

1 International Criminal Court
2 Trial Chamber VI
3 Situation: Central African Republic II
4 In the case of The Prosecutor v. Mahamat Said Abdel Kani - ICC-01/14-01/21
5 Presiding Judge Miatta Maria Samba, Judge María del Socorro Flores Liera, Judge
6 Sergio Gerardo Ugalde Godínez and Judge Keebong Paek
7 Trial Judgment - Courtroom 1
8 Wednesday, 23 September 2026
9 (The hearing starts in open session at 11.01 a.m.)
10 THE COURT USHER: [11:01:43] All rise.
11 The International Criminal Court is now in session.
12 Please be seated.
13 PRESIDING JUDGE SAMBA: [11:02:12] Good morning, everyone.
14 Madam Court Officer -- sorry, Mr Court Officer, can you call out the case, please.
15 Thank you.
16 THE COURT OFFICER: [11:02:45] Good morning, Madam President. Good
17 morning, your Honours.
18 This is the second situation in the Central African Republic, in the case of The
19 Prosecutor v. Mahamat Said Abdel Kani, case reference ICC-01/14-01/21.
20 And for the record, we are in open session.
21 PRESIDING JUDGE SAMBA: [11:02:57] Thank you very much.
22 Can I now ask for representations, please, starting with the Prosecution.
23 MR NIANG: [11:03:08](Interpretation) Good morning, Madam President, your
24 Honours. Today, the Office of the Prosecutor is represented by Ms Holo Makwaia,
25 senior trial lawyer and head of the team; Thomas Bifwoli, trial lawyer; Marie-Jeanne

1 Sardachti. We have two other assistant trial lawyers, Brunhild Le Bailly; Ms Sanyu
2 Ndagire, legal assistant; Alessia Vitiello, analyst; and our case manager, Thomas
3 Laugel. And, of course, this is a team that I am leading as Prosecutor, as acting
4 Prosecutor.

5 PRESIDING JUDGE SAMBA: [11:04:15] Thank you very much, Mr Prosecutor.
6 The Defence, please.

7 MR JACOBS: [11:04:18](Interpretation) Good morning, Madam President, your
8 Honours. Today, to my right, Fiana Gantheret, Emma Conty. Behind me, Emma
9 Roux Hooock, Ambre Poyer. And as for myself, I am Dov Jacobs, counsel for
10 Mr Said.

11 PRESIDING JUDGE SAMBA: [11:04:42] Thank you very much, Defence counsel.
12 For the victims, please.

13 MS PELLET: [11:04:47](Interpretation) Thank you, Madam President, your Honours.
14 The victims today are represented by Ana Peña, Tars Van Litsenborgh, and myself
15 Sarah Pellet, counsel, Office of Public Counsel for Victims.

16 PRESIDING JUDGE SAMBA: [11:05:05] Thank you very much, Ms Pellet.
17 And for the record, I do take note that Mr Said is here in court with us.
18 A very good morning to you, Mr Said.

19 MR SAID: [11:05:18](Interpretation) Yes, good morning, Madam President.

20 PRESIDING JUDGE SAMBA: [11:05:24] Good morning.

21 We are here today to deliver a summary of the Chamber's judgment pursuant to
22 Article 74 of the Statute, hereinafter referred to as "the judgment". This summary is
23 intended to convey the main findings made in the judgment for the benefit of the
24 accused and the public. The judgment contains the Chamber's analysis of the
25 evidence and its detailed reasoning and is the only authoritative document.

1 This case concerns crimes against humanity and war crimes relating to the alleged
2 detention and mistreatment of persons at the Central Office for the Repression of
3 Banditry, hereinafter referred to as the OCRB, between the 12th day of April 2013 and
4 the 30th day of August 2013, in Bangui, the Central African Republic, hereinafter
5 referred to as the CAR.

6 Specifically, this case against Mr Said concerns 18 charged incidents (labelled A
7 through R) allegedly committed at the OCRB, and which involves one or more
8 victims.

9 Mr Said is accused of the crimes against humanity of imprisonment or other severe
10 deprivation of physical liberty (count 1, pursuant to Article 7(1)(e) of the Statute, in
11 relation to all charged incidents, torture (count 2, pursuant to Article 7(1)(f) of the
12 Statute, in relation to a number of charged incidents), other inhumane acts (count 5,
13 pursuant to Article 7(1)(k) of the Statute, in relation to all charged incidents) and
14 persecution (count 7, pursuant to Article 7(1)(h) of the Statute, in relation to all
15 charged incidents), as well as the war crimes of torture (count 3, pursuant to
16 Article 8(2)(c)(i)-(iv) of the Statute, in relation to a number of charged incidents), cruel
17 treatment (count 4, pursuant to Article 8(2)(c)(i)-(iii) of the Statute, in relation to
18 a number of charged incidents) and outrages upon personal dignity (count 6,
19 pursuant to Article 8(c)(ii) of the Statute, in relation to all charged incidents). The
20 Prosecution alleges that Mr Said is responsible for these crimes as a direct
21 co-perpetrator, pursuant to Article 25(3)(a) of the Statute or, in the alternative, on the
22 basis that he ordered or induced their commission, pursuant to Article 25(3)(b) of the
23 Statute.

24 Before looking at the charged crimes, the Chamber will first set out its analysis of the
25 contextual elements in this case, starting first with the contextual elements for war

1 crimes.

2 The crimes charged in the present case are alleged to constitute war crimes which
3 took place in the context of a conflict not of an international character between the
4 "Seleka", a coalition of armed groups, and a group of forces referred to by the
5 Prosecution as the "pro-Bozizé forces", so-called for their alleged alignment with the
6 then President of CAR, François Bozizé.

7 At the outset, the Chamber unanimously considers that there was a non-international
8 armed conflict in CAR between the Seleka and the Central African armed forces
9 supported by the South African armed forces from at least late December 2012 until
10 the 24th day of March 2013. In reaching this conclusion, the Chamber determines
11 that the Seleka were sufficiently organised from at least late December 2012 and were
12 opposed by the Central African armed forces, supported by South African forces.

13 Furthermore, the Chamber also determines that there was protracted armed violence
14 between these two groups between late December 2012 and 24 March 2013.

15 A central question in the case is whether the conflict continued after the Seleka took
16 over power on the 24th day of March 2013, during the period relevant to the charged
17 crimes, we're talking about April to August 2013.

18 For the reasons set out fully in the judgment, the Chamber, by majority, Judge Flores
19 Liera dissenting, was unable to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the armed
20 conflict between the Seleka and the Central African armed forces continued following
21 the Seleka takeover of Bangui on the 24th day of March 2013.

22 In reaching this conclusion, the majority of the Chamber has considered: first, that the
23 Central African armed forces, supported by the South African forces, before the
24 Seleka takeover on the 24th day of March 2013 were different from the group of
25 individuals that joined together to form the Anti-Balaka later in 2013; second, that

1 while the groups that would become the Anti-Balaka had intent to engage militarily
2 with the Seleka from at least June 2013, they had a basic command structure and only
3 developed limited military capacity to launch initial operations in the Bossangoa
4 region in September 2013, with a capacity to launch larger-scale attacks emerging
5 only in December 2013 -- with a capacity to launch large-scale attacks emerging only
6 in December 2013; third, that it could not determine the scale of the armed violence
7 between the Seleka and the Anti-Balaka in the period between 24 March 2013 and the
8 5th day of December 2013 to reach a determination that the armed conflict continued
9 after 24 March 2013. Based on these and other considerations, the majority of the
10 Chamber found that François Bozizé's ouster on the 24th day of March 2013
11 represented a complete defeat of the Central African armed forces by the Seleka and
12 brought to an end the armed conflict that began between these opposing parties in
13 2012.

14 The majority emphasises that the period following 24th March 2013 was anything but
15 peaceful for the civilians in CAR. During this period, tensions continued to remain
16 high. The Seleka were targeting civilians, including former members of the state
17 armed forces. Certain actors were preparing to retaliate militarily against the Seleka.
18 However, in the view of the majority of the Chamber, this was the precursor to a new
19 armed conflict, involving a different party in opposition to the Seleka.

20 In Judge Flores Liera's view, the Anti-Balaka constituted a splinter group of the
21 Central African armed forces that, as a non-state armed group, continued the armed
22 conflict against the Seleka after 24 March 2013. Therefore, in her view, the armed
23 conflict that began in December 2012 continued after 24 March 2013 in the months
24 following the takeover of Bangui and with levels of intensity in violence never
25 dropping below the required threshold well into 2014. However, Judge Flores Liera

1 is also of the view that Mr Said did not have the requisite knowledge of the factual
2 circumstances establishing the existence of such a conflict, given his role and
3 hierarchy in the Seleka and under Michel Djotodia's presidency. Judge Flores Liera,
4 therefore, joins the majority in concluding that the Chamber need not consider the
5 allegations for the war crimes of torture as in count 3; cruel treatment, as in count 4;
6 and, outrages upon personal dignity, count 5, as applicable concerning the charge
7 incidents.

8 The Chamber now turns to the contextual elements of crimes against humanity. The
9 charged crimes in the present case are also alleged to constitute crimes against
10 humanity.

11 For the reasons set out in the judgment, the Chamber unanimously finds that the
12 Seleka carried out a widespread and systematic attack against the civilian population
13 of Bangui from at least April 2013 up until at least November 2013. These events
14 include the attacks carried out by the Seleka on the 7th *arrondissement* on or about 13
15 April 2013 and on Boy-Rabe on or about 14 April 2013 and 20 August 2013 during
16 which the Seleka shot indiscriminately at people, committed multiple crimes against
17 civilians, including killings, rape, mistreatment and other forms of violence, and
18 extensively looted homes and private properties.

19 The Seleka targeted the part of the population they perceived to support François
20 Bozizé. The targeted population was identified by religion (Christian), ethnicity
21 (particularly people belonging to the Gbaya, Mandja, and Banda ethnic groups),
22 gender (predominantly male), and association with Bozizé's regime (including family
23 members and personal associates of François Bozizé, former state officials and
24 members or former members of the security and defence forces).

25 Based on the temporal extent of the attack, the population density of some of the areas

1 that were particularly targeted in Bangui, the scale at which civilians fled the Seleka's
2 exactions, and the repetitive and similar pattern of criminality, the Chamber finds that
3 the attack was widespread. In addition, considering that throughout the period of
4 the charges, the Seleka attacked civilians in Bangui whom they perceived to be linked
5 to Francois Bozize, used informants to assist in locating them, engaged in a repetitive
6 and similar pattern of criminality (particularly in relation to the operations conducted
7 in particular areas and the mistreatment in detention and extortion of money from
8 detainees), the Chamber finds that these attacks were also systematic.

9 As set out in the judgment, the Chamber is also satisfied that there was an
10 organisational policy on the part of the Seleka to attack the civilian population
11 perceived to support François Bozizé during the period relevant to the charges. The
12 Chamber is satisfied that the Seleka's exactions were motivated by a desire to punish
13 or extract what they perceived to have been owed from persons perceived as
14 associated with the Bozizé regime. Senior Seleka leaders were present when crimes
15 were committed and were also themselves implicated. In addition, the Seleka
16 leadership failed to take genuine and effective actions to prevent or punish the
17 criminality among their ranks, despite the fact that they could have done so. Having
18 regard to the foregoing, the Chamber concludes that the only reasonable inference is
19 that the Seleka's attack against the civilian population of Bangui from at least
20 April 2013 up until at least November 2013 was carried out pursuant to an
21 organisational policy.

22 The Chamber will now turn to the charged crimes in the present case. As part of
23 their attack against the civilian population, the Seleka set up a number of detention
24 facilities in Bangui where they would detain and mistreat individuals, as well as
25 extort money from family members for their release. One such facility was set up at

1 the OCRB, which the Seleka used following their taking over of Bangui until the 30th
2 day of August 2013.

3 At this juncture, the Chamber notes that although it heard accounts of the suffering
4 that the civilian population endured at the time, which was necessary to determine
5 whether the contextual elements in this case were established, Mr Said's alleged
6 criminal responsibility is limited to specific incidents of detention and mistreatment at
7 the OCRB between 12 April and 30 August 2013.

8 As previously stated, the case against Mr Said concerns 18 charged incidents (labelled
9 A through R) allegedly committed at the OCRB, some of which involve multiple
10 victims. In the judgment, the Chamber has analysed each incident individually.
11 However, in the interests of time, the Chamber will not present all of its findings
12 incident by incident in this summary, but will rather set out a holistic overview of its
13 findings regarding these incidents.

14 At the outset, for the reasons set out in the judgment, the Chamber has not entered
15 factual findings in relation to incidents E, F, K and P, and the allegations regarding
16 one individual in incident R, as the evidence presented was insufficient.

17 Furthermore, for the reasons set out in the judgment, the Chamber dismisses the
18 charges in relation to incident D. Accordingly, these allegations are not considered
19 for the purposes of the Chamber's legal findings. Lastly, the Chamber was not able
20 to reach a conclusion beyond reasonable doubt for some of the allegations in other
21 incidents.

22 Now, after the 24th day of March 2013, the OCRB Seleka used the OCRB as a facility
23 to detain perceived -- to detain people perceived to be supporters of François Bozizé
24 as well as others. The victims of the charged crimes were arrested or brought to the
25 OCRB starting in May 2013. The last persons held at the OCRB who were the subject

1 of the charges were detained around late August 2013. The length of their
2 detentions ranged from a few hours to several weeks.

3 When the Seleka brought individuals to the OCRB, the OCRB Seleka registered the
4 detainees and questioned them about their identities.

5 Some detainees were interrogated upon arrival at the OCRB. Others, such as
6 witnesses P-0547 and P-2241, were questioned later by the OCRB Seleka at the OCRB,
7 or at other locations such as the ministry of security. During interrogations, OCRB
8 Seleka members beat and threatened detainees while asking them for information on
9 François Bozizé or his associates, or otherwise accused detainees of being
10 "pro-Bozizé" and against the Seleka regime. They threatened P-2931 and other
11 Christian detainees in the cell with him for praying and interrogated P-2931 while he
12 was tied. An OCRB Seleka member removed P-3056 from his cell at night, drove
13 him out of the OCRB in a vehicle, interrogated him about Bozizé and others and
14 threatened to kill him with a gun before returning him to his cell.

15 The OCRB Seleka routinely mistreated detainees physically and psychologically at the
16 OCRB. Detainees were beaten, whipped and kicked. On one occasion, OCRB
17 Seleka members ordered 16 detainees to remove their clothing upon arrival at the
18 OCRB, they threw sand, soil or clay mixed with water on their backs and whipped
19 them multiple times, causing two detainees to soil themselves. P-1743's family
20 witnessed his beating.

21 OCRB Seleka members would commonly tie detainees using the *arbatachar* method.
22 This method involved forcing a person to lie down on their stomach and tying all four
23 of their limbs together in the back with a cord. This caused the person excruciating
24 pain and the Chamber considers that this constitutes an act of torture. Several
25 detainees were tied using the *arbatachar* method after enduring a beating. For

1 example, one man was interrogated while he was held on the ground and severely
2 beaten with ropes, whips and military belts all over his body, following which he was
3 tied using the *arbatachar* method.

4 In addition, the Chamber notes the mistreatment of P-0547 who was slapped and
5 beaten all over his body with rifle butts by the OCRB Seleka. The following day, he
6 was tied using the *arbatachar* method, then kicked, hung against a wall, and beaten
7 with various instruments. P-2519 was also beaten while being tied using the
8 *arbatachar* method and he lost consciousness. Two other men were tied using the
9 *arbatachar* method, one of them spending the night tied.

10 Others were severely beaten in the presence of Mr Said, such as a detainee who was
11 beaten and doused with water to such an extent that he defecated on himself.

12 In addition to being mistreated themselves, those detainees witnessed and saw or
13 heard others being beaten. Some of the detainees were threatened with death.

14 There were a number of cells at the OCRB, including an underground cell. The
15 OCRB Seleka held detainees in these cells which lacked basic amenities. P-1289
16 testified that his cell had no windows, no bed or toilet, and its walls were marked by
17 bullet holes and stained with blood. At times, cells in the courtyard were

18 overcrowded to such an extent that the detainees had difficulty breathing and had to
19 take turns to lie down. Sometimes detainees were let out once or twice a day for
20 a maximum of 30 minutes. Family visits, which would often coincide with these
21 timings, were allowed, but not in all cases. P-1289's family was denied access to him
22 and the family of another detainee was threatened.

23 There was no system for providing food or water for the detainees, apart from that
24 provided by family members during visits. Although some family members were
25 occasionally able to bring medicine, the OCRB Seleka did not generally provide any

1 medical assistance or care for the persons detained at the OCRB despite the visible
2 injuries suffered by the detainees.

3 The underground cell, in which multiple detainees were held, was located right under
4 the floorboard in Mr Said's office in the main building of the OCRB. The entrance of
5 the underground cell was approximately 2 metres by 1 metre and its interior was
6 slightly bigger. Detainees had to urinate and defecate inside the underground cell.
7 The underground cell was dark, cramped, dirty, and insufficiently ventilated. The
8 floor was covered in waste and it smelled of faeces and urine.

9 The OCRB Seleka did not comply with lawful procedures governing arrests and
10 detention. Relatives had to rely on word of mouth to find out that the Seleka had
11 detained someone at the OCRB. The Seleka had full discretion to execute purported
12 arrests and their reasons to do so were never apparent.

13 The OCRB Seleka also sometimes demanded payment from the family members of
14 persons detained at the OCRB to secure their release. The OCRB Seleka were not
15 answerable or accountable to the prosecutor, who was unable to carry out regular or
16 frequent visits to the OCRB when the Seleka were based there.

17 The Chamber notes that some Central African police officers were present at the
18 OCRB. However, they were effectively sidelined by the Seleka, unable to exercise
19 their normal functions, and had no control over the OCRB Seleka. Ultimately, the
20 presence of the police at the OCRB Seleka was purely ornamental and they only had
21 an observing function.

22 On the basis of its detailed analysis set out in the judgment, the Chamber finds that
23 the crimes against humanity of imprisonment or severe deprivation of physical
24 liberty, torture, other inhumane acts and persecution are proven for the victims
25 named in a number of incidents, as set out in the verdict.

1 At this juncture, the Chamber wishes to acknowledge that a number of victims of the
2 incidents testified about the impact of crimes on them, their families and their lives.
3 The persons detained at the OCRB gave evidence that they continue to suffer from the
4 trauma they experienced as a result of their detention and abuse. Many of those
5 detained have been unable to forget what happened at the OCRB and the Chamber
6 acknowledges their suffering. P-0547 testified that he remains "completely
7 unbalanced" and that his life has been completely destroyed by the mistreatment he
8 suffered. P-1180 testified that the images of the horrible things he saw at the OCRB
9 haunted him. Some still experience sleep difficulties. Some victims felt humiliated
10 by these events, notably because of the impact of the events on their families. P-1743
11 testified that the fact that the Seleka beat him in the presence of his family has had an
12 "enormous effect upon [his] entire family" and has marked and humiliated him to
13 such an extent that he is not respected and no longer has authority in his household.
14 P-2241 testified that the mistreatment she endured "upsets [her] greatly". P-1743 and
15 P-2263 are still afraid of people in uniforms and guns and soldiers. Images of what
16 happened to them at the OCRB flood back to them.

17 A number of those detained at the OCRB continue to experience physical harm,
18 including headaches, dizziness and insomnia. P-2519 stated that he continues to feel
19 the pain resulting from being tied using the *arbatachar* method. P-0547 gave
20 evidence that after his escape from the OCRB, he had lost the use of his hands, which
21 were "almost paralysed" for a period thereafter.

22 The Chamber now turns to the role and responsibility of the accused.

23 Mr Said was appointed as head of the OCRB by Nouradine Adam, who was a Seleka
24 leader and the minister of public security in mid to late April 2013. Mr Said arrived
25 with a number of Seleka members. On his arrival at the OCRB, Mr Said was

1 presented as being the "new person responsible" for the OCRB. Mr Said was the
2 *de facto* top-ranking official at the OCRB and was in charge. Mr Said had control
3 over the OCRB and when it came to orders and reports everything went through him.
4 All of the Seleka at the OCRB were under Mr Said's command and they reported to
5 him.

6 Mr Said was present on a daily basis at the OCRB during the period relevant to the
7 charges. However, the Chamber received evidence that he was detained at the
8 SRI/SERD for a limited time from 10th day of June 2013, returning to the OCRB by
9 26th day of June 2013. As explained in the judgment, the Chamber has determined
10 that Mr Said is not responsible for crimes which took place during his absence. This
11 notwithstanding, Mr Said remained in charge of the OCRB following his return and
12 remained in that role until the Seleka's departure from the OCRB on 30th day of
13 August 2013.

14 Mr Said worked closely with a number of Seleka individuals, some of whom had
15 roles within the wider Seleka structure and some of whom were directly stationed at
16 the OCRB. Mr Said reported to Nouradine Adam, who frequently attended the
17 OCRB, gave orders to the OCRB Seleka, and was involved in the detention and
18 mistreatment of detainees. In addition to Nouradine Adam, Seleka individuals such
19 as Adoum Rakiss, who was Deputy Director General of the police, Mahamat Sallet
20 Adoum Kette, who was Head of the Military Police, and a Seleka colonel called
21 Damboucha were involved in committing crimes at the OCRB with Mr Said.

22 Furthermore, as noted earlier, Mr Said had supervision and control over the OCRB
23 Seleka, which comprised over 30 Seleka members, including a Seleka colonel called
24 Tahir, a Seleka commander called Yaya and a Seleka known as Noiro, who Mr Said
25 designated guard of the underground cell. All of these named individuals were

1 actively involved in the commission of the charged crimes and they worked with
2 Mr Said.

3 In respect of Mr Said's specific actions and functions at the OCRB, Mr Said had
4 control over access to the cells. The Chamber notes that several release notes which
5 were presented in evidence bear Mr Said's signature, which also appear on a number
6 of Seleka identification badges. Mr Said issued instructions and orders in respect of
7 detainees at the OCRB. Mr Said ordered that several detainees be placed in cells,
8 including in the underground cell, following their arrival at the OCRB. Mr Said was
9 involved in the interrogation and mistreatment of detainees at the OCRB.

10 Mr Said gave orders for the OCRB Seleka to beat detainees. In addition, Mr Said was
11 present when detainees were being beaten and tortured at the OCRB. For example,
12 Mr Said was present, along with Rakiss and Nouradine Adam, when an individual,
13 who had been tied using the *arbatachar* method, was beaten by the OCRB Seleka and
14 questioned as to where they could find Bozizé's inner circle. Furthermore, in respect
15 of his authority and role in the release of detainees at the OCRB, Mr Said extorted
16 money for the release of detainees, along with Tahir and Yaya. Mr Said also decided
17 what interventions would be carried out by the OCRB Seleka and established
18 planning lists concerning patrols.

19 The Chamber has considered the relationships and actions of the individuals involved,
20 including Mr Said's specific role and functions, and considered -- and considers that
21 the consistent manner in which they operated at the OCRB, indicates that there was
22 an agreement or common plan to target perceived Bozizé supporters through the
23 commission of the charged crimes. The common plan was reflective of the broader
24 Seleka policy to attack the civilian population perceived to support François Bozizé.
25 In execution of this policy, the Seleka transferred prisoners between various bases and

1 detention sites in Bangui, including the OCRB, and these bases coordinated their
2 activities.

3 The evidence as set out in the judgment shows that these individuals were actively
4 involved, in varying capacities, in the implementation of elements of the plan and
5 their activities were interconnected. In these circumstances, the Chamber is satisfied
6 that there was an agreement or common plan between Mr Said, Nouradine Adam,
7 Adoum Rakiss, Mahamat Sallet Adoum Kette, Damboucha, Tahir Babikir, Yaya
8 Soumayele aka Soumaine and Noiro aka Nassir Abderraman and other Selekas of the
9 OCRB to target perceived Bozizé supporters in Bangui by committing the crimes
10 charged at the OCRB.

11 The Chamber also considers that Mr Said's role and functions, as just described and as
12 set out fully in the judgment, constitute an essential contribution to this common plan
13 and that, in light of this role and function, Mr Said acted with the necessary intent and
14 knowledge. In these circumstances, the Chamber is satisfied that the relevant
15 elements of Article 25(3)(a) of the Statute are fulfilled and, therefore, has not
16 considered the alternative modes of liability charged.

17 I will now read out a summary of the verdict of the Trial Chamber, which is set out in
18 full in the judgment.

19 Mahamat Said Abdel Kani, can you please stand up.

20 Now, for the foregoing reasons and on the basis of the evidence submitted and
21 discussed before this Trial Chamber at trial and the entire proceedings, pursuant to
22 Article 74(2) of the Statute, the Chamber finds you, Mahamat Said Abdel Kani, under
23 count 1 of the charges with respect to the crimes against humanity of imprisonment or
24 other severe deprivation of physical liberty, pursuant to Article 7(1)(e) and Article
25 25(3)(a) of the Statute:

1 Guilty in respect of at least 39 persons, in the context of several incidents as
2 enumerated in the judgment.

3 Not guilty in respect of 19 persons in the context of several incidents as enumerated in
4 the judgment.

5 Under count 2 of the charges with respect to the crime against humanity of torture,
6 pursuant to Article 7(1)(f) and Article 25(3)(a) of the Statute:

7 Guilty in respect of 22 persons, in the context of several incidents as enumerated in
8 the judgment.

9 Not guilty in respect of 14 persons, in the context of several incidents as enumerated
10 in the judgment.

11 Count 3 of the charges with respect to the war crime of torture, pursuant to
12 Article 8(2)(c)(i)-(iv) and Article 25(3)(a) or Article 25(3)(b) of the Statute:

13 Not guilty.

14 Under count 4 of the charges with respect to the war crime of cruel treatment
15 pursuant to Article 8(2)(c)(i)-(iii) and Article 25(3)(a) and Article 25(3)(b) of the
16 Statute:

17 Not guilty.

18 Under count 5 of the charges with respect to the crime against humanity of other
19 inhumane acts, pursuant to Article 7(1)(k) and Article 25(3)(a) of the Statute:

20 Guilty in respect of 34 persons, in the context of several incidents as enumerated in
21 the judgment.

22 Not guilty in respect of 25 persons, in the context of several incidents as enumerated
23 in the judgment.

24 Under count 6 of the charges with respect to the war crime of outrages upon personal
25 dignity, pursuant to Article 8(2)(c)(ii) and Article 25(3)(a) or 25(3)(b) of the Statute:

- 1 Not guilty.
- 2 Under count 7 of the charges with respect to the crime against humanity of
- 3 persecution, pursuant to Article 7(1)(h) and Article 25(3)(a) of the Statute:
- 4 Guilty in respect of 39 persons, in the context of several incidents, as enumerated in
- 5 the judgment.
- 6 Not guilty in respect of 15 persons, in the context of several incidents, as enumerated
- 7 in the judgment.
- 8 You may be seated.
- 9 Now, the Chamber will issue a scheduling order setting out the next steps and
- 10 deadlines for sentencing today.
- 11 On behalf of this Chamber, I thank our legal officers and admin assistants, I thank the
- 12 Registry, its court officers, including also the VWU, our interpreters and court
- 13 reporters, and our abled security officers.
- 14 This hearing is adjourned.
- 15 THE COURT USHER: [11:57:57] All rise.
- 16 (The hearing ends in open session at 11:58 a.m.)