



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-03-67-PT

Date: 17 May 2007

ENGLISH

Original: French

---

**BEFORE THE PRE-TRIAL JUDGE**

**Before: Judge Jean-Claude Antonetti**

**Registrar: Mr Hans Holthuis**

**Decision of: 17 May 2007**

**THE PROSECUTOR**

**v.**

**VOJISLAV ŠEŠELJ**

---

**DECISION AMENDING THE CRITERIA FOR THE FILING OF  
SUBMISSIONS FROM THE ACCUSED**

---

**The Office of the Prosecutor:**

Ms Christine Dahl  
Mr Ulrich Müssemer  
Mr Klaus Hoffman

**The Accused:**

Mr Vojislav Šešelj

**I, Jean-Claude Antonetti**, Judge 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”);

**NOTING** Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”) whereby “*proprio motu*, a Judge or a Trial Chamber may issue such orders [...] as may be necessary for the purposes of an investigation or for the preparation or conduct of the trial;”

**NOTING** further the “Order Entrusting Functions to Pre-Trial Judge” issued by the President of Trial Chamber III on 27 February 2007 whereby in this case the Pre-Trial Judge was entrusted with all of the pre-trial functions set forth in Rules 66, 67, 73, 73 *bis* and 73 *ter* of the Rules;

**CONSIDERING** that in the “Decision on Filing of Motions” adopted by Trial Chamber I (“Chamber I”) on 19 June 2006 (“Decision of 19 June”),<sup>1</sup> Chamber I ordered that the submissions of Vojislav Šešelj (“Accused”) were not to exceed 800 words unless good cause was shown;<sup>2</sup>

**CONSIDERING** that the Decision of 19 June suggests that the prolixity and repetition of the Accused’s submissions, their patent lack of relevance and the triviality of most of the issues raised led Chamber I to find that the Accused was abusing the process of the court,

**CONSIDERING** the “Practice Direction on the Length of Briefs and Motions” (“Direction”)<sup>3</sup> provides that motions, responses, and replies shall not exceed 3000 words and that the number of words shall be included at the end of the document;

**CONSIDERING** that the Pre-Trial Judge finds that the circumstances which led Chamber I to set the limit at 800 words no longer exist,

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision on Filing of Motions.

<sup>2</sup> Decision of 19 June, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Practice Direction on the Length of Briefs and Motions, IT/184 Rev. 2), 16 September 2005.

**CONSIDERING**, therefore, that no valid reason exists to set the limit below the 3,000 words provided for in the Direction.\*

**FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS**

**PURSUANT TO** Rule 54 of the Rules,

**ORDER** that any submission from the Accused shall be submitted in accordance with the provisions set forth in the Practice Direction on the Length of Briefs and Motions.

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

/signed/

Jean-Claude Antonetti

Pre-Trial Judge

Done this seventeenth day of May 2007

At The Hague

The Netherlands

**[Seal of the Tribunal]**