

### SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE

## IN THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before:

Justice Shireen Avis Fisher, Pre-Hearing Judge

Registrar:

Ms. Binta Mansaray

Date:

30 October 2012

**PROSECUTOR** 

**Against** 

**CHARLES GHANKAY TAYLOR** (Case No. SCSL-03-01-A)

## **Public**

# STATUS CONFERENCE ENTRY AND ORDER

### Office of the Prosecutor:

Ms. Brenda J. Hollis

Mr. Nicholas Koumijan

Mr. Mohamed A. Bangura

Ms. Nina Tavakoli

Ms. Leigh Lawrie

Mr. Christopher Santora

Ms. Kathryn Howarth

Ms. Ruth Mary Hackler

Ms. Ula Nathai-Lutchman

Mr. James Pace

Mr. Cóman Kenny

**Defence Counsel for the Accused:** 

Mr. Morris Anyah

Mr. Eugene O'Sullivan

Mr. Christopher Gosnell

Ms. Kate Gibson

Ms. Magda Karagiannakis

SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEUM. RECEIVED COURT MANAGEMENT

3 0 OCT 2012

NAME ZAINAS T. TOFANAH

SIGN TO MAL

Case No. SCSL-03-01-A

30 October 2012

Justice Shireen Avis Fisher, Pre-Hearing Judge of the Appeals Chamber of the Special Court for Sierra Leone ("Special Court"), acting in accordance with the Chamber's "Order Designating a Pre-Hearing Judge Pursuant to Rule 109 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence", dated 21 June 2012 and pursuant to the Scheduling Order, dated 19 October 2012, held a Status Conference on 25 October 2012. Ms. Brenda Hollis, Prosecutor, and Mr. Morris Anyah, lead Counsel for Charles Taylor, were present. Mr. Taylor voluntarily and in writing waived his right to appear.

The following entries are made for the record following the Status Conference:

- 1) The Parties agreed that Annex A to the Corrigendum to Taylor's Appeal Brief,<sup>3</sup> which was filed on 8 October 2012 to correct certain clerical errors<sup>4</sup> in Taylor's Appeal Brief dated 1 October 2012,<sup>5</sup> is the authoritative version of Taylor's Rule 111 submission to which all references shall be made.
- 2) The Prosecution requested leave to withdraw its Urgent Prosecution Motion Regarding the Defence's Failure to Comply with the Practice Direction, dated 12 October 2012 ("Urgent Prosecution Motion").<sup>6</sup>
- 3) The Parties agreed to provide each other and the Senior Legal Officers of the Appeals Chamber with electronic versions of their submissions pursuant to Rules 111, 112, 113 and 115 (if any) identical in content to the official submissions filed with Court Management Service.
- 4) The Parties agreed and the Pre-Hearing Judge concurred that paragraph 16 of the Practice Direction on the Structure of Grounds of Appeal Before the Special Court ("Practice Direction") does not refer to the impugned Trial Judgment or Sentencing Judgment.
- 5) The Pre-Hearing Judge gave notice that an order scheduling a winter recess would be issued.

  The Parties agreed that the order shall restrict filings during the recess period to emergency matters only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Prosecutor v. Taylor, SCSL-03-01-A-1297, Order Designating a Pre-Hearing Judge Pursuant to Rule 109 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, 21 June 2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Prosecutor v. Taylor, SCSL-03-01-A-1334, Scheduling Order, 19 October 2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prosecutor v. Taylor, SCSL-03-01-A-1331, Corrigendum to Appellant's Submissions of Charles Ghankay Taylor Public with Annexes A and B, 8 October 2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Corrigendum to Appellant's Submissions of Charles Ghankay Taylor Public with Annexes A and B, para. 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Prosecutor v. Taylor, SCSL-03-01-A-1326, Appellant's Submissions of Charles Ghankay Taylor Public with Confidential Annex A and Public Annexes B and C, 1 October 2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Prosecutor v. Taylor, SCSL-03-01-A-1335, Urgent Prosecution Motion Regarding the Defence's Failure to Comply with the Practice Direction, 12 October 2012 ("Urgent Prosecution Motion").

- 6) The Pre-Hearing Judge reminded the Parties of the requirements of paragraph 11 of the Practice Direction.
- 7) The Pre-Hearing gave notice that an order would be issued for a further status conference in two to three weeks to review, *erga omnis*, the progress toward Taylor's filing of any Rule 115 motions.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, pursuant to Rules 54, 65bis, 73, 106(C) and 109(B)(i), as follows:

- 1) The Prosecution Motion Seeking an Order Instructing which Version of Mr. Taylor's Appellant's Submissions is Authoritative<sup>7</sup> is **DISMISSED** as moot;
- 2) The Prosecution's oral motion to withdraw the Urgent Prosecution Motion is **GRANTED** and the Urgent Prosecution Motion is **DISMISSED**;
- 3) Motions alleging technical violations of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence or practice directions and responses to such motions shall include a certification by lead Counsel that a meeting with opposing Counsel was held in person to discuss good faith resolution of the alleged violation and that Counsel have failed to reach a resolution within a reasonable time.

Done in The Hague, The Netherlands, this 30th day of October 2012.

Hon. Justice Shireen Avis Fisher

Pre-Hearing Judge

erra Leone

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> *Prosecutor v. Taylor*, SCSL-03-01-A-1333, Prosecution Motion Seeking an Order Instructing which Version of Mr. Taylor's Appellant's Submissions is Authoritative, 9 October 2012.