Cour Pénale Internationale



International Criminal Court

Original: English No.: ICC-01/05-01/13

Date: 20 April 2015

## TRIAL CHAMBER VII

**Before:** 

Judge Chile Eboe-Osuji, Presiding Judge

Judge Olga Herrera Carbuccia

**Judge Bertram Schmitt** 

## SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

## IN THE CASE OF

THE PROSECUTOR v. JEAN-PIERRE BEMBA GOMBO, AIMÉ KILOLO MUSAMBA, JEAN-JACQUES MANGENDA KABONGO, FIDÈLE BABALA WANDU and NARCISSE ARIDO

# **Public**

Decision on the request of Mr Babala related to telephone surveillance

Order to be notified, in accordance with Regulation 31 of the Regulations of the Court, to:

The Office of the Prosecutor

Counsel for Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo

Ms Fatou Bensouda

Ms Melinda Taylor

Mr James Stewart

Counsel for Aimé Kilolo Musamba Mr Kweku Vanderpuye

Mr Paul Djunga Mudimbi

Counsel for Jean-Jacques Mangenda

Kabongo

Mr Christopher Gosnell

Counsel for Fidèle Babala Wandu Mr Jean-Pierre Kilenda Kakengi Basila

**Counsel for Narcisse Arido** Charles Achaleke Taku

**Legal Representatives of Victims** 

**Legal Representatives of Applicants** 

**Unrepresented Victims** 

**Unrepresented Applicants for** 

Participation/Reparation

The Office of Public Counsel for Victims The Office of Public Counsel for the

**Defence** 

**States Representatives** 

**Others** 

#### REGISTRY

Registrar

**Counsel Support Section** 

Mr Herman von Hebel

Victims and Witnesses Unit

**Detention Section** 

Victims Participation and Reparations

Section

No. ICC-01/05-01/13

2/4

20 April 2015

Trial Chamber VII ('Chamber') of the International Criminal Court, in the case of The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, Aimé Kilolo Musamba, Jean-Jacques Mangenda Kabongo, Fidèle Babala Wandu and Narcisse Arido ('Bemba et al. case'), having regard to Article 64(10) of the Rome Statute ('Statute'), issues the following 'Decision on the request of Mr Babala related to telephone surveillance'.

- 1. On 16 March 2015, the defence for Mr Babala (the 'Babala Defence'), submitted a request seeking the Chamber to order the Office of the Prosecutor (the 'Prosecution') to confirm whether it is monitoring Mr Babala's telephone and if so, to stop this 'illegal measure' or receive notification of any *ex parte* decision of the Chamber in this regard (the 'Request').¹ The Babala Defence submits that it has received information that such monitoring is ongoing and in its view, this surveillance, if confirmed, is a violation to Articles 54(1)(c) and 69(7) of the Statute, which require the Prosecution to respect internationally recognised human rights, including the right to privacy and privileged communications.² It therefore submits that no provision authorises the Prosecution to engage in such telephone surveillance.³
- 2. On 31 March 2015, the Prosecution filed its observations on the Request (the 'Response'), submitting that the Request as speculative and failed in law.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Requête de la Défense de M. Fidèle Babala Wandu aux fins d'obtenir injonction au Bureau du Procureur en vue de confirmer ou d'infirmer la mise sous surveillance des écoutes téléphoniques de M. Babala et, le cas échéant, d'ordonner l'arrêt de cette mesure illégale, ICC-01/05-01/13-846. An addendum was filed on 17 March 2015 (ICC-01/05-01/13-848). As the addendum also includes the same submissions of the original Request, the Chamber will therefore solely to the addendum.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Request, ICC-01/05-01/13-848, paras 6-13, 18-20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Request, ICC-01/05-01/13-848, para.14.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Prosecution's Response to « Requête de la Défense de M. Fidèle Babala Wandu aux fins d'obtenir injonction au Bureau du Procureur en vue de confirmer ou d'infirmer la mise sous surveillance des écoutes téléphoniques de M. Babala et, le cas échéant, d'ordonner l'arrêt de cette mesure illegale » [ICC-01/05-01/13-846] and its Addendum [ICC-01/05-01/13-848], ICC-01/05-01/13-883.

The Prosecution confirms that it is not monitoring the communications of Mr Babala and thus the Request is moot.<sup>5</sup>

The Chamber considers that, given the information from the Prosecution, the Request is moot.

### FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS THE CHAMBER HEREBY

**DISMISSES** the Request as moot.

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

Judge Chile Ebbe-Osuji, Presiding

Judge Olga Herrera Carbuccia

**Judge Bertram Schmitt** 

Dated 20 April 2015

At The Hague, The Netherlands

No. ICC-01/05-01/13

4/4

20 April 2015

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Response, ICC-01/05-01/13-883, para. 5.