AN EXPLORATORY STUDY ON WITNESS PROTECTION AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

Dr. Ajai Veer, Shia P.G. College Lucknow

ABSTRACT

Witnesses occupy a fundamental position in criminal justice systems because their evidence can determine whether serious offences are investigated, prosecuted and adjudicated effectively. Yet the willingness of a witness to testify may be undermined by intimidation, retaliation, coercion, bribery, social pressure, organised crime, terrorism and threats directed against family members. Witness protection has therefore developed from a predominantly police-security function into a broader component of fair-trial administration and access to justice. International standards increasingly recognise that protection must be balanced with the accused's rights, particularly the right to examine witnesses, equality of arms, disclosure and a public hearing. This paper examines witness protection from an international and comparative legal perspective. It analyses the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) framework, Council of Europe standards, European human-rights jurisprudence, the International Criminal Court framework and the United States Witness Security model. The study also considers selected international and comparative cases, including *Doorson v Netherlands*, *Van Mechelen and Others v Netherlands*, *Al-Khawaja and Tahery v United Kingdom* and proceedings before the International Criminal Court involving protective measures. The analysis demonstrates that witness protection and access to justice are mutually reinforcing objectives, but protection measures cannot be unlimited. An effective system must employ proportionality, judicial oversight, confidentiality, risk assessment, procedural safeguards and continuing protection before, during and after testimony. The paper argues that international cooperation is increasingly important because witnesses, threats, digital identities and organised criminal networks frequently cross national borders. It concludes with recommendations concerning independent protection authorities, minimum international standards, cross-border relocation arrangements, digital-security protocols, victim-sensitive procedures, judicial review and stronger data collection.

Keywords: Witness Protection, Access to Justice, Criminal Justice, Human Rights, Fair Trial, Witness Intimidation, Organised Crime, International Criminal Law, Protective Measures, Rule of Law.

1. INTRODUCTION

Witness testimony remains one of the principal mechanisms through which courts establish facts and determine criminal responsibility. In conventional criminal proceedings, the witness is expected to provide evidence openly and subject to scrutiny by the parties. This model reflects the importance of transparency, adversarial testing and the accused's right to a fair trial. However, the traditional model becomes difficult where the witness faces a realistic threat of retaliation because of his or her cooperation with law-enforcement authorities.[1]

The problem is particularly significant in prosecutions involving organised crime, terrorism, trafficking, corruption and serious violence. A criminal organisation may possess the financial resources, social influence and coercive capacity to intimidate witnesses. The threat may extend beyond the witness to family members or persons associated with the witness. UNODC has consequently developed a continuum of protective measures ranging from early identification of vulnerable witnesses and police protection to protection of identity, relocation and, in exceptional circumstances, change of identity.[2]

The legal significance of witness protection extends beyond physical security. If a witness cannot testify because of fear, the prosecution may be unable to present relevant evidence. Consequently, intimidation can interfere with the administration of justice itself. The Council of Europe has recognised that witnesses may require protection before, during and after trial and that protection should be reconciled with the rights of the defence.[3]

At the same time, witness protection cannot become a mechanism for weakening procedural fairness. Measures such as anonymity, voice distortion, remote testimony, restrictions on disclosure or admission of statements from absent witnesses may affect the ability of the accused to challenge evidence. European human-rights jurisprudence has therefore developed safeguards requiring courts to consider the overall fairness of proceedings and to ensure that restrictions on defence rights are justified and appropriately counterbalanced.[4]

2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The development of formal witness-protection programmes is closely associated with the growth of organised crime and the recognition that traditional investigative techniques may fail when criminal organisations possess the capacity to retaliate against witnesses.

Historically, witnesses were principally protected through ordinary police measures. These could include police presence, escorts, temporary security arrangements and protection at court. Such approaches are insufficient in cases where criminal organisations possess information networks capable of locating witnesses after proceedings. The contemporary concept of witness protection therefore encompasses a continuum of protective measures. UNODC identifies a progression beginning with the early identification of vulnerable witnesses and extending to police management, protection of identity during testimony, relocation and, in exceptional circumstances, change of identity.[6]

The United Nations framework is particularly important because Article 24 of the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime requires States Parties to consider appropriate measures to protect witnesses against retaliation and intimidation. The Convention also contemplates procedural measures that may permit testimony to be given in ways that protect witnesses while respecting the rights of the defence.[7] The Council of Europe has developed a particularly detailed regional framework. Its 2022 Recommendation CM/Rec(2022)9 contains 33 principles and specifically recognises contemporary risks arising from social media and technologies such as biometric authentication and facial recognition.[8]

First stage - physical protection:

Police escorts, secure transportation and protection of homes.

Second stage - procedural protection:

Anonymity, pseudonyms, restricted disclosure, video testimony and courtroom arrangements.

Third stage - comprehensive protection:

Relocation, identity management, digital security, psychological support, family protection and international relocation.

This evolution has significant implications for access to justice.

2.1 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Witness protection is significant because the effectiveness of criminal justice depends not merely upon the existence of substantive criminal laws but also upon the ability of victims and

witnesses to participate safely in proceedings. First, witness protection contributes to access to justice. Where intimidation prevents a witness from reporting crime or giving evidence, formal access to courts may exist while meaningful access to justice remains compromised.[10]

Second, protection supports the rule of law. Criminal organisations may attempt to replace the authority of courts with fear. Protecting witnesses helps preserve the capacity of judicial institutions to determine cases according to evidence rather than intimidation. Third, witness protection has a human-rights dimension. States have obligations concerning life, personal security, effective remedies and fair judicial proceedings. The precise obligations differ according to the applicable legal framework, but protection can become especially important where authorities know or ought to know of a serious risk.[11]

Fourth, witness protection raises an important fair-trial dilemma. Protecting a witness by concealing identity or restricting cross-examination can interfere with defence rights. Accordingly, protection must be carefully designed and judicially controlled. Finally, cross-border crime requires international cooperation. A witness may need relocation to another jurisdiction, while criminal suspects and their networks may operate across several states. International cooperation is therefore increasingly necessary for effective witness protection.[12]

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

To examine the international legal principles, standards and institutional mechanisms governing witness protection and access to justice.

To analyse selected international and comparative cases concerning witness anonymity, protective measures, disclosure and the accused's right to a fair trial.

To identify legal and institutional measures capable of strengthening witness protection while maintaining procedural fairness and access to justice.

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What international legal principles and institutional mechanisms govern witness protection and access to justice?

2. How has international and regional courts balanced witness protection against the accused's

rights to a fair trial and effective examination of witnesses?

3. What legal, institutional and international-cooperation measures can strengthen witness protection without undermining judicial fairness?

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research adopts a **doctrinal, comparative and analytical legal methodology**.

Primary sources include:

- International Conventions;
- International Criminal-Law Instruments;
- Regional Human-Rights Instruments;
- Judicial Decisions;
- Statutory Witness-Protection Frameworks; And
- International Institutional Rules.

Secondary Sources Include:

- Scholarly Articles;
- Books;
- Institutional Reports;
- Unodc Publications;
- Council Of Europe Materials; And
- Comparative Legal Scholarship.

The study applies **comparative legal analysis** to identify common principles across different legal systems.

6. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

6.1 UNODC Approach to Witness Protection

UNODC's *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime* remains an important international reference point. It treats witness protection as a comprehensive system rather than merely a security operation. The framework begins with identification of vulnerable witnesses and extends through courtroom protection and, where necessary, relocation and identity change.[13]

The principal contribution of the UNODC approach is its recognition that witness protection must be risk-based and operational. Protection programmes require specialised personnel, confidentiality procedures, security assessments and institutional coordination. The approach is particularly relevant to organised crime because conventional policing may be insufficient against networks capable of identifying and retaliating against witnesses.

6.2 Council of Europe Standards

Council of Europe standards emphasise both witness protection and defence rights. Recommendation R (97) 13 identifies intimidation as a threat capable of interfering with the witness's freedom to testify. It recommends legislative and practical measures to permit witnesses to testify without intimidation while preserving the rights of the defence.[14]

Recommendation Rec (2005) 9 further recognises the importance of protection for witnesses and collaborators of justice, especially in serious crime and terrorism cases.[15]

The 2022 Recommendation CM/Rec (2022) 9 is particularly important for contemporary research because it addresses developments in technology, including social media and biometric identification. It demonstrates that witness protection can no longer be confined to physical security.[16]

6.3 Human Rights Literature

Human-rights jurisprudence approaches witness protection through competing interests. The protection of witnesses may justify limitations on disclosure or confrontation, but such limitations must remain compatible with the overall fairness of proceedings.

The European Court of Human Rights has repeatedly stressed that the defence cannot necessarily demand unrestricted disclosure where competing interests, such as witness safety, exist. However, restrictions must be strictly necessary and accompanied by safeguards sufficient to preserve fairness.[17]

6.4 International Criminal Justice Literature

International criminal proceedings have developed particularly detailed protective measures because witnesses may testify against persons accused of mass atrocities, armed groups or powerful political and military actors. The ICC uses protective and special measures where circumstances justify them, while attempting to preserve the rights of the accused.[18]

The ICC experience demonstrates that witness protection may require a combination of anonymity, pseudonyms, redactions, voice and facial distortion, controlled disclosure and courtroom arrangements. In the *Lubanga* proceedings, for example, numerous witnesses received protective measures including voice and facial distortion and pseudonyms.[19]

6.5 Research Gap

The existing international literature provides substantial discussion of witness protection programmes, human-rights standards and courtroom safeguards. However, an important continuing research problem lies in integrating these strands into a single access-to-justice framework.

Three gaps are particularly relevant.

First, witness protection is sometimes treated primarily as a security issue, while access to justice requires consideration of reporting, participation, testimony and post-trial protection.

Second, comparative studies often examine national programmes separately, whereas cross-border organised crime increasingly requires transnational cooperation.

Third, traditional witness-protection scholarship has focused heavily on physical intimidation, while contemporary threats increasingly involve digital identification, social media, biometric technologies and information leakage. The Council of Europe expressly recognised these emerging challenges in its 2022 Recommendation.[20]

6.6. Conceptual Model of Witness Protection

A useful international model can be constructed around five legal pillars:

Pillar I -Risk Assessment

Protection should begin with an objective assessment of the nature and seriousness of the threat.

Pillar II -Proportionality

The measure adopted should correspond to the actual level of risk.

Pillar III -Procedural Fairness

Protective measures affecting defence rights should be subject to judicial supervision.

Pillar IV -Institutional Independence

Protection should be administered by specialised and properly vetted personnel.

Pillar V -International Cooperation

Cross-border threats require mechanisms for international relocation and information-sharing.

7. INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK

7.1 United Nations Framework

The United Nations framework concerning transnational organised crime supports measures to protect witnesses from retaliation and intimidation. The broader international approach treats witness protection as part of effective criminal justice cooperation.

UNODC's good-practice framework provides practical guidance concerning risk assessment, protective units, confidentiality, courtroom protection, relocation and identity change.[21]

The international framework therefore establishes a principle of effective protection proportionate to risk, rather than a single universal model.

7.2 Council of Europe Framework

The Council of Europe provides one of the most developed regional frameworks. Its standards emphasise:

- Protection before, during and after proceedings;
- Protection of family members where necessary;
- Prevention and punishment of intimidation;
- Alternative methods of testimony;
- Judicial safeguards;
- Training of justice personnel;
- International cooperation; and
- Reconciliation of protection with defence rights.[22]

7.3 International Criminal Court

The ICC framework is particularly significant because witnesses may be exposed to extraordinary risks. The Rules of Procedure and Evidence empower the Court's relevant organs to recommend and implement protection measures and to provide appropriate assistance to witnesses.[23]

Protective measures may include confidentiality, pseudonyms, redaction and courtroom arrangements. Their application must nevertheless be compatible with the rights of the accused.

7.4 United States Model

The United States Witness Security Programme represents a highly institutionalised approach. Under the Witness Security Reform Act, protection can include relocation and related services for witnesses facing retaliation. The system also contemplates protection of eligible relatives and associates.[24]

The U.S. model illustrates an important principle: effective protection requires post-testimony sustainability. Housing, employment, documentation and continuing security can be necessary where a witness cannot safely return to the previous environment.[25]

8. CASE LAWS AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

8.1 *Doorson v Netherlands*

The European Court of Human Rights addressed the tension between witness protection and defence rights in *Doorson v Netherlands*, Application No. 20524/92, judgment of 26 March 1996.

The Court recognised that criminal proceedings may involve competing interests, including the need to protect witnesses. At the same time, restrictions on defence rights must be sufficiently counterbalanced to ensure that the proceedings as a whole remain fair.[26]

The importance of *Doorson* lies in its rejection of an absolute approach. Witness protection is a legitimate objective, but it does not automatically override Article 6 rights. The case therefore supports a balancing and proportionality approach.

8.2 *Van Mechelen and Others v Netherlands*

In *Van Mechelen and Others v Netherlands*, Applications Nos. 21363/93, 21364/93, 21427/93 and 22056/93, judgment of 23 April 1997, the Court further examined anonymous police witnesses.

The Court stressed that measures restricting defence rights must be strictly necessary. It also emphasised that difficulties created for the defence must be adequately counterbalanced by judicial procedures.[27]

The case demonstrates that witness anonymity cannot become routine simply because anonymity is convenient for the prosecution. The greater the restriction on confrontation and examination, the greater the need for judicial safeguards.

8.3 *Al-Khawaja and Tahery v United Kingdom*

In *Al-Khawaja and Tahery v United Kingdom*, Applications Nos. 26766/05 and 22228/06,

Grand Chamber judgment of 15 December 2011, the European Court considered convictions involving statements from witnesses who did not testify at trial.[28]

The judgment developed important principles concerning absent witnesses and the overall fairness of criminal proceedings.

The case is significant because it illustrates that witness protection and witness absence must be analysed separately from the reliability of the prosecution case. The admission of evidence from an unavailable witness requires careful examination of the reasons for non-attendance, the significance of the evidence and the existence of counterbalancing safeguards.

8.4 *M v Netherlands*

In *M v Netherlands*, the European Court reiterated that disclosure rights are not absolute and that competing interests may include protection of witnesses from reprisals. However, restrictions on defence rights must be strictly necessary and balanced by adequate procedural safeguards.[29]

The principle is particularly relevant to modern witness protection because sensitive information may expose witnesses to danger if disclosed. At the same time, confidentiality cannot become a blanket justification for withholding material capable of affecting the fairness of the trial.

9. INTERNATIONAL CASE STUDY -*PROSECUTOR V THOMAS LUBANGA DYILO*

The *Lubanga* proceedings before the ICC provide an important example of the practical operation of witness protection in international criminal proceedings.

During the trial, 25 witnesses received protective measures. These included voice and facial distortion and the use of pseudonyms. Some vulnerable witnesses were also supported by assistants or psychologists.[30]

The *Lubanga* proceedings demonstrate that witness protection may operate at multiple levels:

1. Protection of identity;

2. Protection of physical appearance;

3. Protection of voice;

4. Controlled courtroom interaction;

5. Psychological support; and

6. Confidentiality of sensitive information.

The case also illustrates the necessity of proportionality. The ICC's approach recognises that protective measures should protect witnesses without unfairly prejudicing the defence.[31]

10. COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY -UNITED STATES WITNESS SECURITY PROGRAMME

The United States Witness Security Programme provides a different model from courtroom anonymity. Rather than relying principally upon anonymity, the system may remove the witness from the threatening environment.

The statutory framework permits relocation and protective services where testimony creates a risk of retaliation. The programme can extend to qualifying family members and may involve new documentation and assistance with housing and employment.[32]

The U.S. model demonstrates the value of separating protection from the courtroom itself. Where the threat arises from organised criminal networks capable of locating a witness, anonymity during testimony may be insufficient. Relocation may therefore provide a more comprehensive form of protection.

The model also highlights an important institutional lesson: witness protection requires specialised authorities and clearly defined responsibilities among prosecutors, law-enforcement agencies and protection personnel.[33]

11. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MAJOR APPROACHES

Jurisdiction/Institution	**Principal Approach**	**Major Legal Concern**
UNODC	Risk-based continuum of protection	Operational capacity

Council of Europe	Protection + fair-trial safeguards	Proportionality and defence rights
European Court of Human Rights	Judicial balancing	Article 6 fairness
ICC	Protective and special courtroom measures	Witness safety versus accused's rights
United States	Relocation, security and identity measures	Long-term sustainability and resources

The comparison demonstrates that there is no single universal model of witness protection. States employ different combinations of police protection, anonymity, special testimony arrangements, relocation and identity change.

The common principle is that protection should correspond to the nature and seriousness of the threat while preserving judicial fairness.

11.1 Comparative Legal Matrix

Legal Dimension	**UN Model**	**Council of Europe**	**ICC**	**US Model**
Risk assessment	Central	Central	Important	Central
Physical protection	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Identity protection	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Relocation	Yes	Yes	Possible	Major component
Judicial oversight	Important	Strong	Strong	Institutional/statutory
Digital threats	Developing	Expressly recognised	Increasingly important	Relevant
International relocation	Recognised	Strong emphasis	International environment	Bilateral mechanisms
Defence safeguards	Required	Strong	Strong	Constitutional/procedural
Post-trial protection	Yes	Yes	Yes	Significant

12. WITNESS PROTECTION AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

Access to justice should not be understood solely as the physical ability to enter a courtroom. It includes the practical ability to report crime, participate in proceedings, give evidence without coercion and obtain meaningful judicial consideration. A witness who fears retaliation may refuse to cooperate. Consequently, intimidation can create a hidden barrier to justice.

Witness protection therefore serves at least four access-to-justice functions:

Protection encourages witnesses to participate in criminal proceedings. Protection assists courts in receiving relevant evidence that might otherwise be suppressed by fear. Vulnerable witnesses may require special measures to participate on a meaningful basis. Where witnesses can safely approach authorities, public confidence in the justice system may be strengthened. However, access to justice also includes the rights of accused persons. A system cannot legitimately protect witnesses by eliminating the procedural safeguards necessary for a fair criminal trial.

13. EMERGING CHALLENGES

Social media can expose a witness's identity rapidly. Information that previously required physical surveillance can now be obtained through online activity, facial recognition and data aggregation.

The Council of Europe has specifically recognised social media and biometric technologies as emerging witness-protection challenges.[34]

Criminal networks frequently operate across national boundaries. A witness relocated within one country may still be vulnerable to identification by transnational networks.

International cooperation is therefore increasingly important.[35]

Witness protection requires sensitive information concerning identity, location and family circumstances. Unauthorised disclosure of such information can itself create danger.

Permanent relocation may protect physical safety but can also disrupt employment, education, family relationships and social identity. Modern protection programmes therefore increasingly require holistic support.

Children and persons affected by trauma may require special procedures that minimise repeated questioning, intimidation and unnecessary exposure.

14. FINDINGS

The study produces the following principal findings:

Witness protection is increasingly recognised as an integral component of effective criminal justice rather than merely a law-enforcement service.

There is broad international recognition that witnesses exposed to intimidation require protection before, during and after proceedings. No single model is universally appropriate. Protection should be based upon individual risk assessment. Witness protection must be reconciled with the accused's right to a fair trial.

European human-rights jurisprudence establishes that restrictions on defence rights require necessity, proportionality and adequate counterbalancing safeguards.[36]

International criminal proceedings demonstrate the usefulness of protective measures such as pseudonyms, voice and facial distortion, redactions and controlled courtroom arrangements.

The United States model demonstrates that long-term relocation and social assistance may be necessary where threats are severe. Digital technologies have transformed the nature of witness threats and require witness-protection systems to adopt specialised digital-security procedures. Cross-border cooperation remains essential where threats or criminal organisations operate internationally.

An effective witness-protection programme requires specialised institutions, adequate resources, trained personnel, confidentiality and independent oversight.

15. RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

States should work towards common minimum standards covering risk assessment, confidentiality, emergency protection, courtroom measures, relocation and post-trial protection.

Witness protection should, where practicable, be administered through specialised units with adequate institutional independence from investigators directly responsible for the prosecution.

Protection should be based upon documented risk assessment rather than arbitrary administrative discretion.

Where protective measures restrict defence rights, courts should provide meaningful judicial oversight and ensure proportionality.

States should develop bilateral and multilateral arrangements enabling secure relocation where domestic protection is insufficient.

15.1 Digital Protection

Protection programmes should include:

- Digital identity management;
- Cybersecurity;
- Social-media risk monitoring;
- Biometric-information safeguards;
- Secure communication systems; and
- Strict control of sensitive databases.

Where threats extend to relatives or close associates, appropriate protection should be available to them, subject to lawful eligibility criteria.

Protection should not automatically terminate when testimony concludes. Continuing risk should be assessed.

Children, persons with disabilities, victims of sexual violence and traumatised witnesses should receive procedures adapted to their particular needs.

Judges, prosecutors, police officers, defence counsel and protection personnel should receive specialised training concerning intimidation, confidentiality, trauma and protective measures.

States should systematically collect anonymised information concerning witness intimidation, protection applications, protective measures and outcomes. The Council of Europe has specifically encouraged improved statistics and information-sharing concerning witness cooperation and convictions.[37]

International organisations and national authorities should establish mechanisms for exchanging good practices and responding to transnational threats.

16. CONCLUSION

Witness protection has become an important component of contemporary criminal justice and international rule-of-law policy. The central challenge is to create conditions in which witnesses can participate freely while preserving the fundamental procedural rights of accused persons.

International standards demonstrate substantial convergence around several principles: protection should be effective, proportionate, risk-based, confidential where necessary and capable of continuing beyond testimony. At the same time, anonymity and other restrictions on defence rights cannot be treated as automatic. The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights illustrates the continuing importance of necessity, counterbalancing safeguards and assessment of the fairness of proceedings as a whole.

International criminal justice has further demonstrated that witness protection can involve sophisticated combinations of pseudonyms, voice and facial distortion, redactions, controlled disclosure and psychological support. The United States experience demonstrates the additional importance of relocation, identity management and long-term assistance.

The contemporary challenge is increasingly transnational and technological. Social media, biometric identification, digital databases and international criminal networks can undermine traditional forms of protection. Consequently, witness protection must evolve from a predominantly physical-security model into a comprehensive legal, institutional, technological and human-rights framework.

Ultimately, effective witness protection strengthens access to justice when it enables witnesses to participate without fear while maintaining the procedural safeguards that make judicial proceedings legitimate. The objective should therefore be neither unrestricted protection nor unrestricted disclosure, but a carefully regulated system capable of protecting vulnerable witnesses and preserving the fairness and integrity of criminal adjudication.

REFERENCES

International Instruments and Institutional Materials

1. Council of Europe. *Recommendation No. R (97) 13 concerning intimidation of witnesses and the rights of the defence*. Strasbourg, 1997.

2. Council of Europe. *Recommendation Rec(2005)9 on the protection of witnesses and collaborators of justice*. Strasbourg, 2005.

3. Council of Europe. *Recommendation CM/Rec(2022)9 on the protection of witnesses and collaborators of justice*. Strasbourg, 2022.

4. Council of Europe. *Recommendation CM/Rec(2023)2 on rights, services and support for victims of crime*. Strasbourg, 2023.

5. International Criminal Court. *Rules of Procedure and Evidence*. ICC-ASP/1/3 (Part II-B), as amended.

6. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime*. United Nations, Vienna, 2008.

7. United States Department of Justice. *Justice Manual, Title 9, Criminal Division, Witness Security*.

Cases

1. *Al-Khawaja and Tahery v United Kingdom* [GC], App Nos 26766/05 and 22228/06 (ECtHR, 15 December 2011).

2. *Doorson v Netherlands*, App No 20524/92 (ECtHR, 26 March 1996).

3. *M v Netherlands*, App No 2156/10 (ECtHR).

4. *Van Mechelen and Others v Netherlands*, App Nos 21363/93, 21364/93, 21427/93 and 22056/93 (ECtHR, 23 April 1997).

5. *Prosecutor v Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*, ICC-01/04-01/06, International Criminal Court.

6. *Prosecutor v Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo*, ICC-01/05-01/08, International Criminal Court.

Reports

1. Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. *Witness Protection as an Indispensable Tool in the Fight Against Organised Crime and Terrorism in Europe*, Recommendation

2063 (2015).

2. United States Department of Justice, Office of Inspector General. *The Federal Witness Security Program*, Report No 02-05 (2002).

CITATIONS

1. Council of Europe, *Recommendation No. R (97) 13 concerning intimidation of witnesses and the rights of the defence* (10 September 1997).

2. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime* (UNODC 2008).

3. Council of Europe, *Recommendation Rec(2005)9 on the protection of witnesses and collaborators of justice* (20 April 2005).

4. *Doorson v Netherlands* App no 20524/92 (ECtHR, 26 March 1996); *Van Mechelen and Others v Netherlands* App nos 21363/93, 21364/93, 21427/93 and 22056/93 (ECtHR, 23 April 1997). The European Court's subsequent case-law continues to recognise the need to balance witness protection against defence rights.

5. UNODC, *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime* (2008).

6. Ibid.

7. Witness Security Reform Act of 1984, Part F, ch XII, Comprehensive Crime Control Act 1984, Pub L No 98-473; US Department of Justice, *Justice Manual 9-21.000 Witness Security*.

8. Council of Europe, *Recommendation CM/Rec(2022)9 on the protection of witnesses and collaborators of justice* (31 March 2022).

9. International Criminal Court, *Rules of Procedure and Evidence*, Rule 87 and Rule 88.

10. Council of Europe, *Recommendation CM/Rec(2023)2 on rights, services and support for victims of crime* (15 March 2023).

11. See generally *Osman v United Kingdom* (1998) 29 EHRR 245 concerning positive obligations under Article 2 of the European Convention, subject to the Court's established criteria. ↩

12. Council of Europe, *Recommendation Rec(2005)9*, recognising international cooperation as an important means of protecting persons who cannot adequately be protected nationally.

13. UNODC, *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime* (2008).

14. Council of Europe, *Recommendation No. R (97) 13*.

15. Council of Europe, *Recommendation Rec(2005)9*.

16. Council of Europe, *Recommendation CM/Rec(2022)9*.

17. *M v Netherlands* App no 2156/10 (ECtHR), summarising the principles from *Doorson* and *Van Mechelen*.

18. ICC, *Rules of Procedure and Evidence*, Rules 87–88.

19. International Criminal Court, "Trial of Thomas Lubanga Dyilo: Office of the Prosecutor finishes its case presentation" (14 July 2009).

20. Council of Europe, *Recommendation CM/Rec(2022)9*.

21. UNODC, *Good Practices for the Protection of Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Involving Organized Crime* (2008).

22. Council of Europe, *Recommendation No. R (97) 13* and *Recommendation Rec(2005)9*.

23. ICC, *Rules of Procedure and Evidence*, Rules 87–88.

24. US Department of Justice, *Justice Manual 9-21.000 Witness Security*.

25. US Department of Justice, *Witness Services*, Criminal Resource Manual 705.

26. *Doorson v Netherlands* App no 20524/92 (ECtHR, 26 March 1996), as subsequently summarised by the European Court.

27. *Van Mechelen and Others v Netherlands* App nos 21363/93, 21364/93, 21427/93 and 22056/93 (ECtHR, 23 April 1997). The principle that restrictions must be strictly necessary and counterbalanced is reflected in later ECtHR case-law.

28. *Al-Khawaja and Tahery v United Kingdom* [GC], App nos 26766/05 and 22228/06 (ECtHR, 15 December 2011).

29. *M v Netherlands* App no 2156/10 (ECtHR).

30. International Criminal Court, "Trial of Thomas Lubanga Dyilo: Office of the Prosecutor finishes its case presentation" (14 July 2009).

31. ICC Court Record, *Prosecutor v Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo*, ICC-01/05-01/08-800-Corr-Red4, 6 July 2010, discussing proportional protective measures and avoiding unfair prejudice to the defence.

32. US Department of Justice, *Justice Manual 9-21.100 Witness Security*.

33. US Department of Justice, *Justice Manual 9-21.500 Responsibilities and Prerogatives of the United States Marshals Service*.

34. Council of Europe, *Recommendation CM/Rec(2022)9*.

35. Council of Europe, *Recommendation Rec(2005)9*.

36. *Doorson v Netherlands*; *Van Mechelen and Others v Netherlands*; *Al-Khawaja and Tahery v United Kingdom*.

37. Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Recommendation 2063 (2015), *Witness protection as an indispensable tool in the fight against organised crime and terrorism in Europe*.