

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: English

No.: ICC-01/05-01/08

Date: 15 December 2011

TRIAL CHAMBER III

Before: Judge Sylvia Steiner, Presiding Judge
Judge Joyce Aluoch
Judge Kuniko Ozaki

**SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
IN THE CASE OF
THE PROSECUTOR
v. JEAN-PIERRE BEMBA GOMBO**

Public Document

**With confidential *ex parte* annexes only available to the Registry and the
respective common legal representative**

Decision on 418 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings

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

The Office of the Prosecutor

Ms Fatou Bensouda

Ms Petra Kneuer

Counsel for the Defence

Mr Nkwebe Liriss

Mr Aimé Kilolo Musamba

Legal Representatives of the Victims

Ms Marie-Edith Douzima Lawson

Mr Assingambi Zarambaud

Legal Representatives of the Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

Unrepresented Applicants for Participation/Reparation

The Office of Public Counsel for Victims

Ms Paolina Massidda

The Office of Public Counsel for the Defence

Mr Xavier-Jean Keïta

States Representatives

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar

Ms Silvana Arbia

Defence Support Section

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Ms Maria Luisa Martinod Jacome

Detention Section

Victims Participation and Reparations Section

Ms Fiona McKay

Other

Trial Chamber III (“Chamber”) of the International Criminal Court (“Court”), in the case of *The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo* (“Bemba case”) issues the following Decision on 418 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings (“Decision”).

I. Background

1. On 9 September 2011, the Victims Participation and Reparations Section (“VPRS”) filed its “Twelfth report to Trial Chamber III on applications to participate in the proceedings”, *ex parte*, Registry only,¹ and transmitted 206 victims’ applications to the Chamber,² and redacted versions to the Office of the Prosecutor (prosecution) and the defence (together, “the parties”)³ (“Twelfth Set”).

2. Similarly, on 30 September 2011, the VPRS filed its “Thirteenth report to Trial Chamber III on applications to participate in the proceedings”, *ex parte*, Registry only,⁴ and transmitted 212 victims’ applications to the Chamber,⁵ and redacted versions to the parties⁶ (“Thirteenth Set”).

3. In accordance with the order of the Chamber in the “Decision setting a timeline for the filing of observations on pending victims’ applications”,⁷ the

¹ Twelfth report to Trial Chamber III on applications to participate in the proceedings, 9 September 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1725-Conf-Exp and confidential *ex parte* annexes.

² Twelfth transmission to the Trial Chamber of applications for participation in the proceedings, 9 September 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1723 and confidential *ex parte* annexes.

³ Twelfth transmission to the parties and legal representatives of the applicants of redacted versions of applications for participation in the proceedings, 9 September 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1724 and confidential redacted annexes.

⁴ Thirteenth report to Trial Chamber III on applications to participate in the proceedings, 30 September 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1808-Conf-Exp and confidential *ex parte* annexes.

⁵ Thirteenth transmission to the Trial Chamber of applications for participation in the proceedings, 30 September 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1806 and confidential *ex parte* annexes.

⁶ Thirteenth transmission to the parties and legal representatives of the applicants of redacted versions of applications for participation in the proceedings, 30 September 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1807 and confidential redacted annexes.

⁷ Decision setting a timeline for the filing of observations on pending victims’ applications, 9 September 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1726.

prosecution⁸ and the defence⁹ filed their observations on the Twelfth and the Thirteenth Sets on 3 and 24 October 2011 respectively.

4. In accordance with Article 21(1) of the Rome Statute (“Statute”), the Chamber has considered the following provisions of the Statute, the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”) and the Regulations of the Court (“Regulations”): Article 68 of the Statute, Rules 85 and 89 of the Rules and Regulation 86 of the Regulations.

II. Summary of the observations of the parties

A. Observations of the prosecution

5. The prosecution submits that 357 out of 418 applicants should be granted authorisation to participate as they meet all of the requirements under Article 68(3) of the Statute for participation in the trial stage of proceedings.¹⁰

6. In relation to 14 further applicants, it is submitted that they should be deemed to meet the requirements.¹¹ To that end, the prosecution asserts that membership cards (*cartes d’adhésion*),¹² and *déclarations de reconnaissance* signed and stamped by the *Chef de quartier*¹³ constitute sufficient proof of identity because they contain similar features to documents contained in the list of acceptable documentation previously endorsed by the Chamber. With regard to applications that (i) fail to provide an exact date for the events mentioned in the

⁸ Prosecution’s Observations on 206 Applications for Victims’ Participation in the Proceedings, 3 October 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1811; Prosecution’s Observations on 212 Applications for Victims’ Participation in the Proceedings, 24 October 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1858.

⁹ Observations de la Défense sur les 206 demandes de participation transmises le 9 septembre 2011, 3 October 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1810 and confidential Annex A; Observations de la Défense sur les 212 demandes de participation transmises le 30 Septembre 2011, 24 October 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1859 and confidential Annex A.

¹⁰ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraphs 9 and 20; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraphs 9 to 12 and 28.

¹¹ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraphs 10 to 14 and 20; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraphs 13 to 15 and 28.

¹² ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 13.

¹³ ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 14.

account; (ii) provide a broad or imprecise timeframe for the harm allegedly suffered by the applicant; or (iii) mention a date which falls slightly outside the temporal scope of the charges in the present case, the prosecution underlines that the applicants concerned identify the perpetrators of the alleged crimes as *Mouvement de Libération du Congo* (“MLC”) troops. Noting further that other applications from the same locations concern crimes allegedly committed within the temporal scope of the charges, the prosecution submits that these applicants “have established, *prima facie*, the causal link between the harm suffered and the crimes committed within the acceptable time frame.”¹⁴ Further, the prosecution suggests that discrepancies with regard to two applicants’ dates of birth “do [...] not affect the merits of [their] application[s] which [...] may be deemed to meet the requirements for victim participation.”¹⁵ Finally, it is submitted that one applicant meets all the requirements on account of the crime he personally suffered, but should “be invited to provide further information and/or clarification as to the causes of the harm suffered by his mother, and whether he intends to apply on her behalf.”¹⁶

7. With respect to 13 applicants, the prosecution submits that the applications should be deferred until further information or documentation is obtained.¹⁷ This concerns instances where the applicants provide (i) information on crimes that are not part of the charges against the accused;¹⁸ (ii) an account that makes it difficult to establish whether the perpetrators of the crimes were MLC troops or members of the *Forces Armées Centrafricaines*;¹⁹ (iii) a date that is too vague to establish a causal link between the applicant’s personal victimisation and the crimes charged;²⁰ or (iv) an account of the alleged events and documentation that reveal a “material” discrepancy regarding the date of death of the applicant’s

¹⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraphs 11 to 12; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 13.

¹⁵ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 14; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 15.

¹⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 10.

¹⁷ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraphs 15 to 17 and 21; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraphs 16 to 23.

¹⁸ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 15.

¹⁹ ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 22.

²⁰ ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 20.

relative.²¹ In the same vein, the prosecution recommends that the Chamber reject applications that do not contain (a) any information with regard to the time frame of the alleged events;²² (b) valid identity documents²³ or the required documents with regard to applications submitted on behalf of a relative;²⁴ (c) sufficient information in relation to the harm suffered by a close relative;²⁵ or (d) information on the location of the crimes.²⁶

8. With regard to 29 applications, the prosecution contends that redactions make it difficult to determine whether the applicants meet all the requirements for participation and leaves it to the Chamber to decide whether the applicants have provided adequate proof of identity or sufficient information to demonstrate a link between the alleged harm and the charges in the proceedings.²⁷

9. Finally, the prosecution submits that five applications do not meet the requirements for participation,²⁸ since they (i) provide no information to establish, *prima facie*, that the crimes allegedly suffered by the applicant were committed by MLC troops;²⁹ or (ii) concern harms allegedly suffered as a result of conduct not included among the crimes with which the accused is charged.³⁰

B. Observations of the defence

10. The defence urges the Chamber to (i) reject all 418 applications contained in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Sets;³¹ (ii) order the VPRS to communicate less redacted versions of the applications to the parties or to the prosecution so that it

²¹ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 17.

²² ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 16.

²³ ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraphs 17 and 19.

²⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraphs 16 and 23.

²⁵ ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 18.

²⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 21.

²⁷ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraphs 18 and 22; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraphs 24 to 26 and 30.

²⁸ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 23; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 31.

²⁹ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 19; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 27.

³⁰ ICC-01/05-01/08-1811, paragraph 19; ICC-01/05-01/08-1858, paragraph 27.

³¹ ICC-01/05-01/08-1810, page 12; ICC-01/05-01/08-1859, paragraph 37.

can fulfil its disclosure obligations towards the defence;³² and (iii) instruct the VPRS to examine the redactions procedure with a view to ensuring that redactions are proportionate and are made only when absolutely necessary.³³

11. To substantiate its request to reject all 418 applications, the defence recalls and elaborates upon the arguments it formulated in relation to previous sets of applications. Because most of these arguments have already been addressed in the Chamber's previous decisions, they will be summarised only to the extent that they are supported by new considerations.

1. Failure to submit a valid identity document

12. The defence reiterates its objections to a number of identity documents submitted by the applicants.³⁴ In addition to the documents already challenged in its previous submissions, the defence contests the credibility of *déclarations de reconnaissance*, signed and stamped by the *Chef de quartier*,³⁵ *cartes sanitaires*,³⁶ *cartes d'adhésion*³⁷ and *cartes de religion*³⁸ and submits that these documents should be rejected.

2. Applications failing to establish a link between the alleged harm and MLC troops

13. The defence maintains its request to reject all applications referring to a date or location that is inconsistent with the evidence presented by the prosecution regarding the location of MLC troops during the period covered by the charges.³⁹

³² ICC-01/05-01/08-1810, page 12; ICC-01/05-01/08-1859, paragraph 37.

³³ ICC-01/05-01/08-1810, page 13; ICC-01/05-01/08-1859, paragraph 37.

³⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-1810, paragraphs 29 to 31; ICC-01/05-01/08-1859, paragraphs 23 to 25.

³⁵ See Application a/0893/11.

³⁶ See Application a/0785/11.

³⁷ See Applications a/0531/11 and a/0574/11.

³⁸ See Application a/0758/11.

³⁹ ICC-01/05-01/08-1810, paragraph 12; ICC-01/05-01/08-1859, paragraph 6.

Specifically, on the basis of the testimony of prosecution Witness 6, the defence calls into question any allegations relating to the town of Sibut.⁴⁰

3. Elements undermining the credibility of the applicant

14. In line with its observations on previous sets of applications, the defence requests the Chamber to reject a series of applications on account of various factors that, in the view of the defence, undermine the credibility of the applicants.⁴¹ In particular, the defence challenges applications where the information contained in the application form contradicts information contained in additional statements provided with the application. The defence notably observes a recurrent pattern according to which the account in the application form refers to the destruction of property while in the additional statement, it is claimed that the applicant's belongings were pillaged.⁴² Such inconsistencies, according to the defence, reveal a possible "distortion of the facts" to ensure that the alleged facts fit the charges.⁴³

III. Analysis and conclusions

15. At the outset, the Chamber recalls that in its "Corrigendum to the Decision on 401 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings and setting a final deadline for the submission of new victims' applications to the Registry",⁴⁴ it has already addressed the defence's request for the communication of lesser redacted versions of the applications as well as the submissions regarding the redactions procedure applied by the VPRS. In the present circumstances, the defence does

⁴⁰ ICC-01/05-01/08-1810, paragraph 15; ICC-01/05-01/08-1859, paragraph 9. Prosecution Witness 6 testified on 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 12 April 2011. The defence's submission is notably premised on a statement contained in the transcript of hearing of 5 April 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-T-95-Red-ENG, page 27, lines 6 to 7, according to which "[t]he MLC troops [...] were not able to go as far as Sibut".

⁴¹ ICC-01/05-01/08-1810, paragraphs 37 to 39; ICC-01/05-01/08-1859, paragraphs 31 to 34.

⁴² See Applications a/2135/10; a/2153/10; a/2158/10; a/2166/10 and a/2174/10.

⁴³ ICC-01/05-01/08-1810, paragraphs 37 to 38; ICC-01/05-01/08-1859, paragraph 32.

⁴⁴ Corrigendum to the Decision on 401 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings and setting a final deadline for the submission of new victims' applications to the Registry, 21 July 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1590-Corr, paragraphs 28 to 34 and 38(g).

not provide any new arguments warranting a departure from the Chamber's previous findings. Accordingly, these requests are rejected and the Chamber will limit its analysis to the observations on the 418 individual applications.

16. In its analysis below, the Chamber follows the approach adopted in its previous decisions.⁴⁵ Accordingly, the parties' observations as summarised above will be analysed and decided upon in the present Decision, while a case-by-case analysis for each application, addressing the parties' specific comments, is provided in Annexes A, B, C, D and E.

A. Individual applications for participation

1. Means of identification submitted by the applicants

17. Concerning the defence's challenge to the validity of a number of identity documents, the Chamber recalls that most of these documents have already been accepted by the Chamber in its previous decisions.⁴⁶ In addition, the Chamber recalls its Decision on 772 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings,⁴⁷ in which it ruled that "whenever the documents appended by the applicants have similar features as [the documents enumerated by the Pre-Trial Chamber] and the Chamber is satisfied that at this stage they sufficiently establish the applicants' identity, they will be accepted as proof of identity".⁴⁸ In relation to the Twelfth and Thirteenth Sets, the Chamber finds that *déclarations de reconnaissance*, signed and stamped by the *Chef de quartier*⁴⁹, *cartes de religion*⁵⁰ and

⁴⁵ See, for example, ICC-01/05-01/08-1590-Corr and Decision on 270 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings, 25 October 2011, ICC-01/05-01/08-1862.

⁴⁶ See for example Decision on 772 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings, ICC-01/05-01/08-1017, paragraph 42, accepting electoral cards, baptism cards, *attestations d'état civil*, signed and stamped by the *Chef de quartier*, *certificats d'identité scolaire* and student cards; ICC-01/05-01/08-1590-Corr, paragraph 35, accepting *cartes de demandeur d'emploi*, *actes de notoriété*, *avis de mariage* and *cartes d'identité scolaire*; ICC-01/05-01/08-1862, paragraph 25, accepting cards indicating marital status (*fiches individuelles d'état civil*), police records (*casiers judiciaires*) and duplicates of birth certificates (*duplicata d'acte de naissance*).

⁴⁷ ICC-01/05-01/08-1017.

⁴⁸ ICC-01/05-01/08-1017, paragraph 41.

⁴⁹ See Application a/0893/11.

membership cards (*cartes d'adhésion*)⁵¹ are sufficient to establish an applicant's identity. Conversely, the Chamber is of the view that *cartes sanitaires*⁵² have similar features as vaccination cards and medical cards that were previously rejected by the Chamber.⁵³ For this reason, they will not be accepted as a valid means of identification.

2. The link between the alleged harm and MLC troops

18. The Chamber is not persuaded by the defence's argument that any allegations relating to the town of Sibut are called into question due to the testimony of prosecution Witness 6. In this respect, the Chamber reiterates that "for the Chamber to grant participating status to applicants, it has to satisfy itself [...] that there is a link between the harm suffered and the crimes charged in the case at hand."⁵⁴ For that purpose, the Chamber has already underlined that "according to the Revised Second Amended Document Containing the Charges, which has been accepted by the Chamber,⁵⁵ the accused is charged with the crimes of murder, rape and pillage committed from on or about 26 October 2002 to 15 March 2003 in the locations included, *but not limited to*, those mentioned in the operative section of the counts."⁵⁶ Because the geographic scope of the *Bemba* case is exclusively delineated by the requirement that the alleged crimes occurred on the territory of the Central African Republic, any challenge regarding the presence of the MLC troops at a particular location within the country's borders will not be considered at this stage of the proceedings.

⁵⁰ See Application a/0758/11.

⁵¹ See Applications a/0531/11 and a/0574/11.

⁵² See Application a/0785/11.

⁵³ See ICC-01/05-01/08-1017, paragraph 42.

⁵⁴ ICC-01/05-01/08-1017, paragraph 38; see also *Corrigendum* to Decision on the participation of victims in the trial proceedings and on 86 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings, 12 July 2010, ICC-01/05-01/08-807-Corr, paragraph 23.

⁵⁵ Decision on the defence application for corrections to the Document Containing the Charges and for the prosecution to file a Second Amended Document Containing the Charges, 20 July 2010, ICC-01/05-01/08-836, paragraphs 84 to 86.

⁵⁶ ICC-01/05-01/08-1017, paragraph 55 (emphasis in original). See also Pre-Trial Chamber II, Decision Pursuant to Article 61(7)(a) and (b) of the Rome Statute on the Charges of the Prosecutor Against Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, 15 June 2009, ICC-01/05-01/08-424, paragraphs 66 and 116 to 117.

3. Contradictions in the applicants' accounts of the events

19. Finally, the Chamber will address the defence's observations pertaining to apparent contradictions between information contained in certain applicants' application forms on the one hand, and in additional statements provided with the application on the other. The Chamber has previously held that in light of the evidentiary standard governing the assessment of victims' applications and considering the provisions and precedents inviting the applicants and the VPRS to provide additional information, "clarifications provided through additional information do not warrant, *ipso facto*, a rejection of the application."⁵⁷ Rather, the Chamber "will assess, on a case-by-case basis, whether the additional information provided by the applicant is consistent with the remainder of the facts alleged in the application or whether the changes appear to be of an 'opportunistic' nature, provided with the sole purpose of 'fitting the alleged facts'."⁵⁸ This approach is consistent with the Chamber's practice of assessing each application on the merits of its intrinsic coherence.⁵⁹

20. In the view of the Chamber, obvious contradictions as to the circumstances of the loss of property undermine the intrinsic coherence of an application and, as such, affect the credibility of the applicant's account. Accordingly, in the absence of any explanation for the contradictions, the application will be rejected.

⁵⁷ ICC-01/05-01/08-1862, paragraph 32.

⁵⁸ ICC-01/05-01/08-1862, paragraph 31.

⁵⁹ See annexes to filings 01/05-01/08-807-Corr; ICC-01/05-01/08-1017; Decision on 653 applications by victims to participate in the proceedings, 23 December 2010, ICC-01/05-01/08-1091; ICC-01/05-01/08-1590, endorsing the approach defined by Pre-Trial Chamber III, Fourth Decision on Victims' Participation, 12 December 2008, ICC-01/05-01/08-320, paragraph 31.

B. Summary of the Annexes

21. The applicant-by-applicant analysis is set out in the appended Annexes as follows:

- Annex A, filed as *ex parte* only available to the Registry and Mr Assingambi Zarambaud: analysis of the applications belonging to Group A (alleged crimes committed in or around Bangui and PK12);
- Annex B, filed as *ex parte* only available to the Registry and Ms Marie-Edith Douzima Lawson: analysis of the applications belonging to Group B (alleged crimes committed in or around Damara and Sibut);
- Annex C, filed as *ex parte* only available to the Registry and Ms Marie-Edith Douzima Lawson: analysis of the applications belonging to Group C (alleged crimes committed in or around Boali, Bossembélé, Bossangoa and Bozoum);
- Annex D, filed as *ex parte* only available to the Registry and Ms Marie-Edith Douzima Lawson: analysis of the applications belonging to Group D (alleged crimes committed in or around Mongoumba); and
- Annex E, filed as *ex parte* only available to the Registry and Mr Assingambi Zarambaud: analysis of application filed by the one dual status individual.

IV. Orders

22. For these reasons, the Chamber hereby:

- a. Grants participating status to the following 404 applicants:
 - Group A: a/0477/11; a/0480/11; a/0486/11; a/0492/11; a/0493/11; a/0494/11; a/0495/11; a/0496/11; a/0497/11; a/0498/11; a/0499/11; a/0500/11; a/0502/11; a/0505/11; a/0506/11; a/0509/11; a/0512/11; a/0617/11; a/0621/11; a/0634/11; a/0635/11; a/0698/11; a/0700/11; a/0703/11; a/2199/10;

a/0787/11; a/0788/11; a/0789/11; a/0790/11; a/0791/11; a/0792/11; a/0793/11;
a/0794/11; a/0795/11; a/0796/11; a/0797/11; a/0798/11; a/0799/11; a/0800/11;
a/0801/11; a/0802/11; a/0803/11; a/0804/11; a/0805/11; a/0806/11; a/0807/11;
a/0808/11; a/0809/11; a/0810/11; a/0811/11; a/0812/11; a/0813/11; a/0814/11;
a/0815/11; a/0816/11; a/0817/11; a/0818/11; a/0819/11; a/0820/11; a/0821/11;
a/0822/11; a/0823/11; a/0824/11; a/0825/11; a/0826/11; a/0827/11; a/0828/11;
a/0829/11; a/0830/11; a/0831/11; a/0833/11; a/0834/11; a/0835/11; a/0836/11;
a/0837/11; a/0838/11; a/0839/11; a/0840/11; a/0841/11; a/0842/11; a/0843/11;
a/0844/11; a/0847/11; a/0848/11; a/0849/11; a/0850/11; a/0851/11; a/0853/11;
a/0855/11; a/0857/11; a/0859/11; a/0860/11; a/0861/11; a/0862/11; a/0863/11;
a/0864/11; a/0865/11; a/0866/11; a/0867/11; a/0868/11; a/0869/11; a/0870/11;
a/0871/11; a/0872/11; a/0873/11; a/0912/11; a/0913/11; a/0914/11; a/0915/11;
a/0916/11; a/0917/11; a/0918/11; a/0919/11; a/0920/11; a/0921/11; a/0922/11;
a/0923/11; a/0924/11; a/0925/11; a/0926/11;

- Group B: a/0478/11; a/0490/11; a/0491/11; a/0683/11;
a/0684/11; a/0686/11; a/0687/11; a/0688/11; a/0689/11; a/0690/11; a/0692/11;
a/0693/11; a/0694/11; a/0695/11; a/0696/11; a/0704/11; a/0705/11; a/0706/11;
a/0707/11; a/0708/11; a/0709/11; a/0710/11; a/0711/11; a/0712/11; a/0713/11;
a/0714/11; a/0716/11; a/0717/11; a/0718/11; a/0719/11; a/0720/11; a/0721/11;
a/0722/11; a/0723/11; a/0724/11; a/0725/11; a/0852/11; a/0889/11; a/0890/11;
a/0891/11; a/0892/11; a/0893/11; a/0894/11; a/0895/11; a/0896/11; a/0897/11;
a/0898/11; a/0899/11; a/0900/11; a/0902/11; a/0903/11; a/0904/11; a/0905/11;
a/0907/11; a/0908/11; a/0909/11; a/0910/11; a/0911/11;

- Group C: a/0001/11; a/0002/11; a/0003/11; a/0479/11;
a/0481/11; a/0483/11; a/0484/11; a/0485/11; a/0488/11; a/0489/11; a/0599/11;
a/0600/11; a/0601/11; a/0602/11; a/0603/11; a/0604/11; a/0605/11; a/0606/11;
a/0607/11; a/0608/11; a/0610/11; a/0611/11; a/0612/11; a/0613/11; a/0614/11;
a/0615/11; a/0637/11; a/0638/11; a/0697/11; a/0699/11; a/0702/11; a/3174/10;


a/3179/10; a/3180/10; a/3181/10; a/3183/10; a/0501/11; a/0752/11; a/0753/11;
a/0754/11; a/0755/11; a/0756/11; a/0757/11; a/0758/11; a/0759/11; a/0760/11;
a/0761/11; a/0762/11; a/0763/11; a/0764/11; a/0765/11; a/0766/11; a/0767/11;
a/0768/11; a/0770/11; a/0771/11; a/0772/11; a/0773/11; a/0775/11; a/0776/11;
a/0777/11; a/0778/11; a/0779/11; a/0780/11; a/0781/11; a/0782/11; a/0783/11;
a/0784/11; a/0854/11; a/0856/11; a/0874/11; a/0875/11; a/0876/11; a/0877/11;
a/0878/11; a/0879/11; a/0880/11; a/0881/11; a/0882/11; a/0883/11; a/0884/11;
a/0885/11; a/0886/11; a/0887/11; a/0888/11; a/1439/10; a/2862/10; a/3194/10;

- Group D: a/0451/11; a/0452/11; a/0453/11; a/0454/11;
a/0455/11; a/0456/11; a/0458/11; a/0459/11; a/0460/11; a/0461/11; a/0462/11;
a/0463/11; a/0464/11; a/0465/11; a/0466/11; a/0467/11; a/0468/11; a/0469/11;
a/0470/11; a/0471/11; a/0472/11; a/0473/11; a/0475/11; a/0476/11; a/0504/11;
a/0508/11; a/0513/11; a/0514/11; a/0515/11; a/0516/11; a/0517/11; a/0518/11;
a/0519/11; a/0520/11; a/0521/11; a/0522/11; a/0523/11; a/0524/11; a/0525/11;
a/0526/11; a/0527/11; a/0528/11; a/0529/11; a/0530/11; a/0531/11; a/0532/11;
a/0533/11; a/0534/11; a/0535/11; a/0536/11; a/0555/11; a/0556/11; a/0557/11;
a/0558/11; a/0559/11; a/0560/11; a/0561/11; a/0562/11; a/0563/11; a/0564/11;
a/0565/11; a/0566/11; a/0567/11; a/0568/11; a/0569/11; a/0570/11; a/0571/11;
a/0572/11; a/0573/11; a/0574/11; a/0575/11; a/0576/11; a/0577/11; a/0578/11;
a/0579/11; a/0580/11; a/0581/11; a/0582/11; a/0583/11; a/0584/11; a/0585/11;
a/0586/11; a/0587/11; a/0588/11; a/0589/11; a/0590/11; a/0591/11; a/0592/11;
a/0593/11; a/0594/11; a/0595/11; a/0596/11; a/0597/11; a/0619/11; a/0620/11;
a/0622/11; a/0623/11; a/0624/11; a/0625/11; a/0626/11; a/0627/11; a/0628/11;
a/0629/11; a/0630/11; a/0631/11; a/0632/11; a/0633/11; a/0666/11; a/0668/11;
a/0669/11; a/0670/11; a/0671/11; a/0672/11; a/0673/11; a/0674/11; a/0675/11;
a/0676/11; a/0677/11; a/0678/11; a/0679/11; a/0680/11; a/0681/11; a/0682/11;
a/0701/11; a/0786/11; a/0929/11; a/0930/11; a/0931/11; a/0932/11; a/0933/11;
a/0934/11; a/0935/11; a/0936/11; a/0937/11; a/0938/11; a/0939/11; a/0940/11;


- Group E: a/0507/11;
- b. Rejects the applications to participate of 14 applicants, namely: a/1715/10; a/0685/11; a/0004/11; a/0482/11; a/0609/11; a/0510/11; a/0774/11; a/0785/11; a/2135/10; a/2153/10; a/2158/10; a/2166/10; a/2174/10; a/3239/10;
- c. Orders the Registry to submit to the Chamber as soon as practicable a report on any potential requests for protective and special measures of victims who have been granted status to participate;
- d. Orders the Registry, in accordance with the Chamber's oral decision of 2 December 2010,⁶⁰ to provide the parties with a lesser redacted version of application a/0507/11, completed by an individual who also appeared as a witness before the Chamber;
- e. Orders the Registry to (i) prepare a report compiling the extracts of the annexes to the present decision relating to applicants represented by the Office of Public Counsel for Victims ("OPCV") and whose applications were rejected; and (ii) notify such report to the OPCV as soon as practicable.

⁶⁰ Transcript of hearing of 2 December 2010, ICC-01/05-01/08-T-42-CONF-ENG-ET, page 8, lines 10 to 13.

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



Judge Sylvia Steiner



Judge Joyce Aluoch



Judge Kuniko Ozaki

Dated this 15 December 2011

At The Hague, The Netherlands