

ANNEX A

Public Redacted Version of
ICC-02/05-01/20-1320-Conf-AnxA

N.B. The page numbers in this redacted table of contents have updated to align with the public redacted version of the brief, rather than the confidential version.

INTRODUCTION.....	3
CONFIDENTIALITY	3
SUBMISSIONS	3
I. The Chamber correctly applied the principle of legality (Part A).....	3
I.A. The Chamber did not violate article 22(2) (Ground 1)	5
I.B. The Chamber properly determined that the charge of forcible transfer (count 10) met the requirements of article 22(1) (Ground 2).....	13
I.C. The Chamber properly determined that the persecution charges (counts 11, 21, and 31) met the requirements of article 22(1) (Ground 3)	15
I.D. The Chamber did not err in rejecting Abd-Al-Rahman’s claim of a national law duty to follow unlawful orders (Ground 4)	19
I.E. The Chamber adequately considered Abd-Al-Rahman’s personal circumstances (Ground 5)	22
II. Abd-Al-Rahman had a fair trial (Part B).....	25
II.A. The Court’s investigations in Sudan and [REDACTED] conformed with the Statute, including article 4(2) (Grounds 6-7).....	25
II.B. The Chamber correctly rejected the request for a non-disclosure order (Ground 8)	34
II.C. The Chamber correctly found that Sudan’s failure to provide certain documents requested by the Defence did not render the trial unfair (Grounds 9, 11).....	38
II.D. The Chamber properly rejected the submission that cooperation with the Court was criminalised under Sudanese law (Ground 10)	42
II.E. The Chamber correctly dismissed Defence arguments about the impossibility of protecting witnesses in Sudan (Ground 12).....	45
II.F. The Chamber did not err in its findings concerning the alleged non-delivery of visas to the Defence to enter Sudan (Ground 13).....	48
II.G. The Chamber correctly found that the Prosecution did not breach its disclosure obligations (Ground 14).....	53
II.H. The Chambers’ findings relating to Defence field missions in Sudan were correct (Grounds 16-17)	55
II.I. The Prosecution did not elevate the risk to witnesses by not marking statements as confidential (Ground 19).....	60
II.J. The Chamber properly imposed a 300 page limit for the Defence’s Final Brief (Ground 21)	61
III. The Chamber properly assessed the evidence (Part C)	64
III.A. The Chamber properly assessed inconsistencies in witnesses’ asylum applications (Ground 22)	65
III.B. The Chamber applied consistent standards in assessing the evidence of Prosecution and Defence witnesses (Ground 24)	69
III.C. The Chamber reasonably assessed the evidence of Defence witnesses on the Identity Issue (Ground 25).....	72
III.D. The Chamber consistently assessed Prosecution and Defence challenges to witness evidence (Ground 26)	76
III.E. The Chamber reasonably assessed insider witness evidence (Ground 28)	78

III.F.	The Chamber reasonably relied upon contemporaneous records in assessing the credibility of certain witnesses (Ground 29)	82
IV.	The Chamber properly determined that Abd-Al-Rahman is ‘Ali Kushayb’ (Part D)..	85
IV.A.	The Chamber complied with the Video Admissibility Appeal Judgment (Ground 30)	85
IV.B.	The Chamber assessed all the evidence concerning the Identity Issue and correctly applied the standard of proof (Ground 31).....	89
IV.C.	The Chamber did not erroneously discount D-0016’s identity-related evidence (Ground 32)	92
IV.D.	The Chamber properly considered alleged inconsistencies between the features of ‘Ali Kushayb’ and Abd-Al-Rahman’s actual features (Ground 33).....	94
IV.E.	The Chamber properly considered any alleged impact of the public release of court documents on the evidence (Ground 35).....	97
IV.F.	The Chamber properly allowed witnesses to be cross-examined on the 2013 media reports, and their submission into evidence (Ground 36).....	100
IV.G.	The Chamber properly relied on evidence of witness recognition in videos and photographs (Ground 37).....	102
IV.H.	The Chamber properly relied on in-court recognition evidence from three witnesses (Ground 38).....	105
V.	Abd-Al-Rahman held a position of authority and influence (Part E)	107
V.A.	The Chamber properly found that Abd-Al-Rahman was a <i>de facto Janjaweed</i> leader (Ground 40).....	108
V.B.	The Chamber properly found that Abd-Al-Rahman had a relationship with the leadership of the GoS, and GoS forces at the locality level (Ground 44)	112
V.C.	The Chamber properly noted that several witnesses described Abd-Al-Rahman as <i>agid al-ogada</i> and perceived him as a <i>Janjaweed</i> leader (Grounds 45-47)	115
V.D.	The Chamber reasonably found that the <i>Janjaweed</i> included members of the Ta’aisha tribe (Ground 48)	117
V.E.	The Chamber properly assessed the roles played by Hamdi, Hassaballah, Solonga and Al-Helu (Grounds 49-52).....	119
V.F.	The Chamber reasonably found that Abd-Al-Rahman was an influential figure in the Wadi Salih area before the conflict (Ground 53).....	121
VI.	The Chamber properly rejected any defence of mistake of law (Part H).....	122
VI.A.	The Chamber provided sufficient reasoning for its conclusion (Ground 54)	122
VI.B.	The Chamber properly found that a person in Abd-Al-Rahman’s position would not have believed his acts and conduct were legal or justified (Grounds 56-57).....	129
VII.	The Chamber properly assessed the Kodoom and Bindisi operation (Part I)	132
VII.A.	The Chamber properly found that Abd-Al-Rahman exercised authority over the perpetrators of the Kodoom and Bindisi attacks (Ground 64).....	133
VII.B.	The Trial Chamber reasonably established that Abd-Al-Rahman ordered the crimes committed in Kodoom and Bindisi (Grounds 66-67)	136
VII.C.	The Trial Chamber properly assessed Abd-Al-Rahman’s <i>mens rea</i> , including for rape (Grounds 65, 68)	139
VIII.	The Chamber properly assessed the Mukjar and Deleig operations (Part J)	144
VIII.A.	The Chamber properly found that Abd-Al-Rahman was a co-perpetrator of the crimes at Mukjar and Deleig (Ground 70).....	144
VIII.B.	The Chamber properly assessed crimes against children at Mukjar Police Station (Ground 72).....	150

VIII.C.	The Chamber properly assessed P-0919’s evidence about mistreatment at Mukjar Police Station (Ground 73)	152
VIII.D.	The Chamber properly assessed Abd-Al-Rahman’s role in the Deleig operation (Ground 74)	154
VIII.E.	The Chamber properly assessed Abd-Al-Rahman’s role in Garsila (Ground 75)	164
VIII.F.	The Chamber properly assessed crimes against boys in Deleig (Ground 76)	166
IX.	The Chamber properly approached the crime of persecution (Part K)	168
IX.A.	The Chamber properly approached the concept of “intersectionality” in assessing the persecution charges (Grounds 77-78)	169
IX.B.	The Chamber did not convict Abd-Al-Rahman of events at the Mukjar Locality Building (Ground 79)	174
CONCLUSION		176