

**IN TRIAL CHAMBER II****Before: Judge David Hunt, Presiding****Declassified to Public  
06 September 2012****Judge Antonio Cassese****Judge Florence Ndepele Mwachande Mumba****Registrar: Mrs Dorothee de Sampayo Garrido-Nijgh****Decision of: 24 February 1999****PROSECUTOR****v****MILORAD KRNOJELAC**

---

**DECISION ON THE DEFENCE PRELIMINARY MOTION  
ON THE FORM OF THE INDICTMENT**

---

**The Office of the Prosecutor:****Mr Franck Terrier****Ms Peggy Kuo****Ms Hildegard Uertz-Retzlaff****Counsel for the Accused:****Mr Mihajlo Bakrac****Mr Miroslav Vasic****I Introduction**

1. Milorad Krnojelac ("the accused") is charged on eighteen counts arising out of events at the Foca Kazneno-Popravni Dom ("KP Dom" or "KPD FOCA") – said to be one of the largest prisons in the former Yugoslavia – of which he is alleged to have been the commander and in a position of superior authority. The charges against him allege:

1.1 grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, consisting of torture (Count 3), wilfully causing serious injury to body or health (Count 6), wilful killing (Count 9), unlawful confinement of civilians (Count 12), wilfully causing great suffering (Count 14) and inhuman treatment (Count 17);<sup>1</sup>

1.2 violations of the laws and customs of war, consisting of torture (Count 4), cruel treatment (Counts 7 and 15), murder (Count 10) and slavery (Count 18);<sup>2</sup> and

1.3 crimes against humanity, consisting of persecution on political, racial and/or religious grounds (Count 1), torture (Count 2), inhumane acts (Counts 5 and 13), murder (Count 8), imprisonment (Count 11) and enslavement (Count 16).<sup>3</sup>

2. On 8 January 1999, the accused filed a Defence Preliminary Motion on the Form of the Indictment ("Motion"). On 22 January, the prosecution filed its Response to the Motion ("Response"). Leave was granted to the accused to file a Reply to that Response ("Reply"), and such Reply was filed on 10 February. The prosecution was given leave to file a further Response to two new matters raised in the Reply ("Further Response"), and this was done on 17 February.

## **II Nature of Accused's Responsibility**

3. As to all counts, the accused requires the prosecution to identify, in relation to each count, whether the charge laid in that count is based on the accused's individual responsibility (Art 7(1) of the Statute) or on his responsibility as a superior (Art 7(3) of the Statute).<sup>4</sup> However, paras 4.9 and 4.10 of the indictment assert that the accused has both individual responsibility and responsibility as a superior, as well as (in the alternative) responsibility as a superior only. These assertions are

clearly intended to be read distributively as applying to all the counts in the indictment. This indictment may not be the most stylish of pleadings, but this particular complaint as to form is rejected.

4. The next complaint is that, by pleading in this way, the prosecution does not know whether the accused is being charged "cumulatively or alternatively" which, the accused says, makes the indictment imprecise.<sup>5</sup> As paras 4.9 and 4.10 are to be read distributively, there is no such imprecision, and this complaint is also rejected.

## **III Different charges based upon the same facts**

5. It is also submitted that, because these different responsibilities are based upon the same factual grounds, the indictment is nevertheless defective because "[r]esponsibility may not be accumulated".<sup>6</sup> Such a pleading is said to be contrary to the laws of the former Yugoslavia, but the Statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Tribunal ("Rules") are not to be read down so as to comply with those laws. This pleading issue has already been determined by the International Tribunal in favour of the prosecution: previous complaints that there has been an impermissible accumulation where the prosecution has charged such different offences based upon the same facts – as it has here – have been consistently dismissed by the Trial Chambers, upon the basis that the significance of that fact is relevant only to the question of penalty.<sup>7</sup> More importantly, the Appeals Chamber has similarly dismissed such a complaint.<sup>8</sup>

6. Two specific arguments are nevertheless put by the accused. The first is that the same act or omission cannot support both a charge of individual responsibility and a charge of responsibility as a superior. Whether or not that is so (and it is unnecessary in this case to resolve that issue), that is not the way in which the indictment here has been pleaded. What the prosecution has done is to assert in fairly general terms that the accused is guilty of a particular offence without identifying any specific acts or omissions of the accused which would demonstrate whether his responsibility is alleged to be individual (either by way of personal participation or as aiding and abetting those who did so participate) or as a superior. For example, par 5.2 says (in part):

**MILORAD KRNOJELAC** persecuted the Muslim and other non-Serb males by subjecting them to prolonged and routine imprisonment and confinement, repeated torture and beatings, countless killings, prolonged and frequent forced labour, and inhumane conditions within the KP Dom detention facility.

Such an allegation is consistent with either type of responsibility, and the nature of the alleged responsibilities of the accused are spelt out in paras 4.9 and 4.10, in the way already stated.

7. This somewhat clumsy style of pleading appears to have been adopted because this accused was indicted with a number of others whose names remain under seal. There appears to have been an attempt to state the charge in general terms against all of the accused and then to assert that different accused have different responsibilities for the matters so charged. A pleading is not defective because its style is clumsy provided that, when taken as a whole, the indictment makes clear to each accused (a) the nature of the responsibility (or responsibilities) alleged against him and (b) the material facts – but not the evidence – by which his particular responsibility (or responsibilities) will be established. In the present case, the first of those matters has been made clear, as already stated. Something will be said later about the failure of the prosecution to give sufficient (and, in many cases, any) particulars of the material facts by which his different responsibilities will be established. At this stage, it is sufficient to say that there is no basis for this first specific argument put by the accused.

8. The second specific argument put is that crimes against humanity (Art 5 of the Statute), grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions (Art 2 of the Statute) and violations of the laws and customs of war (Art 3 of the Statute) are mutually exclusive, and that the prosecution is not permitted to rely upon them all in relation to the same facts.<sup>9</sup> But each Article is designed to protect different values, and each requires proof of a particular element which is not required by the others.<sup>10</sup> It therefore does not follow that the same conduct cannot offend more than one of those values and thus fall within more than one of those Articles.

9. This submission by the accused may be the product of a confusion with the principle of double jeopardy which, in very general terms, states that a person should not be prosecuted for an offence where he has already been prosecuted and either convicted or acquitted of a different offence arising out of the same or substantially the same facts. This principle has found expression in the Constitution of the United States of America:

[N]or shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb [...].<sup>11</sup>

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights also reads:

No one shall be liable to be tried or punished again for an offence for which he has already been finally convicted or acquitted in accordance with the law and penal procedure of each country.<sup>12</sup>

The former has been interpreted as saying, and the latter states expressly, that it is concerned with *successive* prosecutions upon different charges arising out of the same (or substantially the same) facts, and not with the prosecution of such charges in the *same* trial.<sup>13</sup>

10. The prosecution must be allowed to frame charges within the one indictment on the basis that the tribunal of fact may not accept a particular element of one charge which does not have to be established for the other charges, and in any event in order to reflect the totality of the accused's criminal conduct, so that the punishment imposed will do the same. Of course, great care must be taken in sentencing that an offender convicted of different charges arising out of the same or

substantially the same facts is not punished more than once for his commission of the individual acts (or omissions) which are common to two or more of those charges. But there is no breach of the double jeopardy principle by the inclusion in the one indictment of different charges arising out of the same or substantially the same facts.

#### **IV Particularity in pleading – individual responsibility**

11. However, the only specific facts alleged in the indictment in the present case relevant to the accused's *individual* responsibility in relation to any of the charges are to be found in para 3.1 of the indictment, where it is alleged in general terms (and without any particularity) that the accused was present when detainees arrived and that he appeared during beatings. Even so, para 3.1 is directed only to showing that the accused had responsibility as a superior, not that he personally participated in any beatings. It may be that – differently expressed, and in a distinct, separate and more detailed allegation – these facts would go at least some way to support a finding that the accused had aided and abetted in the beatings and that he was therefore individually responsible for those beatings,<sup>14</sup> but para 3.1 does not provide particulars of the individual responsibility of the accused.

12. The accused therefore complains, with some justification, that he has not been informed of the facts upon which the prosecution relies to establish his individual responsibility.<sup>15</sup> The extent of the prosecution's obligation to give particulars in an indictment is to ensure that the accused has "a concise statement of the facts" upon which reliance is placed to establish the offences charged,<sup>16</sup> but only to the extent that such statement enables the accused to be informed of the "nature and cause of the charge against him"<sup>17</sup> and in "adequate time [...] for the preparation of his defence".<sup>18</sup> An indictment must contain information as to the identity of the victim, the place and the approximate date of the alleged offence and the means by which the offence was committed.<sup>19</sup> However, these obligations in relation to what must be pleaded in the indictment are not to be seen as a substitute for the prosecution's obligation to give pre-trial discovery (which is provided by Rule 66 of the Rules) or the names of witnesses (which is provided by Rule 67 of the Rules).<sup>20</sup> There is thus a clear distinction drawn between the material facts upon which the prosecution relies (which must be pleaded) and the evidence by which those material facts will be proved (which must be provided by way of pre-trial discovery).

13. But, even recognising that distinction, the indictment as presently drafted gives the accused no idea at all of the nature and cause of the charges against him so far as they are based upon his individual responsibility – either by way of personal participation or as aiding and abetting those who did so participate. It is not sufficient that an accused is made aware of the case to be established upon only one of the alternative bases pleaded.<sup>21</sup> What must clearly be identified by the prosecution so far as the individual responsibility of the accused in the present case is concerned are the particular acts of the accused himself or the particular course of conduct on his part which are alleged to constitute that responsibility.<sup>22</sup>

14. The prosecution has already given pre-trial discovery of all the supporting material which accompanied the indictment when confirmation was sought.<sup>23</sup> It has not yet provided the accused with translated witness statements.<sup>24</sup> It submits that the supporting material "should" supply all necessary details as to the nature of the case to be made against the accused sufficient to enable him to prepare his defence, so that there is no need to amend the indictment.<sup>25</sup> Reliance is placed upon the decision of the ICTR in *Prosecutor v Nyiramashuko*<sup>26</sup> as supporting that proposition. What the ICTR said was:

"Whilst it is essential to read the indictment together with the supporting material,

the indictment *on its own* must be able to present clear and concise charges against the accused, to enable the accused to understand the charges. This is particularly important since the accused does not have the benefit of the supporting material at his initial appearance."<sup>27</sup>

15. It is true that, in a limited class of case, less emphasis may be placed upon the need for precision in the indictment where complete pre-trial discovery has been given. For example, if all of the witness statements identify uniformly and with precision the circumstances in which the offence charged is alleged to have occurred, it would be a pointless technicality to insist upon the indictment being amended to reflect that information. That is, however, a rare situation. It has not been shown to be the case here. Indeed, the lack of particularity in the indictment strongly suggests that the prosecution does not have statements which fall within that limited class of case. It is not clear from the judgment of the ICTR in *Prosecutor v Nyiramashuko* whether that case fell within such a limited class, but this Trial Chamber does not accept any interpretation of the ICTR decision which suggests that the supporting material given during the discovery process can be used by the prosecution to fill any gaps in the material facts pleaded in the indictment, except in the limited class of case to which reference has already been made.

16. Where the discovered material does not cure the imprecision in the indictment, the dangers of an imprecise indictment remain – such as in relation to subsequent pleas of *autrefois acquit* and *autrefois convict*.<sup>28</sup> The prosecution has not established that the discovered material does cure these imprecisions.

17. The prosecution is therefore required to amend the indictment so as to identify, *in relation to each count or group of counts*, the material facts (but not the evidence) upon which it relies to establish the individual responsibility of the accused for the particular offence or group of offences charged. The complaints by the accused in relation to the particulars of his responsibility as a superior will be dealt with separately.

### **V Particularity in pleading – responsibility as a superior**

18. In relation to the allegation that the accused was in a position of superior authority,<sup>29</sup> the accused requires the prosecution to identify with precision the "grounds" for the allegations made that, "at the critical time", he was "the head of the KPD FOCA and in a superior position to everybody in the detention camp" and "the person responsible for the functioning of the KPD FOCA as a detention camp".<sup>30</sup> The indictment identifies the relevant time as being from April 1992 until at least August 1993. The statements quoted by the accused are to some extent inaccurately transcribed, and in one aspect significantly so. They are also taken out of context. Paragraph 3.1 in its entirety is in the following terms:

#### **SUPERIOR AUTHORITY**

3.1 From April 1992 until at least August 1993, MILORAD KRNOJELAC was the commander of the KP Dom and was in a position of superior authority to everyone in the camp. As commander of the KP Dom, MILORAD KRNOJELAC was the person responsible for running the Foca KP Dom as a detention camp. MILORAD KRNOJELAC exercised powers and duties consistent with his superior position. He ordered and supervised the prison staff on a daily basis. He communicated with military and political authorities from outside the prison.

MILORAD KRNOJELAC was present when detainees arrived, appeared during beatings, and had personal contact with some detainees.

19. The accused's argument fails once the actual wording of the paragraph itself is considered. To describe the accused as the "commander" of a camp – the word "commander" is significantly omitted in the statements quoted by the accused – is sufficient "ground" for asserting that he was superior to everyone else and that he was responsible for the functioning of the camp. Even if it were not, the allegations made in the remainder of the paragraph provide sufficient "ground" for asserting that the accused was in a position of superior authority as part of the basis for making him criminally responsible in accordance with Art 7(3). The manner in which these material facts are to be proved is a matter of evidence and thus for pre-trial discovery, not pleading.

20. The accused's second argument is that particular precision is required in relation to these assertions because, he says, at the relevant time the Foca KP Dom in fact consisted of two institutions – one which was under the control of the army and used for detaining war prisoners, and the other a civil correction centre. It is said that the accused will prove that he was the "head" of the second such institution, but that he had "no competence" in relation to the first. This argument also fails. An objection to the form of an indictment is not an appropriate proceeding for contesting the accuracy of the facts pleaded.<sup>31</sup> The prosecution's obligation is to establish the fact alleged in the indictment, that the accused was "the person responsible for running the Foca KP Dom as a detention camp". Its obligation to eliminate any reasonable doubt as to that fact arises only when

the material giving rise to such a doubt appears in the evidence; it does not have to eliminate some possibility merely suggested during the course of argument,<sup>32</sup> still less does it have to plead the evidence by which it will do so.

21. The accused's complaint is rejected.

#### **VI Complaints as to imprecision in the indictment**

22. The accused complains of the imprecision of a number of allegations made in the indictment.<sup>33</sup> There is some merit in that complaint, although the details of that complaint provided in his Motion demonstrates at times a misunderstanding of the distinction between the material facts which must be pleaded and the evidence which must be disclosed by way of pre-trial discovery. It is necessary to deal separately with each of these complaints of imprecision.

23. Under the heading "Background", the indictment asserts that "[m]ost, if not all" of the detainees in the Foca KP Dom were "civilians, who had not been charged with any crime".<sup>34</sup> The purpose of this allegation is to demonstrate that such detainees were persons protected by the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, an allegation made expressly in para 4.3, and thus relevant to the International Tribunal's jurisdiction to try the charges made under Art 2 of its Statute.

24. The accused complains that he has not been informed of the identity of the detainees who were *not* civilians, which identity, it is said, is an important matter in relation to his responsibility under Art 2.<sup>35</sup> The prosecution, however, does not have to establish who were *not* civilians; it has to establish that the detainees who are alleged to be the victims of the offences charged under Art 2 *were* civilians. The allegations under the heading "Background" are in any event intended only to place in their context the material facts which are alleged in the indictment when dealing with each count or group of counts. It is in relation to those material facts, rather than the background facts of a

general nature only, that the accused is entitled to proper particularity.<sup>36</sup>

25. This complaint is rejected.

26. The accused also complains of what is said to be an inconsistency between this assertion that "[m]ost if not all" of the detainees were "civilians, who had not been charged with any crime" (to which reference has already been made) and the assertion (made later in the indictment)<sup>37</sup> that torture had been applied to these detainees in order to obtain a confession from them or to punish them for acts which they had committed.<sup>38</sup> But there is no suggestion in the later assertion that the persons who had been tortured were being detained as a result of some legal process following formal charges laid against them. Indeed, the assertion assumes the absence of any proper legal process.

27. This complaint is also rejected.

28. The accused complains<sup>39</sup> of what is said to be an inconsistency between the allegation that he was the commander of the Foca KP Dom "from April 1992 until at least August 1993" (made in paras 2.1 and 3.1 of the indictment) and that made in para 4.5 of the indictment:

All acts and omissions alleged in this indictment took place between April 1992 and October 1994, unless otherwise indicated.

If the reference to "at least" August 1993 is intended to permit the prosecution to prove that the accused was such commander at any time after that date, the accused is left without any real assistance as to the nature of the prosecution case upon an important material fact. The prosecution is directed to amend paras 2.1 and 3.1 of the indictment by deleting the words "at least" in each paragraph.

29. Upon the assumption that the words "at least" are deleted, there can be an inconsistency between these allegations only if it is assumed that all the offences charged took place at a time when the accused was the commander of the camp. As a matter of *form*, that assumption cannot be made, as the accused is charged with individual responsibility as well as responsibility as a superior. Nevertheless, para 4.9 of the indictment expressly limits the individual responsibility of the accused to the same period ending August 1993, so that it is clear as a matter of *substance* that, if the accused is being charged in the alternative upon both bases in relation to each count,<sup>40</sup> there is no room for an interpretation of the indictment as alleging *any* responsibility on the part of the accused in relation to events which took place after he ceased to be the commander of the Foca KP Dom.

30. The prosecution says that the references in the indictment to the longer period are intended to reflect the responsibilities of others indicted with the accused but whose names remain under seal. The current redacted form of the indictment is thus unintentionally misleading, but the prosecution has now conceded that, so far as *this* accused is concerned, para 4.5 of the indictment should be treated as having been limited to the period ending August 1993. There appears to be some similar inconsistencies in the indictment, at paras 5.16, 5.30 and 5.36, and the prosecution is directed to make similar concessions in relation to the periods upon which it relies so far as this accused is concerned.

31. A new complaint by the accused, made for the first time in the Reply, is that the allegation that he was the commander of the Foca KP Dom "from April 1992 until [...] August 1993" (made in paras 2.1 and 3.1 of the indictment, and to which reference was made when dealing with the last complaint) is in any event imprecise because the specific date in April upon which he became such commander is not stated.<sup>41</sup> He draws attention to a particular event which is stated in para 5.6 of the indictment to have occurred on 17 April, and he claims not to know whether he is alleged to be

responsible for that event as a superior.

32. That complaint is answered once more by paras 4.9 and 4.10 being read distributively as applying to all counts in the indictment. The prosecution does not have to establish the date upon which the accused became commander of the Foca KP Dom. The only fair interpretation of the allegation in question is that the accused is alleged to have been such commander during the period from the beginning of April 1992 until the end of August 1993. It will be sufficient for the prosecution to establish that he was such commander at the time of the various incidents which are alleged to have taken place during that period and of any other incidents upon which the prosecution may rely to establish his responsibility as a superior. In any event, the prosecution now says<sup>42</sup> that the earliest date upon which its best available evidence shows the accused to be the "head" of the Foca KP Dom is 18 April 1992, so that – unless evidence not currently available to it shows otherwise – it will not attribute to the accused any criminal conduct earlier than that date (including the event described in para 5.6 of the indictment).

33. The accused complains<sup>43</sup> of the inclusion of the words "aiding and abetting" in para 4.9 of the redacted indictment, which falls under the heading "General Allegations" and which alleges:

4.9 **MILORAD KRNOJELAC**, from April 1992 until August 1993, and others are individually responsible for the crimes charged against them in this indictment, pursuant to Article 7 (1) of the Statute of the Tribunal. Individual criminal responsibility includes committing, planning, initiating, ordering or aiding and abetting in the planning, preparation or execution of any acts or omissions set forth below.

The accused says that the words "aiding and abetting" do not provide sufficient clarity as to the case which he has to meet.

34. The concept of individual responsibility by way of aiding and abetting in the commission of an offence by others was extensively discussed recently in *Prosecutor v Furundzija*,<sup>44</sup> and the concept itself cannot be said to be unclear. The Trial Chamber has already determined in this present decision that the accused is entitled to particulars of the material facts (but not the evidence) upon which the prosecution relies to establish the individual responsibility of the accused for each offence or group of offences charged.<sup>45</sup> Such particulars must necessarily demonstrate the basis upon which it is alleged that the accused aided and abetted those who personally participated in each of the offences charged.

35. This complaint is rejected.

36. The accused complains<sup>46</sup> that the indictment fails in many instances to identify even the approximate time when the various offences are alleged to have occurred.<sup>47</sup> The prosecution submits that, because the charges concern events which took place over a specified period in the conduct of a detention center, it is not obliged to provide information as to the identity of the victim, the specific area where and the approximate date when the events are alleged to have taken place or (where the accused is charged with responsibility as a superior or as aiding and abetting rather than as having personally participated in those events) the identity of the persons who did personally participate in those events.

37. On the face of it, the stand taken by the prosecution is directly contrary to its obligations as to pleading an indictment as imposed by the Statute and the Rules, to which reference has already been made,<sup>48</sup> as interpreted by the Trial Chamber in *Prosecutor v Blaskic*.<sup>49</sup> The prosecution nevertheless relies upon the decision of the Trial Chamber in *Prosecutor v Aleksovski*<sup>50</sup> as justifying its stand.



38. According to that decision, the indictment charged Aleksovski in relation to certain events which occurred in the Kaonik prison while he was responsible for it. The indictment identified a period of five months during which it was alleged that he was so responsible. It is apparent from the decision that the indictment did not identify either the place or the approximate date of the events which are alleged to have occurred. The Trial Chamber stated:<sup>51</sup>

The time period – the first five months of 1993 – is sufficiently circumscribed and permits the accused to organise his defence with full knowledge of what he was doing. It follows that, because it specifies the overall period during which the crimes were allegedly committed, the indictment does not violate the rules governing the presentation of the charges.

Insofar as that decision supports the submission of the prosecution, that it is not obliged to provide the information referred to in the paragraph before last, there are two observations to be made about it. The first is that it is no answer to a request for particulars that the accused knows the facts for himself; the issue in relation to particulars is not whether the accused knows the true facts but, rather, whether he knows what facts are to be alleged against him.<sup>52</sup> It cannot be assumed that the two are the same. The second observation is that what the accused needs to know is not only what is to be alleged to have been his own conduct giving rise to his responsibility as a superior but also what is to be alleged to have been the conduct of those persons for which he is alleged to be responsible as such a superior. Only in that way can the accused know the "nature and cause of the charge against him".<sup>53</sup> With great respect to the Trial Chamber in *Aleksovski*, this Trial Chamber is unable to agree with the decision insofar as it supports the prosecution's submission.

39. In any event, the accused in the present case is also charged upon the alternative basis of his own individual participation in these events. Particulars must be supplied which enable the accused to know the nature of the case which he must meet upon that basis.

40. It may be, of course, that the prosecution is simply unable to be more specific because the witness statement or statements in its possession do not provide the information in order for it to do so. It cannot be obliged to perform the impossible, but in some cases there will then arise the question as to whether it is fair to the accused to permit such an imprecise charge to proceed. The inability of the prosecution to provide proper particulars may itself demonstrate sufficient prejudice to an accused person as to make a trial upon the relevant charge necessarily unfair.<sup>54</sup> The fact that the witnesses are unable to provide the needed information will inevitably reduce the value of their evidence. The absence of such information effectively reduces the defence of the accused to a mere blanket denial; he will be unable, for example, to set up any meaningful alibi, or to cross-examine the witnesses by reference to surrounding circumstances such as would exist if the acts charged had been identified by reference to some more precise time or other event or surrounding circumstance.

41. In some jurisdictions, a procedure has been adopted of permitting an oral examination and cross-examination of a witness prior to the trial by counsel in the case (who are less restricted in their scope for questioning than police officers or other investigators), in an endeavour to elicit from the witness sufficient information to cure the prejudice which would otherwise exist.<sup>55</sup> But it is necessary first to determine whether the prosecution is able to give better particulars.

42. The complaint by the accused is at this stage upheld, and the prosecution is required to identify in the indictment the approximate time when each offence is alleged to have taken place. Obviously, there will be cases where the identification cannot be of a specific date, but a reasonable range should be specified. The period of April 1992 to August 1993 would *not* be a reasonable period.

43. The accused has also suggested that greater precision than usual will be required in specifying these times in relation to the offences based upon Art 2 of the Statute because the period from April

1992 to August 1993 straddles the period of May 1992 when – so it was found by the Trial Chamber in *Prosecutor v Tadic* – the conflict ceased to be an international one in the relevant area.<sup>56</sup> However, that finding was one of fact only, made upon the evidence presented in that trial and in proceedings between different parties. It cannot amount to a *res judicata* binding the Trial Chamber in this trial.<sup>57</sup> In the Celebici case, for example, it was held that the conflict in that area continued to be international in character for the rest of 1992.<sup>58</sup> It is clear that it is for the Trial Chamber in each individual trial to determine this issue for itself upon the evidence given in that trial. That is not an issue of fact which can be resolved at this stage.

44. When identifying the facts by which Counts 2 to 7 are to be proved,<sup>59</sup> the indictment, under the general heading "Beatings in the Prison Yard", has alleged as facts:

5.4 On their arrival in the prison and/or during their confinement, many detainees of the KP Dom were beaten on numerous occasions by the prison guards or by soldiers in the presence of regular prison personnel.

5.5 On several occasions between April and December 1992, soldiers approached and beat detainees in the prison yard, among them FWS-137, while guards watched without interfering.

The accused asserts that it is unclear whether the case against him is to be that it was the guards or the soldiers who were the perpetrators, and that, if the former, the reference to regular prison personnel is unclear.<sup>60</sup>

45. It is reasonably clear that the prosecution here is relying upon a number of beatings at different times – some by the prison guards, and some by soldiers in the presence of regular prison personnel. The significance of the presence of the regular prison personnel and their inaction at the time is that the beatings by the soldiers were being at least condoned, and perhaps also encouraged, by the regular prison personnel. This in turn suggests that the infliction of such beatings, either by the prison guards or by the soldiers, was a course of conduct approved by the accused as the person in command of the prison.

46. But, if these two paragraphs were intended to stand alone, the prosecution has failed to give the accused any idea at all of the basis of its case. The accused is entitled to know where and approximately when these beatings occurred and the identity of the prison guards, the soldiers and the regular prison personnel. The accused has very properly conceded that, if the prosecution is unable to identify those directly participating in such events by name, it will be sufficient for it to identify them at least by reference to their "category" (or their official position) as a group.<sup>61</sup>

47. Paragraphs 5.6 to 5.9 of the indictment go on to allege facts with a reasonable degree of particularity, and it may be that the prosecution intended paras 5.4 and 5.5 to be merely descriptive in general terms of what follows in those paragraphs. If that is so, this should be made clear. Better still, paras 5.4 and 5.5 should be either deleted or incorporated in the later paragraphs.

48. The complaint as to imprecision is upheld, and the prosecution is directed to amend paras 5.4 and 5.5 of the indictment accordingly.

49. Paragraph 5.15 of the indictment, under a general heading of "Torture and Beatings as Punishment", alleges as facts to be proved:

5.15 In the summer of 1992, the detainees AM, FM, HT and S, who passed messages to one another, were beaten by guards as a punishment.

The accused complains, again with some justification, that the prosecution should plead with more particularity than this.<sup>62</sup> The period specified is far too wide, and there is no specification as to whether this happened on one occasion or on different occasions, where and approximately when it happened or the identity of the guards concerned (at least by reference to their category or position as a group).

50. The prosecution is therefore ordered to amend the indictment in order to provide such further and better particulars of the allegation in para 5.15.

51. Paragraph 5.16 of the indictment refers in general terms (and without any particularity) to detainees being subjected to collective punishment for the misdeeds of individual detainees. It then identifies one such incident which is alleged to have occurred in June 1994. If the general allegation is intended to stand alone, it gives the accused no idea at all as to the nature of the case against him.<sup>63</sup> If it is intended to be merely descriptive in general terms of what follows, then the date is outside the period during which the accused is alleged to have been the commander of the

Foca KP Dom and outside the period identified as that during which he is alleged to have an individual responsibility for the offences alleged. One or the other has to be amended so far as this accused is concerned. The prosecution is directed to amend par 5.16 of the indictment.

52. Paragraph 5.17 of the indictment reads:

5.17 Policemen from the local or the military police, in concert with the prison authorities, interrogated the detainees after their arrival. [...] During or after the interrogation, the guards and others often beat the detainees.

The accused complains that it is not clear what was intended by the reference to "others" in the second sentence.<sup>64</sup> It seems that it was intended to refer to the policemen from the local or military police who also took part in the interrogations but, if this were not intended, the allegation should be made clear. The prosecution is directed to amend para 5.17 accordingly.

53. Paragraph 5.21 of the indictment alleges that the accused participated in concert with political leaders or military commanders in the selection of detainees to be beaten. Those selected are alleged to have been taken for interrogation and then beaten. The indictment then alleges:

Some of the detainees returned to their rooms severely injured. Some of the detainees were selected for beatings several times. A substantial number of the selected detainees never returned from the beatings and are still missing.

The accused submits that the last sentence renders his defence impossible, because he is not made aware of the identity of those still missing, when they were beaten up and whether the beating is alleged to have a direct bearing upon their disappearance.<sup>65</sup>

54. The indictment does assert, in the same paragraph, that:

The selected detainees were mostly prominent inhabitants of Foca, who were suspected of not having told the truth during the official interrogations, who were accused of possessing weapons, or who were members of the SDA.

This assertion provides insufficient information as to the identity of the detainees involved. The prosecution is, however, entitled to ask the International Tribunal to infer that the beatings led directly to the disappearance, and it is not to the point at the pleading stage that, as the accused suggests, there may be the possibility that the detainees were "exchanged" (or, as was probably

intended, transferred).

55. The accused is nevertheless entitled to particulars of those beaten, those who disappeared, approximately when the beatings occurred and by whom. In each case, those persons should be identified at least by reference to their category (or position) as a group. The complaint as to imprecision is upheld, and the prosecution is directed to amend the indictment accordingly.

56. Paragraphs 5.27-28 allege:

5.27 Between June and August 1992, the KP Dom guards increased the number of interrogations and beatings. During this period, guards selected groups of detainees and took them, one by one, into a room in the administration building. In this room, the guards often would chain the detainee, with his arms and legs spread, before beating him. The guards kicked and beat each detainee with rubber batons, axe-handles and fists. During the beatings, the guards asked the detainees where they had hidden their weapons or about their knowledge of other persons. After some of the beatings, the guards threw the detainees on blankets, wrapped them up and dragged them out of the administration building.

5.28 An unknown number of the tortured and beaten detainees died during these incidents. Some of those still alive after the beatings were shot or died from their injuries in the solitary confinement cells. The beatings and torture resulted, at least, in the death of the detainees listed in Schedule A to this indictment.

Twenty-nine names are listed in the schedule.

57. The accused says in effect that, by dividing these allegations into two paragraphs, the prosecution fails to link the allegations in para 5.27 with the charge of murder (as a crime against humanity and as a violation of the laws and customs of war), whilst para 5.28 contains no detail in relation to the detainees who died.<sup>66</sup> There is no basis for this complaint. If the accused had complained to the prosecution *before* seeking relief by way of motion, as he should have, the answer would simply have been that the two paragraphs should be read together. That is necessarily self-evident.

58. The accused is, however, justified in his complaint as to the lack of precision even when the two paragraphs are read together. The complaint that, because the prosecution is unable to state the number of detainees who died, the accused cannot defend himself is nevertheless rejected. The prosecution must provide some identification of who died (at least by reference to their category or position as a group), and it is directed to amend the indictment accordingly. If its case is to be that the detainees which it identifies died, and also that a number of other persons died whom it is unable to identify, the charge would nevertheless be sufficiently pleaded in the circumstances of this case once those particulars have been included in the indictment.

59. Counts 11-15 of the indictment allege, *inter alia*, that the conditions under which the detainees were kept at the Foca KP Dom were inhumane. The accused complains that the generality of the allegations in the indictment that "the health of many detainees was destroyed" and that "some became suicidal, while others simply became indifferent as to what would happen to them" denies to him the opportunity of proving, for example, that this was no more than a consequence which typically manifests itself in detainees.<sup>67</sup>

60. There is, of course, no onus of proof upon the accused to prove anything, but even a complaint that the accused has been completely denied the opportunity of investigating the allegations must be rejected when the context in which these two allegations appear in the indictment:

5.32 During their confinement, the detainees were locked in their cells, except when they were lined up and taken to the mess to eat or to work duties. After April 1992, the cells were overcrowded, with insufficient facilities for bedding and personal hygiene. The detainees were fed starvation rations. They had no change of clothes. During the winter they had no heating. They received no proper medical care. As a result of the living conditions in the KP Dom, the health of many detainees was destroyed. Due to the lack of proper medical treatment, the 40-year old detainee, Enes Hadzic, died in April or May 1992 from a perforated ulcer.

5.33 Torture, beatings and killings were commonplace in the KP Dom prison. The detainees could hear the sounds of the torture and beatings. The detainees lived in constant fear that they would be next. The detainees kept in solitary confinement were terrified because the solitary confinement cells were generally known to be used for severe assaults. Because all detainees lived in a constant state of fear, some became suicidal, while others simply became indifferent as to what would happen to them. Most, if not all of the detainees, suffered from depression and still bear the physical and psychological wounds resulting from their confinement at KP Dom.

There is thus a clear causal connection asserted by the prosecution. That said, however, the allegations are insufficiently precise as to where and approximately when the torture, the beatings and the killings took place and who was individually responsible for that conduct (at least by reference to their category or position as a group). If the prosecution is able to do so, particulars as to who (other than Enes Hadzic) were the victims, should be supplied but, if the events themselves are sufficiently identified, the names of the victims are of less importance.

61. The prosecution is ordered to provide such particulars.

62. Both para 5.36 of the indictment expressly, and para 5.37 by implication, assert either individual responsibility or responsibility as a superior on the part of the accused for offences which took place in 1994 – that is, after the period from April 1992 to August 1993 limited by the general allegations in the earlier part of the indictment for such responsibility. The prosecution must concede that, so far as *this* accused is concerned, these allegations are limited to that period ending August 1993.

63. The accused also points to the absence of any identification of time in para 5.39 of the indictment (which falls within the same group of charges alleging enslavement as paras 5.36-37), and requires particulars.<sup>68</sup> The prosecution is directed to amend the indictment so as to provide such particulars.

## **VII Application for oral argument**

64. In his Preliminary Motion on the Form of the Indictment, in his Motion to file a Reply to the prosecution's Response to the Preliminary Motion, and in a separate request following the filing of the prosecution's Further Response, the accused sought leave to make oral submissions. He did so because the Trial Chamber, in its Order for Filing of Motions,<sup>69</sup> ordered that there will be no oral argument on any motion unless specifically requested by counsel for either party and approved by the Trial Chamber, taking into account the need to ensure a fair and expeditious trial.

65. The general practice of the International Tribunal is not to hear oral argument on such motions prior to the trial unless good reason is shown for its need in the particular case. That general practice is soundly based upon the peculiar circumstances in which the International Tribunal operates, in that counsel appearing for accused persons before it invariably have to travel long distances from where they ordinarily practise in order to appear for such oral argument; counsel appearing for the prosecution are often appearing in other trials currently being heard; and the judges comprising the

Trial Chamber in question are usually engaged in other trials at the time when the motion has to be determined.

66. Counsel for the accused has not identified any particular issues upon which he wishes to put oral arguments or explained why he was unable to put those arguments in writing. In his most recent request, Counsel for the accused has sought to justify oral submissions upon the basis that the prosecution's Further Response has failed to respond, or has responded in a contradictory and insufficient way, to the submissions which he had put in support of the accused's Motion. Insofar as that very general assertion may be accurate, it is well within the competence of the judges of the International Tribunal to see that fact for themselves.

67. Having regard to the very extensive written submissions already put forward by counsel for the accused, and the need to ensure a fair and expeditious trial, the Trial Chamber is not persuaded of the need for oral argument in this case.

68. The application is refused.

### **VIII Disposition**

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, Trial Chamber II decides that –

1. the Motion is granted, with regards to and as set out in paras 17, 28, 30, 39, 42, 46-48, 49-50, 51, 52, 55, 58, 60-61, 62 and 63 of this decision. The Prosecutor is directed to amend the indictment accordingly and to file and serve an amended indictment on or before 26 March 1999; and
2. the Motion is rejected, including the application for oral argument, with regards to and as set out in the remainder of this decision.

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

Done this 24<sup>th</sup> day of February 1999

At The Hague

The Netherlands

---

David Hunt

Presiding Judge

[Seal of the Tribunal]

1. The jurisdiction 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 ("International Tribunal") to try these offences is to be found in Article 2 of the Statute of the International Tribunal ("Statute").
2. Article 3 of the Statute.
3. Article 5 of the Statute.
4. Paragraph 5 of the Motion. See also para 30 of the Motion.
5. *Ibid*, para 18.
6. *Ibid*, paras 5 and 31.
7. See, for example, *Prosecutor v Tadic*, Case No IT-94-1-T, Decision on the Defence Motion on the Form of the Indictment, 14 Nov 1995, paras 15-18; *Prosecutor v Delalic*, Case No IT-96-21-T, Decision on Motion by the Accused Zejnail Delalic Based on Defects in the Form of the Indictment, 2 Oct 1996, para 24; *Prosecutor v Blaškić*, Case No IT-95-14-PT, Decision on the Defence Motion to Dismiss the Indictment Based on Defects in the Form Thereof, 4 Apr 1997, para 32; *Prosecutor v Kupreškić*, Case No IT-95-16-PT, Decision on Defence Challenges to Form of the Indictment, 15 May 1998, p 3. See also *Prosecutor v Delalic*, Case No IT-96-21-T, Judgment, 16 Nov 1998, paras 1221-1223. The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda ("ICTR") – whose Statute does not differ significantly from this Tribunal's Statute in any way relevant to this issue – has as well held that an accused may properly be convicted of two offences arising from the same facts where the offences have different elements, or the provisions creating the offences protect different interests, or it is necessary to record a conviction for both offences in order fully to describe the true character of what the accused did: *Prosecutor v Akayesu*, Case No ICTR-96-4-T, Judgment, 2 Sept 1998, para 468.
8. *Prosecutor v Delic*, Case No IT-96-21-AR72.5, Appeal Decision, 6 Dec 1996, paras 35-36.
9. Paragraph 32 of the Motion.
10. *Prosecutor v Tadic*, Case No IT-94-1-T, Opinion and Judgment, 7 May 1997, para 609; *Prosecutor v Kupreškić*, Case No IT-95-16-PT, Decision on Defence Challenges to Form of Indictment, 15 May 1998, p 3.
11. Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.
12. Article 14(7). See also the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, Protocol No 7, Art 4(1); and the American Convention on Human Rights, Art 8(4).
13. *Green v United States* 355 US 184 (1957) at 187-188; *United States v Dixon* 509 US 688 (1993) at 704. Such was also the law of ancient Greece: *United States v Jenkins* 490 F 2d 868 (1973) at 870; affd 420 US 358 (1975); and of ancient Rome: *Bartokus v Illinois* 359 US 121 (1959) at 152.
14. See, generally, *Prosecutor v Furundžija*, Case No IT-95-17/1-T, Judgment, 10 Dec 1998, para 249.
15. Paragraph 30 of the Motion.
16. Article 18 of the Statute; and Rule 47(B) of the Rules.
17. Article 21(4)(a) of the Statute.
18. *Ibid*, Art 21(4)(b).
19. *Prosecutor v Blaškić*, Case No IT-95-14-PT, Decision on the Defence Motion to Dismiss the Indictment Based upon Defects in the Form Thereof, 4 Apr 1997, para 20. An oft quoted statement as to the particularity with which a criminal offence must be pleaded in common law jurisdictions is that of Isaacs J in *R v Associated Northern Collieries* (1910) 11 CLR 738 at 740-741:

"I take the fundamental principle to be that the opposite party shall always be fairly apprised of the nature of the case he is called upon to meet, shall be placed in possession of its broad outlines and the constitutive facts which are said to raise his legal liability. He is to receive sufficient information to ensure

a fair trial and to guard against what the law terms 'surprise', but he is not entitled to be told the mode by which the case is to be proved against him."

A valid indictment must identify the essential factual ingredients of the offence charged; it must specify the approximate time, place and manner of the acts or omissions of the accused upon which the prosecution relies, and it must provide fair information and reasonable particularity as to the nature of the offence charged: *Smith v Moody* [1903] 1 KB 56 at 60, 61, 63; *Johnson v Miller* (1937) 59 CLR 467 at 486-487, 501; *John L Pty Ltd v Attorney General (NSW)* (1987) 163 CLR 508 at 519-520; *R v Saffron* (1988) 17 NSWLR 395 at 445.

20. *Prosecutor v Delalic*, Case No IT-96-21-T, Decision on the Accused Mucic's Motion for Particulars, 26 June 1996, paras 9-10.

21. The prosecution has suggested that the decision in *Prosecutor v Blaškic*, Case No IT-95-14-PT, Decision on the Defence Motion to Dismiss the Indictment Based upon Defects in the Form Thereof, 4 Apr 1997, para 32, has said to the contrary, but that is not correct. That decision makes it clear that the accused must be able to prepare his defence on "either or both alternatives" (emphasis added).

22. *Prosecutor v Tadic*, Case No IT-94-1-T, Decision on the Defence Motion on the Form of the Indictment, 14 Nov 1995, para 12; *Prosecutor v Djukic*, Case No IT-96-20-T, Decision on Preliminary Motion of the Accused, 26 Apr 1996, para 18.

23. Rule 66(A)(i).

24. Rule 66(A)(ii).

25. Paragraph 15 of the Response. The proposition is repeated in para 6 of the Further Response.

26. Case ICTR-97-21-I, Decision on the Preliminary Motion by Defence Counsel on Defects in the Form of the Indictment, 4 Sept 1998.

27. (Paragraph 13). The emphasis has been supplied.

28. See, generally, *Connelly v DPP* [1964] AC 1254 at 1301-1302, 1339-1340, 1364, 1368; *Rogers v The Queen* (1994) 181 CLR 251 at 256; and *R v Beedie* [1998] QB 356 at 361.

29. Paragraph 3.1 of the indictment.

30. Paragraph 9 of the Motion.

31. *Prosecutor v Delalic*, Case No IT-96-21-T, Decision on the Accused Mucic's Motion for Particulars, 26 June 1996, paras 7-8; *Prosecutor v Blaškic*, Case No IT-95-14-PT, Decision on the Defence Motion to Dismiss the Indictment Based upon Defects in the Form Thereof, 4 Apr 1997, para 20; and *Prosecutor v Kupreškic*, Case No IT-95-16-PT, Order on the Motion to Withdraw the Indictment Against the Accused Vlatko Kupreškic, 11 Aug 1998, p 2.

32. *R v Youssef* (1990) 50 A Crim R 1 at 2-3 (NSW CCA).

33. Paragraph 14 of the Motion.

34. Paragraph 1.3 of the indictment.

35. Paragraph 15 of the Motion.

36. cf *Prosecutor v Kunarac*, Case No IT-96-23-PT, Decision on Defence Preliminary Motion on the Form of the Amended Indictment, 21 Oct 1998, p 1.

37. Paragraph 4.6 of the indictment.

38. Paragraph 15 of the Motion.

39. Paragraph 16 of the Motion.



40. See paras 3-4, *supra*.
41. Paragraph 12 of the Reply.
42. Paragraph 4 of the Further Response.
43. Paragraph 23 of the Reply. This complaint replaces that originally made in para 17 of the Motion.
44. Case No IT-95-17/1-T, Judgment, 10 Dec 1998, paras 190-249. The legal ingredients to be established by the prosecution are stated in para 249.
45. Paragraphs 13 and 17, *supra*.
46. Paragraph 19 of the Motion.
47. See *Prosecutor v Blaškic*, Case No IT-95-14-PT, Decision on the Defence Motion to Dismiss the Indictment Based upon Defects in the Form Thereof, 4 Apr 1997, para 20, referred to in para 12, *supra*.
48. See para 12, *supra*.
49. Case No IT-95-14-PT, Decision on the Defence Motion to Dismiss the Indictment Based upon Defects in the Form Thereof, 4 Apr 1997, para 20.
50. Case No IT-95-14/1-PT, Decision of Trial Chamber I on the Defence Motion of 19 June 1997 in Respect of Defects in the Form of the Indictment, 25 Sept 1997, para 11.
51. Paragraph 11.
52. This is a matter of fairness, and has been recognised in many cases in common law jurisdictions: *Spedding v Fitzpatrick* (1888) 38 Ch D 410 at 413; *Turner v Dalgety & Co Ltd* (1952) 69 WN (NSW) 228 at 229; *Philliponi v Leithead* (1959) SR (NSW) 352 at 358-359; *Bailey v FCT* (1977) 136 CLR 214 at 219, 220.
53. Article 21(4)(a) of the Statute.
54. See, for example, *S v The Queen* (1989) 168 CLR 266 at 275 (that case was primarily concerned with the situation where there had been sexual assaults over a long period of time, and where the prosecution had failed to identify from that course of conduct the particular assaults upon which the three counts had been based, but the principle remains the same); *R v Kennedy* (1997) 94 A Crim R 341 (NSW CCA).
55. The procedure is examined in some detail in two New South Wales cases: *R v Basha* (1989) 39 A Crim R 337 at 339-340 (NSW CCA); *R v Sandford* (1994) 33 NSWLR 172 at 180-181 (NSW CCA).
56. Case No IT-94-1-T, Judgment, 7 May 1997, para 607.
57. *Prosecutor v Delalic*, Case No IT-96-21-T, Judgment, 16 Nov 1998, para 228. See also *Prosecutor v Blaškic*, Case No IT-95-14-PT, Decision on the Defence Motion to Dismiss the Indictment Based upon Defects in the Form Thereof, 4 Apr 1997, para 28.
58. *Prosecutor v Delalic*, Case IT-96-21-T, Judgment, 16 Nov 1998, par 234.
59. They charge crimes against humanity (torture and inhumane acts), grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions (torture and wilfully causing serious injury to body or health) and violations of the laws or customs of war (torture and cruel treatment).
60. Paragraphs 20-21 of the Motion.
61. Paragraphs 20 and 22 of the Reply.
62. Paragraph 22 of the Motion.

63. Paragraph 23 of the Motion.

64. Paragraph 24 of the Motion.

65. Paragraph 25 of the Motion.

66. Paragraph 26 of the Motion.

67. Paragraph 27 of the Motion.

68. Paragraphs 28-29 of the Motion.

69. The order is dated 17 June 1998.