



Original: English

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

Date: 9 June 2016

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 Redacted Document

**Public redacted version of "Prosecution's Notice of Compliance", 11 April 2014,
ICC-01/05-01/13-332-Conf-Exp**

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

Ms Fatou Bensouda

Mr James Stewart

Mr Kweku Vanderpuye

Counsel for Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo

Ms Melinda Taylor

Counsel for Aimé Kilolo Musamba

Mr Paul Djunga Mudimbi

Mr Steven Sacha Powles

Counsel for Jean-Jacques Mangenda Kabongo

Mr Christopher Michael Gosnell

Mr Arthur Vercken De Vreuschmen

Counsel for Fidele Babala Wandu

Mr Jean-Pierre Kilenda Kakengi Basila

Mr Azama Shalie Rodoma

Counsel for Narcisse Arido

Mr Charles Achaleke Taku

Ms Beth Lyons

The Office of Public Counsel for Victims

The Office of Public Counsel for the Defence

States Representatives

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar

Mr Herman von Hebel

Counsel Support Section

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Mr Nigel Verrill

Detention Section

Victims Participation and Reparations Section

Other

I. Notice

1. The Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”) hereby informs the Chamber of its compliance with the Chamber’s Decision on the “Prosecution’s Application for Redactions pursuant to Rule 81(4) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence”, dated 21 March 2014” (“Decision”).¹

2. While implementing the authorised redactions², the Prosecution became aware of inconsistencies in their application as proposed in two respects: (1) references to [REDACTED] and (2) references to the function of the [REDACTED]. These have been rectified and the limited redactions applied in line with the Decision are set out below:

- a. The Single Judge granted redactions of [REDACTED]’s name in document CAR-OTP-0075-0189.³ Consequently, the Prosecution has also redacted her name at CAR-OTP-0074-1065 and CAR-OTP-0075-1238.
- b. The Single Judge granted redactions to the function of [REDACTED] in documents CAR-OTP-0075-0589; CAR-OTP-0075-0593; CAR-OTP-0075-0600 and copies thereof.⁴ Consequently, the Prosecution has also redacted his position in documents CAR-OTP-0075-0173; CAR-OTP-0075-0182; CAR-OTP-0075-0186 ; CAR-OTP-0075-0189 and CAR-OTP-0074-1065. Moreover, the Prosecution has made additional redactions to his position in the documents for which such redactions were

¹ ICC-01/05-01/13-315; see id., at p.7 (requiring the Prosecution to implement certain approved redactions in the Decision and to disclose the affected documents by 11 April 2014).

² ICC-01/05-01/13-315, page 6 (recognising the application of certain categories of redactions); and ICC-01/05-01/13-315-Conf-Exp-AnxA (confirming the redactions proposed by the Prosecution on a document by document basis).

³ ICC-01/05-01/13-315-Conf-Exp-AnxA, page 9.

⁴ CAR-OTP-0075-1252; CAR-OTP-0075-1256; CAR-OTP-0075-1452; and CAR-OTP-0075-1457: the redactions were granted in ICC-01/05-01/13-315-Conf-Exp-AnxA, at pages 52, 54, 57, 100, 102, 105, and 108 respectively.

already granted, namely CAR-OTP-0075-0600 and copies thereof.⁵

II. Confidentiality

3. Pursuant to Regulation 23(1)*bis* of the RoC, the Prosecution requests that this filing be classified as “Confidential, *Ex parte*, Prosecution and Victims and Witnesses Unit Only”, as it contains confidential information.⁶



Fatou Bensouda, Prosecutor

Dated this 9th Day of June 2016
At The Hague, The Netherlands

⁵ More specifically additional redactions were applied to paragraph 4 of the documents DRC-OTP-0075-0600, DRC-OTP-0075-1252, DRC-OTP-0075-1256, DRC-OTP-0075-1452, and DRC-OTP-0075-1457.

⁶ See, ICC-01/05-01/13-98, para. 5 (“It is - and should be - obvious that, for the procedure leading to the Chamber's determination of a request to be effective, the specific, factual reasons underlying a request for redaction under rule 81 must only be submitted to the Chamber and not divulged to the other parties prior to the Chamber's determination as to whether the grounds set forth in rule 81 are met.”).