



អង្គជំនុំជម្រះវិសាមញ្ញក្នុងតុលាការកម្ពុជា

Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia
Chambres Extraordinaires au sein des Tribunaux Cambodgiens

Request for Correction

Case : 002/19-09-2007-ECCC/TC

ឯកសារដើម
ORIGINAL/ORIGINAL
ថ្ងៃ ខែ ឆ្នាំ (Date): 29-Apr-2014, 14:34
CMS/CFO: Sann Rada

To Document No(s):	ERN(s):	Request Date:	Correction Type:
E1/215.1	00934939-00935029	29-04-2014	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change to Original <input type="checkbox"/> Change to Translation <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassification

Reason for changes:

Error in interpretation.

Details:

The correction is made on the English version:

ERN 00935026, p. 85, L. 12-13.

The following footnote is added to this transcript:

"Corrected transcript: Text occurring between less than (<) and greater than (>) signs has been corrected to ensure consistency among the three language versions of the transcript."

Filed by: Reath Panhean

Signature: 

Approved by Greffier (for originals):

Signature: 

Approved by ITU (for translations):

Signature: 

1 because Angkar did not refer to any individual person in
2 particular.

3 Q. Thank you. Based on your person experience, were you
4 frequently referred to as Angkar?

5 A. It was kind of a closer reference. When a person was close to
6 me, yes. I would be referred to as Angkar.

7 Q. Was there any particular feature that the people or your
8 subordinates referred to you as Angkar? Did you possess certain
9 qualification in order for you to be referred to as Angkar?

10 A. ~~<Well of course, I felt, "if I let go this practice, it would~~
11 ~~not be good. It One should not address> > would not be actually~~
12 ~~appropriate for the people to refer to an individual as Angkar. I~~
13 ~~<thought to myself and I immediately educated and advised them~~
14 ~~not to> would educate them not to refer to any particular~~
15 ~~individual as Angkar.~~

16 [15.32.32]

17 Q. In reference to your testimony this morning, around 09.39, you
18 responded to some questions put to you by the Prosecutor
19 concerning the Krang Ta Chang office. You stated that you knew it
20 in 1974. That is, you knew about the existence of Krang Ta Chang.
21 My question to you is: Is your response correct?

22 MR. PRESIDENT:

23 Witness, please wait. The Prosecution, you may proceed.

24 MR. RAYNOR:

25 Sorry, Mr. President. I made reference to the statement in which