



Case No. SCSL-2003-01-T

THE PROSECUTOR OF  
THE SPECIAL COURT  
V.  
CHARLES GHANKAY TAYLOR

THURSDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 2008  
9:30 A.M.  
TRIAL

TRIAL CHAMBER II

---

Before the Judges:

Justice Teresa Doherty, Presiding  
Justice Richard Lussick  
Justice Julia Sebutinde  
Justice Al Hadji Malick Sow, Alternate

For Chambers:

Mr Simon Meisenberg  
Ms Doreen Kiggundu

For the Registry:

Ms Rachel Irura

For the Prosecution:

Ms Brenda J Hollis  
Mr Mohamed A Bangura  
Ms Leigh Lawrie

For the accused Charles Ghankay  
Taylor:

Mr Terry Munyard  
Mr Morris Anyah

1 Thursday, 4 September 2008

2 [Open session]

3 [The accused present]

4 [Upon commencing at 9.30 a.m.]

09:21:32 5 PRESIDING JUDGE: Good morning. I notice some changes of  
6 appearance. Ms Hollis?

7 MS HOLLIS: Good morning Madam President, your Honours,  
8 opposing counsel. Today for the Prosecution: Mohamed A Bangura,  
9 Leigh Lawrie and Brenda J Hollis.

09:30:03 10 PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you, Ms Hollis. Mr Munyard?

11 MR MUNYARD: Good morning Madam President, your Honours,  
12 Ms Hollis and counsel opposite. This morning it is myself Terry  
13 Munyard and Morris Anyah representing the defendant.

14 PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you, Mr Munyard. I will remind the  
09:30:45 15 witness of his oath. Mr Witness, I again remind you this morning  
16 that you have taken the oath to tell the truth and the oath  
17 continues to be binding upon you. You must answer questions  
18 truthfully and I would also remind you of the need to speak  
19 slowly so that the interpreters and those recording your evidence  
09:31:06 20 can get it down correctly. You understand?

21 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

22 PRESIDING JUDGE: As we are in open session, I remind you  
23 of what Ms Hollis, Mr Munyard and myself have said concerning  
24 your own security. Please proceed, Mr Munyard.

09:31:18 25 WITNESS: TF1-338 [On former oath]

26 MR MUNYARD: I am afraid I am going to have to ask for us  
27 to go into private session because I want to revisit briefly a  
28 couple of matters from yesterday.

29 MS HOLLIS: The Prosecution supports that request.

1           PRESIDING JUDGE: For purposes of record and the rules if  
2 anyone is in the public gallery or monitors we are going into  
3 private session for reasons of security of the witness.

4

5                           [At this point in the proceedings, a portion of  
6 the transcript, pages 15407 to 15440, was  
7 extracted and sealed under separate cover, as  
8 the proceeding was heard in private session.]

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

1 [Open session]

2 MS IRURA: Your Honour, we are in open session.

3 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Witness, we are now in open session  
4 again and I remind you to take care not to reveal anything that  
11:04:43 5 would identify you.

6 MR MUNYARD:

7 Q. Mr Witness, was it Issa Sesay's objective to disarm after  
8 the Lomé Peace Accord and in the years 2000 and 2001?

9 A. It was his objective, his own objective.

11:05:13 10 Q. Thank you. And did you have a problem achieving that  
11 because of a number of occasions when RUF people were attacked by  
12 pro-government forces?

13 A. Yes, we were about getting problems in Kono, but it was  
14 later amended because they resolved that the disarmament of the  
11:05:40 15 RUF should be concurrent with the disarmament of the Kamajors on  
16 the Kono axis.

17 Q. And is it right that the RUF were worried that if they  
18 disarmed unconditionally they might still be attacked by armed  
19 groups such as the Kamajor militias?

11:05:59 20 A. Yes, some commanders within the RUF were worried about  
21 that.

22 Q. Is it also the case that in 2000 and 2001 the Government of  
23 Liberia had a number of rebel forces invading their country?

24 A. Yes, the Government of Liberia, within 2000 and 2001 there  
11:06:29 25 were rebels invading their country and they were referred to as  
26 the LURD.

27 Q. And indeed you spent almost the whole of 2001 in Foya from  
28 January to November of that year assisting the Liberian  
29 government to repel the rebels?

1 A. Some people stayed there who did not even disarm. Some  
2 remained there and they did not even come for disarmament,  
3 because when they were attacked from Foya and they entered the  
4 forest they were cut off. They did not have a way to enter  
11:07:07 5 Sierra Leone to disarm.

6 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Witness, the question is about where  
7 you spent most of 2001, not a general question.

8 MR MUNYARD:

9 Q. Mr Witness, I am just confirming something that you said to  
11:07:27 10 us earlier. I think you agree that you spent almost the whole of  
11 2001 based in Foya, from January to November of that year, is  
12 that right?

13 A. I spent six months in Foya whilst I was there as commander  
14 and Issa later immediately called me for me to go to Kono, Koidu  
11:07:54 15 Town.

16 Q. But it is right that you were in Foya from January to  
17 November of 2001, isn't it?

18 A. I was in Foya at that time.

19 Q. Thank you. And did the Government of Liberia ask the RUF,  
11:08:20 20 "If you're going to disarm, lay down your arms, would you give  
21 them to us so that we can fight the rebels in our country, rather  
22 than handing them over to anybody else"? Is that right?

23 A. He did not request that if we were disarming we should hand  
24 over our weapons to them, but he requested that the arms he gave  
11:08:49 25 to us we shouldn't disarm to the government troops of Sierra  
26 Leone. We shouldn't hand them over to the government troops of  
27 Sierra Leone. He said we should return them to him.

28 Q. Did Charles Taylor ever suggest that you should delay  
29 disarming?

1 A. He did not suggest that we should delay the disarmament,  
2 but he told us not to disarm to the SLPP government and not even  
3 the UNAMSIL.

11:09:37 4 Q. Could I ask you to look at tab 1, please. It is page 11 of  
5 tab 1.

6 A. I am there.

7 Q. Thank you. I am going to ask you to start at line 9. This  
8 is an answer given by you:

9 "Then thereafter Superman have died they appoint another  
11:10:17 10 commander to go there to be there to handle the situation. From  
11 there the disarmament process came in. The disarmament process  
12 came in, Charles Taylor is still pressing us that we should not  
13 allow for us to disarm because the United Nations is still trying  
14 to capture us. They are petting us. For us to disarm they are  
11:10:35 15 petting us."

16 Did you say that?

17 A. I did say that, but that was not after the death of  
18 Superman. They called on Superman to go on an operation in  
19 Freetown. That was the time they sent another commander to take  
11:10:55 20 care of his position. He had not yet died by then.

21 Q. So are you saying that you have made a mistake there, or  
22 that they have made a mistake in recording what you were telling  
23 them?

24 A. I want to believe that the mistake came from the typing,  
11:11:13 25 because I was talking orally whilst they were typing and as I was  
26 talking they were typing.

27 Q. Now you were asked on line 15, "What do you mean by  
28 petting?" Your answer is, "To encourage you for to do  
29 something". Then the interviewer says, "Pushing you to?" You

1 say, "Not pushing by force, but talk to you, pet you, encourage  
2 you to do the thing". Did you say all that?

3 A. I did say that.

11:11:50

4 Q. Thank you. Then, "After Superman have died now we still in  
5 reliance not to disarm". Did you tell them that?

6 A. Yes, after the death of Superman.

11:12:11

7 Q. "Gibri I Massaquoi came and he said Charles Taylor said we  
8 should not disarm. Well, we have to disarm to give the people  
9 peace, so they all support that. Let us disarm to give the  
10 people peace, but yet still we don't want to disarm earlier in  
11 Kono so we decide to hold on in Kono."

12 Did you say that?

13 A. Yes, I said that.

11:12:29

14 Q. Last line on that page: "Charles Taylor said if you are  
15 going to disarm then try to take some ammunition and send it to  
16 Liberia". Did you say that?

17 A. Yes, I said that.

11:12:52

18 Q. "Then they take some ammunition with some manpower and they  
19 send them to Liberia. The manpower they used to infiltrate in  
20 Guinea. The manpower they used they infiltrate in Guinea so the  
21 Guinean war was there now."

22 Did you say that?

23 A. Yes, I said that.

11:13:12

24 Q. So you agree that you did tell them Charles Taylor said,  
25 "If you're going to disarm then try to take some ammunition and  
26 send it to Liberia"?

27 A. The arms that he gave to us, because he gave us arms for  
28 the Guinea mission for us to infiltrate Guinea. He said we  
29 should assemble the manpower so he will support us with arms and

1 ammunition, so the support came. He sent the arms - he sent the  
2 arms to us and we supported with the manpower. That is what I am  
3 trying to talk about here.

11:14:27 4 Q. Tab 10, please, paragraph 88. It's on page 23 of that  
5 particular tab, Mr Witness. Now this is where you're dealing  
6 with the meeting on 26 July 2000 where you had met the West  
7 African Presidents, two of them French speakers, one of them  
8 President Yahya Jammeh from The Gambia and one of them President  
9 Obasanjo, and then you told us later on that same day you go and  
11:15:25 10 have a meeting with Mr Taylor. Do you remember telling us about  
11 that? Just before I take you to the document, I am just  
12 summarising.

13 A. Yes, I remember I said that.

14 Q. Can you see the last two lines - well, actually we will  
11:15:48 15 start from the last three lines:

16 "Charles Taylor, he said he was ready to give them all the  
17 support they needed. He told them they shouldn't disarm to  
18 anybody. Charles Taylor said that whenever the UN says they  
19 should disarm they would just agree, but would delay."

11:16:09 20 Yes?

21 A. We will just agree, but we shouldn't allow it to happen.

22 Q. And the reason for delaying was what?

23 A. That is to say we should deny them. We shouldn't - we  
24 shouldn't allow them to disarm us. That is to say we should  
11:16:38 25 accept in their presence, but we would not agree to do it.

26 Q. Why were people concerned that you should delay disarming?  
27 What was the problem that would prevent you from disarming  
28 immediately?

29 A. I did not know what the problem was, but the problem he



1 told us was that those Presidents were British elected Presidents  
2 and he said the UNAMSIL, that is the UN, they will talk to us  
3 today and tomorrow they refuse us. So he said we shouldn't allow  
4 to disarm to them. That was what he said, but I did not know  
11:17:37 5 actually what he had in mind about that.

6 Q. What do you mean by, "They would talk to us today and  
7 tomorrow refuse us"?

8 A. What I meant was that today they would encourage us and  
9 they will tell us that if we disarm they will not do - nothing  
11:18:00 10 would go wrong with us, nothing would happen to us, but at the  
11 end of the day if we did - if we did - if anything happened to us  
12 they will deny us. Because for instance we did not even know  
13 about the Special Court. We did not know whether the Special  
14 Court was going to be established at that time. So, like I said,  
11:18:20 15 they will encourage us today, accept us today and tomorrow after  
16 all they deny us.

17 Q. What do you mean by "deny us"? What was this problem that  
18 was going to happen to you?

19 A. I have just given you an example. What I mean by the  
11:18:42 20 denial is that they will encourage us today and say, "Disarm, we  
21 will come to your amnesty, nobody will do anything wrong to you,  
22 we will talk to the Tejan Kabbah government, you will live  
23 peacefully with them, nobody will do you anything".

24 But like I gave the analogy of the Special Court. We did  
11:19:01 25 not know about the Special Court. We did not know whether after  
26 the disarmament there was going to be a Special Court. But deep  
27 into the disarmament whilst we were completing the disarmament we  
28 later came to know that the Special Court was coming and that it  
29 had already been established in fact. So that is just an

1 example. It's just an analogy that initially they said nothing  
2 will happen to us and we accepted to disarm, but at the end of  
3 the day the Special Court came. That is what I am talking about  
4 "deny".

11:19:30 5 Q. Are you saying that the RUF were worried because of their  
6 history with the Kabbah government that if they did disarm to the  
7 UN the next thing their fighters would be arrested?

8 A. No, I did not say that the RUF was worried because if he  
9 was worried he wouldn't have refused the instruction given to him  
11:20:00 10 by Charles Taylor. I did not think he was refused. We had  
11 different commanders in the RUF at different times at different  
12 points in time, but I don't want to believe that under the  
13 command structure of Issa he had any problem or worries about  
14 disarmament.

11:20:17 15 Q. But he didn't disarm until 2002, did he? What was the  
16 reason for him delaying disarming?

17 A. Not in all areas. He started the disarmament at the end of  
18 2001 going to 2002, but in certain areas he delayed the  
19 disarmament because of certain things that were happening in  
11:20:45 20 those particular areas.

21 Q. Such as what?

22 A. Like, for instance, in the northern area, that is around  
23 Kambia, he refused to disarm early in Makeni because of the  
24 operation that was going on at Pamelap. And in the Koinadugu  
11:21:09 25 area also he refused to disarm early because of the mission that  
26 was going to take place in Kissidougou. And in Kailahun also he  
27 refused to disarm early because of the operation that was going  
28 to take place from Foya to Guéckédou. These were some of the  
29 reasons why in certain areas he delayed the disarmament in 2002.

1 Q. Right. In some areas they delayed because they were  
2 assisting the Government of Liberia in repelling rebels attacking  
3 that country, yes?

4 A. Yes, according to the instruction, because it was according  
11:21:51 5 to instruction that we decided to infiltrate there.

6 Q. Yes. You received a request and you agreed to it, yes, to  
7 help the Government of Liberia to deal with its rebels?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Give us examples of why the RUF did not disarm earlier in  
11:22:18 10 2001 because of its concerns of what might happen to its fighters  
11 if it did.

12 A. I have told you that if Issa was concerned actually that  
13 something bad was going to happen to his fighters he wouldn't  
14 have refused to carry out the instruction given to him by Charles  
11:22:46 15 Taylor, because by then he had all the powers to refuse  
16 disarmament at that particular time, but in my opinion I don't  
17 think he had any problems with disarmament at that particular  
18 time, whether he was worried that something was going to happen  
19 to his fighters if they disarmed. The only thing was that in  
11:23:08 20 certain areas he delayed the disarmament because of certain  
21 reasons.

22 Q. Right. It's the case, isn't it, that the RUF on one  
23 occasion gave back to the United Nations weapons that they had  
24 seized from the United Nations back in 1998? That's right, isn't  
11:23:33 25 it?

26 A. It was not in 1998 that the weapons were given. The issue  
27 of the weapons happened in 2000.

28 Q. I am not suggesting that the weapons were given back in  
29 '98. I am suggesting that weapons the RUF seized from the UN in

1 1998 were given back voluntarily by you, weren't they?

2 A. In 1998, I don't recall that the RUF seized weapons from  
3 the UN in 1998. I don't recall that.

11:24:26

4 Q. Whatever the year, do you recall the RUF agreeing to give  
5 back to the United Nations weapons they had seized from UN  
6 troops?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And on whose advice did the RUF return those weapons to the  
9 UN?

11:24:46

10 A. Well, the decision came from Issa, because a meeting was  
11 convened in Magburaka.

12 Q. And did Issa get advice from anybody as to the returning to  
13 the United Nations of its weapons?

11:25:18

14 A. Issa did not tell me whether he got advice from anybody and  
15 I too do not believe that he got advice from anybody that we  
16 should return the materials to the UN besides the release of the  
17 UN personnel.

18 MR MUNYARD: Your Honour, I am conscious of the time, but I  
19 think I can tie this one up now:

11:25:38

20 Q. Tab 5, please. Thank you, Mr Witness. Have you got tab 5  
21 there? Yes?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. Paragraph 2, you clarified that:

11:26:06

24 "Weapons that had been taken from the United Nations troops  
25 in 1998 were turned back to the United Nations through General  
26 Opande who was the ECOMOG force commander first disarmament.  
27 They were turned back by Issa Sesay from orders from Charles  
28 Taylor."

29 Did you tell the Prosecution that?

1 A. I did not tell them anything concerning the weapons, but I  
2 told them something concerning --

3 THE INTERPRETER: Your Honours, there is something the  
4 witness referred to that was not very clear to the interpreter.

11:26:47 5 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Witness, the interpreter did not hear  
6 you clearly. Please repeat your answer from the point where you  
7 say, "I told them something concerning --" Continue from there,  
8 please.

9 THE WITNESS: Concerning the fighters, the force, that is  
11:27:06 10 the individual persons, but I did not tell them about weapons and  
11 I did not give them that particular date that it was in 1998  
12 because in 1998 we did not know about the UN, but we knew about  
13 the ECOMOG.

14 MR MUNYARD:

11:27:23 15 Q. Well, I think that - sorry, if the time is running out.

16 PRESIDING JUDGE: I think the time is up.

17 MR MUNYARD: Well, I can't finish then. In the light of  
18 that answer I have got to pursue it. I will do it after the  
19 break, your Honour.

11:27:38 20 PRESIDING JUDGE: I understand that. Mr Witness, we are  
21 now taking the mid-morning break. We will resume court at 12  
22 o'clock. Please adjourn court until 12.

23 [Break taken at 11.30 a.m.]

24 [Upon resuming at 12.00 p.m.]

11:56:07 25 PRESIDING JUDGE: Please proceed, Mr Munyard.

26 MR MUNYARD: Thank you, Madam President:

27 Q. Mr Witness, before we broke we were looking at tab 5,  
28 paragraph number 2, in which the Prosecutors have recorded you  
29 saying that weapons that had been taken from UN troops in 1998

1 were turned back to the UN through General Opande, turned back by  
2 Issa Sesay on orders from Charles Taylor. You are now saying,  
3 are you, that you never told them that the weapons were seized in  
4 1998 and you never told them that it was on Charles Taylor's  
12:00:54 5 instructions that they were returned?

6 A. I am talking in terms of the weapons. Yes, I did not tell  
7 them that.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Witness, what exactly do you mean "in  
9 terms of the weapons"?

12:01:21 10 THE WITNESS: What I mean is that if Issa had any advice  
11 from Charles Taylor to release the weapons to UNAMSIL, I did not  
12 tell them that, and it was not in 1998 that the weapons were  
13 released.

14 PRESIDING JUDGE: Perhaps it is me, but my understanding of  
12:01:55 15 that sentence is that the weapons were taken in '98, not returned  
16 in '98. Could we clarify that, please, Mr Munyard.

17 MR MUNYARD:

18 Q. That is clearly what is said here, that the weapons had  
19 been taken from the UN troops in 1998. Did you tell the  
12:02:13 20 Prosecutors that?

21 A. I did not tell them that weapons were taken from the UN  
22 troops in the 1998.

23 JUDGE SEBUTINDE: Mr Witness, is your point that you - is  
24 your contravention with the year 1998, or with the description of  
12:02:45 25 the troops being UN troops? What is wrong with that sentence?

26 THE WITNESS: The thing that is wrong with that sentence is  
27 that they did not take any advice from Charles Taylor to return  
28 the weapons and again it was not in 1998. Those are the two  
29 things.

1 JUDGE SEBUTINDE: What was not in 1998?

2 THE WITNESS: It was not in '98 that the weapons were  
3 seized from the UN troops.

4 MR MUNYARD:

12:03:22 5 Q. Right. Can you tell us what year the weapons were seized  
6 and then tell us what, if anything, you told the Prosecutors on  
7 13 March 2006 when you were interviewed as a result of which  
8 these notes were typed up?

9 JUDGE SEBUTINDE: Mr Munyard, I think what would help is  
12:03:44 10 one question at a time. One question at a time would really  
11 help.

12 MR MUNYARD: Your Honour, I suppose you must be right. I  
13 was hoping he might be able to cope with those two fairly simple  
14 ones, but we will deal with it one at a time:

12:03:59 15 Q. What year were the weapons seized from the UN?

16 A. They seized the weapons at the beginning of 2000.

17 Q. What year did you tell the Prosecutors when they  
18 interviewed you on 13 March 2006 that the weapons were seized?

19 A. When they interviewed me I told them that the weapons were  
12:04:30 20 seized in 2000. That was when the weapons were seized. And they  
21 ended up returning them at the end of 2001 to 2002.

22 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Munyard, "They interviewed you on 13  
23 March 2006." I have 20 March 2006.

24 MR MUNYARD: Your Honour, I think I erroneously referred to  
12:04:57 25 it as 20 March because that's the date that the document was  
26 sent. If you look at the first paragraph --

27 PRESIDING JUDGE: I can appreciate your point now. Thank  
28 you, Mr Munyard.

29 MR MUNYARD: 13 March. I think I was responsible for

1 spreading the error, as it were:

2 Q. So you told the Prosecutors the weapons were seized in 2000  
3 and they ended up returning them at the end of 2001 to 2002.

4 What did you tell them, if anything, about Charles Taylor's role  
12:05:30 5 in getting these weapons returned to the United Nations?

6 A. We did not talk about Charles Taylor's role that he played  
7 in the return of the ammunitions, but we spoke about the role he  
8 played in the release of the UN peacekeepers. Maybe it was that  
9 they misunderstood that they wrote that everything was the same.

12:05:58 10 I spoke about the release of the UN peacekeepers, not the  
11 ammunition.

12 Q. There is nothing in this paragraph about the peacekeepers,  
13 is there?

14 A. Yes, there is nothing here that talks about peacekeepers or  
12:06:38 15 peacekeeping forces.

16 Q. So I am going to ask you again for the last time: What did  
17 you tell them, if anything, about Charles Taylor's involvement in  
18 returning the weapons to the United Nations?

19 A. I cannot recall talking with them regarding the return of  
12:07:06 20 weapons to the UN. I cannot - I don't recall telling them that  
21 in my statement.

22 Q. Well, can you think of anything that you said to them when  
23 you were telling them on that date about UN weapons that involved  
24 Charles Taylor that has led to them recording you as saying he  
12:07:27 25 gave the instructions to return the weapons?

26 A. I was talking about UN weapons to them, because they asked  
27 me how the UN weapons were returned. They asked me how they were  
28 released and that coincided with when I was explaining about how  
29 the UN peacekeepers were released. They asked me the two



1 questions together, so I explained together. Maybe it was during  
2 the explanation they did not get it clearly that they  
3 misunderstood the answers, so they swapped both about Charles  
4 Taylor. They asked me about who advised the release of the UN  
12:08:12 5 peacekeepers and the weapons. Maybe while I was answering they  
6 misunderstood the Charles Taylor role there.

7 Q. You read English. Just tell us where in that paragraph  
8 there is any mention of UN peacekeepers.

9 A. I am telling you that in the paragraph they did not talk  
12:08:37 10 about UN peacekeepers. It states weapons. That is what I am  
11 telling you, that I did not tell them that anybody gave them  
12 instructions to release the weapons. Issa did that on his own  
13 accord.

14 Q. Did you have a chance to read over this interview at the  
12:09:01 15 time, the notes of this interview?

16 A. Like this note, this current note that I am reading, I am  
17 just reading it now for the first time.

18 Q. I am sorry, are you saying you have never before been shown  
19 the notes of this interview before this morning?

12:09:38 20 A. They gave me a lot of notes to read, but at that time I was  
21 not that very patient enough to read paragraph by paragraph,  
22 okay? Not like now. They will just tell me to browse through  
23 and I will sign. So I would browse through them and I'd sign  
24 because of time and at that time I also had something to do  
12:10:02 25 because I needed to earn my living, so maybe I will spend two  
26 hours or two hours and 30 minutes. I will do it quickly because  
27 I would want to go and do my job. I was a security then. So I  
28 will just come and browse it and where I thought this is what to  
29 correct I will do, then I will go quickly to do my job.

1 Q. Were you taking your responsibility as a witness seriously?

2 A. I took it seriously that, yes, they had met me to obtain  
3 statement from me.

12:10:50

4 Q. So why didn't you very carefully look through these  
5 accounts of what you are said to have told them, rather than just  
6 browsing through them as you're telling us today?

12:11:13

7 A. I am telling you that the first time that the Special Court  
8 came, they will just invite you. When they heard about someone  
9 they would invite the person and they would obtain statement from  
10 you and they will give you a time when they will call you again  
11 to go over your statement and during those times I too was  
12 working.

12:11:30

13 So any time they would invite me I will tell them that I  
14 was not going to spend much time, I will spend maybe one or two  
15 hours then I will go back to do my job. So whatever they will  
16 give to me I will just read well to the best of my understanding  
17 and what I would see that was not as correct I would correct  
18 that, but I did not read it step by step as carefully as I have  
19 done now here now. I did not. At that time I was working and  
20 they did not --

12:11:55

21 Q. Mr Witness --

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you. Carry on, if you  
24 want to.

12:12:04

25 A. No, you can go ahead.

26 Q. All right. I will ask my question. Just browsing through  
27 and looking quickly is not taking your responsibility as a  
28 witness seriously, is it?

29 A. I took it seriously. I took it seriously that I was

1 working with the Special Court. That means I was giving them a  
2 statement and they had to cross-check that, so I took it  
3 seriously.

12:12:44 4 Q. Right. Let us look at the number of occasions you have had  
5 the chance to look through this particular set of notes. You are  
6 interviewed on 13 March 2006. Did they read back to you what  
7 they had written on that day, can you now remember?

8 A. It was not every day that they will read it. It was not  
9 that very day that they would interview me that they would read  
12:13:10 10 it back to me. They will give me some time when I go back home  
11 because they will tell me they were going to type it out and  
12 after that they will call my some other day, I will come and I  
13 will read it and they will ask me to sign and I sign.

14 Q. Did they always follow that procedure? They would just  
12:13:27 15 send you away at the end of the interview and tell you, "We'll  
16 call in you when we've typed it up", or were there occasions when  
17 they read back to you the handwritten notes they had taken before  
18 you left their office so as to ensure they had recorded  
19 everything correctly? Were there any such occasions?

12:13:52 20 A. They did not take their time to do that. I repeat it. Any  
21 time I came they never read the handwritten statement to me. All  
22 the statements that were obtained from me that they read to me  
23 were typed out.

24 Q. Let us be clear. Are you saying they never, ever read back  
12:14:13 25 the interview notes to you on the day of the interview?

26 A. Yes, on that date that they did an interview to me they  
27 will never go over it. As I said to you, as I spoke they will  
28 just release me to go.

29 Q. Right. So when after 13 March 2006 were you invited to

1 read over the typed up notes of that interview?

2 A. They used to invite me, maybe after the interview it will  
3 take about a month, or maybe within that same month that they had  
4 interviewed me maybe at the end of that month they will call me  
12:15:00 5 back to go through the interview, but I did not take records  
6 that, okay, this was this particular month that I read this  
7 document except when they asked me to sign. Then when I signed I  
8 will date it. So I will not say I can recall exact months  
9 actually. I hadn't any diary where I wrote down the number of

12:15:22 10 times or the dates that I visited the Special Court. No, I  
11 hadn't a diary to do that.

12 Q. I am going to stop you there. I am going to stop you  
13 there. No-one would criticise you for not being able to remember  
14 how long after a particular interview they asked you to come in.

12:15:38 15 I am not suggesting there is anything wrong with not being able  
16 to remember that. In fact, I suggest it would be very strange  
17 indeed if you could remember a specific date of an interview two  
18 years ago. I want to know from your recollection of how these  
19 things generally were conducted how long after the interview you  
12:15:59 20 think you were called in to go over the notes. You have said you  
21 think it may have been in the same month, yes?

22 A. At times it would be in the same month at the end of the  
23 month, or maybe it would be one, two or three months before they  
24 could invite me back, because I was not the only person they were  
12:16:24 25 dealing with.

26 Q. All right. And when you were invited back to look over the  
27 notes is this when you say you would quickly browse through  
28 because you were too busy to actually check with any real degree  
29 of accuracy what they had recorded?

1 A. Yes, because during that time, '96/'97, I was working with  
2 a security agency and I was working at night. I was running  
3 nightshifts and in the morning I was to rest. So that was when  
4 they invited me - maybe two hours to the start of my shift they  
12:17:03 5 would invite me and when I would go I would just tell them, "I  
6 just have two hours to start my shift". And they said, "Okay,  
7 just go through it briefly and tell us the mistakes" and I will  
8 go through it and indicate the mistakes and they would ask me to  
9 sign and I would sign and date it and I would leave the place.

12:17:21 10 Q. I think that maybe a slip of the tongue. You used '96/'97.  
11 You meant 2006/2007, is that right?

12 A. 2006/2007, yes.

13 Q. So when you were left to do it by yourself you did it in a  
14 rather slipshod way, is that right?

12:17:47 15 A. Yes, because there were times when they did it they had a  
16 small room in the court, they will just put me in that room,  
17 there would not be any staff there and they will put the  
18 documents and the papers in front of me. And to me I said,  
19 "Okay, if that is the case, well, let me just browse through it".  
12:18:04 20 Maybe there were times I did not even stop reading it and I would  
21 just stop where I had read up to that point and then I will say,  
22 "Well, let me go".

23 Q. Right. That wasn't taking your responsibility as a witness  
24 seriously, was it?

12:18:22 25 A. I took my responsibility seriously because I answered their  
26 calls.

27 Q. In May of last year we saw the declaration this morning  
28 that you had signed saying that you had been through this  
29 particular statement. Your Honours, the wrong date is given, but

1 there is no dispute I'm sure that the date of 20 May is - it's  
2 just taken from the face of the document. You were taken through  
3 by the investigators at the end of May this year - taken through  
4 that particular statement, weren't you?

12:19:13 5 A. May 20, I think that they went through, because I cannot  
6 recall the particular month, but I knew I was going there often  
7 to go through my statements and sign. And those that needed  
8 corrections, I made them and I signed.

9 Q. All right. And you didn't make any corrections on that  
12:19:37 10 statement in May of 2007, did you?

11 A. I am still telling you that this particular statement, I  
12 have only seen it for the first time the day. This particular  
13 paragraph, I have seen it for the first time today.

14 Q. We hear what you say. In addition to being taken through  
12:20:03 15 these statements in May, you were also taken through this  
16 statement again in September of last year. We know that from the  
17 second document that was put on the screen this morning. Did you  
18 make any amendments as a result of being taken through it again  
19 in September?

12:20:29 20 A. Any time they would invite me to talk about a statement  
21 that they had obtained from me, because it was not only one  
22 statement that they obtained from me, they obtained various  
23 statements - so whenever they did that I will make sure that I  
24 will make corrections and I will point out those corrections to  
12:20:47 25 them. And the man who would come to collect the statement from  
26 me, I will tell him that this was the correction, these were the  
27 corrections, and he will tell me that, "Okay, were going to  
28 effect the changes that you have made now, but that I will do  
29 later".

1 Q. Are you saying that in May and September last year when  
2 these different gentlemen took you through these statements that  
3 you didn't read the paragraph number 2 that we have been looking  
4 at which you claim you have only seen for the first time this  
12:21:21 5 morning?

6 A. I am telling you that this particular paragraph that says  
7 release of arms, or weapons, for the UNAMSIL, I am coming across  
8 it for the very first time today. This particular paragraph,  
9 today is my first time to come across it, because the statements  
12:21:48 10 were too many, because whatever we discussed they would pen that  
11 down and I would go over it. At times I will come and see a  
12 bunch of documents and they will ask me to read it. There are  
13 times I will concentrate and read and there were times I will  
14 just browse through to see the mistakes.

12:22:06 15 If I detected - if I saw mistakes I will correct the  
16 mistakes, because I was thinking that when it would come to time  
17 for me to testify they will ask me - we will go through  
18 everything before coming to the Court, but they were doing it  
19 after the statements that they did in Freetown. When they  
12:22:30 20 obtained the statements from me in Freetown one month or two  
21 months they will call me to go through that particular statement  
22 and I will tell them the mistakes that I had seen. Then they  
23 say, okay, they will effect the corrections.

24 Q. But this paragraph you have never seen before this morning,  
12:22:46 25 yes?

26 A. I did not come across it, except this morning that I have  
27 seen it, because the statements were too many. Even if I came  
28 across this one maybe I cannot recall now, because there were too  
29 many, because I am sure that I did not discuss such a thing with

1 them.

2 Q. Tab 17, please. Could you turn please to tab 17,  
3 Mr Witness. Before you look at it, can you tell us where you  
4 were on 25 February this year?

12:23:51 5 A. February 25 this year I was in The Hague here.

6 Q. Thank you. And were you taken through your statements when  
7 you were here in The Hague in February?

8 A. They invited me to read it and - but I did not complete  
9 reading it and they told me that I was not to testify, so I went  
10 back.

12:24:27

11 Q. And who are we talking about when you say, "They invited me  
12 to read it"? Who are "they"?

13 A. Those who brought me.

14 Q. Who are "they"? Give us the names?

12:25:00

15 A. It was just one lawyer who brought this statement for me to  
16 read.

17 Q. And who was that lawyer?

18 A. According to her she said her name was Mel rose.

19 Q. Right. Did she give you any other name?

12:25:27

20 A. No, that was the name she gave to me.

21 Q. Did she --

22 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Interpreter, could you please repeat  
23 the name that the witness gave? I don't recall it as recorded.

24 THE INTERPRETER: The witness, your Honour, said Mel rose.

12:25:49

25 PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you, Mr Interpreter. Please  
26 proceed.

27 MR MUNYARD:

28 Q. How many statements did she go through with you, this lady  
29 called Mel rose?



1 JUDGE LUSSICK: Was it a lady?

2 MR MUNYARD: "She said her name was Melrose", your Honour.

3 JUDGE LUSSICK: Yes, thank you.

4 MR MUNYARD: On the face of it it's a lady.

12:26:11 5 THE WITNESS: It was --

6 THE INTERPRETER: Your Honours, can the witness repeat this  
7 whole bit.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Witness, the interpreter cannot get  
9 you clearly. Please repeat your answer. You said, "It was --"

12:26:26 10 Please proceed from there.

11 THE WITNESS: It was the first statement that was obtained  
12 from me in 2003 that was brought to me to read, but I did not  
13 read up to ten papers. That was when I got the information that  
14 I was not going to testify and I was to return.

12:27:04 15 MR MUNYARD:

16 Q. Well, let's have a look at what is in tab 17. Can I just  
17 confirm, because I think there is a slight chronological error  
18 with the ordering of the tabs here. Does everybody have in tab  
19 17 "Corrections provided by this witness on 25 February 2008"?  
12:27:30 20 Can I confirm that that's what is in the Court's bundle, thank  
21 you. Justice Sebutinde seems not to have it.

22 PRESIDING JUDGE: I don't have a date on tab 17, but it is  
23 headed "For authorised distribution, et cetera, corrections  
24 provided by witness". It has just been pointed out to me, "While  
12:27:57 25 reviewing his statements on February 25th, 2008". Sorry, I  
26 didn't read far enough.

27 MR MUNYARD: Thank you. I only mentioned it now because I  
28 realise it follows tab 16 which is June and July of 2008. I  
29 think I have slipped up with my order of getting everything in

1 the right chronological order, but as long as we are all on the  
2 same page:

3 Q. Now, Mr Witness, this lady called Melrose, she asked you to  
4 make corrections in two statements, didn't she? Can you  
12:28:35 5 remember?

6 A. She told me that while I was reading whatever mistake I saw  
7 I should write it down and she would effect the corrections.

8 THE INTERPRETER: Your Honours, the witness is using a term  
9 that could mean either he or she. Can he clarify.

12:28:53 10 MR MUNYARD: That brings Justice Lussick's question back  
11 into play:

12 Q. Is Melrose a man or a woman?

13 A. A woman.

14 Q. How did she go about this exercise? Did she read out your  
12:29:09 15 statements line by line and ask you to interrupt her if there was  
16 anything wrong, or did she give you the documents for you to  
17 study so that you could then point out to her anything that was  
18 wrong?

19 A. She put it in front of me to read it and she told me that  
12:29:31 20 whenever I come across a mistake I should write against that  
21 mistake and tick it.

22 Q. Right. Well look, please, at the first one that is headed  
23 "Statement of 7 March 2006" and don't worry about all the page  
24 numbers that follow after that. You went through a statement  
12:29:50 25 dated 7 March 2006 and you changed four things. One in paragraph  
26 2 of a page ending in 76, another in paragraph 8 on page ending  
27 77, another in paragraph 10 on page ending 77, and another in  
28 paragraph 11 on page ending 78. Do you remember going through  
29 very carefully statements and picking out different bits that you

1 wanted to change? Do you remember that?

2 A. I can recall going over it carefully and I changed some of  
3 the things that were there.

4 Q. Yes, because that was your task then. You are in The  
12:30:43 5 Hague, you are not about to go on nightshift and you have got all  
6 the time in the world to carefully review these statements,  
7 haven't you?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And, indeed, it was the job of the lady called Melrose to  
12:31:00 10 make sure that you did carefully review these statements, wasn't  
11 it?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Just before we go on, have you ever seen Melrose since that  
14 occasion?

12:31:17 15 A. Well, I have not seen her from that time.

16 Q. Statement of 13 March 2006, halfway down the page. Again,  
17 don't worry about the numbers that follow that date. And for the  
18 benefit of the Court you will appreciate that this is a third set  
19 of numbering, but there is no argument, I am sure, about the fact  
12:31:40 20 that it is the contents of tab 5. Now, the first paragraph

21 there, it gives a page number and then paragraph 2, "General  
22 Opande was the UN force commander, not the ECOMOG force  
23 commander". Did you tell Melrose that there was an error in that  
24 statement in paragraph 2 because it gave the wrong title to  
12:32:16 25 General Opande in the original?

26 A. I ticked it and changed it, but I did not tell him.

27 Q. Pardon?

28 A. I ticked it, because she told me that whatever I saw I  
29 should tick it.

1 Q. What do you mean by that?

2 A. That is to tick it. That means to underline it and write  
3 what you think was correct, you write it on top of it.

4 Q. Right. Well, let us see what it was that you were writing  
12:33:05 5 on correcting on the actual page. Turn back, please. Keep your  
6 finger in tab 17, but turn back please to tab 5. Have you got  
7 tab 5 now?

8 A. Yes, I have got it. I have got it.

9 Q. It has a date on it of 20 March 2006 where it says date  
12:34:13 10 then below that let's go to paragraph 2. Is General Opande  
11 mentioned in paragraph 2?

12 A. Yes, it is - he is mentioned by the weapons.

13 Q. Is General Opande mentioned in paragraph 2 is what I asked.  
14 Don't worry about the weapons. Is he mentioned?

12:34:44 15 A. Yes, that is what I am telling you, that he is mentioned.

16 Q. And in paragraph 2 how is General Opande described?

17 A. They said ECOMOG force commander.

18 Q. Who said ECOMOG force commander?

19 A. The writer.

12:35:09 20 Q. And the writer is writing down whose information?

21 A. He was writing my information.

22 Q. Yes. Was it you who said back in March of 2006 when you  
23 were giving this account that General Opande was the ECOMOG force  
24 commander?

12:35:35 25 A. That is why I said that maybe the writer got me wrong, or  
26 maybe while I was explaining he was not listening.

27 Q. No, just answer the question, please. Was it you in March  
28 of 2006 who described General Opande as the ECOMOG force  
29 commander?

1 A. I am still telling you that I did not tell him that.

2 Q. Right. So they got that wrong in March of 2006 and then in  
3 February of 2008 you carefully read through that paragraph and  
4 point out the error, yes?

12:36:22 5 A. Yes, I read it and pointed out the mistakes. I read it. I  
6 came across it and I told them that he was not ECOMOG force  
7 commander.

8 Q. Thank you. So you read that paragraph at the very least on  
9 25 February this year, yes?

12:36:49 10 A. I read it and I made the correction.

11 Q. So it is complete nonsense to suggest that you have never  
12 read that paragraph before you saw it this morning, isn't it?

13 A. Maybe General Opande's name would be in some other  
14 paragraph or some other statement, because they took various  
15 statements - obtained various statements from me. What I am  
16 telling you, this weapons advice or arms advice from Charles  
17 Taylor, I did not tell them that any advice was obtained from  
18 Charles Taylor to return weapons in '98.

19 Q. You are telling lies about this statement, aren't you?

12:37:29 20 A. I am not telling lies. I am telling you my understanding  
21 and what I told them.

22 Q. Now at some earlier stage in my questioning of you we  
23 looked at paragraph 5 of tab 5 where it is recorded that on  
24 2001/04/20, in other words, 20 April 2001, "Witness was given  
12:38:05 25 3,500 pieces of diamonds." I am pausing here because I am  
26 concerned that we are in open session so I am not going to  
27 mention any names at this stage. Witness was given 3,500 pieces  
28 of diamonds by somebody to be taken somewhere and given to  
29 someone else. Do you realise I am just omitting the names at the

1 moment, Mr Witness? Do you realise why I am reading it out in  
2 that way?

3 A. I don't know why you are reading it that way.

12:38:58

4 Q. It is for your personal security. Will you just confirm  
5 that without reading out any names that that is what the first  
6 sentence of paragraph 5 of this interview reads, that on the date  
7 I have mentioned that you were given 3,500 pieces of diamonds by  
8 someone to be taken somewhere and given to someone else? Do you  
9 agree that is what it says?

12:39:25

10 A. Yes, I have seen it.

11 Q. Right. Yesterday you said you'd never told them that it  
12 was - no, in fact I think it was today. You said you'd never  
13 told them it was 3,500 pieces of diamonds, it was 350 pieces of  
14 diamonds. Do you remember telling us that this morning?

12:39:53

15 A. I remember telling you that it was 350 carats, then 3,500  
16 pieces of diamonds. I can remember telling you that. 350 carats  
17 and 3,500 pieces.

18 Q. In any event, you told me this morning they had got that  
19 wrong in the March interview, didn't you? March 2006.

12:40:21

20 A. They got it wrong when they said it was 3,500 carats.  
21 That's why I said they got it wrong.

22 Q. Tab 17 again, please. This time we are going to go to the  
23 next correction that you made on this statement. Do you see on  
24 the left-hand side of this page of tab 17 there are paragraph  
25 numbers going from 1 to 7? Do you see that?

12:41:04

26 A. Yes, I have seen that.

27 Q. I would like you to look, please, at paragraph 6. It says  
28 there - it gives the page and it's referring to what we have been  
29 looking at in tab 5 and it says:

1 "Para 5" - that's the one we have just been looking at -  
2 "Witness changed the first sentence to read on 2001/04/20", in  
3 other words the same date, "The witness" - and then it says  
4 another person and a third person - "Took 3,500 pieces of  
12:41:54 5 diamonds to" - and it names another person.

6 So you reviewed paragraph 5 of the interview of March 2006  
7 that we are looking at and you changed the people by adding  
8 people and by including one of them as a member of the party who  
9 you had previously said wasn't a member of the party that took  
12:42:34 10 the diamonds to the other person. Do you see that? I am leaving  
11 out the names. You have made a correction, haven't you, in  
12 February of this year to the interview or the statement that is  
13 dated the 20th but is an interview on 13 March, two years ago?  
14 Do you see that?

12:43:07 15 A. I see it, but I cannot recall making such a correction.

16 Q. Well, it's perfectly plain you don't recall making the  
17 correction because it's different from the evidence that you have  
18 been giving in this Court, isn't it, this correction?

19 A. I don't remember making a correction like this. If they  
12:43:29 20 can bring where I wrote, if they can bring my handwriting as a  
21 proof, then that would be better.

22 Q. You mean you are not prepared to accept that in February of  
23 this year you told Melrose that on 20 April 2001 you and two  
24 other people together took 3,500 pieces of diamonds to another  
12:43:57 25 person?

26 A. I am still telling you that I don't remember making this  
27 correction, except if my handwriting could be brought, because I  
28 wrote it with pen.

29 Q. Is it right what is in this correction, that you went with

1 two other people named there to see the third party and that the  
2 three of you took 3,500 pieces of diamonds to give to them?

3 A. The thing that is wrong here is that the two other people  
4 that you are referring to, we did not go together to give that  
12:44:44 5 amount that you are now referring to, that quantity that you are  
6 referring to, to give to that person.

7 Q. So you are now correcting your correction, is that right?

8 A. I am not correcting my correction. That's why I said I did  
9 my correction using pen, so would you please request for that  
12:45:07 10 handwriting form of the correction that I made - the handwritten  
11 form that I corrected?

12 Q. You haven't changed the 3,500 pieces of diamonds in that  
13 correction, have you?

14 A. The 3,500 pieces, I travelled with it. I travelled with  
12:45:33 15 it, but it was not - I did not travel together with these two  
16 people on that occasion.

17 MR MUNYARD: Would your Honours give me a moment? I am not  
18 sure if I have correctly recalled what the witness said earlier  
19 about the 3,500.

12:45:56 20 JUDGE LUSSICK: Mr Munyard, take a look at page 5 and round  
21 about line 18.

22 MR MUNYARD: Page 5, your Honour?

23 JUDGE LUSSICK: Yes, of this morning's testimony.

24 MR MUNYARD: Yes, I have to go to page 5. I am very  
12:46:22 25 grateful to your Honour. I don't propose going over it with the  
26 witness again. I think we have been round the houses on this one  
27 sufficiently often:

28 Q. What is your latest version of events then? Give us the  
29 final version of the story, please. How many people - sorry,



1 what did you take first of all on that date?

2 A. What date - which day are you talking about?

3 Q. The one on the page in front of you. It is written  
4 backwards, but it is 20 April 2001.

12:47:25 5 A. I do not recall this month, but what I am trying to tell  
6 you is that I took this particular 3,500 pieces to

7

8 [Redacted]

9

and I

12:47:50 10 recall that I said it in one of my statements.

11 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Witness, pause. Ms Hollis?

12 MS HOLLIS: Yes, when he begins to get into the specifics

13 as the whom he took it to, who was with him, where he went and

14 what happened after that, I think we need to redact that out of

12:48:08 15 the public version. Now I don't know what it is on your screen,  
16 but on mine I'm on page 75. It would be line 14 for me,

17 beginning, he says, "3,500 pieces to ..." So it would be from

18 the name of that person all way down to on mine 17 where he names

19 a transport and a location and then he says "... and I recall".

12:48:42 20 I know we have a difference with pages and lines, but those are  
21 the lines on my screen.

22 PRESIDING JUDGE: Mr Munyard, you have heard counsel.

23 MR MUNYARD: I don't have a difficulty with that.

24 [Trial Chamber conferred]

12:49:34 25 PRESIDING JUDGE: That application is granted. There will  
26 be a redaction and, Madam Court Officer, you have heard the  
27 pertinent lines. If there are members of the public or monitors  
28 listening to this evidence, the parts referred to by counsel for  
29 the Prosecution are not to be repeated in public or disseminated

1 in any way. Mr Munyard?

2 MR MUNYARD: While we are on the subject of corrections, I  
3 think I am now going to deal with corrections generally so we  
4 might be moving from subject to subject, but I think since we  
12:50:43 5 have now become quite embedded in this issue I will deal with it  
6 as a whole at this stage:

7 Q. Mr Witness, you have talked a great deal about how you have  
8 corrected various accounts that the Prosecution have wrongly  
9 recorded you saying and I am going to go through your  
12:51:15 10 corrections, the ones that are relevant to the evidence you have  
11 given, in just a moment, but I want to deal first of all with  
12 your interviews in December 2003.

13 Your Honours, can I clarify something that my learned  
14 friend, Ms Hollis, very kindly drew to my attention during the  
12:51:57 15 mid-morning break. You will recall me saying yesterday that I  
16 had many duplicates of the material supplied to us I had filleted  
17 it out of my file and that's how those two declarations of  
18 Mr Saffa and the other investigators came to be in a different  
19 place. Ms Hollis has pointed out to me - and it's entirely my  
12:52:23 20 error - that the reason I had so many different copies is that in  
21 fact on some of them and attached to those declarations were  
22 copies of the December 2003 interviews with some corrections on  
23 them.

24 Madam Court Officer has helpfully reproduced the bundle  
12:52:43 25 with the handwritten corrections on them. I haven't had a chance  
26 to go through them, but I am not asking for time to do that.  
27 What I propose to do is to go to areas where there are  
28 corrections that seem to me to be relevant to the evidence the  
29 witness has given and deal with those and then of course it is

1 entirely open to my learned friend to raise any corrections that  
2 I haven't touched on and I say that simply because I haven't  
3 looked at them until now. I got the bundle as we came back into  
4 court just before 12.

12:53:25 5 These corrections appear to follow from the meeting between  
6 Mr Saffa and the witness on 19 September 2007. That was the  
7 second declaration that was on the screen earlier this morning  
8 and I am literally going to turn the pages as we have them in  
9 front of us and when I come across a correction that appears to  
12:54:02 10 be relevant I will deal with it.

11 Well, in fact I would like to start, if I may, by dealing  
12 with something that isn't corrected by this witness. However, it  
13 deals with material that potentially identifies him and I fear  
14 therefore we will have to go into private session for this part  
12:54:44 15 of the evidence.

16 PRESIDING JUDGE: Ms Hollis, you have heard the  
17 application.

18 MS HOLLIS: We support that application.

19 [Trial Chamber conferred]

12:55:07 20 PRESIDING JUDGE: For purposes of record and the rules and  
21 those members of the public the Court will go into a private  
22 session to adduce evidence for reasons of the security of the  
23 witness. Please implement that.

24

12:55:18 25 [At this point in the proceedings, a portion of  
26 the transcript, pages 15473 to 15536, was  
27 extracted and sealed under separate cover, as  
28 the proceeding was heard in private session.]

29

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29

[Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 4.30 p.m.  
to be reconvened on Friday, 5 September 2008 at  
9.30 a.m.]

I N D E X

WITNESSES FOR THE PROSECUTION:

TF1-338	15405
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MUNYARD	15406