



Original: English

No.: ICC-01/05-01/13

Date: 16/09/2015

TRIAL CHAMBER VII

Before: Judge Bertram Schmitt, Presiding Judge
Judge Marc Perrin de Brichambaut
Judge Raul Pangalangan

SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

IN THE CASE OF

THE PROSECUTOR

*v. JEAN-PIERRE BEMBA GOMBO, AIMÉ KILOLO MUSAMBA, JEAN-JACQUES
MANGENDA KABONGO, FIDÈLE BABALA WANDU AND NARCISSE ARIDO*

Public with Public Annexes A and B

**Corrigendum of “Joint Defence Request for Leave to Reply to the ‘Prosecution’s
Response to “Joint Defence Request pursuant to Regulation 35 of the Regulations
of the Court to defer notification concerning expert witnesses””**

Source: Counsel for Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo
Counsel for Aimé Kilolo Musamba
Counsel for Fidèle Babala Wandu
Counsel for Narcisse Arido

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

The Office of the Prosecutor

Fatou Bensouda

James Stewart

Kweku Vanderpuye

Counsel for the Defence of Mr Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo

Melinda Taylor

Counsel for the Defence of Mr Aimé Kilolo Musamba

Paul Djunga

Steven Powles

Counsel for the Defence of Jean-Jacques Mangenda Kabongo

Christopher Gosnell

Arthur Vercken De Vreuschmen

Counsel for the Defence of Fidèle Babala Wandu

Jean-Pierre Kilenda Kakengi Basila

Roland Azama Shalie Rodoma

Counsel for the Defence of Mr Narcisse Arido

Charles Achaleke Taku

Philippe Laroche

REGISTRY

Registrar

Herman von Hebel

Defence Support Section

Deputy Registrar

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Detention Section

Victims Participation and Reparations Section Other

Introduction

1. The Defence for Mr. Jean-Pierre Bemba, Mr. Aimé Kilolo, Mr. Fidèle Babala and Mr. Narcisse Arido (“the Defence”) respectfully requests the leave of the Trial Chamber to file a reply in relation to the ‘Prosecution’s Response to “Joint Defence Request pursuant to Regulation 35 of the Regulations of the Court to defer notification concerning expert witnesses”(ICC-01/05-01/13-1235)’.¹

2. In particular, there is good cause to address the Prosecution’s assertion that no prejudice was occasioned by the format of the version of the report of Mr. Pluijmers disclosed to the Defence.

3. Having received a format that enables the Defence to identify the specific references (as opposed to guessing which open source materials correspond to the footnotes),² the Defence has discovered that critical source material is only available in Dutch.

4. The Defence immediately requested the Prosecution to disclose a translation of these materials so that the Defence can properly explore the foundation for Mr. Pluijmer’s conclusions.³ This is consistent with right of the Defence to examine and test any sources relied upon by an expert witness.⁴

¹ ICC-01/05-01/13-1242.

² For example, the top search result of "WODC: Het gebruik van de telefoon - en internettap in de opsporing" leads to the webpage in the domain of WODC: <https://www.wodc.nl/onderzoeksdatabase/effectiviteit-van-tappen.aspx?cp=44&cs=6796#project-informative>.

The second search result of the same keywords is a PDF file, which is also the linked file on the aforementioned page: https://www.wodc.nl/images/ob304-volledige-tekst_tcm44-453677.pdf. Neither of these documents are the correct result. If the Defence had attempted to rely on internet searches alone, it would have based its analysis on irrelevant/erroneous information.

³ Annex A.

⁴ “There must be sufficient information as to the sources used in support of the statements. The sources must be clearly indicated and accessible in order to allow the other party or the Trial

5. The Prosecution responded on 15 September 2015 that it was not in possession of these documents in a working language of the Court, and that it was incumbent on the Defence to seek translations from the Registry.⁵

6. The Defence has submitted such a request, but has not yet received a response as concerns the capacity of the Registry to conduct these translations or the time required to do so.

7. Given that one of the documents is 200 pages, the Trial Chamber's adjudication of the Defence request would benefit from the submission of specific information on these matters, including the predicted translation date supplied by the Registry.

Relief sought

8. For the reasons set out above, the Defence for Mr. Bemba, Mr. Kilolo, Mr. Babala and Mr. Arido requests the Trial Chamber to grant it leave to reply to the "Prosecution's Response to "Joint Defence Request pursuant to Regulation 35 of the Regulations of the Court to defer notification concerning expert witnesses" (ICC-01/05-01/13-1235)', in order to update the Trial Chamber in relation to the matters raised herein.

Chamber to test or challenge the basis on which the expert witness reached his or her conclusions. In the absence of clear references or accessible sources, the Trial Chamber will not treat such a statement or report as an expert opinion, but as the personal opinion of the witness, and weigh the evidence accordingly". Prosecutor v. Dragomir Milosevic, Decision on Admission of Expert Report of Robert Donia, 15 February 2007, at para 8. See also Prosecutor v. Ojdanic, Order on Procedure and Evidence, 11 July 2006, para. 7, "Expert reports should, however, be fully referenced in order to facilitate the Chamber's determination of their probative value and, ultimately, the weight to be ascribed to them." See also ICC-01/09-01/11-844, para. 27, concerning the relevance of a witness's sources to the weight of the expert's testimony.


⁵ Annex B.




Melinda Taylor
Counsel of Mr. Jean-Pierre Bemba



Paul Djunga
Lead Counsel of Mr. Aimé Kilolo



Jean-Pierre Kilenda Kakengi Basila
Lead Counsel of Mr. Fidèle Babala



Charles Achaleke Taku
Lead Counsel of Mr. Narcisse Arido

Dated this 16th day of September, 2015

The Hague, The Netherlands