

SPECIAL TRIBUNAL FOR LEBANON

المحكمة الخاصبة بلينان

TRIBUNAL SPÉCIAL POUR LE LIBAN

THE TRIAL CHAMBER

Case No: STL-11-01/T/TC

Before: Judge David Re, Presiding

Judge Janet Nosworthy Judge Micheline Braidy

Judge Walid Akoum, Alternate Judge Judge Nicola Lettieri, Alternate Judge

Registrar: Mr Daryl Mundis

Date: 16 October 2017

Original language: English

Classification: Public

ORDER SUPPLEMENTING THE DISPOSITION OF DECISION F3359 OF 13TH OF OCTOBER 2017

(Extract from Official Public Transcript of Hearing on 16 October 2017, page 3, line 18 to page 4, line 16)

The Chamber makes the following variation to the disposition of decision F3359 of 13th of October, 2017, in which the Trial Chamber ordered disclosure to the Oneissi Defence of 12 requests for assistance concerning mobile telephone 095 attributed to the accused Mr. Hussein Hassan Oneissi.

As set out in the disposition at subparagraphs (i) to (xii), page 17 of the decision, and though not specifically addressed in the decision, and having regard to paragraph 47 to 49 of the decision and the finding or ruling that, the request to assistance to which there was no response could and would in the circumstance meet the criteria of materiality for the Defence preparations.

It follows that the Prosecution should concurrently with the disclosure ordered in the decision that the Prosecution implemented on Friday, the 13th of October, that the Prosecution should also inform the Oneissi Defence of which of the requests for assistance which were disclosed elicited a return of no response whatsoever and which produced the

Interpretation serves to facilitate communication.
Only the original speech is authentic.

response that there was no information, material, or document which met the terms or criteria specified in the request for assistance.

The Chamber considers that this is a process which it does not have to oversee but which the parties can fully address by themselves without a further order.

And the Chamber does not anticipate that this will present any challenge for the Prosecution.

Interpretation serves to facilitate communication.
Only the original speech is authentic.