

Case No. SCSL-2003-01-T

THE PROSECUTOR OF THE SPECIAL COURT V.

CHARLES GHANKAY TAYLOR

MONDAY, 18 AUGUST 2008 9.30 A.M. TRIAL

TRIAL CHAMBER II

Before the Judges:

Justice Teresa Doherty, Presiding Justice Richard Lussick Justice Julia Sebutinde Justice Al Hadji Malick Sow, Alternate

For Chambers:

For the Registry:

Mr Gregory Townsend Ms Advera Kamuzora Ms Rachel Irura

Mr William Romans Ms Sidney Thompson

For the Prosecution:

Ms Brenda J Hollis Mr Nicholas Koumjian Ms Maja Dimitrova

For the accused Charles Ghankay Mr Courtenay Griffiths QC Taylor: Mr Terry Munyard Mr Morris Anyah

For the Office of the Principal Mr Silas Chekera Defender:

1 Monday, 18 August 2008 2 [Open session] [The accused not present] 3 [Upon commencing at 9.30 a.m.] 4 PRESIDING JUDGE: Good morning and I welcome you all back 09:22:59 5 to this next session. I note the accused is not present in 6 7 I will first take appearances and then I will ask about court. 8 his absence. Good morning, Ms Hollis. 9 MS HOLLIS: Good morning Madam President, your Honours. Brenda J Hollis, Nicholas Koumijan, Maja Dimitrova appear this 09:30:12 10 morning for the Prosecution. 11 12 PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you. 13 MR GRIFFITHS: Good morning your Honours, counsel opposite. 14 Courtenay Griffiths, my learned friend Mr Terry Munyard, my 09:30:26 15 learned friend Mr Morris Anyah and Silas Chekera. Thank you, Mr Griffiths. I also note the PRESI DI NG JUDGE: 16 17 presence of the Registrar's representative here in The Hague and 18 I will now ask again I note the absence of the accused. 19 Mr Griffiths, can you advise us? 09:30:54 20 MR GRIFFITHS: Your Honour, on Friday last I received a 21 telephone call from Mr Taylor expressing concerns about a 22 heightened level of security occasioned, he was informed, by certain intelligence received by the prison authorities. As a 23 24 consequence of that call Mr Townsend and Mr Chekera attended upon 09:31:23 25 Mr Taylor in the afternoon of Friday last and, having spoken to 26 him, from my conversation with Mr Chekera the situation is this: 27 Intelligence has been received by the custody officials 28 suggesting that there is a general security risk unrelated to 29 Mr Taylor and there is no specific suggestion, as I understand

1 it, that Mr Taylor himself poses any risk, but nonetheless, as a consequence of that intelligence, there is a raised level of 2 3 security which relates in particular to his transportation to 4 court.

Now those measures include two particular procedures to 09:32:15 5 which the defendant objects. Firstly, during the course of his 6 7 transportation from the unit he is transported in such a way as 8 to effectively cause him sensory deprivation. Secondly, during 9 the course of that - and I have put that in those terms because I have been specifically requested by Mr Townsend on behalf of the 09:32:54 10 security officials that I don't spell out precisely what measures 11 12 are employed during the course of his transportation which is why 13 I have been so elliptical in the way in which I have put that, 14 your Honours. But the second particular procedure is that the 09:33:21 15 defendant is chained around his waist and effectively led like a leashed animal and he finds that particularly objectionable and 16 17 Now whereas the defendant accepts the need for degrading. security, he challenges the two particular procedures which have 18 19 been demanded by the security services.

Now your Honours will be aware that this heightened level 09:33:54 20 21 of security caused us difficulties in the past during the course 22 of these proceedings and on that occasion upon further 23 investigation it was discovered that it was a totally false 24 alarm. As a consequence Mr Taylor is concerned that the need for 09:34:22 25 these heightened security measures be investigated properly and, 26 whereas he accepts the need for some form of security, will not 27 be willing to attend court if those two particular measures 28 remain in place. 29

Now part of the difficulty, particularly from our point of

1 view as his legal representatives is the lack of transparency so 2 far as these intelligence notifications are concerned and we are 3 particularly concerned in light of the history of these matters 4 when the need for heightened security measures in the past was found to be totally unfounded. We submit that these matters 09:35:10 5 ought in the first place to be properly investigated and, 6 7 secondly, we are concerned at the impact the imposition of such 8 measures might have upon Mr Taylor's fair trial rights, in 9 particular because the adoption of such measures in the first 09:35:34 10 place taints his public image not only with the Court, but we submit also with the public, suggesting, as it does, that he 11 12 personally poses some particular security risk. Secondly of 13 course it affects his ability to prepare for and concentrate on 14 the proceedings whilst in court because of the anxieties 09:36:00 15 occasioned by the circumstances of his transportation and in particular it distracts not only the accused from following the 16 17 proceedings properly, but also his advisors who have necessarily to deal with and confront these matters obviously to the 18 19 detriment of other more important issues with which we have to 09:36:27 20 deal.

21 Whereas we appreciate that at one level these are 22 administrative matters, we do submit that unresolved they do 23 impinge upon the fair trial rights of the accused and obviously 24 upon the smooth and efficient running of the Court. So far as 25 that latter point is concerned, the point of my submission this 26 morning is that we should not sit today until such matters are 27 resolved.

> Now I appreciate the pressures upon this Court in terms of time, finance and otherwise, but equally I have to balance that

1 against the rights of the accused to a fair trial and the Court 2 will no doubt be aware of the degree to which the defendant has 3 become involved directly and personally in the conduct of his 4 defence and I would be loathe as lead counsel to embark on the cross-examination of an important witness in the absence of the 09:37:34 5 accused, because whereas we are in possession of instructions so 6 7 far as this witness is concerned necessarily matters may arise ex improviso during the course of the proceedings which require the 8 9 direct attention of the accused and the taking of specific instructions from him and it seems to us in the circumstances it 09:38:01 10 would be very difficult for us to proceed properly in the absence 11 12 of Mr Taylor.

13 So the application we make this morning is that the 14 proceedings be adjourned until these particular difficulties are 09:38:19 15 resolved. That is my application, your Honour, unless there are 16 any specific matters upon which I can further assist you.

PRESIDING JUDGE: Before I invite a reply, Mr Griffiths, I
note that you say that - point out "not sit today" and then you
later say "the proceedings to be adjourned until the particular
difficulties are resolved". That appears to be - the second
point appears more open-ended than the first.

22 MR GRIFFITHS: Your Honour, yes, and perhaps I should be 23 clearer. It may be that during the course of today the matters 24 can be further investigated and we can arrive at some modus 25 vivendi which allows us to proceed tomorrow. If that is not 26 possible then my clear application would be that we not sit until 27 the matter be resolved.

> Now I do understand from speaking to Mr Townsend earlier that negotiations have been afoot to try and resolve these

1 difficulties, the stumbling block being those two particular 2 Now it seems to me that it should not be beyond the wit matters. 3 of the staff of this Court to try and resolve those matters 4 during the course of today, a working day, as opposed to over the weekend which might have posed other logistical difficulties. 09:39:55 5 So I am optimistic that Mr Townsend can use today to attempt to 6 7 resolve these matters.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you for that clarification,
9 Mr Griffiths. Ms Hollis, you have heard the application. Your
09:40:15 10 reply, please.

MS HOLLIS: The Prosecution opposes the application. We
believe this is clearly a situation that falls under Rule
60(A)(i). This accused, as far as we know, has had the
opportunity and right to come to court. He has refused to do so.
09:40:34 15 An accused's refusal to come to court does not undermine his fair
trial rights since it is his choice not to attend.

17 In terms of taking the time to resolve the issues, it 18 sounds from the application that the only resolution that would 19 bring this accused back in court would be for the removal of the 19 two conditions he apparently finds unacceptable. So in effect he 21 is attempting to use these proceedings to impose his will over 22 the security personnel who have made determinations about 23 appropriate measures.

We believe that that should not be allowed and we believe that we should go forward because it is a voluntary absence, he has refused to attend and therefore he has waived his right to be present and these proceedings should not be hostage to his whims about how he is transported or what security measures are determined appropriate in the circumstances.

1 PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you, Ms Hollis. Before I confer 2 with my learned colleagues, Mr Townsend, I note you have heard 3 both the application and the reply. Are there any matters that 4 you can help assist the Court with?

09:41:48

5 MR TOWNSEND: May it please the Trial Chamber, yes, your Honour, if I might briefly just give you some additional 6 7 information upon which you might base any decision on how to 8 proceed today. The ICC authorities at the detention centre 9 informed Mr Taylor, it is my information, on 13 August 2008, 09:42:09 10 that's last Wednesday, that the security would go from medium level to high level and that this change in security level was 11 12 not applicable only to Mr Taylor, but also to one ICC detainee. Mr Taylor voiced objections, as Mr Griffiths admitted, to 13 14 two conditions and Mr Taylor expressed those same objections to 09:42:40 15 me on Friday, 15 August 2008. Mr Taylor appeared in a good condition, he has been in custody over the recess and this 16 17 morning at 8.25 we received from Mr Tjonk an absence from court form in which Mr Taylor was advised that proceedings would 18 19 continue today and that his absence may be an implied waiver to 09:43:07 20 his right to be present at trial and Mr Taylor declined to fill 21 out that waiver form, having given instructions to counsel. 22 We have indeed addressed the Dutch transport authorities, 23 the DV&O, about these two objections and they have not been able 24 to accommodate us based on their security protocol. It's not 09:43:40 25 that Mr Taylor is being - having security measures escalated 26 being targeted at him, but rather it's just a changed security 27 scene on the ground and those are all the - that's all the 28 information I have at this point, your Honour. PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you. Mr Townsend, may I take it 29

1 that you have given copies of this document signed by Mr Tjonk to counsel for the Defence and Prosecution? 2 3 MR TOWNSEND: Yes, your Honour, and all the parties. 4 PRESIDING JUDGE: Thank you. Please allow me to confer. [Trial Chamber conferred] 09:44:14 5 The Chamber will withdraw to discuss this application and 6 7 we will reconvene as soon as we have reached a decision. You will be notified through the Legal Officer. Please adjourn court 8 9 temporarily. 09:44:43 10 [Break taken at 9.45 a.m.] [Upon resuming at 10.20 a.m.] 11 12 PRESIDING JUDGE: We have considered the submissions of the 13 parties and of the Registrar's representative. We note that the 14 trial has been proceeding smoothly hitherto and one reason is 10:20:43 15 that Mr Taylor has conducted himself very reasonably. There has not been any evidence put before us to show that 16 17 the upgrading of Mr Taylor's security regime has been as a result of his behaviour. 18 19 We agree with the Defence that it is at a disadvantage in 10:21:07 20 having to cross-examine this particular witness without the benefit of instructions from the accused and that this is a 21 22 feature that has some bearing on his fair trial rights. It would appear that the matter is capable of resolution 23 24 and, in our view, the Registrar should be directly involved. 10:21:34 25 Accordingly we adjourn the hearing for one day and direct 26 the Registrar to investigate with a view to urgently resolving 27 this issue and to report to the Trial Chamber tomorrow at 9.30 28 a.m. Ms Hollis, I note the witness is absent from the witness's 29

stand and I would therefore be grateful if someone would explain this to him. I appreciate it will not be you, but perhaps I should have directed that to the Registrar more properly than to Mr Registrar, you have heard what I said. you. In the circumstances we will adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow. 10:22:15 Please adjourn court. [Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 10.24 a.m. to be reconvened on Tuesday, 19 August 2008 at 9.30 a.m.]