

289)

SCSL-03-01-1  
(10123 - 10152)



THE SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE

10123

In Trial Chamber II

**Before:** Justice Julia Sebutinde, Presiding  
Justice Richard Lussick  
Justice Teresa Doherty  
Justice El Hadji Malick Sow, Alternate

**Registrar:** Mr. Herman von Hebel, Acting Registrar

**Date:** 12 June 2007

**Case No.:** SCSL-2003-01-T

THE PROSECUTOR

-v-

CHARLES GHANKAY TAYLOR

THE SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE  
OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR  
FREETOWN, SIERRA LEONE  
THOMAS GEORGE  
1005

---

**URGENT & PUBLIC**

**DEFENCE OFFICE APPLICATION TO SUSPEND ALL TIME LIMITS  
PENDING THE RESOLUTION OF ISSUES SURROUNDING THE TERMINATION  
OF MR. KARIM KHAN BY MR. CHARLES GHANKAY TAYLOR  
BEFORE THE PROSECUTION OPENING STATEMENT ON 4 JUNE 2007**

---

**Office of the Prosecutor**

Ms. Brenda J. Hollis  
Ms. Wendy van Tongeren  
Ms. Ann Sutherland  
Ms. Shyamala Alagendra  
Mr. Alain Werner  
Ms. Leigh Lawrie

**Office of the Principal Defender**

Mr. Vincent O. Nmehielle  
Mr. Charles Jalloh

10/24

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Defence Office was established pursuant to Rule 45 of the Special Court for Sierra Leone Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”), in order to ensure the “rights of suspects and accused”. Specifically, the Defence Office, headed by a Principal Defender, “shall...provide advice, assistance and representation to...accused persons before the Special Court”.<sup>1</sup> The Defence Office fulfils its functions by providing, among other things, “adequate facilities for counsel in the preparation of the defence” to the extent of the provision made by the Registrar of the Court who was charged with establishing, maintaining and developing the office, consistent with the letter and spirit of Article 17 of the Statute of the Court.<sup>2</sup>
2. In accordance with its mandate under Rule 45, the Defence Office respectfully requests this Trial Chamber, whose ultimate responsibility it is to protect Mr. Charles Taylor’s fundamental fair trial rights under Article 17 of the Statute of the Court, to issue an order suspending all time limits, including the start date of trial, pending resolution of concerns raised at the 4 June 2007 opening of Mr. Taylor’s trial.
3. In addition to the relief requested below, the Defence Office seeks an expedited exchange of pleadings and decision in order to ensure that any prejudice to Mr. Taylor’s case arising from his complaints to the Court on 4 June 2007 are quickly remedied, in particular, to ensure that Defence preparations for trial are not impeded by the lack of adequate time and resources.

## II. TIME LINE OF THE TAYLOR PROCEEDINGS

4. Mr. Taylor was taken into custody by the Court on 29 March 2006. At that time, the Defence Office provided advice, assistance and representation to him as per its mandate under Rule 45, including representing him before the Honourable Trial Chamber during the initial appearance on 3 April 2006.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 45(A)(ii) of the Special Court for Sierra Leone Rules of Procedure and Evidence, as amended 14 May 2007.

<sup>2</sup> The Trial Chamber has previously ruled that it is mandated, in limited circumstances, to review administrative decisions “where they are closely related to the fundamental trial rights of the Accused and hence may negatively impact upon his statutory rights under Article 17(2) of the Statute and therewith ultimately on the trial proceedings...” *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-137, Decision on Urgent and Public Defence Motion Requesting Removal of Camera from Conference Room, 30 November 2006, pg. 3 (“Camera Decision”). The Trial Chamber has additionally stated that it will apply the same standard as far as an alleged failure to act might be attributable to the Registrar. *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-164, Decision on Adequate Time and Facilities, 23 January 2007, para.15 (“Joint Decision”).

10/25

5. During the initial consultation with Mr. Taylor upon his transfer into the custody of the Court, he informed the Principal Defender that he needed legal assistance as he did not have the means to hire his own lawyers. He requested the services of lawyers of international reputation due to the size and complexity of his case. The Defence Office contacted some of these lawyers and invited them to fulfil the requirements for them to be included in the list kept by the Principal Defender under the Court's Legal Aid Scheme. Two of the lawyers contacted for this purpose flatly rejected any notion of payment for their services on the Court's legal aid rates, which they found to be inadequate for the type of case at hand.
6. On 3 April 2006, the Principal Defender provisionally determined that Mr. Taylor may be indigent or partially indigent,<sup>3</sup> and on 5 April 2006, assigned Mr. Karim A. A. Khan, a British barrister, as Provisional Counsel to Mr. Taylor for ninety days, pursuant to Article 9(B) of the Directive on the Assignment of Counsel.<sup>4</sup>
7. On 19 June 2006, the President of the Court ordered that the pre-trial proceedings, trial and any appeal of Mr. Taylor be conducted in The Hague.<sup>5</sup> This Order followed United Nations Security Council Resolution 1688 (2006) of 16 June 2006, which facilitated the transfer of Mr. Taylor from Sierra Leone to the Netherlands.
8. On 20 June 2006, Mr. Taylor was transferred to The Hague prior to the Status Conference which was scheduled for 21 June 2006 in Freetown and in which Mr. Khan made his initial representation appearance on behalf of Mr. Taylor.<sup>6</sup>
9. After the Principal Defender determined that Mr. Taylor was partially indigent, he formally assigned Mr. Khan as counsel for Mr. Taylor on 13 July 2006.<sup>7</sup> On 21 September 2006, Mr.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-85, Principal Defender's Determination of Mr. Charles Ghankay Taylor's Indigence, 3 April 2006.

<sup>4</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-88, Principal Defender's Decision to Provisionally Assign Counsel to Charles Ghankay Taylor, 5 April 2006.

<sup>5</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-108, Order Changing Venue of Proceedings, 19 June 2006.

<sup>6</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT, Freetown Status Conference, Transcript, 21 June 2006.

<sup>7</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-111, Principal Defender's Decision to Reassign Counsel to Charles Ghankay Taylor, 13 July 2006; *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-112, Corrigendum to Principal Defender's Decision to Reassign Counsel to Charles Ghankay Taylor, 13 July 2006.

Khan signed a Legal Services Contract with the Defence Office. Mr. Khan has since diligently and competently served as Lead Counsel to Mr. Taylor. Since his assignment as Counsel, Mr. Khan has consistently engaged with the Defence Office on the need for adequate resources to ensure the fair trial rights of the accused. The Defence Office has in turn consistently engaged the Registry to ensure the provision of adequate resources for the realization of the fair trial rights of the accused.

10. At the Pre-Trial Conference in The Hague on 7 May 2007, a number of important concerns regarding the fair trial rights of Mr. Taylor were raised with the Trial Chamber both by the Defence Office and by Counsel for Mr. Taylor. Those concerns related to the lack of adequate time and adequate resources for Mr. Khan and his team, and also to Mr. Taylor's welfare in detention. In addition, the issue surrounding the inability of the of the Principal Defender to consult with Mr. Taylor regarding his defence problems due to the denial of the Principal Defender's authorization to travel.
11. These fundamental concerns were not resolved by 10:30am on 4 June 2007, the time and date scheduled for the opening of Mr. Taylor's trial.<sup>8</sup> Consequently, Mr. Taylor terminated Mr. Khan's representation<sup>9</sup> and informed the Acting Registrar in writing that he intended to represent himself.<sup>10</sup>

### III. BACKGROUND REGARDING DEFENCE TEAM CONCERNS

12. The Defence Office is aware that the provision of adequate time and facilities to the Defence Team has been a continual concern of Mr. Taylor's. Mr. Khan has consistently argued that the principle of equality of arms is not being upheld in this regard, and that this prejudices the fair trial rights Mr. Taylor. The Defence Team has filed a number of motions requesting more time.<sup>11</sup> A lack of adequate resources and facilities necessarily means that the Defence Team

---

<sup>8</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-253, Order Rescheduling the Time For Start of the Trial on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2007, 24 May 2007.

<sup>9</sup> See Letter re: Termination of Representation, from Charles Taylor to Justice Julia Sebutinde, dated 1 June 2007 [Annex 1].

<sup>10</sup> See Letter re: Self-Representation, from Charles Taylor to Herman von Hebel, dated 4 June 2007 [Annex 2].

<sup>11</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-148, Public Defence Motion on Adequate Time for the Preparation of Mr. Taylor's Defence, 15 December 2007; *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-168, Public Defence Application for Leave to Appeal 'Joint Decision on Defence Motions on Adequate Facilities and Adequate Time for the Preparation of Mr. Taylor's Defence, dated 23 January 2007', 26 January 2007; *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-220,

10/27

will require more time.<sup>12</sup> Perhaps the Trial Chamber has not been fully apprised of the administrative issues which have made it difficult for the Taylor Defence to adequately address substantive legal and investigative concerns in preparation for trial.

13. The Defence Office is aware of the impact that budgetary constraints and security concerns have had in regard to the composition of the Taylor Defence Team. The Defence Office is aware that Mr. Khan has approached upwards of ten distinguished lawyers to lead Mr. Taylor's defence. Although most of them have been interested, all of them have turned down the opportunity because of the limited funding available under the legal aid regime for a case of this size and complexity.<sup>13</sup> Until May 2007, the Defence Team struggled to find a suitable Liberian investigator.<sup>14</sup> Based on the principle of equality of arms, the Defence Office is aware of the concern that the Taylor Defence should be allocated more resources to match the size and complexity of its case, as it is in this way that the Court can ensure Mr. Taylor's fair trial rights will not be in jeopardy.<sup>15</sup>

14. The Defence Office is aware that the Defence Team has suffered from a lack of office space and basic office facilities during the pre-trial period.<sup>16</sup> As Mr. Khan stated before the Trial Chamber, the Taylor Defence Team had to work from cafés and restaurants and personal accommodations in The Hague from June 2006 until March 2007, when the Team was finally able to move into their allocated office in The Hague Sub-Office.<sup>17</sup> This has caused serious setbacks for the Defence Team, as it has not had a secure place to store disclosure, to meet

---

Defence Motion Requesting Reconsideration of 'Joint Decision on Defence Motions on Adequate Facilities and Adequate Time for the Preparation of Mr. Taylor's Defence, dated 23 January 2007', 17 April 2007; *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-230, Defence Application for Leave to Appeal the 25 April 2007 "Decision on Defence Motion Requesting Reconsideration of 'Joint Decision on Defence Motions on Adequate Facilities and Adequate Time for the Preparation of Mr. Taylor's Defence, dated 23 January 2007', 30 April 2007 ("Leave to Appeal").

<sup>12</sup> See Letter re: Defence Rule 59(A) Complaint Submitted on behalf of Mr. Charles Ghankay Taylor to Chief of Detention on 26 March 2007, from Karim Khan to Herman von Hebel, 14 May 2007 (referencing the series of unanswered or delayed letters from the Defence to the Registry) [Annex 3].

<sup>13</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT, Pre-Trial Conference, Transcript, 7 May 2007, pg. 8, ln. 6 – pg. 10, ln. 6; *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T, Opening Day, Draft Transcript, 4 June 2007, pg.95, ln. 4 – pg. 97, ln. 7.

<sup>14</sup> See Memo re: Efforts re: Investigator in Liberia, from Avi Singh to Defence Team, 15 April 2007 [Annex A].

<sup>15</sup> The series of draft budgets as proposed by the Defence Office and as cut by the Registry are available, *ex parte* and confidentially, upon request by the Trial Chamber.

<sup>16</sup> See Letter from Karim Khan to Lovemore Munlo, dated 15 December 2006 [Annex 4].

<sup>17</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T, Opening Day, Draft Transcript, 4 June 2007, pg. 16, lns. 3-9. The Defence Team began to occupy space at The Hague in March, however, even as late as 17 March 2007, CITS was working at the Sub-Office to install computers and internet access, and as of 21 March 2007, there were still no working telephone connections.

confidentially as a Team, or to do any other routine legal preparation – in a location close to where Mr. Taylor is detained.<sup>18</sup> Because of being spread between essentially three locations – The Hague, Freetown and Monrovia (Liberia) – during this pre-trial period, yet having only one office in Freetown until February 2007,<sup>19</sup> the Defence Team has struggled to operate at all, much less efficiently, under conditions brought about by circumstances outside its control.

15. The Defence Office is aware of the detailed pleadings and correspondence that have been tendered in relation to Mr. Taylor's conditions of detention,<sup>20</sup> which remain the responsibility and under the jurisdiction of the SCSL Registry, despite Mr. Taylor's detention in ICC facilities.<sup>21</sup> Complaints have ranged from issues of culturally appropriate food and telephone minutes to visas for family members and friends of Mr. Taylor. The amount of time the Defence Team has been forced to spend following up with the Registry regarding complaints has taken away from time better spent on trial preparation.<sup>22</sup>
16. The Defence Office is also aware of the enormous time the Defence Team spent resolving the issue of video surveillance due to the fact that, for over four months, a video camera was installed in the conference room in the ICC Detention Unit where Mr. Taylor met with his Defence Team.<sup>23</sup> Though this issue was eventually resolved,<sup>24</sup> it did, however, create serious

<sup>18</sup> See Letter re: 22 August 2006 Letter from Herman von Hebel to Karim Khan, 18 September 2006 [Annex 5].

<sup>19</sup> The Defence Team was able to secure a container to serve as an office at the UNMIL premises in Monrovia by late February. See Letter from re: Request for facilities outlined in 8 February 2007 Meeting, from Karim Khan to Alan Doss, dated 12 February 2007 [Annex B].

<sup>20</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-146, Defence Application Requesting Review of the Memorandum of Understanding Between the International Criminal Court and the Special Court for Sierra Leone dated 13 April 2006 & Modification of Mr. Charles Taylor's Conditions of Detention, 14 December 2006; *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-194, Defence Reply to Registrar's Submission Pursuant to Rule 33(B) in Relation to Issues Raised in the Defence Motion Requesting a Review of the Memorandum of Understanding Between the International Criminal Court and the Special Court for Sierra Leone dated 13 April 2006 & Modification of Mr. Charles Taylor's Conditions of Detention, 26 February 2007; *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-204, Defence Response to the Prosecution's Submission Regarding Defence Application Requesting Review of the Memorandum of Understanding Between the International Criminal Court and the Special Court for Sierra Leone dated 13 April 2006 & Modification of Mr. Charles Taylor's Conditions of Detention, 15 March 2007.

<sup>21</sup> Memorandum of Understanding Between the International Criminal Court and the Special Court for Sierra Leone, dated 13 April 2006, Article 6.4.

<sup>22</sup> See Annex 3.

<sup>23</sup> Leave to Appeal, 30 April 2007, paras. 5 – 10.

<sup>24</sup> The Registry made no apparent response to a Trial Chamber decision of 30 November 2006 that urged "the Chief of Detention and the Registrar to deal with the matter promptly in accordance with Rule 59(C) of the Rules of Detention". Camera Decision, pg. 4 (emphasis added). This non-responsiveness of the Registry forced the Defence to file additional motions and engage in further discussions to stop the video surveillance. Mr. Khan warned the Registrar on 15 December 2006 that if a reply was not received before the Christmas recess, the Defence Team

10/29

difficulty for the accused to consult with his defence team and impacted adversely on this right of privileged consultation with his lawyers. The Defence Office is informed that this contributed immensely to Mr. Taylor's lack of confidence that he would secure a fair trial before the Court.

#### IV. BACKGROUND REGARDING DEFENCE OFFICE CONCERNS

17. The Defence Office continues to suffer from lack of the recognition of its role by the Registry in the facilitation of adequate defence for the accused. The Registry has of late made it very difficult for the Defence Office to consult with it in this regard and disregarded budgetary proposals submitted by the Defence Office which might have alleviated Mr. Taylor's concerns.
18. The Defence Office has striven to provide adequate resources to the Taylor Defence Team, within the constrained financial parameters set out by the Registry in the overall notion of a "Lean and Mean Budget," which must govern the operations of the Court, particularly when it relates to Defence resources. On numerous occasions, based on the principle of equality of arms, the Principal Defender has made serious efforts to obtain more resources for the Defence of Mr. Taylor due to the size and complexity of the case, to no avail.
19. The Defence Office has proposed various budgets that reasonably would have catered for the defence of Mr. Taylor, but various aspects of these budget proposals were challenged and cut by the Registry on the grounds that the international donors would not have it.<sup>25</sup> For example, the Defence Office recommendation for at least a P5 International Investigator was cut down to a

---

would consider "suspending all further legal consultations with our client with immediate effect. We will also consider raising this with the Trial Chamber as further grounds to delay the trial date". See Annex 4, pg. 1. Still the Registry was silent, and despite a decision from the President of the Special Court on 21 February 2007 requiring the Registrar to communicate to the ICC "forthwith" his decision that video surveillance of legal consultations should be discontinued, the Registry did not assure the Defence Team that the surveillance camera would not be used during legal consultations until 22 March 2007. *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-189, Decision of the President on Urgent and Public Defence Motion Requesting Cessation of Video Surveillance of Legal Consultations, 21 February 2007, para. 29; *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-213, Notification of Resumption of Legally Privileged Attorney-Client Consultations with Mr. Charles Taylor, 23 March 2007. In the interim, the Defence was indeed forced to suspend all legally-privileged attorney-client consultations with Mr. Taylor for eighteen days. *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-197, Notification of Suspension of Legally Privileged Attorney-Client Consultations with Mr. Charles Taylor, 5 March 2007.

<sup>25</sup> See Email re: draft budget 2007-2009, from Herman von Hebel to Vincent Nmehielle et al, dated 5 March 2007 [Annex 6].

10/30

P3 investigator despite the need to attract reasonably qualified individuals for the investigative needs of Mr. Taylor's trial.<sup>26</sup>

20. The Defence Office proposed to have a staff complement of three for The Hague Sub-Office (a P4 Senior Legal Officer, a P3 Duty Counsel and an administrative assistant) to properly and effectively service the Defence Team during trial given the size and complexity of the case. This request was denied and the Defence Office was allocated only a P3 Duty Counsel, who has to severely exert himself to fulfil the envisaged role of three people.
21. The Defence Office respectfully submits that in the fulfilment of their important institutional mandate under Rule 45 of the Rule of Procedure and Evidence, it important that the Principal Defender and the Defence Office Legal staff should, as part of the routine process, travel to The Hague to perform their functions, including meeting with Mr. Taylor or otherwise participating in the trial processes. It should not normally take an Order of the Honourable Chamber for that to happen.

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED

22. In the light of this history of concerns and these recent developments, and in an effort to assist Mr. Taylor before the Special Court, it is the view of the Defence Office that, pursuant to Rule 54, it is within the power of the Trial Chamber to issue an order for a suspension of time limits and to postpone the resumption of trial -- as this is necessary for the proper resolution of the resource issues that are bound to affect the preparation and conduct of the trial.
23. Having regard to the fair trial rights guarantees to Mr. Taylor under Article 17 of the Statute of the Court, it is in the interests of justice for the Defence Office to be given time for the Principal Defender to meet and discuss with Mr. Taylor with the view to determining a way forward towards the resolution of the current impasse in the implementation of the second directive of the Trial Chamber of 4 June 2007.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Again, proposed and final budgets are available *ex parte* upon request by the Trial Chamber.

<sup>27</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T, Opening Day, Draft Transcript, 4 June 2007, pg. 100, lns. 18-20.



24. As it strives to ensure the provision of adequate resources for the Defence of Mr. Taylor, the Defence Office submits that Mr. Taylor should not represent himself and that new counsel should not be appointed; rather, Mr. Khan should continue as his Counsel to avoid the loss of more time than is necessary. The assignment of new Counsel in this case would lead to a loss of not less than six to nine months.
25. Overall, the Defence Office is aware of the various complaints raised by Mr. Taylor and his counsel. The Defence Office is also aware that in the context of the Taylor case, it is one that is geographically divorced from the seat of the Court and the alleged crime base. In the circumstances, the Defence Office prays that the Trial Chamber:
- i) Order an expedited filing sequence due to the urgency of the present Application;
  - ii) Suspend all time limits for responses and replies related to pending motions in order to preserve the rights of Mr. Taylor; and
  - iii) Postpone the resumption of the Prosecution case, currently scheduled for 25 June 2007, until matters regarding adequate time and resources for the Defence of Mr. Taylor are resolved.

Respectfully submitted this 12<sup>th</sup> Day of June 2007,



**Vincent O. Nmehielle,**  
**Principal Defender**

10/32

## List of Authorities

### Prosecutor v. Taylor Filings

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-85, Principal Defender's Determination of Mr. Charles Ghankay Taylor's Indigence, 3 April 2006

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-88, Principal Defender's Decision to Provisionally Assign Counsel to Charles Ghankay Taylor, 5 April 2006

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-108, Order Changing Venue of Proceedings, 19 June 2006

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-111, Principal Defender's Decision to Reassign Counsel to Charles Ghankay Taylor, 13 July 2006

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-112, Corrigendum to Principal Defender's Decision to Reassign Counsel to Charles Ghankay Taylor, 13 July 2006

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-137, Decision on Urgent and Public Defence Motion Requesting Removal of Camera from Conference Room, 30 November 2006

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-146, Defence Application Requesting Review of the Memorandum of Understanding Between the International Criminal Court and the Special Court for Sierra Leone dated 13 April 2006 & Modification of Mr. Charles Taylor's Conditions of Detention, 14 December 2006

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-148, Public Defence Motion on Adequate Time for the Preparation of Mr. Taylor's Defence, 15 December 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-164, Decision on Adequate Time and Facilities, 23 January 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-168, Public Defence Application for Leave to Appeal 'Joint Decision on Defence Motions on Adequate Facilities and Adequate Time for the Preparation of Mr. Taylor's Defence, dated 23 January 2007', 26 January 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-189, Decision of the President on Urgent and Public Defence Motion Requesting Cessation of Video Surveillance of Legal Consultations, 21 February 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-194, Defence Reply to Registrar's Submission Pursuant to Rule 33(B) in Relation to Issues Raised in the Defence Motion Requesting a Review of the Memorandum of Understanding Between the International Criminal Court and the Special Court for Sierra Leone dated 13 April 2006 & Modification of Mr. Charles Taylor's Conditions of Detention, 26 February 2007

10133

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-197, Notification of Suspension of Legally Privileged Attorney-Client Consultations with Mr. Charles Taylor, 5 March 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-204, Defence Response to the Prosecution's Submission Regarding Defence Application Requesting Review of the Memorandum of Understanding Between the International Criminal Court and the Special Court for Sierra Leone dated 13 April 2006 & Modification of Mr. Charles Taylor's Conditions of Detention, 15 March 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-213, Notification of Resumption of Legally Privileged Attorney-Client Consultations with Mr. Charles Taylor, 23 March 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-220, Defence Motion Requesting Reconsideration of 'Joint Decision on Defence Motions on Adequate Facilities and Adequate Time for the Preparation of Mr. Taylor's Defence, dated 23 January 2007', 17 April 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-230, Defence Application for Leave to Appeal the 25 April 2007 "Decision on Defence Motion Requesting Reconsideration of 'Joint Decision on Defence Motions on Adequate Facilities and Adequate Time for the Preparation of Mr. Taylor's Defence, dated 23 January 2007', 30 April 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT-253, Order Rescheduling the Time For Start of the Trial on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2007, 24 May 2007

**Prosecutor v. Taylor Transcripts**

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT, Freetown Status Conference, Transcript, 21 June 2006

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-PT, Pre-Trial Conference, Transcript, 7 May 2007

*Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T, Opening Day, Draft Transcript, 4 June 2007



**SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE**  
JOMO KENYATTA ROAD • FREETOWN • SIERRA LEONE  
PHONE: +39 0831 257000 or +232 22 297000 or +39 083125 (+Ext)  
UN Intermission 178 7000 or 178 (+Ext)  
FAX: +232 22 297001 or UN Intermission: 178 7001

Court Management Section – Court Records

**CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE**

This certificate replaces the following confidential document which has been filed in the *Confidential* Case File.

Case Name: The Prosecutor – v- Charles Ghankay Taylor  
Case Number: SCSL-2003-01-T  
Document Index Number: 289  
Document Date 12 June 2007  
Filing Date: 12 June 2007

Number of Pages 30

Page Numbers from: 10134-10152

- Application**
- Order
- Indictment
- Other
- Correspondence

Document Title: **Confidential Document**

Name of Officer:

**Thomas Pimeh Kitel George**

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas Pimeh Kitel George', written over a horizontal line.