

059

1152

SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
RECEIVED
 COURT RECORDS
 - 4 512 2003
 NAME: NEIL GIBSON
 SIGN: *Maha*
 TIME: 13:05

SCSL-2003-06-PT-05
 (1152-1168)



SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
 JOMO KENYATTA ROAD • FREETOWN • SIERRA LEONE
 PHONE: +1 212 963 9915 Extension: 178 7000 or +39 0831 257000 or +232 22 295995
 FAX: Extension: 178 7001 or +39 0831 257001 Extension: 174 6996 or +232 22 295996

IN THE TRIAL CHAMBER

Before: His Lordship, The Rt. Hon. Judge Benjamin Mutanga Itoe
Registrar: Robin Vincent
Date: 22nd day of July 2003.

The Prosecutor against **Tamba Alex Brima**
 SCSL03-06-PT

**RULING ON THE APPLICATION FOR THE ISSUE OF A WRIT OF HABEAS
 CORPUS
 FILED BY THE APPLICANT**

Office of the Prosecutor:
 Mr. James Johnson
 Mr. Nicolas Browne-Marke

Applicant Counsel:
 Mr Terrence Michael Terry

Attorney General:
 Mr. Joseph G Kobba

Registry:
 Mrs. Musu Kamara
 Ms. Mariana Goetz

1 HIS LORDSHIP, THE RT. HON. JUDGE BENJAMIN MUTANGA ITOE:

2
3 JUDGE: This is my Ruling on this Application.

4
5 The Applicant in these proceedings, Tamba Alex Brima, stands indicted by the
6 Prosecutor of the Special Court of Sierra Leone and is currently remanded in custody
7 on a 17 count indictment dated 3rd of March 2003, preferred against him, and
8 charging him with diverse crimes he committed against humanity and international
9 humanitarian law in the territory of Sierra Leone, crimes which come within the
10 context of the provisions of Article 1 of the Agreement between the United Nations
11 and the Government of Sierra Leone, creating the Special Court for Sierra Leone on
12 the one hand, and also those of Articles 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 of the Statute of the said Court
13 on the other.

14
15 Since the Applicant considers his detention illegal, his counsel, Mr Terence Michael
16 Terry, on the 28th of May, 2003, filed a motion in the Registry of the Special Court
17 for leave for the issue of a Writ of "Habeas Corpus" as well as for an Order for a Writ
18 of "Habeas Corpus ad subjiciendum" releasing the Applicant from his present
19 detention which he argues, is unlawful and illegal, and this, pursuant to Rules 54 of
20 the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Special Court of Sierra Leone, and under
21 the "Habeas Corpus" Act of 1640 and 1816.

22
23 This motion is brought against the following Respondents: The Director of Prisons
24 of the Republic of Sierra Leone, The Officer in charge of the Special Detention
25 Facility in Bonthe, and Any other Official who might at the time, have been holding
26 the Applicant in custody.

27
28 Having been designated pursuant to Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence
29 to adjudicate on this matter, and considering the urgency of the application, I issued
30 an Order on the 18th of June 2003, granting leave for the Writ of "Habeas Corpus"

1 to be filed, but no immediate date was fixed for the hearing of the substantive matter
2 for two reasons; the first being the prolonged but justified absence of Learned
3 Counsel for the Applicant, Mr. Terence Michael Terry, who was out of the
4 jurisdiction and secondly, the necessity in my opinion, for the submissions so filed to
5 be served on the Honourable and Learned Attorney General and Minister of Justice
6 of the Republic of Sierra Leone, the State to which the accused seeks to be released
7 if the application were granted.

8
9 I accordingly made an Order to this effect, and this, in execution of the inherent
10 discretion of the Court to make certain Orders which are in consonance with the
11 overall objectives of fostering good practices aimed at enhancing and reinforcing the
12 supremacy of the Rule of Law and of the Due Process.

13
14 In so doing, I have taken cognisance of the fact that Rule 65(B) of the Rules on 'Bail'
15 contains these provisions and that since applications touching on either Bail or on "
16 Habeas Corpus" if granted, produce the same effects of releasing the accused to the
17 State of Sierra Leone, it was equitable, fair, in conformity with legal norms, and
18 acceptable, to order that the Attorney General be associated to these proceedings,
19 served with the submissions of the Parties, and heard on the application for "Habeas
20 Corpus", a procedure which I agree and appreciate, is not provided for by the Rules
21 of Procedure and Evidence of the Special Court.

22
23 Following the Order, the submissions of all the Parties were served on the Learned
24 and Honourable Attorney General for him to submit on issues raised therein, and
25 eventually to appear personally or to be represented at the hearing of the application,
26 and this, following my decision to hold such a hearing in open Court pursuant to the
27 provisions of Rule 73, in addition to the submissions which have been filed by the
28 parties.
29

1 At the hearing on the 15th of July, 2003, Counsel representing the parties including
2 the Honourable Attorney General's representative, Mr. Joseph. G. Kobba, made oral
3 submissions and arguments to sustain their respective cases.

4
5 For the Applicant, his counsel, Mr. Terry, based his arguments on the illegality of the
6 detention of his client on the following grounds:

7
8 -That the name of the person detained is not the same as the person mentioned in
9 the indictment, and further that his identity was mistaken as he did not, as alleged in
10 the indictment, join the Sierra Leonean Army in 1985, and never rose and could not
11 of course have risen to the rank of a Staff Sergeant. The Applicant contends that to
12 that extent, the indictment so approved was, and continues to be fundamentally
13 flawed, invalid and tantamount to a miscarriage of Justice.

14
15 -That the warrant of arrest was not served on the Applicant on the date of his arrest
16 by any competent authority.

17
18 -That the indictment is defective in that no prima-facie case was established against
19 the Applicant before it was approved and signed by the Judge and that this was in
20 violation of the provisions of Article 47 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of
21 the Special Court.

22
23 The Respondents in reply to the arguments in support of the application for the
24 issue of a Writ of "Habeas Corpus" have, on their part, canvassed the following
25 arguments:

26
27 -That the Application should be rejected on the grounds that neither the Statute nor
28 the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Special Court, make provisions for the
29 Writ of "Habeas Corpus" and that it is unknown to the Rules of the Special Court.
30

1 - That if the Court were to decide that the Defence motion would be dealt with as
2 the motion under Rule 72 or 73 challenging the lawfulness of the Applicant's
3 detention, such a motion should be rejected on its merits for the following reasons:

4
5 -That the contention that the Provisions of Rule 47 of the Rules have been violated is
6 unfounded as all what is required to conform with these provisions had been done
7 by the Respondents who filed the indictment for approval by the designated Judge.
8 The Respondents in any event further contend that the Applicant failed to
9 demonstrate in what sense and in what way the provisions of Rule 47 had been
10 violated.

11
12 -On the argument that the indictment is flawed ex-facie because it erroneously
13 contained information to the effect that the Applicant joined the Sierra Leonean
14 Army in 1985 and rose to the rank of a Sergeant, the Respondent in reply, argued in
15 effect that the issue of the veracity of a fact pleaded in an indictment relates to and in
16 fact touches and borders on examining the merits of the case and that this issue can
17 only be determined by the Trial Chamber after hearing the totality of the evidence.

18
19 -On the said warrant of arrest which the Applicant contends is flawed for reasons
20 advanced by his counsel, Mr. Terry, in open Court in that it did not, nor did the
21 Judge specifically order the arrest of the Applicant whose identity is contested, the
22 Respondent has canvassed the arguments that the said warrant dated the 7th of
23 March, 2003, is clearly and unambiguously entitled 'Warrant of Arrest and Order for
24 Transfer and Detention.

25
26 -On the Applicant's argument that his arrest was flawed because the said warrant of
27 arrest was not served on him, the Respondents contend and seek to rely on the
28 Declaration dated the 31st of May, 2003, of "Moris Lengor" a Police investigator in
29 the Prosecutor's Office, who solemnly declared that the warrant was duly served on
30 the Applicant before he was arrested.

1
2 -On the allegation that the rights of the Applicant have been grossly violated, the
3 Respondent argue that his rights as guaranteed under Article 17 of the Statute have
4 been properly respected.

5
6 On the argument by the Respondent that the Special Court cannot apply the
7 procedure of "Habeas Corpus" because it does not form part of the Judiciary of the
8 Republic of Sierra Leone nor is it a Sierra Leonean Court, Counsel for the
9 Applicant, Mr. Terence Michael Terry, submits on the contrary, that the Special
10 Court for Sierra Leone is clearly part of the Courts of Sierra Leone and that to that
11 extent, as an Adjudicating Body, it falls under the supervisory jurisdiction of the
12 Supreme Court of the Republic of Sierra Leone to which applications for "Habeas
13 Corpus", as provided for by Section 125 of the 1991 Constitution of the Republic of
14 Sierra Leone, can be brought. This Section provides as follows:

15
16 'The Supreme Court shall have supervisory jurisdiction over all other Courts in
17 Sierra Leone and over any adjudicating authority, and in the exercise of its
18 supervisory jurisdiction shall have power to issue such directions, orders or writs
19 including writ of "Habeas Corpus", orders of certiorari, mandamus and prohibition,
20 as it may consider appropriate for purposes of enforcing or securing the enforcement
21 of its supervisory powers.'

22
23 This argument, the Respondent submits, should be rejected. In making this
24 submission, the Respondent relies on the provisions of Sections 10 and 11 of the
25 Special Court Agreement 2002 Ratification Act, 2002.

26
27 Section 10 of this Act reads and I quote:

28
29 "The Special Court shall exercise the jurisdiction and the powers conferred upon it
30 by the agreement in the manner provided in the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of

1 the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in force at the time of the
2 establishment of the Special Court as adapted for purposes of the Special Court by
3 the Judges of the Special Court as a whole”.

4
5 Section 11 (2) of the same Ratification Act provides as follows and I quote:

6 “The Special Court shall not form part of the judiciary of Sierra Leone”.

7
8 In his oral arguments in Court, Mr. Terry, Counsel for the Applicant, urged me to
9 hold and to declare that the Provisions of Section 11 (2) of the 2002 Ratification Act,
10 in so far as they are contrary to or inconsistent with the provisions of Sections 125 of
11 the Constitution of Sierra Leone, should, to the extent of that inconsistency, be
12 declared unconstitutional and to quote him, “ex facie” null and void.

13
14 Mr. Terry went further and urged me to stay these proceedings and to state a case to
15 the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone for a directive on what he called ‘this important
16 constitutional question’. It is in the background of these arguments that I will now
17 proceed to examine the merits and demerits of the application before me.

18
19 On the preliminary issue of the propriety of the Special Court entertaining an
20 application for “Habeas Corpus”, a fact which surfaces in the proceedings, albeit
21 subtly, as a preliminary objection by the Respondents to this application, I will like to
22 observe that this historic Common Law Writ is founded basically on the principle
23 that no individual should be subjected to an illegal detention.

24
25 Indeed, one of the most regularly and too-often deplored breaches of human rights
26 today is the violation of individual liberties which are guaranteed not only by the
27 provisions of Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights but also, by
28 practically all democratically inspired Constitutions of Countries of the world, and
29 particularly, those of Member States of the United Nations Organisation.

1 It is my opinion that because the right to liberty is too sacred to be violated by
2 whoever, any Court faced with or called upon to rule on applications of this nature,
3 in whatever form they may be brought, should, for reasons based on the universal
4 resolve and determination to uphold by all lawful means, respect by all and sundry
5 and in all circumstances, of this entrenched fundamental human right, should
6 entertain such applications and refrain from dismissing them merely on technical
7 pretexts or niceties, geared at and designed to prevent them from being entertained
8 and examined.

9
10 This is the philosophy that has guided me all along in granting the application “ex-
11 parte” on the 18th of June 2003, for leave to file the substantive application for the
12 issue of the writ of “Habeas Corpus”. In so doing, I agree with the submission of the
13 Respondents that the procedure for granting a release through a Writ of “Habeas
14 Corpus” features nowhere in the Rules for Procedure and Evidence which are
15 applicable to the Special Court. However, entertaining this Writ is dictated by the
16 imperatives of universally ensuring the respect of human rights and liberties.

17
18 Besides, this application can be assimilated to a motion brought under Section 73 of
19 our Rules of Procedure and Evidence which, like in this case, which, just as a single
20 Judge can handle applications for Writs of “Habeas Corpus”, confers on a single
21 Judge of the Trial Chamber designated under Rules 28 of the Rules of Procedure, the
22 right to handle issues of this nature, after hearing the parties.

23
24 In the case of the *Prosecutor vs Radoslav Brdanin*, in the matter of an application
25 for the issue of a writ of “Habeas Corpus” in the favour of the Applicant, the Trial
26 Chamber of The International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia (ICTY), on the 8th
27 of December, 1999, composed of His Lordship, Judge Antonio Cassese, Presiding,
28 and Their Lordships, Florence Ndepele Mwachande Mumba ,and David Hunt,
29 Judges, had this to say:

1 “This Tribunal has no power to issue Writs in the name of any Sovereign or other
2 Head of State. But the Tribunal certainly does have both the power and the
3 procedure to resolve a challenge to the lawfulness of detainees in detention.”
4

5 This decision was preceded by that of *Jean Bosco Barayagwiza vs The Prosecutor*,
6 where the Appeal’s Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunal of Rwanda
7 (ICTR) presided over by His Lordship. Judge Gabrielle Kirk Mc Donald, flanked by
8 Their Lordships, Judges Mohamed Shahabuddeen, Lalchand Vorah, Wang Tieya and
9 Rafael Nieto-Navia, made the following remarks, and I quote;

10
11 “Although neither the Statute nor the Rules specifically addressed Writs of “Habeas
12 Corpus” as such, the notion that a detained individual shall have recourse to an
13 independent judicial officer for a review of the detaining authorities’ act, is well
14 established by Statute and Rules”.

15
16 In the light of the above analysis, I hold that the Applicant’s Writ of “Habeas
17 Corpus” is properly before me, and this, notwithstanding the objection of Learned
18 Counsel for the Respondents, Mr. Browne-Marke, based on the failure of the
19 Applicant to file a proper substantive Writ after he had obtained leave to file same.
20 In this regard, I will like to observe that an examination of the traditional practice in
21 filing Writs of “Habeas Corpus” is, as in this case, and as it is indeed permissible, to
22 couple the application for leave with the substantive application and to file and serve
23 them at the same time since the application for leave to file Writs of this nature is
24 hardly refused at that preliminary level.

25
26 Turning now to the merits and substance of this application, one of the very hotly
27 contested and interesting issues in this matter is whether, as Mr Terry, Counsel for
28 the Applicant contends, the Special Court is part of the judicial hierarchy of the
29 Courts of Sierra Leone as provided for under the provisions of the Constitution of
30 the Republic of Sierra Leone.

1
2 It should be recalled here that the Special Court was created by Resolution No.
3 1315, 2000 of the Security Council dated the 14th of August, 2000, and an
4 Agreement dated the 16th of January, 2002, signed between the United Nations and
5 the Government of Sierra Leone to which is annexed, the Statute that forms an
6 integral part of the said Agreement. The Special Court was so created because of the
7 deep concern expressed by the Security Council at the very serious crimes committed
8 within the territory of Sierra Leone, against the People of Sierra Leone and the
9 United Nations and Associated Personnel, and the need to create an independent
10 Special Court to prosecute persons who bear the greatest responsibility for the
11 commission of serious violations of international humanitarian law and crimes
12 committed under the Sierra Leonean law.

13
14 Article 1(2) of the Agreement setting up the Special Court stipulates as follows and I
15 quote:

16
17 “The Special Court shall function in accordance with the Statute of the Special
18 Court for Sierra Leone. The Statute is annexed to this Agreement and forms an
19 integral part thereof.”

20
21 Article 14 (1) of the Statute provides as follows and I quote:

22
23 “The Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Criminal Tribunal for
24 Rwanda obtaining at the time of the establishment of the Special Court shall be
25 applicable mutatis mutandis to the conduct of legal proceedings before the Special
26 Court.”

27
28 Sub-Section 2 of the same Article provides as follows and I quote:
29

1 “The Judges of the Special Court as a whole may amend the Rules of Procedure and
2 Evidence or adopt additional rules where the applicable Rules do not or do not
3 adequately provide for a specific situation. In so doing, they may be guided, as
4 appropriate, by the Criminal Procedure Act, 1965, of Sierra Leone.”
5

6 This provision underscores the fact that the Sierra Leonean Criminal Procedure Act,
7 1965 which is an emanation of the Sierra Leonean Parliament, the Municipal
8 Legislative Organ of this Country and which regulates the procedure and conduct of
9 proceedings in all Courts vested with criminal jurisdiction by the 1991 Constitution
10 of the Republic of Sierra Leone, is not applicable to the proceedings in the Special
11 Court, even though it equally, like the Sierra Leonean Criminal Courts, is vested
12 with an essentially criminal jurisdiction, albeit, of an international character.
13

14 Pursuant to the provisions of Article 14 sub 1 and sub 2 of the Statute, all Judges of
15 the Special Court of Sierra Leone at a Plenary Meeting held in London, adopted, on
16 the 8th of March, 2003, Rules of Procedure and Evidence which today are applicable
17 in the functioning of the Special Court and very independently of any other Rules
18 of Procedure and Evidence and least still, of those contained in the Sierra
19 Leonean 1965 Criminal Procedure Act, or any other which are an emanation of the
20 municipal legislative mechanisms of the Republic of Sierra Leone.
21

22 Viewed from another perspective, the Special Court of Sierra Leone holds its
23 existence, not to the Constitution or to the Parliament of the Republic of Sierra
24 Leone, but solely to the Security Council Resolution No: 1315 2000, of the 14th of
25 August 2000 and the International Agreement between the United Nations and the
26 Government of Sierra Leone which set it up. This Resolution and Agreement are
27 both international instruments which had to come into force as required by
28 international law and practice, following a ratification instrument of the Government
29 of Sierra Leone. It is this formality that warranted the enactment by the Sierra
30 Leonean Parliament, of the Special Court Agreement Ratification Act 2000, and this,

1 very long after the coming into force of the 1991 Constitution of the Republic of
2 Sierra Leone.

3
4 From these dates, it can be deduced that the Sovereign People and the equally
5 Sovereign Parliament of the Republic of Sierra Leone, in enacting the 1991
6 Constitution in time of peace, never could have enacted or even envisaged
7 constitutional provisions for structures which were supposed to regulate a post civil
8 war stabilizing institution which is what the Special Court of Sierra Leone represents
9 today.

10
11 In interpreting therefore the provisions of Sections 125 of the Constitution of the
12 Republic of Sierra Leone or of any other provisions, I am guided by the dictum in the
13 case of the *Bank of England vs Vagliano Brothers* where His Lordship, The Learned
14 Lord Justice Herschel had this to say:

15
16 'I think the proper course is in the first instance to examine the language of the
17 Statute and to ask what its natural meaning is'. The natural meaning, the natural
18 interpretation of Section 125 and other provisions of the Sierra Leonean
19 Constitution is that these provisions are only meant to apply to the Courts of Sierra
20 Leone and the Courts which come within the judicial hierarchy of the Constitution
21 of the Republic of Sierra Leone.

22
23 I therefore hold that application of Section 125 and other sections of the
24 Constitution which had been referred to by Learned Counsel for the Applicant, is
25 only limited to the Courts created by the 1991 Constitution of Sierra Leone and not
26 to a post 1991 International creation that owes its existence to an international
27 instrument of the Security Council and an equally International Agreement between
28 the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone.

1 To crown it all, Section 10 of the Special Court Agreement Ratification Act provides,
2 and I quote:

3
4 'The Special Court shall exercise its jurisdiction and powers conferred upon it by the
5 Agreement.' Section 11(2) of the same Ratification Act provides:

6
7 "The Special Court shall not form part of the Judiciary of Sierra Leone."
8

9 In the course of arguments in Court, Learned Counsel for the Applicant, Mr Terence
10 Terry, urged me to state a case to the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone on the
11 constitutionality of the provisions of Article 11 (2) of the Ratification Act 2002
12 which he submitted, are unconstitutional in so far as they are inconsistent with the
13 provisions of the 1991 Constitution of the Republic of Sierra Leone.
14

15 It is my considered opinion in this regard that the jurisdiction of the Special Court is
16 limited only to matters that fall under the provisions of the Statute and the
17 Agreement. Indeed, nowhere in these two instruments is the Special Court of Sierra
18 Leone subjected to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone, nor is it
19 empowered or authorised to state cases to that Court or even to get into examining
20 issues relating to constitutionality or even arrogating itself with the competence of
21 declaring unconstitutional, a sovereign enactment of the Sovereign Legislature of the
22 Republic of Sierra Leone or Acts of its Executive Organs.
23

24 I therefore hold, from the foregoing analysis, that the Special Court, even though
25 created by a special International Agreement between the United Nations and the
26 Government of Sierra Leone, and even though, by that same International
27 Agreement, Distinguished Judges, Counsels and Jurists of Sierra Leonean origin are
28 appointed to serve on it, is not, should not, and cannot be considered as forming an
29 integral part of Courts of the Republic of Sierra Leone. Rather, it is, to all intents
30 and purposes, a Special International Criminal Jurisdiction whose mandate is

1 defined by Security Council Resolution Number 1315, 2000 of the 14th of
2 August, 2000, and further that all appeals from the Trial Chamber of the Special
3 Court lie, in the last resort, not to the Supreme Court of The Republic of Sierra
4 Leone, but before its Appeal Chamber which is the highest and final jurisdiction in
5 its judicial hierarchy. It therefore has no connection with the Supreme Court of
6 Sierra Leone nor is it subjected to its jurisdiction, supervisory or otherwise.

7
8 Having examined the constitutional, procedural, and jurisdictional issues of this
9 matter, I will now address the most important aspect on which the application for
10 "Habeas Corpus" is based, that is, the alleged illegality of the detention of the
11 Applicant.

12
13 In this regard, I would like to refer to a very well known principle that was laid
14 down in the case of *Zamir vs the United Kingdom* 40 DR 42 at page 102 where it
15 was decided that the burden of proving the legality of the detention rests on the
16 State. In contesting the legality of the detention of the Applicant, Learned Counsel,
17 Mr. Terry, contends that the Applicant in his affidavit affirms that his name is
18 Tamba Alex Brima and not Alex Tamba Brima as appears in the indictment filed by
19 the Prosecutor and subsequently approved by His Lordship, Judge Bankole
20 Thompson pursuant to the provisions of Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure and
21 Evidence.

22
23 To buttress this argument, Counsel for the Applicant alleges that the indictment
24 contains erroneous information in that it alleges that his client had joined the Sierra
25 Leonean Army in 1985 and rose to the rank of a Staff Sergeant. He argues and has
26 produced documentary evidence of correspondences his Chambers has had with the
27 Headquarters of the Sierra Leonean Army, showing that the Applicant has never
28 been enrolled in the Sierra Leonean Army. He therefore contends that the said
29 indictment was fundamentally flawed. He also argued that the warrant of arrest was
30 equally flawed for similar reasons.

1
2 On the contested identity of the Applicant, I observe from the indictment that it
3 reads as follows: The Prosecutor versus Alex Tamba Brima also known as aka Tamba
4 Alex Brima aka Gullit. Could this not be interpreted as charging the same Applicant
5 before me who admits that his real names are Tamba Alex Brima as is alleged in the
6 indictment? Besides, the indictment alleges and attaches another name to the
7 Applicant's name, that is, 'Gullit'. When the Applicant was called up with all these
8 names and arraigned before me on the 17th of March, 2003, as well as when he was
9 called up and again appeared before me on the 15th of July, 2003, he, also known as
10 (aka) Tamba Alex Brima Aka Gullit, did not contest the fact that he is also called
11 'Gullit'

12
13 Since he took the plea as Alex Tamba Brima, I will like to imagine without
14 concluding, that he could be one and the same person that the Prosecutor is
15 targeting as Alex Tamba Brima. Even if a doubt is created in respect of his having
16 served in the Sierra Leonean Army, I cannot at this stage, as a designated Pre-trial
17 Judge, resolve this issue which I consider properly within the competence and
18 jurisdiction of the Trial Chamber and which, in my judgement, is the rightful venue
19 to examine evidence on those facts which touch on the indictment and on the
20 warrant of arrest in the course of the trial of the Applicant.

21
22 Learned Counsel for the Applicant also challenged the legality of the warrant of
23 arrest on the basis that it did not contain an Order by the Judge to specifically arrest
24 Tamba Alex Brima. In this regard, I observe that the relevant provisions of Rules 47
25 (H) and 55 do not consecrate a format for a warrant of arrest. It would appear to me
26 sufficient, if, as the instant warrant does, the name of the person to be arrested is
27 specified and the said person is identified and arrested accordingly. In any event,
28 having been taken into custody, a mere technical flaw in the warrant of arrest neither
29 renders the said arrest nor the detention based on that arrest, illegal.
30

1 On the contention by learned Counsel for the Applicant that the approved
2 indictment was flawed in that it was signed ex-parte by the Judge when a prima-facie
3 case was not established by the Prosecutor, I would like to refer to the relevant
4 portions of the Rules.

5
6 Under Rule 47 (A), the Judge is conferred with powers to approve the indictment.

7
8 Under Section 47 (C) It is stated that the indictment shall contain and be sufficient
9 if it contains the name and particulars of the suspect, a statement of each specific
10 offence of which the named suspect is charged, and a short description of the
11 particulars of the offence. It shall be accompanied by a Prosecutor's summary briefly
12 setting out the allegations he proposes to prove in making his case.

13
14 Under Section 47 (E), the designated Judge shall review the indictment and the
15 accompanying material to determine whether the indictment should be approved.

16 The Judge shall approve the indictment if he is satisfied that:

17
18 (a) "The indictment charges the suspect with a crime or crimes within the jurisdiction
19 of the Special Court"; and

20 (b) "The allegations in the Prosecutor's summary would, if proven, amount to the
21 crime or crimes as particularized in the indictment"

22
23 From the foregoing analysis, it is clear that the Application by the Prosecutor for the
24 approval of the indictment is made to the Judge ex-parte and that the Judge, in my
25 opinion, either applying the objective or subjective test, approves it as such. The
26 Prosecutor cannot indeed at that stage, without having called evidence in Court, be
27 expected to establish a prima-facie case nor can the Judge, in such circumstances,
28 without evidence having been so adduced, so find. Indeed, all the indictment needs
29 to satisfy for it to be approved is what is contained in Rule 47 (E) and not that the
30 documents so submitted should establish a prima-facie case against the accused.

1 Once the Judge at this stage is satisfied that the indictment and the facts
2 accompanying it, if proven, amounts to the crime or crimes particularized in the
3 indictment, he should, without more, like His Lordship, Judge Bankole Thompson
4 did, sign the indictment so submitted by the Prosecutor.

5
6 Since this argument, like all others relating to the illegality of the Applicant's
7 detention, fail to justify the case the Applicant set out to establish in order to secure
8 the immediate release by the granting and issuing of a Writ of "Habeas Corpus", I
9 accordingly dismiss it and at the same time, dismiss the application for the issue of
10 the Writ of "Habeas Corpus in his favour because the arguments of Learned Counsel
11 for the Applicant, Mr. Terence Michael Terry, even though very profoundly and
12 ingenuously presented, lack the legal merits to meet the standards required for the
13 issue of a Writ of this nature, and particularly in a situation such as this, where the
14 Prosecution has fully discharged the burden placed on it to justify the legality of the
15 Applicant's detention.

16
17 The application for the issue of this Writ is therefore refused and is accordingly
18 dismissed.

19
20 The Applicant will continue to remain in custody.

21
22
23 Done at Freetown, this 22nd day of July 2003

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

HIS LORDSHIP, THE RT. HON. JUDGE BENJAMIN MUTANGA ITOE.

