

UNITED
NATIONS

MICT-12-20
28-07-2016
(755 - 738)

755
ZS



Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals

Case No: MICT-12-20

Date: 21 July 2016

Original: English

Before: Judge Theodor Meron, President

Registrar: Mr. John Hocking

PROSECUTOR

v.

BERNARD MUNYAGISHARI

PUBLIC

MONITORING REPORT FOR JUNE 2016

Monitor:
Ms. Stella Ndirangu
Ms. Elsy Sainna

Received by the Registry
Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals
28/07/2016 10:05

Two handwritten signatures in black ink, one appearing to be 'J.D.' and the other a more stylized signature.

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	DETAILED REPORT.....	3
	A. <i>Monitoring Mission from 5 June 2016 to 9 June 2016</i>	3
	<u>High Court Hearing of 7 June 2016</u>	3
	<u>Meeting with Defence Counsel Bruce Bikotwa and Jeanne d'Arc Umutesi held on 8 June 2016</u>	5
	B. <i>Monitoring Mission for 13 June 2016</i>	8
	<u>Supreme Court Hearing of 13 June 2016</u>	8
	C. <i>Monitoring Mission for 16 June 2016</i>	11
	<u>High Court Hearing of 16 June 2016</u>	11
	<u>High Court Hearing of 17 June 2016</u>	12
	D. <i>Monitoring Mission from 20 June 2016 to 23 June 2016</i>	12
	<u>High Court Hearing of 21 June 2016</u>	12
	<u>Meeting with Mr. Munyagishari held on 22 June 2016</u>	14
	E. <i>Monitoring Mission from 27 June 2016 to 30 June 2016</i>	18
	<u>Meeting with Victor Mugabe CEO Rwanda Bar Association held on 29 June 2016</u>	18
III.	CONCLUSION.....	18

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to the Terms of Reference for the Monitors, particularly part "C" of Annex II to the MOU between the Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals ("MICT" or "Mechanism") and the Kenya Section of the International Commission of Jurists ("ICJ Kenya"), we respectfully submit this Report to the President of the MICT through the Registrar.
2. This Monitoring report pertains to the activities of interactions of Ms. Stella Ndirangu and Ms. Elsy Sainna Monitor's appointed by the Mechanism ("Monitors"), with Mr. Munyangishari, Defence Counsel Bruce Bikotwa and Counsel Jeanne d'Arc Umutesi, and with Mr. Victor Mugabe, the Executive Secretary of the Rwanda Bar Association (RBA) during the month of June 2016 ("the Reporting Period").
3. During the Reporting Period, the Monitor's undertook five missions to Rwanda on 5 June 2016 to 9 June 2016, 13 June 2016, 16 June 2016, 20 June 2016 to 23 June 2016 and 27 June 2016 to 30 June 2016 to monitor the Bernard Munyagishari case.
4. During the month of June 2016, the High Court held three hearings, with one scheduled hearing that did not take off because of the unavailability of the witness, the Supreme Court held one hearing. The Accused person was absent from the three of the hearings held by the High Court on 7 June 2016, 16 June 2016 and on 16 June 2016.
5. A detailed report on all activities during the Reporting Period is provided below.

II. DETAILED REPORT

A. Monitoring Mission from 5 June 2016 to 9 June 2016

High Court Hearing of 7 June 2016

1. The hearing was held before Presiding Judge Alice Ngendakuriyo, Judge Fidele Nsanzimana and Judge Timothee Kanyegezi. The Prosecution represented by Mr. Bonaventure Ruberwa,

Defence Counsel Bruce Bikotwa and Jean d'Arc Umutesi were present. The Accused, Mr. Bernard Munyangishari, was absent during the proceedings.

2. At the invitation of the Court, Mr. Bikotwa submitted that on the 6 June 2016, the Defence had filed a motion, which they had served on the Prosecution requesting to for time to carry out defence preliminary investigations before the trial could proceed.
3. Defence Counsel argued in the application, that unless they conducted preliminary investigations, they would be unable to properly cross-examine the witnesses.
4. Defence Counsel further submitted, that they had not been furnished with all the witness statements contained in the Prosecution files and for this reason, were applying to stay the proceedings until they had dispensed with their preliminary investigations and identification of defence witnesses.
5. In response to the submissions, the Prosecution opposed the motion stating that Defence Counsel could still carry out the preliminary investigations, even as the trial proceeded without the need to stay the proceedings.
6. On the question of full disclosure of witness statements, the Prosecution asserted that they had shared all the witness statements with Defence including those that were contained in their file.
7. At this juncture, the Court intervened, stating that in the its view, there was no need to stay proceedings, reiterating that the purpose of hearing that day was to proceed with hearing the testimony of Prosecution witnesses. The Presiding Judge asked whether Defence Counsel were willing and ready to cross-examine the witness.
8. The Court stated further, that it did not want to establish a precedent of staying proceedings and directed the Prosecution to furnish Defence Counsel with witness statements, that were not in their possession but the Prosecution remained adamant that they had already shared all the witness statements.

9. In response to the Court's view, that proceedings should not be stayed, Defence Counsel Jean d'Arc Umutesi submitted that the motion they had filed had espoused the implications on time and resources required in order for the Defence to prepare an effective defence.
10. Counsel Jeanne d'Arc further submitted that there was a list of 16 witnesses contained in the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) case file for Mr. Munyagishari. The Defence required time and resources to travel to Arusha to obtain these witness statements. For these reasons, Counsel Jeanne d'Arc implored the Court to consider the motion they had filed, before making the decision on whether the proceedings should continue,
11. The Court sought clarification, as to the distinction between the motion filed in April 2016, which the Chamber had discussed at the hearing on 11 April 2016, and issued a decision on at the hearing held on 13 April 2016 and the motion dated 6 June 2016,¹ requesting for time to carry out preliminary investigations. Defence Counsel clarified that the main difference between previous and current motion was that the latter did not cover the 16 Defence witnesses.
12. The Court adjourned at 10.30 am to deliberate and resumed at 10.55 am. The Court ruled that the hearing would proceed, because the request for time, to undertake preliminary investigations had been dealt with previously been dealt with by the Court. In any case, the Court observed that the Defence would eventually be given time to prepare a schedule of its preliminaries with respect to defence witnesses.
13. The Court proceeded to hear the oral testimony of Prosecution witness MDE until 1.00 pm when the Court adjourned. The hearing resumed at 2.40 pm, where Prosecution witness MDE continued testifying. The Court adjourned for the day at 4.30 pm, indicating the hearing would resume on 16 June 2016 at 8.00 am with the examination and cross-examination of witness MDE by the Prosecution and Defence.

Meeting with Defence Counsel Bruce Bikotwa and Jeanne d'Arc Umutesi held on 8 June 2016

14. The Monitor met with Defence Counsel Bruce Bikotwa and Jean d'Arc Umutesi in the presence of an Interpreter.

¹ See *The Prosecutor v. B. Munyagishari*, Case No. MICT-12-20, Public Monitoring Report for April 2016 ("April

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

22. Defence Counsel showed the Monitor a letter they had written to the President of the High Court Chamber of International Crimes, in which they had lodged a formal complaint against Presiding Judge. In the letter,³ Counsel had stated that the conduct of Presiding Judge was violating the principle of equality of arms.

23. Defence Counsel informed the Monitor, that no response was received after they had filed their letter dated 6 May 2016, they were forced to make an application for Presiding Judge to

³ Letter dated 6th May 2016 written by Defence Counsel Bruce Bikotwa and Jeanne d’Arc Umutesi and addressed to the President of the High Court Chamber of International Court.

recuse herself but a decision was taken that she would continue to preside over the hearing trial.

24. Defence Counsel also expressed the view that on further reflection and with the benefit of hindsight, they now understood and appreciated the frustrations expressed by previous Defence Counsel, in their view, they indicated they foresee a situation where Rwandan Lawyer's would be reluctant to take up transfer cases, because of lack of the necessary support required to adequately mount a strong defence.
25. Defence Counsel further expressed the view that the President of the Rwanda Bar Association (RBA), had not been in touch with them to assist with the impasse, despite copying the RBA in all their correspondence with the Court. Counsel requested the Monitor to raise the issue with the RBA.
26. Turning to the question of Prosecution witness statements, raised in court, the Monitor sought clarification on whether Counsel had been provided with all the statements. Counsel, were non-committal explaining that they had received some witness statements but were concerned about the lack of full disclosure by the Prosecution which was not forthcoming since this would enable them adequately prepare the defence.

B. Monitoring Mission for 13 June 2016

Supreme Court Hearing of 13 June 2016

27. The hearing begun at 3.40 pm, before the full Chamber comprising of Judge Fedilite Kanyange, Judge Alphonse Hitiyarenye and Judge Agnes Nyirandabaruta. Mr. Bonaventure Ruberwa represented the Prosecution. The Accused, Mr. Munyagishari was present in Court, assisted by Defence Counsel John Hakizimana.
28. The Registrar of the Supreme Court introduced the case by summarizing the contents of the applications received and the proceedings that had been before the Court until that date. After summing up the case file, the Registrar indicated that the hearing that day was scheduled for submissions on the substantive appeal.

29. The Court then invited the Court interpreter to take oath.
30. Mr. Munyagishari addressed the Court, protesting the reference used by the Registrar to identify him. He explained that the Registrar had made reference to Kanzenze as his area of origin. According to Mr. Munyagishari, the area he was being identified with, was not even cited in his identity card.
31. Mr. Munyagishari submitted that the High Court had refused to decide on questions he had raised regarding his nationality. Asserting that he was of Congolese origin, he told the Court that he was proud of being Congolese, and did not want to be affiliated with any other nationality.
32. Mr. Munyagishari then asked the Court to confirm if they had received the explanatory note dated 13 June 2016, filed in relation to his pleadings. He requested the Court to allow him to read to them the explanatory note in Court.
33. The Court informed Mr. Munyagishari that if he had filed the note, they were in possession and there was no need for him to read its contents in Court.
34. Mr. Munyagishari insisted that the contents of the note were relevant to the hearing that day, and would assist the Court in determining how to proceed with the case.
35. The Court informed Mr. Munyagishari that it hoped that the contents of the note, he was referring to, were linked to the substantive appeal, which was subject of the day's hearing. The Court indicated that if the note was linked to the substantive appeal then the registrar would take note of it.
36. Mr. Munyagishari, begun to read the note. The Court stopped him as he was submitting, and clarified that it had scheduled the hearing, in order to hear the appeal that the Accused had filed against the decision of the High Court. The Court indicated it wanted Mr. Munyagishari to restrict his submissions, to the substantive appeal.

37. In response, Mr. Munyagishari asserted that he could not explain the appeal, if he was not provided with the decision of the High Court that he was appealing against, in a language that he could read.
38. The Court informed the Accused that it had already issued its decision, on the issue of provision of translated court documents.
39. Mr. Munyagishari informed the Court that in his note to the Court, he had explained the reasons as to why, he could not proceed to submit on the substantive appeal. He then revisited the note and continued to read its contents, from where he had left off before.
40. The Court stopped the Accused from submitting on the note, and requested Counsel John Hakizimana to assist his client by directing him on how to submit on the substantive appeal.
41. Counsel John in response referred to the last paragraph of Mr. Munyagishari's note, where Mr. Munyagishari had requested the Court to use its discretionary powers to reconsider its decision of 15 April 2016, in order to safeguard the right to defence.
42. The Court interrupted the submission by Counsel, asking him to explain to Mr. Munyagishari the procedure of lodging appeals after the Supreme Court has upheld a decision of the High Court, that had been appealed against.
43. Counsel Hakizimana informed the Court that before the hearing had commenced, Mr. Munyagishari had informed him, that he was not in a position to plead his appeal because he had been denied court documents in French, which was the language he understood.
44. The Court then invited the Prosecution to submit on the issues raised.
45. The Prosecution submitted that they were surprised that Mr. Munyagishari and Defence Counsel, were alleging that they could not expound on the substantive grounds of their appeal, because of the decision not to provide translated court documents. Asserting that it was not possible to reverse the decision made by the Supreme Court on the issue, the Prosecution submitted that when Mr. Munyagishari had filed his appeal, the Prosecution had filed its response, as a result the Prosecution did not see any reason for the Court not to

proceed with the substantive appeal, because the Defence had enough time to prepare the grounds in support of the appeal.

46. At the invitation of the Court, Mr. Munyagishari submitted that he was not surprised by the submissions made by the Prosecution, as they were aware that the Supreme Court had taken an adverse decision against him, for which there was no appeal possibility. He then continued to submit on the last paragraph of his letter. He indicated that he knew that he could not appeal the decision of 15 April 2016, by the Supreme Court, therefore in his note to the Court, he was requesting the Court to do the following;

- a) Declare that Rwanda was unable to try his case.
- b) If the Court does not issue the declaration, then the Court uses its discretionary powers to reconsider its decision of 15 April 2016, in order to safeguard the right to defence.
- c) In addition, the Supreme Court order's the High Court to consider the halting effect of his appeal and stop's it from conducting proceedings in his case as if it were a judicial marathon.
- d) Lastly, that the assigned Counsel, whose only motivation is money be ordered to leave his case, in order to preserve justice, instead of worsening the situation.

47. After Mr. Munyagishari's submission, the Court asked the Prosecution if they had anything to say regarding the submission. The Prosecution indicated that they had nothing else to add.

48. The Court adjourned the hearing, indicating that it would issue a decision on the issues raised, on 15 July 2015.

C. Monitoring Mission for 16 June 2016

High Court Hearing of 16 June 2016

49. The hearing was held before the full Chamber, Mr. Bonaventure Ruberwa appeared for the Prosecution. Defence Counsel Bruce Bikotwa and Jean d'Arc Umutesi were in attendance. The hearing proceeded in the absence of the Accused, Mr. Munyagishari.

50. The hearing commenced with the Court explaining that the hearing would continue with the testimony of witness MDE, who at the hearing of 7 June 2016, had testified on his knowledge of Mr. Munyagishari's involvement in the genocide. The hearing would focus on the examination in chief by the Prosecution, followed by cross-examination by the Defence.
51. At the invitation of the Court, the Prosecution asked the witness to clarify some of the assertions he had made at the last hearing regarding Mr. Munyagishari's role in enrolling, training, equipping the interahamwe with weapons and commissioning them to commit genocide in Gisenyi area.
52. Once the Prosecution had closed its examination, the Defence was invited by the Court to cross-examine the witness.
53. The session was adjourned for two hours at 12.00pm. When the session resumed at 2.45pm the Defence continued to cross-examine the Prosecution witness.
54. At 3.40pm Court adjourned the hearing to 17 June 2016, the Defence was directed to prepare to finish the cross-examination the next hearing within 3 hours.

High Court Hearing of 17 June 2016

55. On 17 June 2016, the Parties were informed that witness MDE had been taken ill, and therefore was unavailable to testify. The hearing was adjourned to 21 June 2016.

D. Monitoring Mission from 20 June 2016 to 23 June 2016

High Court Hearing of 21 June 2016

56. The hearing was held before the full Chamber. Mr. Bonaventure Ruberwa appeared for the Prosecution. Defence Counsel Bruce Bikotwa and Jean d'Arc Umutesi were also in attendance. The hearing proceeded in the absence of the Accused Mr. Munyagishari.
57. The hearing continued after adjournment on 17 June 2016, when witness MDE had indicated

he was unwell, therefore could not continue with his testimony.

58. Defence Counsel were allocated 3 hours, to finish the cross-examination of witness MDE.
59. In the course of the cross-examination the Court asked Defence Counsel to stop asking the witness repetitive questions.
60. Counsel, in response indicated they were of the opinion the questions were relevant, in helping ascertain the truth of what the witness had told the Court.
61. The Court informed Counsel that it was well aware of what the witness had said in Court, and there was no reason to keep asking the witness to repeat the same assertions, and Counsel should take direction from the Court.
62. Defence Counsel, indicated that if the Court felt that it was not necessary to continue with the cross examination, they did not see why they should continue. Counsel then sat down.
63. The next witness MDK was invited to testify. They took the stand and the oath was administered.
64. The Prosecution introduced the witness as former neighbor of Mr. Munyagishari, who was aware of the people Mr. Munyagishari had killed. The witness was in Court testify on this issues related to Mr. Munyagishari's role in the genocide that were within his knowledge.
65. The Court advised the witness to ensure he did not disclose his identity during his testimony, as he was a protected witness. The Prosecution and Defence were also advised to avoid disclosing the identity of the witness.
66. When the witness had finished summarising his testimony, the Court invited the Prosecution to examine the witness.
67. After the examination, the Court informed the witness that they would be asked questions by the Defence, which they should answer. The Defence was then invited to cross-examine the witness.

68. Once the Defence had completed the cross-examination the Court stood down the witness and advised the Parties that the hearing would be adjourned to 27 June 2016, when the Court would hear the testimony of witness MDB.
69. Defence informed the Court that they had scheduled hearings at the Supreme Court on Monday, 27 June 2016 and Tuesday, 28 June 2016.
70. Having heard, the request by the Defence, after consultations among the judges the Court scheduled the next hearing for 14 July 2016.

Meeting with Mr. Munyagishari held on 22 June 2016

71. The Monitor met with Mr. Munyagishari at the Kigali Central Prison in the presence of an interpreter.
72. Mr. Munyagishari, begun the meeting by updating the Monitor on the conditions of detention. He praised the Prison Director referring to him as good leader.
73. Mr. Munyagishari informed the Monitor that the Director has bought the television decoder for the special enclosure; they were now able to access all the TV channels they desired. He also updated the Monitor that the complaints about the food had also been resolved and the old caterer had resumed her duties and the food was good.
74. Turning to his case, Mr. Munyagishari showed the Monitor the letter dated 17 June 2016, from President of the MICT, acknowledging receipt of his letter dated 14 May 2016, and assuring him of the MICT President's continued monitoring of his case. Mr. Munyagishari indicated that he was happy to receive the response, particularly because of the assurance that the President remains engaged in his case.
75. Mr. Munyagishari expressed disappointment in Counsel Bikotwa and Jeanne d'Arc for their assertions in Court that he had a list of defence witnesses that he had refused to give them.⁴

⁴ See *The Prosecutor v. B. Munyagishari*, April 2016 Monitoring Report para. 139.

76. Mr. Munyagishari informed the Monitor that when the Supreme Court, issued its decision on 15 April 2016, denying him the right to receive court documents in French, he had called Counsel Bikotwa requesting him and Counsel Jeanne d’Arc to come to Prison to meet him. Counsel came to meet him on 6 May 2016, he requested them to stop acting in his case, because if they continued appearing in Court, in the pretext of representing him, he was unlikely to get a fair trial. According to Mr. Munyagishari, Defence Counsel promised act as advised but to his surprise, they were still appearing in Court in his case. He informed the Monitor that he had also documented the same request in a letter to both Counsel dated 3 May 2016, which they received on 6 May 2016, when they came to prison to meet him.

77. When he learnt that they had not stopped acting in his case, he initially thought it was because they were acting in the interest of justice, as impressed on them by the Court. After further research however, he learnt that the refusal by Counsel Bikotwa and Jeanne d’Arc to listen to his instructions, could amount to a violation of their obligation to him as their client. Mr. Munyagishari referenced the code of conduct for lawyers before the ICTR. In the introduction no. 3 provides that, Counsel have an overriding duty to defend their client’s interests, to the extent that they can do so without acting dishonestly or by improperly prejudicing the administration of justice.⁵

78. Mr. Munyagishari referred to Organic law no. 30/2008, the law relating to Rwandan nationality, where Article 29, provides on contentious matters on nationality, either in isolation or arising from appeals. Arguments against a party based on nationality or foreign nationality are public matters, which the Court ought to examine even if the parties do not invoke them. Such arguments based on nationality shall be examined before the case, which may lead to the adjournment of the case related to the subject matter. Mr. Munyagishari also referred to Article 15, of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights⁶ and paragraph 50 of the March 2016, Monitoring Report⁷. He decried that his rights have been violated because even the Congolese Government was not informed of his arrest and allowed to access him in Rwanda.

79. According to Mr. Munyagishari, if Counsel had taken time to study his case, they would

⁵ See Code of Professional Conduct for Defence Counsel 8 June 1998, Arusha, Tanzania

⁶ UN General Assembly, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 10 December 1948, 217 A (III), available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3712c.html> [accessed 19 July 2016]

⁷ See *The Prosecutor v. B. Munyagishari*, Case No. MICT-12-20, Public Monitoring Report for March 2016 (“March 2016 Monitoring Report”).

have discovered, that his former Counsel Niyibizi had written to the Chief Registrar of the High Court, on 16 December 2013, informing the Registrar that the defence witnesses list could only be compiled, if a complete defence team composed of the lead counsel, co-counsel, legal assistant and two investigators, mandated with a special mission to locate and identify witnesses outside Rwanda, was constituted. That was the only process of developing the defence witness list.

80. Mr. Munyagishari averred that since this proposal by his former Counsel was not accepted by the High Court, and his Counsel were replaced with the new Counsel on record, he had appealed and now the issue of him being able to mount an effective defence with the assistance of his Counsel, was before the Supreme Court.

81. Mr. Munyagishari expressed that the blunders by Counsel Bikotwa and Jeanne d'Arc, had led to the High Court deciding to proceed with the hearings regardless of the availability of defence witnesses. This according to Mr. Munyagishari is evidence that Lead Counsel Bikotwa was not an effective Defence Counsel.

82. Mr. Munyagishari referred to the hearing of 21 March 2016, where his letter to the Court dated 15 March 2016, was considered. At the hearing, Counsel had indicated that they were not copied in the letter, and therefore they left it to the Court to decide whether to proceed with the hearing. Mr. Munyagishari questioned why Counsel had not requested for time to go and study the letter, this according to Mr. Munyagishari, was further evidence that Defence Counsel did not have his interest at heart.⁸

83. Mr. Munyagishari also complained that Defence Counsel had been filing pleadings in Court in Kinyarwanda - a language he cannot read, and therefore doesn't know what they are telling the Court. Mr. Munyagishari asserted that he is greatly disadvantaged, since his previous Counsel would file pleadings in French, which is the language he understands.

84. Moving to the Court procedure, Mr. Munyagishari informed the Monitor that Article 147 of the Criminal Procedure Code,⁹ requires compulsory appearance in Court of an Accused person in case of a felony. He asserted that the High Court had disregarded this law.

⁸ See *The Prosecutor v. B. Munyagishari*, March 2016, Monitoring Report para 105.

⁹ No. 30/2013 OF 24/5/2013 Law relating to the Code of Criminal Procedure.

85. In reference to paragraph 14 of the April 2016, Monitoring Report, Mr. Munyagishari wondered why Defence Counsel had not objected to the decision by the Court to have the Prosecution respond to defence submissions on the indictment after the testimonies of Prosecution witnesses. According to him this was un-procedural and an infringement to defence rights. He questioned the reason behind the postponement of such an important element of the trial.
86. Mr. Munyagishari expressed disappointment that Defence Counsel had agreed to proceed with the case before sufficient preparation. To reinforce his assertion he referred the Monitor to paragraph's 160,164, 169 of the April 2016, Monitoring Report,¹⁰ where according to Mr. Munyagishari, the Prosecution and the Court ridicule Defence Counsel for being disorganized in their preparations for the case. In his opinion Defence Counsel should have stood their ground from the beginning and insisted that the Court to allow them sufficient time to prepare the defence. By agreeing to the commencement of the trial, while unprepared, Counsel had jeopardized the possibility of them mounting an effective defence.
87. Mr. Munyagishari asserted that the Court was biased in its conduct of his trial, and had deliberately appointed new Counsel to represent him, so as to scuttle his defence. The new Counsel had made errors that assisted in the continued general bias of the presiding judge in his case. Mr. Munyagishari asserted that he was fighting to make sure his right to a fair trial was respected and that he is guaranteed to get a strong defence team that can ensure his rights are respected.
88. Mr. Munyagishari informed the Monitor that he intended to use all the available avenues for appeal before requesting his *pro bono* Counsel, before the Mechanism to file a revocation request.
89. Mr. Munyagishari told the Monitor that he had been informed, that Defence Counsel had written to the Registrar of the Mechanism, requesting to access his file in order to derive the list of defence witnesses, he asked the Monitor to inform the Registrar of the Mechanism, to ignore such the requests because they were not done under his instructions as the client.

¹⁰ See *The Prosecutor v. B. Munyagishari*, April 2016, Monitoring Report.

E. Monitoring Mission from 27 June 2016 to 30 June 2016

Meeting with Victor Mugabe CEO Rwanda Bar Association held on 29 June 2016

90. The Monitor met with Mr. Mugabe at to discuss some of the concerns that Defence Counsel had raised regarding the ongoing proceedings and the lack of intervention by the RBA leaving them feeling abandoned.
91. Mr. Mugabe explained to the Monitor that the contract that they had signed with Counsel was for facilitation of their fees. The bar was mandated to intervene in cases allocated to its lawyers, if it was considered that there was a substantial threat to the legal profession.
92. He continued to explain that in the present case, the letter that Counsel had written to the Judge copied to the RBA, related to the proceedings, as they were requesting for more time to conduct investigations.
93. Mr. Mugabe, informed the Monitor, the Bar was aware of the developments in the proceedings having been copied in the correspondence, but Counsel had not made a request to the Bar to intervene. As far as they were concerned they were copied in the correspondence for their information about the developments in the cases.
94. Mr. Mugabe explained that the Bar would overstep its mandate, if it intervened without a lawyer's request for assistance.
95. Mr. Mugabe assured the Monitor, that in the event that they observed a flagrant violation or threat to the legal profession, in the proceedings they would reach out but for now they considered that it was too early for such an intervention.

III. CONCLUSION

96. The Monitor's remain available to provide any information, at the President's direction.

Dated this 21st day of July 2016

Respectfully submitted

//Stella Ndirangu//

Monitor for the B. Munyagishari case
Nairobi, Kenya

//Elsy C. Sainna//

Elsy Sainna
Monitor for the B. Munyagishari case
Nairobi, Kenya



**TRANSMISSION SHEET FOR FILING OF DOCUMENTS WITH THE
MECHANISM FOR INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNALS/
FICHE DE TRANSMISSION POUR LE DÉPÔT DE DOCUMENTS DEVANT LE
MÉCANISME POUR LES TRIBUNAUX PÉNAUX INTERNATIONAUX**

I - FILING INFORMATION / INFORMATIONS GÉNÉRALES

To/ À :	<input type="checkbox"/> MICT Registry/ Greffe du MPTI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arusha/ Arusha	<input type="checkbox"/> The Hague/ La Haye
From/ De :	<input type="checkbox"/> Chambers/ Chambre	<input type="checkbox"/> Defence/ Défense	<input type="checkbox"/> Prosecution/ Bureau du Procureur
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other/ Autre : Monitor
Case Name/ Affaire :	Prosecutor v. B. Munyagishari		Case Number/ Affaire n° : MICT-12-20
Date Created/ Daté du :	21-07-2016	Date transmitted/ Transmis le :	21-07-2016
		No. of Pages/ Nombre de pages :	18
Original Language / Langue de l'original :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> English/ Anglais	<input type="checkbox"/> French/ Français	<input type="checkbox"/> Kinyarwanda
		<input type="checkbox"/> B/C/S	<input type="checkbox"/> Other/Autre (specify/préciser) :
Title of Document/ Titre du document :	Monitoring Report for June 2016		
Classification Level/ Catégories de classification :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclassified/ Non classifié	<input type="checkbox"/> Ex Parte Defence excluded/ Défense exclue	<input type="checkbox"/> Ex Parte Prosecution excluded/ Bureau du Procureur exclu
	<input type="checkbox"/> Confidential/ Confidentiel	<input type="checkbox"/> Ex Parte R86(H) applicant excluded/ Art. 86 H) requérant exclu	<input type="checkbox"/> Ex Parte Amicus Curiae excluded/ Amicus curiae exclu
	<input type="checkbox"/> Strictly Confidential/ Strictement confidentiel	<input type="checkbox"/> Ex Parte other exclusion/ autre(s) partie(s) exclue(s) (specify/préciser) :	
Document type/ Type de document :	<input type="checkbox"/> Motion/ Requête	<input type="checkbox"/> Submission from parties/ Écritures déposées par des parties	<input type="checkbox"/> Indictment/ Acte d'accusation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Decision/ Décision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Submission from non-parties/ Écritures déposées par des tiers	<input type="checkbox"/> Warrant/ Mandat
	<input type="checkbox"/> Order/ Ordonnance	<input type="checkbox"/> Book of Authorities/ Recueil de sources	<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Appeal/ Acte d'appel
	<input type="checkbox"/> Judgement/ Jugement/Arrêt	<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavit/ Déclaration sous serment	

II - TRANSLATION STATUS ON THE FILING DATE/ ÉTAT DE LA TRADUCTION AU JOUR DU DÉPÔT

<input type="checkbox"/> Translation not required/ La traduction n'est pas requise					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Filing Party hereby submits only the original, and requests the Registry to translate/ La partie déposante ne soumet que l'original et sollicite que le Greffe prenne en charge la traduction : (Word version of the document is attached/ La version Word est jointe)					
<input type="checkbox"/> English/ Anglais	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> French/ Français	<input type="checkbox"/> Kinyarwanda	<input type="checkbox"/> B/C/S	<input type="checkbox"/> Other/Autre (specify/préciser) :	
<input type="checkbox"/> Filing Party hereby submits both the original and the translated version for filing, as follows/ La partie déposante soumet l'original et la version traduite aux fins de dépôt, comme suit :					
Original/ Original en	<input type="checkbox"/> English/ Anglais	<input type="checkbox"/> French/ Français	<input type="checkbox"/> Kinyarwanda	<input type="checkbox"/> B/C/S	<input type="checkbox"/> Other/Autre (specify/préciser) :
Translation/ Traduction en	<input type="checkbox"/> English/ Anglais	<input type="checkbox"/> French/ Français	<input type="checkbox"/> Kinyarwanda	<input type="checkbox"/> B/C/S	<input type="checkbox"/> Other/Autre (specify/préciser) :
<input type="checkbox"/> Filing Party will be submitting the translated version(s) in due course in the following language(s)/ La partie déposante soumettra la (les) version(s) traduite(s) sous peu, dans la (les) langue(s) suivante(s) :					
<input type="checkbox"/> English/ Anglais	<input type="checkbox"/> French/ Français	<input type="checkbox"/> Kinyarwanda	<input type="checkbox"/> B/C/S	<input type="checkbox"/> Other/Autre (specify/préciser) :	

Send completed transmission sheet to/ Veuillez soumettre cette fiche dûment remplie à :

JudicialFilingsArusha@un.org OR/OU JudicialFilingsHague@un.org

Rev: Avril 2014/Rév. : Avril 2014