

1 International Criminal Court
2 Trial Chamber VI - Courtroom 2
3 Situation: Democratic Republic of the Congo
4 In the case of The Prosecutor v. Bosco Ntaganda - ICC-01/04-02/06
5 Presiding Judge Robert Fremr, Judge Kuniko Ozaki and
6 Judge Geoffrey Henderson
7 Hearing on issues related to Rule 118 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence
8 Thursday, 23 October 2014
9 (The hearing starts in open session at 12.56 p.m.)
10 THE COURT USHER: All rise.
11 The International Criminal Court is now in session.
12 Please be seated.
13 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to this hearing
14 pursuant to Rule 118(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, which is held on the
15 detention of Mr Ntaganda. And please accept our apologies for the late notice of the
16 change in time and we thank you for accommodating this last-minute change.
17 Thank you.
18 Now, court officer, please call the case.
19 THE COURT OFFICER: Yes, your Honour. Good afternoon.
20 Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in the case of The Prosecutor
21 versus Bosco Ntaganda, case reference ICC-01/04-02/06.
22 And for the record we are in open session.
23 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you.
24 Now, can counsel please introduce themselves for the record, starting with
25 Prosecution, please.

1 MS SAMSON: Yes, good afternoon, Mr President, and your Honours. The
2 Prosecution today is represented by Ms Kristy Sim and Mr Rens van der Werf, both
3 assistant trial lawyers; by Ramu Bittaye, the case manager; and myself, Nicole Samson,
4 senior trial lawyer.

5 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you, Ms Samson.
6 Now, Defence, please.

7 MR BOURGON: (Interpretation) Good afternoon, your Honours.
8 Mr Bosco Ntaganda is represented today by Mr William St-Michel, legal assistant;
9 Margaux Portier, case manager; Mélissa Beaulieu, an intern; and myself,
10 Stéphane Bourgon. Thank you, your Honour.

11 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: And maybe I will add for the record that
12 Mr Ntaganda is present as well.
13 Now, common representative, please.

14 MR SUPRUN: (Interpretation) Good afternoon, your Honours. The victims are
15 represented today by myself, Dmytro Suprun. I'm a counsel within the -- as well as
16 another colleague, my colleague, Ms Sarah Pellet, who represents former child
17 soldiers is not present today. She has provided a power of attorney allowing me to
18 act on her behalf. And Mr Mohamed Abdou, an associate counsel, is present and he
19 is a member of her team.

20 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you very much, Mr Suprun. Maybe I would
21 like to confirm that the Chamber has received a power of attorney filed by the legal
22 representative for former child soldiers, Ms Pellet, indicating that she had given the
23 other legal representative, Mr Suprun, a power of attorney to represent her during
24 today's hearing.

25 As to this filing of power of attorney, the Chamber notes that Ms Pellet had already

1 during the status conference held last Friday informed the Chamber of her absence
2 and the fact that Mr Suprun would represent her today. So in such a case, a
3 subsequent written submissions on power of attorney was, according to us, not
4 necessary. Just to clarify this point.

5 Now, the purpose of today's hearing is to discuss Mr Ntaganda's detention.

6 On 17 July 2014, the Single Judge of Pre-Trial Chamber II issued the third decision on
7 interim release, deciding that Mr Ntaganda was to remain in detention.

8 The Chamber is mindful that the 120-day review period for pre-trial detention,
9 according to Rule 118(2), is imminent. It therefore wishes to hear the observations of
10 the parties and participants on the release or continued detention of Mr Ntaganda.

11 Please note that the Chamber does not see a need to receive written observation on
12 this matter. However, if you have any materials that you wish to file in support of
13 your observation, you are instructed to do so by noon tomorrow.

14 In case you would wish to address certain matters in private session, please inform
15 the Chamber so we could proceed accordingly.

16 Please limit your initial observations to eight minutes in maximum and focus on the
17 existence and impact of any changed circumstances since the previous ruling on
18 detention of Mr Ntaganda. The Chamber will then allow for four minutes of
19 responses to these initial submissions.

20 Please note that we are on a really strict time schedule this afternoon and must finish
21 this hearing strictly within one hour; therefore, please be concise and focused in your
22 submissions.

23 So now, Prosecution, we will start with you.

24 MS SAMSON: Thank you, Mr President.

25 The Prosecution submits that the accused's detention in this case must be maintained.

1 According to Article 60(3) of the Statute under which the present review is being
2 conducted, the Chamber is only required to determine whether there has been a
3 change in the circumstances underpinning the previous ruling on detention. The
4 Appeals Chamber in the Gbagbo case, and I'm referring to decision 548 in that case at
5 paragraph 40, held that where no changed circumstances exist, the Chamber is not
6 required to further review the ruling on release or detention.

7 In our assessment and submission, the conditions warranting Bosco Ntaganda's
8 detention under Article 58(1) of the Statute persist.

9 There are no changed circumstances that would modify the three previous decisions
10 of the Single Judge of Pre-Trial Chamber II ordering his detention. The only changes
11 in circumstance since the most recent decision on the accused's interim release, the
12 third decision of 17 July of this year, militate in favour of continued detention in order
13 to ensure the accused's appearance at trial and in order to ensure that he does not
14 obstruct or endanger the investigation or the Court's proceedings.

15 First, this Chamber has set a trial date of 2 June 2015 with set disclosure deadlines for
16 the Prosecution, including the disclosure of the identity of additional Prosecution
17 witnesses. These disclosure deadlines are upcoming, they are scheduled for 31
18 January and 2 March 2015.

19 The Appeals Chamber in the Lubanga case reasoned, and I'll quote, that "If a person is
20 charged with grave crimes, the person might face a lengthy prison sentence, which
21 may make the person more likely to abscond." End quote. That's decision number
22 824 at paragraph 136.

23 And in its first, second and third decisions on detention, the Single Judge of the
24 Pre-Trial Chamber found these considerations to be applicable in the instant case.

25 In the first decision, the Single Judge held that, and I quote, "The charges or counts

1 Mr Ntaganda is facing are numerous and of such gravity that they might result in an
2 overall lengthy sentence. These two factors if considered together may make it likely
3 that Mr Ntaganda will abscond, should the opportunity arise." End quote.

4 The Pre-Trial Chamber also considered the conviction of Thomas Lubanga for 14
5 years for only part of the charges with which Mr Ntaganda is currently charged and
6 found that that could increase his chances of absconding in this case. This reasoning
7 was confirmed throughout all three of the detention decisions.

8 And in the third decision on release, the Single Judge found that the likelihood of
9 absconding or the risk of the accused absconding is even higher now that the

10 Pre-Trial Chamber confirmed the charges against him.

11 In this context the recent setting of the trial date and disclosure deadlines can only be
12 seen to increase the risk that the accused may abscond should the opportunity arise.

13 This conclusion is even more compelling in view of the Single Judge's findings that he
14 has the financial means to abscond if released. And I'm quoting from the third
15 decision on interim release, number 335 at paragraph 35.

16 In our assessment, accordingly, Mr Ntaganda's detention continues to be necessary to
17 secure his appearance in Court. Secondly, the need to protect witnesses from
18 intimidation or interference is equally important in the lead-up to trial to ensure that
19 the investigation and the court proceedings are not obstructed.

20 The accused currently has the identity of 38 of the 47 Prosecution witnesses who were
21 relied upon during the confirmation hearing and he will receive further detailed
22 information about witnesses in the months to come.

23 In its third decision on interim release, the Single Judge found that Mr Ntaganda
24 continues to have influence in the DRC due to contacts that he retained with a
25 considerable number of former soldiers, including those from the UPC and the

1 CNDP.

2 These findings are supported by the Registry's confidential redacted security report
3 filed yesterday indicating that the accused continues to have strong support and
4 influence in certain regions of Ituri and that some people tried to prevent potential
5 victims from submitting applications to participate in the case.

6 Taken together with the seriousness of the charges and the accused's documented
7 history of violence, as confirmed by both the Pre-Trial Chamber in decision 335 and
8 the Appeals Chamber in its decision number 271, the risk of the accused exerting
9 pressure or intimidation on witnesses will increase if he were to be released.

10 The Prosecution additionally refers to its confidential filing number 349 which
11 provides, in our submission, strong support for increased risk to witnesses if the
12 accused were to be released.

13 Lastly, Mr Ntaganda's detention is not unreasonable in the context of Article 60(4).

14 The Appeals Chamber in the Lubanga proceedings held, and I quote, "... the
15 unreasonableness of any period of detention prior to trial cannot be determined in the
16 abstract but has to be determined on the basis of the circumstances of each case."

17 End quote. And that's decision 824, paragraph 22.

18 The accused has been detained for over one year-and-a-half. The confirmation took
19 place in an expeditious manner with disclosure on an ongoing basis. A trial date has
20 now been set to which the Defence did not take issue.

21 The Prosecution submits that the length of the accused's detention in this case thus far
22 remains within acceptable limits in the interests of justice.

23 In conclusion, your Honours, we submit that there has been no change in any of the
24 circumstances forming the basis of the third decision on interim -- on detention;
25 rather, the setting of the trial date, the setting of Prosecution disclosure deadlines, the

1 circumstances revealed in Prosecution filing 349 and in the Registry report on the
2 security situation in Ituri have all rendered the need for continued detention even
3 more compelling.

4 In our assessment the accused's detention must be maintained. Thank you.

5 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you very much, Ms Samson. And also thank
6 you for keeping the time limit given to you sharply. Thank you.

7 Now, Mr Suprun, you have the floor also for eight minutes.

8 MR SUPRUN: (Interpretation) Just a moment, if you don't mind, your Honour.

9 Thank you, your Honour. Your Honours, the Common Legal Representatives jointly
10 submit that Mr Bosco Ntaganda must remain in detention because the conditions of
11 58(1) of the Rome Statute still prevail. In accordance with ongoing jurisprudence of
12 the Court as set out recently by the appellate Chamber in the Gbagbo case, a review
13 under paragraph 2 of Article 60 does not mean the assessment of -- a new assessment
14 of the requireds; rather, the review is limited to the changed circumstances.

15 The legal representatives are of the opinion that there have been no changes in the
16 circumstances since the last decision on detention which was handed down by the
17 Single Judge of Pre-Trial Chamber II on 17 July. The considerations and conclusions
18 of that decision still apply today.

19 In particular, as was stressed by the Pre-Trial Chamber in its ruling, the only
20 significant development ever -- since previous decisions was the issuance of the
21 document containing the charges. Indeed, the confirmation of charges, the extent
22 and the particularly serious nature of the charges confirmed and the fact that the trial
23 is coming up very soon, these are factors that argue in favour of continued detention
24 of Mr Ntaganda. His -- he must remain in detention. This is even more necessary
25 than before.

1 We wish to remind the Chamber that various other Chambers of the Court have
2 consistently deemed that the risk of a person absconding increases as the trial draws
3 nearer.

4 The criteria of Article 58(1) are found here when we consider the particularly serious
5 nature of the crimes that were -- charges, rather, that were confirmed. Never has an
6 accused person faced so many charges in a trial before this Court.

7 We also wish to remind the Chamber that the Appeals Chamber has consistently
8 ruled that the seriousness of crimes for which the accused person is being prosecuted
9 and the extent of the possible sentence are important factors that increase the risk of
10 his absconding if the person were to be released and thus justify his continued
11 detention.

12 The legal representatives are of the opinion that confirmation of the charges is in of
13 itself a sufficient ground to justify Mr Ntaganda's continued detention as was stressed
14 by the Single Judge in his ruling of 17 July.

15 Even though two arrest warrants were issued for Mr Ntaganda, he was able to evade
16 justice for a very long period of time, showing total disregard for the serious charges
17 against him.

18 The so-called voluntary surrender of Mr Ntaganda at the US Embassy in Kigali was
19 not done in good faith. It was dictated by external factors, including the near -- the
20 fear of being killed by former allies.

21 The trial is coming up very soon and this can only strengthen the presumption that
22 Mr Ntaganda's attitude will continue in these circumstances.

23 As the legal representatives have constantly argued - and this is to be found in their
24 joint observations of 8 July - the accused has had access to a great deal of evidence,
25 both incriminatory and exculpatory. He has also reviewed the decision containing

1 the charges, which sets out the reasoning of the Chamber and the relevant probative
2 evidence on which the charges were confirmed. The accused person now has the
3 crucial information relating to the case, including the identity of witnesses and the
4 details of their statements.

5 I think it's important to remember the conclusions of the Single Judge. According to
6 him, Mr Ntaganda still has influence in the DRC through his former soldiers
7 which -- whom he's still in contact with. On that basis, the Single Judge ruled as
8 follows: (Speaks English) "One cannot rule out the possibility of him influencing,
9 threatening or intimidating witnesses and victims and/or their family members.

10 Moreover, the fact that he has also the financial means necessary strengthens the
11 conclusion that he is capable of carrying out these acts. Accordingly, if Mr Ntaganda
12 were to be released, the risk would increase that he might succeed in exerting
13 pressure on those witnesses to change their testimony, either directly or indirectly,
14 through his loyalist or his family members." End of quote.

15 (Interpretation) Your Honours, this final item is the concern that is most often
16 expressed by the victims whom we represent. The victims that we have met with in
17 recent trips to the Ituri region all insist that Mr Ntaganda must remain in detention.
18 They all have expressed fears relating to their safety. They have mentioned the very
19 unstable situation in the region which could lead to a fresh wave of violence in the
20 places where they live.

21 The victims have reminded us that, if their identities are to be protected, they have to
22 be kept safe. Right now it is very easy to identify them. The risks of interfering
23 with victims or threats to their safety and even their life are rife.

24 In light of all these aspects, the legal representatives would argue that Mr Ntaganda
25 must continue to remain in detention because the conditions set out in 58(1) of the

1 Rome Statute are still met and there have been no changes to the circumstances in the
2 meaning of Article 63 of the Rome Statute. There have been no changes since the last
3 ruling in this regard.

4 I thank you.

5 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you very much, Mr Suprun, and we will
6 conclude this first round of submissions by submission from Defence.

7 Please, Mr Bourgon.

8 MR BOURGON: Thank you, Mr President.

9 I must say that I was hoping to make a 30-second submission this afternoon. The
10 issue is are there changes in circumstances justifying the fact that Mr Ntaganda would
11 be released today, and the clear answer to this question is that we have no
12 observations to make regarding any change in circumstances further to the last
13 decision rendered by the Single Judge on 17 July of this year. However, in light of
14 the submissions made by my colleague, I do have to -- to make some observations at
15 this time.

16 The Prosecution begins by saying there is no change in circumstances, and then it
17 goes back to issues which were litigated, which were addressed and on which a
18 decision was rendered in the first, the second or the third decision. Why the need to
19 go back to issues that were addressed previously when this hearing is supposed to
20 address any change in circumstances, I don't know. Do they want more record?
21 Do they want the Trial Chamber to repeat again what has been found and what is in
22 other decisions? I don't know, but I feel that there is no need to address previous
23 circumstances.

24 Just to address a few examples. Talking about the seriousness of charges, I mean
25 there is nothing new here and it is not -- nothing has happened between 17 July and

1 today addressing the seriousness of the charges. Mr Ntaganda is very well aware of
2 the seriousness of the charges and we will do a trial and he is looking forward to be
3 tried so that the truth can come out.

4 Looking at the voluntary surrender, an issue raised by the victims -- participating
5 victims' representatives, I mean this issue was dealt with. And I can tell you in
6 advance, Mr President, that this is an issue that will be addressed in the course of trial
7 and, when it will be addressed, the circumstances that will show exactly why
8 Mr Ntaganda surrendered will come clear to the Chamber. So there's no need for us
9 at this time to address that issue. It is not a change of circumstances.

10 Looking at access to evidence, against -- again, not much has changed since 17 July.

11 There's been a disclosure process. Mr Ntaganda has received disclosure. Yes, he
12 has information. He had this information before and he may have had -- and he may
13 have a bit more information, but that is not a change in circumstances affecting
14 whether he should or should not remain in pre-trial detention.

15 The fact of the confirmation decision. The confirmation decision was rendered in
16 June. Since the confirmation decision, Mr Ntaganda is very well aware of the
17 charges he faces. So, again, no change in circumstances here.

18 But there are two particular issues I would like to address: First is the Prosecution's
19 reference to a confidential filing. This confidential filing the Chamber is well aware
20 of what it includes and so is Mr Ntaganda. This confidential filing is pending there
21 has been no decision rendered it is still in the process of being litigated we are still
22 awaiting issues that might change the way this confidential filing will be -- will be
23 handled by the Chamber and in this regard it should not be taken into account as a
24 change of circumstances. When the Chamber will rule on this confidential filing
25 then it might become a change in circumstances, but certainly not at this time.

1 The other issue I want to raise is that of Mr Ntaganda's influence in the region.

2 Again this is an issue that was addressed at length in all litigation leading to

3 Mr Ntaganda's continued detention, but I must recall for the benefit of the Chamber
4 the dissenting opinion which can be found in the Appeals Chamber decision which
5 confirmed the pre-trial detention.

6 In that decision, two Judges out of five said clearly that they were worried with the
7 way anonymous hearsay was being handled and the probative value that was being
8 accorded to anonymous evidence. And that is, Mr President, very important.

9 The proceedings against Mr Ntaganda have entered a new phase. We're no longer
10 talking about reasonable grounds to believe or substantial grounds to believe. We
11 are now talking about proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The Prosecution will have
12 to come up with real evidence, will have to come up with evidence that will be -- that
13 will be assessed by the Chamber and it will no longer be possible for the Prosecution
14 to rely on anonymous evidence and on hearsay evidence to the extent it has up to
15 now.

16 Mr Ntaganda is looking forward to this trial. The truth will come out. And it is our
17 firm opinion, Mr President, that by the end of this trial any perception which the
18 Chamber may or may not have at this time regarding Mr Ntaganda will change, and
19 the Ntaganda that is being pictured in all this anonymous hearsay will not be the
20 same Ntaganda that will appear to you at the end of this case. That is why we feel it
21 is inappropriate to address issues such as his interference in the region as being a
22 change of circumstances at this time.

23 My last comment, Mr President, has to do with my colleague representing the victims,
24 and he says that the victims he represents consistently tell him that Mr Ntaganda
25 should remain detained.

1 This is a very, very important statement. This means that the victims have already
2 pre-judged Mr Ntaganda. This is going to be a real trial, with real evidence and real
3 witnesses and not anonymous people coming to testify. We feel that these
4 statements that we -- should be at least made with some kind of reservation.

5 All this to say, Mr President, that at this point in time on behalf of Mr Ntaganda we
6 have no observations to make regarding any change of circumstances in the Trial
7 Chamber's decision whether to maintain his pre-trial detention, or to release him.

8 Of course we reserve the right to make such an application - an application for
9 provisional release - in the future should there be a change in circumstances.

10 That is all I have to say on behalf of Mr Ntaganda this afternoon. Thank you,
11 Mr President.

12 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you very much, Mr Bourgon, and also thank
13 you very much for dealing with caution this issue of confidential filing. Thank you.
14 Now, maybe I would just ask my colleagues whether they do have any questions to
15 the parties? No questions, it seems. Okay. So it means we could just move to the
16 second round of submissions which is intended to be devoted to replies.

17 So now we can again start with Prosecution. Ms Samson, you have the floor.

18 MS SAMSON: Thank you, Mr President.

19 I will address two of the issues raised by the Defence today. The first issue is the
20 need to get into detail on the changes of circumstance and the circumstances that
21 existed at the time of the previous decisions. And, your Honour, the answer is quite
22 a simple one and it's contained in certainly the very last decision on interim release,
23 Decision 335, whereby the Single Judge notes in paragraph 21 of that decision that, of
24 course, conducting an Article 60(3) review necessitates looking at changed
25 circumstances, but that as the Appeals Chamber has clarified in its jurisprudence,

1 changed circumstances import either a change in some or all of the facts underlying a
2 previous decision on detention.

3 And so the Single Judge states, and I quote, "This necessitates that the Chamber
4 'revert to the ruling on detention to determine whether there has been a change in the
5 circumstances that have a bearing on the conditions under Rule 58(1) of the Statute.'"

6 And this is where it gets very important. "It follows that revisiting the conditions on
7 the basis of which it was decided in the ..." prior "... decision that Mr Ntaganda
8 continued to be detained is essential."

9 So, your Honours, the Prosecution's submission is that while we have to look at what
10 circumstances may have squarely changed for or against detention, it will necessitate
11 a review of the underpinning facts that supported the earlier decision.

12 Secondly and lastly, your Honour, in relation to confidential filing number 349, it's
13 correct that that filing is pending, but what is not pending before your Honours is a
14 decision as to the credibility or not of the underlying information. What remains is
15 that the Prosecution's information is relevant as described in that filing to this
16 particular determination and as to whether or not there is an increased risk of witness
17 intimidation or interference, should the accused be permitted to be released, and in
18 our view that is squarely relevant to the issue that your Honours have to decide
19 irrespective of the nature of the pending issues before the Chamber. Thank you.

20 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you very much, Ms Samson.

21 Now, Mr Suprun, the floor is yours if you want.

22 MR SUPRUN: (Interpretation) Thank you, Mr President. Just two brief remarks
23 regarding what Defence has submitted. The first remark regards the circumstances
24 of detention of Mr Ntaganda. In 2013, according to Defence, the information is no
25 longer relevant in today's hearing. According to the legal representatives, this

1 information in fact is extremely relevant for this hearing because it points to the
2 conduct of Mr Ntaganda prior to his going to Kigali in March 2013. So it is very
3 important to underscore that he had evaded justice for several years and it is only
4 because of external circumstances that he surrendered, or he went to Kigali.
5 Secondly, and this is in relation to the fact that victims are insisting that Mr Ntaganda
6 should remain in detention, this information also is very relevant and very important
7 for this particular hearing because once again victims have been waiting for several
8 years before this trial even began. They, the victims, know full well what happened,
9 and for them Mr Bosco Ntaganda is the author or the perpetrator of the crimes that
10 they suffered and, therefore, the victims are of the view that Mr Ntaganda should be
11 held in detention at least to the end of the trial. Thank you.

12 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you very much, Mr Suprun.

13 And we will be ending by Prosecution.

14 Mr Bourgon, will have the last word.

15 MR BOURGON: Defence, Mr President.

16 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Forgive me. Sorry.

17 MR BOURGON: Very quickly. I just want to -- I disagree, I respectfully disagree
18 with my colleague that the -- to use her exact word "credibility" or not of the
19 underlying information contained in the confidential filing yet to be addressed by the
20 Chamber is of any relevance at this point in time.

21 If and when this information is addressed in a decision, the situation might, and I
22 stress the word "might" change, but for the time being I dare to say, Mr President, that
23 it is not relevant.

24 And second comment is: I'm -- I'm very worried about what I hear from my
25 colleague representing the victims. The victims are participating in this proceeding,

1 and we have the utmost of respect for any victims of any crimes committed anywhere.
2 We do not want to belittle in any way the rights of victims to participate in these
3 proceedings, but this is a very good indication, Mr President, of what will motivate
4 any submissions made by participating victims in these proceedings. Everything
5 they will say, my colleague just said it, they believe that Mr Ntaganda is guilty,
6 anything they will say in these proceedings will not be coming to the truth, it will be
7 at establishing the guilt of Mr Ntaganda.

8 The victims have a right to participate, we fully agree with that, but we have to be
9 very careful in our consideration of what is said, of what is brought forward by
10 victims who already have decided that Mr Ntaganda is guilty before the trial even
11 began.

12 In light of what was said today, Mr President, I would just like to invite the Chamber
13 that in our view there is no need to address past circumstances in your decision that
14 you're about to render concerning the continued detention of Mr Ntaganda.

15 Contrary to what my colleague from the Prosecution just said, that there is a need to
16 revisit the circumstances, yes, to revisit the circumstances when there is a change; but
17 if there is no change, there is no need to revisit what has not changed. There is a
18 principle called judicial economy. The Chamber referred to it in the first status
19 conference. I think we should abide by this principle, and there is no need to rehash
20 again and again and again things that have happened in the past unless there is a
21 judicial reason to do so.

22 Thank you, Mr President.

23 PRESIDING JUDGE FREMR: Thank you, Defence. Thank you, Mr Bourgon.

24 So now before we close I have to ask you are there any further issues, requests or
25 questions from the floor?

- 1 I see it is not the case. So this concludes our today hearing. The Chamber will take
- 2 your observations into thorough consideration and will issue its decision on detention
- 3 in due course, but in any case before 14 November 2014. Thank you all for coming
- 4 and for your input.
- 5 So have a good rest of the day.
- 6 THE COURT USHER: All rise.
- 7 (The hearing ends in open session at 1.36 p.m.)