

PUBLIC
ANNEX B

Table of Contents of the Ngaïssona Defence Closing Brief

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE PROSECUTION’S CASE IS BASED ON UNRELIABLE, CONTAMINATED AND OVERABUNDANT NON-PROBATIVE EVIDENCE	2
A. The Prosecution excessively relied on circumstantial evidence.....	2
B. The Prosecution excessively relied on uncorroborated insider evidence, prior recorded statements and impugned witnesses	3
1. Uncorroborated insider evidence	3
2. Rule 68(2) and 68(3) prior record statements	3
3. Impugned key witnesses	5
3.1. P-0306	5
3.2. P-0965	7
3.3. POUSSOU (P-2625)	8
3.4. KOKATÉ (P-0801).....	10
3.5. P-1847	12
3.6. P-0487	12
3.7. DEMAFOUTH (P-2328).....	15
3.8. P-2673	17
3.9. P-2926	18
C. The Prosecution relied on contaminated testimonies of key witnesses	20
1. Evidence shows a pattern of interference	20
2. Key involved witnesses.....	21
2.1. P-2673	22
2.2. P-1847	22
2.3. KOKATÉ (P-0801).....	23
2.4. P-1719	24
2.5. P-0884	25
D. The Prosecution’s excessive use of the submission regime has unduly burdened the Defence with an excessive quantity of non-probative evidence.....	26
E. The extensive Facebook material should be given little to no evidentiary weight.....	28
1. The Facebook material is not self-authenticating as ‘business records’	28
2. The absence of testimony from a Facebook employee or technical expert limits the evidentiary weight of the material	32
3. The Facebook conversations have little to no probative value	34
4. The use of the Facebook material is overly prejudicial	39
F. The call data material should be dismissed as a matter of law	40
1. The CDRs are not self-authenticating	40

2. The Prosecution failed to authenticate the Orange, Telecel or MTN CDRs.....	44
3. The testimony from a MOOV representative cannot authenticate CDRs from other CSPs.....	48
4. N'DOUBA failed to establish the reliability of the MOOV CDRs.....	51
5. The Call Sequence Tables ('CST') are unreliable	52
6. The CDRs are fundamentally deficient.....	55
G. The Prosecution cannot apply double standards to evidence	57
H. The Prosecution abused the process regarding Article 70 of the Statute.....	57
III. THE PROSECUTION FAILED TO PROVE THE CONTEXT OF THE CHARGED CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY AND WAR CRIMES	59
A. The background of the conflict does not support the existence of an organizational policy 60	
1. Origin of the Seleka	59
2. The Prosecution failed to prove an early development of an organizational policy. 64	
B. The Prosecution failed to prove the conception and implementation of an organisational policy	68
1. Failure to prove that BOZIZÉ's intent was to reclaim power at all costs	69
2. Failure to prove a coordination of the alleged criminal policy at the alleged inner circle level	72
2.1. Lack of specificity regarding the "inner circle"	72
2.2. Insufficient level of coordination within each alleged geographical group	72
2.2.1. The so-called 'Cameroon group'	73
2.2.2. FROCCA	76
2.2.2.1. FROCCA was not a pro-BOZIZÉ structure and never set up a bureau	76
2.2.2.2. FROCCA was never formalised.....	77
2.2.2.3. BOZIZÉ's return to power was an option, rather than an objective	78
2.2.2.4. FROCCA's objectives were non-violent.....	79
2.2.2.5. FROCCA Facebook accounts are not attributable to FROCCA members	80
2.2.2.6. BANOUKEPA worked alone.....	81
2.2.2.7. FROCCA had no military capacity	82
2.2.2.8. FROCCA did not finance the Anti-Balaka.....	84
2.2.3. The 'GOBÉRÉ group'	84
2.3. Insufficient level of coordination between the different alleged geographical groups 86	
2.3.1. MOKOM was not organising Mr YEKATOM's group	86
2.3.2. The 'GOBÉRÉ group' was not 'deployed'	87
C. The 'GOBÉRÉ group' did not have the required means and capacity to carry out the alleged attacks.....	91

IV. THE PROSECUTION FAILED TO PROVE THE ALLEGED EXISTENCE OF A COMMON CRIMINAL PURPOSE.....	99
A. The common criminal purpose is impermissibly broad and vague	99
B. There is no identifiable ‘group of persons’ within the meaning of Article 25(3)(d) of the Statute	100
1. The Anti-Balaka is not one group	101
2. The existence of fake Anti-Balaka	103
C. The Prosecution failed to prove that the alleged crimes were committed by members of Anti-Balaka groups.....	104
D. The Anti-Balaka groups never shared a common purpose to commit crimes against the Muslim civilian population.....	107
1. No common purpose to target the Muslim civilian population	108
2. No Anti-Muslim animus established at the outset of the conflict.....	108
3. No Anti-Muslim animus shared by groups located in the provinces	109
4. The objective of ousting the Seleka was legitimate.....	111
E. The crime of rape was not part of the common purpose	114
1. No evidence that the common purpose encompassed acts of rape or SGBV	115
2. Insufficient evidence on the alleged perpetrators of rape or SGBV acts	117
3. No evidence that Mr NGAÏSSONA contributed to and was aware of the alleged commission of SGBV by the Anti-Balaka	118
V. THE PROSECUTION FAILED TO PROVE THE CHARGED CRIMES IN BOSSANGO.....	119
A. The war crime of directing attacks against the civilian population (Count 30) and the alleged underlying crimes have not been proven (Counts 31-33, 35, 37 and 39-42).....	120
1. The ‘BOSSANGO group’ did not target the civilian population during the 5 December attack on BOSSANGO.....	121
1.1. The ‘BOSSANGO group’ did not attack indiscriminately on 5 December 2013	122
1.2. The ‘BOSSANGO group’ took precautionary measures to not target the civilians	123
1.3. The civilian population was not the target of the ‘BOSSANGO group’	123
1.3.1. The ‘BOSSANGO group’ targeted legitimate military objectives	123
1.3.2. A large proportion of Muslim civilians actively participated in hostilities on 5 December 2013.....	125
1.4. The 5 December attack was proportionate.....	128
2. The Prosecution failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt the commission of the charged crimes (Counts 31-33, 35, 37, 39-42) by the ‘BOSSANGO group’	129
2.1. The alleged murder of 28 unarmed Muslim civilians on 5 December 2013 has not been established (Counts 31 and 32)	129
2.1.1. The Prosecution did not show that all 28 individuals were killed.....	129

2.1.2. There is credible evidence that the alleged victims actively participated in the hostilities at the time of their death.....	133
2.1.3. The identity and mens rea of the perpetrator(s) are not established.....	136
2.2. The 'BOSSANGO group' did not pillage and destroy the Muslim homes during and after the attack (Counts 33 and 34).....	137
2.3. There is no evidence that the Anti-Balaka destroyed the central mosque of BOSSANGO (Count 35)	141
2.4. There is no evidence that the Anti-Balaka imprisoned, displaced, or forcibly transferred the Muslim population (Counts 37, 38 and 39)	143
2.4.1. Muslim civilians left their homes as a result of a lawful attack and for their own security	144
2.4.2. The departure of Muslim civilians for Chad was entirely voluntary	145
2.4.3. There was no order to displace the Muslim civilians.....	147
2.4.4. Anti-Balaka elements did not force Muslim civilians to remain at École Liberté	148
2.4.5. The alleged rape of P-2462 was not proven (Counts 40 and 41)	151
2.4.5.1. The alleged rape did not occur	151
2.4.5.2. The identity of the alleged perpetrator was not established.....	153
2.4.6. Due to its failure to prove the underlying crimes, the Prosecution failed to prove the crime of persecution (Count 42).....	155
B. The evidence related to events in BOSSANGO is plagued by credibility issues....	155
1. The Imam's relatives and their acquaintances are not credible	156
2. The additional evidence fails to offset testimonial flaws	160
VI. THE PROSECUTION FAILED TO PROVE THAT MR NGAÏSSONA CONTRIBUTED TO THE COMMISSION OF ANY CRIMES	160
A. The Prosecution failed to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA was part of BOZIZÉ's so-called inner circle.....	163
1. Mr NGAÏSSONA's alleged membership in a so-called inner circle or alleged proximity to BOZIZÉ cannot be inferred from shared ethnicity	163
2. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not participate in "youth mobilisation".....	164
3. Mr NGAÏSSONA never expressed anti-Muslim sentiment or sow division within the CAR population.....	167
4. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not follow BOZIZÉ to Cameroon, regularly visit him or live at his residence	169
5. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not participate in meetings with BOZIZÉ in Cameroon....	172
5.1. Alleged meetings at the Hilton Hotel.....	173
5.2. Alleged meeting at Hôtel des Députés.....	174
5.3. Alleged meeting(s) at the CAR embassy in YAOUNDÉ.....	175
5.4. Alleged meeting at Mr NGAÏSSONA's alleged villa in YAOUNDÉ	175
5.5. Alleged meetings at the Golf residence	176

B. The Prosecution failed to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA took steps to structure the Anti-Balaka and FACA pre-January 2014	177
1. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not assist the Anti-Balaka and FACA through FROCCA ...	177
2. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not assist the Anti-Balaka and FACA located at the border with Cameroon	182
3. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not assist Anti-Balaka and FACA elements in GOBÉRE ..	183
4. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not assist Anti-Balaka based in BANGUI	186
5. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not assist Anti-Balaka and FACA in Zongo	187
C. The Prosecution failed to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA's appointment as political coordinator was planned prior to his return to BANGUI	187
D. The Prosecution failed to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA financed the Anti-Balaka for the commission of the Charged Crimes, including through the purchase and distribution of weapons and other equipment	188
1. Mr NGAÏSSONA struggled financially while in Cameroon	189
2. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not provide equipment and transportation prior to 5 December 2013	190
3. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not provide money, weapons, ammunitions or any other material	195
3.1. Prior to 5 December 2013	195
3.1.1. CAR border	195
3.1.2. GOBÉRE	199
3.1.3. BANGUI	203
3.1.4. ZONGO	207
3.2. After 5 December 2013	209
E. The Prosecution failed to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA issued military instructions to Anti-Balaka members, including regarding the 5 December 2013 attack and preceding attacks	212
1. Insufficient evidence to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA and Bernard MOKOM summoned NGAÏKOSSET so he could return to CAR to carry out attacks	212
2. Insufficient evidence to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA instructed the Anti-Balaka to attack BOUAR and BELOKO in October 2013	214
3. Unreliable Facebook evidence alleging that Mr NGAÏSSONA provided military instructions in November 2013	216
4. Insufficient evidence to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA provided instructions to the Anti-Balaka in CAR relating to attacks, including the 5 December attack	217
F. The Prosecution failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt that Mr NGAÏSSONA liaised and coordinated with BOZIZÉ, MOKOM, Mr YEKATOM and Anti-Balaka leaders of BOSSANGO prior to or at the time of the Charged Crimes	219
1. Prior to 5 December 2013	219
1.1. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not liaise with BOZIZÉ	219
1.2. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not liaise with Bernard MOKOM	220

1.3. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not liaise with MOKOM	221
1.4. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not liaise with Mr YEKATOM.....	224
1.5. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not liaise and coordinate with alleged Anti-Balaka leaders in BANGUI	227
1.6. Mr NGAÏSSONA did not liaise with the alleged leaders of the 'BOSSANGOA group'	231
2. After 5 December 2013	232
VII. THE PROSECUTION FAILED TO PROVE THAT MR NGAÏSSONA HAD THE REQUIRED INTENT AND KNOWLEDGE	235
A. The Prosecution failed to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA lent his assistance for the purpose of facilitating the offence	237
B. The Prosecution failed to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA's alleged contribution was intentional, and made with the aim of furthering the criminal activity or criminal purpose of the group, or in the knowledge of the intention of the group to commit the charged crimes	239
C. The Prosecution failed to prove that Mr NGAÏSSONA was aware of the intention of the alleged group to commit the crime, or knew that the offence would occur in the ordinary course of events	240
D. Mr NGAÏSSONA's words and actions in 2014 prove he never harboured any criminal intent.....	240
1. Lists and badges.....	242
2. Means of subsistence	242
3. Military police	243
4. Meetings with Comzones	244
5. Mission orders	244
6. Press communiqués and other statements	244
7. Billeting and DDRR	245
8. High level advocacy, BRAZZAVILLE forum and implementation of peace accord	246
9. Creation of the PCUD.....	248
10. NAIROBI negotiations	248
E. Mr NGAÏSSONA's failure to stop the violence is not indicative of a criminal intent.....	249
VIII. RELIEF SOUGHT	250