

1 International Criminal Court
2 Trial Chamber I - Courtroom I
3 Presiding Judge Adrian Fulford, Judge Elizabeth Odio Benito, and
4 Judge René Blattmann
5 Situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo - ICC-01/04-01/06
6 In the case of the Prosecutor versus Thomas Lubanga Dyilo
7 Status Conference
8 Tuesday, 15 November 2011
9 The hearing starts at 2.31 p.m.
10 (Open session)
11 COURT USHER: All rise. The International Criminal Court is now
12 in session. Please be seated.
13 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Good afternoon. There is an issue in
14 relation to which we would very much appreciate your assistance. To
15 describe the issue very briefly, and I'm only going to do it briefly
16 because you have notification of it, there is an undoubted gap that will
17 arise between the judgement finally being ready in English and the French
18 translation thereafter being completed, and I want to say straight away
19 that anything that is said by us this afternoon in relation to that
20 period of delay is not meant to be, nor should it be interpreted as, any
21 kind of criticism of those in this court who have responsibility for
22 preparing the translation. We have investigated this, and it is
23 undoubtedly an enormous undertaking, and there is simply an inevitability
24 that there will be a gap.
25 However, it is likely that the decision in English will be ready

1 to be issued at the turn of the year, and we have been told that even if
2 the constituent parts of that decision are provided from today on a
3 rolling basis to the translation section, there is a real risk that the
4 French translation will not be ready until April next year.

5 There are two related questions. The first is whether it would
6 be appropriate to issue the English decision first -- or, rather, the
7 decision in English first, waiting, as it were, for the translation in
8 French to catch up, or must they both be issued together.

9 The second question, which is intimately related, concerns
10 Regulation 155 -- sorry, Regulation -- sorry, Rule 150, mistaking my
11 Rules and my Regulation and my numbers, Rule 150 and the requirement that
12 an appeal is filed not later than 30 days of notification of the
13 decision, be it a conviction or an acquittal.

14 I'm going to say no more, and we would like your help as to what
15 the Chamber should do.

16 Mr. Sachdeva, do you want to go first?

17 MR. SACHDEVA: Thank you, Mr. President. Of course, ideally the
18 judgement or the decision in English and in French should be issued
19 concurrently, and any right of appeal should commence from that date.
20 However, the Prosecution is also interested in efficiency in these
21 proceedings, and if it is the case that the English judgement is going to
22 be ready three or four months prior to the French translation, then the
23 Prosecution would ask that the English judgement be issued. And although
24 the Statute does not foresee a right of appeal stemming from a
25 translation of the judgement in another language of the court of the

1 choice of the accused, we feel in the interests of justice that the right
2 of appeal ought to commence from the rendering of the French version of
3 the judgement.

4 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Very clear. Can I just test you
5 slightly on it to see whether there are any difficulties along the way.
6 Maybe you're absolutely right.

7 If we look at Rule 150, it says that an appeal against a decision
8 of conviction or acquittal is to be filed not later than 30 days of the
9 notification of the decision.

10 Now, can we think this through together. What would you be
11 submitting, that the English version of the decision isn't, in fact, the
12 decision. The decision is only promulgated when the French translation
13 is available. Is it that, or is it that the Chamber can stipulate that
14 time only starts to run once both versions are available? How do you
15 address that issue?

16 MR. SACHDEVA: It's certainly the latter, Mr. President.

17 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: And are you saying that this should
18 just be a little bit of appropriate judicial activism on our part filling
19 in the spaces in the Rome Statute framework, or are you saying there is
20 something within the Statute, the Rules, or the Regulations that we can
21 latch onto to find support for that approach?

22 MR. SACHDEVA: Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, the Statute
23 does not foresee this course of action, in my submission, and indeed, any
24 assistance in terms of interpretation accorded to the accused should
25 be -- is conferred on the accused via Article 67(f). However, it is the

1 Prosecution's position that in the interests of fairness and considering
2 it is a -- clearly a critical decision of your Honours, the appeal timing
3 could start from the rendering of the French judgement, but, of course,
4 the English judgement is as authoritative in terms of the French.

5 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: So just to tie you down, it -- the
6 publication of the English version would be the decision, but we then say
7 time runs from the point at which the French translation is notified.

8 MR. SACHDEVA: Certainly. There is, of course, Mr. President,
9 one caveat to that, and -- and it depends on the length of time there is
10 going to be between the English version and the French version.

11 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Work on four months.

12 MR. SACHDEVA: In that case, I maintain the submissions the
13 Prosecution has made.

14 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: It's the best we can do and it seems
15 the most realistic. Thank you, Mr. Sachdeva, unless there's anything
16 else.

17 MR. SACHDEVA: Nothing further, Mr. President.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you very much.

19 Maitre Mabilie.

20 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) For once, Mr. President, I
21 believe that we're going to be in agreement with Mr. Prosecutor. The
22 Defence would not be opposed to the idea that the judgement be rendered
23 in English. This is not, in our submission, a notification. The
24 notification would come at the time when we would have access to the
25 translation in French of the decision. And I would go on to add that it

1 seems to me that were the Chamber to consult Rule 144(2)(b) and also
2 Regulation 31 of the Regulations of the Court, this Regulation 31 of the
3 Regulations of the Court would seem that it provides the Chamber with
4 jurisdiction or competence to assess the time at which notification
5 becomes reality.

6 I am referring now to subparagraph (2). I'm going to read it to
7 you in French:

8 Unless otherwise provided for in the Statute, Rules, or the
9 Regulations, or ordered by the Chamber, or unless the Chamber decides
10 otherwise, a participant is deemed to have been notified, informed, or
11 communicated with a document or decision or order on the day it is
12 effectively sent from the Court by the Registry.

13 And the important detail therein is the -- are the words "or
14 whether the Chamber decides otherwise."

15 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: The difference between you, as I
16 understand it, is that Mr. Sachdeva is saying that the English version
17 would be the decision, but that we would order that time only starts to
18 run when the French translation is available, whereas you are saying that
19 the decision is only going to be issued once the French translation is
20 available.

21 Now, if I've understood you right, Maitre Mabilille, what then
22 would be the status of whatever it is that we hand down at the turn of
23 the year? If it's -- if it's not a decision, what is it?

24 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) This might be a problem of
25 terminology. To my mind, this would be a decision, a decision that would

1 not be notified as such, and then subsequently we would have access to
2 the notification of the decision, which would then bring into play the
3 time lapse or duration of the appeal.

4 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: And, of course, depending on what is
5 said at the turn of the year, there are two, at the moment, absolutely
6 equally balanced possibilities. One is, as a result, there would be an
7 order of the accused's release. The other is there would have to be
8 consideration of sentence. And would your submission be that the Chamber
9 could then move to the next stage, either release or sentence, or would
10 that need to wait until the French version of the document was ready?

11 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) I would ask for a moment, please,
12 Mr. President.

13 (Defence counsel confer)

14 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) Yes. Thank you for that. It
15 would seem that there is a subsidiary question that arises now. Now,
16 does this time-limit run in the same manner for the Prosecution and the
17 Defence? The Office of the Prosecutor, were he to receive the English
18 version, does not have any difficulty because he has always worked in
19 English, and -- well, does this time-limit of notification, would it be
20 the same were an acquittal to arise or were there to be a conviction?
21 And were there to indeed be a conviction, would the Prosecutor then
22 consider that the time-limit starts to run from the moment at which you
23 render your decision in English?

24 That is the first question, I believe. Does the Chamber deem
25 that we, both the Prosecution and the Defence, have the right to the same

1 time-limit for notification purposes?

2 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Well, as I understood Mr. Sachdeva, he
3 was saying that time only starts to run across the board once the French
4 version is notified. So the decision has been issued, but time only
5 begins on notification in French.

6 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) One moment, please. I'm sorry.
7 (Defence counsel confer)

8 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) Mr. President, I'd like to come
9 back to the idea that I developed at an earlier stage. Even if I have
10 understood that Mr. Sachdeva and the Office of the Prosecutor deems that
11 the notification period, whatever the decision is, starts to run from the
12 point in time at which the translation is available. However, let us
13 study the hypothesis of an acquittal of Mr. Lubanga.

14 Of course, the Defence would not then file an appeal to this
15 decision. The Prosecutor would, however, appeal this decision. Were
16 this to be the case, the Prosecutor would have the judgement in English,
17 and he could then start running this time of notification, if you like.
18 The Defence would not need the translation in French immediately, and so
19 then my question arises again: Would the notification period be the same
20 for the Office of the Prosecutor and for the Defence when we are not in
21 the same situation?

22 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you.

23 I think it would be useful to hear you on that, Mr. Sachdeva.
24 Your submissions at the outset, as I understood them, were really
25 intended to ensure that the Chamber could get on with its business

1 without prejudicing the accused. Taking the hypothesis advanced by
2 Maitre Mabilie, if it were to be an acquittal, you would presumably not
3 in those circumstances submit that Rule 144, nonetheless, requires that
4 the Prosecution's obligation to file any notice of appeal should only
5 start to run once the French version is available.

6 MR. SACHDEVA: Mr. President, may I have one moment?

7 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Certainly.

8 (Prosecution counsel confer)

9 MR. SACHDEVA: Mr. President, of course, ideally under the
10 Statute and the Rules the -- if a judgement is issued in English, then
11 any right of appeal or start of appeal time should commence from that
12 judgement. There's nothing in the Statute that requires in a sense a
13 good turn to be undertaken by the Prosecution or by the Chamber for the
14 accused or vice versa for another party. And in that regard, if we are
15 going to run into problems, then perhaps it's wise for the appeal to
16 commence once the judgement in English is issued, because under the
17 Statute that is the correct approach.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Are you entirely changing your position
19 from what you said at the outset then, Mr. Sachdeva?

20 MR. SACHDEVA: That -- no, Mr. President. That would be the
21 ideal course of action. However, given the possibility of -- in the
22 event of an acquittal and the judgement in English is rendered, then our
23 appeal time would run from that date of the judgement.

24 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you. That's very clear.

25 I think, Maitre Mabilie, what is being accepted is that although

1 it's not a perfect position, there would, in fact, be a difference, that
2 in the event of an acquittal, Mr. Sachdeva is accepting that the Chamber
3 should ordain that time starts to run for the Prosecution once the
4 English version of the decision is available, but that if it were a
5 conviction, time would only start to run once the French version is
6 available. And if I've misunderstood Mr. Sachdeva, he will no doubt
7 shortly get to his feet and correct me.

8 There is still -- I just want to make sure on one final issue
9 that there's no misunderstanding. On that basis, if I've correctly
10 described it, do I understand you to be saying, therefore, that if the
11 English decision, the English version of the decision, is issued at the
12 turn of the year, whatever the result is, you accept that we can move to
13 the next stage, be it the release of the accused if he is acquitted, or
14 to sentence if he is convicted?

15 (Defence counsel confer)

16 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) This seems difficult to me,
17 Mr. President, and I do apologise once again if I have not understood
18 what the Chamber is saying. I think it would be simpler for us to be
19 clear on the matter.

20 If Mr. Lubanga were to be convicted, the Defence would then file
21 an appeal, and we would file an appeal from the moment in time when we
22 would have notification in French of the decision, and until the moment
23 in time at which we have notification, nothing would be able to happen
24 for us in terms of the case. This is what we have understood.

25 I did not quite grasp when you mentioned the new stage. I'd like

1 to know what the Chamber meant when using that term.

2 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Now, Maitre Mabilie, one needs to be
3 careful about this. If the accused is acquitted, I would imagine you
4 will not be asking for him to remain in custody until such time as the
5 Prosecution has filed its appeal and the Appeals Chamber has resolved the
6 issue. Similarly, if the accused is convicted, notwithstanding any
7 appeal that you may file, are you submitting that there is any impediment
8 to the Chamber moving to the next stage, pursuant to Article 76, of sentencing?

9 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) This is indeed the position of the Defence,
10 Mr. President, having read the text. Of course I would have had to prepare for this,
11 but upon reading the legal text. * What we understand from the texts today is that we
12 making submissions on the issue of guilt, following which the Chamber hands down a
13 decision on guilt. We are talking here about the
14 problem of guilt, and were there to be an appeal on one side or the other
15 of the courtroom, then the Chamber would not be able to move on to other
16 aspects of the case file. This is what we have believed that we
17 understood from reading the texts and, in particular, the excerpts on
18 reparations and on sentencing.

19 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Well, Maitre Mabilie, I'm not sure
20 whether the texts of the court support you on this. Article 76 begins
21 simply:

22 "In the event conviction, the Trial Chamber shall consider the
23 appropriate sentence to be imposed and shall take into account the
24 evidence presented ..." et cetera, et cetera.

25 I'd be grateful to you'd point us to any provision that indicates

1 that either the release of the accused, if he is acquitted, or his
2 sentence, if he's convicted, needs to wait for the outcome of any
3 appellate proceedings which, history tends to indicate, could take rather
4 a long time.

5 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) Regarding release, it seems that
6 in the documents, in the texts, there is a so-called automatic release.
7 So the problem does not arise when it comes to release, but with regard
8 to the other textual argument, I would like to refer to Article 76(3),
9 and this is the first article that I can refer to. But, your Honour, if
10 there is no final judgement on guilt, how is it possible for the Chamber
11 to move on to the next stage of sentencing or reparations? I think we
12 need to have a final judgement on guilt or innocence or, rather, on guilt
13 before we can move on to sentencing or reparations --

14 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: So your submission, then, is a general
15 one rather than founded on the texts. You would say that there's a
16 general point of principle that the -- that the Chamber should not
17 sentence if there's a conviction in any case until the Appeals Chamber
18 has finally determined whether or not the conviction is a good one or
19 not. That could mean, Maitre Mabilille, if you're right, that the accused
20 would be waiting for a period of, what, 9, 12, 15 months before he is
21 told what sentence he is going to receive. Some might say that that is a
22 fundamental breach of his rights in terms of knowing the outcome of the
23 proceedings within a timely fashion, but I understand that's your
24 submission.

25 Now, that's a broadly based submission, and as I understand it,

1 it's not one that's founded on the timing of delivery of the French
2 version of the decision. It's one that's founded on a wider and more
3 general principle that there should be no sentencing until the
4 Appeals Division has made up its mind on a conviction. Is that correct?

5 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) Just an observation on the texts.
6 I was not prepared for that, but after reading the texts, the Defence
7 feels that there are three types of decision -- decisions that can be
8 appealed and that there are three types of appeals in the texts. I
9 cannot refer to them right now, because I am unable to locate them right
10 now, * but the texts indicate that there are three decisions that can be appealed.
11 That is, a decision on guilt, a decision on sentencing and
12 a decision on reparations.

13 So I agree with the Chamber of what has been said today, but I
14 believe that it is our Chamber that's going to create jurisprudence on
15 this issue, but all these possible appeals are provided for in the texts,
16 that is, at three stages.

17 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you.

18 Anything else, Mr. Sachdeva?

19 MR. SACHDEVA: Mr. President, just that the Prosecution does not
20 concur with the Defence's formulation and that in the event of -- in the
21 event of a conviction, despite the fact that the French judgement may be
22 issued four months later, the Chamber is authorised, we would submit, to
23 move into a sentencing process after the English judgement has been
24 rendered in the event of a conviction.

25 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: I'm not sure that that's what

1 Maitre Mabilie was submitting, Mr. Sachdeva. I -- and it may be that
2 I've misunderstood. I thought Maitre Mabilie was submitting that the
3 sentencing process, if there's a conviction, shouldn't begin until after
4 the appeals division has rendered its decision, not that it should wait
5 until after the French version was made available. The last question I
6 put to Maitre Mabilie was specifically directed at that point, and I
7 didn't detect any suggestion that if there is a conviction, that the
8 sentence phase should await the delivery of the French version.

9 MR. SACHDEVA: Perhaps, Mr. President, there was a
10 misunderstanding, but our submission would be that the Court can proceed
11 to a sentencing hearing once the English judgement has been rendered
12 irrespective of whether it's after the French judgement or after an
13 appeal.

14 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: And similarly, if it is an acquittal,
15 the Chamber can move, because the decision has been issued, to the
16 release of the accused.

17 MR. SACHDEVA: Indeed.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: I just want to make sure that, as it
19 were, both possibilities are equally catered for in an exactly neutral
20 way, Mr. Sachdeva.

21 MR. SACHDEVA: Precisely, Mr. President, yes.

22 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you.

23 Some observations have been made about the timing of the
24 availability of the French version of the decision. Have we correctly
25 described it, Ms. Tomic?

1 MS. TOMIC: Well, this is the first judgement. Therefore, we
2 have no precedence, your Honour. What we have is roughly some data which
3 we don't feel are really applicable, again, because the length of any
4 judgement will necessarily impact the time that it takes to translate it,
5 at the risk of stating the obvious, the number of references, footnotes,
6 et cetera. So until we see the document, we will not be able to actually
7 say -- to give you an estimate, but we are basing ourselves on -- on what
8 your Honour has said, four months, but that's not something that we can
9 say for sure, professionally speaking. We really need to see it.

10 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: But on the basis of the approximate
11 number of pages that we have provided to you, on that basis, something in
12 the region of four months is, as I understand it, as good an estimate as
13 you can give; is that right?

14 MS. TOMIC: We would need to see the pages first, your Honour.

15 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you.

16 Maitre Mabilie.

17 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) Your Honour, I would like to make
18 a respectful observation to the Chamber regarding this time-scale of four
19 months. We were particularly concerned by that, and we have a suggestion
20 to make to the Chamber. We do not want the translation services to take
21 my suggestions badly.

22 We contacted three firms that are specialised in the translation
23 of judicial documents. We asked them for estimates, cost estimates --

24 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Maitre Mabilie, forgive me for
25 interrupting. If you have suggestions for the Registry that may improve

1 the timing of delivery of the French version, can I ask you to
2 communicate those directly, please, to Ms. Tomic so that she can consider
3 them and discuss them with you. If it requires any form of adjudication
4 on our part, then we will willingly come back into court on another day
5 to make a ruling, but I think the detail of alternative translation
6 arrangements should in the first instance be the subject of a discussion
7 between you and her, rather than something that's played out in court.

8 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) Absolutely, your Honour. I will
9 do that, but I just wanted to point out that we are very concerned about
10 this problem. That is why we tried to reflect on solutions that would
11 make it possible to have translations far more quickly.

12 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: We're grateful to you. It's been a
13 matter of very great concern to us. And that's not to be critical of
14 Ms. Tomic or her department, quite the reverse. But it does seem to us
15 that there is, nonetheless, a significant gap that is to be -- that is
16 regretted.

17 Now, anything else you want to say on the substance?

18 (Trial Chamber confers)

19 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Mr. Walley?

20 MR. WALLEY: (Interpretation) Thank you, your Honour. This
21 issue also concerns the victims, because everything that has been
22 discussed also influences the way that the procedures for reparation will
23 be carried out, and this is the position of the victims that we have
24 adopted jointly.

25 Regarding the suggestion of handing down the judgement but to

1 notify it formally with the French version, we do agree with that
2 proposal, as also the fact that the deadline for appeal for the two
3 parties should start running as from the time of the formal notification.

4 Secondly, we also subscribe to the proposal to continue with the
5 procedure, that is, sentencing and reparation in case of conviction,
6 without waiting for the formal notification of the judgement. We did
7 not -- we do not find that the Defence has any legal basis for submitting
8 that that procedure should wait for the formal notification and even for
9 the Appeals ruling. I believe that would slow down the proceedings, and
10 we are in favour of an expeditious procedure.

11 Thank you.

12 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Well, thank you all very much for your
13 assistance on that.

14 Maitre Mabilie, we understand that you would wish to visit
15 Witness 0019 during the course of one of your regular visits to see the
16 accused in custody. The reason, as we understand, being that he is
17 someone who members of your team -- of your team now know, given that you
18 interviewed him and called him, and that he is unwell.

19 Put simply, is that your request, which I understand is made on
20 humanitarian grounds?

21 MS. MABILLE: (Interpretation) Yes, your Honour. Do you wish me
22 to elaborate, or isn't that useful?

23 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: I want to know whether there is any
24 serious objection to that proposal on your part first, Maitre Mabilie.
25 So if you could pause for a moment.

1 Are there any objections from the Registry to the proposal that
2 members of the Defence should visit Witness 0019 on humanitarian grounds
3 during the course of one of their regular visits to see the accused in
4 the detention centre?

5 MR. SANT-ANNA: (Interpretation) Thank you, your Honour. Indeed
6 the Registry received a request from the Defence team to visit
7 Witness 0019 for humanitarian reasons. The head of the detention unit
8 and specifically the Registry opposed that request specifying that only
9 the inspection authorities and the ICRC have the right to carry out
10 humanitarian visits.

11 There was also a case where this was submitted to the Presidency, an issue like
12 this, because a humanitarian request was made, and it was rejected. * And the Registry
13 is even more surprised to see this matter brought before the Chamber, because
14 when a visit is refused, notification is made both to the party requesting the visit
15 and to the person receiving the visit. And then under Regulation 180, it is up to the
16 detained person himself to refer the case to the competent authorities.

17 Thank you.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: Thank you, Mr. Sant-Anna.

19 (Trial Chamber confers)

20 PRESIDING JUDGE FULFORD: There is an application by counsel
21 acting on behalf of the accused that they are permitted to visit
22 Witness 0019, who is currently detained in this country pending his
23 removal to the Democratic Republic of Congo. He is unwell, and the
24 Chamber, without going into the detail of it, has been kept extremely
25 well informed of the extent of his ill health.

1 Under Article 68 of the Rome Statute, we have an obligation to
2 protect the physical and psychological well-being of witnesses, and
3 pursuant to that provision, it is our decision that it is both necessary
4 and appropriate for members of the Defence team to be able to meet with
5 Witness 0019, who they know reasonably well having interviewed him at
6 some length before he was called to give evidence. That meeting should
7 not be limited artificially by way of time. It should instead be
8 reasonable and proportionate, and I hope -- we hope that there can be an
9 easy understanding reached as to what length would be appropriate. Nor
10 is it to be limited to one occasion only. There may be more than one
11 visit by the Defence to Witness 0019, again so long as the arrangements
12 are reasonable and proportionate in all the circumstances. And if there
13 is -- if there are any disagreements in relation to the detail, then the
14 Chamber can be informed in writing.

15 Is there anything else that anyone else would wish to raise?

16 Thank you all very much for your assistance. We will deliver our
17 decision as regards the timing of the delivery of the Article 74 decision
18 in writing.

19 COURT USHER: All rise.

20 The hearing ends at 3.21 p.m.

21 CORRECTIONS REPORT

22 The Court Interpretation and Translation Section has made the following corrections
23 in the transcript:

24 * Page 10 lines 11 to 13:

25 " what we understand is that we are pleading guilt." Is corrected by

1 "What we understand from the texts today is that we are making submissions on the
2 issue of guilt, following which the Chamber hands down a decision on guilt."

3 * Page 12 lines 10 to 12:

4 "but the texts indicate that there are three decisions, judgements, that can be appealed.
5 That is a decision on guilt, a decision on the appeal, and a decision on appeal."

6 is corrected by

7 " but the texts indicate that there are three decisions that can be appealed. That is, a
8 decision on guilt, a decision on sentencing and a decision on reparations."

9 * Page 17 lines 12 to 15:

10 "This is referred to the Chamber. When a visit has been rejected, it is notified to the
11 Chamber. " is corrected by

12 "And the Registry is even more surprised to see this matter brought before the
13 Chamber, because when a visit is refused, notification is made both to the party
14 requesting the visit and to the person receiving the visit.