

ANNEX 15

Public Redacted

Version

From: Trial Chamber V Communications
Sent: 23 May 2023 14:23
To: OTP CAR IIB; D29 Yekatom Defence Team; D30 Ngaissona Defence Team; 'V44 LRV Team'; V44 LRV Team OPCV; V45 LRV Team
Cc: Associate Legal Officer-Court Officer; Chamber Decisions Communication; Trial Chamber V Communications
Subject: Decision on the Yekatom Defence's Requests regarding Filings ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf and 1871-Conf

[ICC] RESTRICTED

Dear Counsel,

The Single Judge takes note of the emails below.

The Single Judge recalls that the matter at hand is limited to the adjudication of the Prosecution's request for assistance (ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf) (the 'Request'). In this context, the Single Judge requested the Prosecution to share the requests for assistance to [REDACTED] and responses thereto because he considered that 'the Chamber would be further assisted by obtaining [them]' (see email from the Chamber, 15 May 2023, at 17:30). The Single Judge has not ruled on whether the additional documentation in question is material to the preparation of the defence under Rule 77 of the Rules, or otherwise on the Prosecution's disclosure obligations.

Having assessed the information provided by the Prosecution, the Single Judge is satisfied that the Yekatom Defence possesses the necessary information to respond to the Request (see email from the Yekatom Defence, 10 May 2023, at 14:49). He further notes that the redacted information is not determinative in the adjudication of the Request, and that any prejudice caused to the Yekatom Defence in responding to the Request, if any, is minimal. The Single Judge therefore rejects the Yekatom Defence's requests.

In light of the above, the Single Judge instructs the participants to file responses to the Request, if any, by Monday, 29 May 2023.

Kind regards,

TC V

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2023 10:18
To: OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED]; Trial Chamber V Communications [REDACTED]; D29 Yekatom Defence Team [REDACTED]; D30 Ngaissona Defence Team [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team OPCV [REDACTED]; V45 LRV Team [REDACTED]
Cc: Associate Legal Officer-Court Officer [REDACTED]; Chamber Decisions Communication [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Order regarding Filing ICC-01/14-01/18-1871-Conf

[ICC] RESTRICTED

Dear Trial Chamber V,

The Yekatom Defence respectfully submits that the Prosecution has failed to provide justification for the redactions applied to the Prosecution's correspondence with [REDACTED] ('Correspondence') filed on 16 May (ICC-01/14-01/18-1871-Conf-Anx-Red).

First, the Prosecution's attempt to re-litigate the materiality of redacted portions of the Correspondence is misguided and should be dismissed out of hand. It is established in the Court's case law that once a document has been deemed subject to disclosure, the obligation to disclose 'extends to the entire document and not only to the "relevant" portions of information contained' therein (see e.g. ICC-01/04-01/06-3031, para. 12, cited in ICC-02/04-01/15-1335, para. 5). As held in *Ongwen*, 'documents portions of which are deemed to contain information material to the preparation of the defence within the meaning of Rule 77 of the Rules should be disclosed in their entirety, with any appropriate redactions in accordance with the redaction protocol.' (see, ICC-02/04-01/15-1734, para. 34). The Correspondence has been deemed subject to disclosure by the Chamber and disclosed (see, Trial Chamber V email Decision of 17 May 2023 at 17:34); it is thus now incumbent on the Prosecution to provide justification for any redactions applied, either in accordance with the redaction protocol or in an application to the Chamber.

Further, the Prosecution's reliance on article 93(8)(a) is misplaced. It cannot be reasonably argued that a general obligation on the Court to maintain confidentiality of documents and information received subject to cooperation should override the *lex specialis* of the established procedural framework governing redactions; not least given that article 93(8)(a) expressly provides an exception for disclosure 'as required for [...] the proceedings', and moreover, does not distinguish between disclosure to third parties on the one hand, and on the other, to Parties and participants (see also, ICC-01/14-01/18-677-Anx5, paras 6-7, which applies this general obligation to third parties). For the same reasons, the Prosecution's reliance on Trial Chamber X's *obiter* pronouncements on general disclosure principles is misconceived. In any event, those decisions are materially distinguishable, given that i) they relate to disclosure requests, as opposed to litigation on redactions; and ii) the cited *obiter* relates to cooperation with States Parties (noting that the Statute's cooperation regime generally does not apply to intergovernmental organizations such as [REDACTED]).

The Defence thus respectfully requests that the Chamber re-order the Prosecution to comply with the applicable procedure for redactions; or alternatively, to dismiss *in limine* the Prosecution's initial request (ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf).

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

Legal Assistant, Yekatom Defence

From: OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED]

Sent: 19 May 2023 17:42

To: Trial Chamber V Communications [REDACTED]; OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED]
D29 Yekatom Defence Team [REDACTED]; D30 Ngaissona Defence Team
[REDACTED] V44 LRV Team [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team OPCV
[REDACTED] V45 LRV Team [REDACTED]

Cc: Associate Legal Officer-Court Officer [REDACTED]; Chamber Decisions Communication [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Order regarding Filing ICC-01/14-01/18-1871-Conf

Importance: High

[ICC] RESTRICTED

Dear Trial Chamber V,
Dear All,

Pursuant to the Chamber's instruction below, the Prosecution indicates that the redactions applied to ICC-01/14-01/18-1871-Conf-Anx-Red are necessary under article 87 and 93(8)(a) of the Rome Statute ("Statute"), as interpreted in the Court's jurisprudence and notably ICC-01/12-01/18-859-Conf, para. 9 and ICC-01/12-01/18-768-Conf, para. 6:

"[t]he cooperation regime under the Statute is integral to the effective functioning of the Court and central to that regime is the relationship of trust between the State Parties and the organs of the Court, in this instance, the Prosecution. 9 Although confidentiality is not absolute, it is often required in the communication of cooperation requests and responses, and may be lifted only in particular circumstances, if the specific need for disclosure is demonstrated in accordance with the disclosure regime. Although confidentiality is not absolute, it is often required in the communication of cooperation requests and responses, and may be lifted only in particular circumstances, if the specific need for disclosure is demonstrated in accordance with the disclosure regime".

The redacted information pertaining to contacts between the OTP and ██████ falls squarely within the Court's jurisprudence with respect to confidential communications concerning matters of international cooperation, as foreseen in the regulatory framework. As noted in the Prosecution's Request, a 2015 RFA was duly issued and responded to by ██████. The contents of that response is sufficient to the disposition of the Request, particularly with the supplemental information provided by the Prosecution to the Defence.

The matter at issue before the Chamber is limited to the Prosecution's demonstration of the *necessity* of the Chamber's intervention. It does not extend more broadly to the substance of the relevant charges. Therefore, it is incumbent on the Defence to substantiate a sufficient degree of materiality of the information sought to *overcome* the presumption that "[d]ocuments related to cooperation between the Prosecution and national authorities are not disclosable *per se*" (ICC-01/12-01/18-859-Conf, para. 9). While this applies to national authorities, the Prosecution considers that underlying principle is indistinguishable from a policy perspective from the case of international organisations.

For these reasons, the Prosecution considers that the documents as whole are non-disclosable. But, to the extent that they may contain relevant information they are appropriately redacted and proportional to their relationship to the discrete legal issue before the Chamber. Thank you.

Kind regards,

Kweku Vanderpuye

From: Trial Chamber V Communications ██████
Sent: 17 May 2023 17:34
To: OTP CAR IIB ██████; D29 Yekatom Defence Team ██████;
 D30 Ngaissona Defence Team ██████; 'V44 LRV Team'
 ██████; V44 LRV Team OPCV ██████; V45 LRV Team
 ██████
Cc: Associate Legal Officer-Court Officer ██████; Chamber Decisions
 Communication ██████; Trial Chamber V Communications
 ██████
Subject: Order regarding Filing ICC-01/14-01/18-1871-Conf

[ICC] RESTRICTED

Dear Counsel,

The Single Judge takes note of the Prosecution's filing ICC-01/14-01/18-1871-Conf, as well as the Yekatom Defence's request below (email from the Yekatom Defence, 17 May 2023, at 11:10).

Having reviewed the filing and its annex, the Single Judge notes that the Prosecution does not provide a legal basis for the necessity of the redactions applied to ICC-01/14-01/18-1871-Conf-Anx-Red.

The Single Judge therefore instructs the Prosecution to justify by email, by Friday 19 May 2023 at 17:30, the redactions in question in accordance with the applicable legal framework.

Accordingly, the Single Judge suspends the deadline for participants to respond to filing ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf until further notice.

Kind regards,

TC V

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 May 2023 11:10
To: Trial Chamber V Communications [REDACTED]; OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED]
 D29 Yekatom Defence Team [REDACTED]; D30 Ngaissona Defence Team [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] V44 LRV Team OPCV [REDACTED] V44 LRV Team [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]; V45 LRV Team [REDACTED]
Cc: Associate Legal Officer-Court Officer [REDACTED]; Chamber Decisions Communication [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Order regarding Filing ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf

[ICC] RESTRICTED

Dear Trial Chamber V,

The Yekatom Defence takes note of the 'Prosecution's Notice of Compliance with "Order regarding Filing ICC-01/14-01/18- 1859-Conf"' ('Notice'), to which is annexed the Prosecution's correspondence with [REDACTED] ('Correspondence').

At the outset, the Defence notes that the Correspondence includes i) multiple email exchanges between the Prosecution and [REDACTED] personnel dating to 2018, and ii) a further Prosecution RFA sent in March 2019 – the existence of neither of which appear to have been mentioned by the Prosecution in *inter partes* exchanges with the Defence, or in the Prosecution's 11 May 2023 email to the Chamber.

Extensive redactions are applied to the substance of the Correspondence (see Annex, pp 7, 11-15, 18-19). The Defence recalls that the Chamber has previously held that the burden of justifying redactions lies with the disclosing party (ICC-01/14-01/18-677, para. 73). No explanation or justification for these redactions is provided by the Prosecution in the Notice, though the Defence notes that the Prosecution has made reference to 'confidential communications' in its 11 May 2023 email to the Chamber. The redactions are not applied pursuant to the applicable Redaction Protocol in these proceedings; nor do they *prima facie* appear to fall within the rule 81 disclosure restriction categories, not least given that for the most part, the Prosecution has not redacted the identifies of the Prosecution and [REDACTED] staff involved in these exchanges. The Defence also recalls that, as the Appeals Chamber has held, and as recalled by the Single Judge in these proceedings, 'the overriding principle is that full disclosure should be made and non-disclosure is the exception' (ICC-01/14-01/18-1578-Conf, paras 26, and fn. 43).

It remains unclear to the Defence as to why the Prosecution continues to seek to deviate from the applicable and established procedural framework for matters in relation to disclosure and redaction. The Defence thus respectfully requests that the Prosecution be ordered to either re-disclose the Correspondence with redactions applied pursuant to the Redaction Protocol; or alternatively, to justify the redactions applied to the Correspondence in accordance with the applicable legal framework.

Lastly, the Defence requests that deadline to respond to the “Prosecution’s Request for an order concerning the cooperation with [REDACTED] (ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf), notified on 8 May 2023 remain suspended (as of the Chamber’s 15 May email Order) until the matter is resolved.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

Legal Assistant, Yekatom Defence

From: Trial Chamber V Communications [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 May 2023 17:30
To: OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED]; D29 Yekatom Defence Team [REDACTED];
 D30 Ngaissona Defence Team [REDACTED] V44 LRV Team OPCV [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team [REDACTED]; V45 LRV Team [REDACTED]
Cc: Associate Legal Officer-Court Officer [REDACTED]; Chamber Decisions
 Communication [REDACTED]; Trial Chamber V Communications
 [REDACTED]
Subject: Order regarding Filing ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf

[ICC] RESTRICTED

Dear Counsel,

The Single Judge takes note of the Prosecution’s cooperation request (ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf) (the ‘Request’), as well as the emails below.

Having reviewed the Request, the Single Judge is of the view that the Chamber would be further assisted by obtaining the respective requests for assistance sent by the Prosecution to [REDACTED] as well as the latter’s responses thereto (*see* ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf, para. 10). The Prosecution is thus instructed to file the additional documentation on the record on an *ex parte* basis, latest by tomorrow at 16:00.

The Prosecution is further instructed to file a confidential redacted version thereof, applying redactions as necessary, by the same deadline.

In light of the above, the deadline for the participants to respond to the Request is suspended until the additional documentation in question has been notified.

Kind regards,

TC V

From: Dimitri, Mylene [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 May 2023 15:01
To: OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED] Trial Chamber V Communications [REDACTED]
Cc: D29 Yekatom Defence Team [REDACTED]; D30 Ngaissona Defence Team
 [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team [REDACTED] V44 LRV Team OPCV
 [REDACTED] V45 LRV Team [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Yekatom Defence requests in relation to filing 1859-Conf

[ICC] RESTRICTED

Dear Trial Chamber V,

The Yekatom Defence respectfully reiterates its request for disclosure of the sought RFA and response.

The Defence notes that whereas the Prosecution has previously informed the Defence that [REDACTED] 'effectively declined' the Prosecution's July 2018 cooperation request, no such submission is made to the Chamber below. In the same vein, the Defence has learned for the first time of 'confidential communications', which was not mentioned in by the Prosecution *inter partes*.

The lack of clarity in this regard demonstrates the risk inherent in simply relying on the Prosecution's subjective interpretation of the nature of the Prosecution's interactions with [REDACTED] in respect of its efforts to obtain information from them. More broadly, it is contrary to basic fairness in adversarial proceedings to allow the Prosecution, as the moving party, to withhold documentary material that is clearly relevant to the determination of this litigation, unless there is a specific legal basis to do so. The Prosecution's unilateral determination that the information is 'not necessary', or that the Defence had 'sufficient information' in the form of the Prosecution's own subjective interpretation of the sought material, is not one of them.

There are procedures that apply to the present circumstances; there is no reason to deviate from them here. The Prosecution does not appear to dispute that the RFA and response are material to defence preparation pursuant to Rule 77. Moreover, if there is confidential information in these documents, the Prosecution is free to redact it in accordance with the established redaction protocol. To allow the Prosecution to withhold this information in such circumstances is procedurally unsound and contrary to the fair trial principle of *audi alteram partem*, and would set an undesirable precedent.

The Prosecution's reliance on the previous filing ICC-01/14-01/18-1531-Conf-Red is entirely misplaced. In that litigation, the Defence had been expressly and directly informed that the sought cooperation would not be possible without a court order (see, ICC-01/14-01/18-1492-Red, para. 52), and as such there was little, if any, ambiguity as to whether the intervention of the Chamber was 'necessary'; no such claim is made by the Prosecution as regards its cooperation requests with [REDACTED]. The *ex parte* status of that litigation was justified *inter alia* by the need to protect ongoing Defence investigations, as argued by the Defence (see, ICC-01/14-01/18-1492-Red, para. 67). Again, no such claim is made by the Prosecution here; and moreover, if that were the case, the Prosecution is free to seek to redact that information pursuant to the categories expressly envisioned in the applicable redaction protocol for that purpose. With respect, the Prosecution's attempts to disregard the applicable procedural safeguards should be disallowed.

Kind regards,
Mylène Dimitri

From: OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 May 2023 10:55
To: [REDACTED] Trial Chamber V Communications
 [REDACTED]
Cc: OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED]; D29 Yekatom Defence Team [REDACTED]
 D30 Ngaissona Defence Team [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team
 [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team OPCV [REDACTED]; V45 LRV Team
 [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Yekatom Defence requests in relation to filing 1859-Conf


[ICC] RESTRICTED

Dear Trial Chamber,


First, the Prosecution considers that in the context of *inter partes* communications, the Defence has at its disposal sufficient information to assess whether the requirements for judicial intervention to seek the cooperation of [REDACTED] are made out. To be clear, the Prosecution has advised the Defence of substantial information regarding the

efforts and processes pursued to obtain material relevant to [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] going back to 2015.


This includes a 2015 request:



In July 2018, the Prosecution further requested:



As noted, on 12 March 2019, [REDACTED] responded without providing the requested information, instead, it provided the Director of the former Judicial Cooperation and Complementarity Division of the OTP with links to the following publicly available information, which we provide here below:



We do not believe that any further disclosure is necessary for the Defence to respond effectively. The Prosecution considers that, because of the nature of its interaction with [REDACTED] including confidential communications exchanged in following up on the above-mentioned requests in 2019 and 2020, the Chamber is best suited to determine whether – for the *limited purposes* of the pending Request, disclosure of any further details is necessary.

Second, we recall that in a previous Defence request for similar intervention, the Chamber proceeded to dispose of the matter without providing an opportunity to respond altogether (see ICC-01/14-01/18-1531-Conf-Red, see also email from the Prosecution, 10 August 2022, at 12:07). Even so, given the Defence’s own ostensible efforts to obtain material from [REDACTED] germane to the subject matter of the charges, the Prosecution considers that the requested intervention is in the interests of the Parties and the advances the truth finding function of the Chamber. Thank you.

Kind regards,
Kweku Vanderpuye

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 May 2023 14:49
To: Trial Chamber V Communications [REDACTED]
Cc: OTP CAR IIB [REDACTED] D29 Yekatom Defence Team [REDACTED]
 D30 Ngaissona Defence Team [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team
 [REDACTED]; V44 LRV Team OPCV [REDACTED]; V45 LRV Team
 [REDACTED]
Subject: Yekatom Defence requests in relation to filing 1859-Conf

Dear Trial Chamber V,
Dear all,

The Defence for Mr. Yekatom (“Defence”) takes note of the “Prosecution’s Request for an order concerning the cooperation with [REDACTED] (ICC-01/14-01/18-1859-Conf), notified on 8 May 2023 (“Prosecution’s Request”).

Following an analysis of the Prosecution’s Request, the Defence respectfully requests that the Prosecution be ordered to disclose the Request for Assistance it sent to [REDACTED] (see Prosecution’s Request, paragraph 10) and the ensuing response from [REDACTED] (see Prosecution’s Request, footnote 22).

The Defence recalls that it is well established in the jurisprudence that a Chamber “may seek cooperation for intergovernmental organisations when the requirements of (i) specificity (ii) relevance and (iii) necessity have been met” (ICC-02/05-03/09-170, para. 14). Absent the provision of the RFA sent to [REDACTED] and the ensuing response, the Defence is deprived from the necessary information it needs in order to respond on the “necessity” criterion. Provision of the RFA would allow a proper comparison between the Prosecution’s Request at paragraph 7, and the original request sent to [REDACTED]. The fact that the Prosecution expressly indicated its willingness to provide the RFA response to the Chamber in a footnote within its submissions addressing the ‘necessity’ criterion (see, Prosecution Request, para. 10, fn. 22) should be understood as a concession that the RFA Response is clearly relevant to the Chamber’s assessment of the Request; and by extension, to defence preparation in respect of the Request. It is also recalled that the Defence shared with all Parties and Participants its initial requests to the African Union when it sought the Chamber’s intervention on the matter (see ICC-01/14-01/18-612-Conf-AnxB); and its own requests to [REDACTED] CAR-D29-0007-0036-R01, CAR-D29-0007-0041, CAR-D29-0007-0043).

The Defence engaged in *inter partes* discussions with the Prosecution on this matter and received an answer yesterday evening. The Prosecution contends that because the RFA they sent to [REDACTED] ‘contains confidential information pertaining to international cooperation matters which would require significant redactions’, they would not disclose it to the Defence. Instead, they provided details regarding their interaction with [REDACTED]. It is submitted that provision of the original documents sent to [REDACTED] should be ordered in order to fully assess the original request and, consequently, what [REDACTED] refused to provide. In addition, the assertion that the RFA contains confidential information pertaining to international cooperation is unsubstantiated as it doesn’t, on its face, fall into any disclosure exception rule.

Any confidentiality concerns should be alleviated by the fact that investigations in CAR have been formally concluded by the Prosecutor on [16 December 2022](#), and that redaction might be applied on names and contact of individuals not related to the current proceedings if really necessary. Moreover, to date the Prosecution disclosed dozens of its Request for Assistance which demonstrate that such type of documents are not irreversibly confidential (*see as an example an RFA sent to Cameroon CAR-OTP-2127-0959, to France CAR-OTP-2127-9942, to Ireland CAR-OTP-2130-0268, or to CAR CAR-OTP-2107-8941-R01*).

Should the Chamber grants the request and order the Prosecution to provide the documents sent to [REDACTED] (and received), the Defence also respectfully requests a suspension of the deadline to respond to the Prosecution's Request until the documents have been disclosed.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Legal Consultant
Yekatom Defence

This message contains information that may be privileged or confidential and is the property of the International Criminal Court. It is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized by the owner of the information to read, print, retain copy, disseminate, distribute, or use this message or any part hereof. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message and all copies hereof.

Les informations contenues dans ce message peuvent être confidentielles ou soumises au secret professionnel et elles sont la propriété de la Cour pénale internationale. Ce message n'est destiné qu'à la personne à laquelle il est adressé. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire voulu, le propriétaire des informations ne vous autorise pas à lire, imprimer, copier, diffuser, distribuer ou utiliser ce message, pas même en partie. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez prévenir l'expéditeur immédiatement et effacer ce message et toutes les copies qui en auraient été faites.

This message contains information that may be privileged or confidential and is the property of the International Criminal Court. It is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized by the owner of the information to read, print, retain copy, disseminate, distribute, or use this message or any part hereof. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message and all copies hereof.

Les informations contenues dans ce message peuvent être confidentielles ou soumises au secret professionnel et elles sont la propriété de la Cour pénale internationale. Ce message n'est destiné qu'à la personne à laquelle il est adressé. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire voulu, le propriétaire des informations ne vous autorise pas à lire, imprimer, copier, diffuser, distribuer ou utiliser ce message, pas même en partie. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez prévenir l'expéditeur immédiatement et effacer ce message et toutes les copies qui en auraient été faites.

This message contains information that may be privileged or confidential and is the property of the International Criminal Court. It is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized by the owner of the information to read, print, retain copy, disseminate, distribute, or use this message or any part hereof. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message and all copies hereof.

Les informations contenues dans ce message peuvent être confidentielles ou soumises au secret professionnel et elles sont la propriété de la Cour pénale internationale. Ce message n'est destiné qu'à la personne à laquelle il est adressé. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire voulu, le propriétaire des informations ne vous autorise pas à lire, imprimer, copier, diffuser, distribuer ou utiliser ce message, pas même en partie. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez prévenir l'expéditeur immédiatement et effacer ce message et toutes les copies qui en auraient été faites.

This message contains information that may be privileged or confidential and is the property of the International Criminal Court. It is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized by the owner of the information to read, print, retain copy, disseminate, distribute, or use this message or any part hereof. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message and all copies hereof.

Les informations contenues dans ce message peuvent être confidentielles ou soumises au secret professionnel et elles sont la propriété de la Cour pénale internationale. Ce message n'est destiné qu'à la personne à laquelle il est adressé. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire voulu, le propriétaire des informations ne vous autorise pas à lire, imprimer, copier, diffuser, distribuer ou utiliser ce message, pas même en partie. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez prévenir l'expéditeur immédiatement et effacer ce message et toutes les copies qui en auraient été faites.