



Original: English

No.: ICC-01/05-01/08
Date: 8 September 2010

THE APPEALS CHAMBER

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

**SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
IN THE CASE OF
THE PROSECUTOR
*v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo***

Public Document

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

Ms Fatou Bensouda
Mr Fabricio Guariglia

Counsel for the Defence

Mr Nkwebe Liriss
Mr Aimé Kilolo Musamba

Legal Representatives of Victims

Ms Marie-Edith Douzima Lawson

Legal Representatives of Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

**Unrepresented Applicants for
Participation/Reparation**

**The Office of Public Counsel for
Victims**

Ms Paolina Massidda

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

States Representatives

The Government of the Central African
Republic

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar & Deputy Registrar

Ms Silvana Arbia & Didier Preira

Defence Support Section

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

Dated this Wednesday, 8 September 2010
At The Hague, The Netherlands