







International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda Tribunal pénal international pour le Rwanda

TRIAL CHAMBER I

Before:

Judge Florence Rita Arrey, Presiding

Judge Mparany Richard Rajohnson

Judge Aydin Sefa Akay

Registrar:

Mr Adama Dieng

Date:

02 July 2009

The PROSECUTOR

v.

Yussuf MUNYAKAZI

Case No. ICTR-97-36A-1



Prosecution's Response to Munyakazi's Motion for Protective Measures for Defence Witnesses

Office of the Prosecutor

Richard Karegyesa Segun Jegede Didace Nyirinkwaya Dennis Mabura

Counsel for the Defence:

Jwani Mwaikusa Barnabe Nekuie

PROSECUTOR'S RESPONSE

BACKGROUND

- 1. The trial in this case commenced on 20 April 2009 before Trial Chamber I.
- 2. On 4 June 2009, the Prosecution closed its case. Following a Pre-Defence Conference held on 8 June 2009, the Trial Chamber scheduled the 31st August 2009 for the commencement of the Defence case and ordered the Defence to file its Motion for Protective Measures as soon as possible and in any case not later than 30 June 2009.
- 3. On 29 June 2009, the defence filed a motion for protective measures for an unspecified number of Defence witnesses pursuant to article 21 of the Statute and Rules 54, 69, and 75 of the Rules and Procedure and Evidence of the Tribunal (The Rules).

PROSECUTION'S SUBMISSIONS

- 4. The Prosecution respectfully submits that while it recognizes that Article 21 of the statute empowers the Tribunal to make rules for the protection of victims and witnesses, such protective measures are granted on a case by case basis and in relation to justifying supporting material, including affidavits and reports on the current security in a particular region where a witness may reside. Also, in *Prosecution v. Bagosora et al* the trial Chamber laid down the following criteria:
 - "Firstly, the testimony of the witness must be relevant and important to the party's case. Secondly, there must be a real fear for the safety of the witness and a objective basis underscoring the fear. Thirdly, any measure taken should be strictly necessary. If a less restrictive measure can secure the required protection, that measure should be applied."²
- 5. The prosecution states that the instant defence motion is fundamentally defective in several respects in that it fails to meet the established threshold for the orders sought. The Prosecution cites the following reasons for its contention:

¹ The Prosecutor v. Ildephonse Hategekimana, Case No. ICTR-00-55B-T, Order for Witness Identifying Information and justification for Witness Protective Measures, para 6.

² The Prosecutor v. Theoneste Bagasara and others, Case N0, ICTR-96-7-1, Decision on the Extremely Urgent Request Made by the Defence for Protection Measures for Mr Bernard Ntuyahaga (TC), 13 September 1999, para 28.

- a) The defence motion does not identify specific witnesses in respect of whom protective measures are sought nor does it contain any justification for the requested protective measures. Since the motion requests blanket protection for all potential witnesses the Chamber is not in a position to evaluate the relevance of the testimony of individual witnesses.
- b) The Prosecution further submits that in order to meet the criterion of "real fear underscored by an objective basis" stipulated in the Bagosora decision, the witness's subjective fear is insufficient and must be underscored by objective considerations. Therefore, justifying supporting material, including affidavits and reports on the current security situation in locations where the witnesses reside must accompany the motion to enable the Chamber make an objective assessment.
- 6. For the foregoing reasons, the Prosecution respectfully requests the Trial Chamber to deny the motion.

ALTERNATIVELY,

The Prosecution prays the Chamber to defer its decision on the Motion pending the filing of the witness list and necessary justifications by the defence.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

sha this 2nd day of July 2009 Dated at Ar

TRIAI

SEGUN



TRANSMISSION SHEET FOR FILING OF DOCUMENTS WITH CMS

COURT MANAGEMENT SECTION

(Art. 27 of the Directive for the Registry)

I - GENERAL INFORMATION (To be completed by the Chambers / Filing Party)					
То:	Trial Chamber I N. M. Diallo	Trial Chamber II R. N. Kouambo	Trial Chamber III C. K. Hometowu		
	Chief, CMS JP. Fomété	Deputy Chief, CMS M. Diop	Chief, JPU, CMS K. K. A. Afande	Appeals Chamber / The Hague R. Burriss	
From:	Chamber	Defence	Prosecutor's Offi		
	(names)	(names)	Dennis Mabura Assistant Trial		
			Attorney		
Case Name:	The Prosecutor vs. Y	ussuff Munyakazi	(names)	Case Number: ICTR-97-36A-T	
Dates:	Transmitted: 2 July 2009		Document's date: 2 July 2009		
No. of Pages:		Original Language	: 🛛 English	☐ French ☐ Kinyarwanda	
Title of Document:	Prosecution's Response to Munyakazi's Motion for Protective Measures for Defence Witnesses				
Classification Level: ☐ Strictly Confidential / Under Seal ☐ Confidential ☐ Public		TRIM Document Type: Indictment Wa Decision Aff Disclosure On Judgement Ma	idavit Notice of Apder Appeal Boo	ppeal Submission from parties k Accused particulars	
II - TRANSLATION STATUS ON THE FILING DATE (To be completed by the Chambers / Filing Party					
CMS SHALL take necessary action regarding translation.					
Filing Party hereby submits only the original, and will not submit any translated version.					
Reference material is provided in annex to facilitate translation.					
Target Languag English	e(s):	C French		Kinyarwanda	
CMS SHALL NOT take any action regarding translation.					
Filing Party hereby submits BOTH the original and the translated version for filing, as follows					
Original Translation	in ☐ English in ☐ English		☐ French ☐ French	ें □ Ki eyarwanda ≕ □ Kingarwanda	
	·		[] FIEIKII	Kibyerwanda	
CMS SHALL NOT take any action regarding translation.					
☐ Filing Party will be submitting the translated version(s) in due course in the following language(s): ☐ English ☐ Kinyarwanda					
KINDLY FILL IN THE BOXES BELOW					
The OTP is over-seeing translation. DEFENCE is over-seeing translation.					
The document is submitted for translation to: The Language Services Section of the ICTR / Arusha.			The document is submitted to an accredited service for translation (fees will be submitted to DCDMS):		
The Language Services Section of the ICTR / The Hague.			Name of contact person:		
An accredited service for translation; see details below:			Name of service:		
Name of contact person: Name of service:			Address: E-mail / Tel. / Fax:		
Address:					
E-mail / Tel. / Fax:					
III - TRANSLATION PRIORITISATION (For Official use ONLY)					
☐Top priority		COMMENTS		Required date:	
Urgent				☐ Hearing date:	