

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: **English**

No.: **ICC-01/09-01/11**

Date: **7 July 2011**

PRE-TRIAL CHAMBER II

Before: Judge Ekaterina Trendafilova, Presiding Judge
Judge Hans-Peter Kaul
Judge Cuno Tarfusser

SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF KENYA

**IN THE CASE OF THE PROSECUTOR V. WILLIAM SAMOEI RUTO, HENRY
KIPRONO KOSGEY AND JOSHUA ARAP SANG**

Public Redacted Version

**Prosecution's Submissions on the "Order to the Prosecutor to File a Proposed New
Redacted Version of the Article 58 Application" (ICC-01/09-01/11-157)**

Source: Office of the Prosecutor

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

The Office of the Prosecutor

Luis Moreno-Ocampo, Prosecutor
Fatou Bensouda, Deputy Prosecutor

Counsel for the Defence

Mr. Kioko Kilukumi Musau, Mr. Joseph Kipchumba Kigen-Katawa, Mr. David Hooper QC, Mr. Kithure Kindiki, Mr. George Odinga Oraro, Mr. Julius Kipkosgei Kemboy, Mr. Allan Kosgey, Mr. Joel Kimutai Bosek and Mr. Philemon K.B. Koech

Legal Representatives of the Victims

Legal Representatives of the Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

**Unrepresented Applicants
(Participation/Reparation)**

**The Office of Public Counsel for
Victims**

Ms. Paolina Massidda

**The Office of Public Counsel for the
Defence**

States' Representatives

Sir Geoffrey Nice QC
Rodney Dixon

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar

Ms. Silvana Arbia

Deputy Registrar

Mr. Didier Preira

Defence Support Section

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Maria Luisa Martinod-Jacome

Detention Section

**Victims Participation and Reparations
Section**

Ms. Fiona McKay

Other

I. Introduction

1. Pursuant to the Single Judge's Order dated 4 July 2011¹, the Prosecution herewith submits a new confidential redacted version of the "Prosecutor's Application Pursuant to Article 58 as to William Samoei Ruto, Henry Kiprono Kosgey and Joshua Arap Sang" (the "Article 58 Application") with justification for the maintenance of certain redactions. These redactions are necessary to protect the safety, physical and psychological well-being of victims and witnesses.

II. Procedural History

2. On 15 December 2010, the Prosecution submitted the Article 58 Application with 19 annexes.² The Prosecution's Application and 16 out of the 19 annexes were classified "confidential *ex parte*, Prosecutor only". A public redacted version of the Prosecution's Application was simultaneously filed with 3 annexes classified as "public".³
3. On 8 March 2011, the Chamber, by majority, decided to summon William Samoei Ruto, Henry Kiprono Kosgey and Joshua Arap Sang (collectively, the "suspects") to appear.⁴
4. On 21 March 2011, the Single Judge directed the Prosecution to make observations on the possible reclassification of the Article 58 Application and its annexes, and to provide proposals on redactions to be made to the documents concerned.⁵ Pursuant to this order, the Prosecution proposed a new public

¹ See "Order to the Prosecutor to File a Proposed New Redacted Version of the Article 58 Application", ICC-01/09-01/11-157, detailed *infra*.

² ICC-01/09-30-Conf-Exp and its annexes.

³ ICC-01/09-30-Red, Annexes 12, 13 and 14.

⁴ "Decision on the Prosecutor's Application for Summons to Appear for William Samoei Ruto, Henry Kiprono Kosgey and Joshua Arap Sang", ICC-01/09-01/11-1.

⁵ "Decision Requesting the Prosecutor to Submit Observations on the Possible Reclassification of Certain Documents", ICC-01/09-01/11-7.

redacted version of the Article 58 Application and submitted observations on the possible reclassification of the annexes.⁶

5. On 1 April 2011, the Single Judge issued the "Decision on Reclassification of Certain Documents", whereby, *inter alia*, the Prosecution was ordered to file the newly proposed public redacted version of the Article 58 Application, and a number of the annexes were reclassified.⁷ Additionally, the Registrar was ordered to copy the Article 58 Application and its annexes from the record of the Situation in the Republic of Kenya into the record of the case of *The Prosecutor v. William Samoei Ruto, Henry Kiprono Kosgey and Joshua Arap Sang* with the same level of classification.⁸
6. The current public redacted version of the Article 58 Application is accessible in the record of the Situation in the Republic in Kenya under the registration number ICC-01/09-30-Red2, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
7. On 4 July 2011, the Single Judge ordered the Prosecution to file in the record of the case a new public, or if deemed necessary, confidential redacted version of the Article 58 Application and to provide justification for redactions proposed, no later than 7 July 2011 (the "Order").⁹
8. The Prosecution herewith submits a new confidential redacted version of the Article 58 Application with justification for certain remaining redactions. The Prosecution submits that the current public redacted version satisfies the

⁶ "Prosecution's Response to the "Decision Requesting the Prosecutor to submit Observations on the Possible Reclassification of Certain Documents", 28 March 2011, ICC-01/09-01/11-12 ('Observations on the Possible Reclassification of Certain Documents').

⁷ Annexes 2, 3 and 4 were reclassified as "public", Annexes 1, 5-9, 16 and 17 as "confidential" and the Single Judge concurred with the Prosecution that Annexes 10, 11, 15, 18 and 19 should retain the classification of "confidential *ex parte*, Prosecution only".

⁸ ICC-01/09-01/11-23.

⁹ "Order to the Prosecutor to File a Proposed New Redacted Version of the Article 58 Application", ICC-01/09-01/11-157.

principle of publicity of proceedings vis-à-vis the public and that the remaining redactions are necessary to protect confidential information (and/or information which comes from a confidential source) which cannot be disclosed to the public at this time. The Prosecution is proposing a new confidential redacted version in the present case in order to provide the suspects with the greatest amount of information from the Article 58 Application as is possible without compromising the safety, physical and psychological well-being of victims and witnesses.

III. Request for Confidentiality

9. Pursuant to Regulation 23*bis* of the Regulations of the Court, the Prosecution requests that this Application and its annexes be treated as confidential *ex parte* (1) to protect victims and witnesses, (2) to protect ongoing investigations and (3) to ensure the confidentiality of sensitive information not previously available to the public. The Prosecution will simultaneously file a public redacted version of the Application.

IV. Submissions

Legal Basis of Redactions

10. Article 54(3)(f) of the Rome Statute empowers the Prosecution to “take necessary measures, or request that necessary measures be taken, to ensure the confidentiality of information, the protection of any person or the preservation of evidence.” Article 68(1) places an obligation to take appropriate measures to protect the safety, physical and psychological well-being, dignity and privacy of victims and witnesses on the Court as a whole, including the Prosecution.
11. Regulation 23 *bis* of the Regulations empowers a Chamber to review the classification of documents and reclassify documents in the case where the factual or legal basis for the original classification no longer exists. In carrying out this exercise, the Single Judge acknowledged in the Order that a Chamber must

balance the need for protection of victims and witnesses, on the one hand, and the fair trial rights of the suspects, on the other hand.¹⁰

12. In *The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo*, the Single Judge in that case proposed the following guiding principles for the review of the classification of documents, including where appropriate, proposals for redactions:

With regard to the documents filed by the Prosecutor, the Defence, the participants or the Registrar in the records of the situation and of the Case, currently classified as “confidential”, “under seal” as well as marked “*ex parte*” [...] the Single Judge examines (i) whether the content of these documents is already known to the Defence and to the public and if not (ii), whether if it would have an impact, if so revealed to the public: (aa) on the protection and privacy of victims and witnesses in accordance with articles 57(3)(c) and 68(1) of the Statute; (bb) on the effectiveness of a request for cooperation between States Parties and the Court in accordance with articles 57(3)(e), 87 and 93 of the Statute as well as rule 99 of the Rules; (cc) on the privacy of Mr. Jean-Pierre Bemba; and (dd) on the effectiveness of further or ongoing investigations.¹¹

13. It is undisputed that the Court is responsible, as a whole, for “ensur[ing], as a matter of the highest priority, that witnesses are appropriately protected [...] pursuant to article 68 of the Statute”¹² and that the Chambers have an ultimate duty and responsibility to that effect.¹³ Any unilateral disclosure of witness-sensitive information by the Prosecution is likely to frustrate the exercise of the Single Judge’s duty to protect the interests of witnesses, members of their

¹⁰ ICC-01/09-01/11-157, para. 8.

¹¹ ICC-01/5-01/08-528, para. 11.

¹² ICC-01/04-01/07-776 OA7, para. 101.

¹³ ICC-01/04-01/07-776 OA7, para. 93-98; ICC-01/04-01/06-2582 OA18, paras. 50-51.

families, victims and other persons at risk on account of the activities of the Court.¹⁴

14. In light of the above provisions, the Prosecution proposes the redaction of certain information contained in the Article 58 Application for the protection of victims and witnesses. In the section below, the Prosecution outlines the factual basis for its request to maintain certain redactions. A newly proposed confidential redacted version of the Article 58 Application is submitted with this motion.¹⁵

Redactions for the Protection of Victims and Witnesses

15. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Prior to submitting the current requested redactions, the Prosecution has taken the following into account from the Chamber's recent rulings on prior Prosecution requests for redactions: (i) whether the information is currently available to the Defence or to the public; and (ii) whether the disclosure of the information is likely to expose the identity of victims and witnesses and others at risk on account of the activities of the Court. In relation to the second issue, the Prosecution submits that when determining whether the disclosure of information is likely to expose victims and witnesses to an individual (or individuals) receiving the information this assessment must consider that said individual (or individuals) is an informed person.

- 16 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

¹⁴ See *The Prosecutor v. William Samoei Ruto, Henry Kiprono Kosgey and Joshua Arap Sang*, "Redacted First Decision on the Prosecutor's Requests for Redactions and Related Requests", ICC-01/09-01/11-145-Conf-Red, para. 102.

¹⁵ See Confidential *ex parte* Annexes A and B. In Annex A, the document is marked for redaction, allowing the Chamber to see the underlying information proposed for redaction. In Annex B, the proposed redactions have been accepted and the underlying information is obscured.

[REDACTED] ¹⁶ [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

17. The Prosecution seeks to maintain redactions to all footnotes indicating the source of information contained in the Article 58 Application, other than materials disclosed to the Defence or publicly available. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] ¹⁷

18. The Prosecution also seeks to maintain redactions to all of section G.2.II., titled "Planning Meetings and Rallies". This section describes a series of events in chronological order, specifying the dates and details of each event. Revealing this section would vitiate many of the redactions approved and ordered by the Single Judge, which sought to protect the identities of witnesses by redacting the dates of most of these events, and certain details of these events which could reveal the identity of the source. Redacting the dates of these events in the Article 58 Application would not suffice to protect witnesses, as their placement in chronological order would indicate the dates on which these events occurred and

¹⁶ [REDACTED]

¹⁷ [REDACTED]

could lead to the identification of witnesses. As such, the Prosecution requests that the entire section remain redacted.

19. The Prosecution submits that any prejudice that may be occasioned by the maintenance of these redactions to the Article 58 Application is necessary and proportionate, and will in any event be remedied with the Prosecution's filing on 1 August 2011 of the Document Containing the Charges.

No Further Reclassification of Annexes to the Article 58 Application

20. The Prosecution does not propose any further reclassification of the annexes to the Article 58 Application other than that already ordered by the Single Judge on 1 April 2011.¹⁸ The Prosecution submits that the reasoning provided in its Observations on the Possible Reclassification of Certain Documents and with which the Single Judge concurred, remains applicable to those annexes reclassified as confidential¹⁹ and confidential *ex parte*, Prosecution only²⁰.

IV. Conclusion

21. In light of the above, the Prosecution requests that the Chamber approve the proposals for redactions as contained in Annex A to this Application. The Prosecution further requests that Annex B be filed in the record of the case as a new confidential redacted version of the Article 58 Application, should the Chamber approve the proposed redactions.

¹⁸ ICC-01/09-01/11-23.

¹⁹ I.e. documents which contain evidence not yet in the public domain or knowledge of their use by the OTP could prejudice the future work of organizations using the materials: ICC-01/09-01/11-23, para. 10.

²⁰ I.e. documents which contain information which, "can easily be traced back to the providers who are not currently in any protection program" and potentially "bear on witness protection": ICC-01/09-01/11-23, para. 11.



Luis Moreno-Ocampo
Prosecutor

Dated this 7th day of July 2011
At The Hague, The Netherlands