

## INDEX

### Abbreviations used in the index

- ACHPR (African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981) (Banjul Charter))  
 ACHR (American Convention on Human Rights (1969))  
 AP I (Geneva Conventions (1949), First Additional Protocol (international armed conflicts) (1977))  
 CAR (Central African Republic)  
 CERD (UN Committee/Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (1965))  
 DCC (Document Containing the Charges)  
 ECCC (Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia)  
 ECHR (European Convention on Human Rights (1950))  
 ECtHR (European Court of Human Rights)  
 EOC (Elements of Crimes)  
 FIDH (International Federation for Human Rights)  
 FTT (First-tier Tribunal)  
 GC IV (Geneva Convention relating to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (1949))  
 HR (Hague Regulations (1907))  
 IA (Immigration Act)  
 ICC (International Criminal Court/ICC Statute)  
 ICCPR (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966))  
 ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross)  
 ICTR (International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda/ICTR Statute)  
 ICTY (International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia/ICTY Statute)  
 IHL (international humanitarian law)  
 IHRL (international human rights law)  
 ILR (indefinite leave to remain)  
 MLC (*Mouvement de libération du Congo*)  
 NIAA (Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act)  
 QD (Qualification Directive (Council Directive 2004/83/EC))  
 RC (Refugee Convention (1951))  
 RLR (Restricted Leave to Remain/RLR policy)  
 SIA (State Immunity Act)  
 SIAC (UK Special Immigration Appeals Commission)  
 SoS (Secretary of State)  
 TFV (Trust Fund for Victims)  
 UDHR (Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948))  
 UT (Special Administrative Upper Tribunal)  
 VCCR (Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (1963))  
 VCLT (Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969))

### *Babar*

- background (facts and procedural history in order of occurrence)  
 i. respondent's claim for asylum (29 January 2001) 636  
 ii. rejection of asylum claim on RC 1F grounds 636  
 confirmation on appeal but removal impossible as a breach of ECHR 3 (risk of detention/inhuman and degrading treatment) 636  
 grant of exceptional leave to remain 636

**Babar** (*cont.*)

- iii. ILR application (October 2005)/rejection on RC 1F(a) grounds (October 2008) 636-7
  - classification of Babar's behaviour as constituting a pattern of widespread and systematic crimes against the civilian population/crime against humanity 637
  - grant of six months' discretionary leave followed by six months' restricted leave 637
  - impossibility of removal under ECHR 3 637
- iv. ILR application pursuant to Immigration Rule 276B (17 September 2012)
  - grounds for application 638
  - reasons for removal (public interest not outweighed by other considerations/rejection of ECHR 3 claim) 638
  - respondent's admission of visits to Pakistan without any difficulty 637
- v. refusal of application/decision to remove respondent to Pakistan (18 July 2014) 638
- background (previous hearings)
  - FTT 643-4
  - UT 644-5
- background (relevant law) (Immigration Rule 276B (ILR)) 639-43
  - assessing ILR/public interest balance (Long Residence policy statement) 639
  - r 276D (cumulative nature of r 276B requirements) 639
  - text 638
  - "there are no reasons why" (r 276B(ii)), confusing nature 639
    - adoption of the more lenient version (*Pokhriyal*) 639
    - sensible approach to interpretation (*Mabad*) 639
- background (relevant law) (RLR (2015 Asylum Policy Instruction))
  - 1.2.3 (applicability to persons with ECHR barrier to removal) 640
  - 1.2.4 (ECHR 3 considerations outweighing public interest/exceptional circumstances test) (qualified ECHR rights) 640
  - 4.12 (applications for indefinite leave to remain) 640-2
  - 4.12.3 (possibility of reliance on *N*) 641, 643
  - "in exceptional circumstances" likely to be "very rare" (s 1.2.5) vs "usually" be refused (s 4.12.1) (*MS and MBT*) 641-2
  - "exceptional circumstances", focus on 641-2
- appeal (Court's analysis) (UT judge's failings)
  - insufficiency of weight given to the justification for denying settlement to those guilty of crimes against humanity 647
  - avoidance of UK becoming a safe haven, importance 647
  - dependence on *N* as contributory factor 647
  - insufficient attention to respondent's dishonesty/failure to include it in his assessment of public interest 648
  - purpose of RF 1F (protection of the integrity of the asylum process) 647
  - stringency of RC 1F test 647
  - underestimation of what constitutes "exceptional circumstances" 647
- appeal (Court's decision)
  - confirmation of SoS's claim that the respondent has no entitlement to ILR 649
  - remittance to the UT of ECHR 8-based claim to non-removal 649
- appeal (grounds) (UT errors of law)
  - i. improper resort to ECHR 8 balancing exercise 646
  - ii. failure to recognize need for compelling circumstances to override a powerful public interest 646
  - iii. perverse underestimate of "exceptional circumstances" test 640
  - iv. failure to take into account respondent's dishonesty in claiming that he was in fear of returning to Pakistan 646

- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (background)***  
 2, 21-39
1. key findings 21-2
    - Appeals Chamber's task (determination that factual findings that are made beyond reasonable doubt are clear and unassailable) 22
    - duty to take "all necessary and reasonable measures" (ICC 28(a)) 23-4
    - motivation, relevance 23
    - standard of proof (ICC Regulation 52(b)) ("beyond reasonable doubt") 22, 54
  2. grounds of appeal (ICC 81(1)(b)) as presented by appellant
    - 1 (mistrial) 27
    - 2 ("conviction exceeded the charges") 27, 40-59
    - 3 (non-liability as a superior for crimes committed by others) 27, 59-91
      - dismissal/ignoring of evidence relevant to the establishment of effective control 27
      - finding of actual knowledge of MLC crimes 27
      - finding of causation 27
      - finding of effective control 27
      - finding of failure to take all necessary and reasonable measures 27-8
    - 4 (failure to establish the contextual elements of crimes against humanity) 27
    - 5 (error in approach to identification evidence) 27
    - 6 (other procedural errors) 27
  3. procedural history in date order
    - appellant's arrest (24 May 2008) 528
    - Amended DCC/Confirmation Decision (31 March 2009) 40-1
    - Pre-Trial Chamber's Charges Decision (15 June 2009) 528
    - filing of Prosecutor's Summary Presentation of Evidence/Updated Summary (4 November 2009/15 January 2010) 42
    - Second Amended DCC (4 November 2009) 41
      - appellant's challenge to (12 February 2010) 41
      - Decision on Appellant's Challenge to (20 July 2010) 41-2
    - corrected revised version of the Second Amended DCC (14 October 2010) 42
    - conviction under ICC 28(a) of crimes against humanity/war crimes (21 March 2016) (Conviction Decision) 23, 528
    - notice of appeal (4 April 2016) 24
    - sentence to 18 years' imprisonment (21 June 2016) 528
    - filing of Appeal Brief/Additional Evidence Application (19 September 2016) 24, 39
    - Prosecutor's responses to the Appeal Brief and to the Additional Evidence Application (21 November 2016) 24
    - appellant's reply to Prosecutor's Response to the Additional Evidence Application (9 December 2016) 24
    - appellant's reply to the Response to the Appeal Brief (20 December 2016) 24
    - victims' observations on the Additional Evidence Application (21 December 2016) 24
    - victims' observations on the Appeal Brief (9 January 2017) 24
    - appellant's reply to the Victims' Observations 24
    - Appeals Chamber's order for Contextual Elements Submissions (30 October 2017) 24
    - scheduling order for an appeal hearing (7 November 2017) 24
    - appellant's Contextual Elements Submissions (13 November 2017)/Prosecutor's response (27 November 2017) 25
    - Order on the Conduct of the Hearing (27 November 2017) 25
    - victims' Representatives' Observations on the Contextual Elements Submissions (4 December 2017) 26
    - appellant's response (11 December 2017) 26

***Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (background)**  
 (cont.)

- Appeals Hearing (9-11 January 2018) 26, 27
- parties' and participants' further written submissions (19 January 2018) 26
- Bemba et al.* Appeal Judgment of 8 March 2018 30-1, 34, 92, 94-5, 117, 172, 201-2, 271, 276, 329, 331, 355
- Prosecutor's request to present an additional authority (13 April 2018)/appellant's response (20 April 2018) 27, 39
- Appeals Chamber's reversal of Conviction Decision (8 June 2018) 529
- notification of intention to file an Article 85 claim (22 October 2018) 529
- Pre-Trial Chamber II's decision (30 October 2018) 529
- appellant files Article 8 claim (8 March 2019) 529
- Registry's Request for Guidance Regarding Some Procedural Aspects (22 March 2019) 530
- Chamber's clarification (11 April 2019) 530
- Prosecutor's response (6 May 2019) 530
- Prosecutor and Registry's responses to the appellant's responses (13 May 2019) 531
- Registry's Observations on the Defence Compensation Claim (6 May 2019) 531
- appellant's request to file a reply to the Prosecutor and the Registry's submissions (8 May 2019)
- appellant's Reply (3 June 2019) 531
- Prosecutor and Registry's responses to appellant's reply 532

***Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (background)**  
 (standard of review (ICC 83(2)))/grounds of appeal (ICC 81(1))

- Appeals Chamber's right to intervene, factors justifying/not justifying 28, 29-32
- Appeals Chamber's right to reverse or amend the impugned decision, or order a new trial in case of non-compliance
  - with ICC 83(2) 35-6
- clear and unassailable findings, need for 32
- jurisprudence 35
  - Lubanga* 35-6
  - RUF* 35
- material effect on the decision or sentence 28-9, 32-3
- reasonableness test 30-2
- risk of miscarriage of justice 30, 35 n. 58
- Trial Chamber's reasoning, importance 31-2
- unfairness affecting the reliability of the decision or sentence (ICC 81(1)(b)(iv)) 28-9
- unfairness of proceedings/reliability of the conviction decision, interrelationship 36
- error of fact (ICC 81(1)(b)(ii))
  - Appeals Chamber's task (determination of Trial Chamber's compliance with "beyond reasonable doubt" standard)
    - obligation to overturn Trial Chamber's findings in case of reasonable doubt/ substitution of own factual findings distinguished 22, 32, 38
  - clear and unassailable findings, need for 32
  - margin of deference, cautious approach to 29-32, 38-9
  - reasonableness test 30-1
- error of law (ICC 81(1)(b)(iii))
  - Appeals Chamber's independence of assessment/non-deference to Trial Chamber 29-30
  - Bemba et al.* 30-1
  - material effect of error on the decision or sentence, need for 29
- procedural error (ICC 81(1)(b)(i)) 27, 28-9, 32-5
- jurisprudence

- ECtHR jurisprudence, importance 33
- Gotovina and Markač* 35
- Hadjianastasiou* 33
- Kenyatta* OA5 Judgment 32-3
- Lubanga* OA5 Judgment 33
- Lubanga* Sentencing Appeal Judgment 32-3
- Perišić* 35
- Ruto et al.* OA Judgment 32-3
- material effect of error on the decision or sentence, need for 32-3
- procedural error (ICC 81(1)(b)(i)) (failure to provide “a full and reasoned statement of [its] findings on the evidence and conclusions” (ICC 74(5)))
- importance of Trial Chamber’s reasoning to an understanding of the legal and factual basis for decision 33
- need to address all arguments/every item of evidence relevant to a particular factual finding, whether 34
  - new trial before a different trial chamber 34
  - remand of factual finding to the original trial chamber 34-5
  - Tribunal’s determination of the factual question *de novo* 35
- remedies in case of a finding of non-compliance, alternatives 34-5
- substantiation of the arguments (ICC Regulation 58(2)) (appeal brief), requirements 36-7
  - Lubanga* 36-7
  - Ngudjolo* 37
- Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (Merits) (ground 2 (“conviction exceeded the charges”))**
  - procedural background in date order
    - Amended DCC (non-exhaustive list of criminal acts)/Confirmation Decision (31 March 2009) 40-4
    - filing of Prosecutor’s Summary Presentation of Evidence/Updated Summary (4 November 2009/15 January 2010) 42
    - Second Amended DCC (4 November 2009) 41
      - appellant’s challenge to (12 February 2010) 41
      - Decision on Appellant’s Challenge to (20 July 2010) 41-2
      - corrected revised version of the Second Amended DCC (14 October 2010) 42
      - conviction under ICC 28(a) of crimes against humanity/war crimes (21 March 2016) (Conviction Decision) 23, 24
  - Appeals Chamber’s analysis
    - Conviction Decision, scope
      - broadness of terms/absence of important information 51-2
      - scope of charges and sufficiency of notice, relationship 50
      - summary of Trial Chamber’s findings 51-2
    - Conviction Decision, whether amounting to excess (ICC 74(2)) 52-7
      - “facts and circumstances”, role 52-4
      - review of criminal acts claimed to be outside the charges 54-7
      - parameters of ground 2 (scope of the charges (ICC 74(2))) 58
      - parties’ misrepresentation of Trial Chamber’s findings 50 n. 156
  - Appeals Chamber’s Conclusion 57-9
    - acts found beyond reasonable doubt to be within the scope of the charges 58-9
    - acts not falling within the facts and circumstances described in the charges 57-8
  - Appeals Chamber’s determination
    - parameters of ground 2 (scope of the charges (ICC 74(2))): *see* Trial Chamber III’s findings *below*

***Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (Merits)***  
**(ground 2 ("conviction exceeded the charges"))** (*cont.*)

- parties'/participants' arguments (appellant) 40, 44-50
  - i. conviction partly based on unconfirmed criminal acts/inadequacy of notice 44-5, 49-51
  - ii. unacceptability of V1/V2's evidence as the basis of a conviction 44, 45, 49, 50-1
  - iii. conviction based on charges improperly included in the Corrected Revised Second Amended DCC 44, 45-7
    - classification as "facts" (ICC 74(2)) 46
    - specificity requirement (Regulation 52(b)/Rule 121(3)) 146-7
- parties'/participants' arguments (Prosecutor)
  - i. conviction partly based on unconfirmed criminal acts/inadequacy of notice 47-8
  - ii. unacceptability of V1/V2's evidence as the basis of a conviction 48
  - iii. conviction based on charges improperly included in the Corrected Revised Second Amended DCC
    - classification as "facts" (ICC 74(2)) 46
    - specificity requirement (Regulation 52(b)/Rule 121(3)) 48-9
- parties'/participants' arguments (victims)
  - i. conviction partly based on unconfirmed criminal acts/inadequacy of notice 49
  - ii. unacceptability of V1/V2's evidence as the basis of a conviction 49
- Trial Chamber III's findings
  - adequacy of notice to appellant 43-4
  - Confirmation Decision as authoritative definition 40-3

***Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (Merits)***  
**(ground 3 (command responsibility) (failure to take reasonable and necessary measures (ICC 28(a))))** (**Appeals Chamber's analysis and determination**)

- Appeals Chamber's opening remarks
  - appellant's contention/Appeals Chamber's endorsement of 79
  - commander's duty to take "all necessary and reasonable measures" (ICC 28(a)(ii))
    - cost-benefit analysis, acceptability 80
    - intrinsic connection with the extent of a commander's material ability to do so 79
    - limitation of duty to necessary and reasonable measures/strict liability distinguished 80
    - proportionality/feasibility 80
    - "reasonableness" 80
- Trial Chamber III's tasks
  - assessment of "reasonableness"/demonstration of commander's failure to take specific and concrete measures that were available 80
  - identification of what crimes the commander knew or should have known about at the time 80
  - scope 27-8, 59
- issues addressed by the Appeals Chamber
  - i. alleged misappreciation of the limitations of the MLC's jurisdiction and competence to investigate 81, 89
    - alleged failure to consider evidence relating to 81
    - Trial Chamber's finding 81
  - ii. failure to acknowledge that the appellant had asked the CAR Prime Minister to investigate the allegations 83-4
  - iii. wrongful inclusion of motivation 84-5, 89, 90-1
  - iv. attribution to appellant of limitations in the mandate and results of measures taken 89, 90-1
  - v. finding that appellant had failed to empower other MLC officials to fully and adequately investigate and prosecute crimes 89

- vi. failure to indicate approximate number of crimes committed and to assess the impact on finding a breach of ICC 28 89-90
- vii. improper inclusion of redeployment of MLC troops as a measure appellant should have taken 88-9
- viii. adequacy of Trial Chamber's denunciation of the measures taken 85-8
- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (Merits) (ground 3 (command responsibility) (failure to take reasonable and necessary measures (ICC 28(a)))) (preliminary matters including jurisprudence, parties' arguments and Trial Chamber III's findings) 59-91***
- jurisprudence
  - AFRC* 81
  - Aleksovski* 79
  - Blaškić* 79
  - Bošković and Tarčulovski* 68, 74-5, 84
  - Čelebići* 79
  - Dorđević* 84
  - Halilović* 79, 80, 84
  - Kaing Guek Eav* 84
  - Karadžić* 79, 80
  - Lubanga Appeal* 88
  - Orić* 84
  - Renzaho* 80
  - RUF* 84
  - Strugar* 64, 80, 84
- parties'/participants' arguments (appellant)
  - i. failure to apply the correct legal standard 64
  - ii. misappreciation of the limitations of the MLC's jurisdiction and competence to investigate 64-5
    - notification of possible/required measures requirements 64-5, 67-8
  - iii. failure to acknowledge that the appellant had asked the CAR Prime Minister to investigate the allegations 64, 71-2
  - iv. adoption of irrelevant considerations/relevance of motivation 64, 72-5
  - v. unreasonable findings on measures taken, misstatement of the evidence and failure to take relevant evidence into account 64
    - alleged failure to take concrete measures 77
    - alleged limitation of scope and duration of Mondonga Inquiry and Zongo Commission 76-7, 79
    - distortion of Sibut Mission evidence 77-8
    - measures taken (Chad-CAR international commission of inquiry) 76
- parties'/participants' arguments (Prosecutor)
  - appellant's repetition of old arguments 78
  - distortion of Sibut Mission evidence 78-9
  - reasonableness of the weight given by Chamber III to the evidence 78
- parties'/participants' arguments (victims) (importance of motivation) 75
- Trial Chamber III's findings 59-63
  - motivation 61-2
- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (Merits) (ground 3 (command responsibility) (failure to take reasonable and necessary measures (ICC 28(a)))) (relief (ICC 83(2)))***
- acquittal, right to 92
  - pending decision on detention in respect of conviction by another Chamber 92
- options (confirmation, reversal or amendment of the decision appealed or order of a new trial) 35-6, 91

- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (Merits) (ground 3 (command responsibility) (failure to take reasonable and necessary measures (ICC 28(a)))) (relief (ICC 83(2))) (cont.)***  
 impugned decision on grounds of error of fact 91  
 reversal of decision/discontinuation of proceedings in case of  
 acts not falling within the facts and circumstances described in the charges 91
- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Eboe-Osuji J (concurring))*** 379-520
- I. the crux 382-90
    - conclusion 492
    - difficulties of the case
      - appellant's status as commander as opposed to perpetrator/remoteness 382-3, 384-8
      - as enforced restriction of charges to the taking of "all necessary and reasonable measures" 385-8
    - majority/minority divide, features of 383-5
    - margin of deference 383-5
  - II. accountability 390-1
  - III. scope of separate opinion 400-1
  - IV. standard of review 392-417
    - A. margin of deference in relation to findings bearing on guilt or innocence 394-7
    - B. margin of deference in relation to factual findings 397-401
      - must be convinced "beyond reasonable doubt" (ICC 63(3)) 401
    - C. reasonableness of factual findings ("reasonableness test") 401-3
    - D. appellate disadvantage in relation to factual findings 403-13
      - margin of deference and 403-13
      - reasonableness test 410-11
      - restating the principle 411-13
      - risk of letting appellate courts off the hook 412-13
    - E. material effect on the decision or sentence 413-17
  - V. failure to provide "a full and reasoned statement of [its] findings on the evidence and conclusions" (ICC 74(5)) 417-19
  - VI. amendment of the indictment by the Trial Chamber at any stage of the proceedings 420-39
    - introduction 421-5
      - admissible powers of the Trial Chamber 420-1
      - consistency with contemporary practice 423-5
      - general principles of international criminal justice law, trend to allow amendment in certain circumstances 421
    - A. purposive interpretation/interpretation principles 425-9
      - treaty as a whole in context 428-9
    - B. ICC 61(9) (confirmation of charges) 429-39
      - dealing with lacuna 436-9
  - VII. causation (ICC 28) 440-55
    - A. as a complex legal concept 441-2
    - B. pragmatic approach to 442-6
    - C. omission as a cause 446-54
    - D. "as a result of" applicability in *Bemba* case 455
  - VIII. theories of responsibility under ICC 28 455-72
    - A. dereliction of duty 455-60
      - ICC 28 and AP I: 86(2) distinguished 456
      - review of the arguments 455-8



- A.1. dereliction of duty
  - awkwardness of dereliction of duty theory in *Bemba* 458-61
- B. complicity as a theory of command responsibility under ICC 28 461-72
  - 1. accomplice liability 462-6
  - 2. aiding and abetting under ICC 25(3)(c) 466-8
  - 3. complicity under ICC 25(3)(c)/ICC 28 (Grotius) 469-72
- IX. endangerment liability 472-86
  - definition 473-4
  - A. ICC 28 and 474-7
  - B. strict liability and 477-8
  - C. dichotomy between *jus in bello* and *jus ad bellum* 478-9
  - D. fault element (ICC 28) 479-83
  - E. control as a legal factor of liability 483-5
  - F. “necessary and reasonable measures” 485-6
- X. withdrawal of troops in abatement of criminality 486-9
- XI. organizational policy requirement (ICC 7(2)(a)) 489-91
  - “organization” as essential element 490
  - possibility of prosecuting gang members for crimes against humanity (*Ruto*) 489-90
- XII. “reasonable measures” (ICC 28(b)(iii)) 491-2
- Appendix I: rulings on admissibility of evidence 492-504
  - A. Appeals Chamber’s 2011 decision: obligation of evidential ruling on admissibility 492-5
    - summary of the decision 493-4
    - Trial Chamber “may rule on the relevance or admissibility of any evidence” (ICC 69(4))/“will have to” 493-4
  - B. Appeals Chamber’s 2018 decision: no obligation of evidential ruling 495
  - C. ICC Rule 64 496-7
  - D. evidential rulings as a matter of fairness of trial proceedings 497-500
  - E. customary international criminal procedural law and 500-1
  - F. efficiencies of evidential rulings during trial 501-3
  - G. alternative approaches 503-4
- Appendix II: military necessity 504-20: *see also* necessity/duress as defence/justification (including war-related situations, war crimes or crimes against humanity)
  - A. “military objective” and “military necessity” distinguished 504-10
  - B. pacific settlement of international disputes and the defence of military necessity 511-18
    - consistency between war and international law, changes in approach to 511-16
    - ex iniuria ius non oritur* 516-18
  - C. IHRL and 518-20
- Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 1 (“mistrial”) (ICC 70 (administration of justice))**
  - introduction (parties’ arguments) 245
  - A. dismissal of appellant’s arguments *in limine* 246-51
    - 1. relevance of the ICC 70 investigation 246
    - 2. approach to the determinations by the Trial Chamber
      - appellant’s obligation to set out how the proceedings were unfair/how this affected the reliability of the decision 247
      - exclusion of a *de novo* review 247
      - parties’ arguments (appellant) 246-7
      - parties’ arguments (Prosecutor) 246

***Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 1 (“mistrial”) (ICC 70 (administration of justice)) (cont.)***

- 2.a. *ex parte* communications before the Trial Chamber regarding suspected witness interference 247-9
- 2.b. failure to disclose within a reasonable time a suspected scheme of witness interference 249
- 2.c. transmission of privileged and confidential defence information to the Prosecutor 250-1
- B. appellant’s additional evidence request 251-6
  - 1. appellant’s submissions before the Appeals Chamber 251-2
  - 2. Prosecutor’s submissions before the Appeals Chamber 252
  - 3. appellant’s response 252-3
  - 4. observations of the victims’ representative 253
  - 5. analysis
    - Lubanga* 254-5
    - relevant rules and regulations 253-4
- C. Prosecutor’s *ex parte* submissions and alleged disclosure violations, whether compromising appellant’s right to a fair trial 256-68
  - overview 258
    - 1. relevant procedural background 256-8
    - 2. submissions before the Appeals Chamber 257-8
    - 3. analysis 258-68
      - 3.a. alleged irregularities in the proceedings 259-63
      - 3.b. alleged unfairness of the proceedings due to the *ex parte* submissions and alleged disclosure violations 263-8
      - 3.c. conclusion 268
  - D. sharing of Defence’s privileged/confidential information with the Prosecutor 268-79
    - 1. relevant procedural background 268-9
    - 2. submissions before the Appeals Chamber 269
    - 3. analysis 269-79
      - 3.a. relevant legal framework 269-70
      - 3.b. ICC 70 Case review process, whether resulting in a violation of privilege in the main case 270-4
        - i. 14 September 2013 Conversation 274-7
        - ii. intercepted communications containing defence strategies 276-7
        - iii. allegedly confidential intercepted communications 277-8
        - iv. intercepted communications allegedly wrongly disclosed in their entirety 278
        - v. conclusion 278
      - 3.c. failure to segregate ICC 70 investigation team from prosecution team 279
      - 3.d. conclusion 279
- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 2 (“conviction exceeded the charges”) 102-245***
- accused’s rights
  - absence of objection by appellant on grounds of breach of 108-9
  - adequate time for the preparation of the defence (ICC 67(1)(b)) 108
  - applicability to pre-trial phase of proceedings 108
  - as limitation on Prosecutor’s right to rely on more detailed factual allegations 108
  - prompt receipt of detailed information of the charges (ICC 67(1)(a)) 108-9
  - confirmation of charges (ICC 61)
    - Pre-Trial Chamber’s task, parameters (ICC 61(7)) 107
    - purpose (separation out of cases and charges which should go to trial) 106-7

- determination of charges, responsibility of Prosecutor for (ICC 58/ICC 61/ICC 74(2)) 104-5
- dissenting conclusion (compliance of conviction with the charges) 109
- “facts and circumstances” (ICC 74(2)), level of detail required 102-3
- holistic approach to interpretation of 104
- principle of congruence and 104
- Prosecutor’s discretion in formulation of charges/possible approaches to 104-6
  - right to rely on individual acts not relied on for the purposes of the confirmation proceedings 107-8
- right to adequate time for the preparation of the defence (ICC 67(1)(b))
  - applicability to pre-trial phase of proceedings 108
  - travaux préparatoires* 104
- Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 3 (command responsibility) 92-348**
- dissenting conclusions
  - failure to identify any error in the Trial Chamber’s findings or any unreasonableness in the overall conclusions 110, 245
- introduction (points of dissent from the majority) 94, 109-38
  - failure to submit the matter to the competent authorities 110
- A. “appellant took all necessary and reasonable measures” (ICC 28(b)(iii))
  - dissenting conclusion, summary of grounds for 138
  - errors in majority’s findings (overview)
    - continued commission of crimes throughout 2002-3 CAR Operation/appellant’s knowledge of 110
    - failure to engage in any meaningful way with the Trial Chamber’s factual findings or demonstrate awareness of the evidence 112
    - failure to suggest resolutions based on its own examination of the evidence in relation to a number of issues on which it expressed doubt 111-12
    - finding that measures taken “were limited in mandate, execution, and/or results” 110
    - implementation of modified standard of review as demonstration of its incompatibility with achievement of justice 112
    - misconstruction of the nature of criminal liability under ICC 28 111
    - patent failure of measures to match appellant’s extensive material ability to prevent the crimes 110
    - “reasonable”/“necessary”, as a matter of evidence to be determined on a case-by-case basis 114
    - subjective view of Trial Chamber’s reasoning not justified by the Conviction Decision 111
    - uncritical acceptance of appellant’s unsubstantiated arguments 111
  - errors in majority’s findings (assessment of the material impact on the decision of errors it had identified)
    - adoption of appellant’s narrow focus 137
    - failure to assess the findings and evidence supporting the Trial Chamber’s decision 137
    - failure to reach a conclusion in areas of doubt 137
    - limitation of position to expression of “certain doubts” 137
    - misapplication of the standard of review 137
  - errors in majority’s findings (failure to empower other MLC officials)
    - absence of challenge from the appellant 127
    - majority’s misreading of Conviction Decision 127
  - errors in majority’s findings (lack of adequate notice)
    - appellant’s authority and control over MLC troop deployment 133-4

***Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 3 (command responsibility) (cont.)***

- need to address every item of evidence relevant to a particular factual finding, whether 133-5
- sharing of information with the CAR authorities 134-5
- errors in majority's findings (letter to the CAR Prime Minister) 119-21
  - failure to refer to a specific witness testimony, relevance 120
  - majority's failure to assess truth of unchallenged claim that the letter had been sent 120-1
  - need to address every item of evidence relevant to a particular factual finding, whether 120
- errors in majority's findings (motivation) 121-5
  - majority's determination that the Trial Chamber erred in not taking appellant's motivation into account, counter evidence 123-5
  - majority's speculative language imputing a reasoning not apparent from the plain wording of the decision 121-3
- errors in majority's findings (number of crimes committed) 128-33
- errors in majority's findings (purported limitations on appellant's ability to order investigations) 115-19
  - absence of any effort by appellant to substantiate his argument 118
  - erroneous application of the accepted standard of appellate review 115
  - need to address every item of evidence relevant to a particular factual finding, whether 118-19
  - scant regard to the findings and analysis of the Trial Chamber 115, 119
  - test for addressing evidence ("significant" vs "of such importance") 118-19
  - uncritical acceptance of appellant's submissions on the facts 115-18
- errors in majority's findings (scope of assessment) 113-15
  - apparent adoption of "serious doubts" approach 115
  - approval of elements of majority's approach 113-15
  - unfounded criticism of Trial Chamber for not specifically identifying what a commander should have done 114-15
- errors in majority's findings (shortcomings in measures taken by the appellant)
  - misreading of Trial Chamber's finding/misunderstanding of ICC 28 criminal liability 125-6
  - majority's failure to provide its own list of what a commander should have done 155
- B. "lack of effective control"
  1. overview of the Trial Chamber's findings 138-42
  2. conflation of the concepts of "effective control" and "overall command" (error of law)
    - appellant's attempt to distinguish "effective control" and "overall command" 142-3
    - appellant's objection to Trial Chamber's application of a "checklist" of traditional criteria" to cross-border operations 144-5
    - dissenting conclusion (absence of error in Trial Chamber's finding/rejection of appellant's arguments) 145
    - transfer of operational control to the CAR authorities, appellant's challenge to Trial Chamber's view 143
    - Trial Chamber's definition of "effective control"/appellant's acceptance of 142
  3. appellant's "operational control" over MLC troops in the CAR
    - a. assistance by the MLC General Staff 145-8
    - b. MLC forces' independent operation 148-50
    - c. appellant's issuance of orders, significance 150-3
    - d. conclusion 153-4

4. remaining indicia of control
  - a. responsibility for MLC's deployment to the CAR 154-6
  - b. appellant's contact with commanders/receipt of operations and intelligence reports 156-60
  - c. provision of logistical support 160-2
  - d. appellant's retention of primary disciplinary authority 162-3
  - e. appellant's representation of MLC forces in external matters 163-5
  - f. appellant's order to MLC troops to withdraw 165-8
5. conclusion ("not unreasonable" for Trial Chamber to conclude) 168
- C. "evidence dismissed or ignored" 168-96
  1. 2001 intervention 168-71
  2. contested items
    - a. relevant part of the Conviction Decision 171-2
    - b.i. manner of questioning of CHM1 172-4
    - b.ii. General Gambi's rank 174-6
    - b.iii. Document EVD-T-D04-00066/CAR-D04-0003-0137 176-8
    - b.iv. Document EVD-T-D04-00069/CAR-D04-0003-0140 176-9
    - b.v. Document EVD-T-D04-00065/CAR-D04-0003-0136 179-80
    - b.vi. Document EVD-T-D04-00063/CAR-D04-0003-0133 180-1
    - b.vii. Document EVD-T-D04-00058/CAR-D04-0003-0128 181-2
    - b.viii. Document EVD-T-D04-00059/CAR-D04-0003-0129 182-3
    - b.ix. eight Documents dated January or February 2003 183-4
    - b.x. Documents EVD-T-D04-00075/CAR-D04-0003-0141 and EVD-T-D04-00064/CAR-D04-0003-0134 184-5
    - b.xi. overall conclusion in relation to the contested items ("not unreasonable" for Trial Chamber to conclude) 185
  3. expert witness General Jacques Seara 185-6
  4. CHM1's evidence on command 186-92
  5. evidence of Witness P36 192-6
  6. conclusion ("not unreasonable" for Trial Chamber to conclude) 196
- D. "appellant did not have actual knowledge of the alleged crimes" (ICC 22(a)(i))
  1. introduction (arguments on the required mental element) 196
  - 2.a. as legal error 196-211
    - 2.a.i relevant part of the impugned decision 197-8
    - 2.a.ii analysis 198-201
      - direct or circumstantial knowledge, acceptability of either 200
      - "knew"/"should have known", distinguishability 198-201
      - modification of the legal characterization of facts (Regulation 55), consequences 199
      - proximity of commander, relevance 200-1
      - requirement ("knew, or owing to the circumstances at the time, should have known" (ICC 28(a)(i))) 198-201
  - 2.b. evidence erroneously ignored 201-6
    - summary of appellant's arguments 201
    - denials of the commission of crimes allegedly reaching the appellant, relevance of Trial Chamber's failure to address directly 202
    - "full and reasoned statement of . . . findings on the evidence and conclusion"/procedural error (ICC 74(5) requirement) 201-2
    - need for clarity on facts found to have been established beyond reasonable doubt and on assessment of relevant evidence 200-1
    - need to establish significance of any omitted reasons 201-2
    - reasons for treatment of President Patassé's evidence 203-4

***Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 3 (command responsibility) (cont.)***

- Trial Chamber's treatment of D19's evidence, reasons for 202-3
- Trial Chamber's treatment of the Mondonga Inquiry and "Bomengo case file" 204
- Trial Chamber's treatment of Sibut Mission's findings/P15 and D21's evidence on 205
- Trial Chamber's treatment of the Zongo Commission's report 204-5
- 3. alleged failure of facts as found by the Trial Chamber to support finding of knowledge 206-20
  - summary of Trial Chamber's findings/appellant's challenge 206
  - 3.a.i. relevant part of the impugned decision 206-7
  - 3.a.ii. analysis 207-11
    - appellant's claim (Trial Chamber's alleged dependence on RFI syndicated reports) 207
    - alleged disregard of Sibut Mission's evidence on RFI's false reporting 210-11
    - alleged false reporting by RFI 208-9
    - MLC Communication Logs, sufficiency to corroborate claim that RFI allegations were generally viewed with suspicion 210
    - range of international media sources relied on by the Trial Chamber 207-8
    - rejection of appellant's claims 211
    - relevance of the "ignored testimony" of D49, D21 and P33 209-10
  - 3.b. Trial Chamber's reliance on the Mongoumba attack as misstatement of the evidence 211-15
    - 3.b.i. relevant part of the impugned decision 211-12
    - 3.b.ii. analysis 212-15
      - appellant's principal allegation (impossibility of any reasonable trial chamber concluding that this finding was the only reasonable conclusion) 212-13
      - basis for the Trial Chamber's decision 213-14
      - Trial Chamber's inferences, whether reasonable 214-15
    - 3.c.i. relevant part of the impugned decision 215-16
    - 3.c.ii. analysis 216-20
      - appellant's argument (Trial Chamber's treatment of murder, rape and pillage together/ failure to consider information contradicting reports of MLC crimes) 216
      - appellant's selective approach to the evidence 217
      - conclusion ("not unreasonable" for Trial Chamber to conclude) 220
      - credibility of RFI's reporting 218-19
      - required detail of knowledge (ICC 28/ICTY jurisprudence) 216-17
      - Trial Chamber's alleged failure to consider evidence casting doubt on appellant's knowledge of murders 219-20
      - Trial Chamber's reliance on intelligence reports/presumption that appellant had received them 219
      - Trial Chamber's reliance on report of appellant's response to the FIDH report on war crimes in the CAR 219
- E. "finding on causation is invalid" 220-45
  - 1. relevant part of the Conviction Decision 221-2
  - 2. failure to define the applicable standard 222-4
    - absence of a definition of "result of" (ICC 28(a)), relevance 223-4
    - applicability of "full and reasoned statement" obligation to factual and legal findings 222-3
    - effects 222-4
    - jurisprudence (ECHR 6 (fair trial)) 223

- jurisprudence (international criminal courts and tribunals) 223
- obligation to provide “a full and reasoned statement of the Trial Chamber’s findings” (ICC 74(5)) 222-3
- 3. conflation of legal elements and “causation” 224-30
  - causation in case of an omission 229-30
  - 3.a. overall construction of ICC 28(a) 224-30
    - “result of”/causation interrelationship 224-30
  - 3.b. conflation of causation and “necessary and reasonable measures” (ICC 28(a)) 230-1
- 4. Trial Chamber’s alleged misstatement of the evidence and its findings 231-45
  - 4.a. findings related to compensation of MLC troops 232-3
  - 4.b. findings related to training regime of MLC soldiers 233-5
  - 4.c. findings related to the MLC Code of Conduct 235-7
  - 4.d. findings related to the supervision of MLC soldiers 237-8
  - 4.e. findings related to the punishment of MLC troops 238-42
  - 4.f. findings related to the withdrawal of MLC troops 242-5
- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 4 (“contextual elements were not established”)*** 279-305
  - A. Trial Chamber’s alleged error in relation to the *mens rea* requirement for crimes against humanity 279-91
    - 1. parties’ submission 279-80
    - 2. analysis
      - EOC (ICC 7 material elements) 280
      - EOC (knowledge of widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population requirement) 280
      - ICC 28 (*mens rea* requirements specific to commanders) 281
      - “knew, should have known or consciously disregarded information that their subordinates were committing crimes” (ICC 28(b)(i)) 281
      - “with knowledge of the attack” (ICC 7(1)) 280
  - B. Trial Chamber’s alleged error in finding that there was an organizational policy 281-99
    - 1.a. link between any policy and the MLC 281-4
      - 1.b.i. failure to substantiate findings on deliberate failure to prevent 284-5
      - 1.b.ii. failure to properly address contradictory evidence 285-6
    - 2. *modus operandi* 286-90
    - 3. reliance on general motives 290-2
    - 4. reliance on pillaging to prove a policy to commit an ICC 7(1) attack 292-5
    - 5. significance of orders to exercise vigilance and use force against civilians 295-7
    - 6. reliance on factors not available on the evidence 297-9
    - 7. conclusion 299
  - C. Trial Chamber’s alleged error in its consideration of pillage 299-305
    - 1. error in its legal interpretation of the war crime of pillage
      - definition of the law 299-303: *see also* looting/pillage, prohibition (ICC 8(2)(b)(xvi)/ICC 8(2)(e)(v))
      - parties’ arguments 299-300
    - 2. application of the concept of “private or personal use” 304-5
      - conclusion (appellant’s failure to demonstrate that Trial Chamber III’s decision did not meet the no reasonable Trial Chamber test) 304-5
      - parties’ arguments (appellant) 303, 304-5
      - parties’ arguments (Prosecutor) 304-5
      - Trial Chamber III’s findings “beyond reasonable doubt” 303-4

- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 5 (Trial Chamber “erred in its approach to identification evidence”)** 305-21
- A. Trial Chamber’s alleged failure to deliver a reasoned judgment as to the identities of the perpetrators of rape and pillage 305-21
    1. cumulative assessment of identification criteria 305-13  
 conclusion (appellant’s misrepresentation of the facts) 306-7  
 parties’ arguments (appellant) 305-6  
 parties’ arguments (Prosecutor/victims) 305
    2. rape of P22 and uniforms of attackers (appellant’s failure to justify his claim) 307-8
    3. treatment of evidence of the attackers’ language  
 analysis and conclusion (appellant’s failure to justify his claims) 308-11  
 parties’ arguments 308
    4. reliability of other identification criteria, analysis and conclusions  
 alleged insufficiency of reliance on witnesses’ identification 312  
 “exclusive presence” of MLC troops in a given area 312  
*modus operandi* and general motive 313  
 uniforms 311-12
    5. reliability of other identification criteria, parties’ arguments 11
  - B. Trial Chamber’s alleged failure to deliver reasoned judgment on identities of the perpetrators of murder 313-15
    1. murder of P87’s “brother” 313-15
    2. murder of P69’s “sister” 315
  - C. alleged alteration of dates to fit the MLC’s movements 315-21
    1. rape of P68 and P68’s sister-in-law  
 analysis and conclusion (appellant’s failure to demonstrate any error in the Trial Chamber’s overall conclusion) 317  
 parties’ arguments 315  
 Trial Chamber’s findings 315-17
    2. two unidentified girls aged 12 or 13 in Bangui  
 analysis and conclusion (appellant’s failure to demonstrate any error in the Trial Chamber’s overall conclusion) 319  
 parties’ arguments 318  
 Trial Chamber’s findings 318-19
    3. woman in the bush outside PK22  
 analysis and conclusion (appellant’s failure to demonstrate any error in the Trial Chamber’s overall conclusion) 321  
 parties’ arguments 319  
 Trial Chamber’s findings 320
- Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 6 (“other procedural errors invalidate the conviction”), A. reliance on the evidence of P169, P178 and the 19 CAR Witnesses**
1. issue on appeal  
 margin of deference, applicability 322  
 parties’ arguments (appellant) 321-2
  2. reliance on testimony of P169 and P178  
 appellant’s allegations, failure to substantiate 322-7
  - 2.a. lack of sufficient information  
 appellant’s unfounded assertion that the Trial Chamber had failed to order proper investigations 322-3
  - 2.b. superficial credibility analysis (appellant’s failure to substantiate) 328-9



- 2.c. failure to address (appellant's failure to substantiate) 329-30
- 2.d. conclusion (appellant's failure to demonstrate abuse of discretion) 321-3, 348
- 2.e. other reasons to reject the testimony of P169 and P178 (appellant's failure to substantiate) 330-2
- 3. reliance on testimony of 19 CAR Witnesses (appellant's failure to substantiate) 332-3
- Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 6 ("other procedural errors invalidate the conviction"), B. legal representative of victims' involvement** 333-48
  - 1. procedural background and submissions 333-5
  - 2.a. allegedly unconstrained questioning by the victims' representatives 335-40
    - appropriateness of questions 339-40
    - authorization of questions (Rule 91(3)(a)/ICC 68(3)) 337-9
    - conclusion (rejection of appellant's arguments) 340
    - modalities of victims' participation (Rule 91(3)) 334-7
    - "personal interests" 336-7
    - victims' right to present their views and concerns where their personal interests are affected (ICC 68(3)) 335-40
  - 2.b. cross-examination of the defence witnesses 340-8
    - 2.b.i. leading questions 341-2
      - failure to make contemporaneous objections, effect 341-2
    - 2.b.ii. use of lengthy extracts from testimony 342-3
    - 2.b.iii. repetitive questions 343-5
    - 2.b.iv. uneven approach of the victims' representatives 345-6
    - 2.b.v. conclusion (rejection of appellant's arguments) 346
  - 2.c. prejudice caused to appellant 346-8
    - 2.c.i. expeditiousness of the proceedings 346-7
    - 2.c.ii. reliance on evidence led by the victims' representatives 347-8
  - 2.d. conclusion 347-8
- Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), standard of review (factual errors) (margin of deference) ("conventional standard")** 95-102
  - acceptance by all international criminal law courts/tribunals 94-5
  - advantages of 96
  - applicability of principles and rules of international law as interpreted in its previous decisions (ICC 21(2)) 93-6
  - inappropriateness of any different standard of review 95
  - Lubanga* as model 94-5
  - predictability of the law considerations 95
  - roles of Trial Chamber and Appeals Chamber compared 95-7
- Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), standard of review (factual errors) (margin of deference) ("conventional standard"), criticism of majority's departure from**
  - failure to give required margin of deference 96-7
  - obligation to overturn Trial Chamber's findings in case of reasonable doubt, conflict with "material effect" requirement 98
  - removal of substantiation of errors requirement/confusion with pre-conviction burden of proof 100-1
  - risk of miscarriage of justice test, need for explanation of 97
  - "serious doubts" test, incompatibility with

**Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), standard of review (factual errors) (margin of deference) ("conventional standard"), criticism of majority's departure from** (*cont.*)

- margin of deference 98
- material effect on the decision requirement 101-2

**Bemba (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Van den Wyngaert and Morrison JJ (separate opinion))** 348-79

- I. introduction (difficulties attaching to ICC interpretation)
  - "constructive ambiguities" 349
  - unresolved issues from the drafting stage 349
- II. concerns about the evidence and opacity of the reasoning of the Conviction Decision 349-56
  - opacity of Conviction Decision/multiplicity of cross-references 351
    1. hearsay and anonymous hearsay 351-2
      - judicial role (protection of the rule of law), Appeals Chamber members' differences of view 350-1
    2. large amount of circumstantial evidence/disregard for the "beyond reasonable doubt" standard 353-5
      - absence of ruling on admissibility 355-6
- III. concerns about the definition of the scope of the charges
  - "decision shall not exceed the facts and circumstances described in the charges and any amendments to the charges" (ICC 74(2)) 356-61
- IV. definition of "command responsibility" (ICC 28) 361-70
  1. general approach 361
  2. concept of command responsibility 361-3
    - limitation of duty to necessary and reasonable measures/strict liability distinguished 362, 363
  3. *mens rea*/knowledge/recharacterization of the charges 363-70
    - 3.a. "knew, should have known or consciously disregarded information that their subordinates were committing crimes" (ICC 28(b)(i)), distinguishability 364-5
      - recharacterization of the charges 364-5
    - 3.b. concept of knowledge (ICC 28)
      - knowledge *ex ante* and knowledge *ex post facto* distinguished 366-7
      - "unconvinced knowledge" 365-6
    - 3.c. imprecision/insufficient evidentiary base for charges and findings in relation to appellant's knowledge 367-9
  4. causation ("as a result of") 369-70
- V. acts as crimes against humanity 370-7
  1. requirements of a widespread attack and of multiple commission 370-7
  2. failure to establish policy requirement 375-7
- VI. conclusion 377-9

**Bemba (compensation and damages (ICC 85))** 532-62

- I. background and procedural history 528-32; *see also Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (background), 3. procedural history in date order
- II. general remarks
  - arrested or convicted person's enforceable right to compensation (ICC 85) 533-4
  - criticism of language and tone of appellant's Counsel (Code of Professional Conduct for Counsel) 532-3, 535-6
  - two-pronged nature of claim 533

- III. component 1 (compensation for a grave and manifest miscarriage of justice (ICC 85(3))) (background/procedural matters/preliminary considerations) 533-43
- introduction
- Chamber as appeal court, exclusion 539
  - “compensated according to law” (ICC 85(2)) vs “compensation, according to the criteria . . . in the Rules” 534-5
  - request for compensation (Rule 173(2)), time limit 535
  - responsibility for determining the existence of 533
  - time limit for submission of request (Rule 173(2)) 535
- appellant’s criticisms of the Appeal Judgment
- grievances dismissed as matters already discussed 542-3
  - grievances submitted for the first time, limitation of eligibility to matters pertaining to ICC 85(3)/excluded matters 543-4
- appellant’s criticisms of the Appeal Judgment/Chamber’s responses
- conformity of Appeals Chamber’s approach with normal appeals procedure 539-41
  - minority judges’ criticism of Appeals Chamber’s judgment, effect 540-1
  - as a revisiting of issues already dealt with 539-40
- parties’ arguments (appellant)
- i. Prosecutor’s alleged violation of the duty to act impartially following the decision on the confirmation of the charges 535
  - ii. Trial Chamber’s alleged “negligent mismanagement” of the case 536-7
  - iii. alleged excessive scope of the legal representatives of victims’ (the “LRVs”) involvement 537
  - iv. alleged “industrial falsification” of victims’ applications 538
  - v. alleged “sub-standard and unacceptable quality” of the Trial Judgment 538
  - vi. alleged excessive duration of the proceedings in the Main Case 538
- parties’ arguments (Prosecutor) 538-9
- III. component 1 (compensation for a grave and manifest miscarriage of justice (ICC 85(3))) (Chamber’s analysis and determination) (“grave and manifest miscarriage of justice”)
- Chamber’s decision (rejection of claim) 555
- definitions/qualification as
- admissible/excluded matters 543-5
  - definitions 549
  - qualification as/high threshold/“exceptional” 549-50
- determination
- violation of right to an expeditious trial as sole grievance meeting exceptional scenario standard 550
- interpretation principles/aids
- ACHR 551
  - “applicable treaties and . . . principles and rules of international law” 550-5
  - “consisten[cy] with internationally recognised human rights” 550-5
  - general principles of law derived from national law of legal systems of the world 550, 555
  - Ngudjolo* 535, 539, 541, 543-4, 546, 547-50
  - as novelty/sole example 544
  - opposition to provision/adoption of restrictions as compromise 547-9
  - “compensated according to law” (ICC 85(2)) vs “shall be awarded” (ICC 85(2)) vs “compensation, according to the criteria . . . in the Rules” 547-9
- purpose (provision of full range of guarantees against serious violations of fundamental right to a fair trial) 544

**Bemba (compensation and damages (ICC 85))** (*cont.*)

sources

international human rights treaties 544-6

national legislation 546

*travaux préparatoires* 543-4, 547-8, 549

IV. component 2 (compensation for damage caused to assets frozen and seized/failure to manage them properly)

parties' arguments (appellant)

allegations 555-6

Chamber's inherent power/UNCITRAL arbitration as alternatives 556

parties' arguments (Prosecutor)

incompatibility of claim with Statute 556

parties' arguments (Registry)

Court's dependence on States to execute requests concerning assets 556

obligation limited to follow-up with States on their execution in accordance with the applicable legal framework 556

IV. component 2 (compensation for damage caused to assets frozen and seized/failure to manage them properly), Chamber's determination

appellant's claim as a "private law claim alleging tortious behaviour by the ICC" not dependent on ICC 85(3) 558

absence of jurisdiction 558-9

excessive length of proceedings/fundamental right to a fair trial 560-2

absence of provision in the Statute making compensation for breach possible 561-2

Chamber's recommendation for amendment to the Statute 562

ICCPR 14(3)(c)/ECHR 6(1)/ACHR 8(1)/ACHPR 7(1)(d) compared 560 n. 142

right to be tried without undue delay (ICC 67(1)(c)) 560-2

execution of requests

Pre-Trial Chamber's powers and responsibilities (ICC 57(3)(e)/ICC 93(1)(k)) 557

Registry as the channel of communication between the Chamber issuing requests for cooperation and the requested States (Rule 176(2)) 557

State's primary responsibility for 556, 557-8

"inherent powers"

definition 559

purpose (*Nuclear Tests Case*) 559-60

rejection of proposal 559-60

rejection of proposal that States freezing appellant's assets should become

"participants" in the proceedings 560

**Bemba (Final Decision on reparations) (ICC 75) (3 August 2018)** 520-7

acknowledgement of victims 522-4

appreciation of efforts of all parties and participants 524-6

limitation of reparations order to convicted persons (ICC 75(1))/justification for a Final Decision on 521

principles on reparations (ICC 75(1)), decision not to issue 527

TFV's assistance mandate 526-7

**Canada**

consular immunity from jurisdiction (VCCR 43)

commercial activity exception (SIA 5), exclusion 571-3

Federal Courts Act 1985 by section

26 (general original jurisdiction) 565

Labour Code 1985 by section

- 244 (enforcement of orders) 566-7, 573  
 service of process on foreign State or State agency [out of the jurisdiction] (including State immunity issues)  
 waiver, requirements  
   explicit, unequivocal and certain terms 570-1  
   waiver by the State/authorized representative 570-1  
*Zakbary* 569-71  
 State immunity: *see* State Immunity Act 1980 (Canada) by section
- command responsibility (war crimes/crimes against humanity)**  
 concept  
   commander's place in the hierarchy, relevance 362  
   dependence on circumstances 361-3  
 cross-border operations and 144-5  
 ICC Statute (ICC 28) 59-91, 105, 106, 109-245, 361-9: *see also Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Eboe-Osuji J (concurring)); *Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 3 (command responsibility); *Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 6 ("other procedural errors invalidate the conviction"); *Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Van den Wyngaert and Morrison JJ (separate opinion))  
 causation/"as a result of" (ICC 28(a)) 220-31, 369-70, 440-55  
 duty to take "all necessary and reasonable measures" (ICC 28(a)) 23-4, 485-6  
   limitation of duty to necessary and reasonable measures/strict liability distinguished 80, 362, 363, 457, 476-8  
*mens rea* 196-220, 279-91: *see also Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 3 (command responsibility), D. "appellant did not have actual knowledge of the alleged crimes" (ICC 28(2)(i))  
 EOC (knowledge of widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population requirement) 280  
 ICC 28 (*mens rea* requirements specific to commanders) 281  
 "knew, should have known or consciously disregarded information that their subordinates were committing crimes" (ICC 28(b)(i)), distinguishability 281, 364-5  
   knowledge *ex ante* and knowledge *ex post facto* distinguished 366-7  
   recharacterization of the charges 364-5  
   "unconvinced knowledge" 365-6  
   "with knowledge of the attack" (ICC 7(1)) 280  
   required detail of knowledge 216-17
- command responsibility (war crimes/crimes against humanity), jurisprudence**  
*AFRC* 81, 144, 150, 157 n. 338, 163  
*Aleksowski* 79, 200  
*Bagosora and Nsengiyumva* 161, 164  
*Bemba* 59-91, 105, 106, 109-245, 361-70: *see also Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (Merits) (ground 3 (command responsibility)); *Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 3 (command responsibility)  
*Bemba et al.* 120, 145, 171, 172, 201-2  
*Blaskić* 79, 163, 228

**command responsibility (war crimes/crimes against humanity), jurisprudence (cont.)**

- Boškoski and Tarčulovski* 68, 74-5, 84  
*Čelibići* 79, 161, 163, 164, 200, 201  
*Dorđević* 84  
*DRC* 225  
*Furundžija* 223  
*Galić* 200  
*Gbagbo* 68  
*Hadžihasanović and Kubura* 68, 157 n. 338, 161, 223, 228  
*Halilović* 68, 79, 84, 163, 228  
*Kaing Guek Eav* 84  
*Karadžić* 79, 80  
*Kordić and Cerkez* 164, 228  
*Krmojelac* 157 n. 338, 163, 164, 201, 216  
*Lubanga* 88, 200, 227-8  
*Mladić* 68  
*Mpambara* 227  
*Ndindiliyimana* 150, 164  
*Nikola Sainović* 223  
*Nikolić* 223  
*Nizeyimana* 150  
*Ntabakuze* 201  
*Ntaganda* 68  
*Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphân* 84, 223  
*Orić* 84, 164, 228  
*Pagett* 229  
*Perišić* 120, 150, 163  
*Popović* 228  
*Prlić* 133  
*Renzaho* 80  
*RUF* 84  
*Strugar* 73-4, 80, 84, 157 n. 338, 163, 237, 244  
*Tadić* 227  
*Taxquet v. Belgium* 223

**consular immunity from jurisdiction (VCCR 43)**

“commercial activity exception”, exclusion 571-3

**crimes against humanity, definition/classification as/requirements**

- motivation of alleged perpetrator, relevance 84-5, 89, 90-1, 121-5  
 multiple commission of [impugned] acts . . . against any civilian population  
   pursuant to or in furtherance of a State or organizational policy (ICC 7(2)(a)) 375-7,  
   491-2  
 widespread or systematic policy, *Bemba* 371-5

**Elements of Crimes (EOC):** *see* ICC (jurisdiction, admissibility and applicable law) (ICC Part 2), Elements of Crimes (ICC 9) (EOC)

**fair trial (international criminal tribunals)**

evidential rulings, importance to 497-500

**family/private life, respect for, justified restrictions/interference by public authority, grounds/requirements (ACHR 11(2)/ACHR 17/ECHR 8(2)/ICCPR 17)**

- “in accordance with the law”/“prescribed by law” 612-14  
 “proportionate to the legitimate aim” 615-17

**family/private life, respect for, justified restrictions/interference by public authority (ACHR 11(2)/ACHR 17, ECHR 8(2), ICCPR 17), jurisprudence**

- Al Nashif* 613, 614
- Gillan and Quinton* 612-14
- Kardi* 612, 615-17
- Lupsa* 612-14
- Malone* 612-14
- Mayaya* 615
- MS and MBT* 612-18
- N* 615

**ICC (appeal and revision (ICC 81-5))**

- compensation, arrested or convicted person's enforceable right to (ICC 85) 532-62
- “compensated according to law” (ICC 85(2)) vs “compensation, according to the criteria . . . in the Rules” 534-5
- designated Chamber as appeal court, exclusion 539
- grave and manifest miscarriage of justice as ground (ICC 85(3)) 533-62
- admissible/excluded matters 543-5
  - classification as/high threshold/“exceptional” 549-50
  - definitions 549
  - interpretation “consistent with internationally recognised human rights” 550-5
  - responsibility for determining the existence of 535
  - time limit for submission of request (Rule 173(2)) 535
  - travaux préparatoires* 543-4
- jurisprudence
  - Bemba* 532-55
  - Ngudjolo* 535, 539, 541, 543, 546, 547-50
- jurisprudence (ICTR)
  - Rwamakuba* 548
  - Zigiranyirazo* 548
- as novelty/sole example 544
- purpose (provision of full range of guarantees against serious violations of fundamental right to a fair trial) 544
- sources
  - international human rights treaties 544-6
  - national legislation 546
- text 533-4
- travaux préparatoires* (opposition to compensation proposal) 547-8, 549
  - adoption of restrictions as compromise 547-9
  - “compensated according to law” (ICC 85(2)) vs “shall be awarded” (ICC 85(2)) vs “compensation, according to the criteria . . . in the Rules” 547-9
- grounds of appeal (ICC 81(1)(b))/standard of review: *see also* ICC (trial (ICC 62-76)), standard of proof (“beyond reasonable doubt” (ICC 66(3)))
  - “any other ground that affects the fairness or reliability of the proceedings or decision” (ICC 81(1)(b)(iv)) 35-6, 333-48
  - appellant's obligation to set out how the proceedings were unfair/how this affected the reliability of the decision 247
  - Bemba* 35-6, 333-48: *see also Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III's judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 6 (“other procedural errors invalidate the conviction”)
  - exclusion of a *de novo* review 247
  - Lubanga* 247
  - modalities of victims' participation (Rule 91(3)) 334-7

**ICC (appeal and revision (ICC 81-5))** (*cont.*)

- “personal interests” 336-7
- victims’ right to present their views and concerns where their personal interests are affected (ICC 68(3)) 335-40
- Appeals Chamber’s right to reverse or amend the impugned decision, or order a new trial in case of non-compliance with ICC 83(2) 35-6
- error of fact (determination of compliance with “beyond reasonable doubt” standard)
  - Appeals Chamber’s margin of deference to Trial Chamber 29-30, 38-9, 95-102, 322, 394-401, 403-13
  - Appeals Chamber’s right of intervention, factors justifying/not justifying 29-30
  - clear and unassailable findings, need for 32
  - obligation to overturn Trial Chamber’s findings in case of reasonable doubt/ substitution of Appeals Chamber’s own factual findings distinguished 22, 32, 38, 98
  - reasonableness test 30-1, 401-3
- error of law (ICC 81(1)(b)(iii)) 28-9
  - Appeals Chamber’s independence of assessment 29
  - “conviction exceeded the charges” 39-59
  - importance of Trial Chamber’s reasoning to an understanding of the legal and factual basis for decision 33
- error of law (ICC 81(1)(b)(iii)), failure to provide “a full and reasoned statement of [its] findings on the evidence and conclusions” (ICC 74(5)) 33-5, 417-19
  - importance of Trial Chamber’s reasoning to an understanding of the legal and factual basis for decision 33
  - need to address all arguments, whether 34, 208-311
  - remedies in case of a finding of non-compliance 34-5
- error of law (ICC 81(1)(b)(iii)), jurisprudence
  - Delalić* 309
  - ECtHR jurisprudence, importance 33
  - Hadjianastassiou* 33
  - Halilović* 309
  - Kalimanzira* 309
  - Kenyatta* OA5 Judgment 32-3
  - Kvočka* 309, 394-5
  - Lubanga* 32-3, 309
  - Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphân* 309
  - Perišić* 35
  - Ruto et al.* OA Judgment 32-3
  - Simba* 309
- procedural error 28-9, 32-5
  - material effect of error on the decision or sentence, need for
    - ECtHR jurisprudence, importance 33
  - substantiation of errors requirement at appeal stage and pre-conviction burden of proof distinguished 100-1
- standard of review, Appeals Chamber’s right to intervene (ICC 83(2)), limitation to finding of
  - material effect on the decision or sentence 28-9, 98, 194, 413-17
  - “materially affected”, definition 29, 32
  - miscarriage of justice 30, 35 n. 58, 97
  - unfairness affecting the reliability of the decision or sentence 28-9
- standard of review, jurisprudence
  - Bemba* 28-39, 94-102, 392-417: *see also Bemba*



- Bemba et al.* 30-1, 394, 395, 397  
*Fox v. Percy* 400-1  
*Lubanga* 28-30, 33, 94-5, 96, 97, 99-100, 395, 397-8  
*Ngudjolo* 28-9  
*Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphan* (ECCC) 31  
*Pendleton* 399-400  
*Stafford* 399-400
- ICC (Code of Professional Conduct for Counsel)** 532-3
- ICC (general)** 500-1
- interpretation
- consistency with contemporary practice 423-5
  - difficulties attaching to
    - “constructive ambiguities” 349
    - unresolved issues from the drafting stage 349
  - ordinary meaning of terms of treaty in their context and in the light of its object and purpose (VCLT 31(1)), *Bemba* 427-8
  - purposive approach (VCLT 31(1)) 425-9
  - treaty as a whole in context 428-9
  - purpose of ICC (“to guarantee lasting respect for and the enforcement of international justice”) (Preamble) 429
- ICC (international cooperation and judicial assistance (ICC Part 9))**
- execution of requests
- jurisprudence: *see also Bemba* (compensation and damages (ICC 85))
    - Al Bashir* 557
    - Bemba* 555-62
  - Pre-Trial Chamber’s powers and responsibilities (ICC 57(3)(e)/ICC 93(1)(k)) 557
  - Registry as the channel of communication between the Chamber issuing requests for cooperation and the requested States (Rule 176(2)) 557
  - State’s primary responsibility for 556, 557-8
- ICC (investigation and prosecution (ICC 53-61))**
- confirmation of charges (ICC 61)
- Pre-Trial Chamber’s task, parameters (ICC 61(7)) 107
  - purpose (separation out of cases and charges which should go to trial) 106-7
    - Mbarushimana* 106-7
- determination of charges, responsibility of Prosecutor for (ICC 58/ICC 61/ICC 74(2)) 104-5
- initiation and conduct of investigation (ICC 70)/Prosecutor’s responsibility for (ROC 161(5)) 323-4
- Prosecutor’s discretion in formulation of charges/possible approaches to (ICC 61(9)) 104-6, 429-39
- dealing with lacuna in ICC 61(9) 436-9
  - need for confirmation of Prosecutor’s request involving upgrading of a charge/adding a new one or for withdrawal of charges (ICC 61(11)) 432-4
  - relationship with ICC 74(2) (“shall not exceed the facts and circumstances”) 430
- right to adequate time for the preparation of the defence (ICC 67(1)(b)) 108
- applicability to pre-trial phase of proceedings 108
  - as limitation on Prosecutor’s right to rely on more detailed factual allegations 108
- right to receive detailed information of the charges promptly (ICC 67(1)(a)) 108-9
- Trial Chamber’s right to exercise any function of the Pre-Trial Chamber that is relevant (ICC 61(11)) 439
- ICC (jurisdiction, admissibility and applicable law) (ICC Part 2)**
- applicable law (ICC 21)

**ICC (jurisdiction, admissibility and applicable law) (ICC Part 2) (cont.)**

jurisprudence

*Bemba* 95-6, 492-504*Gbagbo* OA 6 95*Lubanga* 95

predictability of the law considerations 95

principles and rules of international law as interpreted in its previous decisions (ICC 21(2))

cautious approach to departure from precedent 93-6

Elements of Crimes (ICC 9) (EOC): *see also under individual headings*

interpretation “within the established framework of the international law of armed conflict” 300

purpose (“assist the Court in the interpretation and application of articles 6, 7 and 8”) 300 n. 1213

pillaging: *see* looting/pillage, prohibition (ICC 8(2)(b)(xvi)/ICC 8(2)(e)(v))**ICC (penalties (ICC 77-80))***Bemba* 92**ICC Regulations of the Court (ROC)**

52(b) (DCC, requirements: statement of facts/standard of review) 22-3, 25 n. 19, 46, 54, 102-3, 108, 356-7

53 (decision of Pre-Trial Chamber: 60-day deadline) 107 n. 44

55 (authority of the Chamber to modify the legal characterization of facts) 199

58(2) (appeal brief: requirements) 36-8

62(1) (additional evidence presented to the Appeals Chamber) 254

97 (communication with defence counsel) 270

101(2) restrictions on access to news and contact: Prosecutor’s right to request restrictions 270

101(3) restrictions on access to news and contact: detained person’s right to notification of Prosecutor’s request/right to challenge 270

**ICC (reparations (ICC 75))***Bemba* 520-7*Rutoll/Sang* 521**ICC (reparations order, requirements) (*Lubanga* model)**

limitation to convicted persons (ICC 75(1))/justification for a Final Decision on 521

**ICC Rules of Procedure and Evidence (2019)**

63(5) (non-applicability of national laws) 501

64 (procedure relating to the relevance or admissibility of evidence) 496-7

77 (inspection of material in possession or control of the Prosecutor) 257, 261-3

81(1) (restrictions on disclosure) 270

81(2) (authorization of non-disclosure of otherwise disclosable material on an *ex parte* basis) 259, 262-3, 267

121(3) (pre-confirmation hearing proceedings: provision of detailed description of charges and list of evidence to be presented at the hearing) 46, 107 n. 44

149 (applicability of the rules governing proceedings and the submission of evidence in the Pre-Trial and Trial Chambers to the Appeals Chamber) 253-4

165 (investigation, prosecution and trial) 257, 323

173(2) (request for compensation: time limit in case of notification of a grave and manifest miscarriage of justice) 535

**ICC (trial (ICC 62-76))**“decision shall not exceed the facts and circumstances described in the charges and any amendments to the charges” (ICC 74(2)) 21, 25 n. 19, 42-59, 99, 102-9, 356-61, 421-39, 463, 480, 533: *see also Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s

- judgment of 8 June 2018) (Merits) (ground 2 (“conviction exceeded the charges”)); *Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Eboe-Osuji J (concurring)); *Bemba* (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting))
- amendment of the indictment by the Trial Chamber/at any stage of the proceedings 420-39
  - admissible powers of the Trial Chamber 420-1
  - general principles of international criminal justice law, trend to allow amendment in certain circumstances 421
  - State practice 421-3
  - ICTY (*Akayesu*) 421
  - principle of congruence and 104
  - Prosecutor’s discretion in formulation of charges/possible approaches to, right to rely on individual acts not relied on for the purposes of the confirmation proceedings 107-8
  - travaux préparatoires* 103-4
  - standard of proof (“beyond reasonable doubt” (ICC 66(3))) 30-2, 401
  - circumstantial evidence, role 30-1
  - “must be convinced” 401
  - substitution of Appeals Chamber’s own views distinguished 32
  - Trial Chamber’s reasoning, importance 31-2
  - victims, Court’s right to permit their views and concerns to be presented (ICC 68(3)) 521
- IHRL (international human rights law)**
  - military necessity and 518-20
- international criminal law principles**
  - amendments to indictments at any stage of the proceedings, trend towards 421
- judicial role/function of the courts**
  - Bemba* 350-1
  - protection of the rule of law 350-1
- looting/pillage, prohibition (HR 47/GC IV:33): see also Bemba** (Appeal against Trial Chamber III’s judgment of 8 June 2018) (separate opinions) (Monageng and Hofmański JJ (dissenting)), ground 4 (“contextual elements were not established”), C. Trial Chamber’s alleged error in its consideration of pillage;
  - looting/pillage, prohibition (ICC 8(2)(b)(xvi)/ICC 8(2)(e)(v))
  - customary IHL/ICRC Rule 52 301-3
  - GC IV:33 provisions
    - absolute terms without exception or justification 301
    - ICRC Commentary on 301-2
  - HR 28/HR 47, absolute nature of prohibition 302
- looting/pillage, prohibition (ICC 8(2)(b)(xvi)/ICC 8(2)(e)(v))** 299-305
  - as a crime against humanity (ICC 8(2)(e)(v)) 300
  - as a war crime (ICC 8(2)(b)(xvi))/elements of
    - appropriation of property without the consent of the owner 300-1
    - customary international law 301
    - “[intention] to deprive the owner of the property and to appropriate it for private or personal use” 300-5

**looting/pillage, prohibition (ICC 8(2)(b)(xvi)/ICC 8(2)(e)(v))** (*cont.*)

- EOC *travaux préparatoires* 302-3
- international armed conflict requirement/exclusion of action justified by military necessity 300-1
- “private or personal use” as distinguishing factor between pillaging and lawful appropriations 302-3
- “within the established framework of international law” 300

**MS and MBT**

- introduction
- appeals
  - Administrative Court decision of 9 December 2016 (MS2 proceedings) 578
  - RLR policy (Restricted Leave Policy) 578
  - UT proceedings (decision of 4 September 2015) 578
- claimants
  - anonymity 579
  - profiles 579
  - requests (ILR) (indefinite leave to remain) 579
- Court’s disposal (dismissal of appeals) 632
- background (facts and procedural history in order of occurrence) (MBT)
  - i. MBT’s conviction in France of terrorism-related offences (19 January 1998) 599
  - ii. MBT’s arrival in the UK/request for asylum (13 May 1999) 500
  - iii. refusal of claim for asylum on RC 1F grounds (22 July 2004) 599-600
    - grant of six months’ discretionary leave, twice repeated 600
  - iv. application for further leave (30 July 2009) 600
    - SoS’s loss of/supply of copy (March 2011) 600
  - v. marriage of MBT, establishment of family with ILR and British citizenship 600
  - vi. application for ILR (6 November 2012)/issue of judicial review proceedings
    - complaining of delay 600
  - vii. rejection of ILR application/grant of six months’ restricted leave with conditions (21 August 2013) 600
  - viii. SoS’s refusal to relax conditions (1 October 2013) 600
  - ix. issue of judicial proceedings challenging 21 August 2013 decision (20 November 2013) 600
  - x. further extension of leave with conditions (20 March 2015) 600
- background (facts and procedural history in order of occurrence) (MS)
  - i. basis of application for asylum (risk of persecution in India as a Sikh) 597
    - rejection by SoS on grounds of support for terrorism pending determination of application 597
  - ii. SIAC proceedings (claim that MS was excluded from RC on terrorism grounds) 597-8
  - iii. SIAC determination (31 July 2000)
    - RC 1F exclusion 198
    - real risk of torture if returned to India/breach of ECHR 3 consequent on 598
  - iv. grant of one year’s “exceptional leave to remain” 598
  - v. grant of discretionary leave on a rolling six-month basis until 8 June 2005 598
  - vi. marriage to British citizen and establishment of a family 598
  - vii. application (7 June 2005) for ILR following 10 years’ lawful presence in the UK 598
  - viii. application for judicial review of continuing absence of a response to request for ILR (March 2014) 599

- ix. SoS's refusal of ILR application on Rule 322(5) grounds/grant of six months' restricted leave with conditions (2 May 2014) 599
- x. application for further leave to remain (30 October 2014) 599
- xi. grant of a further six months' restricted leave (15 January 2015) 599
- xii. evidence presented to the Court 599
- background (facts and procedural history in order of occurrence) (MS2 proceedings)
  - application for further leave to remain/ILR 602
  - refusal of request for ILR/grant of two years' RLR with conditions 602
  - proceedings
    - judgment (9 December 2016) (Collins J) upholding claim 603
    - MS's issue of judicial review proceedings (17 May 2016) 603
    - Order giving effect to judgment 603-4
    - parties' arguments 603
- background (facts and procedural history in order of occurrence) (UT proceedings)
  - findings (Part IV) (rejection of claim of unlawfulness of RLR) 601
  - findings (Part V) (MS1) (lawfulness of RLR)
    - finding for (1) (SoS's failure to consider length of time in the country) 601
    - finding for (2) (SoS's failure to consider request for permission to take a course of study) 601
  - refusal to quash the decision and order it to be retaken 600-1
  - rejection of challenge on most grounds 601
  - findings (Part VI) (MBT) (lawfulness of RLR), rejection of all the submissions 602
  - issues 600-1
- background (relevant domestic law: DL (discretionary leave) (2003))
  - applicability
    - period of discretionary leave 582
    - persons excluded but irremovable 582
    - persons irremovable for reasons other than ECHR 3 582
    - persons not entitled to humanitarian protection 582
  - features
    - eligibility for ILR 582
    - period of discretionary leave 582
    - "road blocks to settlement and to the further building up of private life" (*Kardi*) 596, 619
  - jurisprudence
    - Mayaya* 585
    - N* 583-4
- background (relevant domestic law: RLR (2015 Asylum Policy Instruction))
  - early versions
    - 2011 policy statement 585-7
    - 2012 "interim" Asylum Casework Instruction 587
  - jurisprudence
    - Gedi* 603
    - George* 596-7
    - Kardi* 594-6
- background (relevant domestic law: RLR (2015 Asylum Policy Instruction by section))
  - 578
  - 1.1-1.4 (purpose of instruction) 587-9
    - 1.1 (circumstances for considering granting RLR) 587
    - 1.1.2 provision of specific guidance on eligible persons, duration and conditions of leave, and an active review 587
  - 1.2 (background) 58

**MS and MBT** (*cont.*)

- 1.2.1 (background: *Exclusion under Article 1F of the Refugee Convention*) 589
- 1.2.2 (background: policy towards persons excluded but irremovable for ECHR reasons) 588
- 1.2.3 (applicability to persons with ECHR barrier to removal) 588
- 1.2.4 (ECHR 3 considerations outweighing public interest/exceptional circumstances test (qualified ECHR rights)) 588
- 1.2.5 (regular review with a view to removal as soon as possible/eligibility for settlement or citizenship as very exceptional) 588
- 1.3 (policy intention behind restricted leave) 588-9
- 4 (administration of the policy) 589-92
  - 4.2.1 (duration: reasons for limitation to six months) 589
  - 4.2.2 (duration: individual assessment) 588
  - 4.3 (recourse to public funds/NHS) 589
  - 4.4 (employment restriction) 589-90
  - 4.5.1 (residence restrictions: rationale for) 590
  - 4.5.2 (residence restrictions: standard conditions) 590
  - 4.6.1 (reporting restrictions: frequency) 590
  - 4.6.2 (reporting restrictions: presumption of regular reporting) 590
  - 4.7.1 (restrictions on studies: general prevention from undertaking a course) 590
  - 4.7.2 (restrictions on studies: rationale) 590
  - 4.10 (active review: scope) 590-1
  - 4.10.3 (active review: applicability to persons who enjoyed discretionary leave prior to the introduction of the policy) (text) 591
  - 4.12.1 (ILR application by persons excluded from the RC/Humanitarian Protection: requirements/case-by-case approach) 591
  - 4.12.2 (ILR application: grounds for refusal/consideration of a criminal conviction) 591
  - 4.12.3 (ILR application: right to rely on *N*) 591-2
  - 4.12.4 (ILR application: decision-makers' obligation to consider carefully whether the facts of individual cases are analogous to the specific facts in *N* and applicability of the principles in *N*) 592
  - 4.12.5 (ILR application: action in case of refusal) 592
- background (relevant domestic law: RLR (2015 Asylum Policy Instruction: RLR/ILR relationship (s 1.2.5/s 4.12.1))) 592-4
  - “in exceptional circumstances” likely to be “very rare” (s 1.2.5) vs “usually” be refused (s 4.12.1) 592-4
  - applicability of principles set out in *N* (s 4.12.4)/whether “exceptional” or “rare” 592
  - text of principles 592
  - interpretation of published policies, responsibility (Court vs relevant Minister) 592-3
  - Gangadeen* 593
  - Mandalia* 593
  - O* 593
  - Raissi* 593
- background (relevant domestic law: statutory background/the rules)
  - IA 3(1)(b) (non-patrial: leave to enter or remain in the UK for limited or indefinite period) 581
  - IA 3(1)(c) (non-patrial: conditions attach to leave to enter or remain) 581
  - IA 3(2) (regulations and control: Secretary of State's right to lay rules before Parliament) 581

- Immigration Rules (qualification as a rule) 581
- Immigration Rules 2017
  - r 322(5) (undesirability of permitting a person to remain: conduct including convictions, character or associations, threat to national security) 581-2
- background (relevant international law)
  - RC 1F (non-applicability of the Convention) 579-80
  - QD (EU Qualification Directive) 580
  - RC 33(2) (reasonable grounds for regarding as danger to national security) 580
    - ECHR 3 (expulsion to country where risk of breach of human rights including torture/inhuman treatment) 580-1
- issues on the appeals
  - Collins J's permission to SoS to appeal on ten grounds 604
  - MBT 604
  - MS 604
- issues on the appeals (A), challenge to RLR policy 604, 605-18
  1. *ultra vires* ground ("subject to" (IA 3(1)(c)), alleged effect (to make any breach of conditions necessarily lead to removal)) 605
    - consequential non-applicability to irremovable persons 605-6
    - Court's decision 605-6
    - UT rejection of claimed construction of IA 3(1)(c) 605
  2. *Alvi* ground (failure to lay January 2015 Instruction before Parliament as allegedly required by IA 3(2)) 606-11
    - Court's decision 612
    - dependence on distinction between "rules" and other instructions or statements of policy/case-by-case approach 606-11
    - extracts (*Alvi*) 606-7
    - extracts (*Fakih*) 611
    - extracts (*Mumir*) 607-8
    - extracts (UT) 609
    - summary of the arguments (UT) 608
  3. fettering decision (dismissal as involving essentially the same considerations as the *Alvi* ground) 612
  4. ECHR 8 ground (respect for private and family life, home and correspondence) 612-18
  - 4.i. ECHR rights: common ground (liability/intention of RLR to interfere with ECHR 8 rights) 612
    - MayayaKardi* 612
  - 4.ii. ECHR 8 rights: "within the law" 613-14
    - Al Nashif* 613, 614
    - Gillan and Quinton* (extract) 613
    - Malone/Lupsal Gillan and Quinton* 612-14
  - 4.iii. ECHR 8 rights: compatibility of RLR policy with "legitimate aim" requirement
    - Court's decision (rejection of submission) 615
    - Kardi* (binding effect) 615
    - UT rejection of submission (extracts) 614-15
  - 4.iv. ECHR 8 rights: proportionality and
    - Court's decision (confirmation of UT's finding/rejection of submission) 616-17
    - Kardi* (extracts) 615, 616-17
    - UT (extracts) 615-16
  - 4.v. ECHR 8 in conjunction with ECHR 14 (detention without trial of non-nationals as unlawful discrimination)
    - absence of challenge in either MS's or MBT's grounds of appeal 618
    - UT's rejection of submissions 618

***MS and MBT (cont.)***

- issues on the appeals (B), challenges to the decisions, introduction (standard of review)
  - balancing ordinary rationality review, ECHR 8 proportionality requirement and the public interest 622-3
  - determination of existence of exceptional standards
    - cases where there are clearly no special circumstances 619-20
    - the extent to which the migrant has changed since the offence 621
    - gravity of the conduct leading to migrant's exclusion from humanitarian protection 621
    - individual circumstances 621
    - length of time in the UK/*Kardi* 620-1
    - respondent's position (existence of exceptional circumstances as matter for SoS's judgement) 619-20
    - reviewability of SoS's decision 620
    - scope of review 604-5
  - determination of existence of exceptional standards, relevant considerations
    - strength of the case leading to migrant's original conviction 621 n. 6
- issues on the appeals (B), challenges to the decisions, *MBT*
  - i. UT decision
    - exceptional circumstances 629-30
    - family life (Appendix FM of the Immigration Rules) 629
    - restricted leave 629
  - ii. UT proceedings
    - issue 1 (lawfulness of refusal to grant ILR/grant RLR) 630-1
    - issue 2 (possibility of rational application of the RLR policy to MBT) 631
  - iii. Court's analysis and decision
    - legitimate expectation that SoS will not change policy, absence 631-2
    - length of stay, effect on "exceptional circumstances" 632
    - UT's alleged failure, by not applying 2004 policy, to deal fairly and lawfully with the applicant 631
- issues on the appeals (B), challenges to the decisions, *MS*
  - i. decision letter
    - ECHR 8 625
    - exceptional circumstances 625
    - restricted leave 623-4
  - ii. reasoning of Collins J 625-7
  - iii. Court's analysis and decision
    - appeal allowed 629
    - Collins J's treatment of the reference to *N* as importing a norm that ILR would be granted after 10 years as an error 628
    - ECHR 8 proportionality of SoS's decision 628
    - rationality of SoS's decision 628

**necessity/duress as defence/justification (including war-related situations, war crimes or crimes against humanity)**

- war crimes/crimes against humanity
  - IHRL and 518-20
  - jurisprudence
    - Bemba* 300-1, 504-10
    - Galić* 507-8
    - Göring* 511



- Hostages Case (List)* 505-6, 508
- Kordić* 509
- Prlić* 508
- Strugar* 507-8
- The Caroline* 511
- Lieber Code 509, 510
- “military objective” and “military necessity” distinguished 504-10
- pacifist settlement of international disputes and the defence of military necessity 511-18
- consistency between war and international law, changes in approach to 511-16
- ex iniuria ius non oritur* 516-18
- non-refoulement (RC 33)**
  - asylum distinguished 580 n. 1
- Refugee Convention (1951) (RC), non-application on grounds of crime against peace, war crime or crime against humanity (RC 1F(a))**
  - jurisprudence
    - Babar* 636-40
    - Ruhumuliza* 653-74
  - purpose of provision
    - protection of the integrity of the asylum process 647
    - upholding the international rule of law 647, 665-6, 670
  - Ruhumuliza*** 650-74
    - background (facts relating to the respondent and procedural history in date order)
      - Anglican Bishop Co-Adjutor (Kigali) (1994) 653
      - in Canada (1997) 653
      - Missionary Bishop and Representative of the Archbishop of West Africa in Cameroon (1998) 653
    - arrival in UK on a student visa (January 2004) 653
      - leave to remain as a minister of religion until 31 January 2007 653
    - refusal of application to extend leave to remain (June 2008) 653
      - rejection on grounds of conduct (June 2008) 653
      - withdrawal of rejection 653
    - application for asylum (March 2009) 653
    - rejection of asylum application on RC 1F(a) grounds (10 March 2011) 653
      - concerns that a return to Rwanda might involve a breach of ECHR 6 654
      - exclusion of right of appeal (NIAA 83) 654
      - grant of six months’ discretionary leave to remain 654
    - application for further leave to remain (25 August 2011) 654
      - refusal on suitability grounds (Appendix FM to the Immigration Rules/RF 1F(c)) (20 March 2014) 654
    - appeal to FTT/claim to ILR (r 276B) 654-5
    - hearing on ILR application (3 June 2015) 655
      - cross-examination about respondent’s alleged conduct in connection with Rwanda genocide 655
      - issue (ILR entitlement/disqualifying conduct (r 276B(ii)(c) and (iii))) 655
    - FTT decision allowing appeal in relation to SoS’s failure to consider long residence ground 655
    - SoS’s appeal, dismissal (19 May 2016) 656
  - appeal (overview) (procedural history/jurisprudence)
    - i. 2014 decision letter 656-7
    - ii. FTT’s reasons 657-61

**Rubumuliza** (*cont.*)

iii. UT's reasons 662

iv. *MS* 662-4v. *Babar* 664-5

appeal (Court's analysis and decision) (Underhill LJ)

appellant's arguments/the issue

insufficiency of weight given by FTT to the justification for denying settlement to those guilty of crimes against humanity 665-6

piecemeal nature of evidence/arguments presented to the FTT 666

decision (dismissal of the appeal) 668-9

evaluation of r 276B(ii)(c) in relation to respondent 666-7

avoidance of UK becoming a safe haven, importance 664-7

*Babar/MS and MBT* distinguished 667

FTT's failure to consider decision letter's reference to distribution of weapons, relevance 667-8

FTT's use of "redemption", relevance 668

rationality of FTT's decision 666-7

purpose of RC 1F (upholding the international rule of law) 665-6

separate opinions

Irwin LJ (concurring)

absence of evidence that the respondent participated in the impugned events 673-4

improper deference to the SoS/failure to examine the facts 673

RC 1F(a)-based exclusion (crimes against humanity), stringency of test 173

Singh LJ (dissenting)

FTT/UT's failure to apply the public interest/compelling circumstances legal test correctly 669-71

improper deference to the SoS/failure to examine the facts 671-3

RC 1F(a)-based exclusion (crimes against humanity), stringency of test 169-71

**service of process on foreign State or State agency**

applicable law

law of State where process to be served 567-70

waiver, requirements

explicit, unequivocal and certain terms 570-1

waiver by the State/authorized representative 570-1

*Zakhary* 565-73**State Immunity Act 1980 (Canada) by section**

5 (commercial activity exception) 567-8, 571-3

9(2) (service of document: means of service) 565, 567, 569-70

10(4) (default judgment: application to set aside or revoke) 565

11 (no injunction, specific performance, etc., without consent) 573

**travaux préparatoires as supplementary means of interpretation (VCLT 32)**

EOC 8(2)(b)(xvi) 302-3

ICC 74(2) 103-4

ICC 85(3) 543-4, 547-8, 549

**treaty interpretation (VCLT 31(2)) (context)**

treaty as a whole/holistic approach (relevant materials) 104

**United Kingdom**

Immigration Act 1971 by section

3(1)(b) (non-patrial: leave to enter or remain in the UK for limited or indefinite period) 581

3(1)(c) (non-patrial: conditions attach to leave to enter or remain) 581  
 “subject to” 605-6

3(2) (regulations and control: Secretary of State’s right to lay rules before Parliament) 581

immigration policy: *see Babar, MS and MBT; Ruhumuliza*

policies relating to excluded but irremovable persons: *see MS and MBT*

Immigration Rules

interpretation

adoption of the more lenient version (*Pokhriyal*) 639

sensible approach (*Mahad*) 639

qualification as a rule

*Alvi* 581, 606-11, 656

*MS and MBT* 581, 606-11

Immigration Rules 2014

r 332(5) (registration with the police) 590

Immigration Rules 2017

r 322(2)-(12) (“grounds on which leave to remain and variation of leave to enter or remain . . . should normally be refused”) 581-2

r 322(5) (undesirability of permitting a person to remain: conduct including convictions, character or associations, threat to national security) 581-2

Immigration Rules 2018

r 276B (ILR) 637, 638-48, 654-74: *see also Babar, Ruhumuliza*

r 276B(ii)(c) (ILR) (long residence: public interest considerations: personal history) 654-5, 666-7, 669-73

Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 by section

83 (appeal: asylum claim) 654

**war crimes/crimes against humanity, procedural aspects**

burden/standard of proof

“beyond reasonable doubt”

ICC 62-76 22, 29-32, 34, 39, 51-2, 57-9, 87-8, 94-102, 128-38, 145-68, 171-220, 401: *see also Bemba*

**Zakhary** 563-73

I. the matter 565

II. background (facts in date order)

respondent’s status (cashier at US consulate in Toronto) 565

respondent’s Complaint alleging unjust dismissal (6 October 2010) 565

transmission of Complaint to US consulate by registered mail (9 November 2010) 565

acknowledgement by Embassy human resources officer 566

Federal Ministry of Labour’s invitation to respondent and Consul General to

participate in a voluntary Alternative Dispute Resolution process 566

hearing in absence of the US/finding of unjust dismissal/order to reinstate 566

Canadian Statement of Claim issued by the respondent (31 August 2012)/US filing of Statement of Defence (30 October 2012) 567

**Zakbary** (*cont.*)

- filing of Adjudicator's Order for enforcement (Labour Code 244) (20 February 2013) 566
- service of Certificate on US through diplomatic channels (26 April 2013) 566
- Attorney General's letter setting out Canada's position of applicability of SIA to Labour Code complaints 566-7
- III. Adjudicator's decision (26 March 2012) 567-8
  - finding 1: consulate letter of 9 November 2010 as waiver of US's right to object to failure of service to comply with SIA 9 567
  - finding 2: consulate's activities as a "commercial activity" (SIA 5) 567-8
  - finding 3: applicability of Labour Code to the respondent's employment relationship with the US 568
  - finding 4: unjust dismissal 568
- IV. issues
  - parties' arguments 568
  - order of consideration 568
- V. Court's analysis 569-73
- V.A. Court's analysis (improper service)
  - applicable law (SIA 9(2)) (service through the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs) 569-70
    - compliance as mandatory, jurisdictional precondition to the commencement of proceedings against a foreign State 570
    - failure to comply as breach of VCLT 22 (inviolability of the premises of the mission) 570
    - policy objectives (Circular on Service of Originating Documents in Judicial and Administrative Proceedings Against the Government of Canada in other States (28 March 2014)) 570
    - responsibility for proper service 570
  - jurisprudence
    - Softrade* 569
    - Tritt* 569
- V.B. absence of US waiver of any defect in service 570-80
  - treatment of waiver in domestic context distinguished 570-80
  - waiver requirements
    - explicit, unequivocal and certain terms 570-1
    - waiver by the State/authorized representative 571
- V.C. non-applicability of the commercial exception (SIA 5) 571-3
  - Amaratunga v. Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization* 572-3
  - Employment Appeals Tribunal* 571-2
  - Re Canada Labour Code* 571
- VI. reinstatement order as violation of SIA 11 573
- VII. Court's decision (revocation of reinstatement order) 573