

SD2)

SCSL-03-01-T
(17062-17066)


17062

SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR
Freetown – Sierra Leone

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

Acting Registrar: Mr. Herman von Hebel

Date filed: 12 May 2008



THE PROSECUTOR

Against

Charles Ghankay Taylor

Case No. SCSL-03-01-PT

PUBLIC

PROSECUTION CORRIGENDUM TO URGENT PROSECUTION APPLICATION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORAL DECISION REGARDING PROTECTIVE MEASURES FOR WITNESS TF1-215 OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL ORAL DECISION REGARDING PROTECTIVE MEASURES FOR WITNESS TF1-215

Office of the Prosecutor:

Ms. Brenda J. Hollis
Ms. Kirsten Keith

Defence Counsel for Charles Ghankay Taylor

Mr. Courtenay Griffiths
Mr. Terry Munyard
Mr. Andrew Cayley
Mr. Morris Anyah

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On 9 May 2008, the Prosecution filed "*Urgent Prosecution Application For Reconsideration of Oral Decision Regarding Protective Measures For Witness TF1-215 or in the alternative Application for Leave to Appeal Oral Decision Regarding Protective Measures For Witness TF1-215.*"¹
2. The Prosecution files this corrigendum to correct portions of the Application relating to the number of Group I witnesses covered by the RUF Decision dated 5 July 2004.
3. The Prosecution also seeks leave to substitute corrected pages for those pages of the PTC Materials which are the subject of the corrigendum. The corrected pages are set out in the attached four annexes.

II. CORRIGENDUM

4. The Prosecution corrects the Application as follows, with changes highlighted by bold underscore and errors indicated by bold strikethrough:

Paragraph 15 reads:

The RUF Decision, read in conjunction with prior Prosecution filings upon which the RUF Decision is based, show that TF1-215 was included within the protections granted, as were all ~~266~~ witnesses of fact listed in the 26 April 2004 witness list.

Paragraph 15 should read:

The RUF Decision, read in conjunction with prior Prosecution filings upon which the RUF Decision is based, show that TF1-215 was included within the protections granted, as were all **259² Group I witnesses i.e.** witnesses of fact, listed in the 26 April 2004 witness list

¹ *Prosecutor v Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-T-501, "Public with Confidential Annexes B and E - Urgent Prosecution Application For Reconsideration of Oral Decision Regarding Protective Measures For Witness TF1-215 or in the alternative Application for Leave to Appeal Oral Decision Regarding Protective Measures For Witness TF1-215", 8 May 2008 (**Application**)

² 266 witnesses in total were listed in the Witness List filed on 26 April 2004. Annex B of the Renewed Motion lists 7 experts witnesses, leaving a total of **259** fact witnesses.

Paragraph 17, sentence at lines 3-4 reads:

All fact witnesses refer to the **266** witnesses in the 26 April list.

Paragraph 17, sentence at lines 3-4 should read:

All fact witnesses refers to the **259** witnesses in the 26 April list **who are not listed as experts in Annex B of the Renewed Motion.**

Paragraph 19, sentence at lines 9 -11 reads:

The paragraph was included to indicate that, although the basic protective measures were being requested for all 266 ~~fact~~ witnesses, it was anticipated that not all 266 would testify.

Paragraph 19, sentence at lines 9 -11 should read:

The paragraph was included to indicate that, although the basic protective measures were being requested for all 266 witnesses, it was anticipated that not all 266 would testify.

Paragraph 21 reads

The language and intent of paragraphs 2, 3 5 and 20 make clear that the basic in-court protections sought for fact witnesses – the use of pseudonym and screen - related to all **266** fact witnesses.

Paragraph 21 should read:

The language and intent of paragraphs 2, 3 5 and 20 make clear that the basic in-court protections sought for fact witnesses – the use of pseudonym and screen - related to all **259** fact witnesses **in Group I.**

Paragraph 22, sentence at line 6 reads:

Thus, Trial Chamber I concluded that the Renewed Motion included all **266** fact witnesses.

Paragraph 22, sentence at line 6, should read

Thus, Trial Chamber I concluded that the Renewed Motion included all 259 fact witnesses:

Paragraph 23, sentence at line 1-3, reads:

That the RUF Decision granted basic in-court protections to all ~~266~~ fact witnesses listed in the 26 April list, including TF1-215, is clear in light of the implementation of that decision by both Trial Chambers during the testimonies of fact witnesses in the *RUF* and *AFRC* cases.

Paragraph 23, sentence at line 1-3, should read:

That the RUF Decision granted basic in-court protections to all 259 fact witnesses listed in the 26 April list, including TF1-215, is clear in light of the implementation of that decision by both Trial Chambers during the testimonies of fact witnesses in the *RUF* and *AFRC* cases.

IV. CONCLUSION

- 5) The Prosecution respectfully requests that this corrigendum be considered in conjunction with it's Application.

Filed in the Hague,
12 May 2008
For the Prosecution,



Brenda J. Hollis
Senior Trial Attorney

List of Authorities

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-T

Prosecutor v Taylor, SCSL-03-01-T-501, “Public with Confidential Annexes B and E - Urgent Prosecution Application For Reconsideration of Oral Decision Regarding Protective Measures For Witness TF1-215 or in the alternative Application for Leave to Appeal Oral Decision Regarding Protective Measures For Witness TF1-215”, 8 May 2008