

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: English

No. ICC-01/09-01/11 OA

Date: 1 August 2011

THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before: Judge Daniel David Ntanda Nsereko, Presiding Judge
Judge Sang-Hyun Song
Judge Akua Kuenyehia
Judge Erkki Kourula
Judge Anita Ušacka

SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF KENYA

**IN THE CASE OF THE PROSECUTOR v. WILLIAM SAMOEI RUTO,
HENRY KIPRONO KOSGEY and JOSHUA ARAP SANG**

Public document

Decision on the Application on behalf of the Government of Kenya for Leave to Reply to the "Prosecution's response to the 'Appeal of the government of Kenya against the Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the Case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute'"

No: ICC-01/09-01/11 OA

1/6

Decision to be notified in accordance with regulation 31 of the Regulations of the Court to:

The Office of the Prosecutor

Ms Fatou Bensouda, Deputy Prosecutor
Mr Fabricio Guariglia

Counsel for William Samoei Ruto

Mr Joseph Kipchumba Kigen-Katwa
Mr David Hooper
Mr Kioko Kilukumi Musau

Counsel for Henry Kiprono Kosgey

Mr George Odinga Oraro,

Counsel for Joshua Arap Sang

Mr Joseph Kipchumba Kigen-Katwa

The Office of Public Counsel for Victims

Ms Paolina Massida

States Representatives

Mr Geoffrey Nice
Mr Rodney Dixon

REGISTRY

Registrar

Ms Silvana Arbia



The Appeals Chamber of the International Criminal Court,

In the appeal of the Republic of Kenya (hereinafter: “Kenya”) against the decision of Pre-Trial Chamber II entitled “Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the Case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute” of 30 May 2011 (ICC-01/09-01/11-101),

Having before it the “Application on behalf of the Government of Kenya for Leave to Reply to the ‘Prosecution’s response to the “Appeal of the Government of Kenya against the Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the Case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute”” of 20 July 2011 (ICC-01/09-01/11-208 (OA), hereinafter: “Application to Reply”),

Unanimously,

Renders the following

DECISION

The Application to Reply is rejected.

REASONS

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On 30 May 2011, Pre-Trial Chamber II (hereinafter: “the Pre-Trial Chamber”) issued its “Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the Case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute”¹ (hereinafter: “Impugned Decision”) wherein it found the case against Mr Ruto, Mr Kosgey and Mr Sang to be admissible. On 6 June 2011, Kenya filed its appeal against the Impugned Decision.²

2. On 20 June 2011, Kenya filed its “Document in Support of the ‘Appeal of the Government of Kenya against the Decision on the Application by the Government of

¹ ICC-01/09-01/11-101.

² “Appeal of the Government of Kenya against the ‘Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the Case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute’”, ICC-01/09-01/11-109.

Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the Case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute”³ (hereinafter: “Document in Support of the Appeal”).

3. On 12 July 2011, the Prosecutor filed the “Prosecution’s response to the ‘Appeal of the Government of Kenya against the Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the Case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute’”⁴ (hereinafter: “Response to the Document in Support of the Appeal”).

4. On 20 July 2011, Kenya filed its Application to Reply, in which it sought leave to reply to the Response to the Document in Support of the Appeal under regulation 24 (5) of the Regulations of the Court. Kenya submits that the Response to the Document in Support of the Appeal contains “new and erroneous assertions of law and fact” which are “central to the appeal”.⁵

5. On 21 July 2011, the Appeals Chamber ordered the Prosecutor, Mr Ruto, Mr Kosgey and Mr Sang to file, before 26 July 2011, observations on whether the Application to Reply should be granted or rejected.⁶

6. On 22 July 2011, the Prosecutor filed his observations, submitting that the Application to Reply should be dismissed (hereinafter: “Prosecutor’s Observations”).⁷

7. On 26 July 2011, Mr Ruto and Mr Sang filed their joint observations (hereinafter: “Joint Observations of Mr Ruto and Mr Sang”), in which they support Kenya’s Application to Reply.⁸ They submit that the Appeals Chamber could grant the Application to Reply pursuant to regulation 28 (2) of the Regulations of the Court,

³ ICC-01/09-01/11-135. A Corrigendum thereto was filed on 21 June 2011, ICC-01/09-01/11-135-Corr.

⁴ ICC-01/09-01/11-183.

⁵ Application to Reply, para. 3; *see also*, paras 13-20, 21-24, 25, and 26.

⁶ “Order on the filing of observations in relation to the Application on behalf of the Republic of Kenya for Leave to Reply to the ‘Prosecution’s response to the “Appeal of the Government of Kenya against the Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the case Pursuant to Article 19 (2)(b) of the Statute’””, ICC-01/09-01/11-214 (OA).

⁷ “Prosecution’s response to the Application on behalf of the Government of Kenya for Leave to Reply to the ‘Prosecution’s response to the ‘Prosecution’s response to the “Appeal of the Government of Kenya against the Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute’””, ICC-01/09-01/11-217.

⁸ “Response to the Application on behalf of the Government of Kenya for Leave to Reply to the ‘Prosecution’s response to the “Appeal of the Government of Kenya against the Decision on the Application by the Government of Kenya Challenging the Admissibility of the case Pursuant to Article 19(2)(b) of the Statute’””, ICC-01/09-01/11-223.

in order to allow Kenya to “provide the Appeals Chamber with the most up-to-date information [...] given the Government and the Prosecution’s different definitions of what constitutes the time frame for determining admissibility, and what constitutes the definition and evidence of an investigation”.⁹ Mr Kosgey did not file any observations.

II. MERITS

8. The Appeals Chamber observes that Kenya seeks leave to reply under regulation 24 (5) of the Regulations of the Court. The Appeals Chamber nevertheless recalls that it has previously held that replies to responses to documents in support of appeal may not be filed pursuant to regulation 24 (5) of the Regulations of the Court for appeals brought under rule 154 and 155 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. This is because “the more specific provisions of subsection 1 of Section 4 of Chapter 3 of the regulations of the Court do not foresee replies to responses to documents in support of appeals”.¹⁰ Therefore, the present application is rejected.

9. However, the Appeals Chamber has held that it has discretion under regulation 28 of the Regulations of the Court to order further submissions by parties or participants when it is “necessary for the proper disposal of the Appeal [...] bearing in mind the principle of equality of arms and the need for expeditious proceedings”.¹¹ The Appeals Chamber observes that while Kenya does not invoke regulation 28 of the Regulations of the Court, the Prosecutor¹², Mr Ruto and Mr Sang¹³ expressly refer to it in their observations. The Prosecutor submits that the regulation does not apply to the circumstances of this case, while Mr Ruto and Mr Sang support Kenya’s Application to Reply on the basis of this regulation.

⁹ Joint Observations of Mr Ruto and Mr Sang, para. 8.

¹⁰ “Decision on the Prosecutor’s ‘Application for Leave to Reply to “Conclusions de la défense en réponse au mémoire d’appel du Procureur””, 12 September 2006, ICC-01/04-01/06-424 (OA 3), para. 6; and “Decision on the Prosecution’s Request for Leave to Reply”, 18 January 2008, ICC-01/04-01/07-148 (OA), para. 6.

¹¹ “Decision on the Prosecutor’s ‘Application for Leave to Reply to “Conclusions de la défense en réponse au mémoire d’appel du Procureur””, 12 September 2006, ICC-01/04-01/06-424 (OA 3), para. 7. See also “Decision on the ‘Prosecution’s Application under Regulation 28 to provide Clarification or Additional Details which Impact on the Appeals against the Decisions to Stay the Proceedings and Release the Accused’”, 13 October 2008, ICC-01/04-01/06-1476 (OA 12 and OA 13), para. 3.

¹² Prosecutor’s Observations, paras 5-6.

¹³ Joint Observations of Mr Ruto and Mr Sang, paras. 7-10.

10. The Appeals Chamber is not persuaded that further observations from Kenya would be necessary for the proper disposal of the appeal. In this respect, the Appeals Chamber notes that Kenya raises several matters that it would address if its application were granted, namely the: (a) the relevant time for determination of admissibility challenge; (b) the definition and evidence of “an investigation”; and (c) the alleged erroneous assertions in the Prosecutor’s responses.¹⁴ None of these issues warrant further submissions as they are already before the Appeals Chamber or, in the view of the Appeals Chamber, appear to be mere disagreements with the Prosecutor’s arguments.

11. For these reasons, the Appeals Chamber does not deem it necessary to exercise its discretion pursuant to regulation 28 of the Regulations of the Court to order further submissions from Kenya.

Done in both English and French, the English version being authoritative.



Judge Daniel David Ntanda Nsereko
Presiding Judge

Dated this 1st day of August 2011

At The Hague, The Netherlands

¹⁴ Application to Reply, paras. 13-25.