

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: English

No.: ICC-02/05-02/09

Date: 7 May 2009

PRE-TRIAL CHAMBER I

Before: Judge Sylvia Steiner, Presiding Judge
Judge Sanji Mmasenono Monageng
Judge Cuno Tarfusser

SITUATION IN DARFUR, SUDAN

IN THE CASE OF THE PROSECUTOR V. BAHR IDRIS ABU GARDA

Public Redacted Version

Decision on the Prosecutor's Application under Article 58

Document to be notified, in accordance with regulation 31 of the *Regulations of the Court*, to:

The Office of the Prosecutor
Mr Luis Moreno-Ocampo, Prosecutor
Mr Essa Faal, Senior Trial Lawyer

Counsel for the Defence

Legal Representatives of Victims

Legal Representatives of Applicants

Unrepresented Victims

**Unrepresented Applicants for
Participation/Reparation**

**The Office of Public Counsel for
Victims**

**The Office of Public Counsel for the
Defence**

States Representatives

Amicus Curiae

REGISTRY

Registrar
Ms Silvana Arbia

Defence Support Section

Victims and Witnesses Unit

Detention Section

**Victims Participation and Reparations
Section**

Other

PRE-TRIAL CHAMBER I of the International Criminal Court (the “Chamber” and the “Court” respectively);

NOTING the “Prosecutor’s Application under article 58” (the “Application”),¹ filed on 20 November 2008 pursuant to article 58 of the Statute of the Court in the investigation of the Situation in Darfur, Sudan, whereby it requested the Chamber to issue warrants of arrest or, alternatively, summonses to appear for **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda** (“Abu Garda”), [REDACTED], on a confidential and *ex parte* basis;

NOTING all the supporting material and information submitted by the Prosecutor;²

NOTING, in particular, the “Submission of information on the Prosecutor’s Application Pursuant to Article 58 and request for summonses to appear”,³ filed by the Prosecutor on 23 February 2009, whereby, *inter alia*, he requested the Chamber to issue a summons to appear against Abu Garda, partially modifying his original Application;

¹ ICC-02/05-163-Conf-Exp + Anxs1-5.38-19.

² ICC-02/05-165-Conf-Exp and ICC-02/05-165-Conf-Exp-Anxs1-8; ICC-02/05-172 and ICC-02/05-172-Conf-Exp-AnxsA-B24; ICC-02/05-173 and ICC-02/05-173-Conf-Exp-AnxsB25-B26; ICC-02/05-203 and ICC-02/05-203-Conf-Exp-Anx1; ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp and ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp-Anxs1-2; ICC-02/05-212-Conf-Exp; ICC-02/05-214-Conf-Exp and ICC-02/05-214-Conf-Exp-Anx1; ICC-02/05-216-Conf-Exp; ICC-02/05-221-Conf-Exp and ICC-02/05-221-Conf-Exp-Anx.

³ ICC-02/05-194-Conf-Exp; ICC-02/05-194-Conf-Exp-Anx1.

CONSIDERING that, based upon the Application, the evidence and other information submitted by the Prosecutor, it is appropriate, for the sake of expeditiousness and taking due account of the confidentiality issues, to decide only on the Prosecutor's request to issue a summons to appear for Abu Garda at this stage;

HEREBY RENDERS THIS DECISION:

Jurisdiction and admissibility (article 19 of the Statute)

1. Article 19(1) of the Statute requires the Chamber to satisfy itself that it has jurisdiction in any case brought before it. As the Chamber has previously held:

[...] a case arising from the investigation of a situation will fall within the jurisdiction of the Court only if the specific crimes of the case do not exceed the territorial, temporal and possibly personal parameters defining the situation under investigation and fall within the jurisdiction of the Court.⁴

2. The Chamber notes that (i) regarding the jurisdiction *ratione loci*, although the events forming the subject of the Prosecutor's Application took place in Sudan, which is not a State Party to the Statute, the Situation in Darfur, Sudan, was referred to the Court by the Security Council under article 13(b) of the Statute;⁵ (ii) in relation to the jurisdiction *ratione temporis*, the allegations contained in the Application relate to conduct which allegedly occurred on 29 September 2007 and, therefore, after 1 July 2002, date of entry into force of the

⁴ ICC-01/04-01/07-4, para. 9.

⁵ ICC-02/05-01/07-1-Corr, para. 16.

Statute;⁶ and (iii) regarding the jurisdiction *ratione materiae*, the factual allegations contained in the Application, if proven, would give rise to criminal responsibility for war crimes punishable under article 8(2)(c)(i) (violence to life), article 8(2)(e)(iii) (attack on a peacekeeping mission) and article 8(2)(e)(v) (pillaging) of the Statute.

3. On this basis, and without prejudice to any subsequent determination under article 19 of the Statute, the Chamber is satisfied that the present case falls within the jurisdiction of the Court.

4. With regard to the admissibility of the case, the Chamber notes, firstly, that the instant application was made on a confidential and *ex parte* basis. Particularly since the Prosecutor has indicated that there are no national proceedings in relation to the case,⁷ the Chamber sees no ostensible cause or self-evident factor compelling it to exercise its discretion to review the admissibility of the case *proprio motu* at the instant stage of the proceedings. As a result, the Chamber declines to use its discretionary *proprio motu* power to determine the admissibility of the case against Abu Garda at this stage.

Whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that at least one of the crimes described in the Prosecutor's Application has been committed

5. In its Application, the Prosecutor alleges that the African Union Mission in Sudan ("AMIS") personnel and property stationed at the Military Group Site

⁶ The Application, para. 3.

Haskanita (Sector 8) (“MGS Haskanita”), Umm Kadada Locality, North Darfur were attacked on 29 September 2007,⁸ and that during the attack, twelve AMIS personnel were killed and eight were severely wounded.⁹ According to the Prosecutor, the attackers also appropriated certain property, including vehicles, refrigerators, computers, mobile phones, boots, uniforms, fuel and money during and after the attack.¹⁰ These acts, in the Prosecutor’s view, constitute war crimes under articles 8(2)(c) and 8(2)(e) of the Statute.¹¹

6. Since the definition of every crime within the jurisdiction of the Court includes both contextual and specific elements, the Chamber will first consider whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that the contextual elements of at least one crime within the jurisdiction of the Court are present. The Chamber will then analyse whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that the specific elements of any such crime are also met.

7. The Prosecutor submits that the alleged attack on the MGS Haskanita took place in the context of an armed conflict not of an international character which occurred in Darfur, Sudan from approximately August 2002 to the filing date of the Application on 20 November 2008, between the Government of Sudan (“GoS”) and various armed groups, including the Justice and Equality Movement (“the JEM”).¹² Specifically, the Prosecutor submits that the attack on

⁷ The Application, para. 8.

⁸ The Application, para. 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 71 and 91.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 72.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, para. 1.

¹² *Ibid.*, para. 34.

the MGS Haskanita was committed by a joint group of forces which had broken away from, *inter alia*, the JEM.¹³

8. According to the Prosecutor, as of June 2006, Abu Garda held the position of Vice President in JEM.¹⁴ It is alleged, however, that, following a series of internal splits within JEM, Abu Garda and others broke away from that part of the movement led by Khalil Ibrahim and subsequently continued to carry out military operations together, supported by troops loyal to them.¹⁵

9. The Chamber notes, firstly, that articles 8(2)(c) and 8(2)(e) of the Statute set forth crimes committed in the context of an armed conflict not of an international character. The Chamber has also highlighted that:

[...] article 8(2)(f) of the Statute makes reference to “protracted armed conflict between [...] organized armed groups”, and that, in the view of the Chamber, this focuses on the need for the organised armed groups in question to have the ability to plan and carry out military operations for a prolonged period of time. In this regard, the Chamber observes that, to date, control over the territory by the relevant organised armed groups has been a key factor in determining whether they had the ability to carry out military operations for a prolonged period of time.¹⁶

10. The Chamber considers that from August 2002¹⁷ until at least on or around 20 November 2008,¹⁸ the filing date of the Application, a protracted

¹³ *Ibid*, paras. 4 and 64.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, paras. 14 and 49.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, paras. 50-56. The Prosecutor submits that Abu Garda and others subsequently established their own group, JEM Collective Leadership, on 4 October 2007. The Application, para. 58.

¹⁶ ICC-02/05-01/09-3, para. 60.

¹⁷ ICC-02/05-01/07-1-Corr, para. 47; *see also* ICC-02/05-01/09, para. 60.

armed conflict not of an international character existed in Darfur,¹⁹ and that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the JEM (i) was one of the main groups opposing the GoS in Darfur; (ii) organised themselves between 2001 and 2002; (iii) began to resort to armed violence in 2002; (iv) fulfilled, despite internal disputes and splits, the organisational requirements required by article 8(2)(d) and (f) of the Statute; (v) conducted sustained military operations for a prolonged period of time; and (vi) controlled certain areas of the territory in the Darfur region.²⁰

11. The Chamber is also satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that Abu Garda held the position of Deputy Leader and Secretary for Darfur Sector within JEM from 3 January 2005²¹ and that the forces loyal to Abu Garda, which would later become the Justice and Equality Movement Collective Leadership ("the JEM-CL"),²² broke away from that part of the JEM which remained loyal to JEM Chairman Khalil Ibrahim between late September and early October 2007.²³ As a result, the Chamber is satisfied that there are

¹⁸ BBC News, "Sudan declares Darfur ceasefire", DAR-OTP-0160-0709 (Anx 5.29 to the Application); *see also* Peace Agreement Between the Government of the Republic of Sudan and the Sudanese Liberation Army, 3 September 2003, DAR-OTP-0116-0433 (Anx 5.9 to the Application); Agreement on Humanitarian Ceasefire on the Conflict in Darfur: Status of Mission Agreement (SOMA) on the Establishment and Management of the Ceasefire Commission in the Darfur Area of the Sudan (CFC), 4 June 2004, DAR-OTP-0154-0021 (Anx 5.26 to the Application).

¹⁹ *See generally* Small Arms Survey Book Series, "Divided They Fall: The Fragmentation of Darfur's Rebel Groups", DAR-OTP-0158-0502 (Anx 5.19 to the Application) at 0462-050.

²⁰ J. Flint/A, de Waal, *Darfur- A Short History of a Long War*, 2005 (Anx 5.14 to the Application) DAR-OTP-0120-0678 at 0779-0783; *see also* ICC-02/05-01/09-2-Conf-Exp, para. 61. *See also* Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur, para. 132

²¹ Organisational Structure and Legal and Executive Leaders of the Justice and Equality Movement, DAR-OTP-0156-0031 (Anx 5.11 to the Application) at 0034.

²² Founding Declaration, "Important Statement, Sudanese Justice and Equality Movement – Collective Leadership", 11 October 2007, DAR-OTP-0156-0097 (Anx 5.25 to the Application) at 0099.

²³ Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0262 (Anx 5.35 to the Application) at 0324-0326.

reasonable grounds to believe that, as a senior commander in an armed group which was party to the above-mentioned armed conflict,²⁴ Abu Garda was aware of the factual circumstances establishing the existence of the armed conflict.²⁵

12. On the basis of the evidence and information provided by the Prosecutor, the Chamber is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that (i) the MGS Haskanita was attacked by a group of approximately 1000 persons armed with anti-aircraft guns, artillery guns and rocket-propelled grenade launchers on 29 September 2007;²⁶ (ii) the above-mentioned attack was carried out by splinter forces of JEM, under the command of Abu Garda, jointly with the troops belonging to another armed group; and (iii) the attack occurred in the context of and was associated with the above-mentioned armed conflict.

13. The Application alleges that Abu Garda and others directed the above-mentioned attack on the MGS Haskanita.²⁷ Specifically, the Prosecutor alleges that the events which took place during the attack give rise to crimes under articles 8(2)(c)(i) (violence to life), 8(2)(e)(iii) (attacking personnel or objects involved in a peacekeeping mission) and 8(2)(e)(v) (pillaging) of the Statute.²⁸

²⁴ Agreement on Humanitarian Ceasefire on the Conflict in Darfur: Status of Mission Agreement (SOMA) on the Establishment and Management of the Ceasefire Commission in the Darfur Area of the Sudan (CFC), 4 June 2004, DAR-OTP-0154-0021 (Anx 5.26 to the Application).

²⁵ Founding Declaration, Sudanese Justice and Equality Movement – Collective Leadership, 11 October 2007, DAR-OTP-0156-0097 (Anx 5.25 to the Application) at 0097.

²⁶ Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0352 (Anx 1 to ICC-02/05-211) at 0359, para. 44; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0157-1124 (Anx 5.36 to the Application) at 1247-1250, lines 165-197; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0262 (Anx 5.35 to the Application) at 0349, lines 285-292.

²⁷ The Application, para. 69.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 1.

14. In relation to the specific elements of the above-mentioned crimes, the Chamber notes, firstly, that in order to be protected under article 8(2)(c)(i), a person must be either *hors de combat* or must be considered as a civilian, medical personnel or religious personnel not taking an active part in the hostilities.²⁹

15. On the basis of the material submitted by the Prosecutor, the Chamber is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that (i) the mandate of AMIS tasked the forces with monitoring and observing compliance with the Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement of April 2004, as well as future peace agreements,³⁰ (ii) AMIS' rules of engagement permitted the use of lethal force only in personal self-defence,³¹ and (iii) AMIS forces neither exceeded their mandate nor their rules of engagement.³² Accordingly, the Chamber finds that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the AMIS personnel were entitled to the protection offered to civilians not taking any active part in the hostilities.

16. The Chamber is further satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that, during the attack, the attackers killed twelve³³ and severely wounded eight³⁴ AMIS personnel.

²⁹ Elements of Crimes, Article 8(2)(c)(i)-1(2).

³⁰ African Union Communiqué, Peace and Security Council 17th Meeting, 20 October 2004, DAR-OTP-0021-0158 (Anx 5.5 to the Application) at 0160.

³¹ Human Rights Watch, "Imperatives for Immediate Change – the African Union Mission in Sudan", DAR-OTP-0154-0074 (Anx B4 to ICC-02/05-172) at 0102.

³² Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at 0525, para. 21.

³³ Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at 0533, para. 73; International Herald Tribune, "Darfur Raid Kills 10 African Peacekeepers", 30 September 2007, DAR-OTP-0154-0329 (Anx 5.1 to the Application); Associated Press, "Sudan Rebels Kill 10 Darfur Peacekeepers", DAR-OTP-0154-0292 (Anx 5.2 to the Application); Sudan Tribune, "Peacekeeper dies 2 months after Darfur's Haskanita Attack", 12 December 2007, DAR-OTP-0152-0230 (Anx 5.21 to the Application) at 0231; Public Source, DAR-OTP-0154-0148 (Anx 5.22 to the Application) at 0148.

17. The Chamber notes that, in order to be protected under article 8(2)(e)(iii) of the Statute, the person or object subject to the attack must be (i) considered as personnel, installations, material, units or vehicles “involved in a humanitarian assistance or peacekeeping mission in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”;³⁵ and (ii) entitled to that protection given to civilians or civilian objects under the international law of armed conflict.³⁶

18. The Chamber has already found that there are reasonable grounds to believe that, the AMIS personnel were entitled to the protection given to civilians not taking any active part in the hostilities under the international law of armed conflict.³⁷ The Chamber also concludes that there are reasonable grounds to believe that AMIS forces were not using their installations, material, units or vehicles to make an effective contribution to the military action of a party to the conflict and that the objects thus retained the protection afforded to civilian objects.³⁸

19. Additionally, the Chamber is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe (i) that the AMIS mission was present in Darfur in accordance with

³⁴ International Herald Tribune, “Darfur raid kills 10 African Peacekeepers, 30 September 2007, DAR-OTP-0154-0329 (Anx 5.1 to the Application) at 0330; Associated Press, “Rebel Attack Came at End of Ramadan Fast”, DAR-OTP-0154-0349 (Anx 5.3 to the Application) at 0350.

³⁵ Elements of Crimes, Article 8(2)(e)(iii)(2).

³⁶ Elements of Crimes, article 8(2)(e)(iii)(4).

³⁷ See *supra* para. 15.

³⁸ Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0026 at DAR-OTP-0158-0086-0087 (Anx 5.37-2 to the Application), lines 441-463.

the consent of the State of Sudan and the other parties to the conflict,³⁹ (ii) that the AMIS troops were neutral or impartial,⁴⁰ and (iii) that the AMIS troops' rules of engagement permitted the troops to use force only in self-defence.⁴¹ The Chamber thus concludes that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the personnel and objects belonging to the AMIS mission were involved in and associated with a peacekeeping mission "in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations" and were thus entitled to protection under article 8(2)(e)(iii) of the Statute.

20. The Chamber further considers that there are reasonable grounds to believe that Abu Garda was aware of the factual circumstances establishing the above-mentioned protection.⁴²

21. In the view of the Chamber, there are reasonable grounds to believe that, during the attack on the MGS Haskanita, in addition to attacking AMIS personnel, the attackers destroyed the communications installations,

³⁹ Agreement with the Sudanese Parties on the Modalities for the Establishment of the Ceasefire Commission and the Deployment of Observers in the Darfur of 28 May 2004, DAR-OTP-0005-0308; Status of Mission Agreement (SOMA) on the Establishment and Management of the Ceasefire Commission in Darfur Area of the Sudan of 4 June 2004, DAR-OTP-0154-0021 (Anx 5.26 to the Application) at 0023-0024; Protocol between the Government of the Sudan, the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A), the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) on the Enhancement of the Security Situation in Darfur in accordance with the Ndjama Agreement of 9 November 2004, DAR-OTP-0154-0004 (Anx B2 to ICC-02/05-172) at 0006-0009.

⁴⁰ Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at 0525, para. 21; Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0424 at 0431, para. 28.

⁴¹ Human Rights Watch Report, "Sudan: Imperatives for Immediate Change – the African Union Mission in Sudan", DAR-OTP-0154-0074 (Anx B4 to ICC-02/05-172) at 0102; Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at 0525, paras. 19-20.

⁴² Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at 0527, para. 33; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0157-0275 (Anx 5.36 to the Application) at 1221, lines 1162-1174 and 1225, lines 1303-1305; Witness Interview Summary Notes, DAR-OTP-0161-0159 at 0180.

dormitories, vehicles and other materials belonging to AMIS.⁴³ The Chamber further finds that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the AMIS personnel, installations, material, units and vehicles stationed at the MGS Haskanita were the intended object of the attack.⁴⁴

22. Furthermore, the material submitted by the Prosecutor provides reasonable grounds to believe that after the attack, the attackers appropriated certain AMIS property, including approximately seventeen vehicles, as well as refrigerators, computers, cellular phones, military boots and uniforms, fuel, ammunition and money.⁴⁵ The Chamber is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the attackers intended to appropriate the above-mentioned AMIS property for private or personal use,⁴⁶ and that such appropriation was without the consent of the owner or owners.

23. On the basis of the forgoing, the Chamber is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that (i) the war crime of violence to life in the form of murder was committed or attempted (article 8(2)(c)(i) of the Statute), and that (ii) the war crimes of attacking a peacekeeping mission (article

⁴³ See, e.g. Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Ex) at 0534; AU Investigation Report on the Attack on MGS Haskanita, 9 October 2007, DAR-OTP-0160-0826 (Anx B8 to ICC-02/05-172) at 0830.

⁴⁴ Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at 0527, paras. 31-33; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0026 (Anx 5.37 to the Application) through 02222 at DAR-OTP-0158-0073 at 0086-0087.

⁴⁵ Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0352 at 0361-0362 (Anx 1 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp), paras. 60; Witness Statement DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at 0535, paras. 81 and 86; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0026 (Anx 5.37 to the Application) at 0089-0090, lines 535-559; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0262 (Anx 5.35 to the Application) at 0378-0379, lines 1278-1303.

⁴⁶ DAR-OTP-0158-0262 (Anx 5.35 to the Application) at 0340 at 0378-0379, lines 1304-1318; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0026 (Anx 5.37 to the Application) at 0099-0100, lines 895-910; Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0352 at 0362, para. 62.

8(2)(e)(iii) of the Statute) and pillaging (article 8(2)(e)(v) of the Statute) were committed during the attack on the MGS Haskanita on 29 September 2007.

Whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that Bahr Idriss Abu Garda is criminally responsible for the crimes mentioned above

24. The Prosecutor alleges that Abu Garda and others are individually criminally responsible as co-perpetrators or as indirect co-perpetrators under article 25(3)(a) of the Statute for the above-mentioned crimes.⁴⁷

25. As noted above, the Chamber is of the view that there are reasonable grounds to believe that (i) the attack to MSG Haskanita was carried out by splinter forces of JEM acting in concert with the forces of another armed group; and (ii) Abu Garda was in command of the said splinter forces of JEM,⁴⁸ which were hierarchically organised.⁴⁹

26. Furthermore, in the view of the Chamber, the material submitted by the Prosecutor provides reasonable grounds to believe that (i) a common plan to attack the MGS Haskanita existed between Abu Garda and the other

⁴⁷ The Application, para. 140.

⁴⁸ Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0157-1124 (Anx 5.36 to the Application) through 1244 at DAR-OTP-0157-1244 at 1247-1250; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0262 (Anx 5.35 to the Application) at 0349, lines 285-292.

⁴⁹ Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0157-0275 (Anx 5.34 to the Application) at 0427-0429; Founding Declaration, "Important Statement, Sudanese Justice and Equality Movement – Collective Leadership", 11 October 2007, DAR-OTP-0156-0097 (Anx 5.25 to the Application) at 0099.

commanders whose troops participated in the attack;⁵⁰ and (ii) the common plan included the commission of the war crimes referred to in the previous section.⁵¹

27. The Chamber also finds that there are reasonable grounds to believe that Abu Garda, as commander of splinter forces of JEM, exercised, along with the other commanders, whose troops participated in the attack, joint control over the commission of the alleged crimes and that their respective contributions to the perpetration of the alleged crimes were essential.⁵² Moreover, there are reasonable grounds to believe that, as commanders of their respective forces during the attack to Haskanita, they were aware of their respective abilities to jointly control the commission of the alleged crimes.⁵³

28. For the forgoing reasons, the Chamber finds that there are reasonable grounds to believe that Abu Garda is criminally responsible as a co-perpetrator or as an indirect co-perpetrator under articles 25(3)(a) and/or 25(3)(f) of the Statute for:

- (i) The war crime of violence to life in the form of murder, whether committed or attempted, under article 8(2)(c)(i) of the Statute;

⁵⁰ Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0521 (Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at para. 80; Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0161-0159 (Anx B5 to ICC-02/05-172) at 0184; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0157-0275 (Anx 5.34 to the Application) at 0427-0429; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0026 (Anx 5.35 to the Application) at 0081 to 0084; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0026 (Anx 5.37 to the Application) through 0222 at DAR-OTP-0158-0073 at 0085, lines 400-404.

⁵¹ Witness Statement, DAR-OTP-0165-0352 (Anx 1 to ICC-02/05-211-Conf-Exp) at para. 67.

⁵² Witness Transcript DAR-OTP-0157-0275 (Anx 5.34 to the Application) at 0408, lines 374-394; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0157-1124 (Anx 5.36 to the Application) through 1244 at DAR-OTP-0157-0244 at 1254-1255.

⁵³ Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0158-0026 (Anx 5.37 to the Application) through 0222 at DAR-OTP-0158-0073 at 0085, lines 400-404; Witness Transcript, DAR-OTP-0157-0275 (Anx 5.34 to the Application), lines 1016-1018.

- (ii) The war crime of attacking personnel or objects involved in a peacekeeping mission, under article 8(2)(e)(iii) of the Statute; and
- (iii) The war crime of pillaging, under article 8(2)(e)(v) of the Statute.

Whether the specific requirements under article 58 of the Statute for the issuance of a summons to appear have been met

29. The Chamber notes that the second requirement provided for by article 58(7) of the Statute is that the Chamber is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a summons is sufficient to ensure the person's appearance.

30. In its Application, the Prosecutor initially requested the issuance of a warrant of arrest for Abu Garda.⁵⁴ However, the Prosecutor also stated that a summons to appear could be a feasible alternative should the commanders express a willingness to pursue that route.⁵⁵ Subsequently, the Prosecutor submitted that, indeed, the issuance of summonses would be sufficient to ensure the appearance of Abu Garda.⁵⁶ The Prosecutor has continued to provide additional information to the Chamber in that regard.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ The Application, para. 169.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, para. 170.

⁵⁶ See, e.g. ICC-02/05-165-Conf-Exp; ICC-02/05-165-Conf-Exp-Anxs1-8.

⁵⁷ See ICC-02/05-194-Conf-Exp; ICC-02/05-194-Conf-Exp-Anxs1-2. ICC-02/05-221-Conf-Exp; ICC-02/05-221-Conf-Exp-Anx.

31. On the basis of the information submitted by the Prosecutor, the Chamber is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a summons to appear is sufficient to ensure the appearance of Abu Garda before the Court within the meaning of article 58(7) of the Statute.⁵⁸

32. The Chamber reserves its right to review this finding either *proprio motu* or at the request of the Prosecutor, however, particularly if the suspect fails to appear on the date specified in the summons or fails to comply with the orders contained in the summons to appear issued by the Chamber.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE CHAMBER HEREBY

DECIDES TO ISSUE

A SUMMONS TO APPEAR for Bahr Idriss Abu Garda, for his alleged responsibility under articles 25(3)(a) of the Statute for:

- (i) The war crime of violence to life, in the form of murder, whether committed or attempted, within the meaning of article 8(2)(c)(i) of the Statute;

⁵⁸ Video Material, Anx 2 to ICC-02/05-194-Conf-Exp.

- (ii) The war crime of intentionally directing attacks against personnel, installations, materials, units and vehicles involved in a peacekeeping mission, within the meaning of article 8(2)(e)(iii) of the Statute;
- (iii) The war crime of pillaging, within the meaning of article 8(2)(e)(v) of the Statute;

DECIDES

that the summons for **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda** shall be included in a separate self-executing document containing the information required by article 58(7) of the Statute and imposing on **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda**, without prejudice to further decisions of the Chamber in this respect, the following conditions:

- (i) to refrain from discussing issues related to either the charges which form the basis of the present summons or the evidence and information presented by the Prosecutor and considered by the Chamber;
- (ii) to refrain from making any political statements while within the premises of the Court, including the location assigned to him;
- (iii) not to leave, without specific permission of the Chamber and for the whole period of his stay in the Netherlands, the premises of the Court, including the location assigned to him;
- (iv) to comply, in any case, with all the instructions of the Registrar for the purposes of his appearance before the Court;

ORDERS

the Registrar to, as soon as practicable, serve the above-mentioned summons on **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda** as required by article 58(7) of the Statute and in accordance with regulation 31(3)(b) of the Regulations of the Court;

ORDERS

the Registrar to:

- (i) monitor **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda's** compliance with the conditions set forth by the Chamber in the summons to appear and contained in the present decision from the moment it is served upon him;
- (ii) immediately report any violation of the said conditions by **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda** to the Chamber;

RECALLS

the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1593, acting pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in which the Security Council decided that the Government of the Sudan and all other parties to the Darfur conflict, shall cooperate fully with and provide any necessary assistance to the Court and the Prosecutor pursuant to the Resolution and, while recognizing that States not party to the Statute have no obligation under the Statute, urged

all States and concerned regional and other international organisations to cooperate fully;

ORDERS

the Registrar, as appropriate, to prepare and to transmit to any other State any request for cooperation which may be necessary to facilitate the voluntary appearance of **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda** before the Court pursuant to articles 87 and 93 of the Statute;

REQUESTS

the Prosecutor to transmit to the Chamber and to the Registry, as far as its confidentiality obligations allow, all information available to the Prosecutor that may assist in averting any risks to victims or witnesses associated with the transmission of any of the above-mentioned cooperation requests;

REQUESTS

the Prosecutor to transmit to the Chamber and to the Registry, as far as its confidentiality obligations allow, all information available to it that, in its view, would facilitate the transmission and execution of any of the above-mentioned cooperation requests;

ORDERS

the Registrar to file a copy of all documents related to the Prosecutor's Application in the record of the case against **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda**;

ORDERS

the Registrar to maintain copies of all documents related to the Prosecutor's Application, with their current levels of confidentiality, in both records of the case and the record of the Darfur Situation until otherwise decided by the Chamber;

REQUESTS

the Prosecutor to file in the record of the case against **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda** :

- (i) a redacted and confidential version of the Prosecutor's Application, in which all identifying information of the other two individuals for whom the Prosecutor seeks the issuance of a summons to appear in the Application shall be redacted, to be given to **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda** upon his arrival at the seat of the Court in The Hague in accordance with this decision;
- (ii) a public redacted version of the Prosecutor's Application within 10 days of **Bahr Idriss Abu Garda's** arrival at the seat of the Court in The Hague.

Done in both English and French, the English version being authoritative.

Judge Sylvia Steiner

Presiding Judge

Judge Sanji Mmasenono Monageng

Judge Cuno Tarfusser

Dated this Thursday, 7 May 2009

At The Hague, The Netherlands