

**Cour  
Pénale  
Internationale**

**International  
Criminal  
Court**



Original: English

No.: ICC-01/14-01/21

Date: 1 August 2025

**TRIAL CHAMBER VI**

**Before:** Judge Miatta Maria Samba , Presiding Judge  
Judge María del Socorro Flores Liera  
Judge Sergio Gerardo Ugalde Godinez  
Judge Keebong Paek , Alternate Judge

**SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC II**

***IN THE CASE OF THE PROSECUTOR v. MAHAMAT SAID ABDEL KANI***

**Confidential**

**Prosecution's response to Defence's request for leave to appeal the "Decision on the Defence's Request to Reclassify Witness Statements"(ICC-01/14-01/21-1000)**

**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

☒ Counsel for the Defence

☒ Legal Representatives of the Victims

☐ 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 Zavala Giler Osvaldo

☐ Counsel Support Section

☐ Victims and Witnesses Unit

☐ Detention Section

☐ Victims Participation and  
Reparations Section

☐ Other

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Office of the Prosecutor ('Prosecution') respectfully requests the Chamber to reject the Defence's request for leave to appeal (the 'Leave to Appeal')<sup>1</sup> the Decision on the Defence's Request to Reclassify Witness Statements (the 'Decision').<sup>2</sup>
2. The Prosecution submits that none of the four issues proposed for certification constitutes "appealable issues" nor do they satisfy the cumulative criteria for leave to appeal under article 82(1)(d) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (the "Statute").

## II. CONFIDENTIALITY

3. Pursuant to regulation 23*bis*(2) of the Regulations of the Court, this filing is filed as confidential since it responds to a request filed confidentially. A public redacted version will be filed as soon as practicable.

## III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

4. On 20 June 2025, the Defence filed a request to reclassify a number of statements of witnesses for the Office of the Prosecutor (the 'Request').<sup>3</sup>
5. On 3 July 2025 the Prosecution filed a response to the Request (the 'Response').<sup>4</sup>
6. On the same day, the Common Legal Representative of Victims (the 'CLR') also responded to the Request (the 'Victims' Response').<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Demande d'autorisation d'interjeter appel de la "Decision on the Defence's Request to Reclassify Witness Statements" of 28 July 2025, ICC-01/14-01/21-1003-Conf.

<sup>2</sup> ICC-01/14-01/21-1000.

<sup>3</sup> Requête de la Défense visant à reclassifier « public » des déclarations antérieures de témoins de l'Accusation afin d'assurer la publicité des débats composante essentielle du procès équitable., 20 June 2025, ICC-01/14-01/21-985.

<sup>4</sup> Réponse de l'Accusation à la « Requête de la Défense visant à reclassifier « public » des déclarations antérieures de témoins de l'Accusation afin d'assurer la publicité des débats composante essentielle du procès équitable », 3 July 2025, ICC-01/14-01/21-991.

<sup>5</sup> Public redacted version of "Victims' Response to "Requête de la Défense visant à reclassifier 'public' des déclarations antérieures de témoins de l'Accusation afin d'assurer la publicité des débats composante essentielle du procès équitable" (No. ICC-01/14-01/21-985)", 3 July 2025, ICC-01/14-01/21-990-Red. A confidential version was filed simultaneously (ICC-01/14-01/21-990-Conf).

7. On 7 July 2025, the Defence sought leave to reply to the Response.<sup>6</sup>
8. On 10 July 2025, the Chamber granted the Defence leave to reply to the Response.<sup>7</sup>
9. On 14 July 2025, the Defence filed its reply to the Response (the 'Reply').<sup>8</sup>
10. On 21 July 2025, in its Decision,<sup>9</sup> the Chamber rejected the Request, allowing the Parties and Participants to refer to confidential information in the public versions of their Closing Briefs (and Closing Submissions) as long as doing so will not lead to the identification of witnesses whose identity is not already public, or otherwise compromise the security of such witnesses. The Chamber further ordered the Parties and Participants to liaise *inter partes* prior to the filing of the public redacted versions of their Closing Briefs.

#### IV. SUBMISSIONS

##### **A. The issues raised by the Defence are not appealable issues within the terms of article 82(1)(d) of the Statute.**

11. The conditions for granting leave to appeal under article 82(1)(d) have three principal limbs. First, an "issue" must "aris[e] from the decision".<sup>10</sup> An issue constitutes "an identifiable subject or topic requiring a decision for its resolution, not merely a question over which there is disagreement or conflicting opinion."<sup>11</sup> No appealable issue arises if a party misreads or misrepresents the decision or

---

<sup>6</sup> Demande d'autorisation de répliquer à la « Réponse de l'Accusation à la « Requête de la Défense visant à reclassifier « public » des déclarations antérieures de témoins de l'Accusation afin d'assurer la publicité des débats composante essentielle du procès équitable » » (ICC-01/14-01/21-991-Conf), 7 July 2025, ICC-01/14-01/21-993.

<sup>7</sup> Email from the Chamber to the Parties, dated 10 July 2025, at 17:48.

<sup>8</sup> Réplique de la Défense à la « Réponse de l'Accusation à la « Requête de la Défense visant à reclassifier « public » des déclarations antérieures de témoins de l'Accusation afin d'assurer la publicité des débats composante essentielle du procès équitable » » (ICC-01/14-01/21-991-Conf), 14 July 2025, ICC-01/14-01/21-995, with one public redacted annex.

<sup>9</sup> Decision, para.40.

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. ICC-01/04-01/10-487 (["Mbarushimana Decision"](#)), para. 4.

<sup>11</sup> ICC-01/04-168 OA3, para. 9.

record.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, the resolution of the issue must be “essential for the determination of matters arising under the judicial cause under examination”.<sup>13</sup>

12. Second, the decision must involve an issue that would “significantly” affect both the “fair” and “expeditious” conduct of the proceedings *or* the outcome of the trial.<sup>14</sup> An issue may “significantly affect the fairness of the proceedings whenever the procedural rights of the parties and participants are not respected, and their expeditiousness ‘whenever failure to provide for an immediate resolution of the issue at stake by the Appeals Chamber would entail the risk that lengthy and costly trial activities are nullified at a later stage’”.<sup>15</sup>

13. Third, the issue must be one for which, in the opinion of the relevant Chamber, an immediate resolution by the Appeals Chamber may materially advance the proceedings.<sup>16</sup> This means that “the issue must be such that its immediate resolution by the Appeals Chamber will settle the matter [...] through its authoritative determination, ridding thereby the judicial process of possible mistakes that might taint either the fairness of the proceedings or mar the outcome of the trial”.<sup>17</sup>

14. These requirements are cumulative and, therefore, failure to demonstrate one makes it unnecessary for the Chamber to address the others.<sup>18</sup> Chambers have emphasised the “limited nature of the remedy foreseen by article 82(1)(d) of the Statute”, and highlighted that “[i]n the system of the Statute, interlocutory appeals are meant to be admissible only under limited and very specific circumstances”.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> See e.g., ICC-01/04-01/10-487, paras. 32-33; ICC-01/05-01/13-1489, paras. 9-10; ICC-01/05-01/08-75, para. 32.

<sup>13</sup> ICC-01/04-168 OA3, 13 July 2006, para. 9.

<sup>14</sup> [ICC-01/18-429](#), para. 13; [ICC-01/22-111](#) (“[Mongolia Decision](#)”), para. 23.

<sup>15</sup> [ICC-01/18-429](#), para. 15.

<sup>16</sup> [DRC Extraordinary Review AJ](#), para. 14. See also [ICC-01/18-429](#), para. 13; [Mongolia Decision](#), para. 23.

<sup>17</sup> [DRC Extraordinary Review AJ](#), para. 14. See also [ICC-01/18-429](#), para. 16.

<sup>18</sup> See e.g. [ICC-01/18-429](#), para. 13. See also [Mongolia Decision](#), para. 23; [ICC-01/14-10/18-560](#), para. 55; [ICC-01/12-01/18-342-Red-tENG](#), para. 24.

<sup>19</sup> [ICC-01/12-01/18-342-Red-tENG](#), para. 25; [ICC-01/04-135-tEN](#), para. 22; [Mongolia Decision](#), para. 23.

15. The Defence identifies four issues (collectively referred to as the "Issues") for which it seeks leave to appeal: (i) *la Chambre a-t-elle commis une erreur de droit en n'appliquant pas les règles constantes à la CPI en matière d'octroi de mesures de protection aux témoins ?*; (ii) *la Chambre a-t-elle commis une erreur de droit en refusant de mettre en oeuvre le régime juridique applicable à l'octroi de mesures de protection en raison du temps que cela prendrait?*; (iii) *la Chambre a-t-elle commis une erreur de »fait en considérant que la mise en oeuvre du régime juridique applicable aux mesures de protection prendrait un temps considérable ?*; and (iv) *la Chambre a-t-elle commis une erreur de droit en se reposant sur la jurisprudence Abd-Al-Rahman sans expliquer en quoi elle serait strictement applicable à la présente situation?*.

16. As set forth below, the Defence fails to identify any appealable issue arising from the Decision. Instead, the Defence reiterates arguments previously presented in support of its Leave to Appeal, and merely disagrees with the Decision. Considering that the requirements of article 82(1)(d) of the Statute are cumulative and that failure to fulfil one of the requirements is fatal to an application for leave to appeal,<sup>20</sup> the Prosecution respectfully submits that the Leave to Appeal must be rejected on this basis.

i. *The First Issue - la Chambre a-t-elle commis une erreur de droit en n'appliquant pas les règles constantes à la CPI en matière d'octroi de mesures de protection aux témoins ?*

17. The Defence argues that the Chamber erred in law in its findings at paragraph 38 of the Decision.<sup>21</sup> The Prosecution respectfully submits that "the Trial Chamber has an independent duty to take the necessary steps to protect the safety of individuals

<sup>20</sup> ICC-01/05-01/08-3273, para. 8; ICC-02/11-01/15-117, para. 26; ICC-02/11-01/15-132, para. 5.

<sup>21</sup> Para. 38 of the Decision : "In respect of a way forward, the Chamber finds that, at this stage of the proceedings, to order a review of the prior recorded testimony of all Prosecution rule 68(2) witnesses which are currently classified as 'confidential' would be unduly burdensome, lead to delays in the filing of the Closing Briefs, and not facilitate the expeditiousness of the proceedings. The Chamber finds that such an exercise would, inter alia, require the Parties and Participants to contact all the witnesses concerned, leading to an intensive, rigorous review of the prior recorded testimony, and likely result in extensive litigation on redactions. To engage in this exercise at this stage of the proceedings would impact Mr Said's right to be tried without undue delay."

at risk on account of the activities of the Court (...) and to ensure the confidentiality of information”.<sup>22</sup> Whereas “the Prosecution bears the burden of proof to justify in-court protective measures for witnesses as they constitute exceptions to the rights of the accused to a public trial and to witnesses testifying in open session with their identities disclosed to the public,[...] the safeguarding of the legitimate protected interests of witnesses, victims and other persons otherwise at risk on account of the testimony of a witness is a duty placed on the Court as a whole, including on the Chamber.”<sup>23</sup> The Chamber therefore complied with the Court’s legal framework and took into account pertinent considerations. Indeed, the Chamber identified the factors taken into consideration, including the fact that there has been extensive litigation between the Parties on redactions relating to witness testimony requiring intervention by the Chamber.<sup>24</sup> The Defence merely disagrees with the Decision. Whilst carefully carrying out the balancing exercise in its obligation to ensure that victims and witnesses who cooperate with it are not put at risk, as well as the need to ensure that the Parties and Participants can make their final submissions in the most public way possible, the Chamber, has duly exercised its discretion to ensure that Mr SAID’s right to be tried without undue delay, as set out under article 67(1)(c) of the Statute, is safeguarded.

18. The Defence also fails to appreciate that the principle of publicity of proceedings is not absolute<sup>25</sup> and does not translate into a blanket disclosure to the public of every element of the case file, regardless of the need for non-disclosure necessary to protect the administration of justice.<sup>26</sup> In so far as evidentiary items that were submitted to a trial chamber are concerned, “these are not generally made

---

<sup>22</sup> ICC-01/14-01/21-1000 at para. 37 “ Decision on the Defence’s Request to Reclassify Witness Statements.” See also Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Judgement on the appeal of Mr Laurent Gbagbo against the oral decision on redactions of 29 November 2016, ICC-02/11-01/15-915-Red OA9, 31 July 2017, para. 42.

<sup>23</sup> Prosecutor v. Ongwen, Decision on the “Prosecution’s application for in-court protective and special measures”, ICC-02/04-01/15-612-Conf, 29 November 2016, para. 10.

<sup>24</sup> ICC-01/14-01/21-1000 at para. 37 “ Decision on the Defence’s Request to Reclassify Witness Statements.”

<sup>25</sup> Prosecutor v. Katanga & Ngudjolo, Transcripts, ICC-01/04-01/07-T-189-ENG ET WT 20 September 2010, 11/19 EA T, pp. 10-11.

<sup>26</sup> Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Decision on the Defence for Mr Gbagbo’s Request for the Record of the Case to be Made Public, the Creation of a Public Database and for Emails to be Placed on the Record of the Case, ICC-02/11-01/15-1430, 13 April 2022, paras. 6, 10, 14, 15.

publically available in any case before the Court.”<sup>27</sup> In any event, the requirements of publicity and transparency of proceedings have been fully met in this case since there is an extensive record which is already available on the Court’s website including the filings and decisions of the pre-trial and trial proceedings, as well as thousands of pages of hearing transcripts reflecting the witness testimony.<sup>28</sup> In light of these considerations, the first Issue is not an appealable issue arising from the Decision.

*ii. The Second Issue - la Chambre a-t-elle commis une erreur de droit en refusant de mettre en oeuvre le régime juridique applicable à l’octroi de mesures de protection en raison du temps que cela prendrait?*

19. The Defence contends that the Chamber erred in law in its assessment of the legal framework on protective measures to be afforded to witnesses.<sup>29</sup> In this regard, the Defence claims firstly, that the Chamber’s Decision that “to order a review of the prior recorded testimony of all Prosecution rule 68(2) witnesses which are currently classified as ‘confidential’ would be unduly burdensome, lead to delays in the filing of the Closing Briefs, and not facilitate the expeditiousness of the proceedings”, is deprived of any legal foundation,<sup>30</sup> and secondly, that such a Decision breaches Mr SAID’s right to be entitled to a public hearing, and is devoid of any legal and logical basis.<sup>31</sup>

20. The Prosecution respectfully submits that the Defence’s arguments are unfounded and they merely illustrate a disagreement with the Decision. Firstly, the Defence argument that rule 68(3) witness statements should be reclassified as public simply because the Prosecution has not requested protective measures for its rule 68(2) witnesses because they did not provide in person testimony is misguided and lacks

---

<sup>27</sup> Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Decision on the Defence for Mr Gbagbo’s Request for the Record of the Case to be Made Public, the Creation of a Public Database and for Emails to be Placed on the Record of the Case, ICC-02/11-01/15-1430, 13 April 2022, para. 17.

<sup>28</sup> Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Decision on the Defence for Mr Gbagbo’s Request for the Record of the Case to be Made Public, the Creation of a Public Database and for Emails to be Placed on the Record of the Case, ICC-02/11-01/15-1430, 13 April 2022, para. 16.

<sup>29</sup> Leave to Appeal, para. 46.

<sup>30</sup> Leave to Appeal, para. 47.

<sup>31</sup> Leave to Appeal, para. 48.



legal basis. Secondly, in so far as rule 68(2) witnesses statements submitted to a trial chamber are concerned, "these are not generally made publically available in any case before the Court."<sup>32</sup> What the Defence for **Mr SAID** is seeking is "unprecedented, without proper justification as to necessity and would entail the use of an extensive amount of limited resources."<sup>33</sup> The requirements of publicity and transparency of proceedings have been fully met in this case since there is an extensive record which is already available on the Court's website including the filings and decisions of the pre-trial and trial proceedings, as well as thousands of pages of hearing transcripts reflecting the witness testimony.<sup>34</sup> If, for specified reasons, "members of the public seek access to a particular item of evidence then such access can be considered by the Prosecution on a case by case basis, resources permitting."<sup>35</sup> The Chamber did carefully analyse article 68 of the Statute and the need to ensure that confidential information is not released into the public domain, as well as its legal obligation to ensure protection of victims and witnesses,<sup>36</sup> and in this vein, rightly ruled on the need to uphold Mr **SAID**'s right to an expeditious trial. Accordingly, the second issue is not an appealable issue arising from the Decision.

---

<sup>32</sup> Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Decision on the Defence for Mr Gbagbo's Request for the Record of the Case to be Made Public, the Creation of a Public Database and for Emails to be Placed on the Record of the Case, ICC-02/11-01/15-1430, 13 April 2022, para. 17.

<sup>33</sup> Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Decision on the Defence for Mr Gbagbo's Request for the Record of the Case to be Made Public, the Creation of a Public Database and for Emails to be Placed on the Record of the Case, ICC-02/11-01/15-1430, 13 April 2022, para. 17.

<sup>34</sup> Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Decision on the Defence for Mr Gbagbo's Request for the Record of the Case to be Made Public, the Creation of a Public Database and for Emails to be Placed on the Record of the Case, ICC-02/11-01/15-1430, 13 April 2022, para. 16.

<sup>35</sup> Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Decision on the Defence for Mr Gbagbo's Request for the Record of the Case to be Made Public, the Creation of a Public Database and for Emails to be Placed on the Record of the Case, ICC-02/11-01/15-1430, 13 April 2022, para. 18.

<sup>36</sup> Decision, Para. 37.

*iii. The Third Issue : la Chambre a-t-elle commis une erreur de fait en considérant que la mise en oeuvre du régime juridique applicable aux mesures de protection prendrait un temps considérable?*

21. The Defence contends that the Chamber erred in fact by ruling that ordering a review of the prior recorded testimony of all Prosecution rule 68(2) witnesses, currently classified as 'confidential' would be unduly burdensome and lead to delays in the proceedings. The Defence further suggests the procedural steps which the Prosecution and the Chamber can adopt in order to circumvent such delays.<sup>37</sup> The Prosecution respectfully submits that in so doing, the Defence is merely reiterating its previous submissions.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, the Defence's contention is inaccurate as the Chamber did consider and analyse these procedural steps, including the requirement to contact all the witnesses, before ruling that such exercise would lead "to an intensive, rigorous review of the prior recorded testimony, and likely result in extensive litigation on redactions."<sup>39</sup> The Prosecution therefore submits that the third Issue is unfounded, is a mere disagreement of the Chamber's determination, and not appealable.

*iv. The Fourth Issue - la Chambre a-t-elle commis une erreur de droit en se reposant sur la jurisprudence Abd-Al-Rahman sans expliquer en quoi elle serait strictement applicable à la présente situation?*

22. Under the fourth Issue, the Defence contends that the Chamber erred in law by relying on the jurisprudence from the *Abd-Al-Rahman* case and that the Decision lacks reasoning, in that it never explains how, in practice, the decision in the *Abd-Al-Rahman* case was applicable to the question which was pending before the Chamber in the *Said case*.<sup>40</sup> The Defence further puts forward its justification for the non-applicability of the jurisprudence from the *Abd-Al-Rahman* case to the

<sup>37</sup> Leave to Appeal, paras. 50 and 51.

<sup>38</sup> Request, paras. 36, 39 and 40.

<sup>39</sup> Decision, para. 38.

<sup>40</sup> Leave to Appeal, para. 53.

present matter.<sup>41</sup> In so doing, the Defence is merely reiterating its previous submissions<sup>42</sup> that the jurisprudence from the *Abd-Al-Rahman* case is not relevant to the matter under consideration. The Prosecution respectfully submits that this issue was already raised by the Defence in its Reply, and duly considered by the Chamber.<sup>43</sup> As such, the Chamber did not err in its quest of finding an alternative solution before concluding that the approach taken by the Parties, Participants and Trial Chamber in *Abd-Al-Rahman* case is pragmatic and facilitates the publicity of the final submissions to the greatest extent possible. The Defence's submissions regarding this purported appealable issue is therefore a mere re-hashing of its previous submissions, as well as its disagreement with the Decision, and hence, not appealable.

**B. The Issues do not significantly affect the fair and expeditious conduct of the proceedings or the outcome of the trial.**

23. Even if the Chamber were to consider that the Issues identified by the Defence are appealable, the Defence fails to substantiate how any of the Issues impacts the fair and expeditious conduct of the proceedings or the outcome of the trial.

24. With regard to fairness, the Defence contends that "*La décision attaquée, en ce qu'elle permet à l'Accusation d'obtenir l'anonymat automatique de ses témoins relevant de la Règle 68(2), sans débat contradictoire et sans décision judiciaire pour chacun des témoins concernés, constitue une décision portant atteinte de manière excessive à la publicité des débats*"<sup>44</sup> affects the principle of equality of arms and overall the fairness of the proceedings. The Defence reiterates an argument previously submitted on the rights of Mr SAID,<sup>45</sup> and the related claim reflects as a result, a mere disagreement with the Decision. Further, the contention, as formulated, is broad and falls short

---

<sup>41</sup> Leave to Appeal, para. 54.

<sup>42</sup> Leave to Appeal, para. 28-30

<sup>43</sup> Decision, para. 39.

<sup>44</sup> Leave to Appeal, para. 56.

<sup>45</sup> Decision, para. 7.

of distinctly linking this criteria to the specific Issues, as required by the jurisprudence.<sup>46</sup>

25. The Prosecution respectfully submits that the Defence's arguments on fairness should be rejected because the impact on fairness is speculative. The Defence fails to show why this course of action is unfair or to whom it causes unfairness, in particular when the decision is taken to protect witnesses and the same rule applies to the defence. Moreover, the publicity of rule 68(2) statements can be decided on a case by case basis.

**C. The immediate resolution of the Issues by the Appeals Chamber will not materially advance the proceedings.**

26. The Prosecution respectfully submits that the immediate resolution of any of the Issues by the Appeals Chamber will not materially advance the proceedings. The Defence argues that if the Request is not granted, this will entail issuing a Judgement in opacity, with 91.3% of Prosecution witnesses' versions not being debated in public and this will lead to a breach of the fundamental rights of the Accused, in particular his right to a fair trial.<sup>47</sup> This contention is unfounded and based on a mischaracterization of the Decision since the requirements of publicity and transparency of proceedings have been fully met in this case as there is an extensive record which is already available on the Court's website including the filings and decisions of the pre-trial and trial proceedings, as well as thousands of pages of hearing transcripts reflecting the witness testimony.<sup>48</sup> As previously discussed, the Decision gives due consideration to the fairness of the proceedings and the importance of an expeditious trial while also proposing an alternative

---

<sup>46</sup> ICC-02/11-01/15-524, para. 16 ("It is not the duty of the Chamber to identify specific issues to appeal from broadly formulated requests. A broad reference to the fundamental rights of the accused and how the alleged violation necessarily has an impact on the fairness of the proceedings, without more, cannot satisfy the leave to appeal.").

<sup>47</sup> Leave to Appeal, paras. 57 and 58..

<sup>48</sup> Prosecutor v. Gbagbo & Blé Goudé, Decision on the Defence for Mr Gbagbo's Request for the Record of the Case to be Made Public, the Creation of a Public Database and for Emails to be Placed on the Record of the Case, ICC-02/11-01/15-1430, 13 April 2022, para. 16.

solution. Consequently, the Defence's arguments on the need for an immediate appellate resolution of the Issues should be rejected.

27. But more importantly, the resolution by the Appeals Chamber will not materially advance the proceedings because the Trial Chamber will soon render its judgment where it will evaluate the said evidence and provide its reason and conclusions in relation thereof. Hence litigating the publicity of rule 68 statements when the Trial Chamber will soon consider this material in its judgment will only delay the proceedings.

## V. CONCLUSION

28. In light of the foregoing, the Prosecution respectfully requests the Chamber to deny the Request.



---

**Mame Mandiaye Niang, Deputy Prosecutor**

Dated this 1<sup>st</sup> day of August 2025  
At The Hague, The Netherlands