719)

SCSL-04-15-1 (26037 - 26039)

26037

# IN THE SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE

#### THE TRIAL CHAMBER

Before: Judge Bankole Thompson, presiding

Judge Pierre Boutet Judge Benjamin Itoe

Registrar: Mr Lovemore G Munro SC

Date filed: Friday 2 March 2007

Case No. SCSL 2004 - 15 - T

THE PROSECUTOR

**Against** 

ISSA SESAY MORRIS KALLON AUGUSTINE GBAO SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
RECEIVED
GOURT MANAGEMENT

0 2 MAR 2007

IAME HOMAS CHORGE

# GBAO REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF JOINT STATEMENT

**PUBLIC** 

# Office of the Prosecutor

James Johnson Peter Harrison

### **Court Appointed Counsel for Augustine Gbao**

Andreas O'Shea John Cammegh

#### Counsel for co-accused

Wayne Jordash and Sareta Ashraph for Issa Sesay Shekou Touray, Charles Taku and Melron Nicol-Wilson for Morris Kallon 1. On 30 October 2006, this Chamber rendered its Order on the Commencement of Trial in which it, *inter alia*, provided that:

That the prosecution and each of the defence teams submit, as soon as practicable, and in any event no later than the 16<sup>th</sup> February 2007, a joint statement of agreed facts and matters which are not in dispute as well as a joint statement of contested matters of fact and law.<sup>1</sup>

2. On 27 February 2007, the Chamber ordered:

The Defence and the Prosecution to file their joint statement of agreed facts within 7 days from the return of Accused Sesay in the jurisdiction of the Special Court.<sup>2</sup>

- 3. We interpret the first order to permit either separate joint statements or one joint statement for all the teams, or at least that if there are three joint statements that their content may be identical.
- 4. In this context we interpret the Chamber order of 27 February as permitting expressly or by implication all three teams to defer compliance under the conditions prescribed. In other words, we interpret the word 'Defence' as being capable of including all three teams and therefore being the proper interpretation as the one most favourable to the accused. The implication results from the desirability of a joint statement agreeable to all teams.
- 5. This is a request for an extension of time which is filed to cover the eventuality that the Chamber disagrees with our interpretation of its Orders.
- 6. The Defence for Gbao is concerned to preserve its right to be tried in a manner whereby the accused is in no way prejudiced by a joint trial. It is in the interests of the accused to avoid in so far as possible any confrontation with

Prosecutor v Sesay, Kallon and Ghao, SCSL-04-15-T

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Scheduling Order Concerning the Preparation and the Commencement of the Defence Case, 30 October 2006, SCSL-04-15-T-659 paragraph 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Decision on Sesay Defence Application for Extension of Time to File a 'Joint Statement of Agreed Facts', 27 February 2007, SCSL-04-15-T-713, at the disposition.

2 26039

other accused in this trial. This is a strategic decision taken by counsel in the interests of the accused. That being the case, we wish to avoid committing ourselves to any agreements which might place the accused in a position of confrontation with other accused in his trial.

7. Accordingly, we deem it prejudicial to our defence strategy and therefore the interests of the accused to file any separate joint statement of agreed position on facts or law until we know the position of the Sesay team on any proposed agreements.

8. In that light:

## IT IS HEREBY REQUESTED THAT:

The Chamber, in the event that it disagrees with our interpretation of its Orders, grant an extension of time to the Gbao defence, and by necessary implication from our aforesaid reasoning, the Kallon defence if that team supports this application, for the filing of any joint statement as referred to in the Chamber's Scheduling Order of 30 October 2006.

In marrie of Andreas O'Shea

Counsel for Gbao

2 March 2007