UNITED NATIONS

IT-04-74-T D5 - 1/58058 BIS 19 February 2010

5/58058 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:

3 February 2010

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 John Hocking

Decision of:

3 February 2010

THE PROSECUTOR

V.

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

PUBLIC

DECISION ON STOJIĆ DEFENCE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR CERTIFICATION TO APPEAL THE ORDER TO ADMIT EVIDENCE REGARDING WITNESS 4D-AB

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 3 February 2010

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 "Bruno Stojić's Motion for Reconsideration or, in the Alternative, for Certification to Appeal the 'Ordonnance portant sur l'admission d'éléments de preuve relatifs au Témoin 4D-AB' dated 14 January 2010", presented publicly by the Counsel for the Accused Bruno Stojić ("Stojić Defence") on 21 January 2010 ("Motion"),

NOTING the "Prosecution Response to Two Defence Requests for Reconsideration or Certification to Appeal the Trial Chamber's Decision of 14 January 2010 Denying the Admission of Evidence Tendered Through Witness 4D-AB", filed publicly by the Office of the Prosecutor ("Prosecution") on 28 January 2010 ("Response"), in which the Prosecution asks the Chamber to reject the Motion in its entirety,

NOTING the "Order to Admit Evidence Regarding Witness 4D-AB", filed publicly on 14 January 2010 ("Order of 14 January 2010"),

NOTING the "Decision Regarding Requests Filed by the Parties for Reconsideration of Decisions by the Chamber", filed publicly on 26 March 2009 ("Decision of 26 March 2009"), in which the Chamber dealt with the requests for reconsideration filed by the parties and recalled that such requests should remain the exception and not the rule,

CONSIDERING that other Defence teams did not file a response to the Motion,

CONSIDERING, firstly, that, in view of the section of the Motion concerning the request for reconsideration, the Chamber observes that the Stojić Defence has neither brought to the fore any exceptional circumstances nor shown that the Chamber made a discernible error in its reasoning when it denied the tendering into evidence of Exhibits 2D 00765 and 2D 00786, which would necessitate a re-examination of the Order of 14 January 2010; that it contents itself to question, through the Motion, the decision made by the Chamber in this Order; that the Chamber consequently decides to reject the Motion with regard to the first section,

3/58058 BIS

request for certification to Appeal the Order of 14 January 2010, the Chamber believes the Order to be reasonable and believes that the Stojić Defence failed to show that the object of the Request involves an issue that should significantly affect the fair

CONSIDERING, secondly, that, in view of the section of the Motion concerning the

and expeditious conduct of the proceedings or the outcome of the trial, and for which

an immediate resolution by the Appeals Chamber may materially advance the

an immediate resolution by the Appeals Chamber may materially advance the

proceedings,

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS,

PURSUANT TO Rules 54, 73(B) and 89 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence,

REJECTS the Motion for Reconsideration of the Order of 14 January 2010 filed by

the Stojić Defence for the reasons set out in this decision, AND,

REJECTS the Motion for Certification to Appeal the Order of 14 January 2010, filed

by the Stojić Defence for reasons set out in this Decision.

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

The Presiding Judge appends a dissenting opinion to this decision:

/signed/

Jean-Claude Antonetti Presiding Judge

Done this third of February 2010 At The Hague The Netherlands

[Seal of the Tribunal]

Case No. IT-04-74-T 3 3 February 2010

DISSENTING OPINION OF THE PRESIDING JUDGE JEAN-CLAUDE ANTONETTI

The practice of requests for **reconsideration** on the part of both the Prosecution and the Defence poses a genuine problem with respect to the *res judicata*.

The sole option available to the Prosecution or the Defence who do not agree with a decision of the Chamber, is a request for **certification to appeal**.

The Rules of Procedure and Evidence do not provide for this type of procedure, and at no point did the permanent judges wish to propose any amendment to the Rules regarding this issue.

Decisions made by a trial chamber have been carefully thought out and each judge decides on the solution to be adopted.

There is, therefore, no reason to question the said decision several hours or days after it has been filed.

A decision might contain a **material** error; in that case the Trial Chamber renders a new decision in which the material error is corrected.

Consequently, I believe that any request for reconsideration constitutes, in the sense of Rule 73(D) of the Rules, an frivolous motion or, indeed, abuse of procedure.

Therefore, the only option available under Rule 73(B) is a request for certification to appeal if the decision involves an issue that would significantly affect the fair and expeditious conduct of the proceedings or the outcome of the trial and for which an immediate resolution by the Appeals Chamber may materially advance the proceedings.

I believe it to be my duty to offer a dissenting opinion because, in my opinion, the procedure set out in Rule 73(D) concerning the fees caused by this type of

proceedings should have been implemented in order to avoid two sets of rules from being applied among the attorneys in the sense of this procedure being implemented towards a defence.

I am inclined to uphold this principle even though, in the cases in question, I did not agree with the other judges; however, having been adopted by the majority, the decision must be applied.

/signed/

Jean-Claude Antonetti Presiding Judge

Done this third of February 2010 At The Hague The Netherlands

[Seal of the Tribunal]