

(1554 - 15~~69~~⁷²)**IN THE TRIAL CHAMBER**

Before: Judge Bankole Thompson
 Judge Pierre Boutet
 Judge Benjamin Mutanga Itoe

Registrar: Mr. Robin Vincent

Date Filed: 19th April 2004

PROSECUTOR against

MORRIS KALLON

(Case SCSL-2004-15-PT)


**DEFENCE MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COUNSEL TO FILE A
 RESPONSE TO "PROSECUTION MOTION FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE AND
 ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE"**

Office of the Prosecutor:

Luc Cote, Chief of Prosecutions
 Robert Petit, Senior Trial Attorney
 Paul Flynn
 Abdul Tejan-Cole
 Leslie Taylor
 Boi-Tia Stevens
 Christopher Santora
 Sharan Parmar

Defence:

Shekou Touray
 Raymond M. Brown
 Melron Nicol-Wilson
 Wilfred Bola Carrol



INTRODUCTION

1. The Defence for Morris Kallon files this “Request for an Extension of Time to File a Response” to the Prosecution “Motion for Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence” pursuant to Rules 7 (C) and 92 *bis* (C) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

2. The Accused Morris Kallon is indicted before the Special Court for Sierra Leone pursuant to a Warrant of Arrest and Indictment dated the 7th March 2003, which Indictment has been consolidated by Order of the Trial Chamber on the 27th January 2004¹.
3. On the 1st May 2003, the Registrar provisionally appointed Messrs James Oury and Steven Powles as Assigned Counsel for Morris Kallon.
4. On the 10th December 2003, Mr. James Oury agreed to represent the Accused under the terms of a Legal Services Contract entered into with the Principal Defender.
5. On the 16th February 2004, Morris Kallon wrote a letter to the Principal Defender requesting the withdrawal of Assignment of Counsel.
6. On the 27th February 2004, the Principal Defender issued a decision withdrawing Messrs Oury and Powles as Counsel for Morris Kallon.
7. On the 17th March 2004, the Principal Defender provisionally assigned Mr. Shekou Touray as new Counsel for Morris Kallon.
8. Relevant materials pertaining to Morris Kallon’s case are still in the custody and possession of Messrs Oury and Powles and have not been returned to the Defence Office for onward transmission to Mr. Shekou Touray, the new Assigned Counsel.
9. On the 13th April 2004, Morris Kallon authorised Messrs Oury and Powles to immediately hand over all relevant materials in their possession pertaining to his case to the Defence Office and to Mr. Shekou Touray and members of his new Defence team. The authorization is set out in “ **Annex A**” attached to this Motion.

Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon and Gbao (SCSL-2004-15-PT)

10. Messrs Oury and Powles have communicated with the Defence Office promising to respond within a week, as set out in “**Annex B**” attached to this Motion.
11. On the 3rd March 2004 the Prosecution filed a Motion for “Request to Admit” on the Defence. On the 2nd April 2004, the Prosecution filed a “Motion for Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence”.
12. The Defence Office on behalf of Morris Kallon responded to the “Request to Admit” arguing that it would be “premature” to respond to the Request in the absence of complete disclosure of all materials by the Prosecution.
13. The “Motion for Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence” in Paragraph 3 concedes that the facts stated in the “Request to Admit” are similar in nature to the facts sought to be judicially noticed or admitted in evidence.
14. There are also Preliminary Motions on issues that go to the substratum of the proceedings which await determination by the Trial Chamber including the following:
 - a) The Defence “Motion for Quashing the Consolidated Indictment” filed on the 10th February 2004
 - b) The Prosecution “Request for Leave to Amend the Indictment” filed on the 9th February 2004.
16. The Prosecution’s disclosure obligations under the Rules of Procedure and Evidence are continuing and for the moment incomplete.

LEGAL BASIS FOR THIS MOTION

17. The right of the Accused are enshrined in Art. 17 of the Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, which provides that: -

“1. All accused shall be equal before the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

[...]

4. In the determination of any charge against the Accused pursuant to the present Statute, he or she will be entitled to the following minimum guarantees in full equality.

b) To have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his or her defence and to communicate with Counsel of his or her choosing.

Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon and Gbao (SCSL-2004-15-PT)

e) *To examine or have examined, the witnesses against him or her and to obtain the attendances and examination of witnesses on his or her behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him or her.*"

18. Article 25 of the Directive on the Assignment of Counsel further stipulates:

"(B) Where the assignment of Counsel is withdrawn by the Principal Defender, or where the services of Assigned Counsel are discontinued, said Counsel must deliver within 15 days of withdrawal all the original documents in the file to the Counsel who succeeds him or to the Defence Office who will then forward the materials to the new Assigned Counsel or where the Suspect or Accused has chosen to represent himself, to the Suspect or Accused."

SUBMISSIONS**Need for adequate preparation and fair trial.**

19. The Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, the Rules of Procedure and Evidence and the Directive on the Assignment of Counsel, do in substance guarantee the need for an Accused person to be given adequate time and necessary facilities for the preparation of a proper defence in order to ensure due process and a fair trial.
20. The provision for an Accused to an Assigned Counsel under the Directive on the Assignment of Counsel would not be discharged by an assignment at such time or under such circumstances as would preclude the giving of effective aid and reasonable time in the preparation and presentation of his defence.
21. Assigned Counsel must be given the opportunity to obtain all the relevant and background materials essential to the defence for him to adequately and effectively marshal the Defence Case and respond to pending matters in the proceedings.
22. The rules on Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence are of a secondary nature and are intended to enhance judicial economy on time, but not to overreach the minimum guarantees provided for the benefit of the Accused under the Statute.
23. Substantially, the facts sought to be judicially noticed and admitted in evidence under the Prosecution Motion touch on complex matters which go into matters in issue and which if

Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon and Gbao (SCSL-2004-15-PT)

allowed to go through without effective response would tend to undermine the minimum guarantee the Accused has under the Statute to confront witnesses against him.

24. International Jurisprudence supports the granting of extension of time in the interest of justice. Extensions of time have been granted for diverse reasons such as, the fact that Counsel has only recently been appointed²; the complexity of the case³; the need to prepare a case within reasonable extended time limits⁴; the necessity to prepare a number of Grounds of Appeals⁵; the fact that Counsel underestimated the time needed to undertake extensive legal research.⁶

Good Cause

25. Assigned Counsel has since the 17th March 2004, the date of his Assignment, been engaged in several consultations with the Defence Office and Morris Kallon on the setting up of an effective Defence team. In the midst of that he has been busy familiarising himself with the Status of the case, interviewing the Client, obtaining instructions, setting up of an investigating machinery and preparing Case and Stage Plans amongst other things.
26. The Defence team has just recently been completed, whereupon several team consultations have been held and tasks assigned with a view to preparing an effective Defence within the limited time available before trial.
27. Further, the new Defence team has yet to be furnished with other relevant materials on the Case still in the possession of Messrs Oury and Powles previously representing Morris Kallon, and which are essential to assist them in formulating a firm position on the Prosecution Motion.
28. It is submitted that there is good and sufficient cause for seeking an extension of time to respond to the Prosecution “Motion for Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence” and that given time the Defence will be ably put in position to respond appropriately.

² *Prosecutor v. Dragen Obrenovic: Order Granting an Extension of Time, 4th October 2001*

³ *Prosecutor v. Dusko Tadic: Decision on Motion for Extension of Time Limit, 21st November 2000*

⁴ *Prosecutor v. Zoran Zigic : Decision on the Defence Motion to extend the Time Limit for submitting Preliminary Motions, 24th June 1998*

⁵ *Elizaphan Ntakirutimana and Gerard Ntakirutimana v. The Prosecutor: Order granting Extension of Time for the filing of the Appellants Appeal Briefs.*


⁶ *Prosecutor v. Radislav Krstic: Order for the Extension of Time, 1st May 2003.*

Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon and Gbao (SCSL-2004-15-PT)

29. It is further submitted that what constitutes “good cause” would depend on the circumstances of the case and the merits of the request, and that the circumstances herein adumbrated clearly disclose a genuine and well deserving case for an extension of time and are not purposively designed to delay the proceedings.
30. The Special Court has in the past granted extensions of time in deserving cases on grounds that good and sufficient cause have been shown, although equally concerned about the need to maintain a fair and expeditious trial.
31. It is in the interest of justice and for the purpose of ensuring a fair trial in accordance with the Statute, the Directive on the Assignment of Counsel and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence that an extension of time be granted to the Defence to respond to the Prosecution Motion.

RELIEF SOUGHT

32. The Defence in the light of the foregoing seeks an extension of time to respond to the Prosecution “ Motion for Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence” and prays the Trial Chamber to grant an extension of time to the Defence of 21 days from the delivery of Defence materials in the possession of Messrs Oury and Powles to the Defence Office and/or to Assigned Counsel and in any event conditional upon full compliance by the Prosecution of its disclosure obligations under the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.



Shekou Touray

Lead Counsel

19th April 2004

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

- The Prosecutor v. Dragen Obrenovic, Vidoje Blagojevic, Dragean Jokic: Order granting an Extension of time IT-01-43-Pt, 4th October 2001.
- The Prosecutor v. Dusko Tadic: Decision on Motion for Extension of Time Limit, 21st November 2000
- The Prosecutor v. Zoran Zigic: Decision on the Defence Motion to Extend the Time Limit for Submitting Preliminary Motions, 24th June 1998
- Elizaphan Ntakirutimana and Gerard Ntakirutimana v. The Prosecutor: Order Granting an Extension of Time for the Filing of the Appellants Appeal Briefs, Case No. ICTR- 96-10-A and ICTR-96-17-A, 20th May 2003
- The Prosecutor v. Radislav Krstic: Order for an Extension of Time, Case IT-98-33-A, 1st May 2003



SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
 JOMO KENYATTA ROAD • FREETOWN • SIERRA LEONE
 PHONE: +39 0831 257000 or +232 22 297000 or +39 083125 (+Ext)
 UN Intermission 178 7000 or 178 (+Ext)
 FAX: +232 22 297001 or UN Intermission: 178 7001

THE PROSECUTOR v MORRIS KALLON -SCSL -2004-15-PT

For the attention of Messrs. James Oury and Steven Powles

I, Morris Kallon, an Accused presently detained at the Special Court Detention Facility at New England Ville, Freetown and awaiting trial do hereby authorize my former Counsel, Messrs. James Oury and Steven Powles to immediately hand over all or any documents in their possession relating to my case to the Defence Office of the Special Court for Sierra Leone and Mr. Shekou Touray, my new Counsel together with other members of my new defence team including Messrs. Raymond Brown, Bola Carrol and Melron Nicol-Wilson.

I also authorize Messrs. Oury and Powles to answer any and all questions relating to my case that may be posed by my new Counsel, Mr. Shekou Touray and other members of his Defence team.

Dated this 13 day of April 2004

Signed.....Mallon.....

Morris Kallon

Witnessed by.....Lansana Dumbuya.....

Lansana Dumbuya
 Defence Investigator

Case: IT-01-43-PT
IT-98-33/1-PT
IT-01-44-PT

IN THE TRIAL CHAMBER

Before:

**Judge David Hunt, Presiding Judge
Judge Florence Mumba
Judge Liu Daqun**

Registrar:

Mr Hans Holthuis

Decision of:

4 October 2001

Prosecutor v Dragan OBRENOVIC

Prosecutor v Vidoje BLAGOJEVIC

Prosecutor v Dragan JOKIC

ORDER GRANTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

The Office of the Prosecutor:

**Mr Peter McCloskey
Mr Mark Vlastic
Ms Janet Stewart**

Counsel for accused

**Mr David Wilson for Dragan Obrenovic
Mr Michael G Karnavas for Vidoje Blagojevic
Mr Miodrag Stojanovic for Dragan Jokic**

I Judge David Hunt, Pre-Trial Judge,

NOTING the "Prosecution's Motion for Joinder" ("Motion") filed on 11 September 2001 and the order of the President of 14 September 2001 assigning the Motion to Trial Chamber II for determination;

NOTING the "Scheduling Order" ("Order") issued by the Pre-Trial Judge on 18 September 2001 ordering that the accused Dragan Obrenovic ("Obrenovic"), Vidoje Blagojevic ("Blagojevic") and Dragan Jokic ("Jokic") file within 14 days of the date of the Order a response to the Motion of the prosecution;

NOTING the "Accused's Request for Extension of Time to File an Opposition to Prosecutor's Motion for Joinder" ("Request") filed by Counsel for the accused Blagojevic on 27 September 2001 seeking an extension of time of 60 days from the time of full disclosure by the Prosecutor pursuant to Rule 66 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence ("Rules");

NOTING the "Prosecution Reply to Accused's Request for Extension of Time to File An Opposition to Prosecutor's Motion for Joinder" ("Reply") filed on 2 October 2001 in which the Prosecutor objects to the extension of time sought on the basis that the Request is "misleading" as the Prosecutor has met and exceeded her disclosure requirements pursuant to Rule 66 (A) (i);

NOTING FURTHER that the Prosecutor does not object to the granting of an extension of time to Blagojevic of 30 days from 17 September 2001;

NOTING FURTHER that Jokic has only recently retained trial counsel to appear for him;

NOTING FURTHER the "Accused Obrenovic's Opposition to Motion for Joinder" ("Opposition") filed by Counsel for Obrenovic on 2 October 2001 in which Obrenovic seeks permission to file a supplemental memorandum on the issue of joinder no later than the final date set by the Tribunal for the filing of oppositions to joinder by Blagojevic and Jokic;

CONSIDERING that good cause has been shown for an extension of the time in which all three accused have to respond,

BUT CONSIDERING that the Request by Blagojevic proceeds upon a mistaken basis as to the nature of the issue to be determined by the Motion, and that the time sought by him in which to respond to the Motion is excessive and unjustified;

PURSUANT TO Rule 65 *bis* of the Rules;

HEREBY ORDERS:

1. That Blagojevic and Jokic are granted an extension of time of 30 days from the date of this Order to respond to the Prosecutor's Motion.
2. That Obrenovic is granted an extension of 30 days from the date of this Order to file a supplementary memorandum to the accused Obrenovic's Opposition to the Motion.

Dated this 4th day of October 2001,
At The Hague,
The Netherlands.

Judge David Hunt
Pre-Trial Judge

[Seal of the Tribunal]

THE APPEALS CHAMBER OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL

Before:

**President Claude Jorda
Judge Mohamed Bennouna
Judge Patricia Wald
Judge Fausto Pocar
Judge Liu Daqun**

Registrar:

Mrs. Dorothee de Sampayo Garrido-Nijgh

Decision of:

21 November 2000

THE PROSECUTOR

v.

DUSKO TADIC

**DECISION ON MOTION
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME-LIMIT**

Counsel to Appellant:

Mr. Vladimir Domazet, for Milan Vujin

The Office of the Prosecutor:

Mr. Upawansa Yapa

Other parties:

Mr. Anthony Abell

THE APPEALS CHAMBER of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (hereinafter "the International Tribunal"),

NOTING the Motion by interested party, Dusko Tadic, to vary, by extension, the time-limit prescribed for a response to the Appellant's Brief filed in English on 14 November 2000 (hereinafter "the Motion"),

NOTING the Decision on the Application for leave to appeal rendered on 27 October 2000,

NOTING the Appellant's Brief filed in English on 3 November 2000 (hereinafter "the Brief"),

PURSUANT to Rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (hereinafter "the Rules") and the Practice Direction on Procedure for the Filing of Written Submissions in Appeal Proceedings before the International Tribunal (IT/155) (hereinafter "the Direction"),

CONSIDERING that, pursuant to Article 8 of the Direction, a Respondent's Brief must be filed within ten days of the filing of the Brief, that is, in this case, by no later than 13 November 2000,

CONSIDERING that, in the Motion, Dusko Tadic contends *inter alia* that good cause within the meaning of Rule 127(B) of the Rules is: (i) he received the Brief on 6 November 2000 and (ii) the issues raised in the case are complex,

CONSIDERING that pursuant to Rule 127(B) of the Rules, the Appeals Chamber may enlarge any time prescribed by or under the Rules on good cause being shown by motion,

CONSIDERING that the grounds put forward constitute good cause within the meaning of Rule 127(B) of the Rules bearing in mind the specific circumstances of the case,

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS,

ORDERS that the Respondent's Brief be filed no later than Friday, 1 December 2000,

Done in French and English, the French version being authoritative.

Done this twenty-first day of November 2000
At The Hague
The Netherlands

(signed)

Claude Jorda
President of the International Tribunal

[Seal of the Tribunal]



International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
Tribunal pénal international pour le Rwanda

IN THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before: Judge Mehmet GÜNEY, Pre-Appeal Judge

Registrar: Mr. Adama DIENG

Decision of: 20 May 2003

Élizaphan Ntakirutimana and Gérard Ntakirutimana
v/
THE PROSECUTOR

Case No. ICTR-96-10-A and ICTR-96-17-A

**ORDER GRANTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE FILING OF THE
APPELLANTS' APPEAL BRIEFS**

Counsel for the Prosecutor:

Mr Norman FARRELL

Counsel for Elizaphan Ntakirutimana

Mr Ramsey CLARK

Counsel for Gérard Ntakirutimana

Mr David JACOBS

I, Mehmet Güney, Pre-Appeal Judge,

NOTING the Judgement and Sentence rendered in the present case on 21 February 2003 by Trial Chamber I of the International Tribunal;

NOTING the Notices of Appeal filed pursuant to Rule 108 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence ("the Rules") by Elizaphan Ntakirutimana and Gérard Ntakirutimana ("the Appellants") and the Prosecution respectively on 21 March 2003;

BEING SEISED of an "Urgent Defence Motion for an Extension of Time for the Filing of the Appellants' Briefs", filed jointly by Elizaphan Ntakirutimana and Gérard Ntakirutimana on 9 May 2003 ("the Request") wherein the Appellants request on the basis of Rule 116 of the Rules an extension of time of 45 days from 3 June 2003 in which to file their Appellant Briefs;

NOTING the Prosecution's "Response to Urgent Defence Motion for an Extension of Time for the Filing of the Appellant's Appeal Briefs" filed on 13 May 2003 in which the Prosecution consents to the extension of time sought by the Appellants and requests that any extension of time granted should apply equally to the Prosecution;

NOTING Rule 111 of the Rules, which provides, *inter alia*, that the Appellant's Brief shall be filed within seventy-five days of filing of the Notice of Appeal;

NOTING Rule 116 of the Rules which provides that the Appeals Chamber may grant a motion to extend a time limit upon a showing of good cause;

CONSIDERING that in their Request, the Appellants submit, *inter alia*, that Counsel for Gérard Ntakirutimana is involved in the case *The Prosecutor v. Georges Rutaganda, Case no. ICTR-96-3-A* and that there are a number of grounds of appeal to prepare in the present case;

CONSIDERING that all the other submissions in the Request are not relevant to the Request;

CONSIDERING that the Appellants have indicated that they intend to present submissions on most legal issues in only one brief to avoid repetition;

CONSIDERING that subject to the above, the specific circumstances of the Request constitute good cause in this case;

CONSIDERING, however, that an extension of time of 45 days is not justified in this case;

PURSUANT TO Rule 116 of the Rules;

HEREBY GRANT the Request for an extension of time and **ORDER** that the Appellants and the Prosecution file their Appellant Briefs no later than Monday 23 June 2003.

Done in English and French, the English text being authoritative.

Mehmet Güney
Pre-Appeal Judge

Dated this twentieth day of May 2003,
At The Hague,
The Netherlands.

[Seal of the Tribunal]

IN THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before:
Judge David Hunt, Pre-Appeal Judge

Registrar:
Mr Hans Holthuis

Order of:
1 May 2003

PROSECUTOR
v
Radislav KRSTIC

ORDER ON EXTENSION OF TIME

Counsel for the Prosecution:

Mr Norman Farrell
Mr Mathias Marcussen

Counsel for the Appellant:

Mr Nenad Petrusic
Mr Norman Sepenuk

I, Judge David Hunt, Pre-Appeal Judge in this appeal,

NOTING the "Defence Appeal Brief Concerning Rule 68 Violations", filed confidentially on 10 April 2003 ("Defence Motion");

BEING SEISED OF an "Extremely Urgent Motion for Extension of Time" ("Motion for Extension of Time"), filed by the Prosecution on 1 May 2003, whereby it seeks an extension of time in which to file its Response to the Defence Motion;

NOTING that the Prosecution says that it has underestimated the time needed to undertake the extensive legal research required to address the present matter fully;¹

NOTING the Scheduling Order of 22 April 2003 in which the Appeals Chamber ordered the Prosecution to respond to the Defence Motion no later than 1 May 2003 and invited the Prosecution to pay particular attention when doing so to the issue of prejudice in relation to alleged violations of Rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence;²

CONSIDERING that the number of issues to be dealt with in the Response, including the question

of prejudice, may require additional time for the Prosecution to adequately address these matters;

CONSIDERING also that the Defence has said that it does not object to the extension of time being granted;³

CONSIDERING that good cause has been shown;

HEREBY GRANT LEAVE to the Prosecution to file its Response no later than 8 May 2003.

Done in both English and French, the English text being authoritative.

Done this 1st of May 2003,
At The Hague,
The Netherlands.

Judge David Hunt
Pre-Appeal Judge

[Seal of the Tribunal]

-
1. Motion for Extension of Time, par 2.
 2. Page 2.
 3. Motion for Extension of Time, par 7.

04/13/2004 04:34 PM

cc:
Subject: Fw: Kallon

Ibrahim: For Your Info:

Sylvia Pyne-Caulker
Admin. Assistant
Defence Section
Special Court for Sierra Leone
Jomo Kenyatta Road
New England, Freetown
Sierra Leone

Tel: +232-22-297210 (SL line)
Mobil:+232-22 (0)30 254 408
Home: +232-22-241 815
e-mail:pyne-caulker@un.org
sylvia.pyne@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded by Sylvia Pyne-Caulker/SCSL on 04/13/2004 04:32 PM -----

"SPYNE-CAULKER" <pyne-caulker@un.org>

To: "SPYNE-CAULKER" <pyne-caulker@un.org>

04/13/2004 04:20 PM

cc:
Subject: Kallon

Please open the attached document.
This document was sent to you using an HP Digital Sender.

Sent by: SPYNE-CAULKER <pyne-caulker@un.org>
Number of pages: 1
Document type: B/W Document
Attachment File Format: Adobe PDF

To view this document you need to use the Adobe Acrobat Reader.
For free copy of the Acrobat reader please visit:

<http://www.adobe.com>

For more information on the HP Digital Sender please visit:

<http://www.digitalsender.hp.com>

Ibrahim S Yillah To: Sylvia Pyne-Caulker/SCSL@SCSL
04/14/2004 10:07 AM CC:
Subject: Fw: Kallon

Sylvia,
Could you please file this correspondence in the Kallon file? Many thanks.

----- Forwarded by Ibrahim S Yillah/SCSL on 04/14/2004 10:00 AM -----



Steven Powles
<s.powles@doughtystr
eet.co.uk>
04/13/2004 06:07 PM

To: "Ibrahim S Yillah" <yillah@un.org>
cc:
Subject: RE: Kallon

Dear Ibrahim,

I hope you are well. Thanks for this. I have spoken to James and he will be forwarding appropriate documents to Freetown.

On a separate note - could you please send me a copy of the Appeals Chamber Decision on the Lome Argument and the Constitutionality of the Court Argument I did not receive either of these

Hope to see you soon,

Kind regards

Steven

-----Original Message-----

From: Ibrahim S Yillah [mailto:yillah@un.org]
Sent: 13 April 2004 17:39
To: Steven Powles; Allison.Walsh@ouryclarksolicitors.com
Subject: Fw: Kallon

----- Forwarded by Ibrahim S Yillah/SCSL on 04/13/2004 04:37 PM -----

Sylvia Pyne-Caulker

To: Ibrahim S Yillah/SCSL@SCSL

Ibrahim S Yillah To: Sylvia Pyne-Caulker/SCSL@SCSL
04/14/2004 10:07 AM cc:
Subject: Fw: Kallon

Sylvia,
Could you please file this correspondence in the Kallon file? Many thanks.

----- Forwarded by Ibrahim S Yillah/SCSL on 04/14/2004 10:00 AM -----



Steven Powles
<s.powles@doughtystr
eet.co.uk>
04/13/2004 06:07 PM

To: "Ibrahim S Yillah" <yillah@un.org>
cc:
Subject: RE: Kallon

Dear Ibrahim,

I hope you are well. Thanks for this. I have spoken to James and he will be forwarding appropriate documents to Freetown.

On a separate note - could you please send me a copy of the Appeals Chamber Decision on the Lome Argument and the Constitutionality of the Court Argument I did not receive either of these

Hope to see you soon,

Kind regards

Steven

-----Original Message-----

From: Ibrahim S Yillah [mailto:yillah@un.org]
Sent: 13 April 2004 17:39
To: Steven Powles; Allison.Walsh@ouryclarksolicitors.com
Subject: Fw: Kallon

----- Forwarded by Ibrahim S Yillah/SCSL on 04/13/2004 04:37 PM -----

Sylvia Pyne-Caulker

To: Ibrahim S Yillah/SCSL@SCSL