

**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-04-75-T
Date: 23 October 2012
Original: English

IN THE TRIAL CHAMBER

Before: Judge Guy Delvoie, Presiding
Judge Burton Hall
Judge Antoine Kesia-Mbe Mindua

Registrar: Mr. John Hocking

Decision: 23 October 2012

PROSECUTOR

v.

GORAN HADŽIĆ

PUBLIC

**DECISION ON PROSECUTION MOTIONS FOR ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE
OF GH-015, GH-107, AND GH-125 PURSUANT TO RULE 92 *ter***

The Office of the Prosecutor:

Mr. Douglas Stringer

Counsel for Goran Hadžić:

Mr. Zoran Živanović

Mr. Christopher Gosnell

1. **THIS TRIAL 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”) is seised of the “Prosecution Motion for Admission of Evidence of GH-015 Pursuant to Rule 92*ter*”, filed confidentially with a confidential annex on 26 September 2012 (“First Motion”), “Prosecution Motion for Admission of Evidence of GH-107 Pursuant to Rule 92*ter*”, filed publicly with a confidential annex on 28 September 2012 (“Second Motion”), and “Prosecution Motion for Admission of Evidence of GH-125 Pursuant to Rule 92*ter*”, filed publicly with a confidential annex on 28 September 2012 (“Third Motion”) (collectively referred to as “Motions”).

A. Submissions

2. In the Motions, the Prosecution requests the admission of the evidence of GH-015, GH-107, and GH-125, pursuant to Rule 92 *ter* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Tribunal (“Rules”), arguing that the evidence is probative, relevant, and reliable and meets the requirements for admission under that Rule. The Prosecution submits that admitting the evidence in this manner will enable it to present its case-in-chief in an efficient and expeditious manner, without compromising the fairness of the proceedings.¹ In relation to GH-015, the Prosecution requests the admission of six associated exhibits, one of which under seal.² In relation to GH-107, the Prosecution requests the admission of one associated exhibit, under seal, that, in its view, forms an integral part of the tendered Rule 92 *ter* statement.³

3. The Defence has no submissions on the Motions.⁴

B. Applicable Law

4. The main objective of Rule 92 *ter*—entitled “Other Admission of Written Statements and Transcripts”—is to ensure an effective and expeditious trial, while simultaneously ensuring and respecting the rights of the accused. The jurisprudence of the Tribunal has applied the rule as permitting, by necessary inference,⁵ the admission of exhibits where they accompany written

¹ First Motion, paras 1, 4; Second Motion, paras 1, 4, 6; Third Motion, paras 1, 3-4, 6.

² First Motion, para. 7.

³ Second Motion, paras 7, 11.

⁴ Emails from Defence to Trial Chamber, 11 and 12 October 2012.

⁵ *Prosecutor v. Stanišić and Župljanin*, Case No. IT-08-91-T, Decision on Prosecution’s Motions for Admission of Evidence Pursuant to Rule 92 *ter* (ST012 and ST019), 29 September 2009 (confidential) (“*Stanišić and Župljanin* Decision”), para. 18; *Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-T, Decision on the Application of Rule 92 *ter* of the Rules, 25 June 2007, p. 2; *Prosecutor v. Delić*, Case No. IT-04-83-T, Decision on Prosecution Motion to Admit Written Witness Statements under Rule 92 *ter*, 27 September 2007, para. 10.

statements or transcripts and form an “inseparable and indispensable” part of the evidence.⁶ In order to satisfy this requirement, the document must be one without which the witness’s testimony would become incomprehensible or of lesser probative value.⁷ Moreover, the evidence sought to be admitted, whether a written statement or a transcript of oral testimony, must fulfil the general requirements of admissibility of Rule 89(C): the proposed evidence must be relevant and have probative value.⁸

C. Discussion

5. GH-015’s proposed Rule 92 *ter* statement contains information about (a) the arming of Serbs in Borovo Selo; (b) the establishment of the police and Territorial Defence; (c) the attack on and takeover of Dalj and other villages in SBWS; (d) the acts of Hadžić and other alleged members of the alleged joint criminal enterprise, including meetings they attended; (e) the establishment of Arkan’s headquarters at the TO Training Centre in Erdut; and (f) detention facilities in Dalj and Borovo Selo. The tendered associated exhibits are discussed in the Rule 92 *ter* statement. The Trial Chamber finds that the tendered statement and associated exhibits are relevant, have probative value, and are appropriate for admission pursuant to Rules 89(C) and 92 *ter*.

6. GH-107’s proposed Rule 92 *ter* statement contains information about alleged crimes committed against Croat villagers in Klisa in November 1991. The tendered associated exhibit is discussed in the Rule 92 *ter* statement. The Trial Chamber finds that the tendered statement and associated exhibit are relevant, have probative value, and are appropriate for admission pursuant to Rules 89(C) and 92 *ter*.

7. GH-125’s proposed Rule 92 *ter* statement contains information about (a) the attack on and takeover of Erdut; (b) the creation of a Serb police unit in Erdut and its commander; (c) the establishment of Arkan’s headquarters at the TO Training Centre in Erdut and the detention and mistreatment that allegedly occurred there; and (d) the disappearance of Croats and Hungarians in

⁶ *Stanišić and Župljanin* Decision, para. 18; *Prosecutor v. Lukić and Lukić*, Case No. IT-98-32/1-T, Decision on Confidential Prosecution Motion for the Admission of Prior Testimony with Associated Exhibits and Written Statements of Witnesses Pursuant to Rule 92 *ter*, 9 July 2008 (“*Lukić and Lukić* Decision”), para. 15; *Prosecutor v. Ljubičić*, Case No. IT-00-41-PT, Decision on Prosecution’s Motion for Admission of Transcripts Pursuant to Rule 92 *bis* (D) of the Rules, 23 January 2004, p. 3; *Prosecutor v. Đorđević*, Case No. IT-05-87/1-T, Decision on Prosecution’s Motion for Admission of Evidence Pursuant to Rule 92 *ter*, 10 February 2009 (“*Đorđević* Decision”), para. 5.

⁷ *Stanišić and Župljanin* Decision, para. 18; *Lukić and Lukić* Decision, para. 15; *Prosecutor v. Stanišić and Simatović*, Case No. IT-03-69-T, Decision on Prosecution’s Motion for the Admission of Written Evidence of Witness Slobodan Lazarević Pursuant to Rule 92 *ter* with Confidential Annex, 16 May 2008, para. 19; *Prosecutor v. Haraqija and Morina*, Case No. IT-04-84-R77.4, Decision on Prosecution Motion for Admission of Evidence Pursuant to Rule 92 *bis* and/or 92 *ter*, 2 September 2008 (“*Haraqija and Morina* Decision”), para. 12; *Đorđević* Decision, para. 5.

⁸ *Stanišić and Župljanin* Decision, para. 19; *Lukić and Lukić* Decision, para. 20; *Đorđević* Decision, para. 6; *Haraqija and Morina* Decision, para. 13.

Erdut. The Trial Chamber finds that the tendered statement is relevant, has probative value, and is appropriate for admission pursuant to Rules 89(C) and 92 *ter*.


D. Disposition

8. Accordingly, the Trial Chamber, pursuant to Rules 54, 89(C), and 92 *ter* of the Rules, hereby

- (a) **DECIDES** that the evidence of GH-015, GH-107, and GH-125 is appropriate for admission into evidence; and
- (b) **INFORMS** the parties that the Trial Chamber will make a final decision on whether to admit the evidence, if the conditions set forth in Rule 92 *ter* have been fulfilled when the witnesses give evidence in these proceedings.

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

Done this twenty-third day of October 2012,
At The Hague,
The Netherlands.



Judge Guy Delvoic
Presiding

[Seal of the Tribunal]