



Original: English

No.: ICC-01/09-01/11
Date: 12 September 2013

APPEALS CHAMBER

Before: Judge Sang-Hyun Song, Presiding Judge
Judge Sanji Mmasenono Monageng
Judge Akua Kuenyehia
Judge Erkki Kouroula
Judge Anita Ušacka

SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF KENYA

**IN THE CASE OF
THE PROSECUTOR *v.* WILLIAM SAMOEI RUTO *and* JOSHUA ARAP SANG**

Public

Corrigendum to Prosecution's consolidated response to the requests for leave to submit *amici curiae* observations in the Prosecution's appeal against the Trial Chamber V(a)'s "Decision on Mr Ruto's Request for Excusal from Continuous Presence at Trial"

Source: 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

Ms. Fatou Bensouda
Mr. James Stewart
Mr. Fabricio Guariglia

Counsel for the Defence

For William Samoei Ruto:

Mr. Karim Khan
Mr. David Hooper

For Joshua Arap Sang:

Mr. Joseph Kipchumba Kigen-Katwa
Mr. Silas Chekera

Legal Representatives of the Victims

Mr. Wilfred Nderitu

The Office of Public Counsel for Victims

Ms. Paolina Massidda

State Representatives

The Republic of Burundi
The State of Eritrea
The Republic of Rwanda
The United Republic of Tanzania
The Republic of Uganda

REGISTRY

Registrar

Mr. Herman von Hebel

Deputy Registrar

Mr. Didier Preira

Counsel Support Section

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Mr. Patrick Craig

Submissions

1. On 10 and 11 September 2013, the United Republic of Tanzania,¹ the Republic of Rwanda,² the Republic of Burundi,³ the State of Eritrea⁴ and the Republic of Uganda⁵ requested leave to submit *amici curiae* observations in the appeal of the Prosecution against the decision of Trial Chamber V(a) entitled “Decision on Mr Ruto’s Request for Excusal from Continuous Presence at Trial”.⁶
2. The Prosecution notes that the current issue on appeal is narrow and purely legal, namely: the correctness of Trial Chamber V(a)’s interpretation of Article 63(1) that permits the absence of the accused from most of the trial. Therefore, arguments related to the potential impact of the Appeals Chamber’s ruling on the ratification of the Rome Statute⁷ or State cooperation with the Court⁸ have no identifiable bearing on the matters *sub judice*. The Prosecution further notes that, and in order to assist the Chamber in its determination of the issue on appeal, any observation under Rule 103 (2) should avoid the repetition of submissions already provided by the parties.⁹
3. However, the Prosecution defers to the Appeals Chamber’s discretion as to whether submissions from the above listed State authorities would assist it in the determination of the matters *sub judice*. If leave is granted, the Prosecution will respond to the observations as provided by Rule 103(2).

¹ ICC-01/09-01/11-918-Anxl OA5.

² ICC-01/09-01/11-921-Anxl OA5.

³ ICC-01/09-01/11-924-Anxl OA5.

⁴ ICC-01/09-01/11-926-Anxl OA5.

⁵ ICC- 01/09-01/11-928-Anxl OA5.

⁶ ICC-01/09-01/11-777. On 29 July 2013 the Prosecution filed its appeal brief: ICC-01/09-01/11-831OA5.

⁷ ICC-01/09-01/11-921-Anxl OA5, para.5.

⁸ ICC-01/09-01/11-918-Anxl OA, para.5; ICC-01/09-01/11-924-Anxl OA5, para.5; ICC- 01/09-01/11-928-Anxl OA5, para.5 ; ICC- 01/09-01/11-928-Anxl OA5, para.5.

⁹ ICC-01/05-01/08-602 OA2, para. 11.



Fatou Bensouda, Prosecutor

Dated this 12th day of September 2013

At The Hague, the Netherlands