

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: English

No. ICC-01/14-01/18

Date: 7 October 2025

THE APPEALS CHAMBER

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

SITUATION IN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC II

*IN THE CASE OF THE PROSECUTOR v.
ALFRED ROMBHOT YEKATOM & PATRICE-EDOUARD NGAÏSSONA*

Public

Public redacted version of "Prosecution Response to the Yekatom Defence request for extension of time to file the appeal brief", ICC-01/14-01/18-2820-Conf, 7 October 2025

Source: The 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

D29

D30

☒ Legal Representatives of the Victims

V44

V45

☐ 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

☐ Detention Section

☐ Victims Participation and
Reparations Section

☐ Other

SUBMISSIONS

1. The Prosecution does not oppose the Yekatom Defence's request for an extension of time to file its appeal brief ("Request").¹
2. The Prosecution notes in particular the Yekatom Defence's submission that good cause exists for an extension of time under regulation 35(2) of the Regulations of the Court ("RoC") due to: Mr Yekatom's need to receive translations of essential parts of the Judgment pertaining to the case against him;² the importance of promoting judicial economy and efficiency in these appeal proceedings;³ [REDACTED].⁴
3. The Ngaïssona Defence supports the Request and joins in seeking the same extension of time to file its appeal brief.⁵
4. The Prosecution has appealed the Judgment insofar as it concerns the case against Mr Ngaïssona.⁶ Thus, if the Chamber is minded to grant any extension, the Prosecution requests that the Chamber order *all* parties to file their appeal briefs on the same date to maintain the synchronised briefing schedule.⁷ A synchronised briefing schedule is in the interests of justice and ensures fair and efficient appellate proceedings.⁸ It is also consistent with the practice of the Court in the other case involving multiple accused.⁹ An unsynchronised briefing schedule, in contrast, increases the likelihood of further requests for extensions of time and/or requests for variation of grounds of appeal, especially when a party would be faced with preparing an appeal brief and an appeal response at the same time.

¹ ICC-01/14-01/18-2817-Conf.

² Request, paras. 24-28, 42.

³ See Request, paras. 43-48.

⁴ Request, paras. 30-31.

⁵ ICC-01/14-01/18-2819-Conf. See [ICC-01/14-01/18-2815](#).

⁶ [ICC-01/14-01/18-2814](#).

⁷ [ICC-01/14-01/18-2794](#), para. 13 (granting the same extension of time to all parties to file their notices of appeal and appeal briefs, following requests by both Defence teams).

⁸ See [ICC-01/12-01/18-2647](#), para. 18; [ICC-01/12-01/18-2606](#), paras. 13-15; see also e.g., ICTY *Prosecutor v. Prlić et al*, IT-04-74-A, [Decision on motions for extension of time to file appeal briefs and for authorization to exceed word limit](#), 22 August 2013, para. 15.

⁹ [ICC-01/05-01/13-2046](#), para. 18.

5. Moreover, a synchronised briefing schedule will not cause any additional delays. Under regulation 63(1)(b) of the RoC, unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Chamber, the Prosecutor *shall* file a consolidated response, when more than one convicted person files an appeal brief.¹⁰ Pursuant to regulation 63(4) of the RoC, the time limit for filing a consolidated response by the Prosecution runs only from the notification of the last appeal brief filed by a convicted person in this case.

6. This response is classified as confidential in accordance with regulation 23 *bis*(2) of the RoC since it responds to another filing with the same classification. [REDACTED].¹¹ A public redacted version of this response will be filed in due course.



Mame Mandiaye Niang, Deputy Prosecutor

Dated this 7th day of October 2025
At The Hague, the Netherlands

¹⁰ (Emphasis added). The Prosecution also notes that in accordance with regulation 63(3) of the RoC, the page limit for a consolidated response would be less than the combined page limits if the Prosecution were to file two distinct responses, and would thus be more efficient for the administration of justice.

¹¹ ICC-01/14-01/18-2818-Conf.