Trial Hearing (Open Session) ICC-02/05-01/20

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 International Criminal Court
- 2 Trial Chamber I
- 3 Situation: Darfur, Sudan
- 4 In the case of The Prosecutor v. Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman ("Ali
- 5 Kushayb") ICC-02/05-01/20
- 6 Presiding Judge Joanna Korner, Judge Reine Alapini-Gansou and Judge Althea Violet
- 7 Alexis-Windsor (absent pursuant to Rule 140 bis of the Rules of Procedure and
- 8 Evidence)
- 9 Trial Hearing Courtroom 2
- 10 Wednesday, 25 October 2023
- 11 (The hearing starts in open session at 9.31 a.m.)
- 12 THE COURT USHER: [9:31:00] All rise.
- 13 The International Criminal Court is now in session.
- 14 7please be seated.
- 15 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [9:31:14] Yes, good morning, all.
- We'll start in open session and then, once the introductions have taken place, we'll go
- 17 straight into private session.
- 18 Yes. Start again with the Defence. Is it the same as yesterday and the day before?
- 19 MR LAUCCI: [9:31:36] Yes, plus Madam Audrey Mateo, our legal adviser.
- 20 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [9:31:44] Right. Thank you.
- 21 Yes, Prosecution, same as yesterday?
- 22 MR NICHOLLS: [9:31:47] Good morning, Madam President. Good morning
- 23 everybody in the courtroom, your Honour. Yes, same as yesterday.
- 24 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [9:31:52] And Ms Von Wistinghausen, you're slightly
- 25 less this morning.

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 MS VON WISTINGHAUSEN: [9:31:54] For us it's a minus. Yes, good morning,
- 2 Madam President. Good morning, your Honour. Good morning, colleagues.
- 3 Same as yesterday, minus our case manager, Saif Kassis. So we are just two this
- 4 morning. Thank you.
- 5 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [9:32:07] All right.
- 6 Yes. Good morning to you, sir. And we will go straight in to private session,
- 7 please.
- 8 (Private session at 9.32 a.m.)
- 9 THE COURT OFFICER: [9:32:29] We're in private session, Madam President.
- 10 (Redacted)
- 11 (Redacted)
- 12 (Redacted)
- 13 (Redacted)
- 14 (Redacted)
- 15 (Redacted)
- 16 (Redacted)
- 17 (Redacted)
- 18 (Redacted)
- 19 (Redacted)
- 20 (Redacted)
- 21 (Redacted)
- 22 (Redacted)
- 23 (Redacted)
- 24 (Redacted)
- 25 (Redacted)

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

25.10.2023 Page 5

25.10.2023 Page 6

25.10.2023 Page 7

25.10.2023 Page 8

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

(Private Session)

Trial Hearing

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 (Open session at 12.11 p.m.)
- 2 THE COURT OFFICER: [12:11:06] We are in open session, Madam President.
- 3 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:11:09] Yes, right. Now, Mr Edwards, you are
- 4 submitting that various documents from which the Prosecution wish to cross-examine
- 5 the witness should not be put?
- 6 MR EDWARDS: [12:11:15] Yes.
- 7 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:11:16] Right.
- 8 MR EDWARDS: [12:11:17] And if I can go from the general, to the principled, to the
- 9 concrete, dealing specifically with some of the documents on the Prosecution's list,
- they relate to -- on the face of it -- all right, perhaps I can take them, take item 7,
- Booklet on Implementation of IHL, and item 15 and 16.
- 12 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:12:16] (Microphone not activated)
- 13 THE INTERPRETER: [12:12:18] Mic, please, your Honour.
- 14 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:12:20] Sorry. Is 15 the original and 16 the
- 15 translation?
- 16 MR EDWARDS: [12:12:28] Yes. The reason why I group these two documents
- 17 together or three documents, but one is a translation of one of the documents is
- that these are both documents that were on the Prosecution's list of evidence, but
- 19 which, for whatever reason, they chose not to seek to submit -- to be recognised as
- 20 formally submitted.
- 21 The document at 15 and 16 entitled "The Law of Armed Conflict" was specifically
- associated with a Prosecution witness, P-0103. This was a witness that the
- 23 Prosecution sought to have admitted under Rule 68(3). This was in their tenth
- 24 application to seek to introduce evidence under Rule 68(3), and your Honours ruled
- 25 in your decision number 660 of 4 April 2022, that P-0103 was a witness that provided

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

1 unique and detailed evidence and for various reasons ruled that, no, this is a witness

- 2 whose evidence merited being heard entirely viva voce.
- 3 So, 0103 turns into a viva-voce witness. The Prosecution relied on 0103 in numerous
- 4 other Rule 68 motions as amounting to a corroborating witness because of his position,
- 5 because of the evidence that he could give. But then, the Prosecution, by way of an
- 6 email dated 18 November of last year, indicated that they were withdrawing him.
- 7 The document at 15 and 16 -- the "Law of Armed Conflict" document -- it's a book,
- 8 actually, was not then sought to be introduced by way of a bar table motion or
- 9 through any other witness, and so when the Prosecution closed its case, that
- document simply wasn't in the case file.
- Now, were the Prosecution to try and suggest now, well, this whole issue of
- 12 international humanitarian law and how it is taught and how it is applied in the
- 13 Sudanese Armed Forces, its existence within the framework of armed forces law in
- 14 Sudan at the relevant time, is only a subject that has recently become clear to us, it's
- only something that the Defence has recently raised as a point that we now have to
- deal with. If that is the Prosecution case, it simply doesn't stand up to scrutiny
- 17 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:16:18] No, sorry, I see -- you're anticipating the
- 18 Prosecution's argument, because it's been clear throughout that you've been saying
- 19 that no training in IHL was given to lower ranks anyhow.
- 20 MR EDWARDS: [12:16:37] Exactly. And not just before your Honour's court -- not
- 21 before your Honour's Chamber, but Mr Laucci made the point clear beyond any
- 22 doubt at the confirmation of charges hearing, back on 26 May of 2021, transcript
- 23 number 9, and I'm just going to quote for a moment from page 5 of that transcript.
- 24 Mr Laucci says this:
- 25 "And on that basis, and that's the real point of departure of my presentation this

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 morning, we have no information, no start of evidence that either Mr Abd-Al-Rahman
- 2 or Ali Kushayb, or both of them, followed the slightest military training, or any
- training or awareness raising with respect to international humanitarian law [...] or [...]
- 4 any awareness raising in the principles of the distinction between combatants and
- 5 non-combatants."
- 6 And, in fact, if your Honours were to read further down in the transcript from the
- 7 confirmation of charges hearing, you will see that Mr Laucci relied on an expert
- 8 report, essentially, relating to the place of IHL in Sudan. I think it was a fairly short
- 9 report prepared by someone that we are all familiar with, Linda Murnane.
- 10 So there can be absolutely no basis for any Prosecution argument that, well, this is
- a new matter that we didn't know anything about. So, so much for those
- 12 documents --
- 13 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:18:48] Well, just a moment. So the witness with
- 14 whom they were supposed to be introduced is the one that they, in the end, did not
- 15 call.
- 16 MR EDWARDS: [12:18:55] Yes.
- 17 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:18:56] So that opportunity was gone. But you're
- saying, are you, that they should have put it into -- sorry, they should have sought its
- 19 admittance through the bar table motion.
- 20 MR EDWARDS: [12:19:11] Yes, if they were -- they ought to have known that they
- 21 were going to have to deal with this Defence argument, so to pre-empt --
- 22 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:19:26] Sorry, I'll just stop you there, Mr Edwards.
- 23 At that stage, they have not the faintest idea who you are calling as a Defence witness.
- 24 MR EDWARDS: [12:19:31] It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter in the slightest bit.
- 25 They knew that it was going to be a point taken by the Defence -- it was going to be

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- a fundamental point to be taken by the Defence. They should have introduced
- 2 the -- whatever evidence they have about the place of IHL in Sudanese Armed Forces
- 3 law during the course of their case.
- 4 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:19:55] Okay.
- 5 MR EDWARDS: [12:19:56] They ought to have got their house into order, they
- 6 ought to have had material on the record in the case file in order to be able to deal
- 7 with the point when the Defence in evidence raises it. Because they could -- because
- 8 they could not have said, "We didn't realise that this is going to be raised".
- 9 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:20:19] Well, yes, it's raised as part of
- 10 your -- certainly it was raised and it has been clear, as you say, right from the
- beginning, that that was part of what you were arguing. But without a witness to
- 12 explain these documents, how were they supposed to have put them in? Simply in
- advance of the fact that you might have called one?
- 14 MR EDWARDS: [12:20:54] Your Honour, the Prosecution sought admission of all
- 15 kinds of documents by the bar table that they didn't pretend for a moment required
- the intervention of a Prosecution witness to get in.
- 17 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:21:12] Is it --
- 18 MR EDWARDS: [12:21:12] That was -- that was a major argument in the bar table
- motion, we don't need -- we don't need to call witnesses to get a large number of these
- 20 documents in and the case law of this Court does not require us to bring
- 21 documentation in, bring exhibits in, through a witness. We can do it through the bar
- table and it saves time, and dah, dah, dah, dah, dah, you know, the standard
- 23 arguments.
- 24 So in answer to your Honour's --
- 25 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:21:52] Is it also --

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 MR EDWARDS: [12:21:53] Forgive me, but just in answer to your Honour's question,
- 2 that they could have done it via the bar table, because they did it with a bunch of
- 3 other documents.
- 4 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:21:58] Is it also your contention that they may
- 5 not cross-examine this witness about the contents of the documents even if the
- 6 documents themselves don't go in?
- 7 MR EDWARDS: [12:22:08] It would be my contention that they can't even use these
- 8 documents.
- 9 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:22:14] Why?
- 10 MR EDWARDS: [12:22:15] For the same reasons that -- for the same reasons that I
- 11 have alluded to, that it's artificial to create a distinction between documents that can
- be used with a witness in cross-examination and documents that then go in as
- exhibits -- qua exhibits for the consideration of the Trial Chamber in due course.
- 14 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:22:39] But, Mr Edwards, one of the things about
- 15 this witness which has been quite odd, actually, is that you didn't seek to put him
- 16 forward as an expert but, as I remarked yesterday, {ICR: (Redacted)
- 17 (Redacted)} and, is it your
- 18 contention that the Prosecution should not be allowed to explore with him the various
- manuals that were in existence at the time one of which appears to be a Sandhurst
- 20 manual translated into Arabic to test that knowledge or to assist in the Court's
- 21 determination? Is that your argument?
- 22 MR EDWARDS: [12:23:39] Well, whilst -- and I repeat myself -- whilst I certainly
- can't say that there is a blanket prohibition, when it comes to documents that have
- 24 never been disclosed to the Defence before --
- 25 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:23:58] But you said that these have been

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- disclosed; they were going to go in with the witness who disappeared, or who wasn't
- 2 called?
- 3 MR EDWARDS: [12:24:05] No, no, the law of -- the law of armed conflict document,
- 4 which is a tome, is originally an Arabic document -- it's an Arabic book, I think.
- 5 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:24:22] I'm sorry, which one are you looking at?
- 6 The booklet on the implementation?
- 7 MR EDWARDS: [12:24:31] No.
- 8 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:24:32] Which one is it, then?
- 9 MR EDWARDS: [12:24:33] It's number 15, DAR-OTP-0107 --
- 10 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:24:39] I've got 16, I've haven't got 15.
- 11 MR EDWARDS: [12:24:44] Well, 15 is the Sudanese original and 16 is the translation
- 12 of that.
- 13 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:24:49] Right.
- 14 MR EDWARDS: [12:24:51] Is that the document you say comes from Sandhurst?
- 15 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:24:54] Yes, I thought it was Sandhurst, yes.
- 16 Sorry, (indiscernible). Sorry, you are quite right. Yes, 16, okay, that's never been
- 17 disclosed to you?
- 18 MR EDWARDS: [12:25:03] No, that one has been disclosed --
- 19 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:25:07] Right. Which one hasn't then? The
- 20 booklet on the implementation?
- 21 MR EDWARDS: [12:25:19] The Booklet on the Implementation of International
- 22 Humanitarian Law was on the list of exhibits, but never admitted.
- 23 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:25:26] Okay. So that's disclosed as well.
- 24 MR EDWARDS: [12:25:28] Yes.
- 25 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:25:29] What hasn't been disclosed before.

- WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016
- 1 MR EDWARDS: [12:25:31] The documents that weren't on the original list of
- 2 evidence is -- I'll just say the English translation rather than -- it's the document at 10.
- 3 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:25:51] I'm sorry, I thought for the moment we
- 4 were simply sticking to these two tomes, if you like, that you were addressing us on.
- 5 MR EDWARDS: [12:26:01] Yes.
- 6 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:26:01] Right.
- 7 MR EDWARDS: [12:26:03] We'll stick with --
- 8 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:26:04] But those two have been disclosed to you
- 9 and were originally on the Prosecution list of exhibits?
- 10 MR EDWARDS: [12:26:07] Correct, yes.
- 11 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:26:08] All right.
- 12 MR EDWARDS: [12:26:10] Yes, and we were anticipating dealing with them when
- 13 P-103 comes to testify. But we simply couldn't because the Prosecution chose not to
- 14 call him.
- 15 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:26:25] Yes, okay.
- MR EDWARDS: [12:26:26] But in terms of the -- so I have addressed you in terms of
- 17 the documents that were on the list of evidence, but never submitted for -- or never
- admitted, but then in terms of documents that were not on the list of evidence and, it
- 19 follows, obviously, never submitted by the Prosecution are the documents at lines
- 20 8 ---
- 21 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:27:02] The press article?
- 22 MR EDWARDS: [12:27:05] Yes. 10, 12, 14, 17, 27 and 37. And apart from the last
- 23 two, at 27 and 37, being the English translation, the other documents we received for
- 24 the first time yesterday.
- 25 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:27:55] Sorry, can you just list those for me?

- WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016
- 1 MR EDWARDS: [12:28:00] Yes, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 17.
- 2 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:28:12] Okay, so --
- 3 MR EDWARDS: [12:28:14] I'm --
- 4 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:28:16] Those you've never had disclosed to you
- 5 before.
- 6 MR EDWARDS: [12:28:20] Yes.
- 7 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:28:21] 27 and 37 you have, but they weren't on
- 8 the Prosecution's list.
- 9 MR EDWARDS: [12:28:25] Correct. And really, when -- all of these documents in
- 10 fact --
- 11 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:28:27] So this is --
- 12 MR EDWARDS: [12:28:28] I was about to say -- I was about to say all of these
- documents deal with the IHL in Sudan point, they don't -- many do, but in terms of
- 14 the ones that don't deal with our argument about IHL in Sudan --
- 15 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:29:02] Okay. Can we -- I think we just need to
- 16 go through them. So 8 is -- looks as though it comes from the website of the ICRC.
- 17 MR EDWARDS: [12:29:12] Yes.
- 18 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:29:13] Right. 10, does it say what it is? It
- 19 doesn't. Courses run by the ICRC --
- 20 MR EDWARDS: [12:29:30] Yes.
- 21 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:29:32] 12, I'm not -- well, again, as you say, it's
- 22 ICRC ---
- 23 MR EDWARDS: [12:29:47] Yes.
- 24 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:29:49] 14 --
- 25 MR EDWARDS: [12:29:55] ICRC.

- WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016
- 1 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:29:57] Yes.
- 2 MR EDWARDS: [12:29:59] 17 is different. 17 is a document dated 31 March 2002
- 3 and it's entitled: Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Sudan and
- 4 the Sudan People's Liberation Movement to Protect Noncombatants Civilians.
- 5 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:30:17] Yes. I'm afraid that doesn't seem to have
- 6 made its way into my binder.
- 7 MR EDWARDS: [12:30:26] Can I hand up my copy of it.
- 8 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:30:28] It has, no, I'm sorry, beg your pardon.
- 9 Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Sudan -- well, the Sudanese
- 10 Liberation Movement is the insurgents, is it?
- 11 MR EDWARDS: [12:30:46] Yes.
- 12 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:30:47] Right.
- 13 MR EDWARDS: [12:30:48] So I confess I'm at something of a disadvantage, because
- we don't know precisely the use to which the Prosecution wants to put this document,
- and this may be one of those documents where, undesirable though it is, we are going
- to have to deal with it when it becomes clearer what the Prosecution wants to do with
- 17 it.
- 18 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:31:10] Okay, all right, and 27.
- 19 MR EDWARDS: [12:31:17] 27 is an unofficial translation of a -- yes, it's an order
- 20 establishing the Special Criminal Court on the Events in Darfur.
- 21 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:31:40] Is this what the Chief Justice was referring
- 22 to when he talked about the special court?
- 23 MR EDWARDS: [12:31:46] He did -- well, he did give evidence about a special court
- 24 being established. Again, I don't know if it's -- I don't quite know what the
- 25 Prosecution will -- (Overlapping speakers)

- WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016
- 1 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:31:59] All right. And 37?
- 2 MR EDWARDS: [12:32:01] And 37 is a partial translation of --
- 3 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:32:03] A statement. Is this one of the ones taken
- 4 by the Sudanese?
- 5 MR EDWARDS: [12:32:13] Yes, I think this -- this comes from what is -- what has
- 6 come to be called the Darfur file.
- 7 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:32:31] Oh, I see. There's a huge number of them,
- 8 I see.
- 9 MR EDWARDS: [12:32:35] That's right. So on the -- on the Prosecution's list of
- 10 evidence, but not -- not admitted. And in a way I understand why not, because the
- 11 entire Darfur file -- well, 99 per cent of it is --
- 12 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:32:52] Didn't you -- didn't you object to the
- 13 admission?
- 14 MR EDWARDS: [12:32:55] Probably. I don't know.
- 15 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:32:57] And didn't we -- this -- this one where we
- agreed that we wouldn't admit them, was it part of the bar table motion?
- 17 MR EDWARDS: [12:33:09] No, I think -- I think the Darfur I'm looking to my
- 18 friend I think -- I think the entirety of the Darfur file is quite irrelevant, because
- 19 it -- there are one or two pages from it that are conceivably relevant, but the entire
- 20 thing is a document of many hundreds of pages and the entire thing hasn't been
- 21 admitted into evidence.
- 22 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:33:34] Yeah, well, it just goes to show, isn't it,
- 23 that what -- I go back to what Judge Antonetti had to say, if the Prosecution were
- 24 allowed to put in all the evidence on which it wished to rely, the case file would be
- 25 tripled, or quadrupled, in file.

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 MR EDWARDS: [12:33:51] Well, it's pleasing that the Prosecution has approached
- 2 its task with a degree of discrimination by not throwing in the kitchen sink, but why
- 3 they are now seeking to introduce some additional pages from that Darfur file now,
- 4 again, we're -- we're just not sure at this stage, so --
- 5 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:34:15] All right.
- 6 MR EDWARDS: [12:34:17] -- I am at some disadvantage.
- 7 But really it's the principles and the factors that we invite your Honours to take into
- 8 account as discussed in Ntaganda, which -- Ntaganda and Bemba et al. Bemba et al.
- 9 is cited in paragraph 16 of the Ntaganda decision. These are relevant considerations
- 10 for your Honours to apply.
- 11 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:34:51] Yeah. All right. Well, I mean we've
- 12 certainly taken those on board.
- 13 Yes, all right,
- 14 Yes, Mr Nicholls, you're going to deal with this, are you?
- 15 MR NICHOLLS: [12:35:04] Yes. Very briefly, your Honour, I'll try to. I know
- there's a sort of one lawyer per argument thing, I may have to consult with
- 17 Mr Edwards on a couple of the specific exhibits, but, I mean, I'll try to keep this brief,
- but just from the beginning, there is no prohibition in the Statute, there's no
- 19 prohibition or general principle that supports what he says in the Rules, there's no
- 20 Appeals Chamber decision on this which would bind you in any way.
- 21 Our conduct of the proceedings in this case, paragraph 44, also anticipates and
- 22 understands that undisclosed items may be used in cross-examination and that's why
- 23 it includes that those should be sent by email.
- 24 And I'll try not to repeat what your Honour said, although some of it I had written
- 25 down, but I do not believe that Ntaganda is citing Hadžihasanovic with approval. I

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 would advocate that that is not a good decision, it was not followed in other
- 2 chambers at the ICTY. And what the Chamber in Ntaganda is saying, that even in
- 3 that case the Prosecution was still allowed to introduce these types -- new evidence
- 4 that was not on the exhibit list, had not been used before, in order to test the
- 5 responsibility of the accused.
- 6 The -- my friend's argument really comes down to only the principle, which is, if it
- 7 exists, not a good one.
- 8 The example of P-103 is a good one. Now, we wanted to call that witness, we didn't
- 9 not bother to call him.
- 10 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:37:04] Is he the one you couldn't get hold of?
- 11 MR NICHOLLS: [12:37:06] Well, I --
- 12 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:37:07] Or there was all sorts of toing and froing, I
- 13 remember.
- 14 MR NICHOLLS: [12:37:12] In open session, I will say that we were not able to obtain
- 15 his testimony -- is, the Defence asked to speak to that witness and he refused to speak
- to them when we, according to the protocol, approached him.
- 17 So he -- he could not be called by either of us and it was not a question of not
- 18 bothering to put him in.
- 19 But again, these documents may have been listed with him, they would relevant for
- 20 that witness, P-103.
- 21 This witness again, in open session, without saying it in ways which would reveal
- 22 him talks about these same types of documents, refers to them in his statement, and
- 23 it's absolutely proper cross-examination material. We would not have known that
- 24 they would have called this person or that they would go through this type of detail.
- 25 And this is just normal that we use materials that are relevant, that come out of the

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 witness's statement and testimony, for cross.
- 2 It's possible we would try to use an -- and it should be admissible, a document not
- 3 even on our list before the witness started if something comes up in the direct
- 4 examination that we didn't anticipate and couldn't have.
- 5 And what my friend hasn't pointed out to you is any prejudice whatsoever from any
- 6 of these documents. I mean, the number -- number 7 is directly related to the
- 7 witness, he discusses that. The same with number 16. He talks about those
- 8 documents and those issues and the Defence doesn't want you to be able to hear
- 9 cross-examination on it.
- 10 If you look at the --
- 11 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:39:11] You say he talks about it in his statement
- that he made to the Defence.
- 13 MR NICHOLLS: [12:39:16] I'm looking at Mr Jeremy, but I believe so.
- 14 Yes, he's referred to the manual in his statement and in the course of his direct
- examination, and they don't want us to be able to use it on cross. I mean, it's -- it's
- 16 bordering on ridiculous at that point.
- 17 If you look at the Bemba et al. oral decision, which my friend helpfully sent out, the
- 18 test there --
- 19 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:39:52] Just a moment. Where is that? I just
- 20 need to get that oral decision.
- 21 MR NICHOLLS: [12:39:57] It's labelled annex 4, confidential.
- 22 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:40:02] Oh, right.
- 23 MR NICHOLLS: [12:40:04] Well, confidential, this -- this ...
- 24 But I think if your Honours look at paragraphs 5 and 6 --
- 25 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:40:16] Yes.

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 MR NICHOLLS: [12:40:17] The last sentence at paragraph 5, the
- 2 "items tendered by the Prosecution [...] must, in principle, have a genuine and not
- 3 pretextual connection to [...]" the cross.
- 4 Well, of course. And that's true with items on direct as well.
- 5 So, yes, there -- I can see an objection to having missed some huge issue in your case
- 6 and trying to shovel in tonnes of documents through an unrelated witness. That's
- 7 not what's happening here and it's not happened in any case I've worked on.
- 8 And then if you see in paragraph 6, part of the test is documents which are not
- 9 sufficiently linked should not, you know, may not be admitted. But again, that just
- 10 common sense and the way it is with every document a party tries to submit.
- 11 So I would also make the point that --
- 12 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:41:13] Can I -- just before you leave that,
- 13 Mr Nicholls, did he refer -- you're right, he referred to the implementation of
- 14 international humanitarian law. Did he also refer to the manual? Yes, he did, I
- 15 think. Okay. Yes.
- 16 Actually, not the book. He referred to the manual, but didn't refer to the Booklet on
- 17 the Implementation of International Humanitarian Law.
- 18 {ICR: (Redacted)
- 19 (Redacted)
- 20 (Redacted)
- 21 (Redacted)
- 22 (Redacted)
- 23 (Redacted)}
- 24 MR NICHOLLS: [12:41:59] I don't know if oh, he's sitting
- 25 down Mr Abd-Al-Rahman was standing up. I didn't know if he had a problem.

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:42:07] Thank you.
- 2 Yes, we'd better redact that part. Okay.
- 3 MR NICHOLLS: [12:42:09] And again, I would say that this was litigated in Popovic.
- 4 In fact, it's always raised and litigated and it's always denied. It was raised in
- 5 Popovic that the defence I believe it was for Nikolic said that nothing should be
- 6 used that wasn't, you know, except for in exceptional circumstances, nothing that
- 7 wasn't on your exhibit list or used in evidence could be used for cross.
- 8 Same in Karadzic and in -- I don't have the decisions at hand, but that that was not the
- 9 practice there adopted, despite being the same court as Hadžihasanovic, and it's for
- 10 the very good reason that purpose of cross-examination is to test the evidence to get
- 11 to the truth.
- 12 And this is really just an effort to hamper us at doing that and being able to provide
- 13 you with a proper cross-examination, because he has not been able to point to any
- prejudice -- our case has been crystal clear from the beginning against this accused.
- Our theory hasn't changed. This case hasn't evolved over time into why -- who he is,
- or why he is responsible and for which crimes. That has been crystal clear all along.
- 17 So there is no prejudice in any of these documents in the terms of my friend began
- 18 with "we need to know the case". Well, he does know the case and none of these
- 19 documents contradict any part of our theory or what we're doing. This is exactly
- 20 what you would expect us to put to a witness on cross-examination.
- 21 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:43:43] I suppose the question, though, and
- certainly one that Mr Edwards raised, Mr Nicholls, is this: When it came to the bar
- 23 table motion, as you were aware, clearly, that there was an issue, to the extent at least
- 24 that the -- the lower ranks of the army, that is to say anybody who was
- a non-commissioned officer didn't get any training, why you didn't put these two

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 documents in as part of the bar table?
- 2 MR NICHOLLS: [12:44:16] I'm not sure -- you know, I can't remember why these in
- 3 particular, but it's something your Honour mentioned, something my friend
- 4 mentioned is that we do try not to -- this has been a fairly tight, concise case in terms
- 5 of witnesses and documents and we have not tried to take the approach of shovelling
- 6 everything in. If there is this rule, then the Prosecution will have to put everything
- 7 that might ever possibly be used on a bar table motion because of this gotcha game.
- 8 And it's also in terms of putting in evidence that may be relevant. I can't say that we
- 9 will try to put in every single document that could potentially -- that even if it is
- 10 relevant if we think -- and we've gotten through and we've -- we've presented our
- 11 case adequately.
- However, if they call witnesses to testify to these points, it's hard to describe how
- perfectly normal it is that we will use these documents which are relevant to
- 14 cross-examination. And so again, he -- the bar that my friend is trying to raise is
- really just this matter of principle, because there is no prejudice and unfairness.
- And what it comes down to is that my friend's in this case and it happens in these
- international courts trying to depart from the way it works in domestic jurisdictions,
- 18 which is when you put on your case, you put on a defence. You don't have to put on
- 19 a defence, but when you do put on a defence there's cross-examination. And, you
- 20 know, evidence that doesn't help you may come in on cross. That's the way it
- 21 happens outside this building, that's the way it happened at the ICTY, but there's
- 22 always, for some reason, this effort to create this special rule here that probably ties
- 23 mainly back to this Hadžihasanovic decision.
- 24 And the last point I would make is we do have the submission system here and so
- 25 this evidence coming in just allows you to view it at the end and decide what weight,

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 if any, to give to it. So unless it doesn't pass the test of not being connected to the
- 2 witness's testimony, for some reason being grossly prejudicial, it should be included
- 3 whether it was previously on the witness list, previous exhibit list, previously in
- 4 evidence or previously disclosed.
- 5 Thank you.
- 6 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:46:53] Yeah, well, Mr Nicholls, and it may be that
- 7 Mr Jeremy probably ought to deal with it, is the purpose for the non -- the documents
- 8 that have never been disclosed before, the first which is -- sorry -- that's 8, which is the
- 9 ICRC website.
- 10 MR NICHOLLS: [12:47:12] Yes, I don't mean to interrupt you, your Honour, just we
- may need-- it may be better to go into private to discuss how these documents are
- 12 relevant to the testimony.
- 13 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:47:22] Yes, all right, we'll go back.
- 14 Yes, Mr Edwards.
- 15 MR EDWARDS: [12:47:25] Before we do that, while we are still in public --
- 16 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:47:27] Yes.
- 17 MR EDWARDS: [12:47:28] -- can I just respond before getting into the nitty-gritty.
- 18 I don't know if your Honour's ever seen the 1973 film, The Wicker Man, Christopher
- 19 Lee and -- I can't remember --
- 20 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:47:38] It was actually filmed very close to where
- 21 we live.
- 22 MR EDWARDS: [12:47:42] I feel we are in The Wicker Man now, in the sense that
- 23 Mr Nicholls has filled this room full of straw men. I have not -- perhaps he wasn't in
- 24 the room when I was making my submissions, I thought he was -- I have not sought
- 25 to argue that there is a blanket ban. I think I have even said it two, if not three times,

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 in the course of my submissions. I have not suggested that there is a blanket
- 2 prohibition on the use of new documents. All I have said is that it is not unlimited.
- 3 It is not unfettered the right of the Prosecution to use new documents and that in
- 4 deciding whether that right should be fettered or not, there are three principles,
- 5 essentially, that the Court should take into account. That's all.
- 6 Mr Nicholls has turned this into something much, much broader than it ever started
- 7 out as being.
- 8 When he says that, "Well, it's not the case that we didn't bother to bring P-103" well,
- 9 whilst we might have sympathy that they had difficulty getting one witness to come
- 10 to Court, in particular it doesn't matter how hard they tried or whether they really
- wanted him or not. The fact is, he didn't come. That's what's important. Not
- what the Prosecution's deepest desires were in terms of how lovely it would be if the
- 13 witness came or not.
- 14 And then as far as prejudice is concerned, it is a matter of principle. That's all.
- 15 Now at this point, I can't point to any --
- 16 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:49:58] Well, what is --
- 17 MR EDWARDS: [12:49:59] I can't point to any prejudice, because we don't know yet
- 18 what the documents are going to be used for, so I might have to deal with the
- 19 question of prejudice in a moment.
- 20 But, finally, my learned friend makes this point, we were careful, this was a tight case,
- 21 we didn't just shovel everything in. And that may be right, but to suggest that these
- 22 IHL documents -- IHL in Sudan documents would have amounted to a shovelling in
- of wildly irrelevant, as it were, kitchen sink evidence, it's my submission that the
- 24 Prosecution is very wide of the mark. This was a critical issue that was raised at the
- 25 confirmation of charges hearing. It was crucial and no doubt that's why the

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 Prosecution wanted 103 to come in the first place, perhaps amongst other things.
- 2 But to suggest that -- if it were to be suggested that this was only ever a peripheral
- 3 issue that falls out with the tight framework of the Prosecution's case, that simply
- 4 doesn't stack up at all.
- 5 IHL was fundamental, it was at the heart of this case from the beginning.
- 6 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:51:19] Well, that is, I think, a slight exaggeration,
- 7 because it's not really. The heart of this case is whether or not the accused is, in fact,
- 8 the man known as Ali Kushayb --
- 9 MR EDWARDS: [12:51:34] Yes.
- 10 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:51:35] -- and, if so, whether he committed the
- 11 acts that have been described.
- 12 But certainly as an incidental but clearly important issue you have raised from the
- 13 beginning, that warrant officers of his rank did not --
- 14 MR EDWARDS: [12:51:53] Yes.
- 15 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:51:54] Warrant officers, if he was Ali Kushayb,
- didn't get any IHL training, not that -- it hasn't really gone into the nuts and bolts of
- 17 what that IHL training was, other than to say -- I think you asked two witnesses,
- maybe more, as to whether -- who got the training and when it was.
- 19 MR EDWARDS: [12:52:20] Yes, were there manuals and were exams -- and that sort
- 20 of thing. I think one witness said something along the lines of "We were given
- a booklet and it was left up to us whether we read it or not".
- 22 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:52:33] But I perfectly accept, and I think the
- 23 Prosecution do, that it's been an issue.
- 24 MR EDWARDS: [12:52:37] Yes. And even if it wasn't clear in the course of the
- 25 confirmation of charges hearing, your Honours will know that the Appeals Chamber

Trial Hearing (Private Session) ICC-02/05-01/20

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- in delivering its decision on our appeal against the confirmation of charges --
- 2 (Counsel confers)
- 3 MR EDWARDS: [12:52:56] Sorry, against jurisdiction --
- 4 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:52:59] Was this your -- when you applied for
- 5 a reconsideration of the original --
- 6 MR EDWARDS: [12:53:03] Yes.
- 7 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:53:04] Yes.
- 8 MR EDWARDS: [12:53:05] And your Honours recall the essence of the finding of the
- 9 Appeals Chamber in terms of foreseeability of criminality when we are talking about
- 10 a country that is not a state party to the ICC.
- 11 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [12:53:28] Yes, okay. All right, I think -- well, yes,
- we are not going to be sitting at quarter past 2, I don't think, so we'll have to get
- 13 a message to the witness somehow.
- Right, Mr Jeremy or Mr Nicholls, can you just go through the other documents to
- 15 which objection is taken -- as to what purpose they are being used for and where they
- 16 come from -- oh, in private session, sorry, we will go into private session. Yes.
- 17 (Private session at 12.54 p.m.)
- 18 THE COURT OFFICER: [12:54:05] We are in private session, Madam President.
- 19 (Redacted)
- 20 (Redacted)
- 21 (Redacted)
- 22 (Redacted)
- 23 (Redacted)
- 24 (Redacted)
- 25 (Redacted)

(Private Session)

Trial Hearing

(Private Session)

Trial Hearing

ICC-02/05-01/20 Trial Hearing (Private Session) WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016 1 (Redacted) 2 (Redacted) 3 (Redacted) 4 (Redacted) 5 (Redacted) 6 (Redacted) 7 (Redacted) 8 (Redacted) 9 (Redacted) 10 (Redacted) 11 (Redacted) 12 (Redacted) 13 (Redacted) 14 (Redacted) 15 (Redacted) 16 (Redacted) 17 (Recess taken at 1.01 p.m.) 18 (Upon resuming in open session at 2.31 p.m.) 19 THE COURT USHER: [14:31:31] All rise. 20 Please be seated. 21 PRESIDING JUDGE KORNER: [14:31:47] We are in open session simply for this part of the afternoon. 22

23 The Defence have raised objections to a number of the documents about which

- 24 the Prosecution wish to ask the witness.
- 25 We have carefully considered the application over the adjournment and we have

Trial Hearing (Private Session) ICC-02/05-01/20

WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

- 1 concluded that, as far as documents 8, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 16 and 27 are concerned,
- 2 the Prosecution may ask the witness about those documents.
- 3 As far as 17 and 37 are concerned, I hope I have got the numbers right, we will await
- 4 the actual moment of when the Prosecution wishes to put the documents, because it's
- 5 not entirely clear to us at present what the purpose of these documents is.
- 6 And we will give reasons for our decision at the beginning of the next big session of
- 7 evidence, in other words, November.
- 8 Yes, so can we go back into private session, please.
- 9 (Private session at 2.33 p.m.)
- 10 THE COURT OFFICER: [14:33:47] We are in private session, Madam President.
- 11 (Redacted)
- 12 (Redacted)
- 13 (Redacted)
- 14 (Redacted)
- 15 (Redacted)
- 16 (Redacted)
- 17 (Redacted)
- 18 (Redacted)
- 19 (Redacted)
- 20 (Redacted)
- 21 (Redacted)
- 22 (Redacted)
- 23 (Redacted)
- 24 (Redacted)
- 25 (Redacted)

(Private Session)

Trial Hearing

Trial Hearing (Private Session) ICC-02/05-01/20 WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016

25.10.2023 Page 101

Trial Hearing (Private Session) ICC-02/05-01/20 WITNESS: DAR-D31-P-0016 1 (Redacted) 2 (Redacted) 3 (Redacted) 4 (Redacted) 5 (Redacted) 6 (Redacted) 7 (Redacted) 8 (Redacted) 9 (Redacted) (Redacted) 10 11 (Redacted) (Redacted) 12 (Redacted) 13 (Redacted) 14 (Redacted) 15 16 (Redacted)

(Redacted)

(The hearing ends in private session at 3.56 p.m.)

17

18