



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-A
Date: 27 June 2014
Original: English

IN THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before: Judge Theodor Meron, Presiding
Judge Carmel Agius
Judge Patrick Robinson
Judge Fausto Pocar
Judge Liu Daqun

Registrar: Mr. John Hocking

Decision of: 27 June 2014

PROSECUTOR

v.

**JADRANKO PRLIĆ
BRUNO STOJIĆ
SLOBODAN PRALJAK
MILIVOJ PETKOVIĆ
VALENTIN ČORIĆ
BERISLAV PUŠIĆ**

PUBLIC

**DECISION ON PRALJAK'S REQUEST FOR STAY OF
PROCEEDINGS**

The Office of the Prosecutor:

Mr. Douglas Stringer
Mr. Mathias Marcussen

Counsel for the Defence:

Mr. Michael G. Karnavas and Ms. Suzana Tomanović for Mr. Jadranko Prlić
Ms. Senka Nožica and Mr. Karim A. A. Khan QC for Mr. Bruno Stojić
Mr. Slobodan Praljak
Ms. Vesna Alaburić and Mr. Guénaél Mettraux for Mr. Milivoj Petković
Ms. Dijana Tomašegović-Tomić and Mr. Dražen Plavec for Mr. Valentin Čorić
Mr. Fahrudin Ibrišimović and Mr. Roger Sahota for Mr. Berislav Pušić

1. The Appeals 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 (“Appeals Chamber” and “Tribunal”, respectively) is seised of a request for stay of proceedings (“Request”), contained in a confidential and *ex parte* letter submitted by Slobodan Praljak (“Praljak”) to the President of the Tribunal (“President”) on 30 April 2014 (“Letter”). On 16 May 2014, pursuant to Rule 33(B) of the Tribunal’s Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”), the Deputy Registrar of the Tribunal filed a confidential and *ex parte* submission in response to the Letter.¹ On 21 May 2014, the Pre-Appeal Judge in this case instructed the Registry of the Tribunal (“Registry”) to lift the confidential and *ex parte* status of the Letter and provide a copy to the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”).² The Prosecution filed a response to the Letter on 28 May 2014.³

I. BACKGROUND

2. On 13 September 2004, Praljak submitted a declaration of means pursuant to Article 7 of the Directive on the Assignment of Defence Counsel,⁴ requesting the assignment of Tribunal-paid counsel on the basis that he lacked the means to remunerate counsel.⁵ On 17 June 2005, the Registry denied the request, finding that Praljak had failed to establish his inability to remunerate counsel.⁶ Upon Praljak’s request, on 15 February 2006 Trial Chamber II of the Tribunal directed the Registry to assign counsel to Praljak in the interests of justice,⁷ and ordered Praljak to provide further information to enable an adequate assessment of his financial means.⁸ The Registry assigned Tribunal-paid counsel to Praljak on 6 March 2006,⁹ but on 22 August 2012 determined that Praljak was able to fully remunerate counsel and was therefore ineligible for assignment of Tribunal-paid counsel.¹⁰ Accordingly, the Registry withdrew the assignment of Tribunal-paid counsel to Praljak

¹ Deputy Registrar’s Submission Regarding Slobodan Praljak’s Submission of 28 April 2014, 16 May 2014 (confidential and *ex parte*) (“Registry’s Submission”). A public redacted version of the Registry’s Submission was filed on 28 May 2014.

² Order Lifting Confidential and *Ex Parte* Status of Letter from Slobodan Praljak, 21 May 2014.

³ Prosecution Response to Slobodan Praljak’s Letter of 28 April 2014, 28 May 2014 (“Prosecution’s Response”).

⁴ IT/73/Rev. 11, 11 July 2006 (“Directive”).

⁵ See *Prosecutor v. Jadranko Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-PT, Decision, 17 June 2005 (public with confidential and *ex parte* Appendix I) (“Deputy Registrar’s Decision on Assignment of Counsel”), p. 2. See also *Prosecutor v. Jadranko Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-T, Decision, 22 August 2012 (public with confidential and *ex parte* Appendix I and public Appendix II) (“Decision on Means”), p. 1.

⁶ Deputy Registrar’s Decision on Assignment of Counsel, p. 3.

⁷ *Prosecutor v. Jadranko Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-PT, Decision on Assignment of Defence Counsel, 15 February 2006 (public with a confidential annex) (“Decision on Assignment of Counsel”), para. 12.

⁸ Decision on Assignment of Counsel, para. 13, p. 7.

⁹ *Prosecutor v. Jadranko Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-PT, Decision, 7 March 2006, p. 2 (noting that the assignment was made without prejudice to Rule 45(E) of the Rules and Article 18 of the Directive).

¹⁰ Decision on Means, p. 6.

effective on the date of the rendering of the trial judgement in this case and further decided that Praljak would have to reimburse the Tribunal for the cost of his defence.¹¹

3. Following the delivery of the Trial Judgement on 29 May 2013,¹² the President issued a decision on 25 July 2013 confirming the Decision on Means as far as Praljak's ability to remunerate counsel was concerned.¹³ Consequently, the payment of legal aid to Praljak was discontinued.¹⁴ On 3 October 2013, upon Praljak's request and in accordance with the Decision of 25 July 2013, the Registry appointed Ms. Nika Pinter and Ms. Natacha Fauveau-Ivanović as privately retained counsel ("Counsel"), pursuant to Rule 44(A) of the Rules, to represent Praljak before the Tribunal.¹⁵ On 20 January 2014, in accordance with the Decision of 25 July 2013,¹⁶ the Registry requested the Appeals Chamber to issue an order of contribution by Praljak to the costs incurred by the Registry for his defence.¹⁷ On 13 May 2014, the Appeals Chamber granted the Registry's application and ordered Praljak to reimburse the Tribunal the amount of €2,807,611.10.¹⁸

4. On 21 June 2013, the Pre-Appeal Judge ordered that the notices of appeal of Jadranko Prlić, Bruno Stojić, Valentin Ćorić, and Milivoj Petković (together with Berislav Pušić ("Pušić"), the "Co-Appellants") be filed within 60 days of the issuance of the English translation of the Trial Judgement and, without prejudice, that any notices of appeal by the remaining parties be filed within 90 days of the issuance of the Trial Judgement.¹⁹ On 28 June 2013, Praljak and Pušić filed their notices of appeal.²⁰ The Prosecution filed its notice of appeal on 27 August 2013.²¹ On 22 August 2013, the Pre-Appeal Judge ordered Praljak, Pušić, and the Prosecution to file their respective appeal briefs no later than 135 days from the issuance of the official English translation of the Trial Judgement.²²

¹¹ Decision on Means, pp. 6-7.

¹² *Prosecutor v. Jadranko Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-T, *Jugement*, 29 May 2013. References hereinafter to the Trial Judgement will be to the English translation of the Trial Judgement, filed on 6 June 2014 ("Trial Judgement").

¹³ Decision on Slobodan Praljak's Motion for Review of the Registrar's Decision on Means, 25 July 2013 (confidential and *ex parte*) ("Decision of 25 July 2013"), paras 81-83. A public redacted version was filed on 28 August 2013. The Decision on Means was reversed in so far as it ordered Praljak to reimburse the Tribunal for the cost of his defence. *See* Decision of 25 July 2013, paras 82-83. On 7 October 2013, the President denied Praljak's request for review of the Decision of 25 July 2013. *See* Decision on Slobodan Praljak's Request for Further Review, 7 October 2013, p. 2.

¹⁴ Decision, 3 October 2013 ("Registry Decision of 3 October 2013"), p. 3.

¹⁵ Registry Decision of 3 October 2013, p. 4.

¹⁶ Decision of 25 July 2013, paras 82-83.

¹⁷ Registrar's Application for the Recovery of Legal Aid Funds, 20 January 2014 (public with a confidential and *ex parte* annex), paras 1, 14.

¹⁸ Order on the Registrar's Application Pursuant to Rule 45(E) of the Rules, 13 May 2014 ("Order for Recovery of Legal Aid"), para. 24.

¹⁹ Decision on Motions for an Extension of Time to File Notices of Appeal and Other Relief, 21 June 2013, pp. 4-5.

²⁰ Slobodan Praljak's Notice of Appeal, 28 June 2013; Notice of Appeal on Behalf of Berislav Pušić, 28 June 2013.

²¹ Prosecution's Notice of Appeal, 27 August 2013.

²² Decision on Motions for Extension of Time to File Appeal Briefs and for Authorization to Exceed Word Limit, 22 August 2013, para. 18.

5. On 3 and 4 October 2013, Praljak requested, respectively: (i) a stay of proceedings until he receives the translation of “essential” documents of this case, including the Trial Judgement, in a language he understands, *i.e.* in the Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian language (“B/C/S”);²³ and (ii) that counsel be assigned to him in the interests of justice pursuant to Article 21(4)(d) of the Statute of the Tribunal (“Statute”) and Rule 45*ter* of the Rules.²⁴ On 4 April 2014, the Appeals Chamber dismissed both the Motion for Stay and the Motion for Assignment of Counsel on the ground, *inter alia*, that Praljak was not self-represented.²⁵

6. In his Letter, Praljak informs the President of his decision to withdraw the power-of-attorney from Counsel and henceforth represent himself, and renews his request for a stay of proceedings until he receives all documents listed in the Letter and in a language he understands, *i.e.*, B/C/S.²⁶ Praljak also requests that his case manager, who has allegedly expressed a willingness to continue in her current capacity without reimbursement, retain her status.²⁷

II. APPLICABLE LAW

7. Pursuant to Article 20(1) of the Statute, an accused is entitled to a fair and expeditious trial. In accordance with Article 21(4) of the Statute, an accused is also entitled to certain “minimum guarantees”, including: (i) to be informed promptly and in detail in a language which he understands of the nature and cause of the charge against him; (ii) to have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence and to communicate with counsel of his own choosing; (iii) to defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing; and (iv) to have legal assistance assigned to him, in any case where the interests of justice so require, and without payment by him in any such case if he does not have sufficient means to pay for it.²⁸

8. Rule 45*ter* of the Rules provides that “[t]he Trial Chamber may, if it decides that it is in the interests of justice, instruct the Registrar to assign a counsel to represent the interests of the accused.” Pursuant to Rule 107 of the Rules, Rule 45*ter* of the Rules applies *mutatis mutandis* to proceedings before the Appeals Chamber.

²³ Slobodan Praljak’s Urgent Motion for Stay of Procedure with Confidential Annexes, 3 October 2013 (public with confidential annexes) (“Motion for Stay”), paras 14, 23, 27, 37. In his Motion for Stay, Praljak uses B/C/S, while in his Letter, he requests translations into Croatian. The Appeals Chamber shall hereinafter use the abbreviation B/C/S.

²⁴ Slobodan Praljak’s Motion for Assignment of Counsel in the Interest of Justice, 4 October 2013 (public with public and confidential annexes) (“Motion for Assignment of Counsel”), paras 11, 27.

²⁵ Decision on Praljak’s Motions for Stay of Procedure and Assignment of Counsel in the Interest of Justice, 4 April 2014 (“Decision on Praljak’s Motions”), paras 19, 21-22.

²⁶ Letter, p. 1.

²⁷ Letter, p. 2.

²⁸ Article 21(4)(a)-(b), (d) of the Statute.

III. DISCUSSION

1. Submissions

9. Praljak submits that he does not speak, read or write either English or French.²⁹ He requests a stay of proceedings until the receipt of the B/C/S translations of: (i) the Prosecution’s and his pre-trial briefs; (ii) the trial transcripts; (iii) all final trial briefs; (iv) the Trial Judgement; (v) his Notice of Appeal, as well as that of the Prosecution and all Co-Appellants; and (vi) “all the relevant documents and correspondence” (“Requested Translations”).³⁰

10. The Registry contends that translation requests by self-represented accused are subject to a prior case-by-case determination by the Registry based on, *inter alia*, the Tribunal’s limited facilities for translation and the rights of other accused.³¹ The Registry also submits that it has no legal obligation to translate all court filings for self-represented accused and that the Requested Translations would require expenditure of significant additional resources and years to complete.³² The Registry declares its readiness to make available to Praljak the translations, once complete,³³ of documents required for him to understand the nature and cause of the charges against him under Article 21(4) of the Statute, as provided for under the Registry Policy Governing Translation Services Provided by the Registry of 16 November 2006 (“Registry Translation Policy”).³⁴ The Registry submits that it does not translate transcripts of court proceedings, but that it can provide Praljak with the complete audio recordings of the trial proceedings in B/C/S.³⁵ The Registry adds that, in view of his established financial ability to contribute to his defence, Praljak should bear the costs for any translations not covered by the Registry Translation Policy.³⁶ Finally, with respect to Praljak’s request to retain his case manager on a *pro bono* basis, the Registry submits that it has had communications with Praljak on the matter and is processing his request.³⁷

11. The Prosecution asserts that in accordance with Rule 45*ter* of the Rules, it is in the interests of justice that Praljak be represented by counsel during the appeal proceedings.³⁸ The Prosecution

²⁹ Letter, p. 1.
³⁰ Letter, p. 1.
³¹ Registry’s Submission, para. 6.
³² Registry’s Submission, paras 6, 9, 14, 16-18.
³³ Registry’s Submission, para. 15. The Registry assesses that these translations would take a minimum of two months, possible longer, to complete. *See* Registry’s Submission, para. 15.
³⁴ Registry’s Submission, paras 10, 12, *referring to* Registry Translation Policy, p. 7. According to the Registry, this would include: (i) the Trial Judgement; (ii) filed decisions and orders from the trial and appeal proceedings as well as forthcoming decisions and orders in the appeal proceedings; and (iii) the Prosecution’s notice of appeal, appeal brief, and reply brief.
³⁵ Registry’s Submission, paras 8, 11.
³⁶ Registry’s Submission, paras 2, 9, 19, 21-23.
³⁷ Registry’s Submission, fn. 1.
³⁸ Prosecution’s Response, paras 2-3, 9-10.

emphasises the considerable delay that would be caused in the appeal proceedings should Praljak be allowed to represent himself, due to the need to provide him with translations of “key documents required on appeal.”³⁹ The Prosecution argues, moreover, that the assignment of counsel is justified in light of the unprecedented magnitude and complexity of the case, Praljak’s own preference to have legal representation during his appeal, as well as the right of Praljak and his Co-Appellants to fair and expeditious proceedings.⁴⁰ Acknowledging the dispute between Praljak and the Tribunal regarding Praljak’s eligibility for defence funding, the Prosecution contends that Praljak should, nevertheless, be assigned counsel while, at the same time, the Registry takes steps to recover the defence costs directly from him.⁴¹

2. Analysis

12. While Article 21(4)(d) of the Statute sets out an accused’s fundamental right to represent himself, during both the trial and the appeal phase,⁴² the Appeals Chamber recalls that this right is not absolute.⁴³ Rule 45*ter* of the Rules allows for the possibility of assigning counsel to an accused, if it is in the interests of justice. The existence of reasons warranting assignment of counsel is to be determined on a case-by-case basis.⁴⁴

13. Praljak requests a stay of the proceedings in this case until he receives the Requested Translations because he is a self-represented accused who does not understand either of the working languages of the Tribunal, *i.e.* English or French.⁴⁵ The Appeals Chamber has found that Article 21(4)(a) of the Statute creates an obligation to provide relevant material in a language which the accused can understand “sufficiently in order to allow for the effective exercise of his right to conduct his defence”.⁴⁶ This is a question of fact and must be decided on a case-by-case basis.⁴⁷ In

³⁹ Prosecution’s Response, para. 7.

⁴⁰ Prosecution’s Response, paras 3-6, 8-9.

⁴¹ Prosecution’s Response, para. 2.

⁴² *Prosecutor v. Momčilo Krajišnik*, Case No. IT-00-39-A, Decision on Momčilo Krajišnik’s Request to Self-Represent, on Counsel’s Motion in Relation to Appointment of *Amicus Curiae*, and on the Prosecution Motion of 16 February 2007, 11 May 2007 (“*Krajišnik Decision*”), paras 11-12.

⁴³ *Krajišnik Decision*, paras 9, 13; *Prosecutor v. Slobodan Milošević*, Case No. IT-02-54-AR73.7, Decision on Interlocutory Appeal of the Trial Chamber’s Decision on the Assignment of Defense Counsel, 1 November 2004, paras 12-13.

⁴⁴ See *Prosecutor v. Radovan Karadžić*, Case No. IT-95-5/18-AR73.6, Decision on Radovan Karadžić’s Appeal from Decision on Motion to Vacate Appointment of Richard Harvey, 12 February 2010, para. 35. See also *Prosecutor v. Vojislav Šešelj*, Case No. IT-03-67-AR73.3, Decision on Appeal Against the Trial Chamber’s Decision on Assignment of Counsel, 20 October 2006, para. 20.

⁴⁵ See Letter, p. 1.

⁴⁶ *Prosecutor v. Zdravko Tolimir*, Case No. IT-05-88/2-AR73.1, Decision on Interlocutory Appeal Against Oral Decision of the Pre-Trial Judge of 11 December 2007, 28 March 2008 (“*Tolimir Decision*”), para. 15. See also *Prosecutor v. Radovan Karadžić*, Case No. IT-95-5/18-AR73.3, Decision on Interlocutory Appeal of the Trial Chamber’s Decision on Prosecution Motion Seeking Determination that the Accused Understands English, 4 June 2009 (“*Karadžić Decision*”), para. 12.

⁴⁷ *Tolimir Decision*, para. 15; *Karadžić Decision*, para. 12.

this regard, the Appeals Chamber notes: (i) Praljak's own submissions;⁴⁸ (ii) Presiding Judge Antonetti's acknowledgement, during a status conference at the beginning of the trial, that Praljak does not understand either English or French;⁴⁹ and (iii) concessions to this effect by the Prosecution.⁵⁰ On this basis, the Appeals Chamber is satisfied that Praljak is unable to understand either English or French sufficiently to effectively represent himself during the appeal proceedings.

14. Given Praljak's inability to understand either English or French, the Appeals Chamber considers that Praljak would need to receive not only the B/C/S translations that the Registry has agreed to provide to him pursuant to the Registry Translation Policy (and which would take at least two months to complete),⁵¹ but also, for example, translations of at least all future filings in this appeal.⁵² As the Registry submits, such translations would require a number of years and considerable resources to complete, causing extensive delays in the case as a whole, at a significant cost to the Tribunal.⁵³

15. Moreover, the current case, involving six accused, raises complex legal and factual issues relating to crimes committed in a total of eight municipalities and a network of detention facilities across the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, over a period of more than two years. Praljak has been convicted of grave crimes, including numerous counts of grave breaches of the Geneva Convention of 1949 and crimes against humanity, and has been sentenced to 20 years of imprisonment.⁵⁴ Praljak previously submitted that he has no legal education and lacks the advocacy skills and familiarity with procedural and substantive rules that would allow him to adequately address the complex issues at stake in this appeal.⁵⁵ Unlike other self-represented accused before this Tribunal, Praljak does not currently have any form of legal assistance available to him.⁵⁶ He cannot, therefore, be expected to manage his appeal in an adequate and timely manner and deal with the volume and complexity of tasks that the conduct of his own defence would entail. The Appeals

⁴⁸ See Letter, p. 1.

⁴⁹ *Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.*, Case No. IT-04-74-PT, 30 January 2006, T. 341.

⁵⁰ See Prosecution Consolidated Response to Slobodan Praljak's Urgent Motion for Stay of Procedure and to his Motion for Assignment of Counsel in the Interest of Justice, 11 October 2013 (confidential), para. 2. See also Prosecution's Response, para. 7.

⁵¹ See *supra*, para. 10 and fn. 34.

⁵² Cf. *Prosecutor v. Kvočka et al.*, Case No. IT-98-30/1-A, Decision on Zoran Žigić's Motion for Translation of Documents Pertaining to his Appeal, 3 October 2002, p. 3 (ordering, *inter alia*, that appellant Žigić, for as long as he remains self-represented, receive B/C/S translations of "all documents filed by the prosecution or co-accused relating to the appeal of this appellant, as well as all orders, decisions and letters filed by the Appeals Chamber which concern the appellant").

⁵³ See Registry's Submission, paras 14, 16-18.

⁵⁴ Trial Judgement, Vol. 4, pp. 197-200 and 430.

⁵⁵ See Motion for Assignment of Counsel, paras 17-19.

⁵⁶ Krajišnik was assigned an *amicus curiae* during the appeal proceedings and was assisted by three legal associates, while Tolimir, whose case is currently pending on appeal, continues to receive the support of his legal advisor appointed at trial. See *Krajišnik* Decision, para. 18; *Prosecutor v. Zdravko Tolimir*, Case No. IT-05-88/2-A, Decision on Tolimir's Request for Extension of Time for Filing an Appellant's Brief, 17 June 2013, p. 1.

Chamber must take into account this factor, which can very likely cause additional significant delays in the appellate proceedings, in assessing Praljak's present request.

16. The Appeals Chamber considers that the delays that would inevitably result from allowing Praljak to represent himself will negatively affect the right of Praljak, as well as that of his Co-Appellants (all of whom are represented by counsel) to fair and expeditious proceedings. As a trial chamber of the Special Court for Sierra Leone has held, ensuring adequate legal representation of each defendant is of particular importance in the context of a multi-accused case.⁵⁷ The Appeals Chamber notes that this consideration is relevant to the case at hand.⁵⁸ Praljak himself has stated on several occasions that his interests would be better served through assistance of counsel, in particular during appeal proceedings.⁵⁹ The Appeals Chamber is therefore satisfied, given the specific circumstances of this case, that Praljak should not be allowed to represent himself in these proceedings and considers *proprio motu* that the assignment of counsel to Praljak would be in the interests of justice pursuant to Rule 45*ter* of the Rules. Accordingly, the Appeals Chamber finds that there is no reason to stay proceedings as requested by Praljak.

17. The Appeals Chamber emphasises that Rule 45*ter* of the Rules does not modify the requirements of Article 21(4)(d) of the Statute or Rule 45 of the Rules that only an accused with insufficient means to remunerate counsel is entitled to Tribunal-paid counsel.⁶⁰ Since it has been determined that Praljak has sufficient funds to remunerate counsel,⁶¹ Praljak is still required to reimburse the Tribunal for the costs already incurred for his defence and the costs to be sustained in connection with this appeal. The Appeals Chamber appreciates the Registry's concerns about the recovery of further funds to be expended by the Tribunal for the assignment of counsel to Praljak.⁶² While it fully shares this concern, the Appeals Chamber cannot halt the appeal proceedings until past costs are recovered. Doing so would be to the detriment of Praljak's Co-Appellants and run contrary to the interests of justice.

⁵⁷ See *Prosecutor v. Sam Hinga Norman et al.*, Case No. SCSL-04-14-T, Decision on the Application of Samuel Hinga Norman for Self Representation Under Article 17(4)(d) of the Statute of the Special Court, 8 June 2004, paras 13-14, 26 (evaluating a request for self-representation in a multi-accused case and taking into account the "complexities of the judicial process and the gravity of the alleged crimes", as well as the "disruption to the Court's timetable and calendar").

⁵⁸ Cf. *Prosecutor v. Rasim Delić*, Case No. IT-04-83-A, Decision on the Outcome of the Proceedings, 29 June 2010, para. 7.

⁵⁹ See Motion for Assignment of Counsel, paras 16-19.

⁶⁰ Decision on Praljak's Motions, para. 20.

⁶¹ Order for Recovery of Legal Aid, paras 20-21, 24.

⁶² See Registrar's Submission Pursuant to Rule 33(B) Regarding Slobodan Praljak's Motion for Assignment of Counsel in the Interest of Justice, 22 October 2013, paras 40-41, 43.

IV. DISPOSITION

18. For the foregoing reasons and pursuant to Article 20(1) of the Statute and Rules 45*ter* and 107 of the Rules, the Appeals Chamber:


DENIES the Request;

INSTRUCTS the Registrar to assign counsel to Praljak in the interests of justice; and

ORDERS Praljak to reimburse the Tribunal for the costs sustained in providing him with legal aid in connection with his appeal proceedings.

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

Dated this 27th day of June 2014,
At The Hague,
The Netherlands.



Judge Theodor Meron
Presiding Judge

[Seal of the Tribunal]