email⁵ that it was seeking to interview no less than 17 of the Defence's witnesses on the provisional witness list, which accounts for more than half of the witnesses on the said list.⁶ The Prosecution invoked paragraph 31 of the Protocol,⁷ which specifies that the calling party must ask the witnesses whether they wish to be interviewed or contacted within five days.
6. The next day, on 15 September 2023, the Defence responded and requested whether pursuant to paragraph 3 of the Protocol, the Prosecution would be willing to deviate from the Protocol by: (1) postponing the procedure delineated in paragraph 31 until 20 November 2023, which is the first working day after the Defence will have filed its Final List of Witnesses, and (2) by providing the Defence

⁵ Annex 1.

⁶ ICC-01/14-01/18-2055-Conf-Anx1.

⁷ ICC-01/14-01/18-156-AnxA.

with the topics and later questions on which it wishes to interview the Defence's witnesses since it appeared to the Defence that the Prosecution may be abusing the Protocol.⁸

7. On the evening of 15 September 2023, several key services of the Court became unavailable both at the Headquarters and remotely because of a cyber security incident.⁹
8. On 19 September 2023, given the attendant difficulties of communicating *via* email, the Prosecution hand delivered a hard copy of its answer to the Defence's email request to deviate from the Protocol.¹⁰ The Prosecution informed the Defence that it did not agree to deviate from the Protocol by postponing the procedure specified in paragraph 31. The Prosecution also recalled that the Protocol does not require that the Party identify the subject matter of its prospective interview, even though the Defence acknowledged this by requesting that the Prosecution deviate from the Protocol. The Prosecution did not answer whether it was amenable to the Defence's suggestion that for those witnesses who are retained on the Final List of Witnesses, the Defence could put the Prosecution's questions directly to the witnesses.
9. On the same day, 19 September 2023, the Defence, *via* email, acknowledged receipt of the Prosecution's position and further informed the Prosecution that due to the lack of mutual agreement to deviate from the Protocol, the Defence would seize the Chamber to obtain authorization to postpone contacting any Defence witnesses to ask whether they consent to an interview with the Prosecution.¹¹

IV. APPLICABLE LAW

⁸ Annex 1.

⁹ Email from the Registry re: Cyber security incident / Incident de cybersécurité dated September 18, 2023 at 5:37PM.

¹⁰ Annex 2.

¹¹ Annex 1.

10. Paragraph 1 of the Protocol states that the purpose of the protocol is “to protect the safety of witnesses, victims and other individuals at risk, as well as the integrity of investigations, in a manner consistent with the rights of suspects and accused.” Absent from the Protocol is any mention of the purpose being to “facilitate the non-calling Party’s preparation.”¹²
11. Paragraph 3 of the Protocol provides that “any deviation from this Protocol requires the prior authorization of the Chamber. However, the parties may mutually agree to deviate from this Protocol without seeking the prior authorization of the Chamber.”¹³
12. In its “Order Scheduling a First Status Conference”,¹⁴ the Chamber decided that unless otherwise indicated the procedures adopted by Pre-Trial Chamber II, which included the Protocol would continue to remain in place.

V. SUBMISSIONS

13. Given the Defence’s inability to reach a mutual agreement with the Prosecution, the Defence requests the Chamber to deviate from the Protocol and order the Prosecution to postpone making its request to the Defence until 20 November 2023, which is the first working day after the Defence would have filed its Final List of Witnesses. The Defence submits that such an order from the Chamber is necessary to ensure that: (1) the integrity of the Defence’s investigations is preserved, and (2) the Defence has sufficient time and resources to prepare its case. Additionally, for two witnesses mentioned in the Prosecution Request, the Defence has determined it will not be unduly prejudiced if it were to contact them for a potential Prosecution interview. However, the Defence requests the Chamber to place limits on the Prosecution’s scope of questioning.

¹² Annex 2.

¹³ The Protocol, para. 3.

¹⁴ ICC-01/14-01/18-459.

14. Out of the 17 witnesses, the Defence submits that for [REDACTED] of these witnesses, it has [REDACTED]. Therefore, any potential interview with the Prosecution that would have to be organized at this time would endanger the integrity of the Defence's investigations. Additionally, for another [REDACTED] of these witnesses, the Defence is currently assessing whether they should remain Defence witnesses. The Chamber has given the Defence until 17 November to finalize its list of witnesses, and this should not be impeded by the Prosecution's request that the procedure for facilitating interviews of a non-calling party's witness be applied now. Facilitating such potential interviews implies the spending of Court resources on the Prosecution interviewing Defence witnesses [REDACTED].

15. After the Defence received the Prosecution's response that it is not willing to postpone the Prosecution Request until 20 November 2023, the Defence has determined that complying with the Protocol for witnesses [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] will not cause undue prejudice to the Defence. The Defence has [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. Therefore, a deviation from the Protocol is not necessary to protect the Defence's investigations and preparations with respect to these two witnesses. Witness [REDACTED] has already agreed to be interviewed by the Prosecution in the presence of a representative of the Defence. However, the Defence requests the Chamber to give the Prosecution instructions as to the scope of the permitted interviews.

i. Granting the Defence's request to deviate from the Protocol is necessary to ensure the integrity of the Defence's investigations

16. In its *inter partes* request to the Prosecution to deviate from the Protocol, the Defence recalled its submissions to the Chamber, wherein it stressed its need to complete its investigations regarding its witnesses.¹⁵ If the Defence must comply

¹⁵ Annex 1.

with the Protocol and contact the 17 witnesses cited in the Defence's provisional witness list, its investigations will be hindered by destabilizing the witnesses and [REDACTED], [REDACTED].

17. The Protocol specifically states that one of its intended purposes is to protect the integrity of investigations in a manner that is consistent with rights of suspects and accused.¹⁶ In *The Prosecutor v. Bemba*, Trial Chamber III reminded the Prosecution that in interviewing Defence witnesses it:

must exercise great caution in its investigations; it must ensure that by its actions it does not deter or destabilize any of the defence witnesses, and that it does not impair the opportunity for the Chamber to consider all relevant and available evidence. Therefore, it is critical that it demonstrate circumspection and caution in taking [...] investigative steps as regards the defence witnesses.”¹⁷

18. Here, the Prosecution has indicated to the Defence that it does not intend to use any caution with respect to its investigations regarding Defence witnesses. It wishes to question 17 of the Defence's witnesses not only on the very broad topics mentioned in the Defence's short summaries contained in the provisional witness list, but also on “any other matter probative of the charges that may be reasonably with the witnesses' awareness”.¹⁸

19. Such broad questioning by the Prosecution of Defence witnesses is inappropriate at this stage because for [REDACTED] out of the 17 witnesses, the Defence has [REDACTED], or [REDACTED].¹⁹ For all these witnesses, the Defence has planned [REDACTED]. Similarly, for the Defence expert witnesses the Prosecution wishes to interview, namely [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; and [REDACTED]²⁰ the

¹⁶ The Protocol, para. 3.

¹⁷ *Prosecutor v. Bemba*, “Decision on the “Prosecution's Motion on Procedure for Contacting Defence Witnesses and to Compel Disclosure”, ICC-01/05-01/08-2293, para. 29 *citing* ICC-01/04-01/06-2192, para. 60.

¹⁸ Annex 2.

¹⁹ [REDACTED]

²⁰ The Prosecution noted that two of the expert witnesses on its provisional list have the same pseudonym assigned. This was an oversight by the Defence, and it will be corrected in due course. The Defence does not

Defence is in the process of liaising with the Registry to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

20. To contact the witnesses inquiring whether they would like to be interviewed by the Prosecution would be destabilizing, since the Defence has [REDACTED]. Indeed, the Defence has informed these witnesses that it would be that it would be conducting further interviews, which is what they are all reasonably expecting.
21. Rather than now making such arrangements, because of the application of the five-day rule contained in paragraph 31 of the Protocol, the Defence is now requested to arrange interviews for the Prosecution to potentially examine the witnesses on lines of questioning that [REDACTED]. This will result in confusion seeing as these witnesses are expecting further interviews by the Defence and they have not been informed that the Prosecution would be potentially interviewing them. The Defence did not expect such action from the Prosecution at this stage of the proceedings, less than two months before the Defence's filing of the Final List of Witnesses.
22. Even were the witnesses to consent to the Defence's presence during the prospective interviews, their answers on lines of questioning [REDACTED], but [REDACTED], will very likely differ when asked by the Prosecution rather than the Defence. The Prosecution has stated that it intends to prepare for the Defence case through the witness interviews.²¹ Therefore, the manner of questioning will be geared towards impugning the witnesses' prospective testimony rather than eliciting the truth. The answers the witnesses will give will most likely differ [REDACTED]. Such a scenario impedes the Defence's investigation of all material facts of the case since it has [REDACTED], and it may prevent a proper selection of individuals to be retained for the Final List of Witnesses. It is also contrary to

wish to name the individuals associated with the pseudonym, and kindly refers the Chamber to Annex 1 for the relevant information.

²¹ Annex 2.

one of the purposes of allowing the non-calling party to question the calling party's witness, namely for the Chamber to have access to all material that can assist in determining the truth.²²

23. The Defence has not refused that the Prosecution contact its witnesses. Rather, the Defence asks that the Prosecution give the Defence the time, which has been decided by the Chamber, namely 17 November, to finalize its list of witnesses. To make a final decision on which individuals remain and which individuals will be withdrawn from the provisional witness list, the Defence must [REDACTED] without the external influence of the Prosecution's questions.

24. After receiving the Prosecution's response that it would not mutually agree to postpone the procedure in paragraph 31 of the Protocol, the Defence assessed whether for any witnesses cited by the Prosecution, the prejudice would be limited if the Defence were to comply with the Protocol. Since the Defence has been able to [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and is, at this time, [REDACTED], the Defence determined that it would not be prejudicial to its investigations and preparations to comply with the Protocol. [REDACTED] has agreed to meet with the Prosecution and has agreed to do so in the Defence's presence. The Defence has informed the Prosecution of this development. The Defence has called [REDACTED] but has not had the opportunity to speak with him. It will keep the Prosecution apprised of all relevant developments.

ii. Granting the Defence's request to deviate from the Protocol is necessary to ensure that the Defence has sufficient time and resources to prepare its case

25. In addition to damaging the integrity of the Defence's investigations, applying the Protocol and contacting the 15 remaining witnesses will also be prejudicial to the Defence's right to have time and facilities to prepare its defence under Article

²² *Prosecutor v. Bemba*, "Decision on the "Prosecution's Motion on Procedure for Contacting Defence Witnesses and to Compel Disclosure", ICC-01/05-01/08-2293, para. 8 *citing* ICC-01/04-01/06-2192, para. 49.

67(1)(b) of the Rome Statute. The Defence submits that the diversion of its human and financial resources is not a speculative risk at this stage. While the Defence has not contacted the remaining fifteen witnesses cited in the Prosecution request, it anticipates that most, if not at all, will agree to be interviewed. Such a prediction is well founded given that the Court in *Bemba* noted that “such interviews are accepted and common practice.”²³ Moreover, the Defence has always approached potential witnesses saying that they are being interviewed to assist the Chamber in the manifestation of the truth. Given these individuals have agreed to participate as witnesses in these proceedings, they show commitment to this endeavour and therefore will most likely agree to meet with the Prosecution. However, at this stage, the Defence does not have the time or the resources to facilitate such interviews. Therefore, it asks for a postponement of applying the Protocol until 20 November 2023.

26. As the Defence has announced in its first notice of intent to present evidence²⁴ and in its request for reconsideration of the Chamber’s deadlines related the Defence’s presentation of evidence,²⁵ the Defence is operating under significant time and logistical constraints to be able to meet the Chamber’s deadlines. It has emphasized the truly provisional nature of the provisional witness list that it filed on 25 August 2023.²⁶ Additionally, since the filing of those two requests, the Defence has received updates regarding certain requests for assistance, which has expanded the scope of [REDACTED], which [REDACTED].

27. The Defence does not have the human and financial resources to facilitate Prosecution interviews and have a Defence representative be present for each of the 17 interviews. The Defence is aware that the Protocol does not bestow a right

²³ ICC-01/05-01/08-2293, para. 16.

²⁴ ICC-01/14-01/18-2055-Conf.

²⁵ ICC-01/14-01/18-1997-Conf-EXP

²⁶ ICC-01/14-01/18-2055-Conf.

to the Defence to be present at the interviews. Indeed, the right belongs to the witness to determine whether they wish to have a representative of the Defence present.²⁷ However, it is not speculative that the Defence anticipates that most of the witnesses, if they do consent to an interview, will opt for a Defence representative to be present. Unlike the Prosecution, the Defence has already established [REDACTED] rapport with all 17 individuals cited. This is already evidenced by the Defence's contact with [REDACTED] who has agreed to meet with the Prosecution and has availed herself of her right to have a Defence representative present. While the Defence will be able to free up its limited resources for the Prosecution interview with [REDACTED][REDACTED], this is not the case for the remaining witnesses.²⁸

28. Unlike for Witness [REDACTED], the Defence does not have the human and financial resources to facilitate the interviews between the Prosecution and Defence witnesses located in [REDACTED], and to be present for such interviews. As mentioned in these submissions, the Defence is [REDACTED], *inter alia*, on the provisional witness list. These [REDACTED] are [REDACTED] for the Defence to be able to meet the Chamber's deadlines for filing the Final List of Witnesses, the List of Evidence, and to be able to disclose all the material the Defence intends to rely on. If in addition to completing these tasks, the Defence adds facilitating Prosecution interviews, and dispatching a Defence team member to be present at the interview, it will not be able to meet the 17 November deadline set by the Chamber.

29. Allowing the Defence to be present *via* video link during the interviews is not a viable solution for the following three reasons. First, the Defence's presence *via* video link, does not address the time and resources needed to facilitate contact between the Defence witnesses and the Prosecution. Second, it does not affect that

²⁷ Protocol, para. 36.

²⁸ Except for [REDACTED].

the time and human resources needed to analyze the responses of the witness and integrate them into its investigations. Third, the Defence will deploy every effort to be physically present during the interview if the Prosecution decides to conduct an in-person interview. The Defence submits that if the witness wishes for a representative to be present, the Defence should show the witness that their well-being is a priority and that they are willing to travel to the interview.

30. These incredibly resource consuming tasks can be partially avoided if the Defence is given time to finish its investigations and finalize its list of witnesses before having to apply the Protocol as requested by the Prosecution. As previously mentioned, the Defence emphasized that the witnesses in its provisional witness list are subject to change. Therefore, the Defence is not sure if it will call the 17 individuals that the Prosecution now seeks to interview. It needs the next two months to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to decide which of these 17 witnesses will be retained, along with the other [REDACTED] witnesses on the provisional witness list. If the Defence is now obliged to apply the Protocol, and in the end none of these witnesses are called, the Prosecution and the Defence would have needlessly wasted resources. This is in direct contradiction with one of the purposes of the Protocol, which is to “assist in the efficient management of the proceedings.”²⁹

31. For example, the Defence can already inform the Chamber that for the witnesses [REDACTED], the Defence is in the process of [REDACTED]. If the Defence [REDACTED], and the Chamber determines that the Protocol shall not be deviated from, the Prosecution’s prospective interviews with these individuals would have been a waste of everyone’s time and resources.

²⁹ ICC-01/05-01/08-2293, para. 8 *citing* ICC-01/04-01/06-2192, para. 49.

32. The Prosecution has been investigating Mr Ngaïssona for several years. By the time the confirmation of charges proceedings began, it was expected that the Prosecution's investigations would have been largely complete.³⁰ The Defence has had significantly less time to investigate. Indeed, the Confirmation of Charges Decision marked the beginning of more intensive investigations since it was at this time that Mr Ngaïssona was informed that he would stand trial before the Court. Such investigations were conducted while the Defence prepared for the Prosecution's presentation of evidence. Finally, the Defence has entered a stage where it can benefit from a respite in hearings and procedural and evidentiary motions, to conclude its investigations. It should be allowed to do so without having to grapple with further Prosecution investigations into its provisional witnesses. Once the Defence has finalized its list of witnesses and completed disclosure, it will be able to accommodate the Prosecution's request to interview Defence witnesses.

iii. The Defence requests the Chamber to limit the scope of the Prosecution's interviews for Witnesses [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

33. In its exchanges with the Prosecution, the Defence requested the Prosecution to provide the relevant topics and questions the Prosecution wished to ask Defence witnesses. The Prosecution responded that it was not required to give the Defence a response but indicated that its interviews would be extensive when it stated that it would ask the witnesses questions on the topics indicated in the witness summaries and any other matter that was probative of the charges. Further, the

³⁰ ICC-01/14-01/18-163, para. 28, relying on *Prosecutor v. Mbarushimana*, Appeals Chamber, Judgment on the Appeal of the Prosecutor against the Decision of Pre-Trial Chamber I of 16 December 2011 entitled "Decision on the Confirmation of Charges", 30 May 2012, ICC-01/04-01/10-514, para. 44; *Prosecutor v. Kenyatta et al.*, Decision on defence application pursuant to Article 64(4) and related requests, 26 April 2013, ICC-01/09-02/11-728, paras 118-119; *Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*, "Judgment on the Prosecutor's appeal against the decision of Pre-Trial Chamber I entitled 'Decision Establishing General Principles Governing Applications to Restrict Disclosure pursuant to Rule 81 (2) and (4) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence'", 13 October 2006, ICC-01/04-01/06-568 (OA 3), para. 54.

Prosecution stated that the Protocol is intended to facilitate the non-calling party's preparation. This is not correct and is contradicted by the Court's case-law.

34. The Protocol does not mention the non-calling party's preparation for the calling party's witnesses. Indeed, the stated purpose of the Protocol is in relevant part "to protect the safety of witnesses [...] as well as the integrity of investigations, in a manner consistent with the rights of suspects and the accused".³¹ Further, in *Lubanga* and in *Bemba*, the Court reasoned that the purpose of allowing contact between a calling party's witness and a non-calling party was to assist in the efficient management of the proceedings and assist the Chamber in its determination of the truth.³² In *Bemba*, the Chamber added that such interviews could be of assistance where the disclosed summaries of the issues on which the Defence witness will testify provide insufficient detail to the Prosecution. In such circumstances, the Prosecution may need to do an interview to carry out an investigation efficiently and effectively.³³ Here, the Prosecution cannot make such an argument because it will not be in possession of the Defence 's detailed summaries or witness statements until 17 November 2023.

35. Moreover, the Trial Chambers in *Lubanga* and in *Bemba* cautioned against extensive questioning by the non-calling party of a calling party's witness, in particular:

It is critical that the parties approach these meetings sensibly, with focused and identified questions that are reasonable and proportionate. Whilst the Chamber has currently sanctioned [meetings between one party and witnesses called or to be called by the other] if this procedure leads to questioning that is onerous for the witnesses, or if the meetings tend to turn into alternative or preliminary oral testimony, then the chamber will have to consider imposing limitations and tighter controls on the exercise".³⁴

36. Here, the Prosecution has not acted sensibly as cautioned by the Chambers in both *Lubanga* and *Bemba*. First, the Prosecution has precipitously asked to question 17 of

³¹ Protocol, para. 1.

³² ICC-01/05-01/08-2293, para. 8.

³³ *Ibid.* para. 9.

³⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-2293 *citing* ICC-01/04-01/06-T-232-ENG CT WT, page 10, lines 7 to 14.

the Defence's witnesses, even though the Defence has yet to file a Final List of Witnesses, and it is currently uncertain whether these individuals will be retained as Defence witnesses.

37. Second, the Prosecution has announced wishing to question the witnesses on any matter relevant to the charges, which should not be considered reasonable and proportionate under Court's decisions in *Lubanga* and *Bemba*. If the Prosecution is permitted to ask [REDACTED]and [REDACTED]any question related to the charges, there is a real risk that the meeting will impermissibly turn into "alternative or preliminary oral testimony."³⁵ The Defence requests the Chamber to order the Prosecution to limit its questions and to file on record the questions it wishes to ask [REDACTED]and [REDACTED] such that the Chamber can rule on whether the Prosecution's prospective interviews will not be an abuse of the Protocol, which is not intended to be a way for the Prosecution to prepare its examinations of the Defence's witnesses.

VI. RELIEF SOUGHT

The Defence respectfully requests the Chamber to:

- **GRANT** the Defence's request to deviate from the Protocol and postpone the Prosecution request to interview Defence witnesses until 20 November 2023; and
- **GRANT** the Defence's request to limit the scope of the Prosecution's interview with [REDACTED]and [REDACTED]and to submit the questions it wishes to ask the witnesses to the Chamber before any interview with either witness takes place.

³⁵ Ibid.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized 'N' or similar character.

Mr Knoops, Lead Counsel for Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona

Dated this 8 November 2023

At The Hague, the Netherlands.