

585)

SCSL-03-1-T  
(19301 - 19440)


19301

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

Before: Justice Teresa Doherty, Presiding  
Justice Richard Lussick  
Justice Julia Sebutinde  
Justice El Hadji Malick Sow, Alternate Judge

Registrar: Mr. Herman von Hebel

Date filed: 11 September 2008



**THE PROSECUTOR**

**Against**

**Charles Ghankay Taylor**

Case No. SCSL-03-01-T

---

**PUBLIC WITH CONFIDENTIAL ANNEXES A TO C**

**PROSECUTION NOTICE UNDER RULE 92bis FOR THE ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE RELATED  
TO *INTER ALIA* FREETOWN & WESTERN AREA – TF1-023 & TF1-029**

---

Office of the Prosecutor:

Ms. Brenda J. Hollis  
Ms. Leigh Lawrie

Counsel for the Accused:

Mr. Courtenay Griffiths Q.C.  
Mr. Andrew Cayley  
Mr. Terry Munyard  
Mr. Morris Anyah

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Prosecution submits this filing under Rules 73, 89(C) and 92*bis* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Special Court for Sierra Leone (“**Rules**”).
2. The Prosecution gives notice under Rule 92*bis* of its intention to seek admission of the prior trial transcripts and exhibits which relate to the testimony of TF1-023 and TF1-029 in other proceedings before the Special Court for Sierra Leone (“**SCSL**”)<sup>1</sup>.
3. The material which is the subject of this filing is relevant to the crimes charged in the Second Amended Indictment<sup>2</sup> and committed predominantly in Freetown and the Western Area of Sierra Leone.

## II. APPLICABLE LAW

4. Rule 89 sets out the basic principles to be applied by the Court in relation to the admission of evidence. Rule 89(B) provides that the Chamber: “... shall apply rules of evidence which will best favour a fair determination of the matter before it and are consonant with the spirit of the Statute and the general principles of law”. Further, Rule 89(C) provides the Chamber with the discretion to admit relevant evidence.
5. Rule 92*bis* of the Rules provides that:
  - (A) In addition to the provisions of Rule 92*ter*, a Chamber may, in lieu of oral testimony, admit as evidence, in whole or in part, information including written statements and transcripts, that do not go to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused.
  - (B) The information submitted may be received in evidence if, in the view of the Trial Chamber, it is relevant to the purpose for which it is submitted and if its reliability is susceptible of confirmation.
  - (C) A party wishing to submit information as evidence shall give 10 days notice to the opposing party. Objections, if any, must be submitted within 5 days.
6. Rule 89 constitutes the basic rule regulating the admission of evidence which

---

<sup>1</sup> TF1-023 testified in *Prosecutor v. Brima et al* (SCSL-04-16-T) (“**AFRC trial**”) on 9, 10 March and 7 November 2005; and TF1-029 testified in *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al* (SCSL-04-15-T) (“**RUF trial**”) on 28 November 2005. The Prosecution has identified the portions of the prior testimonies and the related exhibits which it seeks to admit via this notice and these portions and exhibit are provided in **Annexes A to C**.

<sup>2</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-263, “Prosecution’s Second Amended Indictment”, 29 May 2007.

- applies in addition to the more specific provisions contained in Rule 92bis.<sup>3</sup> Rule 89(C) only requires that evidence be *relevant* to be admissible. There is no requirement that the evidence be both relevant and probative.<sup>4</sup>
7. The procedural requirements of Rule 92bis must be met by the party seeking admission of a transcript or statement *in lieu of oral testimony*, in addition to the requirements of Rule 89. Accordingly, for witness specific material to be admitted pursuant to Rules 89(C) and 92bis, the evidence must not go to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused, must be relevant and its reliability susceptible of confirmation. Rule 92bis does not otherwise limit the evidence which might be admitted under it.
  8. The Prosecution, therefore, notifies the Court of its intention to seek the admission under Rules 89(C) and 92bis of the prior trial transcripts and exhibits provided in the **Annexes** hereto which relate to the prior testimony of witnesses TF1-023 and TF1-029.

### III. BACKGROUND

9. On 4 April 2007, the Prosecution filed its Rule 73bis Pre-Trial Conference Materials.<sup>5</sup> As part of these materials, the Prosecution filed a witness list (“**Witness List**”) and, in the introductory pages to the Witness List, advised the Court that it might seek to present the evidence of some witnesses through the admission of prior testimony under Rule 92bis. TF1-023 and TF1-029 were included on the Witness List and identified as being such witnesses.
10. TF1-023 testified in the AFRC trial on 9 and 10 March and 7 November 2005. The witness’ testimony consisted of approximately five hours of examination-in-chief and just over an hour of cross-examination; cross-examination having been delayed until 7 November 2005. This prior testimony is provided in confidential **Annex A**. Three exhibits were admitted through this witness, all under seal. The

---

<sup>3</sup> *Prosecutor v. Slobodan Milošević*, Case No. IT-02-54-AR73.4, “Decision on Interlocutory Appeal on the Admissibility of Evidence-In-Chief in the Form of Written Statements”, 30 September 2003, paras 9-10.

<sup>4</sup> *Prosecutor v. Brima et al.*, SCSL-04-16-T-280, “Decision on Joint Defence Motion to Exclude all Evidence from Witness TF1-277 Pursuant to Rule 89(C) and/or Rule 95”, 24 May 2005, para. 13.

<sup>5</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-218, “Public Rule 73bis Pre-Trial Conference Materials”, 4 April 2007 (“**Pre-Trial Conference Materials**”).

three sealed exhibits were numbered AFRC P1, AFRC P2 and AFRC P3 and are provided in confidential **Annex B**.

11. TF1-023's transcripts and exhibits from the AFRC trial were admitted in the RUF trial as RUF Exhibit 59 pursuant to an application made by the Prosecution under Rule 92*bis* granted by Trial Chamber I.<sup>6</sup> While Trial Chamber I's order permitted cross-examination, none of the Defence Counsel for the three RUF Accused requested such cross-examination.
12. The prior trial transcripts of TF1-023 were disclosed in redacted format to the Defence on 17 May 2006 and in unredacted format on 18 July 2008. The three confidential exhibits were disclosed on 4 September 2008.
13. TF1-029 testified in the RUF trial on 28 November 2005. The witness' testimony, direct and cross-examination, lasted just under an hour. This prior testimony is provided in confidential **Annex C**. The prior trial transcript of TF1-029 was disclosed in redacted format to the Defence on 17 May 2006 and in unredacted format on 18 July 2008.

#### IV. SUBMISSIONS

14. The jurisprudence of the SCSL clearly establishes that the Rules "favour a flexible approach to the issue of admissibility of evidence."<sup>7</sup> The jurisprudence of the SCSL also supports the view that expedient and fair trials are promoted where sworn testimony before the Court is admitted in a subsequent trial.<sup>8</sup> This jurisprudence applies the principles enshrined in Article 17 of the SCSL's Statute regarding the Accused's right to a fair and expeditious trial, and the principles underlining Rule 26*bis* which require that trial proceedings be conducted in a fair

<sup>6</sup> *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-448, "Decision on the Prosecution Confidential Notice under 92*bis* to Admit the Transcripts of Testimony of TF1-023, TF1-104 and TF1-169", 9 November 2005.

<sup>7</sup> *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-618, "Decision on Prosecution Notice Pursuant to Rule 92*bis* to Admit Information into Evidence", 2 August 2006, p. 3, quoting with approval *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-391, "Ruling on Gbao Application to Exclude Evidence of Prosecution Witness Mr. Koker", 23 May 2005, para. 4.

<sup>8</sup> See: *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-448, "Decision on the Prosecution Confidential Notice under Rule 92*bis* to Admit the Transcripts of Testimony of TF1-023, TF1-104 and TF1-169", 9 November 2005; *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-557, "Decision on the Prosecution Notice under Rule 92*bis* to Admit the Transcripts of Testimony of TF1-256", 23 May 2006; and *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-559, "Decision on the Prosecution Notice under Rule 92*bis* to Admit the Transcripts of Testimony of TF1-334", 23 May 2006.

and expeditious manner.

The evidence is relevant

15. As required under both Rules 89(C) and 92bis, the evidence of TF1-023 and TF1-029 is relevant to the current proceedings as it concerns *inter alia* crimes committed in Freetown and the Western Area during the Indictment period.<sup>9</sup>
16. Witness TF1-023 gives evidence of sexual violence, abductions and acts of physical violence in the Freetown area by the AFRC/RUF, all during the Indictment period. Witness TF1-029 gives evidence of burning, the abduction and forced labour of civilians, physical violence, unlawful killings and sexual violence occurring in Freetown and the Western Area by the AFRC/RUF during the Indictment period.
17. In addition to specific crime base evidence, the witnesses also provide evidence relevant to the chapeau requirements of the crimes charged in the Second Amended Indictment such as the widespread or systematic nature of the attack, the nexus between the violation or crime and the armed conflict and the civilian status of the victims.

Susceptible of Confirmation

18. As also required under Rule 92bis, the transcripts and exhibits referred to in this notice are susceptible of confirmation. At this stage the Prosecution is not required to prove that the evidence is in fact reliable, only that the reliability of the evidence is susceptible of confirmation.<sup>10</sup> The phrase “susceptible of confirmation” contained in Rule 92bis (B) has been interpreted by the Appeals Chamber in the CDF trial to mean that the “proof of reliability is not a condition of admission: all that is required is that the information should be capable of corroboration in due course.”<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See also the summaries of the witnesses’ evidence provided as part of the Pre-Trial Conference Materials.

<sup>10</sup> *Prosecutor v. Norman et al*, SCSL-04-14AR73, “Fofana – Decision on Appeal Against ‘Decision on Prosecution’s Motion for Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence’”, 16 May 2005, para. 27.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, para. 26, which dicta was recently referred to by this Chamber in *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-01-03-T-556, “Decision on Prosecution Notice under Rule 92bis for the Admission of Evidence Related to

19. This Trial Chamber in the AFRC trial reiterated that “evidence may be excluded because it is unreliable, but it is not necessary to demonstrate the reliability of the evidence before it is admitted.”<sup>12</sup> The Trial Chamber further considered that “reliability of the evidence is something to be considered by the Trial Chamber at the end of the trial when weighing and evaluating the evidence as a whole, in light of the context and nature of the evidence itself, including the credibility and reliability of the relevant evidence.”<sup>13</sup>

*The Rule 92bis evidence does not go to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused*

20. The evidence which the witnesses provide on the RUF command structure, the AFRC/RUF command structure and the relationship between the RUF and the AFRC during the Indictment period is all relevant to the chapeau elements of the crimes such as the systematic nature of the attack, as noted in paragraph 17 above and to several forms of liability alleged by the Prosecution in this case, including the Accused’s participation in a common plan, design or purpose, and his liability based on superior authority for the crimes committed by the AFRC and RUF alliance. In relation to this evidence, it is acknowledged that Rule 92bis specifically excludes witness statements or transcripts which go to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused.
21. However, as noted by this Trial Chamber in its recent decision on Rule 92bis, “there must be a distinction made between ‘the acts and conduct of those others who commit the crimes for which the Indictment alleges that the accused is individually responsible’ and ‘the acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the Indictment

---

*Inter Alia* Kenema District And on Prosecution Notice under Rule 92bis for the Admission of the Prior Testimony of TF1-036 into Evidence”, 15 July 2008 (“**Taylor Rule 92bis Decision**”), p. 4.

<sup>12</sup> *Prosecutor v. Brima et al.*, SCSL-04-16-T, “Decision on Prosecution Tender for Admission into Evidence of Information Contained in Notice Pursuant to Rule 92bis”, 18 November 2005, page 2 (last para), citing *Prosecutor v. Brima et al.*, SCSL-04-16-T, “Decision on Joint Defence Application for Leave to Appeal from Decision on Defence Motion to Exclude All Evidence from Witness TF1-277”, 2 August 2005, para. 6.

<sup>13</sup> *Prosecutor v. Brima et al.*, SCSL-04-16-T, “Decision on Prosecution Tender for Admission into Evidence of Information Contained in Notice Pursuant to Rule 92bis”, 18 November 2005, page. 3 (second full paragraph). See also *Prosecutor v. Norman et al.*, SCSL-04-14-T-447, “Decision on Prosecution’s Request to Admit into Evidence Certain Documents Pursuant to Rules 92bis and 89(C)”, 14 July 2005, page 3.

which establish his responsibility for the acts and conduct of others;’ and that only written statements which go to proof of the latter are excluded by Rule 92*bis*.”<sup>14</sup>

22. The prior trial transcripts and related exhibits for TF1-023 and TF1-029 which the Prosecution seeks to admit under Rule 92*bis* do not go to proof of the acts and conduct of the Accused as that term is defined and limited by the jurisprudence.

### Cross-examination

23. In the recent *Taylor* Rule 92*bis* Decision, this Chamber noted that it is within its inherent power to order cross-examination where the evidence to be admitted under Rule 92*bis*: (i) is so “pivotal to the Prosecution’s case and ... the person whose acts and conduct [the evidence] describes is so proximate to the accused”; or (ii) goes to a critical element of the Prosecution’s case.<sup>15</sup>
24. The Prosecution considers that the following factors support the conclusion that a further cross-examination of TF1-023 and TF1-029 is not required.
25. First, the evidence provided by both TF1-023 and TF1-029 is crime base evidence, evidence which the Defence has indicated on previous occasions it will not seek to challenge.<sup>16</sup> This witnesses’ evidence, therefore, does not concern

<sup>14</sup> *Taylor* Rule 92*bis* Decision, p. 4, citing *Prosecutor v. Galić*, IT-98-29-AR73.2, “Decision on Interlocutory Appeal Concerning Rule 92*bis* (C)”, 7 June 2002, para. 9 and referring to *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-1049, “Decision on Defence Application for the Admission of the Witness Statement of DIS-192 Under Rule 92*bis*, or in the alternative, Under Rule 92*ter*”, 12 March 2008, p. 2-3.

<sup>15</sup> *Taylor* Rule 92*bis* Decision, p. 4.

<sup>16</sup> See Defence Counsel’s statements at the Status Conference held on 20 August 2007: “We further submit that time allowed now will reduce the length of the trial in due course and hence save a great deal of money. I observe in that regard that given the nature of the case and the way in which it appears to us prima facie that the Prosecution have made this allegation against the accused, at first sight we are unable to see the relevance of the crime base witnesses, and it’s an aspect of the case I would like to examine carefully in collaboration with my learned friends both for the Defence and the Prosecution with a view to seeing if we can avoid calling any such witness, save where the evidence of such a witness might impact on other aspects of the case. And of course we will need time in order to examine that. But it seems to us at first blush that none of such evidence really needs to trouble this Court.” (Trial Transcript, 20 August 2007, pages 20-21 (emphasis added)). See also Defence Counsel’s statements on 14 February 2008: “your Honours will recall as long ago as August of last year we outlined the way in which we intended to defend this case and indicated that as far as the crime base witnesses are concerned we didn’t see the need to call any of them to give evidence. We indicated that because, as far as this degree of detail is concerned, it seems to us that we are not in a position to challenge any of it. Now, if this witness were to be naming this accused as being personally present, supervising and ordering this behaviour, then one could see that there was grounds upon which this witness should be called and should be cross-examined. I still fail to see the relevance, particularly as this Tribunal has already heard copious evidence of this nature. So, to what extent does it assist the Court to repeat that experience? Maybe I am missing something here.” (Trial Transcript, 14 February 2008, page 3857, lines 7-20 (emphasis added)).

- persons who might be considered so proximate to the Accused as to require cross-examination.
26. Secondly, the evidence of both witnesses has already been tested by cross-examination by defence counsel in other proceedings. In this regard, Trial Chamber I has considered this testing of evidence to be a relevant factor to be considered when determining whether to order cross-examination.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, Trial Chamber I went so far as to find that if evidence *similar* to that being sought to be admitted under Rule 92bis had been given by other witnesses in the proceedings and this *similar* evidence had been subject to cross-examination, then a cross-examination of the *actual* Rule 92bis evidence might *not* be necessary.
27. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Prosecution advises that, should the Chamber order cross-examination of either or both of the witnesses in question, then the Prosecution will not seek to examine-in-chief these witnesses. The Prosecution has made this determination despite any disadvantage that may occur where it does not elicit during *viva voce* examination-in-chief the mental and physical effect of the crimes on the witnesses and other relevant evidence previously not elicited. In this regard, should further cross examination be allowed, limiting it to matters not previously covered would be efficient and would not impact the fair trial rights of the Accused.

## V. NOTICE

28. The Prosecution gives notice of its intention to submit for admission into evidence the parts of the prior trial transcripts relating to TF1-023 and TF1-029 provided in **Annexes A and C**. As permitted under Rule 92bis, the Prosecution seeks to admit *parts* only of the prior testimony into evidence and wishes to exclude those sections which concern: (i) legal argument which had no impact on the evidence of the witness; (ii) trial administrative matters; and (iii) evidence of the acts and conduct of the Accused. Accordingly, portions of the transcripts set out in the

---

<sup>17</sup> *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-1125, “Decision on Sesay Defence Motion and Three Defence Applications to Admit 23 Witness Statements under Rule 92bis”, 15 May 2008, para. 40.



- aforementioned **Annexes** have been redacted on this basis.<sup>18</sup>
29. Witnesses TF1-023 and TF1-029 are protected witnesses.<sup>19</sup> The protective measures ordered in the other proceedings before this Court continue to have effect *mutatis mutandis* in these proceedings pursuant to Rule 75(F)(i) and so their identities and any other identifying information must not be disclosed to the public or included in the public record.<sup>20</sup> In relation to the protected witness TF1-023, parts of this witness' testimony was given in closed session; accordingly **Annex A** is filed on a confidential basis. Pursuant to TF1-029's protected status, the public version of the transcript of this witness' testimony given on 28 November 2005 in the RUF trial and published on the Special Court's website contains redactions made by WVS. As the unredacted version is provided in **Annex C**, this Annex is filed on a confidential basis.
30. The Prosecution gives notice of its intention to submit for admission into evidence the exhibits related to the testimony of TF1-023 which are provided in **Annex B**. As all three exhibits were filed under seal, the Annex is filed on a confidential basis.

---

<sup>18</sup> This procedure also conforms to the procedure adopted at the ICTR. At the ICTR statements tendered pursuant to Rule 92*bis* are reviewed. Where a statement is tendered that includes information that falls within Rule 92*bis* and information that falls outside the Rule, the statement is admitted but the paragraphs or information that fall outside the Rule are simply not admitted into evidence. See for example *Prosecutor v. Bagosora et al.*, ICTR-98-41-T, "Decision on Prosecutor's Motion for the Admission of Written Witness Statements Under Rule 92*bis*," 9 March 2004. This procedure has now been adopted at the SCSL – see *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-1049, "Decision on Defence Application for the Admission of the Witness Statement of DIS-192 under Rule 92*bis* or, in the alternative, under Rule 92*ter*", 12 March 2008.

<sup>19</sup> The protective measures decision applicable to TF1-023 and TF1-029 is the decision given in the RUF trial, *Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-05-15-T-180, "Decision on Prosecution Motion for Modification of Protective Measures for Witnesses", 5 July 2004. Pursuant to this decision, both testified as Category 1A witnesses (screen + pseudonym + voice distortion) (see Annex A of Decision).

<sup>20</sup> See 5 July 2004 RUF decision referred to in the footnote above.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

31. The Prosecution hereby gives notice under Rule 92*bis* of its intention to seek admission into evidence the material identified in paragraphs 28 and 30.

Filed in The Hague,

11 September 2008

For the Prosecution,



---

Brenda J. Hollis

Principal Trial Attorney

## LIST OF AUTHORITIES

SCSL**Prosecutor v. Taylor, SCSL-2003-01-T**

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-218, “Public Rule 73bis Pre-Trial Conference Materials”, 4 April 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-263, “Prosecution’s Second Amended Indictment”, 29 May 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T, Trial Transcript, 20 August 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T, Trial Transcript, 14 February 2008

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-01-03-T-556, “Decision on Prosecution Notice under Rule 92bis for the Admission of Evidence Related to *Inter Alia* Kenema District And on Prosecution Notice under Rule 92bis for the Admission of the Prior Testimony of TF1-036 into Evidence”, 15 July 2008

**Prosecutor v. Norman et al., SCSL-04-14-T**

*Prosecutor v. Norman et al.*, SCSL-2004-14AR73, “Fofana – Decision on Appeal Against “Decision on Prosecution’s Motion for Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence”, 16 May 2005

*Prosecutor v. Norman et al.*, SCSL-04-14-T-447, “Decision on Prosecution’s Request to Admit into Evidence Certain Documents Pursuant to Rules 92bis and 89(C)”, 14 July 2005

**Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon & Gbao, SCSL-2004-15-T**

*Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-391, “Ruling on Gbao Application to Exclude Evidence of Prosecution Witness Mr. Koker”, 23 May 2005

*Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-05-15-T-180, “Decision on Prosecution Motion for Modification of Protective Measures for Witnesses”, 5 July 2004

*Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-448, “Decision on the Prosecution Confidential Notice under Rule 92bis to Admit the Transcripts of Testimony of TF1-023, TF1-104 and TF1-169”, 9 November 2005

*Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-557, “Decision on the Prosecution Notice under Rule 92bis to Admit the Transcripts of Testimony of TF1-256”, 23 May 2006

*Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-559, “Decision on the Prosecution Notice under Rule 92bis to Admit the Transcripts of Testimony of TF1-334”, 23 May 2006

*Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-618, “Decision on Prosecution Notice Pursuant to Rule 92bis to Admit Information into Evidence”, 2 August 2006

*Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-1049, “Decision on Defence Application for the Admission of the Witness Statement of DIS-192 under Rule 92bis or, in the alternative, under Rule 92ter”, 12 March 2008

*Prosecutor v. Sesay et al.*, SCSL-04-15-T-1125, “Decision on Sesay Defence Motion and Three Defence Applications to Admit 23 Witness Statements under Rule 92bis”, 15 May 2008

**Prosecutor v. Brima et al., SCSL-04-16-T**

*Prosecutor v. Brima et al.*, SCSL-04-16-T-280, “Decision on Joint Defence Motion to Exclude all Evidence from Witness TF1-277 Pursuant to Rule 89(C) and/or Rule 95”, 24 May 2005

*Prosecutor v. Brima et al.*, SCSL-04-16-T, “Decision on Joint Defence Application for Leave to Appeal from Decision on Defence Motion to Exclude All Evidence from Witness TF1-277”, 2 August 2005

*Prosecutor v. Brima et al.*, SCSL-04-16-T, “Decision on Prosecution Tender for Admission into Evidence of Information Contained in Notice Pursuant to Rule 92bis”, 18 November 2005

**ICTY Cases**

*Prosecutor v. Galić*, IT-98-29-AR73.2, Decision on Interlocutory Appeal Concerning Rule 92 bis (C), 7 June 2002 (*Copy provided in previous filing – see SCSL-03-01-T-571*)

*Prosecutor v. Slobodan Milošević*, Case No. IT-02-54-AR73.4, “Decision on Interlocutory Appeal on the Admissibility of Evidence-In-Chief in the Form of Written Statements”, 30 September 2003  
<http://www.un.org/icty/milosevic/appeal/decision-e/030930.htm>

**ICTR Cases**

*Prosecutor v. Bagosora et al*, ICTR-98-41-T, “Decision on Prosecutor’s Motion for the Admission of Written Witness Statements Under Rule 92bis,” 9 March 2004  
<http://69.94.11.53/ENGLISH/cases/Bagosora/decisions/040309.htm>



**SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE**  
BINCKHORSTLAAN 400 • 2516 BL DEN HAAG • THE NETHERLANDS  
PHONE: +31 70 515 9701 or +31 70 515 (+Ext 9725)

Court Management Section – Court Records

**CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE**

This certificate replaces the following confidential document which has been filed in the Confidential Case File.

Case Name: **The Prosecutor – v- Charles Ghankay Taylor**

Case Number: **SCSL-03-01-T**

Document Index Number: **585**

Document Date **11 September 2008**

Filing Date: **11 September 2008**

Document Type: - **Confidential Annexes A TO C**

Number of Pages **128** Numbers from: **19313-19440**

Application

Order

Indictment

Motion

**Other**

Correspondence

Document Title:

**PUBLIC WITH CONFIDENTIAL ANNEX A TO C – PROSECUTION NOTICE  
UNDER RULE 92bis FOR THE ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE RELATED TO INTER  
ALIA FREETOWN & WESTERN AREA – TF1-023 & TF1-029**

Name of Officer:

Vincent Tishekwa

Signed: