



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 December 2009
Original: ENGLISH
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

Order of: 3 December 2009

THE PROSECUTOR

v.

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

PUBLIC

**CORRIGENDUM TO ORDER ON ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE
REGARDING WITNESS DRAGAN ČURČIĆ (P 09324)**

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

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”);

NOTING the “Order on Admission of Evidence Regarding Witness Dragan Čurčić” rendered publicly by the Chamber on 19 November 2009 (“Order”), in which the Chamber admitted Exhibit P 09324,

NOTING the “Notice of Bruno Stojić Regarding Erroneous Admission of Document P 09324” filed publicly on 23 November 2009, in which Counsel for the Stojić Defence (“Stojić Defence”) recall that an earlier notice was filed on 27 October 2009¹ for the purposes of withdrawing the request for the admission of Exhibit P 09324,

CONSIDERING that the Chamber notes that an error slipped into the first “NOTING”,² as well as into the first “CONSIDERING”³ on page 2 of the Order and into its Annex; that by way of the Notice of 27 October 2009, the Stojić Defence withdrew its request for the admission of Exhibit P 09324; that it therefore requested the admission of three, and not four exhibits,

CONSIDERING that the Chamber finds that Exhibit P 09324 should not have been analysed and admitted by the Chamber and decides that it is appropriate to correct the first “NOTING” and the first “CONSIDERING” on page 2 of the Order as follows:

“**NOTING** the request for the admission of [...] 3 exhibits presented by Counsel for the Accused Stojić (“Stojić Defence”),¹ [...]”

“**CONSIDERING** that the Chamber notes that the “Stojić Defence Objection” is not an objection, but rather a notification from the Stojić Defence with

¹ “Bruno Stojić’s Notice to Withdraw Request for Admission of Document P 09324”, public, 27 October 2009 (“Notice of 27 October 2009”).

² “**NOTING** the request for the admission of 3 exhibits presented by Counsel for the Accused Praljak (“Praljak Defence”),² the request for the admission of 4 exhibits presented by Counsel for the Accused Stojić (“Stojić Defence”),² the request for the admission of 7 exhibits presented by Counsel for the Accused Petković (“Petković Defence”),² and the request for the admission of 10 exhibits presented by the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”),² all four regarding the testimony of Dragan Čurčić (“Proposed Exhibit(s)”) who appeared in court on 12 and 13 October 2009 in accordance with Rule 92 *ter* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”).”; See also the Annex to the Order referring to Exhibit P 09324 as admitted by the Chamber.

regard to Exhibit 4 D00618 which is allegedly more specific than Exhibit P 09324,”

CONSIDERING that it is also appropriate to withdraw Exhibit P 09324 from the Annex to the Order,

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS,

PURSUANT TO Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence,

ORDERS that the first “NOTING” and the first “CONSIDERING” on page 2 of the Order be worded as follows:

“**NOTING** the request for the admission of 3 exhibits presented by Counsel for the Accused Praljak (“Praljak Defence”),¹ the request for the admission of 3 exhibits presented by Counsel for the Accused Stojić (“Stojić Defence”),¹ the request for the admission of 7 exhibits presented by Counsel for the Accused Petković (“Petković Defence”)¹ and the request for the admission of 10 exhibits presented by the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”),¹ all four regarding the testimony of Dragan Čurčić (“Proposed Exhibit(s)”) who appeared in court on 12 and 13 October 2009 in accordance with Rule 92 *ter* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”),”

“**CONSIDERING** that the Chamber notes that the “Stojić Defence Objection” is not an objection, but rather a notification from the Stojić Defence with regard to Exhibit 4 D00618 which is allegedly more specific than Exhibit P 09324,”

AND

ORDERS that Exhibit P 09324 be withdrawn from the Annex to the Order.

³ “**CONSIDERING** that the Chamber notes that the “Stojić Defence Objection” is not an objection, but rather a notification from the Stojić Defence with regard to exhibit 4 D00618 which is allegedly more specific than exhibit P 09324, which was also requested for admission by the Stojić Defence,”.

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

/signed/

Jean-Claude Antonetti

Presiding Judge

Done this third day of December 2009

At The Hague (The Netherlands)

[Seal of the Tribunal]