25-04-74-AM65-11 A162 - A160 05 February 209 167

UNITED NATIONS

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-AR65.11 Date: 4 February 2009 Original: English

IN THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before:

Judge Fausto Pocar, Presiding Judge Mohamed Shahabuddeen Judge Mehmet Güney Judge Andrésia Vaz Judge Theodor Meron

Acting Registrar:

Mr. John Hocking

Decision of:

4 February 2009

PROSECUTOR

V.

JADRANKO PRLIĆ BRUNO STOJIĆ SLOBODAN PRALJAK MILIVOJ PETKOVIĆ VALENTIN ĆORIĆ and BERISLAV PUŠIĆ

PUBLIC

PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE GÜNEY TO DECISION ON PRALJAK'S APPEAL OF THE TRIAL CHAMBER'S 2 DECEMBER 2008 DECISION ON PROVISIONAL RELEASE

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 Khan for Bruno Stojić Mr Božidar Kovačić and Ms Nika Pinter for Slobođan Praljak Ms Vesna Alaburić and Mr Nicolas 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

PARTLY DISSENTING OPINION OF JUDGE GÜNEY

1. In my Partly Dissenting Opinions to the *Popović* and *Prlić et al.* Decisions¹ I expressed my disagreement with the majority's interpretation of the *Prlić* Decision of 11 March 2008² which results in imposing, in post-Rule 98*bis* proceedings, an additional requirement of "sufficiently compelling humanitarian reasons" to the two criteria listed in Rule 65(B) of the Rules, contrary to both the Rules and the continuing presumption of innocence, and effectively suspending the grant of discretion to the Trial Chamber by the Rules.

2. In the present instance, the Trial Chamber denied Praljak's Request for provisional release on the sole basis that the humanitarian grounds raised by his Defence did not constitute "sufficiently compelling humanitarian reasons in terms of the Tribunal's case-law".³ The majority endorsed the Trial Chamber's holding. It found "no error in this approach" and "decline[d] to exercise its authority to depart from precedent."⁴

3. For the reasons developed in my Partly Dissenting Opinions, I respectfully dissent from the majority's finding. Should I decide to remain silent on this matter in future cases, my silence should not in any way be construed as an approval of the additional requirement adopted by the majority of the Judges of the Appeals Chamber.

³ Impugned Decision, para. 31.

⁴ Majority Decision, para. 15.

Case No. IT-04-74-AR65.11

2

¹ Prosecutor v. Jadranko 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; Prosecutor v. Jadranko 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; Prosecutor v. Jadranko Prlić et al., Case No. IT-04-74-AR65.9, 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; Prosecutor v. Jadranko Prlić et al., Case No. IT-04-74-AR65.9, Decision on "Prosecution's Appeal from Décision Relative à la Demande de Mise en Liberté Provisoire de l'Accusé Stojić Dated 8 April 2008", 29 April 2008; Prosecutor v. Juvadin Popović et al., Case Nos. IT-05-88-AR65.4, IT-05-88-AR65.5, IT-05-88-AR65.6, Decision on Consolidated Appeal against Decision on Borovčanin's Motion for a Custodial Visit and Decisions on Gvero's and Miletić's Motions for Provisional release during the Break in the Proceedings, 15 May 2008.

² Prosecutor v. Jadranko 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 Ćorić, 11 March 2008, para. 21. I wish to specify that I was not part of the Bench that ruled on this decision.

⁴ February 2009

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

Judge Mehmet Güney Presiding Judge

Done this 4th day of February 2009, At The Hague, The Netherlands.

[Seal of the Tribunal]