

1 International Criminal Court

2 Trial Chamber I - Courtroom 1

3 Presiding Judge Adrian Fulford, Judge Elizabeth Odio

4 Benito and Judge René Blattmann

5 Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo -

6 ICC-01/04-01/06

7 In the case of The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo

8 Wednesday, 31 March 2010

9 (The hearing starts at 2.30 p.m.)

10 (Open session)

11 THE COURT USHER: All rise. The International

12 Criminal Court is now in session. Please be seated.

13 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Good afternoon. Before we

14 return to the evidence of the witness, there are a few matters

15 of housekeeping that need to be addressed. The first that I can

16 deal with in public session is that we need to have, by 4 p.m.

17 tomorrow, an assessment by the Victims and Witnesses Unit as to

18 when we will have a definitive report on the position of

19 intermediary 143, and we need to make it clear that this

20 requires an early rather than a late date. It is critical that

21 we are in a position in the very near future to be able to make

22 a final decision as regards that intermediary.

23 I am not going to set a time now, although it is

24 likely that a time will be set at the end of tomorrow afternoon,

25 but we wish to give the VWU until 4 p.m. tomorrow to indicate to

1 us what the preferred time scale is as far as that unit is  
2 concerned.

3 Now, Maître Mabilie, we understand that there are some  
4 issues arising in relation to Witness 297 and 298. Are they  
5 lengthy matters, or can they be dealt with speedily now?

6 MS MABILLE: (Interpretation) We can deal with them  
7 now very quickly, your Honour.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Right. Whose point is 297,  
9 please?

10 MR SACHDEVA: Mr President, in terms of the  
11 Prosecution, Ms Samson will handle the issue related to 297 and  
12 I'll do in relation to 298.

13 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you. 297, Ms Samson.

14 MS SAMSON: Thank you, Mr President. The issue at the  
15 present time, your Honour, is that, further to discussions  
16 between the Defence and the Prosecution on a suitable  
17 arrangement for the pre-testimony interview of 297, the Defence  
18 has indicated that in their view the appropriate forum for the  
19 interview would be for it to take place here under the same  
20 conditions as are applicable for Defence witnesses, and the  
21 Prosecution isn't in full agreement with that proposition.

22 The witness is not returning as a Defence witness. It  
23 appears he may actually be a Prosecution witness at the --  
24 possibly a court witness, and that it would be in our interest  
25 to be able to meet with him separately in advance of him

1 arriving in The Hague; subject, of course, to the Victims and  
2 Witnesses Unit finding it to be suitable to his well-being that  
3 that interview be conducted prior to his arrival.

4 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Putting it in a sentence,  
5 Ms Samson, I assume therefore that you wish to have a greater  
6 length of time before 297 gives evidence so that you have the  
7 opportunity of investigating any matters that may arise during  
8 the course of that meeting.

9 MS SAMSON: That's precisely the point. And the  
10 Defence suggestion is that this meeting take place over 30 to 45  
11 minutes only, which the Prosecution feels is unduly restrictive.  
12 The Defence themselves were able to meet with the witness for  
13 some just under four hours to discuss matters which the  
14 Prosecution has yet not had an opportunity to address with this  
15 particular witness, and thereafter there may very well be  
16 further matters to speak to other individuals about.

17 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Very straightforward, thank  
18 you. Mr Biju-Duval?

19 MR BIJU-DUVAL: (Interpretation) Your Honour, the  
20 Defence does not object to the holding of a preliminary meeting  
21 as was the case for other Defence witnesses and on the basis of  
22 the model that was followed; that is, a short discussion a few  
23 days prior to the appearance or the arrival of the witness at  
24 The Hague, in the presence of the Defence team. We have no  
25 objection to the adoption of that model.

1           However, we do understand that the OTP would like to  
2   conduct a full and lengthy questioning of Witness 297. We do  
3   not think that this is proper, for the following reasons.  
4   Witness 297 was already examined during 16 and a half hours by  
5   the OTP in two sessions. The Defence interviewed this witness  
6   and sent a transcript of our interview with that witness to the  
7   OTP. In other words, today the OTP has all the material  
8   necessary to prepare for the testimony of that witness.

9           We do not think it would be proper to hold a lengthy  
10   examination or interview of the witness a few days prior to his  
11   evidence. If that were to happen, that would be tantamount to  
12   witness proofing, and that is something that the Chamber has  
13   already prohibited. We do agree that a short meeting should be  
14   held, as was the case for certain Defence witnesses, and that  
15   this should be done at The Hague and in the presence of the  
16   Defence team. That's what we have to say with respect to that  
17   interview.

18           We do not think it would be possible for the Defence,  
19   for reasons which are well known to the Bench, for material  
20   reasons, to go to Kinshasa for a few days, or for several days,  
21   in order to attend such a meeting. And so, for the above  
22   reasons, the Defence would like that the preliminary discussion  
23   should be held on the basis of the conditions that prevailed for  
24   other Defence witnesses.

25           PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you very much,

1 Mr Biju-Duval. Thank you, Ms Samson. We will take advice from  
2 the Victims and Witnesses Unit, given the particular background  
3 to this witness, to inform us before we make a decision on the  
4 submissions that you have just advanced. Thank you.

5 298.

6 MR SACHDEVA: Thank you, Mr President. As the  
7 Prosecution understands it, the Defence would like to interview  
8 Witness 290 out of court. In our submission -- well, first, we  
9 object to this approach by the Defence for a few reasons.  
10 Firstly, the initial decision - and I am referring to 1372 by  
11 the Chamber - granted the right of parties who are not calling  
12 witnesses to interview the other party's witnesses but in  
13 advance of their testimony.

14 As everyone is aware, Witness 298 has already given  
15 testimony and, therefore, the decision that was rendered in  
16 November last year, 2192, wherein it allowed the Prosecution to  
17 go back to its witnesses, was premised on the fact that we  
18 needed to do our investigations in light of allegations the  
19 Defence have raised and, clearly, going back to our witnesses  
20 was not only an obligation, as the Defence suggest under Article  
21 54(1), but reasonable for the Prosecution to do so. There is no  
22 legal basis for the Defence to now go back to 298 at this stage.

23 Secondly, we did not know what the Defence wanted to  
24 canvass with this witness. There may be issues that could have  
25 been put to the witness in cross-examination at the time he

1 testified and, secondly, as the Chamber is aware, there are  
2 certain areas in relation to this witness which should be  
3 treated with extreme caution, and I raise the issue in respect  
4 of the witness's mother. And, in fact, as the Chamber is aware,  
5 questions on that regard were stopped at a particular time  
6 during the cross-examination for those very reasons -- for  
7 humanitarian reasons, I would argue. So, for those reasons, we  
8 object to the approach by the Defence.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Maître Mabilille -- ah,  
10 Mr Desalliers?

11 MR DESALLIERS: (Interpretation) Yes, your Honour.  
12 Indeed, the OTP reviewed a certain number of witnesses, most of  
13 the witnesses who were presented as former child soldiers, and  
14 they did this, but they did not do the same for Witness 298, and  
15 the Defence expressed its position on this matter, stating that  
16 it wasn't only a right, it was also an obligation on the part of  
17 the OTP to see that witness again in order to seek to get more  
18 clarification with respect to new material that emerged.

19 This was not done for 298, and so the Defence would  
20 like to have the opportunity of meeting Witness 298 because it's  
21 important for us to continue to explore certain areas which were  
22 closed at that particular point in time, for understandable  
23 reasons, because the witness was presented as living under very  
24 vulnerable conditions. The answer he gave with respect to his  
25 mother was a bit ambivalent, and we would like that the material

1 which has been presented so far should be reviewed in order to  
2 further explore the issue of the death of the mother of Witness  
3 298.

4 And this witness talked about two intermediaries - two  
5 intermediaries - who were mentioned in the allegations of  
6 various witnesses, including -- and here we are talking about  
7 intermediary 321, for example, and we think it's important for  
8 the Defence to further explore this point.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Mr Desalliers, forgive me  
10 interrupting, and I do so for this reason. Arguably, there are  
11 two different categories here in terms of the material that can  
12 be covered: on the one hand, material that has gained in  
13 relevance, or has become relevant, since the witness gave  
14 evidence, and we bear in mind how early he was called in this  
15 trial; on the other hand, there is material on which he was  
16 properly examined during the course of his evidence and in  
17 relation to which arguably there should be finality, because  
18 otherwise you could have a witness giving evidence and you could  
19 endlessly go back to him and her and try to improve on the  
20 questions which you put and then the answers which you receive  
21 during the course of the evidence. And there may be objections  
22 to that happening, because otherwise trials would never come to  
23 an end.

24 Could you please set out in writing - and you can do  
25 this by way of email - the subjects that you wish to raise with

1 298, together with a short explanation as to why it has become  
2 necessary now to seek to go back to him for a further interview.  
3 Circulate that, please, to the division, via the legal adviser,  
4 copy it to the Prosecution, who will have 48 hours after receipt  
5 of that email to respond to it similarly in email form. Would  
6 that be satisfactory?

7 MR DESALLIERS: (Interpretation) That is  
8 satisfactory, your Honour.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: And I've just made an  
10 observation. Is there anything else you'd like to say?

11 MR DESALLIERS: (Interpretation) No, I think any  
12 original point will be raised in my email, but I'm sure  
13 Maître Mabilille has something else to tell the Bench.

14 MS MABILLE: (Interpretation) I beg your pardon, your  
15 Honour, but we have a short intervention to make with respect to  
16 Witness 257. We did not mention this in our email because we  
17 received this information very late. Can I raise this point  
18 now, your Honour?

19 I think, your Honour, that the Bench remembers that we  
20 insistently asked whether there wasn't some information which  
21 should be disclosed to us by the OTP on Witness 257. The  
22 Chamber issued a decision through which it authorised us to  
23 discuss with the Defence teams of Mr Katanga and others, stating  
24 a certain number of precautions that we had to take. We had  
25 that discussion with the Defence counsel in the Katanga case.

1           Your Honour, we have learned that - and I am going to  
2   give the reference here - that a filing bearing the reference  
3   1378, dated 14 August 2009, as well as filing bearing the  
4   reference 1480, dated 17 September 2009, well, in these two  
5   filings the OTP essentially states, and I quote, that "The  
6   Prosecutor does not consider the evidence given by Witness 157  
7   as evidence that comes from a child soldier." He stated his  
8   intention of not calling the mother to give evidence and his  
9   intention not to rely on the opinions of the expert Salmon and  
10  Adamsbaum.

11           The two filings I have just mentioned, your Honour,  
12  are filings which come from the other Chamber. This means that  
13  for us today the OTP in our case - and we have worked on Witness  
14  157 to prove that he is a child, or rather that he was not a  
15  child soldier -- well, the OTP in the other case is adopting a  
16  position stating that this witness is not a child soldier, but  
17  that information is not relevant for us here and that  
18  information was not relayed to us. And I would like to tell the  
19  Chamber that we are a bit uncomfortable with that position. And  
20  I would like to say that at the appropriate time we are going to  
21  have to draw the consequences of that position adopted by the  
22  OTP.

23           PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Are you engaged in this  
24  point, Mr Mulamba?

25           MR MULAMBA: (Interpretation) Yes, your Honour. We

1 just talked about Witness 298. He is also a victim that I  
2 represent, and I would like to request the Bench -- tell the  
3 Bench that if any information is disclosed between the parties,  
4 such information should also be disclosed to us because that  
5 witness is also our client. Thank you.

6 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you for that.

7 Mr Sachdeva, it's really impossible for us to deal  
8 with this now because we don't have the filings, and if there is  
9 a substantive point here, it is going to require an element of  
10 detailed consideration. I think essentially what's happened is  
11 that Maître Mabilille is suggesting to the Prosecution that there  
12 is an inconsistency in approach between the Prosecution in Trial  
13 Chamber II as regards this individual and the Prosecution in  
14 Trial Chamber I.

15 Can you reflect on that, please, and provide the  
16 Chamber - within two weeks, given Easter is upon us - two weeks  
17 from today, 4 p.m., a short filing setting out the Prosecution's  
18 position in relation to this suggested inconsistency, bearing in  
19 mind particularly filings 1378 and 1480. Is that convenient?

20 MR SACHDEVA: It is. Thank you very much,  
21 Mr President.

22 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you very much, indeed.

23 Quickly, before the witness resumes, we wish to invite  
24 the Prosecution to harmonise its approach to disclosure between  
25 Trial Chamber I and Trial Chamber II as regards Witness 267,

1 unless the Prosecution, by 4 p.m. tomorrow, sends an email to  
2 the legal adviser to the division indicating that you wish to  
3 file submissions in due course justifying maintaining an  
4 inconsistent disclosure regime. I think I have probably said  
5 enough to reveal the issue, but, of course, if you need further  
6 information, please communicate with the legal adviser to the  
7 division later this afternoon, and I will ensure that further  
8 information is provided to you.

9 Private session, please.

10 \*(Private session at 2.51 p.m.) Reclassified as Open session

11 THE COURT OFFICER (The Hague): We are in private  
12 session, your Honours.

13 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you.

14 The legal representatives team V01, in an application  
15 signed by Mr Mulamba, document 2385, 31 March 2010, have  
16 requested an extension of the deadline in order to reply to the  
17 Defence additional observations on intermediaries. It is  
18 suggested that the Defence has "implicated" Mr Mulenda and  
19 Mr Walley (at least to an extent). In the Defence filing, it  
20 refers to one of the intermediaries having acted upon  
21 instructions from Mr Mulenda (see paragraphs 22 to 25 of  
22 document 2364). Mr Walley is seemingly mentioned in annex 1 to  
23 the filing.

24 The legal representatives also suggest that the  
25 Defence submission implicates a particular NGO. In the event

1 the legal representatives wish to study the annex (which runs to  
2 288 pages) in detail, and to consider, if necessary, whether  
3 they need to speak with the NGO in order to clarify its  
4 relationship with intermediary 321. The legal representatives  
5 maintain that the professional reputation of Mr Mulenda and  
6 Mr Walleyne are at risk.

7 In view of the fact that Mr Walleyne is in the United  
8 States until 11 April, additionally, that it can be difficult to  
9 communicate within the DRC, and given that the Easter recess is  
10 about to commence, the legal representatives request leave to  
11 respond by 16 April 2010. The Chamber is of the view that this  
12 application is justified, particularly given the position of  
13 counsel and the extensive amount of material that needs properly  
14 to be considered. Accordingly, the legal representatives have  
15 until 16.00 on 16 April 2010 to file their submissions.

16 Public session, please.

17 (Open session at 2.54 p.m.)

18 THE COURT OFFICER (The Hague): We are in open  
19 session, your Honours.

20 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Ms Samson, if my memory  
21 serves me well - and I am grateful to Judge Blattmann for  
22 reminding me - Ms Bensouda had indicated that she was going to  
23 seek a copy of the transcript of the interview with the  
24 spokesman for the OTP. How do those researches progress?

25 MS SAMSON: To my understanding, your Honour, a copy

1 has been obtained and it will be provided to the Chamber by way  
2 of a filing before the end of the week.

3 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: By email today, please.

4 MS SAMSON: Email today?

5 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: To the legal adviser to the  
6 division.

7 MS SAMSON: Yes, your Honour.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: So it can go into our bags  
9 for the weekend, Ms Samson.

10 MS SAMSON: We will do so.

11 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you very much.

12 We will now return to the evidence of the witness. We  
13 need to go into the altered arrangements for private session,  
14 which involves the curtains being reversed in the court.

15 \*(Private session at 2.56 p.m.) Reclassified as Open session

16 THE COURT OFFICER (The Hague): We are in private  
17 session, your Honours.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: We are now going to return  
19 to the evidence of the witness and can I ask the court officer  
20 if she is able to hear me well?

21 THE COURT OFFICER (Bunia): Yes, your Honour, I hear  
22 you very well.

23 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Excellent. And, for your  
24 reassurance, we also can hear you very well.

25 I am going to ask you, please, to take on an

1 additional function this afternoon. During most of the  
2 witness's evidence yesterday she spoke in relatively short  
3 sentences which were amenable to interpretation by those who've  
4 got this extremely difficult task, but on occasion she engaged  
5 in very long answers, wholly understandably, but it makes our  
6 life, or rather, the life of the interpreters, very difficult.  
7 When the witness does that, can I please encourage you gently to  
8 intervene, perhaps by using some kind of motion with the witness  
9 or speaking to her quietly, to ask her to pause before she  
10 carries on with her answer. I am sure that you will intervene  
11 only where it is necessary and, of course, we will accept the  
12 exercise of your discretion. But can you try and prevent at  
13 your end the answers becoming too long? Is that reasonable?

14 THE COURT OFFICER (Bunia): Yes, your Honour.

15 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you very much. Now,  
16 we need then, please, to see the witness. I don't know whether  
17 she's been brought into the room?

18 Good afternoon, Madam. I'm sorry we've kept you  
19 waiting. Good. We are going to continue now with your evidence  
20 and can I remind you, please, if possible, to keep your answers  
21 short so that the interpreters are able to do their job  
22 effectively. Please try to avoid, if you can, long answers.

23 Yes, Maître Mabilles.

24 MS MABILLE: (Interpretation) Your Honour, I have  
25 concluded my examination-in-chief, especially considering the

1 corrections that were made, and I wish to draw the attention of  
2 the Chamber to the corrections that were done and these are  
3 really major corrections that highlight some major difficulties.  
4 That said, I don't have any further questions for the witness,  
5 your Honour.

6 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Yes. But Maître Mabilille, so  
7 there's clarity, we assume, therefore, that you are now happy  
8 with the state of the transcript in its current form.

9 MS MABILILLE: (Interpretation) I want to be very  
10 precise. I have seen a table with the corrections. The  
11 corrections strike me as being exactly what we are after. For  
12 the time being, they have not yet been included in the  
13 transcript that we've received.

14 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: That's exactly what I meant.  
15 Thank you.

16 Do you have any questions, Mr Sachdeva?

17 MR SACHDEVA: Mr President, I do not.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you. Are there any,  
19 sir?

20 WITNESS: WWW-D01-0014 (On former oath)

21 (The witness answers through interpreter)

22 QUESTIONED BY MR MULAMBA: (Interpretation)

23 Q. Good morning, witness. My name is Maître Mulamba. I  
24 am a lawyer. I'm the legal representative of the victims. I  
25 wish to put a number of questions to you. The question is as

1 follows.

2 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Ms Massidda, if you are  
3 having difficulties, please communicate quietly with the legal  
4 officer. This is a very difficult procedure and we do not wish  
5 to interrupt it. Now, let's not --

6 MS MASSIDDA: There is no French translation, your  
7 Honour.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Well, can I ask counsel  
9 who's questioning whether he is able to hear the answers in  
10 French?

11 MR MULAMBA: (Interpretation)

12 Q. I will start again. My name is Maître Mulamba.

13 THE INTERPRETER: Your Honour, could you ask  
14 Maître Mulamba to switch off his microphone when he has finished  
15 putting the question? That may be a solution to the technical  
16 problem.

17 MR MULAMBA: (Interpretation)

18 Q. I am a lawyer.

19 A. I can hear you.

20 Q. I am the legal representative of the victims. I have  
21 one question to put to you.

22 A. Yes, I understand.

23 Q. Fine. Okay, Witness.

24 A. Okay.

25 Q. I would like to know whether since your son left the

1 region, whether you have spoken to him?

2 A. Ever since then, that child has been to see me just  
3 once and since then I have never seen him.

4 MR MULAMBA: (Interpretation) Okay. Thank you, your  
5 Honour, I have finished.

6 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you very much,  
7 Mr Mulamba. Maître Mabilille? No.

8 Madam, I am sorry you have been brought back for such  
9 a short period of time this afternoon, but that in fact has  
10 concluded your evidence. I want to thank you most sincerely on  
11 behalf of the Judges of this Court for your cooperation in  
12 giving evidence under what I'm sure are most unusual  
13 circumstances for you. We recognise that this will not have  
14 been an easy process and may have caused you some difficulty,  
15 and it is absolutely critical that people such as yourself are  
16 prepared to help us in our search for the truth. So, that  
17 concludes the procedure and you can go now with our sincere  
18 thanks, as I say, for your cooperation and your assistance.

19 Court officer in the DRC, thank you very much indeed  
20 for your help. You have managed to enable us to hear the  
21 witness's evidence in a very satisfactory way. Thank you very  
22 much.

23 Good. The telephone line can now be terminated.

24 (Video link terminates)

25 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Public session, please.

1 (Open session at 3.07 p.m.)

2 THE COURT OFFICER (The Hague): We are in public  
3 session, your Honours.

4 (Trial Chamber confers)

5 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Maître Mabilille, before we  
6 part for the Easter break, we need to resolve how witnesses 32  
7 and 33 are going to give their evidence because arrangements  
8 will need to be made because, as I understand it, they are due  
9 to give evidence shortly after the resumption of the hearing.

10 Now, you ought to know that our preliminary view is,  
11 having watched the exercise with the last witness, that the  
12 difficulties that were encountered were difficulties of language  
13 and interpretation, rather than a problem with the equipment.  
14 It seemed to us that, so long as allowance is made for the  
15 second or two extra that needs to be provided for after  
16 questions are asked and answers are given, that this was,  
17 generally speaking, a satisfactory - although not perfect, a  
18 satisfactory - means by which witnesses can give evidence.

19 Now, are you minded, having seen Witness 14 and  
20 notwithstanding that preliminary indication, to argue that it is  
21 inappropriate for 32 and 33 to give evidence in this way?

22 MS MABILILLE: (Interpretation) Your Honour, the  
23 problem is that in any case we have tried to think about other  
24 solutions and our conclusion was that there were none. So, as  
25 we are pragmatic, the solution is that of video conference

1 links. Other avenues, at least as far as we're concerned, have  
2 been abandoned.

3 I would like to inform the Bench that we have given  
4 thought to the question of the video conference, and there would  
5 be a number of proposals we'd like to make, to make sure that  
6 this could be carried out in the best possible circumstances.  
7 We will be facing a new difficulty, as we see it, and that is  
8 one of the two witnesses speaks only one language, which is a  
9 language that has not yet been used before this Court, and we  
10 run the risk of having translation difficulties that could be  
11 quite significant.

12 I would like to inform the Chamber that we have tried  
13 to anticipate the difficulties and we're suggesting that the  
14 interpreter be seated next to the witness in the place where the  
15 video conference link will be established. We see this as a  
16 more sensible solution that would avoid not necessarily all of  
17 the difficulties, but certainly one of the major difficulties as  
18 we see it.

19 Our proposal, therefore, is that the interpreter be  
20 seated next to the witness and that the interpreter be there and  
21 not here. Other than that, as I've said, we have not found any  
22 other solutions, so we will have to accept this one as being the  
23 lesser of several evils.

24 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you, Maître Mabilie.  
25 I think there is an expression that fools go where angels fear

1 to tread, and I think it would be unwise for the Chamber to  
2 express an opinion on this, as it were, off the cuff.

3 The Registry will have heard your proposal and we  
4 would ask them, please, to respond to us by way of email to the  
5 legal adviser to the division by midday tomorrow, please, so  
6 that firm arrangements can be made prior to the Easter break.  
7 We need to know, in short, whether the proposal just made by  
8 Maître Mabilie is in fact a practical, useful and achievable  
9 one, but thank you very much.

10 Is there anything that you would wish to say on this  
11 issue, Mr Sachdeva?

12 MR SACHDEVA: No, Mr President.

13 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you. Now, this is the  
14 last time that we are going to be meeting before the recess. Is  
15 there anything that anyone else would wish to raise before we  
16 part?

17 We then wish you all a pleasant Easter break. Thank  
18 you.

19 THE COURT USHER: All rise.

20 (The hearing ends at 3.15 p.m.)

## 21 RECLASSIFICATION REPORT

22 Pursuant to Trial Chamber I's email instruction dated 8th  
23 November 2011, the transcript is reclassified as public after the  
24 indicated redactions have been implemented as ordered by the  
25 Chamber. All private sessions (\*) are now available to the public

1 with the exception of the portions of the transcript that have  
2 been redacted.