

Public Annex 1

Table of contents

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUBMISSIONS.....	2
1. Part 1 – Errors in exceeding the parameters of the confirmed charges.....	2
1. Ground 1.1 – The Trial Chamber improperly expanded the factual basis beyond the charges as confirmed.....	2
2. Ground 1.2 – The Trial Chamber convicted Mr. Yekatom for direct perpetration on the basis of an unlawful re-characterisation of the facts.....	5
3. Ground 1.3 – The Trial Chamber erroneously moulded the material facts of Mr. Yekatom’s co-perpetration liability for the PK9-Mbaiki Axis charges.....	7
4. Materiality.....	8
2. Part 2 – Errors in the attribution of responsibility to Mr. Yekatom.....	10
1. Ground 2.1 – The Trial Chamber erred in finding that the Anti-Balaka was ‘one movement’	10
a) The case as pled and confirmed required an Article 25(3) nexus.....	10
b) Misuse of contextual ‘one-movement’ to establish individual responsibility.....	14
c) Materiality.....	20
2. Ground 2.2 – The Trial Chamber erred in finding that Mr. Yekatom was ‘Anti-Balaka’	21
a) Errors in failing to consider the context in which the RFACPP was established.....	21
b) Errors in finding that the RFACPP co-ordinated with the ‘Anti-Balaka’	25
c) Errors in finding that Mr. Yekatom was part of the National Coordination.....	31
d) Errors flowing from the ‘Anti-Balaka’ mischaracterisation	34
e) Materiality.....	41
3. Ground 2.3 – The Trial Chamber erred in finding that Mr. Yekatom targeted the Muslim population	41
a) Errors in findings on Mr. Yekatom’s alleged knowledge of Anti-Balaka perceptions.....	42
b) Errors in finding that Mr. Yekatom perceived Muslim civilians as responsible.....	43
c) Errors in finding Mr. Yekatom knew the group held Muslim civilians responsible	44
d) Errors in finding that Mr. Yekatom gave instructions to kill Muslim civilians	52
e) Materiality.....	60
4. Ground 2.4 – The Trial Chamber erred in finding that Mr. Yekatom exercised control over the RFACPP	63
a) Errors in failing to determine the available ‘power apparatus’	63
b) Errors in finding a strict hierarchy	65
c) Errors in finding exercise of control over the organisation.....	72
d) Errors concerning the execution of crimes by (almost) automatic compliance	79
e) Materiality.....	87
5. Ground 2.5 – The Trial Chamber erred in finding that Mr. Yekatom entered into a common plan with Cœur de Lion and Alkanto	87
a) The Chamber failed to establish the common plan	88
b) The Chamber failed to establish shared control over an organised apparatus	90
c) Materiality.....	92
6. Ground 2.6 – The Trial Chamber erred in finding that Mr. Yekatom made an essential contribution to the crimes	93
a) Errors on essential contribution for 5 December 2013 (Boeing and Cattin)	93
b) Errors on essential contribution for Yamwara incident.....	94
c) Errors on essential contribution for PK9-Mbaiki Axis	96
d) Materiality.....	98

7.	Ground 2.7 – The Trial Chamber erred in its findings on Mr. Yekatom’s <i>mens rea</i>	98
3.	Part 3 – Errors in failing to consider the NIAC circumstances	116
1.	Ground 3.1 – Failure to consider security/operational context at Yamwara	117
a)	Errors in assessment of checkpoints at Yamwara	117
b)	Errors in disregarding the ongoing NIAC during the Yamwara incident	119
c)	Errors in disregarding Mr. Yekatom’s cooperation efforts at Yamwara.....	123
2.	Ground 3.2 – Failure to consider security/operational context on the PK9-Mbaiki Axis	124
a)	Errors regarding the RFACPP’s emergence and advance along the Axis	125
b)	Errors in assessing the evidence on RFACPP checkpoints	127
c)	Errors regarding the RFACPP’s legitimate fund-collecting to support operations	128
d)	Errors in finding that by ‘taking over’ checkpoints, Mr. Yekatom and the RFACPP ‘aimed at searching and identifying Muslims’	128
e)	Errors in dismissing Mr. Yekatom’s cooperative actions.....	132
f)	Errors in findings on the reason for Muslim civilians’ departures	141
3.	Ground 3.3 – Failure to consider security/operational context for 5 December	146
a)	Errors in assessing status of the Traders	146
b)	Errors in properly assessing continuous combat functions.....	146
c)	Errors in assessing the Traders’ direct participation in the hostilities	149
4.	Materiality	152
4.	Part 4 – Errors in the treatment and assessment of evidence	152
1.	Ground 4.1 – General errors in the Trial Chamber’s assessment of P-1339	159
2.	Ground 4.2 – Errors in the assessment of evidence concerning Boeing Market	160
3.	Ground 4.3 – Errors in the assessment of evidence concerning Boeing Mosque	163
4.	Ground 4.4 – Errors in the assessment of evidence concerning Cattin.....	167
5.	Ground 4.5 – Errors in the assessment of evidence concerning Boeing-Cattin displacement.....	169
6.	Ground 4.6 – Errors in the assessment of evidence concerning Djido Saleh	172
7.	Ground 4.7 – Errors in the assessment of evidence concerning Yamwara	179
8.	Materiality	181
5.	Part 5 – The Chamber erred in its findings concerning the specific crimes	183
1.	Errors concerning the definition of ‘attack’ (Article 8(2)(e)(i))	183
2.	Error in failing to prove the existence of an ‘order’ (Article 8(2)(e)(viii))	185
3.	Error in finding there was no military necessity (Article 8(2)(e)(viii)).....	187
4.	Errors concerning severity threshold (Article 7(1)(f)/Article 8(2)(c)(i)-3).....	188
5.	Errors concerning causal link, coercive acts and genuine choice (Article 7(1)(d))	190
6.	Materiality	191
6.	Part 6 – Errors in the determination of sentence.....	192
1.	Errors in the interpretation and application of Article 76	193
2.	Errors in the assessment of aggravating factors	194
3.	Errors in the assessment of mitigating factors.....	195
4.	Errors in the assessment of the gravity of the crimes.....	197
5.	Materiality	198
III.	CONCLUSION and RELIEF	199