

AFRICAN UNION
الاتحاد الأفريقي



UNION AFRICAINE
UNIÃO AFRICANA

AFRICAN COURT ON HUMAN AND PEOPLES' RIGHTS
COUR AFRICAINE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME ET DES PEUPLES

IN THE MATTER OF

CHRIZANT JOHN

V.

THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

APPLICATION NO.049/2016

ORDER FOR PROVISIONAL MEASURES

18 NOVEMBER 2016



The Court Composed of; Sylvain ORÉ, President, Ben KIOKO, Vice President, Gérard NIYUNGEKO, El Hadji GUISSÉ, Rafâa BEN ACHOUR, Solomy B. BOSSA, Angelo V. MATUSSE, Ntyam O. MENGUE, Marie-Thérèse MUKAMULISA- Judges; and Robert ENO-Registrar

In the matter of:

CHRIZANT JOHN

V.

THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

After having deliberated,

Makes the following Order,

I. Subject of the Application

1. The Court received, on 1 September 2016, an Application from Chrizant John (hereinafter referred to as “the Applicant”), instituting proceedings against the United Republic of Tanzania (hereinafter referred to as “the Respondent”), for alleged violations of human rights.
2. The Applicant, who is currently detained at Butimba Central Prison, was sentenced to death by the High Court of Tanzania at Bukoba on

26 June 2015. That death sentence was confirmed by the Court of Appeal, which is the highest Court in Tanzania, on 23 February 2016.

3. The Applicant alleges, *inter alia*, that:

- a) The trial Court and the Court of Appeal erred in law and in fact when they relied on Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2, which is a postmortem report of the deceased and a sketch map of the crime scene as evidence to convict him.
- b) The High Court and the Court of Appeal erred when they failed to consider the inconsistencies and contradictions in the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses and visual identification evidence of Veronica John (PW1), thereby resulting in a miscarriage of justice and a violation of his rights.
- c) Both Courts erred in law and in fact when they discarded the evidence of the Applicant and did not give any reason as to why they reached this decision.
- d) Being subjected to the death penalty violates his right to life which is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as Articles 13 and 14 of the Constitution of Tanzania.

II. Procedure before the Court

4. The Application was received at the Registry of the Court on 1 September 2016.
5. Pursuant to Rule 35 of the Rules of Court, on 26 September 2016, the Registry served the Application on the Respondent.

III. Jurisdiction

6. In dealing with an Application, the Court has to ascertain that it has jurisdiction on the merits of the case under Articles 3 and 5 of the Protocol.
7. However, in ordering provisional measures, the Court need not satisfy itself that it has jurisdiction on the merits of the case, but simply needs to satisfy itself, *prima facie*, that it has jurisdiction.¹
8. Article 3(1) of the Protocol provides that “the jurisdiction of the Court shall extend to all cases and disputes submitted to it concerning the interpretation and application of the Charter, this Protocol and any

¹ See Application 002/2013 African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights v Libya (Order for Provisional Measures dated 15 March 2013) and Application 006/2012 African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights v Kenya (Order for Provisional Measures dated 15 March 2013); Application 004/2011 African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights v Libya (Order for Provisional Measures dated 25 March 2011).

other relevant Human Rights instrument ratified by the States concerned”.

9. The Respondent ratified the Charter on 9 March 1984 and the Protocol on 10 February 2006, and is party to both instruments; it equally deposited, on 29 March 2010, a declaration accepting the competence of the Court to receive cases from individuals and Non-Governmental Organisations, within the meaning of Article 34(6) of the Protocol, read together with Article 5(3) of the Protocol.
10. The alleged violations the Applicant is complaining about are guaranteed under Articles 3(2), 4 and 7(1)(c) of the Charter, and the Court therefore has jurisdiction *ratione materiae* over the Application.
11. In light of the foregoing, the Court has satisfied itself that, *prima facie*, it has jurisdiction to deal with the Application.

IV. On the Provisional Measures

12. The Applicant did not request the Court to order Provisional Measures.
13. Under Article 27(2) of the Protocol and Rule 51(1) of the Rules, the Court is empowered to order provisional measures *proprio motu* “in cases of extreme gravity and when necessary to avoid irreparable

harm to persons” and “which it deems necessary to adopt in the interest of the parties or of justice”.

14. It is for the Court to decide in each situation if, in the light of the particular circumstances, it should make use of the power provided for by the aforementioned provisions.
15. The Applicant is on death row and it appears from this Application that there exists a situation of extreme gravity, as well as a risk of irreparable harm to the Applicant.
16. Given the particular circumstances of the case, where the risk of execution of the death penalty will jeopardize the enjoyment of the rights guaranteed under Articles 3(2), 4 and 7(1)(c) of the Charter, the Court has decided to invoke its powers under Article 27(2) of the Protocol.
17. The Court finds that the situation raised in the present Application is of extreme gravity and represents a risk of irreparable harm to the rights of the Applicant as protected by Articles 3(2), 4 and 7(1)(c) of the Charter, if the death sentence were to be carried out.
18. Consequently, the Court holds that the circumstances require an Order for provisional measures, in accordance with Article 27(2) of the Protocol and Rule 51 of its Rules, to preserve the *status quo*, pending the determination of the main Application.

19. For the avoidance of doubt, this Order shall not in any way prejudice any findings the Court shall make regarding its jurisdiction, the admissibility and the merits of the Application.

For these reasons,

20. The Court, unanimously, orders the Respondent to:

a) refrain from executing the death penalty against the Applicant pending the determination of the Application.

b) report to the Court within sixty (60) days from the date of receipt of this Order, on the measures taken to implement the Order.

Done at Arusha, this 18th day of November in the year 2016, in English and French, the English version being authoritative.

Signed:

Sylvain ORÉ, President

Ben KIOKO, Vice President

Gérard NIYUNGEKO, Judge

El Hadji GUISSÉ, Judge

Rafâa BEN ACHOUR, Judge

The image shows five handwritten signatures in blue ink, corresponding to the names listed on the left. The signatures are: 1. Sylvain ORÉ, President (top, large loop); 2. Ben KIOKO, Vice President (second, long horizontal strokes); 3. Gérard NIYUNGEKO, Judge (third, multiple vertical strokes); 4. El Hadji GUISSÉ, Judge (fourth, cursive); 5. Rafâa BEN ACHOUR, Judge (bottom, large loop and horizontal line).

Solomy B. BOSSA, Judge

Angelo V. MATUSSE, Judge

Ntyam O. MENGUE, Judge

Marie-Thérèse MUKAMULISA- Judge; and

Robert ENO-Registrar

Handwritten signatures in blue ink, including the name "BOSSA" at the top, and a signature that appears to be "Angelo" below it.

