



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-T  
Date: 30 January 2008  
Original: ENGLISH  
French

**IN TRIAL CHAMBER III**

**Before:** Judge Jean-Claude Antonetti, Presiding  
Judge Frederik Harhoff  
Judge Flavia Lattanzi

**Registrar:** Mr Hans Holthuis

**Decision of:** 30 January 2008

**THE PROSECUTOR**

v.

**VOJISLAV ŠEŠELJ**

***PUBLIC DOCUMENT***

---

**DECISION ON THE PROSECUTION'S  
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

---

**The Office of the Prosecutor**

Ms Christine Dahl

**The Accused**

Mr Vojislav Šešelj

**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 the motion filed by the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”) on 14 January 2008 requesting an extension of time to move for certification to appeal (“Motion”),<sup>1</sup>

**NOTING** the Decision on the Prosecution’s Consolidated Motion Pursuant to Rules 89 (F), 92 *bis*, 92 *ter* and 92 *quater* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, rendered on 7 January 2008 (“Decision of 7 January 2008”) in which the Chamber denied the Prosecution’s requests to admit into evidence a number of written witness statements and transcripts testimony from other cases pursuant to Rules 92 *ter* and *quater* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules” and “92 *ter/quater* Motion”, respectively),<sup>2</sup>

**CONSIDERING** that in the same decision the Chamber deferred to rule on the rest of the motion “until the expiry of the time-limit for the Accused to respond to the Clarification”<sup>3</sup> and will thus render a supplementary decision (“Supplementary Decision”),

**CONSIDERING** that the Chamber will not rule on the Prosecution’s request to admit the transcript testimony from other cases of the three witnesses that it intends to call as experts – Ivan Grujić, Ewa Tabeau and Dravor Strinović – before it reaches a decision on their status as experts,<sup>4</sup>

**CONSIDERING** that the Prosecution notes that at this stage a motion for certification to appeal is premature and will remain so until the Chamber rules on the whole of the 92 *ter/quater* Motion,<sup>5</sup>

**CONSIDERING** that the Prosecution’s argument to the effect that a ruling should be deferred on all the requests<sup>6</sup> until the disposition of the issue raised in the

<sup>1</sup> Prosecution’s Motion for Extension of Time to Move for Certification to Appeal the Decision of 7 January 2008, 14 January 2008 (“Motion”).

<sup>2</sup> Decision on the Prosecution’s Consolidated Motion Pursuant to Rules 89 (F), 92 *bis*, 92 *ter* and 92 *quater* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, dated 7 January 2008 (“Decision of 7 January 2008”), para. 59.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, para. 47.

<sup>5</sup> Motion, p. 1.

