





International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda Tribunal pénal international pour le Rwanda

OR: ENG

TRIAL CHAMBER II

Before:

Judge Winston C. Matanzima Maqutu, Presiding

Judge William H. Sekule Judge Arlette Ramaroson

Registrar:

Adama Dieng

Date:

8 October 2002



The PROSECUTOR

 \mathbf{v}_{\bullet}

Samuel MUSABYIMANA

Case No. ICTR-2001-62-T

DECISION ON MUSABYIMANA'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE WITNESS STATEMENTS DUE TO UNDUE DELAY AND LACK OF PROBATIVE VALUE

The Office of the Prosecutor:

Silvana Arbia Jonathan Moses Faria Rekkas

Defence Counsel for the Accused:

Gerardus Knoops





THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL FOR RWANDA (the "Tribunal")

SITTING as Trial Chamber II, composed of Judges Winston C. Matanzima Maqutu, Presiding, William H. Sekule and Arlette Ramaroson (the "Chamber");

BEING SEIZED of:

- (i) the "Motion to Exclude Witness Statements Due to Undue Delay and Lack of Probative Value (Article 20(4) jo. Rule 89 (C))", filed 18 July 2002 (the "Motion");
- (ii) the "Response by the Prosecutor to the Motion to Exclude Witness Statements Due to Undue Delay and Lack of Probative Value" filed on 30 July 2002 (the "Prosecutor's Response");
- (iii) the "Reply to the Response by the Prosecutor to the Motion to Exclude Witness Statements Due to Undue Delay and Lack of Probative Value (Article 20(4) jo. Rule 89 (C))", filed on 12 August 2002 (the "Defence Reply");
- (iv) the "Additional Reply to the Response by the Prosecutor to the Motion to Exclude Witness Statements Due to Undue Delay and Lack of Probative Value (Article 20(4) jo. Rule 89 (C)), "filed on 9 September 2002 (the "Additional Reply");

CONSIDERING the Statute of the Tribunal (the "Statute"), specifically Article 20(4) and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (the "Rules"), in particular Rule 89 (C) of the Rules;

NOW DECIDES the Motion Pursuant to Rule 73(A) of the Rules on the basis of the written briefs only, as filed by the Parties.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES

Defence Submissions

- 1. The Defence requests, pursuant to Rule 89(C) of the Rules and Article 20(4) of the Statute that the Chamber orders the exclusion of the Prosecutor's witness statements.
- 2. Essentially, the Defence submits that nine out of the 21 redacted witness statements, disclosed to it following the confirmation of the Indictment do not mention the Accused and bear no specific factual evidence with regard to the Indictment.
- 3. The Defence further submits that three out of the 21 redacted witness statements, were obtained more than four years ago. The Defence argues that if the witness statements are used at trial, the Accused right to a fair trial and one without undue delay will be infringed upon because of the extreme time interval between when the events occurred and when the said statements of the witnesses were taken.
- 4. In making their submissions, the Defence calls upon the provisions of Rule 89 (D) of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (the "ICTY"), and the resultant jurisprudence as well as the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (the "ECHR") and that of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands.





5. The Defence thus requests the Tribunal to relieve it from an infringement of its rights by excluding the statements of Prosecution witnesses; CSC, CSD, CSA, CAM, CSE, CSB, CSF, CSG and NNZ as evidence in the case against the Accused.

Prosecutor's Submissions

- 6. In objection to the Motion, the Prosecution submits that the Motion is premature, pointing out that she has not made a final decision as to which witnesses will testify at trial. The Prosecution submits that all the witnesses she intends to rely upon will testify *viva voce* subject to Rule 92 *bis* of the Rules so that the statements made by the witnesses will not be produced as evidence.
- 7. Furthermore, the Prosecution submits that since the jurisdiction of the Tribunal is to try persons accused of crimes that were committed during the period between 1 January and 31 December 1994, all the witnesses will be testifying in respect of matters that took place more than seven years ago. The Prosecution argues that nowhere in the Motion does the Defence support her argument that witnesses should be prevented from giving testimony in respect to matters, which took place at this time.
- 8. The Prosecution thus prays that the Motion be dismissed.

The Reply by the Defence

- 9. The Defence argues that the Motion is not premature given the fact that it is obliged, even at this stage of the proceedings, to challenge the Prosecution with regard to the possibility that the above-mentioned statements as obtained and filed, cannot sustain a *prima facie* case according to principles of fair trial.
- 10. The Defence although agreeing with the Prosecution that the jurisdiction of the Tribunal is focused on the period from 1 January to 31 December 1994, argues that such an argument bears no judicial relevance when the judicial authorities fail to comply with the notion and right to prompt adjudication as envisioned by Article 6(1) of the ECHR.

HAVING DELIBERATED

- 11. In the Motion the Defence seeks the exclusion of some of the Prosecutor's witness statements because they do not mention the Accused. Similarly, the Defence seeks the exclusion of other statements because the extreme time lapse between when the statements were taken and the events of 1994 infringes upon the Accused right to a trial without undue delay.
- 12. The Chamber notes that the statements sought to be excluded are the statements produced in support of the Indictment during the confirmation procedure. During that procedure, Judge Gunawardana, the confirming judge, reviewed the evidence in support of Indictment and on the basis of said evidence found in the Decision on the "Confirmation of the Indictment and Order for Non-Disclosure," of 13 March 2001 that a *prima facie* case existed with respect to the charges against the Accused. This Decision to confirm the Indictment cannot be appealed or reviewed.¹

¹ See "Decision on Samuel Musabyimana's Motion to Exclude Anonymous Prosecutorial Witness Statements and to Review the Decision on Confirmation of the Indictment," of 9 September 2002 in this case



- 13. Furthermore, the Chamber, recalls the provisions of Rule 90 of the Rules which state: "Witnesses shall, in principle, be heard directly by the Chambers unless a Chamber has ordered that the witness be heard by means of a deposition as provided for in Rule 71." The Chamber reminds the Parties that, when the oral testimony of a witness is adduced at trial it is then admitted into evidence. The statements of witnesses are not evidence *per se*, rather, they may be used by the Parties, particularly during cross-examination.
- 14. The Chamber further notes that it is being asked through statements given by witnesses to determine the involvement of the Accused in the crimes he is charged with. It is the Chamber's opinion that such an assessment is premature because such an evaluation can only be made at trial on the basis of the testimony of the witnesses heard.
- 15. The Defence further argues that the Accused right to a trial without undue delay has been infringed upon because of the extreme time lapse between the time when the statements were taken and the events of 1994. The Chamber does not agree with this contention because the veracity, reliability and recollection of events by a witness can be tested during cross-examination at trial.
- 16. Accordingly, the Chamber finds that the Defence has not provided sufficient grounds to warrant the exclusion of the statements of the witnesses. The Chamber therefore, dismisses the Motion in its entirety.

FOR THE ABOVE REASONS, THE TRIBUNAL:

DISMISSES the Motion in its entirety.

Arusha, 8 October 2002

Winston/C Matanzima Maqutu

Presiding Judge

William H. Sekule

Judge⁻

Arlette Ramaroson

Judge

[Seal of the Tribunal]

TRANSMISSION SHEET FOR OFFICIAL FILING OF DOCUMENTS WITH CMS

(Art. 27 of the Directive for the Registry, Court Management Section, International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda)

То:	OIC, CMS Trial Cha J.P. Fomété Y. Lii			al Chamber III Appeals Officer Afande F. Talon /A. N'Gum				
From:		Defence	Prosecutor's C					
From:	SIL MANDULA		_	_				
	(name)	(name)	(name)	(name)				
Case Name:	The Prosecutor vs. SAMUEL MUSABYIMAN Case ICTR-2001-62-I Number:							
Date:	Transmitted:	Documer	nt's date:	No. of Pages:				
Original / Transl.	Document ☐ ORIGINAL: Fill sections below ☐ TRANSLATION into ☐ Eng ☐ Fr ☐ Kinyar. is a(n): ☐ Eng ☐ Fr ☐ Kinyarwanda (original was filed on)							
Doc. Title	Decision on Musa	byinane's Mi delay au	a lace of p	de witness statements robative values				
Classification Level: Strictly Confidential Dublic TRIM Doc Type: Indictment Warrant Order Motion Judgement Decision Correspondence Disclosure Submission from parties Submission from non-parties Affidavit Accused particulars Notice of Appeal Appeal Book Book of Authorities								
TRANSLATION STATUS ON DATE OF FILING OF ORIGINAL (completed by Chamber / Filing Party)								
No actio	n required by CMS regardin	g translations:	Please take actio	on with regard to translation:				
Filing Party/Chamber hereby submits BOTH the original and the translation to CMS for filing			Party/Chambers hereby submits the original, and will NOT oversee translation.					
Filing Party/Chamber will be submitting translation to			Ignore the boxes below.					
	lue course, details are provide es below.	ed below. Fill in	Reference material is provided in annex to facilitate translation					
☐ Cham	ber		☐ Defence is overseeing translation Name of contact person:					
	eeing translation. (copy of tran	nslation requisition	The document is submitted to the following					
	ached for reference) contact person:		accredited translation service (Translation fees will be submitted to LDFMS):					
	ument is submitted for translat	ion in:	Name of service:					
☐ Arush		The Hague	Address:					
Target Language: English French Kinyarwanda Email / tel / fax: Translation received by CMS on:								
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (TRIM DATA ENTRY / TRANSLATION PRIORITISATION)								
☑Top Priority (prioritisation to be completed by CMS in consultation with Chambers / LCSS) ☐ Required Date:								
□Urgent		COMMENTS		Hearing Date:				
☐ Norma	al			Other deadlines:				

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO
CONNECTION TEL
SUBADDRESS

CONNECTION ID

ST. TIME USAGE T PGS. SENT

RESULT

1914 #9031206750946

09/10 11:53

02'42

4

OK

1ctr-04-62-I: 9-10-2002 (1882-1877)

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda Tribunal penal international pour le Rwanda 1882 Mons

OR: ENG

TRIAL CHAMBER II

Before:

Judge Winston C. Matanzima Maqutu, Presiding

Judge William H. Sekule Judge Arlette Ramaroson

Registrar:

Adama Dieng

Date:

8 October 2002

JUDICIAL PROCESSES

The PROSECUTOR

V.

Samuel MUSABYIMANA

Case No. ICTR-2001-62-T

DECISION ON MUSABYIMANA'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE WITNESS STATEMENTS DUE TO UNDUE DELAY AND LACK OF PROBATIVE VALUE

The Office of the Prosecutor:



International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda Tribunal Pénal International pour le Rwanda

Arusha International Conference Centre
P.O.Box 6016, Arusha, Tanzania - B.P. 6016, Arusha, Tanzanie
Tel: 255 57 504207-11 504367-72 or 1 212 963 2850 Fax: 255 57 504000/504373 or 1 212 963 2848/49

PROOF OF SERVICE - ARUSHA PREUVE DE NOTIFICATION - ARUSHA

Date:	9 October, 2002	Case Name / Affaire:	The Prosecutor v	SAMUEL MUSABY	'IMANA				
		Case No / Affaire Nr.	ICTR-01-62-I						
To: <i>A:</i>	☐ Judge Møs☐ Judge A. V☐ Judge A. G	rillay, President se, Vice President	received by / reçu par:		by / reçu par				
	☐ A. LEKOY,		9,10.2001 299/10/02/1963		9.10.62 a.9/19/02				
	TC3 K Judge L. G Judge Y. C Judge P. D M. Niang, ()strovsky							
	<u> </u>	REAU DU PROCUREU orney in charge of case		received by	lan 09/10/02				
	☐ Accused / Accused Accused / Accused	Accused / Accusé: SAMUEL MUSABYIMANA complete / remplir "CMS4 FORM" Lead Counsel / Conseil Principal: GEERT-JAN KNOOPS In / à Arusha (signature) by fax complete / remplir "CMS3bis FORM"							
	l — :	☐ Co-Counsel / Conseil Adjoint: ☐ In / à Arusha ☐ by fax complete / remplir "CMS3bis FORM							
	All Decisions:								
From: De:	☐ JP. Fomété (OI			K. Afande (TC 3)	F. Talon (Appeals)				
Cc:	A. Dieng Q[0 02	A. Miller, OLA, NY	☐ L. G. Munlo A C(() 6 %] E. O'Donnell ☐ LDFMS	ΓΨ P₄ Nvambe	S. Van Driessche				
Subjec	t Kindly find atta	ched the following doc	ument(s) / Veuillez trouver en a	annexe le(s) docume	•				

Documents name / titre du document

Date Filed / Date enregistré

Pages

DECISION ON MUSABYIMANA'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE WITNESS STATEMENTS DUE 09-10-2002 TO UNDUE DELAY AND LACK OF PROBATIVE VALUE