943)

SCSL-03-01-T
(28598 - 28609)

28598

SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR

TRIAL CHAMBER II

Before:	Justice Julia Sebutinde, Presiding Justice Richard Lussick Justice Teresa Doherty Justice El Hadji Malick Sow, Alternate Judge
Registrar:	Ms. Binta Mansaray
Date filed:	16 April 2010

THE PROSECUTOR **Against** **Charles Ghankay Taylor**

Case No. SCSL-03-01-T

PUBLIC
PROSECUTION RESPONSE TO DEFENCE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO VARY VERSION IV OF THE DEFENCE RULE 73TER WITNESS LIST AND SUMMARIES

Office of the Prosecutor:
Ms. Brenda J. Hollis
Ms. Kathryn Howarth
Ms. Sigall Horovitz

Counsel for the Accused:
Mr. Courtenay Griffiths, Q.C.
Mr. Terry Munyard
Mr. Morris Anyah
Mr. Silas Chekera
Mr. James Supuwood

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Prosecution files this response to the "Defence Motion for Leave to Vary Version IV of the Defence Rule 73ter Witness List and Summaries", filed on 12 April 2010 ("Motion").
2. In the Motion, the Defence requests leave to add four new witnesses to its witness list, to remove 86 others, and to "re-instate" one witness.
3. The Prosecution does not object to the removal of witnesses from the Defence witness list. However, the Defence request to add four witnesses and re-instate a fifth should be denied as the Defence failed to demonstrate that this would be in the interest of justice at such a late stage of the proceedings.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

4. On 7 May 2009 the Trial Chamber ordered the Defence to file a list of witnesses, listed by name or pseudonym and witness summaries in respect of each of those witnesses by 29 May 2009.
5. On 29 May 2009 the Defence filed a list containing 227 witnesses, which included witness summaries in relation to some but not all of those witnesses.[1]
6. At the Pre-Defence Conference on 8 June 2009 the Prosecution raised its concerns that the number of Defence witnesses is excessive and that the witness summaries provided by the defence were inadequate.[2] Lead Defence Counsel indicated that the Defence would be conducting a sifting or screening process in relation to those 227 witnesses contained in the Defence witness list and he characterized that list as a "global list of witnesses" from whom the Defence would be selecting in due course

[1] Notably, the Defence explained that pseudonyms but not summaries were provided in respect to some witnesses as statements had not yet been taken from some of those witnesses. See *Prosecutor v Taylor*, SCSL-01-T-784, "Public with Annexes A, B, C and Confidential Ex Parte Annex D, Defence Rule 73*ter* filing of Witness Summaries with a Summary of the Anticipated Testimony of the Accused, Charles Ghankay Taylor", 29 May 2009, para. 7. The Defence also explained that on the morning the filing was due the Accused instructed Defence counsel that a further 10 persons known to the Defence team and 36 persons unknown to the Defence team should be added to the witness list; such that the Defence also needed to take statements and provide summaries in relation to those witnesses. See Ibid., para 8.

[2] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, Trial Transcript 8 June 2009, pp. 24257-24259. Note that the Prosecution requested that the Trial Chamber consider ordering the Defence to provide a list of core and back up witnesses and ordering that the Defence to provide adequate summaries with more detail.

the witnesses whom they intended to call.[3] He also promised to provide a "much more comprehensive and helpful list of summaries" later that week.[4]

7. On 12 June 2009 the Defence filed an updated and corrected list of witnesses and witness summaries.[5]

8. At the second Pre-Defence Conference on 6 July 2009 the Prosecution reiterated its concerns that the number of Defence witnesses is excessive and that "most of [the witness] summaries remain inadequate".[6] Lead Defence Counsel again referred to the fact that investigations were on-going and consequently the Defence had been unable to complete their "sifting process".[7]

9. Thus on 10 July 2009, the Defence filed a third updated and corrected witness list and witness summaries. Notably in this filing the Defence in fact added 25 new witnesses (DCT-257 through to DCT-282) to the list of witnesses.[8] Significantly this was filed only a few days before the first witness for the Defence, the Accused, began testifying on 14 July 2009. On 11 November 2009, the Chamber ordered the Defence to provide the Prosecution with a list identifying its "core" and "back-up" witnesses.[9] On 11 December 2009, the Defence provided the requested list.[10]

10. Also on 11 December 2009, the Defence filed a motion seeking leave to withdraw 49 witnesses from its witness list and add 32 new witnesses ("Defence Motion of 11 December 2009").[11] On 22 January 2010, the Chamber granted the Defence Motion of 11 December 2009, and ordered the Defence to file its amended witness list and summaries by 29 January 2010 ("Decision of 22 January 2010").[12] On 29 January

---

[3] Ibid, p. 24264, lines 23 - 24.
[4] Ibid, p. 24268, line 23.
[5] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, SCSL-01-T-793, "Public with Annex A and Confidential Annex B – Updated and Corrected Defence Rule 73*ter* filing of Witness Summaries", 12 June 2009.
[6] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, Trial Transcript 6 July 2009, pp. 24272-24273 (quote at lines 10-11).
[7] Ibid, p. 24278 lines 25 - 28.
[8] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-809, "Public with Annex A and Confidential Annex B, Updated and Corrected Defence Rule 73 *ter* filing of Witness Summaries – Version Three", 10 July 2009, p. 3.
[9] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, Trial Transcript 11 November 2009, p. 31622.
[10] Letter from Courtenay Griffiths, Q.C to Brenda Hollis, copied to Chambers Legal Officers, entitled "List of Core and Back-Up Witnesses", 11 December 2009.
[11] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-869, "Defence Motion for Leave to Vary Version III of the Defence Rule 73 *ter* Witness List and Summaries", 11 December 2009 ("Defence Motion of 11 December 2009").
[12] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-885, "Decision on Defence Motion for Leave to Vary Version III of the Defence Rule 73 *ter* Witness List and Summaries", 22 January 2010 ("Decision of 22 January 2010").

2010, the Defence filed its revised witness list (Version IV), containing 247 witnesses, and provided summaries of their anticipated evidence.[13]

III. APPLICABLE LAW

11. Rule 73 *ter*(E) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence ("the Rules") stipulates as follows:

> "After the commencement of the defence case, the defence may, if it considers it to be in the interests of justice, move the Trial Chamber for leave to reinstate the list of witnesses or to vary its decision as to which witnesses are to be called."

12. In the Decision of 22 January 2010, this Trial Chamber held that when the Defence requests to add witnesses pursuant to Rule 73 *ter* (E) of the Rules, it must demonstrate that such addition is in the interest of justice.[14]

13. Whether adding Defence witnesses is "in the interest of justice" must be assessed on a case by case basis. A variety of factors are weighed as part of this assessment, including "the sufficiency and time of disclosure of the witness' information; the materiality and probative value of the proposed testimony in relation to existing witnesses and allegations in the indictment; the ability of the other party to make an effective cross examination of the witness; and the justification offered by the party for the addition of the witness."[15] Furthermore, according to the jurisprudence of the ICTR, which this Chamber has followed in relation to these matters, "[a] request to

---

[13] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-897, "Public with Annex A and Confidential Annex B, Defence Rule 73 *ter* filing of Witness Summaries – Version Four", 29 January 2010.

[14] In the Decision, the Chamber stressed that "the Defence need only demonstrate that such addition is 'in the interest of justice'. The 'good cause' standard arises from the Prosecution's disclosure obligations under Rule 66(A)(ii), and there is no equivalent obligation for the Defence". Decision of 22 January 2010, p. 4. *But see* TCI's holding that: "Should the Defence seek to add any witness to this list ... it may be permitted to do so only upon good cause being shown". *Prosecutor v Norman et al.*, SCSL-04-14-T-489, "Consequential Order for Compliance with the Order Concerning the Preparation and Presentation of the Defence Case", 28 November 2005, p. 3. This holding was recalled in *Prosecutor v Norman et al.*, SCSL-04-14-T-566, "Order to the First Accused to Re-File Summaries of Witness Testimonies", 2 March 2006 ("*Norman* Order of 2 March 2006"), p. 2.

[15] *Prosecutor v Bagasora*, ICTR-98-41-T, "Decision on Bagosora Motion to Present Additional Witnesses and Vary its Witness List", 17 November 2006 ("*Bagosora* Decision of 17 November 2006"), para. 2; *Prosecutor v Bagasora*, ICTR-98-41-T, "Decision on Prosecution Motion for Addition of Witnesses Pursuant to Rule 73bis(E)", 26 June 2003, ("*Bagosora* Decision of 26 June 2003"), para. 14.

add new witnesses late in a party's case will be scrutinized closely, particularly where it may have the effect of prolonging proceedings".[16]

IV. ARGUMENTS

14. In the Decision of 22 January 2010, the Trial Chamber granted the Defence Motion of 11 December 2009 to add 32 witnesses to its witness list, in light of the prevailing circumstances. In particular, the Chamber recalled that:

> "... at the status conference on 6 July 2009, the Trial Chamber indicated that 'it appreciates that investigations are ongoing', accepted that the Defence was not in a position to provide a final list of core and back-up witnesses at the time, and indicated that this was 'a matter that the Trial Chamber thinks is appropriate to revisit closer to the end of the testimony of the Accused and we intend to do that' ..."[17]

15. Thus, in exceptionally allowing the Defence to add witnesses to its list, the Chamber considered its previous indications (made some six months earlier, on 6 July 2009), including that it would re-visit the issue of a final Defence witness list toward the end of the Accused's testimony.
16. Furthermore, in the Decision of 22 January 2010, the Chamber also recalled that in November 2009, it ordered the Defence to provide a list identifying "core" and "back-up" witnesses by 11 December 2009.[18] The Chamber considered this order to have amounted to an "indication to the Defence that it had a degree of flexibility in finalizing its witness list until 11 December 2009".[19]
17. Therefore, in light of the indications given by the Chamber in July and November 2009, it exceptionally allowed the Defence, on 22 January 2010, to add witnesses to its list. This was about one month before the Accused finished testifying on 18 February 2010.
18. The present Motion, seeking to add new Defence witnesses, was filed almost two months after the end of the Accused's testimony. In the Motion, the Defence essentially provides the same justifications to add witnesses pursuant to Rule 73 *ter*(E)

---

[16] *Bagosora* Decision of 17 November 2006, para. 2; *Bagosora* Decision of 26 June 2003, para. 15; *Prosecutor v Muvunyi*, ICTR-2000-55-T, "Decision on Accused's Motion to Expand and Vary the Witness List", 28 March 2006, para. 17.
[17] Decision of 22 January 2010, p. 4.
[18] Ibid, p. 4. The Decision mistakenly notes that the order (to the Defence to provide a list identifying "core" and "back-up" witnesses) was issued on 12 November 2009, when in fact it was issued on 11 November 2009.
[19] Ibid, p. 5.

of the Rules, as it did in the second Pre-Defence Conference on 6 July 2009 and in the Defence Motion of 11 December 2009, namely, that its on-going investigations and, in the motion, that developments in court, require the calling of additional Defence witnesses.[20] However, the circumstances today are different from those which prevailed in July and December 2009. In particular, the present Motion is made well after the end of the testimony of the Accused, and nine months after the commencement of the Defence case. Eight Defence witness have already taken the stand.

19. In support of its request to add new witnesses, the Defence argues in the Motion that the Trial Chamber "previously acknowledged that the Defence investigations were in a state of transition".[21] In the attached footnote, it refers to the Decision of 22 January 2010.[22] This creates the impression that as late as January 2010 the Chamber acknowledged that the Defence investigations were in a state of transition. But this was not the case: the Decision of 22 January 2010 merely referred to a prior acknowledgement of the Chamber ("...the Trial Chamber has previously acknowledged that the Defence investigations were in a state of transition..."[23]). As noted above, the Chamber reached its Decision of 22 January 2010 based on its prior indications of July and November 2009. These prior indications were followed up by the Chamber in its Decision of 22 January 2010, and cannot continue to bind the Chamber forever. By 22 January 2010, one half year after the start of the Defence case, the Defence was expected to have been prepared to challenge the Prosecution case and to have selected its witnesses accordingly. The Accused must be given an opportunity to present an adequate defence. But this does not mean that the Defence has an unlimited amount of time to conduct its investigations, especially considering both the interests of justice and the Accused's right to an expeditious trial.[24]

---

[20] Motion, para. 11 (compare to Defence Motion of 11 December 2009, para. 16).
[21] Motion, para. 15.
[22] Motion, footnote 18.
[23] Decision of 22 January 2010, p. 5.
[24] *Prosecutor v. Zigiranyirazo*, ICTR-2001-73-T, "Decision on Motion to Vary The Defence Witness List", 9 October 2007, para. 11 (although in this case the Chamber granted the Defence request to add witnesses, it stated explicitly that "[t]he Chamber is authorised to limit the length of time and the number of witnesses allocated to the defence case. Investigations and the search for witnesses cannot continue for an indefinite period of time"). Also see *Prosecutor v. Ndayambaje et al.*, ICTR-98-42-T, "Decision on Joseph Kanyabashi's Motion for Modification of his Witness List, the Defence Responses to the Scheduling Order of 13 December 2006 and Ndayambaje's Request for Extension of Time Within Which to Respond to the Scheduling Order of 13 December 2006", 21 March 2007 ("*Ndayambaje* Decision of 21 March 2007"), para. 36. ("With regard to Ndayambaje's Motion, the Chamber considers that the Defence for Ndayambaje has had ample time to investigate its case, should have complied with the Chamber's previous Orders and therefore denies the Motion.

20. Allowing the Defence to add new witnesses at this very late stage in the proceedings requires a new evaluation of whether the standard of "interest of justice" is satisfied. As noted above, the relevant factors to be considered include "the sufficiency and time of disclosure of the witness' information; the materiality and probative value of the proposed testimony in relation to existing witnesses and allegations in the indictment; the ability of the other party to make an effective cross examination of the witness; and the justification offered by the party for the addition of the witness". Furthermore, as this request is made late in the Defence case it must be scrutinized closely, according to the jurisprudence cited above.[25]

21. The summaries of the evidence of the proposed new Defence witnesses, which are annexed to the present Motion, do not establish that it would be in the interests of justice to add these witnesses. The summaries are so general in scope they provide no such justification. Moreover, the Defence does not offer any additional explanations as to why these witnesses are material to its case and have additional probative value in relation to existing witnesses. The Defence has failed to show that adding these witnesses three quarters of a year into its case would be in the interests of justice. Nor does the Defence offer specific justifications explaining why these witnesses were not discovered earlier.

22. An examination of the summaries provided by the Defence in the annexes to the Motion, reveals that the evidence of the proposed new witnesses will merely duplicate the evidence of witnesses already on the Defence witness list. For example, according to the summary, the evidence of proposed new witness DCT-311 duplicates the cumulative anticipated evidence of witnesses DCT-027, DCT-029 and DCT-248, all three of whom were also ECOWAS officials testifying about acts of the Accused before and during his presidency period. The Defence failed to demonstrate why the evidence of witness DCT-311 is material to its case and has significant additional probative value in relation to existing witnesses. Regarding proposed new witnesses DCT-312 and DCT-313, their evidence has not been shown to have significant

---

Even assuming that investigations were still under way, this is no justification for failure to comply with the Chamber's Orders. The Defence for Ndayambaje should have reduced its list of 49 witnesses, which, the Chamber considers to be excessive"). This decision was upheld on appeal in *Prosecutor v. Ndayambaje et al.*, ICTR-98-42-AR73, "Decision on Joseph Kanyabashi's Appeal against the Decision of Trial Chamber II of 21 March 2007 concerning the Dismissal of Motions to Vary his Witness List", 21 August 2007 ("*Ndayambaje* Appeals Decision of 21 March 2007").

[25] It is recalled that according to TCI, adding Defence witnesses at this stage also requires the showing of "good cause". See footnote 14 above.

additional probative as compared to the cumulative anticipated evidence of witnesses DCT-025, DCT-102, DCT-208, DCT-214, DCT-215, and DCT-292, who are expected to address the recruitment and training procedures at Camp Naama, as well as the RUF invasion of Sierra Leone. Turning to proposed new witness DCT-314, it is noted that cumulative Defence witnesses, who are already on the Defence witness list, are expected to testify about the recruitment and use of child soldiers, including witnesses DCT-100, DCT-111, and DCT-290. The summary makes the unsupported assertion that proposed new witness DCT-314 will refute the evidence of several Prosecution witnesses, but no details are provided as to what evidence will be challenged and how. Furthermore, other existing Defence witnesses are supposedly to challenge the evidence of Prosecution witnesses. As to the proposed new witness DCT-238, whom the Defence seeks to reinstate, it is noted that there are cumulative existing Defence witnesses who will supposedly address the alleged joint criminal enterprise, including Defence witnesses who already testified.

23. In an attempt to justify the addition of witnesses, the Defence stresses that the present Motion also seeks to drop witnesses from the Defence witness list "to prevent the calling of redundant and cumulative evidence from Defence witnesses".[26] The Defence suggests that its withdrawal of 86 witnesses amounts to a circumstance under which "granting it leave to add these witnesses to the list would be in the interest of justice".[27] This attempt by the Defence to portray itself as a promoter of judicial economy is without merit. The fact that the Defence is requesting to amend its witness list for the *fifth* time strongly suggests that it has failed to act diligently to minimize disruption to trial proceedings.[28] Furthermore, it must be stressed that out of the 86 witnesses the Defence wishes to withdraw from its list, 63 are being removed from the "back up" list and only 23 are "core" witnesses, and that the Defence proposes to add five additional witnesses to that "core" list.

24. In light of the above, the Prosecution opposes the Defence request to add four new witnesses to its witness list and to re-instate a fifth witness.

---

[26] Motion, para. 11.
[27] Ibid.
[28] *Cf. Ndayambaje* Decision of 21 March 2007, para. 33 ("...The Chamber considers that Kanyabashi's successive motions for variation of his witness list are unnecessary, and constitute an abuse of process as they endlessly relitigate an issue already adjudicated upon...") (Upheld on appeal in *Ndayambaje* Appeals Decision of 21 March 2007).

25. Alternatively, in the event the Chamber decides not to deny the Defence request, the Defence should be ordered to re-file the summaries of the four proposed new witnesses and the witness it asks to reinstate.[29]

26. In accordance with the established jurisprudence of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, the summaries "shall include detailed summaries of the incidents and/or events which a witness is called to testify upon, exact location and date (if available) of these alleged incidents and/or events, position and/or role of a witness in relation to the crimes charged in the Indictment, nexus between the Accused and the proposed testimony of a witness and other details as Counsel deems necessary and would clearly demonstrate the essence of that testimony".[30]

27. Also this Trial Chamber, on 24 March 2010, granted an extension of time to the Prosecution to prepare its cross examination of Defence witness DCT-146, due to the fact that the summary of his evidence which was provided by the Defence was deficient.[31] The Chamber held that:

> "a summary is not meant to be a complete statement of what the witness will attest to. But it must at least provide a reasonable indication, however brief, of the evidential areas to be covered by the witness in his sworn evidence. The Trial Chamber finds in this particular instance that the summary pertaining to witness DCT-146 falls far short of doing that and, without discussing each and every shortcoming as enumerated by the Prosecution, we find that the summary is not adequate so as to properly enable the Prosecution to cross-examine the witness on all of the evidence he has given in chief".[32]

It is stressed that the summary provided by the Defence in relation to witness DCT-146, as deficient as it is, has more particulars than those provided in relation to the four proposed witnesses the Defence seeks to add and the proposed witness it seeks to reinstate in the present Motion.

---

[29] *Norman* Order of 2 March 2006, p. 4 (having considered a Defence motion to add witnesses, the Chamber ordered the Defence to re-file its motion with more detailed summaries, and to review and reduce its witness list to avoid repetitious or excessive evidence).

[30] Ibid, p. 4, disposition para. 3; *Prosecutor v Sesay et al.,* SCSL-04-15-T-746 "Consequential Orders Concerning the Preparation and the Commencement of the Defence Case", 28 March 2007, p. 5. In addition, in the RUF status conference of 20 March 2007, the Judges asked the parties to review their summaries and remedy the deficiencies, directing them to follow the above Consequential Orders of 28 March 2007 as a guide. See *Prosecutor v Sesay et al.,* Trial Transcript of 20 March 2007, pp. 56-65.

[31] *Prosecutor v Taylor*, Trial Transcript 24 March 2010, p. 37949.

[32] Ibid.

V. CONCLUSION

28. The Prosecution does not object to the removal of witnesses from the Defence witness list. However, it is not in the interests of justice to allow the Defence to add new witnesses, particularly at this late stage of the proceedings. Accordingly, the Defence request to add four new witnesses and reinstate a fifth witness should be denied.

Filed in The Hague,

16 April 2010,

For the Prosecution

Brenda J. Hollis
The Prosecutor

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

SCSL

Prosecutor v Taylor

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-T-885, "Decision on Defence Motion for Leave to Vary Version III of the Defence Rule 73 *ter* Witness List and Summaries", 22 January 2010.

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-T-897, "Public with Annex A and Confidential Annex B, Defence Rule 73 *ter* filing of Witness Summaries – Version Four", 29 January 2010.

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-T-869, "Defence Motion for Leave to Vary Version III of the Defence Rule 73 *ter* Witness List and Summaries", 11 December 2009.

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-T-809, "Public with Annex A and Confidential Annex B, Updated and Corrected Defence Rule 73 *ter* filing of Witness Summaries – Version Three", 10 July 2009.

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-01-T-793, "Public with Annex A and Confidential Annex B – Updated and Corrected Defence Rule 73*ter* filing of Witness Summaries", 12 June 2009.

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-01-T-784, "Public with Annexes A, B, C and Confidential Ex Parte Annex D, Defence Rule 73*ter* filing of Witness Summaries with a Summary of the Anticipated Testimony of the Accused, Charles Ghankay Taylor", 29 May 2009.

Prosecutor v Taylor, Trial Transcript 8 June 2009, pp. 24257-24259, 24264, 24268.

Prosecutor v Taylor, Trial Transcript 6 July 2009, pp. 24272-24273, 24278.

Prosecutor v Taylor, Trial Transcript 11 November 2009, p. 31622.

Prosecutor v Taylor, Trial Transcript 24 March 2010, p. 37949.

Prosecutor v Norman et al.

Prosecutor v Norman et al., SCSL-04-14-T-566, "Order to the First Accused to Re-File Summaries of Witness Testimonies", 2 March 2006.

Prosecutor v Norman et al., SCSL-04-14-T-489, "Consequential Order for Compliance with the Order Concerning the Preparation and Presentation of the Defence Case", 28 November 2005.

Prosecutor v Sesay et al.

Prosecutor v Sesay et al., SCSL-04-15-T-746 "Consequential Orders Concerning the Preparation and the Commencement of the Defence Case", 28 March 2007.

Prosecutor v Sesay et al., Transcript of 20 March 2007, pp. 56-65.

ICTR

Prosecutor v. Zigiranyirazo, ICTR-2001-73-T, "Decision on Motion to Vary The Defence Witness List", 9 October 2007.
http://69.94.11.53/ENGLISH/cases/Zigiranyirazo/decisions/071009.pdf

Prosecutor v. Ndayambaje et al., ICTR-98-42-AR73, "Decision on Joseph Kanyabashi's Appeal against the Decision of Trial Chamber II of 21 March 2007 concerning the Dismissal of Motions to Vary his Witness List", 21 August 2007.
http://69.94.11.53/ENGLISH/cases/Kanyabashi/decisions/070821.pdf

Prosecutor v. Ndayambaje et al., ICTR-98-42-T, "Decision on Joseph Kanyabashi's Motion for Modification of his Witness List, the Defence Responses to the Scheduling Order of 13 December 2006 and Ndayambaje's Request for Extension of Time Within Which to Respond to the Scheduling Order of 13 December 2006", 21 March 2007.
http://69.94.11.53/ENGLISH/cases/Nyira/decisions/070321.pdf

Prosecutor v Bagasora, ICTR-98-41-T, "Decision on Bagosora Motion to Present Additional Witnesses and Vary its Witness List", 17 November 2006.
http://69.94.11.53/ENGLISH/cases/Bagosora/decisions/171106.pdf

Prosecutor v Muvunyi, ICTR-2000-55-T, "Decision on Accused's Motion to Expand and Vary the Witness List", 28 March 2006.
http://69.94.11.53/ENGLISH/cases/Muvunyi/decisions/280306.htm

Prosecutor v Bagasora, ICTR-98-41-T, "Decision on Prosecution Motion for Addition of Witnesses Pursuant to Rule 73bis(E)", 26 June 2003.
http://69.94.11.53/ENGLISH/cases/Bagosora/decisions/260603.pdf

OTHER

Letter from Courtenay Griffiths, Q.C to Brenda Hollis, copied to Chambers Legal Officers, entitled "List of Core and Back-Up Witnesses", 11 December 2009.