Case No. SCSL-2004-14-T
THE PROSECUTOR OF
THE SPECIAL COURT
V.
SAM HINGA NORMAN
MOININA FOFANA
ALLIEU KONDEWA

WEDNESDAY, 22 JUNE 2005
9.41 A.M.
TRIAL

TRIAL CHAMBER I

Before the Judges:	Pierre Boutet, Presiding Bankole Thompson Benjamin Mutanga Itoe
For Chambers:	Ms Sharelle Aitchison Ms Roza Salibekova
For the Registry:	Ms Maureen Edmonds
For the Prosecution:	Mr Joseph Kamara Mr Mohamed Bangura Mr Kevin Tavener
For the Principal Defender:	NO APPEARANCES
For the accused Sam Hinga Norman:	Dr Bu-Buakei Jabbi Ms Clare da Silva (legal assistant) Mr Kingsley Belle (legal assistant)
For the accused Moinina Fofana:	Mr Andrew Ianuzzi
For the accused Allieu Kondewa:	Mr Yada Williams Mr Virgil Chong (intern)

[HN220605A - CR]
Wednesday, 22 June 2005
[Open session]
[The accused Norman not present]
[The accused Fofana not present]
[The accused Kondewa not present]
[Upon commencing at 9.41 a.m.]

PRESIDING JUDGE: Good morning, Mr Prosecutor. Good morning, Defence counsel. We are back in Court this morning to hear whatever comments/application that the Prosecution had about the documents it is seeking to introduce. That's where we left off on Monday. Indications were that you intended to seek the admission of these documents, if I am right, pursuant to Rule 92bis. That's where we left off. You were to meet and discuss with your colleagues from the Defence. So where are we? Mr Kamara, you are the one dealing with this matter?

MR KAMARA: Yes, Your Honour.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Good morning.

MR KAMARA: Good morning. Actually, we are unable to have discussions with the Defence, but we were informed that they are opposing the entire piece of the document.

PRESIDING JUDGE: So?

MR KAMARA: We are going to seek the introduction of this document into evidence and we are making the argument to this Court.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Have you complied with the provisions of 92bis(C) at this time? I was under the impression on Monday that the time prescribed may be causing some difficulties. I'm just raising the issue. I'm not more familiar than that, other than

the fact that mention was made of it either this week or last week.

MR KAMARA: You're very correct, Your Honour. There was short service --

09:45:29 JUDGE ITOE: We were proceeding on the understanding that the Defence would not raise any objections as to your not having respected the time limits.

MR KAMARA: Yes.

JUDGE ITOE: So they need ten days and then they need five

09:45:48 days to reply.

MR KAMARA: The Defence have not raised objections as to that. The objections were as to the admission.

JUDGE ITOE: We will hear the Defence on this.

MR KAMARA: Thank you, Your Honour. In the light of that,

09:46:08 we are trying to rest the case for the Prosecution, that's why we are coming with this motion at this point in time.

PRESIDING JUDGE: But before we hear whatever you may have to say, we will ask Defence counsel if they have any objection not on the substantive nature of the application but on the --

09:46:34 MR KAMARA: The timing.

PRESIDING JUDGE: -- the timing.

MR KAMARA: Very well.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Counsel for first accused?

MR JABBI: Your Honour, we have a joint position on this

09:46:48 matter in the Defence. Mr Yada Williams, learned counsel for the third accused, would kindly oblige on our behalf.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Williams?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes, sir.

PRESIDING JUDGE: You heard my comments. We are not

dealing at this stage with the substantive nature of the motion or the application. My understanding of Mr Kamara's comments was that the Defence, if they have any comment to make, would direct those comments to the substantive nature. It would appear that the Defence would have no objection to the timing prescribed under 92bis(C) that's what I'm putting to you at the moment.

MR WILLIAMS: We have not read the provisions of 92bis(C), My Lord.

PRESIDING JUDGE: So it is the position of Defence counsel, all accused, that the time prescribed under 92bis(C) has to be complied with and has it been complied with, as far as you are concerned?

MR WILLIAMS: We are insisting on 92bis(C) and it has not been complied with.

PRESIDING JUDGE: How is it that it has not been complied with? When were you first notified, if notified at all?

MR WILLIAMS: Your Honour, Thursday of last week.

PRESIDING JUDGE: I want to know a bit more precisely. As you know, 92bis(C) says it shall give ten days' notice to the other party. When was the notice given; if it was ten days, and if there is any an objection, it must be submitted within five days.

MR WILLIAMS: Your Honour, we were served with a document on Tuesday of last week.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Which means you would have been served with the documents on the 14th, Tuesday of last week?

MR WILLIAMS: That's so.

PRESIDING JUDGE: So you are saying you're not waiving these requirements. Ten days will be the 24th, which is

tomorrow?

MR WILLIAMS: Ten days will be Friday morning.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Pardon me, the 24th, which is Friday. I'm misreading my calendar. Mr Kamara, you've heard the -- thank you, Mr Williams, for the time being.

09:50:18

MR KAMARA: Your Honours, I guess I got the position wrongly. Our understanding was that in the course of the discussions with the Defence was that they were going to agree on the substance and not on the procedure. Even if we were to go under the procedure per se the fact that we are coming today and not on Friday --

09:50:37

PRESIDING JUDGE: It doesn't mean to come on Friday. The rule is very clear. They have to be given a notice of ten days.

JUDGE ITOE: It's ten days.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Then if they have an objection, they need to submit it within five days following that. It doesn't mean on Friday they are going to be ready. They have five days. Presumably they will notify you and us whether they are ready within that five days and, within that five days, it doesn't necessarily mean we are ready to hear it. The time prescribed, as I see it, as it would appear to me, is to allow the parties to look at whatever it is you are trying to introduce at this particular moment to give them time to sift through that. We have been given a copy and, just by the look of it, it's many hundreds of pages. I don't think you can expect anybody to go through that in five minutes or even a day.

09:50:57

09:51:15

09:51:36

JUDGE THOMPSON: You ought to understand them to be saying as a matter of law they are not prepared to waive any non-compliance with 92bis, as a matter of law.

MR KAMARA: I agree. The provisions are quite clear on it. It's just the understanding we had. Now they are clear they are not compromising on that, I want to invite your Lordships to --

JUDGE THOMPSON: You say they have indicated to you they were going to waive their rights on 92bis?

MR KAMARA: My understanding of the discussions was that it was admission issues and not on procedural issues.

JUDGE THOMPSON: The point we've now reached --

JUDGE ITOE: Procedural issues have something to do with admission issues, which are tied up with the issue of the time limits, which are set for the taking on of these applications.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Kamara, we are not prepared to entertain any substantial arguments on the substantive nature of this application at this particular moment, given what is prescribed. I know you were about to say but we could apply the prescription of the rules to shorten the timing.

MR KAMARA: That is what I was going to say. Your Lordships can use your inherent jurisdiction in shortening the rules. These are not short documents.

JUDGE ITOE: You want us to ambush the Defence?

MR KAMARA: No, not ambush the Defence. These are documents --

JUDGE ITOE: If the Defence is not ready, they are not ready.

MR KAMARA: Yes, Your Honour, but these are documents they've had already since April of last year.

JUDGE THOMPSON: The difficulty is that this is quite a bundle of material. Even if they have had it since April, memory not being infallible, we, the judges, too, would like to go

through them again. There are going to be all kinds of technicalities about the question of their admissibility. And any amount of indecent haste would, clearly, frustrate the interests of justice. I think it is proper that we follow the rules with great scrupulousness. They say they are not waiving their right, and the question of admission, of course, is a substantive issue, but we are at the procedural level. Therefore, in other words, what are you going to do? They say, "We are insisting on having compliance with 92bis in respect of the notice".

MR KAMARA: Yes, Your Honour, but in the interest of fairness and the expedition of the trial, the Defence have been crying all along of the trial, expedition, expedition. Here we are today, we are trying to expedite the trial in the sense that these documents that have been filed with the court.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Kamara, we are not prepared to use and invoke our inherent power to impose a specific limitation on the time prescribed. You can argue whatever you want, but we are not prepared to do it this morning. I should also mention to you, if that is the case, what is it that you waited until last week to invoke 92bis and give notice when that decision on the judicial notice was rendered on 16 May? We all are at the last moment now and everybody has to rush to try to meet some timeline.

MR KAMARA: Your Honours, this is not a rush in the sense that at the end of our case, where we are today, it's the time we take a look at the entire picture that we presented to the Court and we find it expedient now to put together these pieces to provide a complete picture.

JUDGE THOMPSON: That is a substantive aspect. That is not

an issue, really. Nobody is trying, in fact, to fetter your Prosecutorial discretion in what you do to wind up your case. Of course, as very accomplished Prosecutors, we expect you to do the finishing touches, refine everything before you close your case. That's not the issue now. The issue is, clearly, we have quite a large bundle of material that, in my own judgment, needs to be painstakingly gone through with regards to the question of admissibility. To force upon us a situation whereby expeditiousness demands that we should now rush through what really requires some painstaking effort would seem, to me, to be a kind of an attempt to do things, with the greatest respect, in a not too tidy manner.

PRESIDING JUDGE: And just to reassure you, we are not prepared to impose and use our inherent power to impose any specific limitation on the Prosecution that would deprive the Prosecutor of their ability to bring whatever evidence and information they think is required for the purpose of establishing the counts that are in existence at this particular moment. If that is your fear, let me tell you that is not our intent this morning.

JUDGE ITOE: Was that what you wanted to rely on? You wanted to rely on our inherent -- rather, on our exercise of the powers to limit the times that have been imposed? Is that what you wanted to rely on? For us to embark on the substantive hearing of this matter?

MR KAMARA: Partly, Your Honours.

JUDGE ITOE: Partly. And the other partly, what?

MR KAMARA: The other part is the expedition of the trial.

JUDGE ITOE: Expedition. Well we are all very conscious of

that. We need to move expeditiously, but like my learned brother pointed out, we need to move expeditiously and neatly.

MR KAMARA: Your Honours, if I may suggest here that the Court can hear their arguments and then defer their decision to a later date in a sense that they can make an indicative decision as we've already had.

JUDGE ITOE: How do you want us to hear arguments when your colleagues on this side are saying they are not ready? The provisions of 92bis have not been complied with. How do you expect us to take on arguments? Is that neat?

JUDGE THOMPSON: And those are the circumventions that you propose that I find clearly unacceptable. Really, they go to the issue of procedural irregularity. Remember, the Court is guided by rules and procedures, and flexibility in our approaches to issues does not mean that we throw away the entire concept of procedural tidiness and regularity. Certainly you would not advocate that?

MR KAMARA: No way, I wouldn't advocate that. The only point I am making here, Your Honours, is the fact that strict adherence to the technicality of rules should not inhibit the Court from --

PRESIDING JUDGE: Yes, but technicality here is important, because if this timing has been prescribed, especially when you look at the pile of documents that you are trying to introduce at this particular moment, technicality would require anybody to look through these arguments and try to ascertain what it is you are trying to introduce. Ten days may not even be sufficient. It depends what it is. If it was a one-page document I would say maybe a day would be sufficient.

JUDGE THOMPSON: It is not even technicality. It is equality of arms. Both sides have a right to examine these documents. The Prosecution has had the benefit of looking at them over and over again. The Bench didn't know that they be
09:59:37 received on 92bis or 89C and we, in a way, are slightly taken by surprise and to be able to make any constructive legal contributions to the process, I'm sure that you don't want to entrap us.

MR KAMARA: No way, Your Honour, I don't want to do that.

10:00:01 JUDGE ITOE: Let me be very, very frank. The Chamber was very prepared to go on, to listen to your arguments.

MR KAMARA: Yes.

JUDGE ITOE: If, and only if, the Defence said they were waiving their right to the ten days and the five days and so on
10:00:20 which are provided for under that. Now there is an objection, we cannot --

MR KAMARA: In that case, Your Honour, I ask your indulgence for a short break. We might have to confer further with the Defence and take further instructions.

10:00:36 MR WILLIAMS: Your Honour, it would appear from the way my learned friend is couching his argument, we have not shown any magnanimity to them.

PRESIDING JUDGE: That is not quite the same.

MR WILLIAMS: They would not be prepared to shift, to
10:00:54 compromise. Your Honour, we actually wrote to them on the 16th of this month, My Lord, which was about two days after we were served, telling them if they were to provide us with the written submissions as to the relevance of the document as required by the rules, we would be prepared to waive the provision of

92bis(C). My Lord, they did not get back to us. I mean, we were definitely prepared -- this is a burden on them, My Lords, as is required by 92bis(B) to show not only the relevance, but our - if these things are --

10:01:48 MR KAMARA: Mr Williams, I am sorry, talk to Mr Ianuzzi. We did provide arguments to the Defence, I think, a week ago. We provided a summary of arguments to the Defence, together with copies, to enable them to come --

JUDGE ITOE: To which Defence?

10:02:03 MR KAMARA: We forwarded it to the Defence for the second accused.

JUDGE ITOE: Did you forward it to the third?

MR KAMARA: No, we were made to understand that they would.

MR IANUZZI: If I could be helpful here. We engaged in some informal discussions with Mr Tavener last week. On Thursday 10:02:15 of last week, counsel for the first accused sent an email to the Prosecution indicating that they would waive the ten days' notice requirement if formal submissions were filed with the Court outlining the reasons and the basis for submissions under 92bis. 10:02:38 The following day, counsel for the second accused sent a similar email. We received a draft from the Prosecution on Friday, but it didn't outline the specifics and it wasn't filed with the Court. That's where we stand.

MR KAMARA: I was making an application for a short stand 10:03:00 down for --

PRESIDING JUDGE: What does short stand down mean for you? Half an hour, an hour?

MR KAMARA: Half an hour, Your Honour.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Very well, the Court will adjourn for

half an hour till 10.30.

[Break taken at 10.01 a.m.]

[On resuming at 10.34 a.m.]

PRESIDING JUDGE: Yes, Mr Kamara.

10:35:54 MR KAMARA: Thank you, Your Honours. We've had meaningful discussions with our learned friends on the other side. Unfortunately, we are unable to get a consensus.

PRESIDING JUDGE: So what is your position?

MR KAMARA: The timetable starts running on Friday, from

10:36:07 our understanding and that five days thereafter, they have to respond, and based on the response, if we desire to reply, we do. That might affect the calendar.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Well, if it affects the calendar, we will have to adjust the calendar. It is not with pleasure that I say

10:36:28 this this morning, because we were hopeful, as you were, that everything would be finished this past Tuesday. As I say, we are not prepared to impose some closure against the Prosecution that may have an impact on their ability to do the case as they wish to do it.

10:36:47 MR KAMARA: Yes, Your Honour. And so we wonder whether we will be able to come sometime in the first week of July and submit the arguments.

PRESIDING JUDGE: We will. But, I would like to point out to you, and the Defence, given the way it is moving at this

10:37:01 particular moment, we will ask you to provide, in writing, the arguments you're going to put forward and we'll ask the Defence what, in fact -- we are asking you to more or less comply with the Defence request that you put in writing your argument, because it will be helpful to us as well to understand what it is

and when I say arguments, not only arguments in law, any authority you may have to support that, as well as identifying -- it is not only to have a bundle like this; I want to know in the bundle if it is page 225 you're relying on or all of these pages and why? In other words, try to assist us in making a decision on these matters, in as much as you can.

MR KAMARA: Yes, Your Honour, we will definitely do that.

PRESIDING JUDGE: If you can do that within the 10 days, it would be to the advantage of everybody, including this Court.

10:37:53 MR KAMARA: And that it does not affect the timing as it is going.

PRESIDING JUDGE: No. We'll ask the Defence within the five days that they have to do the same, in that they submit in writing to you and to the Court their position and then we'll

10:38:06 come back in Court. We're planning to come back into Court on 5th July to hear arguments, if we think we need arguments at that time.

MR KAMARA: Good, good. The Defence has already been provided that, so Your Honours we'll forward a copy and file a

10:38:28 copy with the Court.

PRESIDING JUDGE: My brother Justice Thompson reminds me that I should make it clear as well that this is not only the wish of the Court, but this is an order that it shall be complied with, in case there is any doubt as to whether it should be done

10:38:47 or not, so it should be understood that you shall provide your arguments, in writing, along the lines I have described with supporting documentation, if any, and authorities. And clearly identifying whatever it is. As I said, I look at the bundles, as such. There is reference at the top of something, but where is

it?

MR KAMARA: There are indications, there are lines that we've extrapolated as directed by the Appeals Chamber. They are underlined.

10:39:22 JUDGE THOMPSON: Because we don't want to go into the substantive aspects of the issue, just to make sure that everything is done in such a way as to facilitate a clear understanding of the Bench. This is a very important part of your case, and we need to follow you as carefully as possible and

10:39:43 painstakingly so that we understand what this dimension is all about.

PRESIDING JUDGE: On that very issue, I would like to clearly understand - I'm looking here at the one that you have, 92bis and 89(C). It says: "Report of the UN Secretary-General

10:40:04 on 11 February 1998". I'm using that as an example. Presumably looking at that, you will be asking that the whole of the Report of the UN Secretary-General of 5 February 1998 be admitted in evidence, meaning the totality of that report. If that is not the case, I want to know in that report which section, portion

10:40:25 that you're looking at. That's really what we're asking you.

MR KAMARA: Your Honour, that's not the case. It's not the entire report. The portions that we are particularly interested in have been underlined. We will show the page and the lines.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Perhaps to the object of, you know,

10:40:42 seeking that kind of exercise of the Court's discretion in admitting the particular document, because we need to know what is the purpose of doing that. I mean, it's sometimes not just that you're bringing in a document, but I think it's important that we know what is the object behind the application to admit a

particular document or a bundle of documents.

MR KAMARA: Yes, Your Honour. That is why we categorised them differently. Those that are in pursuant to the appellate decision we have indicated, and we were directed to extrapolate information that has been already accepted for its existence and authenticity. And that's what we have done. For those, it is my submission that we need not argue for them. For the others that there may be issues of facts that may be in dispute, then we extrapolate information and then show the relevance of that information.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, evidentiary object. That's the point I'm making. Just to go along with you, so we're not left completely groping in the dark.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Our order and direction is clearly understood. Presumably you are ready to argue your case this morning, the substantive nature, so you would not need much time to reduce that to writing, file it with the Court and serve your friends on the Defence side with that.

MR KAMARA: We will surely do.

JUDGE ITOE: How early do you think you will able to be in possession of your submissions on this?

MR KAMARA: We already actually have it, Your Honour. It is now just to add a few compliances that the Presiding Judge has referred to in terms of the pages.

JUDGE ITOE: And other concerns which have been addressed?

MR KAMARA: Yes, by Friday.

PRESIDING JUDGE: If it is Friday, it is still within the ten days, anyhow.

MR KAMARA: By Friday we should be able to file it with the

Court.

PRESIDING JUDGE: And we will not give any additional time to the Defence. They will have the five days to comply with the same requests and directions of the Court. We will adjourn these proceedings - that's our intent - to 5th July -- just a second, I just want to make sure that my dates are accurate here. 6th July, pardon me. Which is the Wednesday, at 9.30. Hopefully that will be the last day for the Prosecution.

MR KAMARA: We hope so.

PRESIDING JUDGE: At that moment, we will see about a calendar, how we make the necessary adjustments.

MR KAMARA: For the motion of acquittal.

PRESIDING JUDGE: And so on.

JUDGE ITOE: We would like to imagine that at least the Defence have been put on notice. It is already very far gone with their submissions on the judgment of acquittal. I'm sure they might even ask for more time. A judgment of acquittal will not necessarily rest on this pile of documents.

PRESIDING JUDGE: We don't think so, but it is to be seen. We're not making any decision this morning on this matter, so our comments are only to see what it is we can achieve. Again, on this, if it is possible, and we hope it is possible to still maintain the time prescribed and with some adjustments so we certainly would like to see that any documentation required on the judgment acquittal be filed with the Court prior to the recess that is prescribed from Monday, 8th of August.

MR KAMARA: We are still with the same timetable.

PRESIDING JUDGE: We will see to make any adjustment, if required, when we proceed on Wednesday, 6th of July.

MR KAMARA: Thank you, Your Honours.

MR WILLIAMS: Your Honour, do I understand your order to the Prosecution to mean that they should show the relevance of each bit of evidence in those documents that they want to tender, that is, they should show the relevance of each bit of evidence?

PRESIDING JUDGE: Well, not necessarily relevance. We want to know what it is. In other words, when they refer to a report, is it the totality of the report? And if it is the totality of the report, they have to tell us why the totality of the report. Or if it is page 25 of that report, because it is has something they're relying upon, well, what is it they're relying upon? It will facilitate not only your work, but our work as well when we're looking at this amount of documentation, we want to know what it is that we should be looking for. That's really what we're asking them. I presume you will argue that all of it is relevant. In other words, if it is not relevant, we don't want to see it.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Actually, I was the one who in fact injected the idea of the evidentiary objective. So far as it is intellectually possible, they can indicate, for example, in respect of, say, document A, it may be easier to say all the evidentiary objective is so and so. In respect of document B, it may not be all that easy, so there would be some kind of flexibility here. But where they can say this is the evidentiary objective of this particular document, I think we're entitled to know, because it facilitates the decision-making process, rather than leave, -- sometimes judges are left to speculate.

PRESIDING JUDGE: We are not trying here to impose rigid rules on the Prosecution. What we are trying to ask the

Prosecution is to assist us, to work through these documents, the same with the Defence. If you are objecting, presumably it will be based on some arguments, whatever they may be, and if it is arguments that are legal arguments, presumably you are going to 10:47:00 be supporting them with case law and some authorities. That's what we want to know. So if your position - I will use that as an example - that article A is not relevant to any of the issues, you should raise that and tell us why.

MR WILLIAMS: Your Honours, we are seeking clarification, 10:47:16 because we might also come to use 92 when we are presenting our case. For the moment, I need another bit of clarification. My learned friend mentioned a reply after our objections. There is nowhere in the rules that a reply is provided for. They make their submissions and we have five days to raise objections, 10:47:41 period.

PRESIDING JUDGE: The rule does not speak of filing anything in writing. We are asking that they assist us, and we are asking you to assist us. The rule doesn't speak anything about that at all. It says: "Any party wishing to submit any 10:47:59 information shall give ten days' notice to the opposite party." That's all it says. "Objections, if any, must be submitted within five days." That's all it says. So I mean, we are asking both the Defence and the Prosecution to assist us, to essentially tell us in writing what the Prosecution is asking that this be 10:48:15 admitted, you're objecting, why are you objecting and to what you raise your objections. If we were to hear all the arguments on the substantive nature of this application this morning, we would ask the Prosecution to argue and ask you to argue and go back for a reply, so, what's the difference here?

MR WILLIAMS: Your Honour, might that not affect --

PRESIDING JUDGE: The same will apply to you when we get to the Defence case, the same will apply to you, since you raised that.

10:48:52 MR TAVENER: Just one matter raised by His Honour Justice Thompson, is it correct to say we obviously don't want to paraphrase what the evidence says, what's contained in the document. Would it be sufficient for your purposes if we identify what part of the document we're relying upon and say it

10:49:08 goes to individual criminal responsibility.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Precisely. In other words, this whole thing is just to avoid the kind of possibility of things being presented to us in a vacuum. Clearly 92bis and 89(C) envision documents being tendered for particular purposes. That's all I'm

10:49:25 asking.

MR TAVENER: I thought something different, I just wanted to clarify.

JUDGE THOMPSON: That's fair. Precisely.

PRESIDING JUDGE: But if the Prosecution deems it necessary

10:49:38 to file a reply after the Defence has filed their documentation, I just would like to bring to your attention you may do so, but we are in Court on 6th day of July, so reply or no reply, we have to fit it within that time frame.

MR KAMARA: Finally, Your Honours, in terms of style, I'm

10:49:58 thinking of doing a chart itemising the documents and then show what aspects of the indictment or the evidential matters --

JUDGE ITOE: If it is a matter of style, it is for you.

MR KAMARA: If it's convenient for the Court.

JUDGE ITOE: No, it's not a question of convenience. It is

for you to present this document the way you want to present it. If you want to back it up with whatever charts or whatever, it is entirely a matter for the Prosecution, it is your case.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Illustrative evidence. Some call it demonstrative evidence.

10:50:29

PRESIDING JUDGE: Whatever you can do, by the Prosecution or the Defence, to facilitate our work, to sift through this documentation, whatever it is, as such, it will be of assistance to the Court, that's all we're asking. How you do it is up to you.

10:50:43

MR KAMARA: Thanks.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you very much. The Court is adjourned to 6th July at 9.30 a.m.

[Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 10.51 a.m. to be reconvened on Wednesday, the 6th day of July, 2005, at 9.30 a.m.]

10:50:52