

899

SCSL-04-15-T  
(32056-32058)

32056

**SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE**  
**OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR**  
Freetown – Sierra Leone

**TRIAL CHAMBER I**

Before: Hon. Justice Benjamin Itoe, Presiding Judge  
Hon. Justice Pierre Boutet  
Hon. Justice Bankole Thompson

Registrar: Mr. Herman von Hebel

Date filed: 26 November 2007

SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE	
<b>RECEIVED</b>	
COURT MANAGEMENT	
26 NOV 2007	
NAME	<i>Adega Naïma-K</i>
SIGN	<i>Naïma-K</i>
TIME	<i>15:44</i>

**THE PROSECUTOR**

**Against**

**Issa Hassan Sesay**  
**Morris Kallon**  
**Augustine Gbao**

Case No. SCSL-04-15-T

---

**PUBLIC**

**CORRIGENDUM TO “PROSECUTION REPLY TO SESAY DEFENCE RESPONSE TO PROSECUTION APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL DECISION ON THE SESAY DEFENCE MOTION REQUESTING THE LIFTING OF PROTECTIVE MEASURES IN RESPECT OF CERTAIN PROSECUTION WITNESSES”**

---

Office of the Prosecutor:  
Pete Harrison  
Vincent Wagona

Defense Counsel for Issa Hassan Sesay  
Wayne Jordash  
Sareta Ashraph

Defense Counsel for Morris Kallon  
Shekou Touray  
Charles Taku  
Kennedy Ogetto


Defense Counsel for Augustine Gbao  
John Cammegh

1. The Prosecution filed today the “Public Prosecution Reply to Sesay Defence Response to Prosecution Application for Leave to Appeal Decision on the Sesay Defence Motion Requesting the Lifting of Protective Measures in Respect of Certain Prosecution Witnesses” (“**Reply**”).<sup>1</sup>
2. The Reply was filed in response to the Sesay Defence Response (“**Response**”).<sup>2</sup>
3. It has now come to the attention of the Prosecution that there is a typographical error in paragraph 9 of the Reply. The first sentence of paragraph 9 starts: “The Reply also states that ...” and then quotes from paragraph 12 of the *Response*. The first sentence should, therefore, be corrected so that it refers to the Response and read as follows:

The Response also states that “[t]here is a strong presumption in *favour* of ... disclosure to the Defence – rather than it being unusual, novel or in any way exceptional – and the burden lies upon the Prosecution to justify any non-disclosure.”<sup>3</sup>

Filed in Freetown, 26 November 2007

For the Prosecution,



---

Pete Harrison

---

<sup>1</sup> *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-898, “Public Prosecution Reply to Sesay Defence Response to Prosecution Application for Leave to Appeal Decision on the Sesay Defence Motion Requesting the Lifting of Protective Measures in Respect of Certain Prosecution Witnesses”, 26 November 2007 (“**Reply**”).

<sup>2</sup> *Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon and Gbao*, SCSL-04-15-T-884, “Sesay Defence Response to Prosecution Application for Leave to Appeal Decision on the Sesay Defence Motion Requesting the Lifting of Protective Measures in Respect of Certain Prosecution Witnesses,” 19 November 2007 (“**Response**”).

<sup>3</sup> Response, para. 12.

**INDEX OF AUTHORITIES**

*Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon and Gbao*, SCSL-04-15-T-884, “Sesay Defence Response to Prosecution Application for Leave to Appeal Decision on the Sesay Defence Motion Requesting the Lifting of Protective Measures in Respect of Certain Prosecution Witnesses,” 19 November 2007

*Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon and Gbao*, SCSL-04-15-T-898, “Public Prosecution Reply to Sesay Defence Response to Prosecution Application for Leave to Appeal Decision on the Sesay Defence Motion Requesting the Lifting of Protective Measures in Respect of Certain Prosecution Witnesses”, 26 November 2007