



International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda Tribunal pénal international pour le Rwanda 2910 S.Musq

OR: ENG

### TRIAL CHAMBER I

Before:

Judge Erik Møse, presiding

Judge Sergei Alekseevich Egorov

Judge Dennis C. M. Byron

Registrar:

Adama Dieng

Date:

4 October 2004

THE PROSECUTOR

٧.

**Aloys SIMBA** 

Case No. ICTR-01-76-I



# DECISION ON THE DEFENCE MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESS KSM

# Office of the Prosecutor:

Richard Karegyesa William T. Egbe Sulaiman Khan Ignacio Tredici Amina Ibrahim

# Counsel for the Defence

Sadikou Ayo Alao Beth Lyons

6h

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

SITTING as Trial Chamber I, composed of Judge Erik Møse, presiding, Sergei Alekseevich Egorov, and Judge Dennis C. M. Byron;

BEING SEIZED OF the "Defence Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Witness KSM", filed on 20 September 2004;

CONSIDERING the Prosecution's response, filed on 24 September 2004, and the Defence's reply, filed on 29 September 2004;

#### **HEREBY DECIDES** the motion.

#### INTRODUCTION

1. The Defence motion requests the Chamber to exclude the testimony of Prosecution Witness KSM. The witness testified on 14 and 15 September 2004 about events allegedly involving Simba in Kinyamakara and Ruhashya communes.

#### **SUBMISSIONS**

- 2. The Defence's principal ground for excluding Witness KSM's evidence is that it does not relate to the Indictment. The Defence notes that the witness's testimony principally concerned Simba's alleged participation in a massacre in Kinyamakara commune and general killings in Ruhashya commune. The Indictment, however, refers to the distribution of weapons in Kinyamakara commune, not killings, and to two specific massacre sites in Ruhashya commune, which were not mentioned by the witness. The Defence claims that it lacked notice of these new allegations and would be prejudiced by their admission into evidence. The Defence also asserts that Witness KSM's testimony should be excluded because the Prosecution failed to previously identify the points in the Indictment to which she would testify. Furthermore, in the Defence's view, the witness appeared visibly upset and traumatized, which calls into question her capacity to testify, including the validity of her oath and the reliability of her recollections.
- 3. The Prosecution argues that the Defence has waived its rights to challenge KSM's evidence on grounds of lack of notice because it failed to contemporaneously object during her testimony. According to the Prosecution, this failure, the Defence's subsequent cross-examination, and the prior disclosure of the witness's statement reflect that the Defence was not surprised or prejudiced by her testimony. The Prosecution concedes that the evidence pertaining to the massacres in Kinyamakara commune were not pleaded in the Indictment and thus cannot be a basis of conviction. Nonetheless, it submits that Witness KSM's evidence is within the scope of the Indictment and should not be excluded. According to the Prosecution, Witness KSM's testimony refutes Simba's alibi and goes to proving Simba's mens rea during the Ruhashya massacres as well as to establishing the general requirements of a widespread and systematic attack. In addition, the Prosecutor asserts that its summary of Witness KSM's evidence in its motion seeking to leave to vary the witness list adequately specified the points to which the

Ehr

witness was going to testify. The Prosecution also argues that the Defence's challenge to the validity of the witness's capacity to testify are not supported by the evidence.

#### **DELIBERATIONS**

- 4. The Defence first raised the challenges contained in the present motion orally at the close of Witness KSM's evidence. At that time, the Chamber noted the objections for the record and indicated that these issues should be addressed at the closing brief stage.<sup>2</sup> This preserved the Defence's objections for further consideration.<sup>3</sup>
- 5. At this stage of the case, the Chamber is not in a position to fully appreciate the evidentiary value of all aspects of Witness KSM's testimony. While lack of notice may preclude conviction on an unpleaded allegation, the Appeals Chamber has confirmed that the evidence may nonetheless be admitted to the extent that it may be relevant to the proof of any allegation pleaded in the Indictment.<sup>4</sup> The Prosecution has indicated that Witness KSM's testimony will corroborate other witnesses in connection with the massacres in Ruhashya commune. which are pleaded in the Indictment.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, in Chamber's view, neither party has sufficiently addressed in detail the potential problems with each allegation made by the witness or their specific relevance to other aspects of the Indictment or as background for the case.
- 6. Thus, the Chamber finds these submissions to be pre-mature and maintains its position that the parties address these issues in their closing briefs.

# FOR THE ABOVE REASONS, THE CHAMBER

**DENIES** the Defence motion.

Arusha, 4 October 2004

Erik Møse Presiding Judge

Sergei Alekseevich Egorov Judge

Dennis E.M. Byron Judge



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> T. 15 September 2004 p. 43.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> T. 15 September 2004 p. 44. This is particularly true for the Defence's arguments concerning the impact of trauma on the reliability of the witness's testimony, which goes to weight, not admissibility. <sup>3</sup> Niyitegeka, Judgement (AC), paras. 199-200.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Ntahobali and Nyiramasuhuko, Decision on the Appeals by Pauline Nyiramasuhuko and Arsène Shalom Ntahobali on the "Decision on Defence Urgent Motion to Declare Parts of the Evidence of Witnesses RV and ABZ Inadmissible" (AC), 2 July 2004, paras. 14 and 15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> T. 15 September p. 37.



# TRANSMISSION SHEET FOR FILING OF DOCUMENTS WITH CMS

# **COURT MANAGEMENT SECTION**

(Art. 27 of the Directive for the Registry)

I - GENERAL	INFORMATION (T	o be completed by t	he Chambers /	Filing Party)					
То:	☐ Trial Chamber I N. M. Diallo	Trial Chamber II R. N. Kouambo	Trial Chamber I						
	Chief, CMS JP. Fomété	Deputy Chief, CMS M. Diop	Chief, JPU, CM K. K. A. Afande						
From:	☑ Chamber I	Defence	Prosecutor's Of	ffice Other:					
	Judges Møse, Egorov, Byron (names)	(names)	(names)	(names)					
Case Name:	The Prosecutor vs. Simba			Case Number: ICTR-01-76-I					
Dates:	Transmitted: 4 October 2004		Document's date: 4 October 2004						
No. of Pages:	3	Original Language:		☐ French ☐ Kinyarwanda					
Title of Document:	DECISION ON THE DEFENCE MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESS KSM								
Classification Level:  ☐ Strictly Confidential / Under Seal ☐ Confidential ☐ Public		TRIM Document Type:  ☐ Indictment ☐ Wal ☐ Decision ☐ Affice ☐ Disclosure ☐ Ord ☐ Judgement ☐ Mot	davit  Notice of Appeal Bo	Appeal Submission from parties Dok Accused particulars					
II - TRANSLAT	TION STATUS ON	THE FILING DATE (	To be complete	d by the Chambers / Filing Party					
CMS SHALL take necessary action regarding translation.									
☑ Filing Party hereby submits only the original, and will <b>not submit</b> any translated version.									
Reference material is provided in annex to facilitate translation.									
Target Language(s):  English  Kinyarwanda				☐ Kinyarwanda					
CMS SHALL N	OT take any action re	garding translation.							
	· .	I the original and the tr	anslated version	for filing, as follows:					
Original	in 🔲 English		☐ French	☐ Kinyarwanda					
Translation	in English		☐ French	☐ Kinyarwanda					
CMS SHALL N	OT take any action re	garding translation.							
Filing Party will be submitting the translated version(s) in due course in the following language(s):									
☐ English		French		☐ Kinyarwanda					
The OTD is	aver engine translatio	KINDLY FILL IN TH							
☐ The Language Services Section of the ICTR / Arusha. ☐ The Language Services Section of the ICTR / The Hague. ☐ An accredited service for translation; see details below:			The document is submitted to an accredited service for translation (fees will be submitted to DCDMS):  Name of contact person: Name of service: Address: E-mail / Tel. / Fax:						
					Name of contact person: Name of service:			E-mail / Tel. / Fax	E TR
					Address: E-mail / Tel.				O AMO
							ATION (For Official	use ONLY)	ž 1 Dü.
☐Top priority	COMMENTS			Required date					
□Urgent				Hearing date:					
☐ Normal				Other deadlines:					