

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
Tribunal pénal international pour le Rwanda

817 Duy

OR: ENG

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Before Judge:

Dennis C. M. Byron President of the Tribunal

Registrar:

Adama Dieng

Date:

13 February 2008

THE PROSECUTOR

 \mathbf{v} .

Vincent RUTAGANIRA

Case No. ICTR-1995-1C-R73

DECISION ON THE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DENIAL OF EARLY RELEASE

Article 27 of the Statute & Rule 126 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence

Office of the Prosecutor:

Hassan Bubacar Jallow Loretta E. Lynch Richard Karegyesa Toby Smith Renifa Madenga Abdoulaye Seye Dennis Mabura Defence Counsel: François Roux Maroufa Diabira



13 February 2008

INTRODUCTION

- 1. On 14 March 2005, Vincent Rutaganira was sentenced to six years of imprisonment for extermination as a crime against humanity. He was granted credit for time already served since his arrest and transfer to the United Nations Detention Facility on 4 March 2002.
- 2. On 6 March 2006, Vincent Rutaganira filed a motion before the President of the Tribunal ("President") for early release.³ On 2 June 2006, the President, Judge Erik Møse, rejected this request.⁴ Vincent Rutaganira appealed the Impugned Decision on 4 July 2006.⁵ The Appeals Chamber dismissed the application on 24 August 2006 for lack of jurisdiction.⁶
- 3. On 22 February 2007, Vincent Rutaganira moved the President to reconsider his Decision of 2 June 2006.⁷ On 21 May 2007, Judge Dennis C. M. Byron was elected to succeed Judge Erik Møse, while the motion for reconsideration was still pending.

DELIBERATIONS

Is a Motion for Reconsideration of Decisions of the President Admissible?

4. An early release is a commutation of sentence which Article 27 of the Statute provides for. It can be granted at the discretion of the President upon consultation with the Judges, and on the basis of the interests of justice and the general principles of law. While the Statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence ("Rules") do not provide for reconsideration, the jurisprudence of the Tribunal has long established that a Chamber has an inherent power to reconsider its own decisions under specific conditions. In the exercise of his judicial functions, the President has the same inherent power to reconsider, vary or rescind his own decisions where exceptional circumstances and the interests of justice so

The Prosecutor v. Vincent Rutaganira, Case No. ICTR-1995-1C-T ("Rutaganira"), Judgement and Sentence (TC), 14 March 2005.

Id., para. 171.

Requête aux fins de libération anticipée devant le Président du Tribunal pénal international pour le Rwanda, 6 March 2006.

Rutaganira, Decision on Request for Early Release (President), 2 June 2006.

Acte d'appel, 4 July 2006.

⁶ Rutaganira, Decision on Appeal of a Decision of the President on Early Release (AC), 24 August 2006.

Requête en reconsidération de la décision de refus de libération anticipée de M. Rutaganira rendue le 2 juin 2006 devant le Président du Tribunal pénal international pour le Rwanda, 22 February 2007.

See e.g. The Prosecutor v. Théoneste Bagosora, Gratien Kabiligi, Aloys Ntabakuze, Anatole Nsengiyumva ("Bagosora et al.") Case No. ICTR-98-41-T, Decision on Prosecutor's Motion for Reconsideration of the Trial Chamber's "Decision on Prosecutor's Motion for Leave to Vary the Witness List Pursuant to Rule 73bis(E)]" (TC), 15 June 2004, para. 7.



require. It is also settled in the jurisprudence that reconsideration cannot be used to circumvent the inadmissibility of an appeal or a review of an interlocutory decision.⁹

Is Reconsideration of the Impugned Decision Warranted?

- 5. According to the settled law of the Tribunal, reconsideration is warranted when
 - (i) a new fact has been discovered that was not known at the time of the original Decision;
 - (ii) there has been a material change in circumstances since the original Decision; or
 - (iii) there is reason to believe that the original Decision was erroneous or constituted an abuse of power, resulting in an injustice.¹⁰
- 6. There has been no discovery of new facts, and no material changes in circumstances since the original decision.
- 7. Vincent Rutaganira argues that the 10 May 2000 Practice Direction referred to in the Decision of 2 June 2006 cannot be opposed to him because he does not have access it. That argument is irrelevant as the jurisdiction exercised by the President derives from Part Nine of the Rules of Evidence and Procedure in Rules 124 to 126.
- 8. Vincent Rutaganira contends that the President erred in going beyond the enumerated standards in Rule 126 for consideration of early release. However, Rule 126 does not purport to be a complete list of factors that may be considered, as it explicitly states: "In determining whether pardon or commutation of sentence is appropriate, the President shall take into account, *inter alia*, the gravity of the crime..."
- 9. Vincent Rutaganira complains that the President erred in comparing his situation convicted of extermination with that of prisoners convicted of genocide for the purposes of Rule 126, referring to the following extract of the Decision of 2 June 2006: "previous requests for commutation of sentence or early release have been made by prisoners who are serving sentences for genocide". Such reference to the practice on and commutation and early release is a normal feature of decisions.

Emphasis added.



The Prosecutor v. Laurent Semanza, Case No. ICTR-97-20-T, Decision on Defence Motion to Reconsider Decision Denying Leave to Call Rejoinder Witnesses, 9 May 2002, para. 8.

See e.g. The Prosecutor v. Édouard Karemera, Mathieu Ngirumpatse and Joseph Nzirorera ("Karemera et al."), Case No. ICTR-98-44-T, Decision on Joseph Nzirorera's Second Motion for Reconsideration of Sanctions, 8 November 2007, para. 6 (and sources cited). See also Bagosora et al., Decision on Reconsideration of Order to Reduce Witness List and on Motion for Contempt for Violation of that Order (TC), 1 March 2004, para. 11; Bagosora et al., Decision on Defence Motion for Reconsideration of the Trial Chamber's Decision and Scheduling Order of 5 December 2001 (TC), 18 July 2003, para. 25.

13 February 2008

- 10. Finally, Vincent Rutaganira also contends that the factors taken into consideration in sentencing and early release are largely the same, suggesting that the President reviews them in his determination of early release. It is worth recalling that the sentence imposed was based on a guilty plea bargain agreement, and that reconsideration shall not be used as an alternative appeals mechanism. Most importantly the President considers that no injustice results from the rejection of an application for early release from a six year sentence for the grave crime of Extermination as a crime against humanity.
- 11. The application is entirely without merit, none of the conditions for reconsideration is met, and the motion falls to be dismissed.

FOF THOSE REASONS, THE PRESIDENT

DEMES the Motion for Reconsideration on all grounds.

Arus 1a, 13 February 2008, done in English.

Dennis C. M. Byron

President

[Seal of the Tribunal]



TRANSMISSION SHEET FOR FILING OF DOCUMENTS WITH CMS

COURT MANAGEMENT SECTION

(Art. 27 of the Directive for the Registry)

Mark Company

I - GENERAL INFORMATION (To be completed by the Chambers / Filing Party)				
To:	Trial Chamber N. M. Diallo	Trial Chamber II R. N. Kouambo	Trial Chamber III C. K. Hometowu	Appeals Chamber / Arusha F. A. Talon
	Chief, CMS JP. Fornété	Deputy Chief, CMS M. Diop	Chief, JPU, CMS M. Diop	Appeals Chamber / The Hague R. Muzigo-Morrison K. K. A. Afanđe
From:	Chamber	Defence	Prosecutor's Office	Other: Office of the President Sheila Paylan
	(names)	(names)	(names)	(names)
Case Name:	The Prosecutor vs. Vincent RUTAGANIS		Case Number: ICTR-95-1C-R73	
Dates:	Transmitted: 13 February 2008 Document's date: 13 February 2008		: 13 Febraury 2008	
No. of Pages:	4	Original Language:] ≦ rench ⊵ □ Kinyarwanda
Title of DECISION ON THE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DENIAL FEARLY RELEASE Document:				
Classification Level: TRIM Document Type: □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □				
Ex-Parte	dential / Under ©	Indictment ☐ Wa □ Indictment ☐ Wa □ Affi		Submission from parties
Strictly Confidential / Under \$ea		Disclosure Ord		Acoused particulars
☐ Public ☐ Judgement ☐ Motion ☐ Book of Authorities 💆				
II - TRANSLATION STATUS ON THE FILING DATE (To be completed by the Chambers / Filing Party)				
CMS SHALL take necessary action regarding translation.				
⊠ Filing Party hereby submits only the original, and will not submit any translated version.				
Reference material is provided in annex to facilitate translation.				
Target Language(s):				
☐ English		☐ French ☐ Kinyarwanda		nyarwanda
CMS SHALL NOT take any action regarding translation. Filing Party hereby submits BOTH the original and the translated version for filing, as follows:				
Original in English			French	☐ Kinyarwanda
Translation in ☐Eng		llish	French	☐ Kinyarwanda
CMS SHALL NOT take any action regarding translation.				
Filing Party will be submitting the translated version(s) in due course in the following language(s):				
☐ English ☐ French ☐ Kinyarwanda				
KINDLY FILL IN THE BOXES BELOW				
The OTP is overseeing translation. The document is submitted for translation.		ation. Anslation to	DEFENCE is overseeing translation. The document is submitted to an accredited service for	
☐ The Language Services Section			translation (fone will be submitted to DCDMS):	
☐ The Language Services Section		of the ICTR / The Hague.	the ICTR / The Hague. Name of contact person:	
An accredited service for trans		slation; see details below:		
Name of con	•		Address: E-mail / Tel. / Fax:	
Name of service: Address:			L-mail / Tol. / Lax.	
E-mail / Tel. / Fax:				
III - TRANSLATION PRIORITISATION (For Official use ONLY)				
☐Top priority		COMMENTS		Required date:
□Urgent		•		Hearing date:
	⊣ 1			To: ():
				Other deadlines:

NB: This form is available on: http://www.ictr.org/ENGLISH/cms/cms1.doc

CMS1 (Updated on 21 February 2005)