

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: **English**

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

Date: 30 March 2012

TRIAL CHAMBER III

Before: Judge Sylvia Steiner, Presiding Judge
Judge Joyce Aluoch
Judge Kuniko Ozaki

**SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
IN THE CASE OF
THE PROSECUTOR
V. JEAN-PIERRE BEMBA GOMBO**

**Public Document
With
Public Annex A**

**Prosecution's Reply to "Defence Response to the Prosecution's Application for
Admission of Evidence from the Bar Table"**

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 of Jean-Pierre Bemba

Mr. Aimé Kilolo Musamba

Mr. Peter Haynes

Legal Representatives of Victims

Ms. Marie-Edith Douzima-Lawson

Mr. Assingambi Zarambaud

Legal Representatives of Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

Unrepresented Applicants for Participation/Reparation

The Office of Public Counsel for Victims

The Office of Public Counsel for the Defence

States Representatives

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar

Ms. Silvana Arbia

Counsel Support Section

Deputy Registrar

Mr. Didier Preira

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Ms. Maria-Luisa Martinod-Jacome

Detention Section

Victims Participation and Reparations Other Section

I. Introduction

1. On 28 February 2012, the Office of the Prosecutor ("Prosecution") filed a request for admission of materials into evidence pursuant to Article 64(9) of the Rome Statute ("Prosecution's Application") and appended a list of 97 items ("Annex A").¹

2. On 19 March 2012, the Defence filed the "Defence Response to the Prosecution's Application for Admission of Evidence from the Bar Table" ("Defence Response").² The Defence opposes 67 out of 97 items that the Prosecution seeks to admit into evidence. The Defence Response, *inter alia*, argues generally against the Prosecution's submission of these items of evidence via a bar table motion without calling witnesses to testify to them and additionally claims breach of the exceptional use of this procedure; alleges that the Prosecution's approach invites the Chamber to delegate its judicial function to external bodies; asserts prejudice to the rights of the Accused; challenges the submission of "numerous entire reports" without highlighting the relevant extracts or paragraphs; and further disputes the admission of specific categories or pieces of evidence.

3. At the same time, however, the Defence seeks, for the truth of their contents, the admission of the remaining 30 items also requested by the Prosecution, which either belonged to the Accused or were disclosed by the Defence. These items include videos, correspondences and a judicial dossier, as well as information dated prior or subsequent to the Prosecution's charges, and at least two reports of more than 100 pages.

¹ ICC-01/05-01/08-2147+Conf-AnxsA-B, Prosecution's Application for Admission of Materials into Evidence Pursuant to Article 64(9) of the Rome Statute, 28 February 2012.

² ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, Defence Response to the Prosecution's Application for Admission of Evidence from the Bar Table, 19 March 2012.

4. Pursuant to the order of the Trial Chamber III (“Chamber”),³ the Prosecution hereby replies to the Defence submission. In the Prosecution’s view, the purpose of a bar table motion is to introduce evidence without having to call live witnesses; thus the absence of live witnesses is not a *per se* ground to object to the process. The submission of only 97 items of evidence via a bar table motion in a complex criminal case of this nature reflects the Prosecution’s minimalistic and supplementary approach. The admissibility of each of these items is subject only to the three-stage test of relevance, probative value and prejudice.⁴ Furthermore, evidence admitted by bar table motion will be assessed in light of the totality of evidence on record, including evidence tested at trial.

5. Additionally, Defence arguments regarding prejudice to the Accused are general, at times contradictory and, in arguing the weight to be accorded by the Chamber in its final analysis of each item, are irrelevant to the threshold issue of admissibility. The Defence position is, at the very least, contradicted by its concurrent request to admit similar evidence on the Prosecution’s bar table motion without calling witnesses. The complaint about timing is ill-founded; it is the Prosecution’s prerogative to submit its bar table motion when it chooses to. The items submitted via a bar table motion supplement core Prosecution evidence in support of allegations contained in the Prosecution’s corrected revised second amended document containing the charges (“Prosecution’s Charging Document”).⁵ Lastly, the Defence request for reports submitted by the Prosecution to be rejected, solely on the ground that relevant information in such reports is not highlighted, is frivolous and unsupported by any rule regulation, statutory provision or decision of the Court.

³ ICC-01/05-01/08-2173, Decision on the “Prosecution’s request for leave to reply to ‘Defence Response to the Prosecution’s Application for Admission of Evidence from the Bar Table’”, 23 March 2012.

⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, Public redacted version of the First decision on the prosecution and defence requests for the admission of evidence, dated 15 December 2011, 9 February 2012, para. 13.

⁵ ICC-01/05-01/08-950, Corrected Revised Second Amended Document Containing the Charges, 13 October 2010.

II. Prosecution's Reply

6. At the outset, the Prosecution reiterates its main arguments, as advanced in the Prosecution's Application and Annex A,⁶ and thus limits this reply to submissions advanced in the Defence Response.

General Arguments advanced by the Defence

7. Consistent with its acknowledgement of "a clear recognition that a variety of other means of introducing evidence may be appropriate",⁷ this Chamber held that "it is not necessary that each item of evidence be authenticated via witness testimony".⁸ The Chamber further ruled that "whether an item's admission is sought via the 'bar table' is a distinction without a difference because, regardless of the manner in which an item's admission is sought, its admissibility will be determined under the three-stage test".⁹ It follows therefore, contrary to Defence submissions,¹⁰ that items may be admitted without calling the authors, creators, collectors or persons with direct knowledge of the information, provided that other indicia satisfy the three-stage test.¹¹

8. This Chamber has also specifically accepted that "the use of a 'bar table' motion is one permissible way to seek the admission of documentary evidence".¹² The Defence argument, if accepted, would mean that a witness must be called for every single piece of evidence, effectively eliminating the possibility of admitting items via a bar table

⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-2147+Conf-AnxsA-B.

⁷ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, para. 11.

⁸ *Ibid*, para. 15.

⁹ *Ibid*, para. 55, emphasis added.

¹⁰ ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, para. 11.

¹¹ See, ICC-01/04-01/07-2635, Decision on the Prosecutor's Bar Table Motions, 17 December 2010, at para 27.

¹² ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, para. 55.

motion.¹³ It is thus contrary to this Chamber's previous decision. Moreover, requiring live witnesses for evidence that can be otherwise admitted would lead to considerably protracted trials in cases of this complexity.

9. The 67 items included on the Prosecution's bar table motion - plus the 30 items that originated with the Defence itself and which the Defence agrees should be admitted - are exceptional and were conservatively selected. The Prosecution chose carefully from the items listed in its list of evidence (the section "other evidence (documentary and audiovisual material)")¹⁴ so as not to abuse the process.

10. The Defence objection based on the ongoing *Karadzic* case in the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia ("ICTY") is equally meritless. The ICTY Chamber, which is currently still hearing the Prosecution's case, stated as far back as April 2010 that "through the application of Rules 92 *bis* and *quater*, the Chamber has admitted a considerable quantity of written evidence".¹⁵ Furthermore, the Defence citation to language in the *Popovic* case to support its allegation that tendering documents from the bar table rarely allows for proper contextualization,¹⁶ is incomplete and misleading: restoring language omitted by the Defence, the Chamber held that "[t]endering evidence from the bar table rarely allows for proper contextualization," generally leaving relevance and probative value to be assessed on the bare face of the materials, but also notes that the practice has been permitted because it assists in expediting proceedings, helps avoid the calling of witnesses solely to present

¹³ See ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, Section B, particularly, paras. 6 and 10-12.

¹⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-1875-Conf+Conf-AnxsA-B, Prosecution's Submission of Amended List of Evidence, 2 November 2011.

¹⁵ ICTY, *Prosecutor v. R. Karadic*, Case IT-95-5/18-T, Decision on the Prosecution's First Bar Table Motion, 13 April 2010, para 8.

¹⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, para. 8.

documents, and professional judges are able to assign due weight to the materials in light of the circumstances.”¹⁷

11. Contrary to Defence arguments, items listed on the Prosecution’s bar table motion are not improperly substituting documentary evidence for witness testimony, but even if that were true that is not a ground to object to their admission. An item submitted through the bar table is no less admissible than live witness testimony, so long as the Chamber is satisfied that the evidence meets the three-stage test. Further, the probative value of these items will not be assessed in a vacuum. The *viva voce* evidence presented at trial will inform the Chamber’s ability to determine the weight to be accorded to each item. To this end, the Chamber can take into account the totality of evidence presented throughout the trial, including considerations of the form or manner in which evidence was presented.¹⁸ The Defence allegation that the Chamber is being invited “to delegate its judicial function by simply accepting the facts as asserted by NGOs or other agencies as to the existence of particular events or crimes”¹⁹ is unfounded.

12. The Defence alleges prejudice, arguing breach of the Accused’s right to be tried without undue delay - even though requiring live witness evidence will only prolong the process - by urging that the submission of these items through a bar table motion will “inevitably increase the evidentiary record” and “necessarily increase the scope and length or the Defence case”.²⁰ As further illustration of this contradiction, the Defence

¹⁷ ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Popovic*, Case IT-05-88-T, Decision on Prosecution’s motion for admission of exhibits from the Bar Table, motion to amend the Bar Table motion, and oral motion for admission of additional exhibit, 14 March 2008, para. 15.

¹⁸ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, para. 11.

¹⁹ ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, para. 6.

²⁰ *Ibid*, para. 10.

simultaneously asserts that admission of items in Annex A breaches the Accused's right to examine or have examined adverse witnesses who can testify to this evidence.²¹

13. Contrary to the Defence position, the bar table motion is an efficient tool that avoids undue delay that would follow if the parties were required to call witnesses solely to authenticate facially reliable pieces of evidence.²² Secondly, the Chamber has provided adequate safeguards via the three-stage test, which includes the fact that "while it is not necessary that each item of evidence be authenticated via witness testimony, *the Chamber needs to be satisfied that the item is what it purports to be*".²³ Nor is there any identified specific prejudice from the proffered evidence. The items submitted via the bar table motion do not support new factual allegations but rather remain entirely within the bounds of the Prosecution's Charging Document. Generic arguments regarding prejudice are insufficient to show prejudicial effect of a particular piece of evidence, let alone satisfy the Chamber's threshold that even "if potential prejudice is identified, this will not necessarily preclude the item's admission".²⁴ In any event, the Prosecution has demonstrated relevance and probative value of each item in the Prosecution's Application and Annex A²⁵ that would outweigh any potential prejudice. Specific challenges against categories of evidence or individual items will be further addressed below.

14. The Defence claims that the timing of the Prosecution's bar table motion precludes the testing of the reliability or credibility of this material through Prosecution witnesses and complains that no cause has been shown for making this request at the

²¹ *Ibid*, para. 11.

²² ICTY, *Prosecutor v. R. Karadic*, Case IT-95-5/18-T, Decision on the Prosecution's First Bar Table Motion, 13 April 2010, para. 15.

²³ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, para. 15, emphasis added.

²⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, para. 16.

²⁵ ICC-01/05-01/08-2147-AnxA.

“absolute closing stages of the Prosecution case”.²⁶ This submission is misguided. The very use of a bar table motion contemplates that the evidence’s reliability will not be tested through witnesses; thus the timing of the Prosecution’s bar table motion is irrelevant to that complaint. Moreover, as a result of its initial ruling on 19 November 2010²⁷ and prior to the operative decision issued on 31 May 2011,²⁸ the Chamber automatically ruled all items on the Prosecution’s updated list of evidence as admissible, therefore making a bar table motion unnecessary for those items. Since then, the Prosecution has continually submitted items orally from the bar table by counsel or through witnesses.

15. Indeed, submitting items throughout the Prosecution’s case, after evidence highlighting its relevance and probative value has been received by the Chamber, rather than at the beginning, is a more efficient process that additionally finds support in the *Katanga* case and ICTY *Karadzic* case.²⁹ In addition, the Prosecution’s filing of its updated list of evidence provided the Defence with ample notice of its intention to use items contained therein; it is particularly significant that the list clearly marked the contested 67 items and indicated that the Prosecution did not intend to introduce them through witnesses.³⁰ This also provided the Defence the opportunity to use these items for its

²⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, para. 17.

²⁷ ICC-01/05-01/08-1022, Decision on the admission into evidence of materials contained in the prosecution's list of evidence, 19 November 2010.

²⁸ ICC-01/05-01/08-1470, Order on the procedure relating to the submission of evidence, 31 May 2010.

²⁹ See, for example, *Katanga* Case: ICC-01/04-01/07-2635, para. 13: “If at the time of tendering an item of evidence, the party is unable to demonstrate its relevance and probative value, including its authenticity, it cannot be admitted. It does not suffice to argue that its content may be corroborated by other evidence or that the Chamber may subsequently determine its proper evidentiary weight ... It follows that the Chamber must determine the probative value of an item of evidence before it can be admitted into the proceedings.”; see also ICTY, *Prosecutor v. R. Karadic*, Case IT-95-5/18-T, Decision on the Prosecution’s First Bar Table Motion, 13 April 2010, para. 8: “However, the Chamber must also ensure the proper balance between an expeditious and a fair trial and it considers that the admission into evidence at this stage of proceedings, prior to any oral evidence being presented, of a large number of items, many of which go directly to the charges against the Accused ... is not consistent with a fair trial.”

³⁰ ICC-01/05-01/08-1386 OA5 OA6, Judgment on the appeals of Mr Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo and the Prosecutor against the decision of Trial Chamber III entitled “Decision on the admission into evidence of materials contained in the prosecution's list of evidence”, 3 May 2011, para. 44: “... when the Prosecutor filed the Lists of Evidence, he did not do so with a view to submitting the items as evidence for the trial, but for the ‘purpose of informing the Trial

own purposes, and in fact, the Defence availed itself of this right on at least two occasions.³¹

16. The Defence faults the Prosecution for submitting “numerous entire reports into evidence” and complains that the Prosecution made no attempt to highlight the relevant extracts or paragraphs of “these reports, sometimes running to over 100 pages ...”.³² Although the Defence refers to 18 reports,³³ only three of these reports contain more than 100 pages.³⁴ The Prosecution notes that at least two of the documents requested for admission by both the Prosecution and the Defence contain over 100 pages.³⁵ Furthermore, the Defence has made no such attempt to highlight portions relevant to their case nor have they made a similar request for the Prosecution to do so. In any event, this is insufficient basis to reject outright the admission of these items.

Prosecution Reply to Defence Response to Specific categories of evidence

(i) United Nations (“UN”) Reports:

17. The Defence alleges that the four UN reports are not sufficiently reliable due to the lack of identification of author(s) and/or sources of information with sufficient detail, and highlights some criticisms leveled against other UN products elsewhere.³⁶ It further

Chamber and the other parties and participants of the materials that [he] intends to use at trial’ and as a ‘case management tool’.”

³¹ See ICC-01/05-01/08-T-135-FRA ET, p. 30, line 23 where the Defence made reference to document CAR-OTP-0004-0336; see also ICC-01/05-01/08-T-101-ENG CT, p. 17, line 7 where the Defence used document CAR-OTP-0030-0002.

³² ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, paras. 13 and 14.

³³ ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, para. 14.

³⁴ See, ICC-01/05-01/08-2147-AnxA, documents listed under numbers 84, 85 and 86 (CAR-OTP-0011-0002, CAR-OTP-0019-0594 and CAR-OTP-0019-0588).

³⁵ See, ICC-01/05-01/08-2147-AnxA, documents listed under numbers 21 and 31 (CAR-D04-0002-1641 and CAR-DEF-0002-0001).

³⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, paras. 21-23.

states that “while an organization can attest to the authenticity of the report, namely that it is a report which comes from that organization, it cannot attest to its reliability”.³⁷ However, identification of the author(s) is only one indicia of a document’s reliability. These documents provide other sufficient indicia for the Chamber to find them reliable, such as authenticity, as they are all open source materials that generally only require verifiable information about where the item can be obtained. Furthermore, they were generated contemporaneously with the events charged, and prepared by an identifiable organization with no direct interest in the current proceedings.³⁸

18. The Prosecution also notes that the Defence itself tendered UN reports, though “none were authored by the witnesses through whom they are tendered, nor were they authenticated by the witnesses during their testimony”.³⁹ Adhering to the three-stage test, the Chamber admitted CAR-D04-0002-1090 and CAR-D04-0002-1095, the Defence exhibits, into evidence despite the fact that their authors are unidentified and their methodology and analysis are insufficiently detailed.⁴⁰ The Defence documents above, like the four UN reports at issue here, were prepared by, or in conjunction with, reputable UN agencies with qualified staff, based on information from the field.

19. The Prosecution has demonstrated that its tendered documents are what they purport to be, and the Defence has not adduced any evidence to the contrary. The Defence argument that the documents have minimal probative value, or that their reliability is open to dispute, goes to weight, not admissibility: the Chamber has held that it will consider “alleged defects or inconsistencies when determining the weight to

³⁷ ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, para. 12.

³⁸ ICC-01/04-01/07-2635, para. 24.

³⁹ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, paras. 52 and 55.

⁴⁰ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, paras. 52 and 57.

attribute to it”.⁴¹ In this regard, documents 2 and 3 are relevant for the reasons identified in Annex A. This is further evidenced by the fact that the Chamber allowed the Prosecution to pursue this line of questioning regarding crimes committed by *Mouvement de Libération du Congo* (“MLC”) in 2001 and 2002 and measures taken, despite Defence objections during trial on similar grounds.⁴²

(ii) Non-Governmental Organizations (“NGO”) Reports:

20. The Defence challenges the admission of seven NGO reports from *Fédération Internationale des Droits de L’homme* (“FIDH”) and Amnesty International (“AI”) on the basis that the author(s) are not identified; there is insufficient information regarding the methodology used to compile and analyse the reports; FIDH is allegedly biased against the MLC/the Accused and has an interest in these proceedings; and they are based on hearsay, with insufficient identification as to the sources (including anonymous sources in the AI report) and how witnesses were selected. The Prosecution submits that these documents provide sufficient indicia of authenticity. There is no question that the documents derive from the identified organizations, both of which are independent and reputable organizations with qualified staff, and the reports are based on information from the field. It is common practice for such reports to not identify their sources, since naming the persons would jeopardize them. However, there is sufficient information to ascertain that this information comes from victims of crimes in the Central African Republic (“CAR”).

21. The Defence arguments, at their core, focus on issues of credibility and weight, which it can further explore during its case and highlight in its closing brief. The

⁴¹ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, para. 123.

⁴² See, for example, ICC-01-05/01-08-T-165-CONF-ENG ET, p. 36, line 12 to p. 37, line 21.

Chamber will assess this in light of the type of information provided in the reports and against the entirety of the trial record. As to the Defence challenge to the relevance of documents 9 and 10, the Prosecution reiterates the same arguments set forth in Annex A and paragraph 19 above.

(iii) Media/ press articles:

22. The Defence challenges 26 media reports on the basis that such reports are generally unreliable evidence with no probative value due to the fact that they often contain opinion evidence. It also complains that 11 of these reports do not identify an author(s). Yet again, the Prosecution submits that Defence arguments go to the credibility and weight of media reports as opposed to their admissibility. As stated elsewhere herein, naming the authors is not the sole indicia for determining reliability. To the contrary, the media reports satisfy the other indicia for reliability and should therefore be admitted. The various media houses involved had no interest in the CAR events other than reporting what was happening at the time. These reports are contemporaneous and are supported by Prosecution evidence on record and were publicly available at the time. The admission of these articles is sought solely to supplement evidence on the record. At the very least, if they are not admitted for the truth of their contents, they should be admitted for other purposes in Annex A such as proof that MLC crimes were widely broadcasted by the media, including well-known media outlets, which is relevant to the issue of the Accused's knowledge of the alleged crimes.

(iv) Audio recordings from *Radio France Internationale* (“RFI”):

23. The Defence challenges 10 RFI audio recordings on the basis that they lack probative value because they are not sufficiently reliable, and it disputes the credibility of the information reported. The Prosecution submits that these recordings have various indicia of reliability. They are all audio records capturing contemporaneously events as they unfolded. RFI is a reputable organization with correspondents who were based in the CAR at the relevant time. These recordings include direct testimony from CAR victims. The recordings identify the reporters. Furthermore, the chain-of-custody information shows that these recordings were received directly from RFI. The Defence does not indicate that these audio recordings are anything other than what they purport to be: audio recordings from correspondents and interviews of CAR victims.⁴³ At the very least, if these audio recordings are not admitted for the truth of their contents, they should be admitted to prove that MLC crimes were widely broadcasted by the media, including a well-known international media organization. This is relevant to the issue of the Accused’s knowledge of the allegations reported by RFI.⁴⁴

(v) Other documents

24. The Defence alleges that United States Department of State documents (documents 80 and 83) should not be admitted on the basis that they lack probative value and credibility. These documents emanate from a country with no biased interest in the events in the CAR. The Prosecution has also provided other indicia of reliability in

⁴³ ICC-01/05-01/08-2012-Red, para. 93: “... contains statements by several Sibut residents regarding the conflict in that area, which goes to the contextual elements under Articles 7 and 8 of the Statute. In terms of probative value, there is no indication that the video is anything other than what it purports to be: a video or the town of Sibut and interviews conducted with individuals there. While the video has not been authenticated in court, this does not prevent its admission.”

⁴⁴ This is supported by testimony of insider Prosecution witnesses. See, for example, ICC-01/05-01/08-T-208-CONF-ENG ET, p. 31.

Annex A. The Defence has not provided any specific reasons as to why these two documents are not reliable. The Prosecution refers to its arguments in paragraphs 19 to 21 above and reiterates that these documents are sufficiently reliable whilst issues of credibility and weight will be assessed by the Chamber in due course against the totality of the evidence in the trial record.

25. The Defence challenges admission of two medical reports (documents 94 and 95) on the basis that their creators should have been called to testify and that at least one is an expert report, thus requiring adherence to the rules governing experts, including that the Defence should have been allowed to examine the writers on the reports and their expertise. The Prosecution submits that these reports contain sufficient indicia of reliability, such as their authors, information regarding their methodology and analysis and well as their sources of information. Additionally, document 95 is supported by witness testimony from Witness CAR-OTP-PPPP-0087, which was tested in court by the Defence.⁴⁵

26. The Defence alleges that Thuraya telephone records (document 97) cannot be admitted because there is no basis for their provenance or authentication and the Prosecution did not offer “any foundation for its assertion that the telephone number cited belonged to the Accused”.⁴⁶ The Prosecution has provided its source and the relevant statements to the Defence, as outlined in Annex A. Furthermore, the Prosecution authenticated at least one of the numbers on the telephone records during the testimony of its witnesses.⁴⁷ This provides sufficient basis to warrant its admissibility. If the record at the close of the case cannot link the telephone number to

⁴⁵ ICC-01/05-01/08-T-47-CONF-ENG CT2, p. 25, lines 6-13.

⁴⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-2168, para. 48.

⁴⁷ ICC-01/05-01/08-T-150-CONF-ENG ET, p. 43, line 6 to p. 45, line 7; see also ICC-01/05-01/08-T-151-CONF-ENG ET, p. 56, lines 2 to 20.

the Accused, and that failure properly diminishes the weight of the evidence, the Chamber can be trusted to make the appropriate assessment.

27. The Defence disputes the admissibility of the flight logbooks (documents 88 and 89) on the basis that they lack authenticity and should be properly introduced through witnesses who have knowledge of them. The Prosecution provided the Chamber with the source of these flight logs from the relevant authority and the rationale underpinning its probative value in Annex A. Additionally, such a document is self-explanatory and calling an air traffic controller as witness would add very little, if at all anything, to understanding the information contained therein.

III. Conclusion

28. For the reasons set out above, the Prosecution requests that Chamber admit all items listed in Annex A into evidence.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Luis Moreno-Ocampo', with a horizontal line underneath it.

Luis Moreno-Ocampo, Prosecutor

Dated this 30th Day of March 2012

At The Hague, The Netherlands