UNITED NATIONS

IT-04-74-T D4 - 1/46623 BIS 21 January 2009 4/46623 BIS

SF



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:

19 December 2008

ENGLISH

Original:

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: 19 December 2008

THE PROSECUTOR

v.

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

PUBLIC

DECISION ON PRLIĆ DEFENCE MOTION FOR THE ADMISSION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

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

Case No. IT-04-74-T 19 December 2008

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"),

SEIZED of Jadranko Prlić's Motion for the Admission of Documentary Evidence, presented by Counsel for the Accused Prlić ("Prlić Defence") on 5 December 2008 ("Motion"), in which the Prlić Defence requests that the Chamber admit several documentary exhibits ("Proposed Exhibits"),

CONSIDERING that, having read the Motion, the Chamber finds that two points ought to be dealt with now, before the Office of the Prosecutor ("Prosecution") and the other Defence teams file their responses to the Motion,

CONSIDERING, firstly, that the Chamber notes in the Motion that the Prlić Defence states that for several Proposed Exhibits, it has replaced the name of the document source by a pseudonym on the ground that these documents were provided to it on condition that the source not be revealed, ¹

CONSIDERING that the Chamber recalls that the Prlić Defence did not seize it of a motion for protective measures for these documents and explain why such protective measures would be necessary and pursuant to which rule of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence ("Rules") they could be requested,

CONSIDERING that the Chamber recalls that Guideline 9 of the Decision Adopting Guidelines for the Presentation of Defence Evidence of 24 April 2008 ("Guideline 9") requires that the party requesting the admission of documentary evidence in a written motion, must, *inter alia*, provide the source of the exhibit of the document requested for admission and a description of its indicia of reliability,

CONSIDERING that in the present case, the fact that the Prlić Defence has not revealed the sources of some of the Proposed Exhibits prevents the Chamber and the other parties from evaluating their reliability,

1

¹ Motion, para. 4.

2/46623 BIS

CONSIDERING, consequently, that the Chamber holds that the Prlić Defence must seize it of a motion for protective measures for the Proposed Exhibits for which it

wishes to protect the source, and not redact the source on its own initiative,

CONSIDERING, secondly, that the Chamber notes that, although the Prlić Defence

has done substantial work in classifying the Proposed Exhibits according to subject

matter, almost 400 Proposed Exhibits, however, are classified in extremely general

categories (Municipality: general (275) and HVO HZ H-B: general (121)),²

CONSIDERING that the Chamber finds that the Prlić Defence must classify these

Proposed Exhibits in more specific categories, such as done in the Motion for the

other Proposed Exhibits, by referring to the relevant paragraphs of the Amended

Indictment of 11 June 2008 ("Indictment"),

FOR THESE REASONS,

IN ACCORDANCE with Rules 54 and 89 (C) of the Rules,

ORDERS as follows:

(1) the Prlić Defence shall file a motion in due form by 6 January 2009 at the

<u>latest</u> for protective measures for the Proposed Exhibits for which it does not

wish to reveal the source, AND

(2) the Prlić Defence shall classify the ca. 400 Proposed Exhibits into specific and

non-general categories, by referring to the relevant paragraphs of the

Amended Indictment by 6 January 2009 at the latest.

² Motion, para. 5.

monon, puru. 3

Case No. IT-04-74-T 3 19 December 2008

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

/signed/

Jean-Claude Antonetti Presiding Judge

Done this nineteenth day of December 2008 At The Hague The Netherlands

[Seal of the Tribunal]

Case No. IT-04-74-T 4 19 December 2008