UNITED NATIONS

Case No.

MICT-12-29



Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals

Date:

17 February 2016

Original:

English

IN THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before:

Judge Theodor Meron, Presiding Judge Bakone Justice Moloto Judge Christoph Flügge Judge Burton Hall Judge Liu Daqun

Registrar:

Mr. John Hocking

Order of:

17 February 2016

PROSECUTOR

v.

AUGUSTIN NGIRABATWARE

PUBLIC

ORDER TO RE-FILE MOTION FOR ASSIGNMENT OF COUNSEL

The Office of the Prosecutor:

Mr. Hassan Bubacar Jallow

Counsel for Augustin Ngirabatware:

Mr. Peter Robinson

Received by the Registry
Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals
17/02/2016 12:31

J. J. D.

THE APPEALS CHAMBER of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals ("Appeals Chamber" and "Mechanism", respectively);

RECALLING that, on 18 December 2014, the Appeals Chamber (i) affirmed Augustin Ngirabatware's convictions for committing direct and public incitement to commit genocide, and, Judge Moloto dissenting, instigating and aiding and abetting genocide; (ii) reversed his conviction for rape as a crime against humanity; and (iii) imposed a sentence of 30 years of imprisonment;¹

BEING SEISED OF the "Motion for Assignment of Counsel", filed confidentially and ex parte by Ngirabatware on 22 January 2016 ("Motion"), in which he requests that the Appeals Chamber direct the Registrar to assign him counsel, at the expense of the Mechanism, for the purpose of assisting him in relation to the preparation of a request for review;²

NOTING that Ngirabatware filed the Motion confidentially and *ex parte* because, in his view: (i) it relates to a matter in relation to which the Prosecution has no standing; (ii) the release of the information contained in the Motion may result in interference with witnesses; and (iii) the contents of the Motion reveal defence strategy and work product;³

CONSIDERING that, before a review has been authorized, an applicant is only entitled to assigned counsel at the expense of the Mechanism if the Appeals Chamber deems it necessary to ensure the fairness of the proceedings, which is, to a great extent, assessed in light of the potential grounds for review put forward by the applicant;⁴

CONSIDERING that, in general, the Appeals Chamber only authorizes the assignment of counsel at the expense of the Mechanism where it cannot exclude the likelihood of success of a potential ground of review;⁵

CONSIDERING that such a determination necessarily relates to the potential merits of the request for review and as corollary the Prosecution should have the opportunity to respond;⁶

¹ Augustin Ngirabatware v. The Prosecutor, Case No. MICT-12-29-A, Judgement, 18 December 2014, para. 279.

² Motion, paras. 1, 14, 23.

³ Motion, n. 1.

⁴ Eliézer Niyitegeka v. The Prosecutor, Case No. MICT-12-16-R, Decision on Niyitegeka's Request for Review and Assignment of Counsel, 13 July 2015 ("Niyitegeka Decision of 13 July 2015"), para. 8. See also Aloys Ntabakuze v. The Prosecutor, Case No. MICT-14-77-R, Decision on Ntabakuze's Pro Se Motion for Assignment of an Investigator and Counsel in Anticipation of his Request for Review, 19 January 2015, para. 9; Eliézer Niyitegeka v. The Prosecutor, Case No. MICT-12-16-R, Decision on Niyitegeka's Request for Assignment of Counsel, 6 November 2014, para. 7; François Karera v. Prosecutor, Case No. MICT-12-24-R, Decision on Request for Assignment of Counsel, 4 December 2012, para. 10.

⁵ See, e.g., Niyitegeka Decision of 13 July 2015, para. 12; Jean de Dieu Kamuhanda v. The Prosecutor, Case No. ICTR-99-54A-R, Decision on Motion for Legal Assistance, 21 July 2009, para. 18.

CONSIDERING that, while witness protection concerns warrant maintaining the Motion as confidential, Ngirabatware fails to show that there is a risk that the Prosecution may interfere with the witnesses in order to justify its *ex parte* status;

CONSIDERING that, in limited circumstances, particularly sensitive material could be included in an ex parte annex so long as the motion is prepared in such a way to allow for a meaningful response;⁷

CONSIDERING that, in view of Ngirabatware's submissions, prior to lifting the *ex parte* status of the Motion, Ngirabatware should have the opportunity to review his Motion in light of the foregoing considerations;

HEREBY ORDERS Ngirabatware to re-file the Motion in conformity with this Order no later than seven days from the filing of this Order;

ORDERS the Prosecution to file a response to the Motion, if any, within 10 days of the re-filing of the Motion; and

ORDERS Ngirabatware to file a reply, if any, within four days of the filing of the Prosecution's response.

Done in English and French, the English version being authoritative.

Done this 17th day of February 2016, At The Hague, The Netherlands

Judge Theodor Meron, Presiding

[Seal of the Mechanism]

⁶ In this respect, the Appeals Chamber further notes that, at the review stage, the assignment of counsel under the legal aid system has never been authorized on an *ex parte* basis by the Mechanism or the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

Rwanda.

The Appeals Chamber notes that the requirement that an applicant provide information as to the potential grounds for review in the context of a request for the assignment of counsel at the expense of the Mechanism necessarily involves revealing certain aspects of the applicant's strategy in connection with the eventual request for review.



TRANSMISSION SHEET FOR FILING OF DOCUMENTS WITH THE MECHANISM FOR INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNALS/ FICHE DE TRANSMISSION POUR LE DÉPÔT DE DOCUMENTS DEVANT LE MÉCANISME POUR LES TRIBUNAUX PÉNAUX INTERNATIONAUX

I - FILING INFORMATION / INFORMATIONS GÉNÉRALES

Tol À:	MICT Registry/ Gre	effe du MTPI	Arusha/ Arusha	☐ The Haguel La Haye
From/ De:	Chambers/ Chambre	☐ Defence/ Défense	Prosecuti	
Case Name/ Affaire :	Prosecutor v. Augustin Ngirabatware		Case No	
Date Created/ Daté du :	17 February 2016	Date transmitted Transmis le :	17 February 2016	No. of Pages/ 3 Nombre de pages :
Original Language / Langue de l'original :	⊠ English/ ☐ Anglais	French/ Kin	yarwanda B/C/S	S Other/Autre (specify/préciser):
Title of Document/ Titre du document :	Order to Re-file M	otion for Assignme	nt of Counsel	
Classification Level/ Catégories de	☑ Unclassified/ Non classifié	_	e Defence excluded/ D	éfense exclue dl Bureau du Procureur exclu
classification :	☐ Confidential/ Confidential	☐ Ex Parte	R86(H) applicant exc	cluded/ Art. 86 H) requérant exclu ded/ Amicus curiae exclu
	☐ Strictly Confidential ☐ Ex Parte other exclusion/ autre(s) partie(s) exclue(s) Strictement confidential (specify/préciser):			
Document type/ Type de document :	☐ Motion/ Requête	☐ Submission fro Écritures déposée		☐ Indictment/ Acte d'accusation
	☐ Decision/ ☐ Submission from non-parties/ ☐ Warrant/ Décision Écritures déposées par des tiers Mandat			
	Order/ Ordonnance	Book of Author		☐ Notice of Appeal/ Acte d'appel
	☐ Judgement/ Jugement/Arrêt	☐ Affidavit/ Déclaration sous	serment	
			/ ÉTAT DE LA TRAD	UCTION AU JOUR DU DÉPÔT
☐ Translation not requ	ired/ La traduction n'e	est pas requise		Wallack Div
⊠Filing Party hereby s La partie déposante ne (Word version of the do	soumet que l'original	et sollicite que le Gr	effe prenne en charge	la traduction :
☐ English/ Anglais	⊠ Fren Fran	nch/ X Kinyarw	randa 🔲 B/C/S	Other/Autre (specify/préciser) :
☐ Filing Party hereby s La partie déposante so				
	English/ Frem Anglais Fram	nch/ Kinyarw	randa B/C/S	Other/Autre (specify/préciser):
	English/ Frem Anglais Fram	nch/ Kinyarw nçais	randa B/C/S	Other/Autre (specify/préciser):
☐ Filing Party will be s La partie déposante so				
☐ English/ Anglais	☐ Fren		randa B/C/S	Other/Autre (specify/préciser):