

663)

SCSL-03-01-T
(22096 - 22136)

22096



THE SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE


In Trial Chamber II

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

Registrar: Mr. Herman von Hebel

Date: 10 November 2008

Case No.: SCSL-2003-01-T



THE PROSECUTOR

-v-

CHARLES GHANKAY TAYLOR

PUBLIC

**DEFENCE RESPONSE TO PROSECUTION MOTION FOR ADMISSION
OF EXTRACTS OF THE REPORT OF THE
TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION OF SIERRA LEONE**

Office of the Prosecutor

Ms. Brenda J. Hollis
Ms. Leigh Lawrie

Counsel for Charles G. Taylor

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

I. Introduction

1. On the 31 October 2008, the Prosecution filed a *Motion for Admission of Extracts of the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone* (“Motion”) with related Annexes,¹ seeking the admission of extracts from the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Sierra Leone (“the Report”). The application was made pursuant to Rule 89(C), or alternatively under Rules 89(C) and 92*bis*, of the Special Court Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”).
2. In summary, the Defence submit that:
 - a. Rule 89(C) cannot be used in isolation to admit the Report included in The Motion.²
 - b. The Report is only admissible under Rule 89(C) in conjunction with Rule 92*bis* and not Rule 89(C) alone; any evidence within the Report that goes to the acts and conduct of the accused is inadmissible.

II. Applicable Legal Principles

3. The Prosecution recently submitted a similar motion for the Admission of Documents from the United Nations and United Nations Bodies, relying on the same legal principles as in the present Motion.³ The Defence are filing a Response⁴ to that motion today, wherein the Defence articulates the correct legal principles to be applied when a party seeks admission of a document without a witness. So as to not repeat the same argument, the Defence respectfully refers the Chamber to paragraphs 3 to 24 of that Response, substituting any reference to UN Documents with a reference to the TRC Report. A few additional observations are below.
4. The Prosecution states that the original purpose of Rule 92*bis* was to allow the admission of documents, such as materials from a TRC. The Defence agrees with this position; however

¹ *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-652, Prosecution Motion for Admission of Extracts of the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 31 October 2008 (“**Motion**”).

² Motion, Annexes A and B.

³ *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-650, Prosecution Motion for Admission of Documents of the United Nations Bodies, 29 October 2008

⁴ *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T, Defence Response to Prosecution Motion for the Admission of Documents of the United Nations and United Nations Bodies

disagrees with the Prosecution's assertion at paragraph 11 that the reforms in May 2007 changed the position regarding TRC Reports.⁵ The Defence asserts that the reasoning in the Fofana Appeals Decision is the underlying policy behind the rule which has not been altered by the 2007 reforms.⁶ The Defence submits even TRC Reports which go to the acts and conduct of the accused must be excluded under Rule 92bis.

Arguendo: the Report as expert evidence

5. Further, and in the alternative, the Defence submit that the Prosecution should have sought admission of the Report as expert evidence and then called one of the authors as expert witnesses.⁷ Expert evidence is "intended to enlighten the Judges on specific issues of a technical nature, requiring special knowledge in a specific field".⁸ The Report concerns specific issues of a technical nature because it "outlines[s] and interprets[s] the descriptive statistics regarding the nature and extent of the violations, behaviour of perpetrators and characteristics of victims".⁹ The Report required special knowledge in a specific field because "to obtain this information TRC staff and consultants undertook coding, data entry, matching and statistical analysis".¹⁰ In summary, the Report purports to be a scientific and empirical collection and analysis of data which is used to generate statistics. As such it should be considered expert evidence.
6. Secondly, expert witnesses are defined as persons "whom by virtue of some specialised knowledge, skill or training can assist the trier of fact to understand or determine an issue in dispute".¹¹ The authors have specialised knowledge, skills and training in the fields of database development, data collection, data analysis, statistical methods, coding processes, and quantitative analysis.¹² These skills are used to assist the trier of fact by providing "an

⁵ Motion, para. 11.

⁶ Fofana Appeal Decision

⁷ For instance, this is what the Prosecution did in regard to Ian Smillie and his report "Diamonds, the RUF and the Liberian Connection. *Prosecutor v Taylor* SCSL-03-01, Trial Transcript 7 January 2008 and 8 January 2008

⁸ *Prosecutor v Hinga Norman et al.*, SCSL-04-14-T-435, Decision on Prosecution Request for Leave to Call Additional Witnesses and for Orders for Protective Measures, 21 June 2005 ("**Norman Expert Decision**") of 21 June 2005] p.4, citing *Prosecutor v Akayesu*, ICTR-96-4-T, "Decision on a Defence Motion for the Appearance of an Accused as an Expert Witness", 9 March 1998

⁹ Motion, Annex B, p.36.

¹⁰ Motion, Annex B, p.36.

¹¹ Norman Expert Decision, p.4, citing *Prosecutor v Stanislav Galic*, IT-98-29-T, Decision Concerning the Expert Witnesses Ewa Tabeau and Richard Philipps, 3 July 2002, p.2.

¹² As illustrated in Motion, Annex B, pg. 37.

overview of the nature and extent of human right violations experienced during the conflict".¹³ This is an issue in dispute because it demonstrates a widespread and systematic campaign against the civilians of Sierra Leone.

7. Expert witnesses cannot make findings that go to the guilt of the accused. This Trial Chamber has unambiguously approved such an approach to expert witnesses during the testimony of Stephen Ellis: "his testimony should not go to the ultimate issues or to the guilt or innocence of the accused".¹⁴ This is supported by the jurisprudence of the ICTY, ICTR and academic authority.¹⁵
8. Expert evidence also cannot make findings of fact as this would usurp the role of the judges. Instead, the role of the expert is to provide opinions based on particular facts using his professional expertise. It is for the Trial Chamber to determine whether the factual basis for that opinion is truthful.¹⁶

III. Submissions

Preliminary Observations

9. The Defence submits, in rebuttal to the Prosecution's statement at paragraph 15 that there is no obvious live witness alternative, that this is not an accurate representation of the situation. The information contained within the TRC Report is crime based. The Prosecution have led a magnitude of crime based evidence, some of which is likely to cross over into the TRC Report. Secondly, the TRC Report has been prepared by persons who could be called upon to give live evidence so to test the document. Thirdly, the evidence from the TRC Reports is by nature expert evidence which could easily be attested to by one of the expert who compiled the Report.

¹³ Motion, Annex B, p.1.

¹⁴ "It is the unanimous view of the Bench, Mr Bangura, that your witness is presented as an expert witness and, as you know full well, under the jurisprudence of this Chamber his testimony should not go to the ultimate issues or to the guilt or innocence of the accused". *Prosecutor v Taylor*, Trial Transcript, 16 January 2008, p.1450:2 – p.1451:7.

¹⁵ See *Prosecutor v. Kordic and Cerkez*, Trial Transcript, p.13289 28 January 2000; *Prosecutor v. Akayesu*, ICTR-96-4-T, Decision on Defence Motion for Appearance of an Accused as an Expert Witness, 9 March 1998, and, May and Wierda, *International Criminal Evidence*, Transnational Publishers Inc 2002, p.200.

¹⁶ For example see *Prosecutor v. Delalic et al*, IT-96-21-A, 20 February 2000, para. 594 or Richard May, *Criminal Evidence*, Sweet and Maxell 1999, para. 17.

Prosecution is barred from seeking to admit TRC Report

10. The Chief Prosecutor has previously stated that the Prosecution would not seek to admit material obtained during the TRC process in proceedings before the Special Court. Specifically, the Prosecutor announced that he “would not use any evidence collected or heard by the Commission”.¹⁷ The Court took this to mean that even if crucial evidence against an author of a crime against humanity were to surface at a TRC hearing, he would not seek to obtain and use it, in order to avoid any possible conflict with the TRC process. The Prosecution can not now turn around and do exactly what it promised not to do: use evidence collected or heard by the Commission in seeking to admit statistical compilations and analysis of perpetrator responsibility. For matters of public policy, it does not bode well for the successful overlap of truth and reconciliation commissions and war crimes tribunals if people who give statements for the purpose of speaking the truth and reconciling with perpetrators or victims have to be concerned that their statement would later be used for purposes of prosecution. On this basis alone, the Report should be excluded in its entirety.

If both Rules 89(C) and 92bis are applied

11. All documents must be relevant. Information that falls outside the temporal and geographical scope of the Indictment is not relevant and therefore should not be admitted. According to Section 6(1) of the TRC Act of 2000,¹⁸ the TRC is mandated to “create an impartial historical record of violations and abuses of human rights and international humanitarian law related to the armed conflict in Sierra Leone, from the beginning of the conflict in 1991 to the signing of the Lome Peace Agreement [7 July 1999]”. Of course, the Indictment period only overlaps with this time period from September 1996. Thus, much of the Report refers to time periods, as well as locations and perpetrators that fall outside the scope of the Indictment. These are delineated in Annex B of this Response. All references to offences in the locations other than these and in time periods other than those mentioned should be excluded.
12. All documents must also be susceptible to confirmation. While the Defence concurs with the Prosecution that confirmation is not required immediately and that the evidence could be

¹⁷ *Prosecutor v. Norman*, SCSL-03-08-PT-122, Decision on Appeal by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission for Sierra Leone (“TRC” or “The Commission”) and Chief Samuel Hinga Norman JP against the Decision of His Lordship, Mr. Justice Bankole Thompson Delivered on 30 October 2003 to Deny the TRC’s Request to Hold a Hearing with Chief Samuel Hinga Norman JP, 28 November 2003, paras. 6, 15 (“**Norman TRC Appeal**”).

¹⁸ The Truth and Reconciliation Act of 2000, February 2000.

corroborate in due course, the Defence question how this could happen so late in the case. The Prosecution has not shown how the documents are corroborated by the bulk of their witnesses who have already testified.

13. None of the admitted portions of the documents can go to the acts or conduct of the accused. Additionally, none of the admitted portions can refer to the proximate subordinates of the accused without the opportunity to cross-examine a witness in regard to the information.. The Report shows human rights violations in almost every district of Sierra Leone over a nine year period and attributes responsibility primarily to the RUF and AFRC, factions whose leaders the Prosecution considers subordinates of the accused. Additionally, the Report details the existence of an RUF-NPFL Study. This section includes violations by persons of Liberian origin and members of the NPFL. It very clearly goes to the acts and conduct of the Accused as alleged and provides justification for its own exclusion. Alternatively, if admitted, the Prosecution must produce someone for cross-examination on any information within the Report that goes to a critical and proximate element of the Prosecution case.

The probative value of the evidence is outweighed by its prejudicial effect

14. The extracts from TRC Report should be excluded under the Court's inherent jurisdiction to exclude evidence whose probative value is outweighed by its prejudicial effect. The reason for this is the inaccuracy and uncertainty of the Reports findings, weighed against the negative inferences that can be drawn by the Report's conclusion that the RUF was the primary group of perpetrators.
15. Overall there is a "calculated margin of error" for the whole Report.¹⁹ Such errors include "intentional or unintentional inaccuracies in the testimonies provided by the statement givers, data recording mistakes, data coding mistakes, and data entry mistakes".²⁰ Crucially, taking the Report as a whole, it is unable to estimate to what degree these errors affect the accuracy of the Report's evidence: "Direct measurement of these various errors is not possible and estimation of this error is very difficult".²¹ This is an unacceptable level of uncertainty for a document on which the Prosecution proposes to establish facts beyond a reasonable doubt.

¹⁹ Motion, Annex B, p.7.

²⁰ Motion, Annex B, p.32.

²¹ Motion, Annex B, p.7.

16. Notably where the document is able to quantify the level of error it reaches as high as 20%, particularly in regard to violations proximate to acts and conduct of the Accused. For example, the Report admits to a margin of error of up to 22% regarding the percentage of Liberians involved in RUF incidents. It also admits a margin of error of up to 9% for incidents attributed to the NPFL.²² This adds more weight to the prejudicial effect of this document against its probative value.
17. The second ground for excluding this document for its prejudice to the Accused is that neither the primary nor secondary witnesses, on whose testimony and research methodology this Report is based, can or will be tested by cross-examination. Regarding the secondary witnesses who compiled this Report, in any Court of law such expert reports would be subject to a range of questions to test the soundness of their research methodology and implementation. Such questions may include but are not limited to:
- a. Why respondees chose to participate. For example: “the imprecision associated with the proportions derived from the database is due first to who chose to respond”,²³
 - b. How the credibility of respondees was measured and checked, and how these findings affected the statistical results e.g. over 80% of the respondees were victims of crimes;²⁴
 - c. How conflicts and contradictions between statements were dealt with and reflected in the results; and,
 - d. How the researchers avoid double counting of violations as witnesses describe not only violations to themselves but also to others.²⁵

It is proposed by the Prosecution in this Motion that there is no need to subject the authors of this document to such examination. As such, there is no means to test or challenge the manner in which the data has been assembled and presented.

18. Regarding primary witnesses, there is no reason in delimiting the potential questions that would need to be levelled at respondees. The reason is quite simple: there is way to link the statistics to individual witnesses. This is because the Report fails to explain the process

²² Motion, Annex B, p.32.

²³ It should be noted that the Report is not “a complete census of human rights violations”. Motion, Annex B, p. 7.

²⁴ Motion, Annex B, p.3.

²⁵ Motion, Annex B, p.8.

whereby a particular statistic is generated by one or several witness testimonies. Therefore, even if the witnesses could be produced there is no way of knowing to which part of the Report they could speak to. As such, careful attention should be paid to the following assertion in the Report: “Each statistical argument in the report must therefore be understood as “according to the statements presented to the Commission...”.²⁶ In a legal forum this assertion is meaningless because the Defence is not able to pinpoint the testimony that produced the statistic.

19. For the above reasons the Report should be excluded because its probative value is outweighed by its prejudicial effect.

Arguendo: the Report as expert evidence

20. Further and alternatively, the TRC Report, if viewed as the evidence of expert witnesses, should not be admitted because it goes to the guilt or innocence of the accused and/or because it makes findings of fact.. The Report makes extensive findings of fact because the analyses “...reviews the broad dimensions of data available from the TRCs database”,²⁷ which in turn contains 7,706 statements of Sierra Leoneans.
21. For the above stated reasons the Defence submit that the Report, as the evidence of experts, cannot, in its entirety, be admitted.

If only Rule 89(C) is applied

22. All portions of the Report must be relevant, must not violate Rule 95, and their probative value must outweigh their prejudice. Additionally, all documents must not go against the *Kordic and Cerkez* exclusions.²⁸
23. Annex B of this Response outlines the Defence objections in this regard. Because none of the documents the Prosecution seeks to admit have already been entered into evidence, this prong of the test has been omitted from the table. As the Report was produced in October 2004, the entire Report has been available to the Prosecution for the duration of the Prosecution case, and thus should have been tendered through an appropriate witness.

²⁶ Motion, Annex B, p. 7.

²⁷ Motion, Annex B, p.1.

²⁸ Appeals Judgement, Case No. IT-95-14/2-A, para. 190.


24. The third limb of the test excludes material that is not sufficiently significant to warrant admission at so late a stage of the proceedings. Much of the document refers to violations outside the scope of the Indictment because of the actors involved (e.g. ECOMOG, ULIMO) and/or outside of the times and locations specified in the Indictment (as reference is made for all districts between 1991 and 2000). Essentially, the material in the Report is a combination of crime-based evidence and is thus cumulative and does not add to the voluminous material already in evidence. For instance, information on page 9 and pages 25-27 of the TRC Report go to facts that have already been attested to in other documentary or oral evidence admitted by the Chamber.²⁹ Other reports already admitted as exhibits in these proceedings provide the same information as given in those sections of the Report. All of the material is based on anonymous sources or hearsay statements that are incapable of being tested by cross-examination and should be excluded. The statistical data provided makes it incapable of identifying who was actually interviewed, names of victims and perpetrators were removed from the document and it was based on a random sample of collected statements.
25. It is the Defence's submission that for all of the reasons outlined above the relevant passages of the documents cannot be admitted under Rule 89(C) alone.

IV. Conclusion

26. In conclusion, the Defence submits as follows:
- a. The proper gateway for admitting the TRC extracts is Rules 89(C) and 92bis. Under these rules the entire Report should be excluded because it goes to the acts and conduct of the accused or his allegedly subordinate groups, and/or its probative value is outweighed by its prejudicial effect,
 - b. Alternatively, the Report should be considered as expert evidence but again should be excluded for both/either going to the acts and conduct of the accused and/or making ultimate findings of fact,
 - c. If the Chamber is minded to consider this Report solely under Rule 89(C) then the extracts should still be excluded under the Chamber's inherent jurisdiction. Further, it should be excluded because it fails the *Kordic and Cerkez* test.

²⁹ Pages 25 & 26 show graphs of Number of Violations over Time by Perpetrator for each type of violation whilst Page 27 shows a breakdown of RUF Violations by Year and District.

Respectfully Submitted,



SIVAS ARISENA



Courtenay Griffiths Q.C.

Lead Counsel for Charles G. Taylor

Dated this 10th Day of November 2008

The Hague, The Netherlands

Table of Authorities

Prosecutor v. Taylor, SCSL-03-01

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-369, ‘Decision on Prosecution’s Motion for Admission of Material Pursuant to Rules 89(C) and 92bis’, 7 December 2007.

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-241, ‘Prosecution’s Motion for Admission of Material Pursuant to Rules 89(C) and 92bis’, 17 May 2007.

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

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-T Trial Transcript, 14 May 2008

Prosecutor v. Sesay, SCSL-04-15

Prosecutor v Sesay et al, “Ruling on Gbao Application to Exclude Evidence of Prosecution Witness Mr Koker”, 23 May 2005.

Prosecutor v. Sesay et al., SCSL-04-15-T, “Decision on Prosecution Request for Leave to Call an Additional Expert Witness”, 10 June 2005.

Prosecutor v Sesay et al, SCSL-04-15-T-620, “Decision on Prosecution Motion to Admit into Evidence a Document Referred to Cross-Examination”, 2 August 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-129 Under Rule 92bis, or in the Alternative, Under Rule 92ter, 12 March 2008.

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

Prosecutor v. Norman et al, SCSL-04-14-PT-117, Decision on Prosecution’s Motion for Judicial Notice and Admission of Evidence, 2 June 2004.

Prosecutor v Norman et al, SCSL-04-14-AR65-371, “Fofana – Appeal Against Decision Refusing Bail”, 11 March 2005.

Prosecutor v Norman et al, SCSL-04-14-AR73-398, 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-04-16-PT-280, “Decision on Joint Defence Motion to Exclude all Evidence from Witness TFI-277 Pursuant to Rule 89(C) and/or Rule 95”, 24 May 2005.

Prosecutor v. Norman et al., SCSL-04-14-T-435, “Decision on Prosecution Request for Leave to Call Additional Witnesses and for Orders for Protective Measures”, 21 June 2005.

Prosecutor v Norman et al, “Decision on Prosecution’s Request to Admit Evidence into Evidence Certain Documents Pursuant to Rules 92bis and 89(C)”, 14 July 2005.

Prosecutor v Norman et al, SCSL-04-14-T “Decision on Fofona submissions regarding proposed expert witness Mr Daniel J Hoffman Phd”, 7 July 2006.

ICTY

Prosecutor v. Milosevic, ICTY-02-54-T, “Decision on Prosecution’s Request to Have Written Statements Admitted Under Rule 92bis”, 21 March 2002.

Prosecutor v. Galic, ICTY-98-29-AR73.2, “Decision on Interlocutory Appeal Concerning Rule 92bis(C)”, 7 June 2002.

Prosecutor v. Stanislav Galic, IT-98-29-T, “Decision Concerning the Expert Witnesses Ewa Tabeau and Richard Philipps”, 3 July 2002.

Prosecutor v Kordic and Cerkez, Appeals Judgement, Case No. IT-95-14/2-A, 17 December 2004.

Prosecutor v. Martić, ICTY-95-11-T, “Decision on Prosecution’s Motions for Admission of Transcripts Pursuant to Rule 92bis and of Expert Reports Pursuant to Rule 94bis”, 13 January 2006.

Prosecutor v. Martić, ICTY-95-11-T, “Decision on Prosecution’s Motions for Admission of Written Evidence Pursuant to Rule 92 bis of the Rules”, 16 January 2006.

ICTR

Prosecutor v Akayesu, ICTR-96-4-T, “Decision on a Defence Motion for the Appearance of an Accused as an Expert Witness”, 9 March 1998.

Authorities Provided

IT-98-29-AR73.2
A64-A42
07 JUNE 2002

22109
64 KB

UNITED
NATIONS



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

Case: IT-98-29-AR73.2

Date: 7 June 2002

Original: English

IN THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before: Judge David Hunt
Judge Mehmet Güney
Judge Asoka de Zoysa Gunawardana
Judge Fausto Pocar
Judge Theodor Meron

Registrar: Mr Hans Holthuis

Decision of: 7 June 2002

PROSECUTOR

v

Stanislav GALIĆ

DECISION ON INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL CONCERNING RULE 92bis(C)

Counsel for the Prosecutor:

Mr Mark Ierace, Senior Trial Attorney

Counsel for the Defence:

Ms Mara Pilipović & Maître Stephane Piletta-Zanin

The background to the appeal

1. Pursuant to a certificate granted by the Trial Chamber in accordance with Rule 73(C) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence ("Rules"), as Rule 73 then stood,¹ Stanislav Galić (the "appellant") has appealed against the admission into evidence of two written statements made by prospective witnesses to investigators of the Office of the Prosecutor ("OTP"). Both prospective witnesses have died since making their statements.

2. The appellant, as the Commander over a period of almost two years of the Sarajevo Romanija Corps (part of the Bosnian Serb Army), is charged in relation to an alleged campaign of sniping and shelling against the civilian population of Sarajevo conducted during that time by the forces under his command and control. He is charged with individual responsibility pursuant to Article 7.1 of the Tribunal's Statute and as a superior pursuant to Article 7.3 for crimes against humanity and for violations of the laws and customs of war. The prosecution concedes that it is no part of its case that the appellant personally physically perpetrated any of the crimes charged himself.² Its case pursuant to Article 7.1 is that he planned, instigated, ordered or otherwise aided and abetted the commission of those crimes by others.³ Its case pursuant to Article 7.3 is that the appellant knew, or had reason to know, that his subordinates had committed or were about to commit such crimes and that he failed to take reasonable steps to prevent such acts or to punish those who carried out those acts.⁴

3. The first written statement admitted into evidence was made by Hamdija Čavčić. He was a chemical engineer employed by the Department for Criminal and Technical Investigations in Sarajevo as an expert in investigating the traces in the case of fire or explosions. As such, he investigated a shelling on 12 July 1993 in which twelve people had been killed. He prepared a contemporaneous Criminal and Technical Report in which he deduced the direction from which the particular shell had been fired. His written statement to the OTP investigator, which is dated 16 November 1995, annexes that report and confirms that the findings which he had made in it

¹ Certificate Pursuant to Rule 73(C) in Respect of Decisions of the Trial Chamber on the Admission into Evidence of Written Statements Pursuant to Rule 92bis(C), 25 Apr 2002 ("Certificate"). Rule 73, which deals with motions other than preliminary motions, then provided that, unless the Trial Chamber certified pursuant to Rule 73(C) that an interlocutory appeal during the trial was appropriate for the continuation of the trial, decisions rendered during the course of the trial on motions involving evidence and procedure were without interlocutory appeal.

² Prosecutor's Pre-Trial Brief Pursuant to Rule 65ter(E)(i), 23 Oct 2001, par 68.

³ *Ibid*, par 68.

⁴ Indictment, par 11.

were true. He also explains in greater detail how he had reached those conclusions. In addition, the written statement describes a similar investigation of a shelling on 5 February 1994. These two incidents are identified as incidents 2 and 5 in the schedule to the indictment.

4. The second written statement admitted into evidence was made by Bajram Šopi. He was present on 7 September 1993 collecting firewood when a man was killed by a sniper's shot. His statement to the OTP investigator says that both he and the man who was killed were dressed in civilian clothes. It describes his own wounding by shooting and the damage to his house by shelling in two incidents during 1992. It also describes the injuries to his daughter by shelling at an unspecified time. He further states that there were military units behind his house in a school building which had been "levelled". Only that part of the statement which describes the incident on 7 September 1993, which is identified as incident 11 in the schedule, was tendered.

The relevant Rules

5. The appeal principally concerns two rules in Section 3 of the Rules (headed "Rules of Evidence"), Rules 89 and 92*bis*, and the interaction between them. It is convenient, therefore, to quote each of those two Rules in full:

Rule 89 General Provisions

- (A) A Chamber shall apply the rules of evidence set forth in this Section, and shall not be bound by national rules of evidence.
- (B) In cases not otherwise provided for in this Section, a 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.
- (C) A Chamber may admit any relevant evidence which it deems to have probative value.
- (D) A Chamber may exclude evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the need to ensure a fair trial.
- (E) A Chamber may request verification of the authenticity of evidence obtained out of court.
- (F) A Chamber may receive the evidence of a witness orally or, where the interests of justice allow, in written form.

Rule 92*bis* Proof of Facts other than by Oral Evidence

- (A) A Trial Chamber may admit, in whole or in part, the evidence of a witness in the form of a written statement in lieu of oral testimony which goes to proof of a matter other than the acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the indictment.
 - (i) Factors in favour of admitting evidence in the form of a written statement include but are not limited to circumstances in which the evidence in question:

- (a) is of a cumulative nature, in that other witnesses will give or have given oral testimony of similar facts;
 - (b) relates to relevant historical, political or military background;
 - (c) consists of a general or statistical analysis of the ethnic composition of the population in the places to which the indictment relates;
 - (d) concerns the impact of crimes upon victims;
 - (e) relates to issues of the character of the accused; or
 - (f) relates to factors to be taken into account in determining sentence.
- (ii) Factors against admitting evidence in the form of a written statement include whether:
- (a) there is an overriding public interest in the evidence in question being presented orally;
 - (b) a party objecting can demonstrate that its nature and source renders it unreliable, or that its prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value; or
 - (c) there are any other factors which make it appropriate for the witness to attend for cross-examination.
- (B) A written statement under this Rule shall be admissible if it attaches a declaration by the person making the written statement that the contents of the statement are true and correct to the best of that person's knowledge and belief and
- (i) the declaration is witnessed by:
 - (a) a person authorised to witness such a declaration in accordance with the law and procedure of a State; or
 - (b) a Presiding Officer appointed by the Registrar of the Tribunal for that purpose; and
 - (ii) the person witnessing the declaration verifies in writing:
 - (a) that the person making the statement is the person identified in the said statement;
 - (b) that the person making the statement stated that the contents of the written statement are, to the best of that person's knowledge and belief, true and correct;
 - (c) that the person making the statement was informed that if the content of the written statement is not true then he or she may be subject to proceedings for giving false testimony; and
 - (d) the date and place of the declaration.
- The declaration shall be attached to the written statement presented to the Trial Chamber.
- (C) A written statement not in the form prescribed by paragraph (B) may nevertheless be admissible if made by a person who has subsequently died, or by a person who can no longer with reasonable diligence be traced, or by a person who is by reason of bodily or mental condition unable to testify orally, if the Trial Chamber:
- (i) is so satisfied on a balance of probabilities; and
 - (ii) finds from the circumstances in which the statement was made and recorded that there are satisfactory *indicia* of its reliability.
- (D) A Chamber may admit a transcript of evidence given by a witness in proceedings before the Tribunal which goes to proof of a matter other than the acts and conduct of the accused.
- (E) Subject to Rule 127 or any order to the contrary, a party seeking to adduce a written statement or transcript shall give fourteen days notice to the opposing party, who may within seven days object. The Trial Chamber shall decide, after hearing the parties, whether to admit the statement or transcript in whole or in part and whether to require the witness to appear for cross-examination.

The issues in the appeal

6. The appellant has raised a number of issues in his Interlocutory Appeal:
- (1) The appellant says that both statements did not fall within Rule 92*bis* because they go to proof of “the acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the indictment”.⁵ The prosecution responds to this issue in three alternative ways. Either (a) the statements do not go to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused charged in the indictment,⁶ or (if they do go to such proof) (b) Rule 92*bis*(C) does not exclude proof of the acts and conduct of the accused by a written statement of a deceased person,⁷ and (c) the evidence is in any event admissible under Rule 89(C) without the restrictions of Rule 92*bis*.⁸
 - (2) The appellant says that the Trial Chamber did not evaluate what is said to be the requirement of Rule 92*bis*(C)(i) as to “the probability of the said statements”.⁹ The prosecution responds that the appellant has misread the requirements of Rule 92*bis*(C)(i).¹⁰
 - (3) The appellant says that the Trial Chamber “did not engage in establishing the question of reliability”.¹¹ The prosecution responds that the Trial Chamber correctly determined that there were satisfactory *indicia* of the reliability of each statement in the circumstances in which it was made and recorded.¹²
 - (4) The appellant says that Rule 92*bis* does not relate to expert witnesses, whose evidence is admissible only under Rule 94*bis*, so that the statement of Hamdija Čavčić (described in par 3, *supra*) was inadmissible upon that basis also.¹³ The prosecution responds that Rule 92*bis* is directed to any witness whose statement does not go to proof of the acts or conduct of the accused, including expert witnesses,¹⁴ and that Rule 94*bis* is directed to experts who are not in a position themselves to testify directly about the facts upon which they base their expert opinion.¹⁵

⁵ Appeal of the Decisions on [*sic*] the Trial Chamber of 12 April, and 18 April 2002, 2 May 2002 (“Interlocutory Appeal”), pp 2-3, 4-8.

⁶ Prosecution’s Response to Accused Stanislav Galić’s Interlocutory Appeal Pursuant to Rule 73(C) on the Decisions on Trial Chamber I of 12 and 18 April 2002, 13 May 2002 (“Response”), pars 33-49.

⁷ *Ibid*, pars 7-14.

⁸ *Ibid*, pars 15-32, 58-62.

⁹ Interlocutory Appeal, pp 3-4, 11.

¹⁰ Response, pars 50-57.

¹¹ Interlocutory Appeal, p 3.

¹² Response, pars 63-68.

¹³ Interlocutory Appeal, p 9.

¹⁴ Response, par 72.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, par 71.

- (5) The appellant says that it is not in the interests of justice to admit into evidence part of a written statement, and that the other party must be given the opportunity to argue that the statement should be admitted in its entirety because he has no possibility of cross-examining the maker of the statement.¹⁶ The appellant also argues that, if the statement includes material which is irrelevant, the whole statement must be rejected.¹⁷ The prosecution responds that it has the prerogative to tender evidence which it deems to be relevant to its case provided that it is *prima facie* credible.¹⁸

Counsel for the appellant orally informed the Appeals Chamber that his client did not intend to file a reply to the prosecution's Response, but relied upon what is said in his Interlocutory Appeal in answer to the prosecution's arguments.¹⁹

7. The certificate given by the Trial Chamber pursuant to Rule 73(C) (as it then stood) – that it was appropriate for the continuation of the trial that an interlocutory appeal be determined – related only to the first of these issues, as to the proper interpretation of the exclusion in Rule 92*bis*(A) of statements which go to proof of “the acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the indictment”.²⁰ It is, however, within the discretion of the Appeals Chamber to determine also other, related, issues where it considers it appropriate to do so, at least where they have been raised in the interlocutory appeal and the respondent to the appeal has had the opportunity to put his or its arguments in relation to those related issues. It is clear, from the present case and from other cases presently being tried in the Tribunal, that it will be beneficial to the Trial Chambers and to counsel generally that all of these matters be resolved in the present appeal. The Appeals Chamber proposes therefore to deal with them all.

1(a) The “acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the indictment”

8. The appellant emphasises that Rule 92*bis* excludes from the procedure laid down any written statement which goes to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused *as charged in the indictment*.²¹ He says that, as the indictment charges the appellant with individual criminal responsibility –

(i) as having aided and abetted others to commit the crimes charged, and

¹⁶ Interlocutory Appeal, p 11.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p 11.

¹⁸ Response, par 69.

¹⁹ Communication, 22 May 2002.

²⁰ Certificate, p 2.

²¹ Interlocutory Appeal, p 5.

(ii) as the superior of his subordinates who committed those crimes, the acts and conduct of those others and of his subordinates “represent his own acts”.²² The appellant describes those “others” as “co-perpetrators”, and he says that the “acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the indictment” encompasses the acts and conduct of the accused’s co-perpetrators and/or subordinates.²³ This argument was rejected by the Trial Chamber.²⁴

9. The appellant’s interpretation of Rule 92*bis* would effectively denude it of any real utility. That interpretation is inconsistent with both the purpose and the terms of the Rule. It confuses the present clear distinction drawn in the jurisprudence of the Tribunal between (a) the acts and conduct of those others who commit the crimes for which the indictment alleges that the accused is individually responsible, and (b) the acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the indictment which establish his responsibility for the acts and conduct of those others. It is only a written statement which goes to proof of the latter acts and conduct which Rule 92*bis*(A) excludes from the procedure laid down in that Rule.

10. Thus, Rule 92*bis*(A) excludes any written statement which goes to proof of any act or conduct of the accused upon which the prosecution relies to establish –

- (a) that the accused committed (that is, that he personally physically perpetrated) any of the crimes charged himself,²⁵ or
- (b) that he planned, instigated or ordered the crimes charged, or
- (c) that he otherwise aided and abetted those who actually did commit the crimes in their planning, preparation or execution of those crimes, or
- (d) that he was a superior to those who actually did commit the crimes, or
- (e) that he knew or had reason to know that those crimes were about to be or had been committed by his subordinates, or
- (f) that he failed to take reasonable steps to prevent such acts or to punish those who carried out those acts.

²² *Ibid*, p 6.

²³ *Ibid*, p 2. The present appeal is not the occasion to consider whether the expression “co-perpetrator”, rather than “perpetrator” or “principal offender”, is an appropriate description of those persons who actually commit the crimes which the indictment charges the accused with responsibility.

²⁴ Decision on the Prosecutor’s Motion for the Admission into Evidence of Written Statement by a Deceased Witness, and Related Report Pursuant to Rule 92*bis*(C), 12 Apr 2002 (“First Decision”), p 4; Decision on the Prosecutor’s Second Motion for the Admission into Evidence of Written Statement by Deceased Witness Bajram Šopi, Pursuant to Rule 92*bis*(C), 18 Apr 2002 (“Second Decision”), p 4.

²⁵ This is not any part of the prosecution case in this present matter.

Where the prosecution case is that the accused participated in a joint criminal enterprise, and is therefore liable for the acts of others in that joint criminal enterprise,²⁶ Rule 92bis(A) excludes also any written statement which goes to proof of any act or conduct of the accused upon which the prosecution relies to establish –

- (g) that he had participated in that joint criminal enterprise, or
- (h) that he shared with the person who actually did commit the crimes charged the requisite intent for those crimes.²⁷

Those are the “acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the indictment”, *not* the acts and conduct of others for which the accused is charged in the indictment with responsibility.²⁸

11. The “conduct” of an accused person necessarily includes his relevant state of mind, so that a written statement which goes to proof of any act or conduct *of the accused* upon which the prosecution relies to establish that state of mind is not admissible under Rule 92bis. In order to establish that state of mind, however, the prosecution may rely upon the acts and conduct of *others* which have been proved by Rule 92bis statements. An easy example would be proof, in relation to Article 5 of the Tribunal’s Statute, of the knowledge by the accused that his acts fitted into a pattern of widespread or systematic attacks directed against a civilian population.²⁹ Such knowledge may be inferred from evidence of such a pattern of attacks (proved by Rule 92bis statements) that he *must* have known that his own acts (proved by oral evidence) fitted into that pattern. The “conduct” of an accused person may also in the appropriate case include his omission to act.

12. This interpretation gives effect to the intention of Rule 92bis, which (together with the concurrent amendments to Rules 89 and 90)³⁰ was to qualify the previous preference in the Rules

²⁶ In *Prosecutor v Tadić*, IT-94-1-A, Judgment, 15 July 1999 (“*Tadić Judgment*”), at par 220, this liability is described as that of an accomplice.

²⁷ *Tadić Judgment*, par 196; *Prosecutor v Brđanin & Talić*, IT-99-36-PT, Decision on Form of Further Amended Indictment and Prosecution Application to Amend, 26 June 2001, par 31.

²⁸ See also *Prosecutor v Milošević*, IT-02-54-T, Decision on Prosecution’s Request to Have Written Statements Admitted Under Rule 92bis, 21 Mar 2002 (“*Milošević Decision*”), par 22: “The phrase ‘acts and conduct of the accused’ in Rule 92bis is a plain expression and should be given its ordinary meaning: deeds and behaviour of the accused. It should not be extended by fanciful interpretation. No mention is made of acts and conduct by alleged co-perpetrators, subordinates or, indeed, of anybody else. Had the rule been intended to extend to acts and conduct of alleged co-perpetrators or subordinates it would have said so.”

²⁹ *Tadić Judgment*, par 248.

³⁰ At the same time that Rule 92bis was introduced, Rule 90 was amended by deleting par (A), which stated: “Subject to Rules 71 and 71bis, witnesses shall, in principle, be heard directly by the Chambers”, and Rule 89 was amended by adding par (F), which states: “A Chamber may receive the evidence orally or, where the interests of justice allow, in written form”.

for “live, in court” testimony,³¹ and to permit evidence to be given in written form where the interests of justice allow provided that such evidence is probative and reliable, consistently with the decision of the Appeals Chamber concerning hearsay evidence in *Prosecutor v Aleksovski*.³² Far from being an “exception” to Rule 89, as the appellant claims,³³ Rule 92bis identifies a particular situation in which, once the provisions of Rule 92bis are satisfied, and where the material has probative value within the meaning of Rule 89(C), it is in principle in the interests of justice within the meaning of Rule 89(F) to admit the evidence in written form.³⁴ (The relationship between Rule 92bis and Rule 89(C) is discussed in pars 27-31, *infra*.)

13. The fact that the written statement goes to proof of the acts and conduct of a subordinate of the accused or of some other person for whose acts and conduct the accused is charged with responsibility does, however, remain relevant to the Trial Chamber’s decision under Rule 92bis. That is because such a decision also involves a further determination as to whether the maker of the statement should appear for cross-examination.³⁵ The proximity to the accused of the acts and conduct which are described in the written statement is relevant to this further determination.³⁶ Moreover, that proximity would also be relevant to the exercise of the Trial Chamber’s discretion in deciding whether the evidence should be admitted in written form at all.

³¹ *Prosecutor v Kordić & Čerkez*, IT-95-14/2-AR73.5, Decision on Appeal Regarding Statement of a Deceased Witness, 21 July 2000 (“*Kordić & Čerkez* Decision”), par 19.

³² IT-95-14/1-AR73, Decision on Prosecutor’s Appeal on Admissibility of Evidence, 16 Feb 1999 (“*Aleksovski* Decision”), par 15. The relevant passage is quoted in a footnote to par 27, *infra*.

³³ Interlocutory Appeal, p 10.

³⁴ The admission into evidence of written statements made by a witness in lieu of their oral evidence in chief is not inconsistent with Article 21.4(e) of the Tribunal’s Statute (“In the determination of any charge against the accused pursuant to the present Statute, the accused shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality: [...] to examine, or have examined, the witnesses against him and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him; [...]”) or with other human rights norms (for example, Article 6(3)(d) of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms provides: “Everyone charged with a criminal offence has the following minimum rights: [...] to examine, or have examined, witnesses against him and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him; [...]”). But, where the witness who made the statement is not called to give the accused an adequate and proper opportunity to challenge the statement and to question that witness, the evidence which the statement contains may lead to a conviction only if there is other evidence which corroborates the statement: *Unterpertinger v Austria*, Judgment of 24 Nov 1986, Series A no 110, pars 31-33; *Kostovski v The Netherlands*, Judgment of 20 Nov 1989, Series A no 166, par 41; *Vidal v Belgium*, Judgment of 22 Apr 1992, Series A no 235-B, par 33; *Lüdi v Switzerland*, Judgment of 15 June 1992, Series A no 238, par 49; *Artner v Austria*, Judgment of 28 Aug 1992, Series A no 242-A, pars 22, 27; *Saïdi v France*, Judgment of 20 Sept 1993, Series A no 261-C, pars 43-44; *Doorson v The Netherlands*, Judgment of 26 Mar 1996, par 80; *Van Mechelen v The Netherlands*, Judgment of 23 Apr 1997, Reports of Judgments and Decisions, 1997-III, pars 51, 55; *A M v Italy*, Judgment of 14 Dec 1999, 1999-IX Reports of Judgments and Decisions, par 25; *Lucà v Italy*, Judgment of 27 Feb 2001, 2001-II Reports of Judgments and Decisions, pars 39-40; *Solakov v Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, Judgment of 31 Oct 2001, appl No 47023/99, par 57.)

³⁵ Rule 92bis(E).

³⁶ *Milošević* Decision, par 22.

Where the evidence is so pivotal to the prosecution case, and where the person whose acts and conduct the written statement describes is so proximate to the accused, the Trial Chamber may decide that it would not be fair to the accused to permit the evidence to be given in written form.³⁷ An easy example of where the exercise of that discretion would lead to the rejection of a written statement would be where the acts and conduct of a person other than the accused described in the written statement occurred in the presence of the accused.

14. The exercise of the discretion as to whether the evidence should be admitted in written form at all becomes more difficult in the special and sensitive situation posed by a charge of command responsibility under Article 7.3 of the Tribunal's Statute. That is because, as the jurisprudence demonstrates in cases where the crimes charged involve widespread criminal conduct by the subordinates of the accused (or those alleged to be his subordinates), there is often but a short step from a finding that the acts constituting the crimes charged were committed by such subordinates to a finding that the accused knew or had reason to know that those crimes were about to be or had been committed by them.³⁸ Where the criminal conduct of those subordinates was widespread, the inference is often drawn that, for example, "there is no way that [the accused] could not have known or heard about [it]",³⁹ or "[the accused] had to have been aware of the genocidal objectives [of his subordinates]".⁴⁰

15. In such cases, it may well be that the subordinates of the accused (or those alleged to be his subordinates) are so proximate to the accused that *either* (a) the evidence of their acts and conduct which the prosecution seeks to prove by a Rule 92bis statement becomes sufficiently pivotal to the prosecution case that it would not be fair to the accused to permit the evidence to be given in written form, *or* (b) the absence of the opportunity to cross-examine the maker of the statement would in fairness preclude the use of the statement in any event. It must be emphasised, however, that the rejection of the written statement in any of these situations is not based upon any identification of that person's acts or conduct with the acts or conduct of the accused.

³⁷ *Prosecutor v Brđanin & Talić*, IT-99-36-T, (*Confidential*) Decision on the Admission of Rule 92bis Statements, 1 May 2002, par 14 [A public version of this Decision was filed on 23 May 2002.]

³⁸ *Prosecutor v Delalić et al*, IT-96-21-A, Judgment, 20 Feb 2001 ("*Delalić Judgment*"), par 241. There is a helpful list of *indicia* as to whether a superior "must have known" about the acts of his subordinates provided in the Final Report of the UN Commission of Experts (M. Cherif Bassiouni, Chairman), established pursuant to Security Council Resolution 780 (1992), 27 May 1994 (S/1994/674), under the heading "II Applicable Law - D. Command Responsibility".

³⁹ *Prosecutor v Delalić et al*, IT-96-21-T, Judgment, 16 Nov 1998, par 770.

⁴⁰ *Prosecutor v Krstić*, IT-98-33-T, 2 Aug 2001, Judgment, par 648.

16. The Appeals Chamber is very conscious of the fact that, in many cases, the evidence tendered pursuant to Rule 92bis will be relevant at the same time both to (i) the prosecution case that the accused has command responsibility under Article 7.3, and (ii) its case that the accused has individual responsibility under Article 7.1 (including participation in a joint criminal enterprise) other than personally perpetrating the crimes himself. However, Rule 92bis was primarily intended to be used to establish what has now become known as “crime-base” evidence, rather than the acts and conduct of what may be described as the accused’s immediately proximate subordinates – that is, subordinates of the accused of whose conduct it would be easy to infer that he knew or had reason to know. The Appeals Chamber does not believe, therefore, that the concerns which it has expressed as to the use of Rule 92bis in Article 7.3 cases where it relates to the acts and conduct of the accused’s immediately proximate subordinates will unduly limit the advantages to the expeditious disposal of trials which the Rule was designed to achieve. It may be that, where the evidence which the prosecution wishes to establish by extensive use of Rule 92bis in a particular case is specially pivotal to that case because it deals with the acts and conduct of the accused’s immediately proximate subordinates, it will have to elect between the alternative formulations of its case which it has pleaded if it wishes to take advantage of the Rule in relation to that evidence.

17. Returning to the present case, the two statements admitted into evidence by the Trial Chamber pursuant to Rule 92bis(C) did not go to proof of any acts or conduct of the accused, and the objection by the appellant upon this basis is rejected. The issue then arises as to whether they should nevertheless have been rejected in the exercise of the Trial Chamber’s discretion.

18. The written statement by Bajram Šopi, who was present collecting firewood when a man was killed by a sniper’s shot, does not indicate the source of the shot and (on its face and taken by itself) it appears to be of no particular importance to proof of the responsibility of the appellant. No question of discretion arises in relation to that statement. However, the statement of the expert (Hadija Čavčić) concerning his conclusions as to the direction from which the particular shell had been fired, could – for the reasons given in pars 15-16, *supra* – be of substantial importance to the prosecution case if it is the vital link in demonstrating that the shell which is alleged to have caused many casualties was fired from a gun emplacement manned by immediately proximate subordinates of the accused. A question of discretion would therefore

appear to arise as to whether it would be unfair to the accused to permit this evidence to be given in written form in any event, particularly as there can be no opportunity to cross-examine him.

19. The Trial Chamber's Decision in relation to the expert's statement deals in careful detail with the arguments raised as to the statement's compliance with the requirements of Rule 92bis,⁴¹ but it does not discuss any issue of discretion as might have been expected if that issue *had* been considered by the Trial Chamber. This may well be because counsel for the accused appears to have rested her opposition to the application by the prosecution exclusively upon the argument that the acts and conduct of the accused included those of his subordinates and upon the absence of any opportunity to cross-examine the expert, and she did not address the issue of discretion. In the opinion of the Appeals Chamber, however, it would be preferable that a Trial Chamber should nevertheless always give consideration to the exercise of the discretion given by Rule 92bis whenever the prosecution seeks to use that Rule in the special and sensitive situation posed by a charge of command responsibility under Article 7.3 where the evidence goes to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused's immediately proximate subordinates.

20. In the present case, there have been two witnesses who have already given oral evidence concerning the shelling described in the expert's statement (Mirza Sabljica, who conducted the investigation with Hadija Čavčić, and Sead Besić) and a third witness (Muhamed Jusufspahić) has yet to give oral evidence concerning it.⁴² The Trial Chamber concluded that the opportunity which the accused had to cross-examine those witnesses made up for the absence of such an opportunity in relation to the now deceased Hadija Čavčić.⁴³ It may well be – it is not possible to tell on the rather limited material before the Appeals Chamber – that the evidence of those witnesses will reduce or even remove any suggestion that the statement of Hadija Čavčić, despite the absence of the opportunity to cross-examine him, is sufficiently pivotal to the prosecution case that the shell was fired by subordinates of the accused as to render it unfair (because of their immediate proximity to him) to permit the evidence to be given in written form. The Appeals Chamber is, therefore, not in a position in this case to exercise its own discretion in the place of the Trial Chamber as it ordinarily would be.⁴⁴ In these circumstances, and in the light of the

⁴¹ First Decision.

⁴² *Ibid*, p 3.

⁴³ *Ibid*, p 3.

⁴⁴ cf *Prosecutor v Milošević*, IT-99-37-AR73, IT-01-50-AR73 & IT-01-51-AR73, Reasons for Decision on Prosecution Interlocutory Appeal from Refusal to Order Joinder, 18 Apr 2002 ("*Milošević* Appeal Decision"), pars 4, 6.

Appeals Chamber's rejection of the other issues argued in the appeal, it will be necessary to uphold the appeal against the order made in the First Decision so that the matter may be returned to the Trial Chamber for it to consider the exercise of its discretion in accordance with this present Decision in relation to the statement of Hadija Čavčić.

21. For these reasons, it remains appropriate to deal also with the two alternative responses put forward by the prosecution in relation to the exclusion of any written statement which goes to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused.

1(b) Does the exclusion apply to Rule 92bis(C) written statements?

22. The prosecution tendered the two statements in question under Rule 92bis(C), which concerns written statements by persons who have since died or who can no longer with reasonable diligence be traced or who are unable to testify orally by reason of their bodily or mental condition. The prosecution's argument is that Rule 92bis(C) does not exclude proof of the acts and conduct of the accused where the person who made the statement tendered under that Rule has since died. This argument is based upon what is described as a "contextual" interpretation of the Rule.⁴⁵

23. The prosecution submits that Rule 92bis(A) contemplates written statements made by persons who could still be called to give evidence, and that its purpose is to save the time of the evidence being given orally. On the other hand, the prosecution submits, Rule 92bis(C) contemplates statements made by persons who cannot be called to give evidence, and that its purpose is to permit the "best" evidence available to be given.⁴⁶ The prosecution claims support for this submission in the fact that, whereas both Rule 92bis(A) and Rule 92bis(D) (which concerns the admissibility of a transcript of evidence given by the witness in proceedings before the Tribunal) refer expressly to the exclusion of such written statements which go to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused, Rule 92bis(C) does not make any reference to that exclusion. The prosecution calls in aid the maxim *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*.⁴⁷ Such a maxim must always be applied with great care in statutory interpretation, for it is not of universal application. It is often described as a valuable servant but a dangerous master. Contrary to the

⁴⁵ Response, pars 7-8.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, pars 12-13.

⁴⁷ The express mention of one person or thing is the exclusion of another (Co Litt 210a).

prosecution's argument, however, the context which Rule 92bis provides for the particular provision in Rule 92bis(C) demonstrates that the maxim is irrelevant to its interpretation.

24. Rule 92bis(A) makes admissible written statements in lieu of oral testimony, but limits such written statements to those which go to proof of a matter other than the acts and conduct of the accused as charged in the indictment. Rule 92bis(B) sets out the form of a declaration which must be attached to the written statement before it becomes admissible under Rule 92bis(A) in lieu of oral testimony. Rule 92bis(D) provides a separate and self-contained method of producing evidence in a written form in lieu of oral testimony by the tender of the transcript of a witness's evidence in proceedings before the Tribunal. Rule 92bis(C), however, does *not* provide a separate and self-contained method of producing evidence in written form in lieu of oral testimony. Both in form and in substance, Rule 92bis(C) merely excuses the necessary absence of the declaration required by Rule 92bis(B) for written statements to become admissible under Rule 92bis(A).

25. The prosecution argument that Rule 92bis(C) does not exclude proof of the acts and conduct of the accused by a written statement of a deceased person is rejected.

1(c) Admissibility under Rule 89(C) without Rule 92bis restrictions

26. The prosecution's third response to the appellant's arguments that the two statements admitted into evidence go to proof of the acts and conduct of the accused was that they were in any event admissible under Rule 89(C) without the restrictions of Rule 92bis.⁴⁸

27. Rule 89(C) – "A Chamber may admit any relevant evidence which it deems to have probative value" – permits the admission of hearsay evidence (that is, evidence of statements made out of court), in order to prove the truth of such statements rather than merely the fact that they were made.⁴⁹ Hearsay evidence may be oral, as where a witness relates what someone else

⁴⁸ Response, pars 15-24.

⁴⁹ *Aleksovski* Decision, par 15: "It is well settled in the practice of the Tribunal that hearsay evidence is admissible. Thus relevant out of court statements which a Trial Chamber considers probative are admissible under Rule 89(C). This was established in 1996 by the Decision of Trial Chamber II in *Prosecutor v. Tadić* [IT-94-1-T, Decision on the Defence Motion on Hearsay, 5 Aug. 1996 ('*Tadić* Decision')] and followed by Trial Chamber I in *Prosecutor v. Blaškić* [IT-95-14-T, Decision on Standing Objection of the Defence to the Admission of Hearsay with no Inquiry as to its Reliability, 26 Jan. 1998 ('*Blaškić* Decision')]. Neither Decision was the subject of appeal and it is not now submitted that they were wrongly decided. Accordingly, Trial Chambers have a broad discretion under Rule 89(C) to admit relevant hearsay evidence. [footnote continued on next page]

had told him out of court, or written, as when (for example) an official report written by someone who is not called as a witness is tendered in evidence. Rule 89(C) clearly encompasses both these forms of hearsay evidence. Prior to the addition of Rule 92bis, the statement of a witness made to an OTP investigator who had died since making it had been admitted into evidence by a Trial Chamber pursuant to Rule 89(C), in *Prosecutor v Kordić & Čerkez*.⁵⁰ The Appeals Chamber overruled that decision on the basis that the discretion to admit hearsay evidence under Rule 89(C) had to be exercised so that it was in harmony with the Statute and the other Rules to the greatest extent possible,⁵¹ and only where the Trial Chamber was satisfied that the evidence was reliable.⁵² To some extent, the *Kordić & Čerkez* Decision by the Appeals Chamber was dependent upon the preference in the Rules at the time for “live, in court” testimony,⁵³ but its insistence upon the reliability of hearsay evidence was maintained in relation to hearsay written statements, despite the qualification of that preference (see par 12, *supra*), when Rule 92bis was introduced as a result of that decision.

28. Rules 92bis(A) and Rule 92bis(C) are directed to written statements prepared for the purposes of legal proceedings. This is clear not only from the fact that Rule 92bis was introduced as a result of the *Kordić & Čerkez* Decision but also from its description of the written statement as being admitted “in lieu of oral testimony” in Rule 92bis(A), as well as the nature of the factors identified in Rule 92bis(A) in favour and against “admitting evidence in the form of a written statement”. Rule 92bis(D), permitting the transcript of a witness’s evidence in proceedings before the Tribunal to be admitted as evidence, is similarly directed to material produced for the purposes of legal proceedings. Rule 92bis as a whole, therefore, is concerned

Since such evidence is admitted to prove the truth of its contents [*Tadić* Decision, pars 15-19], a Trial Chamber must be satisfied that it is reliable for that purpose, in the sense of being voluntary, truthful and trustworthy, as appropriate; and for this purpose may consider both the content of the hearsay statement and the circumstances under which the evidence arose [*Tadić* Decision, pars 15-19]; or, as Judge Stephen described it, the probative value of a hearsay statement will depend upon the context and character of the evidence in question [*Tadić* Decision, p 3 of Judge Stephen’s concurring opinion]. The absence of the opportunity to cross-examine the person who made the statements, and whether the hearsay is ‘first-hand’ or more removed, are also relevant to the probative value of the evidence [*Blaškić* Decision, par 12]. The fact that the evidence is hearsay does not necessarily deprive it of probative value, but it is acknowledged that the weight or probative value to be afforded to that evidence will usually be less than that given to the testimony of a witness who has given it under a form of oath and who has been cross-examined, although even this will depend upon the infinitely variable circumstances which surround hearsay evidence [*Tadić* Decision, pp 2-3 of Judge Stephen’s concurring opinion].”

⁵⁰ IT-95-14/2-T, 21 Feb 2000, Transcript p 14,701.

⁵¹ *Kordić & Čerkez* Decision, par 20.

⁵² *Ibid*, pars 22-24.

⁵³ *Ibid*, par 19.

with hearsay evidence such as would previously have been admissible under Rule 89(C). But it is hearsay material of a very special type, with very serious issues raised as to its reliability.

29. Unlike the civil law, the common law permits hearsay evidence only in exceptional circumstances.⁵⁴ When many common law jurisdictions took steps to limit the rule against hearsay by permitting the admission of written records kept by a business as evidence of the truth of what they stated notwithstanding that rule, they invariably excluded from what was to be admissible under that exception any documents made in relation to pending or anticipated legal proceedings involving a dispute as to any fact which the document may tend to establish. This exclusion reflected the fact that such documents are not made in the ordinary course by persons who have no interest other than to record as accurately as possible matters relating to the business with which they are concerned. It also rested upon the recognised potential in relation to such documents for fabrication and misrepresentation by their makers and of such documents being carefully devised by lawyers or others to ensure that they contained only the most favourable version of the facts stated.

30. The decision to encourage the admission of written statements prepared for the purposes of such legal proceedings in lieu of oral evidence from the makers of the statements was nevertheless taken by the Tribunal as an appropriate mixture of the two legal systems, but with the realisation that any evidentiary provision specifically relating to that material required considerable emphasis upon the need to ensure its reliability. This is particularly so in relation to written statements given by prospective witnesses to OTP investigators, as questions concerning the reliability of such statements have unfortunately arisen,⁵⁵ from knowledge gained in many trials before the Tribunal as to the manner in which those written statements are compiled.⁵⁶ Rule 92bis has introduced that emphasis.

⁵⁴ See, generally, *Myers v Director of Public Prosecutions* [1965] AC 1001.

⁵⁵ *Kordić & Čerkez Decision*, par 27; *Prosecutor v Naletilić & Martinović*, IT-98-34-T, *Confidential Decision on the Motion to Admit Statement of Deceased Witnesses Kazin Mežit and Arif Pasalić*, 22 Jan 2002, p 4.

⁵⁶ In the usual case, the witness gives his or her statement orally in B/C/S, which is translated into English and, after discussion, a written statement is prepared by the investigator in English. The statement as written down is read back to the witness in English and translated orally into B/C/S. The witness then signs the English written statement. Some time later, the English written statement is translated into a B/C/S written document, usually by a different translator, and it is this third stage translation which is provided to the accused pursuant to Rule 66. Neither the interview nor the reading back is tape-recorded to ensure the accuracy of the oral translation given at each stage.

31. A party cannot be permitted to tender a written statement given by a prospective witness to an investigator of the OTP under Rule 89(C) in order to avoid the stringency of Rule 92bis. The purpose of Rule 92bis is to restrict the admissibility of this very special type of hearsay to that which falls within its terms. By analogy, Rule 92bis is the *lex specialis* which takes the admissibility of written statements of prospective witnesses and transcripts of evidence out of the scope of the *lex generalis* of Rule 89(C), although the general propositions which are implicit in Rule 89(C) – that evidence is admissible only if it is relevant and that it is relevant only if it has probative value – remain applicable to Rule 92bis. But Rule 92bis has no effect upon hearsay material which was not prepared for the purposes of legal proceedings. For example, the report prepared by Hamdija Čavčić (described in par 3, *supra*) could have been admitted pursuant to Rule 89(C) if it was not prepared for the purposes of legal proceedings (as to which the evidence is silent). The prosecution argument that the two statements admitted into evidence were in any event admissible under Rule 89(C) without the restrictions of Rule 92bis is rejected.

2 The “probability of the said statements”

32. The appellant submits that neither of the decisions under appeal indicates that the Trial Chamber had “engaged in evaluation of the requirements prescribed under Rule 92bis(C)(i)”.⁵⁷ By admitting the written statement of a deceased witness “without previously attempting to establish its probability”, the appellant says, the decision of the Trial Chamber is opposed to the provisions of that Rule.⁵⁸ The “failure to engage in establishing the probability of the said statements” is also alleged to have caused the Trial Chamber to fail “in a reliable manner to establish facts on the basis of which these statements will be assessed”.⁵⁹ The submission is later repeated in these terms: “Trial Chamber in the contested decisions [...] did not proceed in accordance with the Rule 92bis(C)(i) and in view of this error, the contested decisions are legally untenable.”⁶⁰

33. The appellant has misread Rule 92bis(C)(i). For convenience, the terms of Rule 92bis(C) are repeated:

(C) A written statement not in the form prescribed by paragraph (B) may nevertheless be admissible if made by a person who has subsequently died, or by a person who can no longer with reasonable diligence be traced, or by a person who is by reason of bodily or mental condition unable to testify orally, if the Trial Chamber:

⁵⁷ Interlocutory Appeal, p 3.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, p 4.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p 4.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p 11.

- (i) is so satisfied on a balance of probabilities; and
(ii) finds from the circumstances in which the statement was made and recorded that there are satisfactory *indicia* of its reliability.

What Rule 92*bis*(C)(i) requires is that the Trial Chamber be satisfied on a balance of probabilities that the written statement was “made by a person who has subsequently died, or by a person who can no longer with reasonable diligence be traced, or by a person who is by reason of bodily or mental condition unable to testify orally”. That is made clear by the use of the words “if the Trial Chamber [...] is *so* satisfied” immediately following those words.⁶¹ The requirements of Rule 92*bis*(C)(i) have nothing to do with the “probability” or any other characteristic of the statement itself. The assessment of the reliability of that statement is the subject of Rule 92*bis*(C)(ii).

34. There was no issue taken by the appellant before the Trial Chamber in relation to the assertion by the prosecution at the trial that the makers of the two statements admitted into evidence were dead, coupled as it was with a death certificate for each of them. This objection by the appellant is rejected.

3 The reliability of the statements

35. The appellant submits that the Trial Chamber “did not engage in establishing the question of reliability”.⁶² This submission has not been developed in his Interlocutory Appeal in any way. The reliability of the statements had been contested before the Trial Chamber, and the Trial Chamber in each of its decisions made findings not only that it was satisfied that the written statement of each witness and the report of Hamdija Čavčić had satisfactory *indicia* of their reliability within the meaning of Rule 92*bis*(C)(ii),⁶³ but also that each had “probative value within the meaning of Rule 89(C)”.⁶⁴ The appellant has criticised the Trial Chamber’s reference to Rule 89(C) as “an error on a question of law”,⁶⁵ saying that there was no need to have recalled the general provisions of Rule 89 as Rule 92*bis* was the special rule applicable. As the Appeals Chamber has already stated, evidence is admissible only if it is relevant and it is relevant only if it has probative value, general propositions which are implicit in Rule 89(C).⁶⁶ The Trial Chamber need not have referred to Rule 89(C), but it did have to be satisfied that the evidence in

⁶¹ Emphasis has been added to the word “so”.

⁶² Interlocutory Appeal, p 3.

⁶³ First Decision, p 3; Second Decision, p 4.

⁶⁴ First Decision, p 3; Second Decision, p 4.

⁶⁵ Interlocutory Appeal, p 9.

⁶⁶ Paragraph 31, *supra*.

the statements was relevant in that sense before they could be admitted. No error was made by the Trial Chamber.

36. The prosecution is correct in its assertion that the appellant has not in this appeal contested the finding of the Trial Chamber in accordance with Rule 92*bis*(C)(ii) that there were satisfactory *indicia* of the reliability of each statement in the circumstances in which it was made and recorded.⁶⁷ Those findings of fact can be interfered with only if the appellant demonstrates that they were ones which no reasonable tribunal of fact could have reached,⁶⁸ or that they were invalidated by an error of law.⁶⁹ There has been no attempt to do so, and the Appeals Chamber, having considered the material before the Trial Chamber, is not satisfied that those findings are open to appellate review.

37. The appellant's complaint is rejected.

4 Application of Rule 92*bis* to expert witnesses

38. The appellant submits that Rule 92*bis* does not relate to expert witnesses, whose evidence is admissible only under Rule 94*bis*, so that the evidence of Hamdija Čavčić, the chemical engineer, was inadmissible under Rule 92*bis*.⁷⁰ Rule 94*bis* provides:

Rule 94*bis* Testimony of Expert Witnesses

- (A) The full statement of any expert witness to be called by a party shall be disclosed within the time-limit prescribed by the Trial Chamber or by the pre-trial Judge.
- (B) Within thirty days of filing of the statement of the expert witness, or such other time prescribed by the Trial Chamber or pre-trial Judge, the opposing party shall file a notice indicating whether:
 - (i) it accepts the expert witness statement; or
 - (ii) it wishes to cross-examine the expert witness.
- (C) If the opposing party accepts the statement of the expert witness, the statement may be admitted into evidence by the Trial Chamber without calling the witness to testify in person.

The appellant says that this Rule makes a formal distinction between witnesses and expert witnesses, so that Rule 92*bis*, in the absence of a clear and formal statement of intention to the

⁶⁷ Response, par 22.

⁶⁸ *Tadić* Judgment, par 64; *Prosecutor v Aleksovski* IT-95-14/1-A, Judgment, 24 Mar 2000, par 63; *Prosecutor v Furundžija*, IT-95-17/1-A, Judgment, 21 July 2000, par 37; *Delalić* Judgment, pars 434-435, 459, 491, 595; *Prosecutor v Kupreškić et al*, IT-96-16-A, Judgment, par 30.

⁶⁹ *Milošević* Appeal Decision, par 6.

⁷⁰ Interlocutory Appeal, p 9.

contrary, must be regarded as being subject to the same formal distinction.⁷¹ The Appeals Chamber does not accept the appellant's submissions.

39. Rule 94*bis* performs two separate functions. Whereas Rule 66(A)(ii) requires the prosecution to disclose the statements of all prosecution witnesses when a decision is made to call those witnesses, and whereas Rule 65*ter* requires the accused to disclose a summary of the facts on which each of his witnesses will testify prior to the commencement of the defence case, Rule 94*bis* provides a separate timetable for the disclosure of the statements of expert witnesses whichever party is calling that expert. Once the statement of an expert witness has been disclosed, Rule 94*bis* requires the other party to react to that statement within a further time limit and, depending upon whether the other party wishes to cross-examine the expert, provides for the admission of that statement without calling the expert witness to testify. No such provision is made in relation to the witnesses whose statements are disclosed by the prosecution pursuant to Rule 66(A)(ii) or the witnesses whose summaries are to be disclosed by the accused pursuant to Rule 65*ter*. In this sense, there is a clear distinction made in Rule 92*bis* between expert witnesses and other witnesses.

40. However, Rule 94*bis* contains nothing which is inconsistent with the application of Rule 92*bis* to an expert witness. Indeed, Rule 92*bis* expressly contemplates that witnesses giving evidence relating to the relevant historical, political or military background of a case (which is usually the subject of expert evidence) will be subject to its provisions. There is nothing in either Rule which would debar the written statement of an expert witness, or the transcript of the expert's evidence in proceedings before the Tribunal, being accepted in lieu of his oral testimony where the interests of justice would allow that course in order to save time, with the rights of the other party to cross-examine the expert being determined in accordance with Rule 92*bis*. Common sense would suggest that there is every reason to suggest that such a course ought to be followed in the appropriate case.

41. There is perhaps less need for reliance upon Rule 92*bis*(C) where an expert witness has died since making his report, as it is usually possible for the party requiring that expert evidence to obtain it from another source. But, again, there is nothing in either Rule which would debar reliance upon Rule 92*bis*(C) in relation to the report of an expert witness in the appropriate case.

⁷¹ *Ibid*, p 9.

The objection taken in the present case is to a witness whose expert evidence could not be replaced by another witness. Hamdija Čavčić describes the results of the shellings which he investigated at the time of their occurrence. His deductions as to the direction from which the shells were fired is without doubt expert evidence, but that expert evidence is based upon facts to which only he could testify directly.

42. It is unclear whether this particular objection was taken by the appellant before the Trial Chamber, but it is obvious that, if it had been, the only reasonable conclusion which would have been open to the Trial Chamber *in relation to this issue* was to have admitted the statement under Rule 92bis. The appellant's objection is rejected.

5 Admissibility of part of a written statement

43. The appellant submits that, in relation to the statement of Bajram Šopi (described in par 4, *supra*), it is not in the interests of justice, and it is to the detriment of his fair trial, not to have admitted that part of that statement which, it is said, states:⁷²

[...] the fact that in the school, which was located in the vicinity of his house, the army was stationed there from where it was going to the first front combat line, that he took part in bringing food for the army, and other facts which prove that he was not a civilian, and that he was present in the zone of legitimate military targets.

The appellant asserts that he should have been given the opportunity to present his stand in relation to this part of the statement, to argue that it should have been admitted because he was unable to cross-examine this witness.⁷³

44. The clear suggestion in those submissions that the appellant was not given the opportunity to put these arguments at the trial is entirely without merit. A response to the prosecution's motion to admit the evidence was filed by the appellant on 8 April.⁷⁴ Its concerns were directed to what are described as the statement's "many inconsistencies and imprecise information" as to incident 11 in the schedule to the indictment, the absence of detail as to the wounding of the witness's wife (which was recounted in a part of the statement not tendered by the prosecution) and, in very general terms, the "poor and incomplete explanation of the facts from his short written statement". Significantly, the response made no mention of the arguments

⁷² Interlocutory Appeal, p 11.

⁷³ *Ibid*, p 11.

⁷⁴ Reply to the Request of the Prosecutor to Present the Evidence in Accordance to [*sic*] Rule 92bis(C), 8 Apr 2002, signed by Ms Pilipović as lead counsel.

now put before the Appeals Chamber. The appeal process is not designed for the purpose of allowing parties to remedy their own failings or oversights at the trial.

45. Moreover, the written statement which was admitted into evidence makes no mention of the witness taking part in bringing food for the army, or any other fact which may prove that he was not a civilian, as the Interlocutory Appeal suggests. Even if the witness could be regarded as a combatant at some earlier time, it is not clear from the statement how he lost his civilian status when he was collecting firewood at the time the other man present was shot. There was no mention in the statement of "legitimate military targets" unless this describes the school building behind the witness's house which (the statement says) had been "levelled" the year before this incident, but which had at that earlier time been used to house military units. If this interpretation was disputed, it was open to the appellant to raise that issue in the cross-examination of another witness to the same incident, one Nura Bajraktarević. No detriment to the fair trial of the appellant has so far been demonstrated by the non-tender of this part of the statement.

46. It must be emphasised that Rule 92*bis*(C) makes specific provision for the admission of part only of a written statement of a witness,⁷⁵ and that it is for the Trial Chamber to decide, after hearing the parties, whether to admit the statement in whole or in part.⁷⁶ Notwithstanding the argument of the prosecution to the contrary,⁷⁷ it is *not* its "prerogative" to determine how much of the statement is to be admitted. Where that part of the written statement not tendered by the prosecution modifies or qualifies what is stated in the part tendered, or where it contains material relevant to the maker's credit, the absence of any opportunity to cross-examine the witness (which must be the case where Rule 92*bis*(C) is concerned) would usually necessitate the admission of those parts of the statement as well. There is no foundation for the appellant's argument that, if the statement includes material which is irrelevant, the whole of the statement must be rejected.⁷⁸

47. The appellant's objection is rejected.

⁷⁵ Rule 92*bis*(A).

⁷⁶ Rule 92*bis*(E).

⁷⁷ Response, par 69.

⁷⁸ Interlocutory Appeal, p 11.

Disposition

48. For the foregoing reasons:

- (1) The appeal against the Trial Chamber's First Decision (given on 12 April 2002) is allowed, so that the matter may be returned to the Trial Chamber for it to consider the exercise of its discretion in accordance with this present Decision in relation to the statement of Hamdija Čavčić.
- (2) The appeal against the Trial Chamber's Second Decision (given on 18 April 2002) is dismissed.

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

Dated this 7th day of June 2002,
At The Hague,
The Netherlands.



Judge David Hunt
Presiding Judge

[Seal of the Tribunal]

ANNEX A

Annex: Objection to Admission of UN Documents through Rule 89(C)

Not sufficiently significant	Cumulative (not an exhaustive list)	Anonymous/Hearsay (no opportunity to cross-examine)
<p>The following are identified as perpetrators in the document but are not identified as principals in the Indictment. As such much of the document refers to violations outside the scope of the Indictment. The actors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECOMOG • GAF • ULIMO • Police • Miscellaneous (Minor Perpetrator groups) • Unidentified rebels <p>The document refers to all districts from Sierra Leone between 1991 and 2000. As such most of it falls outside the following times and locations in the Indictment and should be excluded:</p> <p>Acts of terrorism (Count 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kono from about 01.02.98 - 31.12.98; and, • Freetown and Western Area from about 21.12.98 - 28.02.99 <p>Murder and violence to life (Counts 2 and 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenema district from about 25.05.97 to 31.03.98; • Kono district from about 01.02.98 to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RUF/AFRC human rights violations 1991-2000 (p.9 and 25-27) <p>Relevant to all crimes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit P-69 United Nations Security Council Resolution (1132) 8 October 1997, p.2 para 1 • Exhibit P-78 Sierra Leone - 1998 - A Year of Atrocities against civilians, Amnesty International Report, p.8-9 • Exhibit P-131 IRIN-West Africa Update 146, 98.2.16, University of Pennsylvania - African Studies Center, p.1 • Exhibit P-57, Transcript of RUF speech to Nation delivered on SLBS on 18 June 1997, p.1 • Exhibit P-130 UN Security Resolution, 5th Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Sierra Leone, 9 June 1998, pp.3, 5-9 • Exhibit P-80, UN Security Council 11st Progress Report of Secretary General of the UN Observer Mission in Sierra Leone, 12 August 1998, para 6-8 • Exhibit D-17, Witness to truth: Report of the Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission, p.5, (1991-2000: 11,991 victims of violations, 1,021 victims of sexual violence & forced conscriptions) • Exhibit P-77, Human Rights in Sierra Leone 1998-2000 by TF-150, <i>passim</i> <p>Atrocities committed during invasion of Freetown:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical data - Unable to identify who was actually interviewed, <i>passim</i> • Names of victims and perpetrators removed from document, p.1 • Based on a random sample of collected statements, p.7 • Assumptions made by the coders, p.7

Annex: Objection to Admission of UN Documents through Rule 89(C)

Not sufficiently significant	Cumulative (not an exhaustive list)	Anonymous/Hearsay (no opportunity to cross-examine)
<p>31.01.00;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kailahun district from about 01.02.98 to 30.06.98; and, • Freetown and Western area from about 21.12.98 to 28.02.99 <p>Rape, sexual slavery and outrages against personal dignity (Counts 4, 5 and 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kono district from about 01.02.98 to 31.12.98; • Kailahun district about 30.11.96 to 18.01.02; and, • Freetown and Western Area from about 21.12.98 to 28.02.99 <p>Violence to life and other inhumane Acts (Counts 7 and 8):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kono district from about 01.02.98 to 31.12.98; • Kailahun district: from about 30.11.96 to 18.01.02; • Freetown and Western Area from about 21.12.98 to 28.02.99 <p>Child soldiers (Count 9) not explicitly covered although abductions included outside the time frame of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • about 30.11.96 to 18.01.02 <p>Enslavement (Count 10):</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit P-205A p.29-59 Transcript, SCSL, <i>Prosecutor v Alex Tamba Brima, Brima Bazzy Kamara & Santigie Borbor Kanu</i> 9 & 10 March 2005, • Exhibit P-206 P.7-20 Transcript, SCSL, <i>Prosecutor v Issa Sesay, Morris Kallon & Augustine Gbao</i>, 28 November 2005 • Exhibit P-207 p.38-59, Transcript, SCSL, <i>Prosecutor v Alex Tamba Brima, Brima Bazzy Kamara & Santigie Borbor Kanu</i>, 6 April 2005 <p>Other human rights violations in 1999:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.5320:13 – p.5321:11 and p.5327:9, 5 March 2008 • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.4917:7-20 and p.4926:22 - p.4927:15, p.4928:1 – p.4930:2, p.4924:16-21, 22 April 2008 • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.4048:16 - p.4050:9, 18 February 2008 <p>RUF/AFRC human rights violations 1991-2000 continued (p.9 and 25-27) – specific crimes:</p> <p><i>Abduction, arbitrary detention and forced labour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit P-204B, Trauma and Disease Pattern of Rebel- abducted Victims by Dr S Gassama, March – December 1999, pp. 20587-20589 • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.1436:1-1437:9, 16 January 2008 (RUF- 1991) • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.10419:20-10420:9, 21 May 2008 (1991) 	

Annex: Objection to Admission of UN Documents through Rule 89(C)

Not sufficiently significant	Cumulative (not an exhaustive list)	Anonymous/Hearsay (no opportunity to cross-examine)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenema district from about 01.07.97 to 18.01.02; • Kono district from about 01.02.98 to 18.01.02; • Kailahun district from about 30.11.96 to 18.01.02; and, • Freetown and Western area from about 21.12.98 to 28.02.99 <p>Looting (Count 11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kono district about 01.02.98 to 31.12.98 • Bombali district from about 01.02.98 to 30.04.98 • Port Loko district from about 01.02.98 to 30.04.98 • Freetown and Western Area from about 21.12.98 to 28.02.99 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides overview of the whole situation rather than specific crimes at specific times • Crime based evidence 	<p><i>Child soldiers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit P43 Children associated with the fighting forces in Sierra Leone, Report for OTP 4/5/07- whole document <p><i>Amputation</i> (and p.29-30 of Report)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.4022:9 – p.4024:1, 18 February 2008 • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.8336:22 – p.8339:23, 23 April 2008 • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.3931:13-17, 14 February 2008 • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.17993:1-6, 6 October 2008 • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.19610:10-13, 30 October 2008 • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p1431:20-p1434:2, 16 January 08 (RUF/AFRC campaign-1991) • Exhibit P-79, MSF Press Release- Mutilations of Civilians on the increase in Sierra Leone, 5 May 1998 (1998), <i>passim</i> • Looting • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.10419:20-10420:9, 21 May 2008 (1991) <p><i>Rape</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit P-204B, Trauma and Disease Pattern of Rebel- abducted Victims by Dr S Gassama, 	

Annex: Objection to Admission of UN Documents through Rule 89(C)

Not sufficiently significant	Cumulative (not an exhaustive list)	Anonymous/Hearsay (no opportunity to cross-examine)
	<p>March – December 1999, pp. 20587-20589</p> <p><i>Destruction of property</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Prosecutor v Taylor</i>, Transcript p.10419:20-10420:9, 21 May 2008 (1991) <p><i>Sexual abuse/Sexual slavery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit P-73, Expert Report of Beth Vann-Conflict-related Sexual Violence in Sierra Leone, 14 May 2007 p2 • Exhibit P-73, p6 (1991-2001 - 9,166 people) • Members of the NPFL and Liberians in the RUF (p. 7 of Report) • Exhibit P-203 p.2 Adoption of Statement by Witness and Interview Notes, 4 July 2008 • Exhibit P-18, Report of the panel of experts established by resolution 1306 – S/2000/1195, adopted on 20 December 2000, <i>passim</i> <p>FN 21 p.6 Pre-Trial Brief – civil war in Sierra Leone FN 30 p.8 Pre-Trial Brief – enslavement and exploitation of civilians</p>	