



International Tribunal for the
Prosecution of Persons Responsible for
Serious Violations of International
Humanitarian Law Committed in the
Territory of the Former Yugoslavia
since 1991

Case No.: IT-04-74-T
Date: 17 July 2008
Original: ENGLISH
French

IN TRIAL CHAMBER III

Before: Judge Jean-Claude Antonetti, Presiding
Judge Árpád Prandler
Judge Stefan Trechsel
Reserve Judge Antoine Kesia-Mbe Mindua

Registrar: Mr Hans Holthuis

Decision of: 17 July 2008

THE PROSECUTOR

v.

Jadranko PRLIĆ
Bruno STOJIĆ
Slobodan PRALJAK
Milivoj PETKOVIĆ
Valentin ĆORIĆ
Berislav PUŠIĆ

PUBLIC with CONFIDENTIAL ANNEX

**DECISION ON THE ACCUSED STOJIĆ'S MOTION
FOR PROVISIONAL RELEASE**

The Office of the Prosecutor:

Mr Kenneth Scott
Mr Douglas Stringer

Counsel for the Accused:

Mr Michael Karnavas and Ms Suzana Tomanović for Jadranko Prlić
Ms Senka Nožica and Mr Karim A. A. Khan for Bruno Stojić
Mr Božidar Kovačić and Ms Nika Pinter for Slobodan Praljak
Ms Vesna Alaburić and Mr Nicholas Stewart for Milivoj Petković
Ms Dijana Tomašegović-Tomić and Mr Dražen Plavec for Valentin Ćorić
Mr Fahrudin Ibrišimović and Mr Roger Sahota for Berislav Pušić

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Trial Chamber III (“Chamber”) of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (“Tribunal”) is seized of a motion for provisional release by the Accused Bruno Stojić (“Accused Stojić”) filed confidentially by Counsel for the Accused Stojić (“Stojić Defence”) on 30 June 2008.

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

2. On 30 June 2008, the Stojić Defence confidentially filed “Motion of Bruno Stojić for Provisional Release During the Period of Judicial Recess” (“Motion”), in which for humanitarian reasons it requests provisional release of the Accused Stojić to the Republic of Croatia for as long as possible during the period between 26 July and 24 August 2008.¹

3. On 10 July 2008, the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”) confidentially filed a Prosecution Consolidated Response to Defence Applications for Provisional Release During the Summer Recess (“Response”), in which the Prosecution opposes the release of the Accused Stojić.²

III. APPLICABLE LAW

4. Under Rule 65 (A) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”), once detained, an accused may not be released except upon an order of a Chamber. According to Rule 65 (B), release may be ordered the Chamber only after giving the host country and the State to which the accused seeks to be released the opportunity to be heard and only if it is satisfied that the accused will appear for trial and, if released, will not pose a danger to any victim, witness or other person.

5. According to Tribunal jurisprudence, the Chamber has discretionary power over the decision to grant or deny provisional release pursuant to Rule 65 of the Rules.³ To assess whether the conditions set forth in Rule 65 (B) of the Rules have been met, the Chamber must take into account all the relevant factors that a reasonable Trial Chamber would take in order to make its decision.⁴ The Chamber must then give reasons for its decision on these points.⁵ The relevance of the factors referred to and the weight to be ascribed to them is decided on a case-by-case basis.⁶ Because they depend primarily on the facts of the case in question, all requests for provisional release are examined in the light of the particular situation of the accused.⁷ The Chamber must examine this situation when deciding on provisional release, but, as far as it is able, must foresee what this situation will be like when the accused is to return to the Tribunal.⁸

6. According to recent rulings by the Appeals Chamber, the close of the Prosecution case constitutes an important change of situation that requires a new and detailed evaluation of an accused's risk of flight.⁹ Under these conditions, even if the

¹ Motion, p. 1, 17.

² Response, paras 2, 15-19, 49.

³ *The Prosecutor v. Jovica Stanišić and Franko Simatović*, Case No. IT-03-69-AR65.A, Decision on Prosecution Appeal of Decision on Provisional Release and Motions to Present Additional Evidence Pursuant to Rule 115, 26 June 2008 ("*Jovica Stanišić Decision*"), para. 3; *The Prosecutor v. Milutinović et al.*, Case No. IT-05-87-AR65.2, Decision on Interlocutory Appeal of Denial of Provisional Release During the Winter Recess, 14 December 2006 ("*Milutinović Decision*"), para. 3; *The Prosecutor v. Popović et al.*, Case No. IT-65-88-AR65.2, Decision on Defence's Interlocutory Appeal of Trial Chamber's Decision Denying Ljubomir Borovčanin Provisional Release, 30 June 2006, para. 5; *The Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-AR65.7, Decision on "Prosecution's Appeal from Décision relative à la Demande de mise en liberté provisoire de l'Accusé Petković dated 31 March 2008, 21 April 2008 ("*Petković Decision*"), para. 5; *The Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-AR65.8, Decision on Prosecution's Appeal from Décision relative à la demande de mise en liberté provisoire de l'Accusé Prlić dated 7 April 2008, 25 April 2008 ("*Prlić Decision of 25 April 2008*"), para. 7.

⁴ *The Prosecutor v. Mićo Stanišić*, Case No. IT-04-79-AR65.1, Decision on Prosecution's Interlocutory Appeal of Mićo Stanišić's Provisional Release, 17 October 2005 ("*Mićo Stanišić Decision*"), para. 8; *Jovica Stanišić Decision*, para. 35; *Petković Decision*, para. 8; *Prlić Decision of 25 April 2008*, para. 10.

⁵ *Jovica Stanišić Decision*, para. 35; *Petković Decision*, para. 8; *Prlić Decision of 25 April 2008*, para. 10; *Mićo Stanišić Decision*, para. 8.

⁶ *Jovica Stanišić Decision*, para. 35; *Petković Decision*, para. 8; *Prlić Decision of 25 April 2008*, para. 10.

⁷ *The Prosecutor v. Boškoski and Tarčulovski*, Case No. IT-04-82-AR65.1, Decision on Johan Tarčulovski's Interlocutory Appeal on Provisional Release, 4 October 2005 ("*Tarčulovski Decision*"), para. 7; *Jovica Stanišić Decision*, para. 35; *Petković Decision*, para. 8; *Prlić Decision of 25 April 2008*, para. 10; *Mićo Stanišić Decision*, para. 8.

⁸ *Jovica Stanišić Decision*, para. 35; *Petković Decision*, para. 8; *Prlić Decision of 25 April 2008*, para. 10; *Mićo Stanišić Decision*, para. 8.

⁹ *The Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-AR65.5, Decision on Prosecution's Consolidated Appeal against Decisions to Provisionally Release the Accused Prlić, Stojić, Praljak, Petković and Čorić, 11 March 2008 ("*Prlić Decision of 11 March 2008*"), para. 20.

Trial Chamber is convinced that sufficient guarantees have been given, it may not exercise its discretionary power to grant provisional release unless sufficiently compelling humanitarian reasons cause the scales to tip in this direction.¹⁰ Consequently, provisional release may only be granted “at a late stage of the proceedings, and in particular after the close of the Prosecution case, when sufficiently compelling humanitarian reasons exist to justify the release and, even when provisional release is found to be justified in light of the nature of the circumstances, the length of the release should nonetheless be proportional to these circumstances.”¹¹

7. Nonetheless, according to Appeals Chamber precedents, the Trial Chamber can best assess these matters if procedural circumstances such as the close of the Prosecution case increase the risk of flight during provisional release.¹²

IV. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

8. In support of the Motion, the Stojić Defence submits that: 1) all conditions under Rule 65 (B) of the Rules have been met;¹³ 2) the Government of the Republic of Croatia, which upheld all its obligations during the Accused Stojić’s previous periods of provisional release, a) offered new guarantees for the return of the Accused Stojić, and b) pledged to take all necessary measures to ensure that the Accused Stojić, if released, does not pose a danger to any victim, witness or any other person;¹⁴ 3) the Accused Stojić voluntarily surrendered to the Tribunal;¹⁵ and 4) the Accused Stojić’s full compliance with the terms of his previous provisional releases which guaranteed his return to The Hague and compliance with the provisions of Rule 65 (B) of the Rules.¹⁶ Finally, the Stojić Defence reminds the Chamber of the terms imposed on the Accused Stojić during his previous provisional releases and submits that the Accused

¹⁰ *Prlić* Decision of 11 March 2008, para. 21; *Prlić* Decision of 25 April 2008, para. 16; *Petković* Decision, para. 17.

¹¹ *Petković* Decision, para. 17; *Prlić* Decision of 25 April 2008, para. 16.

¹² *Milutinović* Decision, para. 15.

¹³ Motion, para. 4.

¹⁴ Motion, paras. 1, 4, 13.

¹⁵ Motion, paras. 10, 14.

¹⁶ Motion, paras. 1, 14-16.

Stojić states he will fully comply with the terms and guarantees for his return to be imposed on him should he be released.¹⁷

9. For compelling humanitarian reasons that it regards as sufficient to justify the provisional release of the Accused Stojić, the Stojić Defence draws particular attention to the state of health of his wife, his parents, his mother-in-law and his sister-in-law.¹⁸ In this connection, the Stojić Defence sent the Chamber several medical certificates: a certificate dated 20 May 2008, testifying to the state of health of the Accused Stojić's wife;¹⁹ a medical certificate of 2 June 2008, testifying to the state of health of the Accused Stojić's mother-in-law;²⁰ a medical certificate of 13 June 2008, testifying to the state of health of the Accused Stojić's mother;²¹ a medical certificate of 16 June 2008, testifying to the state of health of the Accused Stojić's father,²² and a medical certificate of 24 June 2008, testifying to the state of health of the Accused Stojić's sister-in-law.²³ Regarding the Accused Stojić's other family members, the Stojić Defence refers to the documents annexed to the previous motions on provisional release.²⁴ The Stojić Defence considers, *inter alia*, that the health problems of his family members would affect the mental and emotional well-being of the Accused Stojić.²⁵

10. In its Response, the Prosecution objects to provisional release for the Accused Stojić because, *inter alia*, the period he requested is excessive and because none of the reasons offered by the Accused in support of his request for release constitute sufficiently compelling humanitarian grounds to justify it.²⁶

11. The Prosecution acknowledges that the submitted humanitarian grounds regarding the family members of the Accused Stojić were recognised by the Appeals Chamber as grounds justifying the previous release of the Accused Stojić.²⁷ However, the Prosecution challenges the argument raised by the Stojić Defence whereby the

¹⁷ Motion, paras. 14-16.

¹⁸ Motion, paras. 5-12.

¹⁹ Medical certificate of the Accused Stojić's wife dated 20 May 2008 annexed to the Motion.

²⁰ Medical certificate of the Accused Stojić's mother-in-law dated 2 June 2008 annexed to the Motion.

²¹ Medical certificate of the Accused Stojić's mother dated 13 June 2008 annexed to the Motion.

²² Medical certificate of the Accused Stojić's father dated 16 June 2008 annexed to the Motion.

²³ Medical certificate of the Accused Stojić's sister-in-law dated 24 June 2008 annexed to the Motion.

²⁴ Motion, paras. 6, 8-9.

²⁵ Motion, para. 10.

²⁶ Response, paras. 2, 17-18, 49.

health problems of his family members affect the mental and emotional well-being of the Accused Stojić as constituting a compelling humanitarian ground.²⁸ The Prosecution argues that the Stojić Defence fails to specify the nature of this affect and submits that, on the contrary, this fact could increase the risk of flight of the Accused Stojić.²⁹ Consequently, according to the Prosecution, this fact argues against the provisional release of the Accused Stojić.³⁰

12. In the alternative, should the Chamber grant the Motion, the Prosecution requests that provisional release not exceed seven days, which would be sufficient time for him to visit the members of his family (including travel),³¹ and that it be subject to strict terms and conditions.³² In particular, the Prosecution requests that the Chamber prohibit the Accused (1) from any and all travel to or presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina; (2) from having any contact with any victims; (3) from discussing the case except with his counsel, and (4) from any and all contact with the media.³³

13. Finally, should the Trial Chamber grant the Motion, the Prosecution requests a stay of the Trial Chamber's decision until a decision has been taken on the appeal it intends to lodge.³⁴

V. DISCUSSION

14. Firstly, the Chamber finds that, pursuant to Rule 65 (B) of the Rules, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the host country, informed the Chamber in its letter dated 2 July 2008 that it did not have any objections to the procedure for possible provisional release.³⁵

15. In its letter dated 16 June 2008, the Government of the Republic of Croatia provided guarantees that the Accused Stojić, if a motion for provisional release were

²⁷ *Prlić* Decision of 25 April 2008, para. 17; Response, para. 12.

²⁸ Response, paras. 17-18.

²⁹ Response, paras. 17-18.

³⁰ Response, para. 18.

³¹ Response, paras 19, 50.

³² Response, paras 2, 47, 50.

³³ Response, para. 47.

³⁴ Response, para. 48.

³⁵ Letter from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands dated 2 July 2008.

to be granted by the Chamber, would not influence or pose a danger, during his provisional release, to any victim, witness or any other person and would return to The Hague on the date ordered by the Chamber.³⁶

16. The Chamber finds that the Accused Stojić has complied with all the conditions and guarantees on his reappearance imposed during his earlier provisional releases in keeping with the orders and decisions of the Trial Chambers rendered on 30 July 2004,³⁷ 26 June 2006,³⁸ 8 December 2006,³⁹ 11 June 2007,⁴⁰ 29 November 2007⁴¹ and 29 April 2008.⁴² The Chamber notes, in particular, that the Accused Stojić complied with the conditions imposed during his last provisional release which took place after the close of the Prosecution case.

17. The Prosecution argues that the arguments raised by the Stojić Defence according to which the health problems in the Accused Stojić's family affect his mental and emotional well-being, could in fact increase the risk of flight and, hence, constitute a ground for the Chamber to deny his release.⁴³ The Chamber is not convinced by the Prosecution's analysis of this argument as it appears to be based on speculation. The Chamber furthermore holds that the guarantees to return offsetting the risk of flight, such as those imposed on the Accused Stojić during his last provisional release,⁴⁴ effectively neutralise all possible risk of flight. Regarding his respectful conduct during his earlier provisional releases, the Chamber is assured that the Accused Stojić, if released, will appear for the continuation of his trial.

18. Furthermore, for these same reasons, the Chamber is of the opinion that the Accused Stojić, if released, will not pose a danger to any victim, witness or any other person, which, again, is not challenged by the Prosecution.⁴⁵

³⁶ Letter from the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Croatia in annex to the Motion, dated 16 June 2008.

³⁷ *The Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-PT, Order on Provisional Release of Bruno Stojić, 30 July 2004.

³⁸ Decision on Motion for Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 26 June 2006.

³⁹ Decision on the Motion for Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 8 December 2006.

⁴⁰ Decision on the Motion for Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 11 June 2007.

⁴¹ Decision on the Motion for Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 29 November 2007.

⁴² Further Decision Regarding the Decision on Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 29 April 2008.

⁴³ Response, para. 18.

⁴⁴ Décision relative à la demande de mise en liberté provisoire de l'Accusé Stojić, 29 April 2008.

⁴⁵ Response. This danger is not assessed *in abstracto* – it has to be real. *Mičo Stanišić* Decision, para. 27.

19. Nevertheless, according to the Appeals Chamber, regarding the stage of the proceedings and the close of the Prosecution case, the Chamber has the duty to determine, in addition, if the humanitarian grounds put forward by the Stojić Defence are sufficiently compelling to justify the provisional release of the Accused Stojić.⁴⁶

20. The Prosecution acknowledges that the humanitarian grounds put forward regarding the circumstances of the family of the Accused Stojić were confirmed by the Appeals Chamber as grounds justifying the previous provisional release of the Accused Stojić.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, the Prosecution opposes the argument raised by the Stojić Defence according to which the health problems of his family members affect the mental and emotional well-being of the Accused Stojić, which would constitute a compelling humanitarian ground.⁴⁸

21. Regarding the medical certificates submitted by the Stojić Defence, the Chamber takes note of the state of health of the family members of the Accused Stojić, namely the father, the mother-in-law and the sister-in-law of the Accused Stojić. The Chamber proceeded with an in-depth assessment, given in the confidential annex attached hereto, and holds that the presence of the Accused Stojić at the side of his family members for a short period could assist them in overcoming their hardships. Therefore, the Chamber characterises the humanitarian grounds raised by the Stojić Defence as sufficiently compelling to justify the provisional release of the Accused Stojić, while noting further that the poor state of health of the family members of the Accused Stojić must indeed have repercussions on his physical and mental health.

22. The Chamber recalls that in order to establish whether the requirements of Rule 65 (B) of the Rules have been met, the Chamber must consider all the relevant factors which a reasonable Trial Chamber would be expected to consider in order to come to a decision.⁴⁹ In this case, the Chamber must also consider the fact that the Accused Stojić surrendered voluntarily to the Tribunal and his exemplary conduct before and during the proceedings, even after the close of the Prosecution case. Furthermore, the Chamber will suspend hearings during the summer court recess.

⁴⁶ *Petković* Decision, para. 17; *Prlić* Decision of 25 April 2008, para. 16.

⁴⁷ *Prlić* Decision of 25 April 2008, para. 17; Response, para. 12.

⁴⁸ Response, paras. 17-18.

Consequently, during this period, there will be no court activity which will require the presence of the Accused Stojić.

23. Furthermore, the Chamber recalls that, in keeping with the case-law of the Appeals Chamber, the excessive length of actual or likely detention is an additional discretionary consideration which can be taken into account in determining provisional release if all the requirements of Rule 65 (B) of the Rules have been met.⁵⁰ To this effect, the Chamber refers to a report the Registrar of the Tribunal submitted at a Diplomatic Seminar organised by the Tribunal on 10 June 2008 (“Registrar’s Report”) wherein he gave an overview of the United Nations Detention Unit (“Detention Unit”) and of the equipment at the disposal of the accused.⁵¹ The Chamber observes that in his report, the Registrar discussed the “unique status of the UNDU detainee population, and noted that ”

“Whilst the UNDU is a remand institution, the average period of detention is significantly longer than the one of national jurisdictions and possibly even closer to many penitentiary institutions. This inevitably has a detrimental affect upon the mental state of the detainees as they are awaiting or undergoing complex trials and appeals over an extended period of time, causing long term stress which is well-known to induce or exacerbate health conditions.”⁵²

The Registrar also discussed the question of the impact of lengthy detentions and hearings on the health of the detainees:

“In addition, the prolonged pre-trial and trial detention, the stress of the trial, the geographical distance from their relatives are circumstances which contribute to exacerbate their overall health condition, both physical and psychological.”⁵³

With respect to the separation of the detainees from their families, the Registrar considered that:

⁴⁹ *Mičo Stanišić* Decision, para. 8; *Jovica Stanišić* Decision, para. 35; *Petković* Decsion, para. 8; *Prlić* Decision of 25 April 2008, para. 10.

⁵⁰ *The Prosecutor v. Haradinaj et al.*, Case No. IT-04-84-AR65.2, Decision on Lahi Brahimaj’s Interlocutory Appeal Against the Trial Chamber’s Decision Denying His Provisional Release, 9 March 2006, para. 23; *The Prosecutor v. Dragomir Milošević*, Case No. IT-98-29/1-PT, Decision on Third Motion for Provisional Release, 16 August 2006, p. 3. It is to be noted that this Decision was confirmed by the Appeals Chamber, *The Prosecutor v. Dragomir Milošević*, Case No. IT-98-29/1-AR65.1, Decision on Appeal Against Decision Denying Motion for Provisional Release, 17 October 2006, paras. 8-9.

⁵¹ Speech by Mr Hans Holthuis, Registrar, ICTY Diplomatic Seminar, The Hague, 10 June 2008.

⁵² Registrar’s Report, pp. 3-4.

⁵³ Registrar’s Report, p. 7.

“The distance from the detainees’ family and the familial social support network, as well as the detainees’ lack of familiarity with the surroundings, inevitably impact on the health condition of the detainees.”⁵⁴

The Registrar ended his report with the following conclusion:

“Despite the measures in place at the UNDU as mentioned, in view of the statistics of the present population of the UNDU (*i.e.*, advanced average age, adverse personal circumstances and existence of serious medical conditions), the risk of the occurrence of a life threatening incident can be described as relatively high. Whilst I do not wish to sound alarmist, I do wish to present a realistic picture and share with you our concerns in this respect.”⁵⁵

24. The Chamber finds that the present case is particularly lengthy because of its scale, complexity and the large number of accused. Except for several short periods of provisional release, the Accused Stojić has been detained in the Detention Unit since the commencement of the proceedings on 25 April 2006,⁵⁶ that is for more than two years. The Chamber further notes that the trial will not be terminated before 2010. Thus, the Tribunal is responsible for the health of the accused who are under its authority and custody. Concerned for the well-being of the accused, the Chamber holds that the possibility that the Accused Stojić has been suffering seriously from his lengthy detention in the Detention Unit, such as described in the Registrar’s Report, is a supplementary factor to be taken into account when making a decision pursuant to Rule 65 (B) of the Rules. The Chamber considers that a certain period outside the Detention Unit and in a family environment during the court recess will allow the Accused Stojić to recuperate. Accordingly, the Chamber hopes to prevent a possible deterioration of the physical and mental state of the Accused, as discussed in the Registrar’s Report.

25. The Chamber further recalls that pursuant to the case-law of the Appeals Chamber, the length of provisional release at a late stage of the proceedings, and in particular after the close of the Prosecution case, is to be proportionate to the circumstances and compelling humanitarian reasons justifying provisional release.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Registrar’s Report, p. 3.

⁵⁵ Registrar’s Report, p. 8.

⁵⁶ *The Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-PT, Order on Provisional Release of Bruno Stojić, 30 July 2004; Decision on the Motion for Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 8 December 2006; Decision on the Motion for Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 11 June 2007; Decision on the Motion for Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 29 November 2007; Further Decision Regarding the Decision on Provisional Release of the Accused Stojić, 29 April 2008.

⁵⁷ *Petković* Decision, para. 17; *Prlić* Decision of 25 April 2008, para. 16.

In addition, the Chamber recalls that the factors it has to take into account influence not only the decision on whether or not to grant provisional release, but also its duration, if any. Thus, *inter alia*, the Chamber must find a balance between the nature and weight of the circumstances justifying provisional release for humanitarian reasons and its duration.⁵⁸

26. In this case, the Accused Stojić seeks provisional release for as long as possible.⁵⁹ The Chamber, for its part, holds it necessary to limit the duration of provisional release to a period not in excess of the time necessary for the Accused Stojić to visit his ill family members and to recuperate, but which includes the time of the journey. Consequently, the Chamber holds that a provisional release not in excess of 12 days is proportionate to the gravity of the illness of the father, the mother-in-law and the sister-in-law of the Accused Stojić, as well as to the necessity to avoid any deterioration in the state of health of the Accused Stojić.

V. CONCLUSION

27. For these reasons, and in light of the Registrar's Report, the Chamber is convinced that the Accused Stojić offers sufficiently compelling humanitarian grounds and holds that provisional release not exceeding 12 days (including travel) is proportionate to the seriousness of the illnesses of the father, the mother-in-law and the sister-in-law of the Accused Stojić and to the need to safeguard the health of the Accused himself and to prevent any repercussions on his health owing to the length of his detention. Consequently, in the exercise of its discretionary power, the Chamber decides to grant provisional release to the Accused Stojić.

28. In view of the circumstances of the case and the stage of the proceedings, the Chamber decides to impose upon the Accused Stojić the following guarantees: that the Accused Stojić remain within the confines set forth by the Chamber⁶⁰ and report daily to the police. The Chamber also decides to order the Croatian authorities to supervise the Accused Stojić twenty-four hours a day during his stay and to provide a situation report every three days.

⁵⁸ *Petković* Decision, para. 17; *Prlić* Decision of 25 April 2008, para. 18.

29. As such, the Accused Stojić will be released for the dates and according to the conditions set forth in the confidential annex attached to the present Decision.

30. Nonetheless, the Chamber decides to stay execution of its decision to release the Accused Stojić until a ruling has been made on the Appeal the Prosecution intends to lodge.⁶¹

VI. DISPOSITION

31. **FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS**, the Chamber

PURSUANT TO Rule 65 (B) of the Rules,

GRANTS the Motion,

ORDERS the provisional release of the Accused Stojić for the dates and according to the conditions set forth in the confidential annex attached to the present Decision,

AND

ORDERS a stay of execution of the present decision until the Appeals Chamber has ruled on the Appeal the Prosecution intends to lodge against this Decision.

Done in English and in French, the French version being authoritative.

/signed/

Jean-Claude Antonetti
Presiding Judge

Done this seventeenth day of July 2008
At The Hague
The Netherlands

[Seal of the Tribunal]

⁵⁹ Motion, paras. 1, 17.

⁶⁰ See in this regard the confidential Annex attached to this Decision.

⁶¹ Response, para. 48.