





International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda Tribunal pénal International pour le Rwanda

OR: ENG

TRIAL CHAMBER II

Before:

Judge William H. Sekule, Presiding

Judge Arlette Ramaroson Judge Solomy Balungi Bossa

Registrar:

Mr Adama Dieng

Date:

30 November 2004

The PROSECUTOR

v.

Pauline NYIRAMASUHUKO et al. Joint Case No. ICTR-98-42-T



DECISION ON PROSECUTOR'S MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE OF EVIDENCE FOR THE DEFENCE AND HARMONIZATION OF PROTECTIVE MEASURES FOR VICTIMS AND WITNESSES (Rules 54, 67, 69, 73 and 75)

Office of the Prosecutor

Ms Silvana Arbia
Ms Adelaide Whest
Ms Adesola Adeboyejo
Mr Michael Adenuga
Ms Astou Mbow, Case Manager

Defence Counsel

Mr Michel Marchand, Ms Simone Santerre for Joseph Kanyabashi

Mr Pierre Boulé, Mr Claude Desrochers for Elie Ndayambaje Ms Josette Kadji, Charles Tchacounte Patie for Sylvain Nsabimana

Mr Duncan Mwanyumba, Mr Normand Marquis for Arsène Shalom Ntahobali

Mr Titinga Frédéric Pacere, Mr Richard Perras for Alphonse Nteziryayo

Ms Nicole Bergevin, Mr Guy Poupart for Pauline Nyiramasuhuko

AM

11141

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

SITTING as Trial Chamber II composed of Judge William H. Sekule, Presiding, Judge Arlette Ramaroson and Judge Solomy Balungi Bossa (the "Chamber");

BEING SEISED of the "Prosecutor's Motion for the Disclosure of the Evidence for the Defence and the Harmonization of Protective Measures for Victims and Witnesses (Rules 54, 67, 69, 73 and 75)" filed on 25 October 2004 (the "Motion");

CONSIDERING "Nsabimana's Response to the Prosecutor's Motion for the Disclosure of the Evidence for the Defence and the Harmonization of Protective Measures for Victims and Witnesses" filed on 2 November 2004 ("Nsabimana's Response");¹

CONSIDERING the "Prosecutor's Reply to the Response of Nsabimana to the Motion on the Disclosure of the Evidence for the Defence and Harmonization of Protective Measures for Victims and Witnesses" filed on 5 November 2004 (the "Reply to Nsabimana");

CONSIDERING "Ndayambaje's Response to the Prosecutor's Motion for the Disclosure of the Evidence for the Defence and the Harmonization of Protective Measures for Victims and Witnesses" filed on 12 November 2004 ("Ndayambaje's Response");²

CONSIDERING the "Prosecutor's Reply to the Response of Ndayambaje to the Motion on the Disclosure of the Evidence for the Defence and Harmonization of Protective Measures for Victims and Witnesses" filed on 19 November 2004 (the "Reply to Ndayambaje");

NOTING the Chamber's Oral Ruling of 18 October 2004 on the harmonization of the disclosure of the identity of protected Defence witnesses (the "18 October 2004 Oral Ruling");³

CONSIDERING the Statute of the Tribunal (the "Statute") and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (the "Rules");

NOW DECIDES the matter pursuant to Rule 73(A) of the Rules.

WHEREAS the Prosecution seeks to have the timeframe for disclosure of unredacted statements and full identity of protected Defence witnesses fixed at 21 days, or any other period ordered by the Trial Chamber, before the commencement of the Defence case;

WHEREAS, in its 18 October 2004 Oral Ruling, the Trial Chamber decided to harmonise the timeframes for disclosure of unredacted statements and full identity of protected Defence witnesses to twenty-one (21) days before the witness' testimony for all Accused;

ANN

2/3

¹ The Response was filed in French and entitled: « Réponse de Sylvain Nsabimana à la requête du Procureur en communication de la preuve de la Défense et en harmonisation des mesures de protection des victimes et témoins ».

² The Response was filed in French and entitled: « Réponse d'Elie Ndayambaje à 'Prosecutor's Motion for the Disclosure of the Evidence for the Defence and the Harmonization of Protective Measures for Victims and Witnesses' ».

³ T. 18 October 2004, p. 18 (ICS).

11140

WHEREAS the Trial Chamber also decided in the same Oral Ruling that where specific issues arise, learned counsels may always come back to the Trial Chamber for further consideration;

WHEREAS the 18 October 2004 Oral Ruling was rendered after hearing the oral submissions made by the Parties;⁴

WHEREAS the submissions made by the Prosecution do not refer to a specific new issue but rather try to relitigate what was decided in the Oral Ruling;

WHEREAS the issues raised by the Prosecution in its Motion have already been ruled upon in the 18 October 2004 Oral Ruling and are therefore moot;

FOR THE ABOVE REASONS,

THE TRIAL CHAMBER

DENIES the Motion in its entirety.

Arusha, 30 November 2004

William H. Sekule Presiding Judge Arlette Ramaroson
Judge

Solomy Balungi Bossa Judge



⁴ T. 18 October 2004, p. 8-9 (ICS).