



Original: English

No.: ICC-01/05-01/08

Date: 08/09/2010

THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before:

Judge Akua Kuenyehia, Presiding Judge
Judge Sang-Hyun Song
Judge Erkki Kourula
Judge Anita Usacka
Judge Daniel David Ntanda Nsereko

SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**IN THE CASE OF
THE PROSECUTOR
v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo**

Public Document

**Defence Response to the Central African Republic's
"Requête aux fins de communication de jugement et prorogation de délai"**

Source: Defence for Mr. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo

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

The Office of the Prosecutor

Mr Luis Moreno-Ocampo, Prosecutor
 Ms Fatou Bensouda, Deputy Prosecutor
 Ms Petra Kneuer, Senior Trial Lawyer

Counsel for the Defence

Mr Nkwebe Liriss
 Mr Aimé Kilolo-Musamba

Legal Representatives of the Victims

Ms. Marie-Edith Douzima Lawson

Legal Representatives of the Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

**Unrepresented Applicants
 (Participation/Reparation)**

**The Office of Public Counsel for
 Victims**

Ms. Paolina Massidda

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

States' Representatives

Mr Emile Bizon – Central African
 Republic

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar

Defence Support Section

Deputy Registrar

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Detention Section

**Victims Participation and Reparations
 Section Other**

1. The Defence for Mr. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo (“the Accused”) takes careful note of the Registry’s observation that Trial Chamber III’s “*Decision on the Admissibility and Abuse of Process Challenges*”¹ of 24 June 2010 (“the Decision”) was to be found on the website of the International Criminal Court as of 13 August 2010.²

2. Furthermore, the learned Appeals Chamber is reminded that the Defence filed a similar application for time-limits to run from the date that the Decision was notified in its French translation. The Appeals Chamber declined to accede to this Defence request in its entirety and allowed, instead, an extension of a few days.³ The learned Appeals Chamber justified its decision by stating that the Accused had at his disposal “*an interpreter to provide sight translation*”.⁴ Applying similar logic, the Defence finds it hard to believe that the Central African authorities, despite the alleged “*ridiculously insignificant*”⁵ budget of the Ministry of Justice, could not have obtained similar translation services even if they lacked the technological ability to access the Court website.

3. For the two reasons cited above, the Defence objects to the Central African Republic’s “*Requête aux fins de communication de jugement et prorogation de délai*”.⁶

¹ ICC-01/05-01/08-802.

² ICC-01/05-01/08-873-Conf-Anx8.

³ ICC-01/05-01/08-827.

⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-827 at para. 8.

⁵ ICC-01/05-01/08-T-22-ENG; 27-04-2010 9/71 at line 4.

⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-873-Conf-Anx6.



Aimé Kilolo Musamba
Associate Counsel



Nkwebe Liriss
Principal Counsel

Done on the 8th of September 2010
At The Hague, The Netherlands