BEFORE THE TRIAL CHAMBER EXTRAORDINARY CHAMBERS IN THE COURTS OF CAMBODIA

FILING DETAILS

Case No:

002/19-09-2007-ECCC/TC

Party Filing:

Co-Prosecutors

Filed to:

Trial Chamber

Original Language:

English

Date of document:

21 February 2011

CLASSIFICATION

Classification of the document

suggested by the filing party:

PUBLIC

Classification by OCIJ

or Chamber:

សាធារណៈ/Public

Classification Status:

Review of Interim Classification:

Records Officer Name:

Signature:

ឯកសារខ្មើន ORIGINAL/ORIGINAL ថ្ងៃ ខែ ឆ្នាំ (Date): 21-Feb-2011, 15:49 Sann Rada CMS/CFO:...

CO-PROSECUTORS' RESPONSE TO IENG SARY'S MOTION AGAINST THE USE OF TORTURE TAINTED EVIDENCE AT TRIAL

Filed by:	Distributed to:	Copied to:
Co-Prosecutors CHEA Leang Andrew CAYLEY	Trial Chamber Judge NIL Nonn. President Judge Silvia CARTWRIGHT Judge YA Sokhan Judge Jean-Marc LAVERGNE Judge THOU Mony	Accused NUON Chea IENG Sary IENG Thirith KHIEU Samphan
		Lawyers for the Defence

Civil Party Lead Co-Lawyers PICH Ang

Elisabeth SIMONNEAU FORT

SON Arun Michiel PESTMAN Victor KOPPE ANG Udom Michael G. KARNAVAS PHAT Pouv Seang Diana ELLIS SA Sovan

Jaques VERGES Phillipe GRECIANO 00645752 E33/1

002/19-09-2007-ECCC/TC

RESPONSE

- The Co-Prosecutors request that the Trial Chamber dismiss Ieng Sary's Motion Against the Use of Torture Tainted Evidence¹ (the "Defence") notified on 7 February 2011 on the basis that it is untimely.
- 2. Admissibility of evidence at the ECCC is governed by Internal Rule 87. All evidence is admissible unless provided otherwise by the Internal Rules (Rule 87-1). The Chamber may reject a request for evidence where it finds that it is: a) irrelevant or repetitious; b) impossible to obtain within a reasonable time; c) unsuitable to prove the facts it purports to prove; d) not allowed under the law; or e) intended to prolong proceedings or is frivolous. This decision can only be made *provided* the evidence has been put before the Trial Chamber by a party (Rule 87-3).
- 3. Consequently rulings as to whether evidence should be admitted or excluded can only usefully be made once the Trial Chamber has had an opportunity to examine the evidence and hear the parties. Such determinations are questions of law and fact. As identified by the Defence in their Motion, the practice of the Trial Chamber in the trial of "Duch" to admit or exclude evidence was done after the evidence was requested for admission by the parties, examined by the Trial Chamber and the parties heard.²
- 4. In this case, pursuant to Rule 80 (3), this Chamber has asked the parties to file a list of documents and exhibits they request to be admitted at trial by 13 April 2011. Following this, Rule 80 (4) then allows the Trial Chamber to order that any objections to the admissibility of these documents or exhibits be made in writing by the parties after the Initial Hearing within a prescribed time. This time period shall allow a reasonable opportunity for the parties to review the lists provided pursuant to Rule 80.

[&]quot;Ieng Sary's Motion Against the Use of Torture Tainted Evidence at Trial", 4 February 2011, Document No. E33, ERN 00640260.

See Case of Kaing Guek Eav alias "Duch", 001/18-07-2007-ECCC/TC, Decision on Parties Requests to Put Certain Materials Before the Chamber Pursuant to Internal Rule 87(2), 28 October 2009, E176, ERN: 00398394-00398401, para. 8.

002/19-09-2007-ECCC/TC

5. Consequently, the Co-Prosecutors request that the Motion be dismissed on this basis that it is premature. It is also requested that this Chamber issue an order as envisaged by Rule 80 (4) to allow the parties to raise any objections to evidence proposed by other parties in a prescribed time period after the Initial Hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Name	Place	Signature
21 February 2011 YET Chakriya Deputy Co-Prosecutor Andrew CAYLEY Co-Prosecutor	Phnom Penh	" " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "