

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: English

No.: ICC-01/21-01/25

Date: 15 August 2025

THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before: Judge Erdenebalsuren Damdin , Presiding Judge
Judge Tomoko Akane
Judge Solomy Balungi Bossa
Judge Luz del Carmen Ibáñez Carranza
Judge Gocha Lordkipanidze

SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

IN THE CASE OF THE PROSECUTOR v. RODRIGO ROA DUTERTE

Public

**Victims' Urgent Request for Varying Standard Time Limit to Respond to the
"Defence Request to Disqualify Chief Prosecutor Karim Khan"**

Source: Office of the Public Counsel for Victims

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

D36

☐ 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

M. Zavala Giler, Osvaldo

☐ Counsel Support Section

☐ Victims and Witnesses Unit

☐ Detention Section

☐ Victims Participation and
Reparations Section

☐ Other

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Principal Counsel of the Office of Public Counsel for Victims (the “Legal Representative”), appointed to represent the collective interests of potential victims until the mandate of the team of common legal representatives takes effect,¹ files her request for varying the standard time limit to respond to the “Defence Request to Disqualify Chief Prosecutor Karim Khan”(the “Request” or “Defence Request”).²

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

2. On 6 August 2025, the Defence filed its Request.³

3. On 14 August 2025, the Legal Representative requested the Appeals Chamber to vary the standard time limit for submitting her response to the Defence Request.⁴

4. On 15 August 2025, the Appeals Chamber instructed the Legal Representative to file her request as a formal filing before it.⁵

III. SUBMISSIONS

5. On 6 August 2025 at the time the Defence for Mr Duterte filed its Request, the Legal Representative did not have access to documents No. ICC-01/21-01/25-81-Conf; No. ICC-01/21-01/25-100-Conf and No. ICC-01/21-01/25-102-Conf. These documents primarily formed the basis of the Defence Request.

¹ See the “Order on the conduct of confirmation proceedings”(Pre-Trial Chamber I), [No. ICC-01/21-01/25-114](#), 17 April 2025, paras. 68-69.

² See the “Defence Request to Disqualify Chief Prosecutor Karim Khan”, [No. ICC-01/21-01/25-226-Conf](#), 6 August 2025 (the “Request” or “Defence Request”).

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ See the email sent by the OPCV to the Appeals Chamber on 14 August 2025 at 15:28.

⁵ See the email sent by the Appeals Chamber to the OPCV on 15 August 2025 at 12:53.

6. Yet, on 11 August 2025, Pre-Trial Chamber I granted the Legal Representative access to said documents⁶ and she was notified after five days following the submission of the Defence Request.

7. Considering the ten days deadline established by regulation 34(b) of the Regulations of the Court to file a response, and, in light of the importance of the matter under litigation for the interests of the victims, the Legal Representative requests the Appeals Chamber to vary the standard time limit for filing her a response so that the relevant time limit starts running from the date of notification of the said documents.

IV. CONCLUSION

8. For the foregoing reasons, the Legal Representative respectfully requests the Appeals Chamber to vary the standard time limit for filing her response to the Defence Request.



Paolina Massidda
Principal Counsel

Dated this 15 August 2025

At The Hague, The Netherlands

⁶ See the email from Pre-Trial Chamber I sent on 11 August 2025 at 16:29.