



Original: **English**

No.: **ICC-01/14-01/18**

Date: **26 August 2019**

PRE-TRIAL CHAMBER II

Before: Judge Antoine Kesia-Mbe Mindua, Presiding Judge
Judge Tomoko Akane
Judge Rosario Salvatore Aitala

**SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC II
IN THE CASE OF *PROSECUTOR v. ALFRED YEKATOM AND PATRICE-
EDOUARD NGAÏSSONA***

Public

**Public redacted version of “Prosecution’s Additional Observations on the Registry’s
First Assessment Report on Applications for Victims’ Participation in Pre-Trial
Proceedings” (ICC-01/14-01/18-198), 14 June 2019, ICC-01/14-01/18-224-Conf**

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 Kweku Vanderpuye

Counsel for Alfred Yekatom

Me Mylène Dimitri
Mr Peter Robinson

Counsel for Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona

Mr Geert-Jan Alexander Knoops

Legal Representatives of Victims

Mr Dmytro Suprun
Mr Abdou Dangabo Moussa
Ms Elisabeth Rabesandratana
Mr Yaré Fall
Ms Marie-Edith Douzima-Lawson
Ms Christine Priso Ouamballo
Ms Paolina Massidda

Legal Representatives of Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

**Unrepresented Applicants
(Participation/Reparation)**

States Representatives

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar

Mr Peter Lewis

Counsel Support Section

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Mr Nigel Verrill

Detention Section

**Victims Participation and Reparations
Section**

Mr Philipp Ambach

Other

INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to the order of Pre-Trial Chamber II (“Chamber”),¹ the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”) hereby provides its Observations concerning (1) the scope of the case as it stands; and (2) the three victim applications [REDACTED] (“Three Applications”).²

2. As concerns the scope of the case, the Prosecution presently intends to modify the charges against Suspect NGAISSONA as set out below.

3. Regarding the Three Applications, the Chamber should defer its determination until at least the filing of the Document Containing the Charges (“DCC”), if not the confirmation decision. Doing otherwise at this point would be premature. However, if the Chamber is disposed to decide the matter now, the Three Applications should be allowed because *prima facie* the alleged victimisation already falls within the current scope of the Prosecution’s case.

I. CONFIDENTIALITY

4. These Observations are filed “Confidential” as they are in part responsive and refer to a filing of the same designation. A public redacted version will be filed as soon as practicable.

¹ ICC-01/14-01/18-220-Conf.

² Victim applications [REDACTED].

II. SUBMISSIONS

A. Scope of the Prosecution's Case

5. The Prosecution's case remains substantially the same as that set out in the Warrants of Arrest,³ with some refinements. However, the Prosecution intends to allege additional crimes [REDACTED]. These are:

- a. [REDACTED]: the crimes of attack against a civilian population under article 8(2)(e)(i) of the Statute; murder, attempted murder, and extermination under articles 7(1)(a), 7(1)(b) and 8(2)(c)(i); pillaging and destruction of adversary's property under articles 8(2)(e)(v) and 8(2)(e)(xii); forcible transfer, deportation and displacement under articles 7(1)(d) and 8(2)(e)(iv); and persecution under article 7(1)(h);
- b. [REDACTED]: the crime of attack directed against a civilian population under article 8(2)(e)(i); and
- c. [REDACTED]: the crimes of outrage upon personal dignity under article 8(2)(c)(ii); and persecution under article 7(1)(h), [REDACTED].

6. These additional charges are predicated on the Prosecution's continuing review of its collection in light of new information (particularly, witness statements) obtained since the filing of its Application for Warrants of Arrest. That material comprises both direct and indirect evidence, as well as substantial corroboration of reported events.

³ ICC-01/14-01/18-1-Red; ICC-01/14-01/18-89-Red.

7. The intended additional charges concerning [REDACTED] identify crimes committed against Muslim civilians [REDACTED].

8. The charges concerning [REDACTED] are predicated on additional evidence recently obtained [REDACTED]. That information was not previously available or before the Chamber in respect of the Prosecution's Application for Arrest Warrants.

9. Notably, all of the above crimes are of the same classifications already set out in the Warrants of Arrest. That said, [REDACTED]. The Prosecution is mindful that, while it may expand the factual basis of the charges beyond that for which Warrants of Arrest were issued, the Defence must be given adequate time to prepare.⁴

B. Disposition of the Three Applications

10. Although the Prosecution does not allege [REDACTED], the Three Applications already fall *prima facie* within the current scope of the Prosecution's case. Should the Chamber determine the matter now – as opposed to defer its decision, as suggested – the Three Applications should be allowed provisionally.

11. *First*, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED].⁵ The mass criminality committed by the Anti-Balaka in Bangui on or around 5 December 2013 is addressed in the Warrants of Arrest – and soon, also in the DCC – as discrete charges. These include:

- a. attack against a civilian population under article 8(2)(e)(i);
- b. forcible transfer, deportation and displacement under articles 7(1)(d) and 8(2)(e)(iv); and
- c. persecution under article 7(1)(h).

⁴ Chambers Practice Manual, pp. 11-12.

⁵ In victim application [REDACTED].

12. [REDACTED]. These include, for instance, persecution, inhumane treatment, cruel treatment, outrages on personal dignity, etc.

13. Where the war crime of attacking civilians is charged, an individual civilian harmed by such an “attack”, whether directly or indirectly (even collaterally), would be a “victim” within the Court’s regulatory framework. This is so, irrespective of whether the individual was attacked in a way that may also amount to another crime. It is not necessary that every single act in an attack — every shooting, beating, looting, or murder — be charged for the affected individuals to be deemed victims of the perpetrator’s *course of conduct*. The same holds true for the crime of persecution. Charging each persecutory act as a discrete crime is unnecessary to granting an individual standing as a victim of such crime.

14. Similarly, [REDACTED]. For instance, forcible transfer may be achieved through many different types of force, threats thereof, or coercion against a person or population causing displacement. Even if a direct victim of that force is never actually displaced, this can still amount to a relevant coercive act underlying the forcible transfer: for example, where a person is notoriously and publicly murdered as a warning to the community at large. As long as it is shown that the perpetrators intended to displace others and that the affected population is in fact displaced, the person murdered would still be a victim of the perpetrator’s *course of conduct* in carrying out the charged displacement. So too would their family members.⁶ Thus, both the individuals fleeing the threat and the person murdered would be victims of conduct underlying the charged crime of forcible transfer.

15. In this case, the Three Applications [REDACTED] may fall within the scope of the charged crimes concerning the 5 December 2013 Anti-Balaka attack in Bangui, namely: (i) attack against a civilian population, (ii) forcible transfer, deportation and

⁶ ICC-01/04-01/06-1432 OA9 OA10, para. 35 “[h]arm suffered by one victim as a result of the commission of a crime within the jurisdiction of the Court can give rise to harm suffered by other victims”).

displacement, and (iii) persecution. Because, as noted, [REDACTED], the Three Applications cannot be excluded. Thus, if the Chamber is inclined to rule on the Three Applications now, they should be provisionally allowed.

16. *Second*, the victimisation described in the Three Applications falls within the Prosecution's broader case against the two Suspects. This is because, when determining an individual's standing as a victim, it is the perpetrator's *conduct* and the resulting harm — not the legal classification — that are determinative.

17. A victim's relationship to that *conduct* can be direct, indirect, relevant to only a part of the charged crime, or amount to a discretely chargeable offence. In any of these scenarios, they are a "victim" within the contemplation of the Court's statutory framework where such a nexus is *prima facie* shown.⁷ As the practice of Chambers of this Court shows, victim status is not limited by the specific crimes charged.⁸ It is only necessary to show that the victim suffered *harm* as a result of an "*incident falling within the parameters* of the confirmed charges."⁹

18. Importantly, the Three Applications allege [REDACTED] committed by elements of the Anti-Balaka. This was the group that NGAISSONA helped to organise and develop, pursuant to a common plan, purpose, and/or policy to *target* the Muslim civilian population of western CAR, based on their perceived responsibility for, complicity with, and/or support for, the Seleka. This targeting encompassed, but was not limited to, the Anti-Balaka's attack in Bangui on 5 December 2013. The criminal acts committed against the applicants therefore fall not

⁷ See article 68(3) of the Statute ("Where the personal interest of the victims are affected..."); rule 85(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence ("'Victims' mean natural persons who have suffered harm as a result of the commission of any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court").

⁸ See ICC-01/09-01/11-17, para. 6 (The incident alleged by the victim applicant must merely "relate to" the offences alleged in the summons to appear, and later, the DCC). See also ICC-01/04-01/06-925 (Sep. Op. Judge Pikis), para. 13 (suggesting that even persons who suffered harm from the "subject-matter of investigation" are victims whose personal interests are affected).

⁹ ICC-01/04-02/06-449, para. 43 (emphasis added).

only within the temporal and geographic scope, but also within the material parameters of the case as set out in the Warrants of Arrest.

III. CONCLUSION

19. For the above reasons, the Chamber should defer its determination on the Three Applications until the DCC is filed, if not, until the confirmation decision is issued. Alternatively, the Three Applications should be provisionally allowed.



Fatou Bensouda, Prosecutor

Dated this 26th day of August 2019
At The Hague, The Netherlands