Cour Pénale Internationale



International Criminal Court

Original: English

No. ICC-01/14-01/18

Date: 29 October 2021

TRIAL CHAMBER V

Before: Judge Bertram Schmitt, Presiding Judge

Judge Péter Kovács Judge Chang-ho Chung

SITUATION IN THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC II

IN THE CASE OF
THE PROSECUTOR v. ALFRED YEKATOM AND PATRICE-EDOUARD
NGAÏSSONA

Public with public Annexes A and B

Twelfth Decision on Victims' Participation in Trial Proceedings (Groups A and B)

Document to be notified in accordance with regulation 31 of the Regulations of the Court to:

The Office of the Prosecutor

Karim A. A. Khan James Stewart Kweku Vanderpuye **Counsel for Alfred Yekatom**

Mylène Dimitri Thomas Hannis Anta Guissé

Counsel for Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona

Geert-Jan Alexander Knoops Richard Omissé-Namkeamaï

Marie-Hélène Proulx

Legal Representatives of Victims

Abdou Dangabo Moussa Elisabeth Rabesandratana Yaré Fall Marie-Edith Douzima-Lawson Paolina Massidda Dmytro Suprun **Legal Representatives of Applicants**

Unrepresented Victims

Unrepresented Applicants for Participation/Reparations

The Office of Public Counsel for Victims

The Office of Public Counsel for the

Defence

States Representatives Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar Peter Lewis

Counsel Support Section

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Nigel Verrill

Detention Section

Victims Participation and Reparations

Section

Philipp Ambach

Other

TRIAL CHAMBER V of the International Criminal Court, in the case of *The Prosecutor v. Alfred Yekatom and Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona*, having regard to Article 68(3) of the Rome Statute, Rules 85 and 89 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (the 'Rules') and Regulation 86 of the Regulations of the Court, issues this 'Twelfth Decision on Victims' Participation in Trial Proceedings (Groups A and B)'.

- 1. The Chamber recalls the procedural history set out in its previous decisions concerning victim participation.¹ In particular, the Chamber recalls the criteria for an applicant to qualify as a victim and the procedure established for the admission of Group A and B applications, namely that 'barring a clear, material error in the Registry's assessment', it would ratify the Registry's assessment of the applications.² The Chamber further recalls that Group A applications correspond to 'applicants who clearly qualify as victims' and Group B applications correspond to 'applicants who clearly do not qualify as victims'.³
- 2. On 30 September 2021, the Chamber received 71 Group A victims' applications (the 'Group A Applications')⁴ and 90 Group B victims' applications (the 'Group B Applications').⁵ Additionally, the Registry filed an assessment report,⁶ containing a brief description of the criteria applied in its assessment of the Group A Applications and the Group B Applications respectively, and several related observations.
- 3. The Registry notes, *inter alia*, that, pursuant to the Chamber's previous decisions, it categorised under Group A applicants who (i) describe crimes committed by Anti-Balaka groups in areas neighbouring the borders of Cattin or

_

¹ See, in particular, Decision on Victims' Participation in Trial Proceedings, 23 November 2020, ICC-01/14-01/18-738, paras 1-5 (the 'First Decision on Victim Participation').

² Pre-Trial Chamber II, Decision Establishing the Principles Applicable to Victims' Applications for Participation, 5 March 2019, ICC-01/14-01/18-141 (the '5 March 2019 Decision'), paras 29-41.

³ 5 March 2019 Decision, ICC-01/14-01/18-141, para. 41(i).

⁴ Tenth Registry Transmission of Group A Applications for Victim Participation in Trial Proceedings, ICC-01/14-01/18-1124 (with 71 confidential *ex parte* annexes, only available to the Registry).

⁵ Fifth Registry Transmission of Group B Applications for Victim Participation in Trial Proceedings, ICC-01/14-01/18-1126 (with 90 confidential *ex parte* annexes, only available to the Registry).

⁶ Twelfth Registry Assessment Report on Victim Applications for Participation in Trial Proceedings, 30 September 2021, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125 (with confidential Annex 1, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125-Conf-Anx1, and confidential *ex parte* Annex 2, only available to the Registry, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125-Conf-Exp-Anx2) (the 'Twelfth Registry Report').

Boeing, and (ii) clearly relate those crimes to the alleged Anti-Balaka attack in Bangui on 5 December 2013.⁷ Further, the Registry notes that it categorises within Group A 'applicants who mention crimes committed by Anti-Balaka groups along the PK9-Mbaiki axis and clearly related to the Anti-Balaka's advance through and takeover of villages along the PK9-Mbaiki axis, notably within a short distance of the villages of Sekia, Ndangala, Bimon, Kapou, Bossongo, Pissa and Mbaiki'.⁸

- 4. The Registry further notes that some of the Group A Applications seemingly 'contain minor discrepancies, pertaining to *inter alia*: the applicant's date of birth, an inversion of the applicant's first and last name, the applicant's signature date or the spelling of the applicant's name, or other minor inconsistencies [...] which appear to be the result of inadvertent errors'. The Registry submits that in assessing the applications, it took note of the instruction by Pre-Trial Chamber II (hereinafter: 'PTC II') that 'a certain degree of flexibility must be shown' and considers that these discrepancies 'do not call into question the overall credibility of the information provided by the applicant'. 10
- 5. The Registry also notes that certain applications 'appear to provide an erroneous date (year) of the alleged events' or 'do not explicitly state specific dates', while at the same time referring to 'publicly known events' or providing 'any other sufficiently detailed contextual descriptions that date the events'. In these cases, the Registry submits that it applied the Chamber's instruction to assess applications 'holistically by assessing their internal coherence and the overall context of the alleged acts'. In these cases, the Registry submits that it applied the Chamber's instruction to assess applications 'holistically by assessing their internal coherence and the overall context of the alleged acts'. In these cases, the Registry submits that it applied the Chamber's instruction to assess applications 'holistically by assessing their internal coherence and the overall context of the alleged acts'.

⁷ Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 22 *referring to, inter alia,* First Decision on Victim Participation, ICC-01/14-01/18-738, paras 27-33.

⁸ Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 22 *referring to* Eleventh Decision on Victims' Participation in Trial Proceedings (Group C), 8 September 2021, ICC-01/14-01/18-1104, paras 36, 39.

⁹ Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 18.

¹⁰ Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 18 *referring to* 5 March 2019 Decision, ICC-01/14-01/18-141, para. 34.

¹¹ Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 23.

¹² Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 23 *referring to* an email from the Chamber to the Registry, 30 July 2020, at 17:29.

- 6. With regard to the Group B Applications, the Registry notes that, in conducting its *prima facie* assessment, it concluded that these applicants 'clearly do not qualify as victims' in the case because the harm alleged has resulted from events falling outside the temporal and/or geographic parameters of the case.¹³
- 7. The Chamber recalls the applicable law set out in its Decision on Victims' Participation in Trial Proceedings¹⁴ and the consistent jurisprudence of the Court on Rule 85 of the Rules, as set out by PTC II.¹⁵
- 8. The Group A Applications were individually assessed by the Registry, which determined that the applicants meet, on a *prima facie* basis, the requirements of Rule 85(a) of the Rules for the granting of victim status. The Group B Applications were also individually assessed by the Registry, which determined that, on a *prima facie* basis, the applicants clearly do not qualify as victims. The Group B applications were also individually assessed by the Registry, which determined that, on a *prima facie* basis, the applicants clearly do not qualify as victims.
- 9. The Chamber has not identified any clear, material error in the Registry's assessment and therefore authorises the participation as victims of the 71 applicants whose applications were transmitted under Group A, and rejects the 90 applicants whose applications were transmitted under Group B.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE CHAMBER HEREBY

ADMITS the 71 applicants whose applications were transmitted under Group A, listed in Annex A to the present decision, as participating victims for the purpose of the trial proceedings; and

REJECTS the 90 applicants whose applications were transmitted under Group B, listed in Annex B to the present decision, as participating victims for the purpose of the trial proceedings.

¹³ Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 26 *referring to* First Decision on Victim Participation, ICC-01/14-01/18-738, para. 38; *See* in detail Annex 2 to the Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125-Conf-Exp-Anx2.

¹⁴ First Decision on Victim Participation, ICC-01/14-01/18-738, paras 11-12.

¹⁵ 5 March 2019 Decision, ICC-01/14-01/18-141, paras 21, 31-36.

¹⁶ See Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 17.

¹⁷ See Twelfth Registry Report, ICC-01/14-01/18-1125, para. 26.

Done in both English and French, the English version being authoritative.

Judge Bertram Schmitt

Presiding Judge

Judge Péter Kovács

Judge Chang-ho Chung

Dated 29 October 2021

At The Hague, The Netherlands