



1395 Way

M LID NATIONS NA LONS LINES

OR: ENG

TRIAL CHAMBER DESIGNATED UNDER RULE 11 BIS

Befrre Judges:

Erik Møse, presiding

Sergei Alekseevich Egorov

Florence Rita Arrey

Reg-strar:

Adama Dieng

Date:

29 February 2008

THE PROSECUTOR

Y.

Gaspard KANYARUKIGA

Case No. ICTR-2002-78-I

HIMA V DICHTS WATCH

DECISION ON AMICUS CURIAE REQUEST BY HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH Rule 74 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence

The 'rosecution

Hassan Bubacar Jallow Bongani Majola Silvana Arbia Alex Obote-Odora Richard Karegyesa Georges Mugwanya Inneke Onsea François Nsanzuwera Florida Kabasinga

The Defence

Ernest Midagu Bahati Camille Yuma

Eh

THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL FOR RWANDA

SIT 'ING as a Trial Chamber designated under Rule 11 bis, composed of Judge Erik Møse, pres ling, Judge Sergei Alekseevich Egorov, and Judge Florence Rita Arrev;

BELVG SEIZED OF an Amicus Curiae Request by Human Rights Watch, filed on 27 Febt tary 2008;

NOT ING the Prosecution Response, filed on 28 February 2008;

HEF EBY DECIDES the motion.

INT CODUCTION

- On 7 September 2007, the Prosecution requested the transfer of the Accused for trial in R vanda under Rule 11 bis of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence. The Chamber has subsi quently made decisions concerning several applications for amicus curiae status.
- Human Rights Walch seeks amicus curiae status on the basis that its extensive know ledge of the Rwandan judicial system may assist the Chamber in its determination of the trans er request.2 The Prosecution does not object, but seeks an opportunity to respond to the meri 3 of Human Rights Watch's submissions if the application is granted.

DEL BERATIONS

- On 22 February 2008, the Chamber denied a Defence motion seeking amicus curiae statu for three non-governmental organisations but granted such status to Human Rights Watt 1.4 Aithough Human Rights Watch had not made any request itself, it had demonstrated an ir ention to accept an invitation to provide submissions based on the fact that it had subnated an amicus curiae brief in Rule 11 bis proceedings before another Chamber. The decis on was based on the assessment that Human Rights Watch possessed expertise relating to the capacity of the Rwandan legal system to ensure a fair trial. As the organisation has alreally been granted amicus curiae status, its present request is moot.
- In the Chamber's decision of 22 February 2008, Human Rights Watch was invited to provide written submissions no later than Friday 7 March 2008. The organisation has attacled the brief it provided in the other Rule 11 bis proceedings to its current Request.⁶ The Chan ber will consider this brief in connection with its deliberations in the present case.

¹ Pros cutor v. Kanyarukiga, Case No. ICTR-2002-78-1, Decision on the Request of the Republic of Rwanda for Le ve to Appear as Amicus Curtae (TC), 9 November 2007; Decision on Defence Request to Grant Amicus Curio: Status to Four Non-Governmental Organisations (TC), 22 February 2003; Decision on Amicus Curioe Reque t by the Organisation of Defence Counsel (ADAD) (TC), 22 February 2018; Decision on Amicus Curiae Reque t by the International Criminal Defence Attorneys Association (ICD/(A) (TC), 22 February 2008; Decisi in on Amicus Curiae Request by the Kigali Bar Association (TC), 22 February 2008; Decision on Amicus Curio: Request by Ibuka and Avega (TC), 22 February 2008.

Request, paras. 1, 5-12.

¹ Resp inse, para. 2.

^{*} Pros cutor v. Kanyarukiga, Case No. ICTR-2002-78-1, Decision on Defence Request to Grant Amicus Curiae Status o Four Non-Governmental Organisations (TC), 22 February 2008.

³ Id., p. tras. 3-7.

⁶ The rosecutor v. Fulgence Kaylshama, Case No. ICTR-2001-67-I, Brief of Human Rights Watch as Amicus Curlae in Opposition to Rule 11 bis Transfer, 3 January 2008.

FMR THE ABOVE REASONS, THE CHAMBER

D' :NIES the motion as moot.

At isha, 29 February 2008

Erik Møse Presiding Judge Sergei Alekseevich Egorov Judge Florence Rita Arrey

[Seal of the Tribunal]