



United Nations  
Nations Unies



International  
Criminal Tribunal  
for the Former  
Yugoslavia

Court  
Management and  
Support Services  
Section

Tribunal Pénal  
International pour  
l'ex-Yougoslavie

Section des  
Services  
d'administration et  
d'appui judiciaire

CASE/AFFAIRE NO. IT-95-5/18-PT (R. KARADŽIĆ) DATE 03 September 2009 D 243623

FROM/DE RAM DORAISWAMY, COURT OFFICER

TO/A

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> President/Président (1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosecutor/Procureur	<input type="checkbox"/> Defense Counsel/Conseil de la Défense
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice President/Vice-Président		
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeals Chamber/ Chambre d'appel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Manager/ Commis aux affaires	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Self-representing Accused  MR. R. KARADŽIĆ
<input type="checkbox"/> Trial Chamber I/ Chambre de 1ère instance I	<input type="checkbox"/> Chief of Investigations/ Chef des enquêtes	
<input type="checkbox"/> Trial Chamber II/ Chambre de 1ère instance II		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal Advisers  MR. G. PETRONIJEVIĆ MR. P. ROBINSON MR. M. SLADOJEVIĆ
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trial Chamber III/ Chambre de 1ère instance III		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-copy		
<input type="checkbox"/> Embassy/Ambassade		

Pro Se Legal Liaison Officer/Juriste chargé de la liaison avec l'accusé  
MS. J. GUDURIĆ

Other/Autre

Registrar/Deputy Registrar/Greffier/Greffier adjoint  
MS. T. MAIKOWSKI / MS. S. FOFANA

VWS Coordinator/Coordinateur de la SVT

Senior Legal Officer/Juriste hors-classe  
MS. Y. FEATHERSTONE / MS. L. DAVIDSON

UNDU Commanding Officer/Commandant du QPNU

Communications Service/Service Communication

OLAD

**PLEASE FIND ATTACHED/VEUILLEZ TROUVER CI-JOINT**

Order/Warrant/decision issued by Appeals Chamber or Trial Chamber or a Judge on/  
Ordonnance/Mandat/Décision émis(e) par la Chambre d'appel ou les Chambres de 1ère instance ou un Juge le \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Order/Decision issued by the President on/Ordonnance/Décision émise par le Président le \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Motion/Request/Application submitted by Prosecution/Defence Counsel/Accused on/  
Motion/Requête/Demande présentée par l'Accusation/le Conseil de la défense le 03/09/2009  
(SUBMISSION)

Response/reply/brief submitted by Prosecution/Defence Counsel/Accused on/  
Réponse/Réplique/Mémoire présenté(e) par l'Accusation/le Conseil de la défense le \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Decision of the Registrar on/Décision du Greffier le \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Other/Autre

RECEIVED/REÇU FILED/ENREGISTRÉ

Office hours/heures ouvrables  
Date: 03/09/2009

Office hours/heures ouvrables  
Date: 03/09/2009

Outside Office hours/en dehors des heures ouvrables  
Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_  
Time/Heure: \_\_\_h\_\_\_

Outside Office hours/en dehors des heures ouvrables  
Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_  
Time/Heure: \_\_\_h\_\_\_

Article 27.2- Directive for the Registry: A party anticipating a late filing will call the Registry during office hours to request permission of the Registrar and instruction for after hour filing.

Article 27.2-Directive pour le Greffe: une partie prévoyant un dépôt hors des heures ouvrables se mettra en rapport avec le personnel du Greffe durant les heures de bureau pour solliciter l'autorisation du Greffier et les instructions nécessaires.

Churchillplein 1, 2517 JW The Hague. P.O. Box 13888, 2501 EW The Hague. Netherlands

Churchillplein 1, 2517 JW La Haye. B.P. 13888, 2501 La Haye. Pays-Bas

Tel.: 31-70-416 5000 Fax: 31-70-416 8637

Notice of confidentiality applicable to fax  
This facsimile transmission contains United Nations proprietary information that is strictly confidential and/or legally privileged, and is intended solely for the use of officials of the United Nations and/or the named recipient hereof. Any unauthorized disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of the information herein is strictly prohibited. If you have erroneously received this facsimile transmission, please notify the United Nations immediately.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL  
FOR THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

IN TRIAL CHAMBER III

Before: Judge O-Gon Kwon, Presiding  
Judge Christoph Flügge  
Judge Michèle Picard

Registrar: Mr John Hocking

Date Filed: 3 September 2009

THE PROSECUTOR

v.

RADOVAN KARADŽIĆ

Case No. IT-95-05/18-PT

*Public*

---

SUBMISSION ON  
COMMENCEMENT OF TRIAL

---

The Office of the Prosecutor

Mr Alan Tieger  
Ms Hildegard Uertz-Retzlaff

The Accused

Dr Radovan Karadžić

IT-95/4-18/PT

## I. Introduction

1. In its *Prosecution Submission Pursuant to Rule 73 bis (D)*, the prosecution has shown no serious inclination to significantly reduce the scope of this mega-trial. Dr Karadžić wishes to alert the Trial Chamber that, should the scope of the trial retain its current or proposed size, he will need an additional 10 months for trial preparation.

## II. The law

2. Article 21(4) of the ICTY Statute provides:

In the determination of any charge against the accused pursuant to the present Statute, the accused shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality: ...

(b) to have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence.

3. The harm in under-allocating preparation time for the defence is that it will place the accused at a disadvantage when presenting his case.<sup>1</sup> He will necessarily be disadvantaged if he is forced to go to trial before he is ready to test “every aspect of the Prosecution’s case”.<sup>2</sup> He “must be able to understand the Prosecution case” before that point.<sup>3</sup> “Adequate preparation” includes preparation for cross-examination of the prosecution’s witnesses.<sup>4</sup> As stated by the European Court of Human Rights, “The accused must have the opportunity to organize his defence in an appropriate way and without restriction as to the possibility to put all relevant defence arguments before the trial court, and thus to influence the outcome of the proceedings.”<sup>5</sup>

4. It is the Trial Chamber’s duty to avoid the injustice of a “hasty trial”.<sup>6</sup> What standard should the Chamber use to decide what is adequate time for the defence? According to the Appeals Chamber, there is no *general* standard of adequate time.

A court must analyse the situation on a case-by-case basis:

The Appeals Chamber considers that it is not possible to set a standard of what constitutes adequate time to prepare a defence. The length of the preparation period depends on a number of factors specific to each case, such as, for example, the

<sup>1</sup> *Ngirabatware* Decision, par. 28. See also *Tadić* Appeal Judgement, par. 43-44 and 48; and *Naletilić* Decision, par. 7. (See Annex II for citation abbreviations.)

<sup>2</sup> *Krajišnik* 1st Decision, par. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Mrkšić* Decision, par. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, par. 8.

<sup>5</sup> *Mayzit* Judgment, par. 78.

<sup>6</sup> *Delalić* Decision, par. 19.

complexity of the case, the number of counts and charges, the gravity of the crimes charged, the individual circumstances of the accused, the status and scale of the Prosecution's disclosure, and the staffing of the Defence team.<sup>7</sup>

5. A court's determination of whether the accused has been granted adequate time for preparation is an objective matter: "the decisive question [is] whether the time for preparation available to the Defence was *objectively adequate* to permit [the accused] to prepare his case in a manner consistent with his rights."<sup>8</sup>

6. The absolute nature of the Article 21(4)(b) right, when combined with the objective approach to the question of temporal adequacy, entails that if an accused reasonably considers that he must still complete tasks T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, and T<sub>3</sub> before he is trial-ready, and if the defence team as a whole, working reasonably efficiently, requires, on a reasonable estimate, the amounts of time t<sub>1</sub>, t<sub>2</sub>, and t<sub>3</sub>, to complete the remaining tasks, the Chamber *must* allow the defence time equal to t<sub>1</sub>+t<sub>2</sub>+t<sub>3</sub> for trial preparation. Because the Chamber has no discretion not to grant the defence adequate time, if it accepts the accused's calculations as reasonable, it must grant the requested time. If a Chamber denies a defence's request for additional time in preparation, it *must* find that one or more of the tasks identified by the accused as conditional for trial-readiness is not reasonable, or that one or more of the times estimated by the accused as necessary for the completion of the tasks in question is not reasonable.

7. It follows from the case law and from a plain reading of Article 21(4)(b) that the defence must be granted time and facilities to be prepared from the very first day of trial. The ordinary meaning of the word "preparation" in the Statute, as well as the etymology of the word "prepare" ("make ready before"), leave no doubt that the accused's preparation must be completed before the trial starts – in particular, before the accused has to answer the prosecution's opening statement and before he has to face the prosecution's first witness. It will not do, therefore, to say that time for preparation can be found also after the trial has begun, and that such post-commencement "preparation" time may be used to calculate "adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence" in the sense of the Statute.

<sup>7</sup> *Ngirabatware* Decision, par. 28. See also *Delalić* Decision, par. 19; *Krajišnik* 1st Decision, par. 10; and *Krajišnik* Appeal Judgement, par. 80.

<sup>8</sup> *Ngirabatware* Decision, par. 24, emphasis added. See also *Orić* Decision, par. 8.

8. Judge Bonomy has already confirmed this point:

when this trial is up and running, the time available to the accused to speak with witnesses is going to be limited because *the trial is going to be sitting on a daily basis*. And I, therefore, in principle, encourage contact with witnesses now with a view to avoiding delay later because that contact is perceived as having to take place immediately before the witness gives evidence.<sup>9</sup>

9. One important reason why preparedness during trial cannot be achieved without preparedness prior to trial is that the defence must have the opportunity to formulate for itself a defence strategy which it can begin to deploy immediately in answering the prosecution's allegations in its opening statement and in cross-examination of the first prosecution witness. Once a witness has testified, he or she may be recalled, if at all, only in exceptional circumstances – and these circumstances do not include a poorly conceived defence strategy in the early stages of the trial.

10. Moreover, a self-represented accused, who must be in court at least five hours a day, and who must suffer time-consuming transfers between the courtrooms and the UNDU, has no time left in a reasonable working day to make up for preparation not completed in the pre-trial stage. He barely has time left to consult members of his defence team and get his papers together for the next day. Judge Bonomy's words emphasize that, in its determination of whether the time granted to Dr Karadžić for trial preparation is objectively adequate, the Chamber must accept that the trial, once underway, will proceed at full speed, leaving no further opportunity for the defence to "prepare", in the correct sense, to meet the prosecution's case.

11. Whether an accused who has been allocated an objectively reasonable amount of time to prepare for trial finally manages to do so is, of course, a separate question. If, by an objective assessment, the defence has enjoyed time and facilities adequate to place it in the desired position by the very first day of trial, and nothing untoward has occurred that is outside the defence's control, the accused may not complain that the proceedings have not been fair in this respect.

12. This concludes Dr Karadžić's submissions on law surrounding Article 21(4)(b). It may be recalled, however, that an accused also has the right to be tried without undue delay: Article 21(4)(c). The right to expeditious treatment is

<sup>9</sup> Status Conference, 20 August 2009, T. 409-10, emphasis added.

designed to prevent the situation where a person is locked away and left to languish until such time as it suits the authorities to deal with his case. This is not the situation with Dr Karadžić, where the authorities sound all too eager to see his trial through before he himself is ready to participate in it. Dr Karadžić would like to emphasize that his right to a speedy trial is not in issue here, and should not serve as a basis for the Trial Chamber to justify any amount of restraint on the right which *is* in issue, namely the right to have adequate time for trial preparation.

13. As for the more general public interest in expeditious trials, the Appeals Chamber has said:

Time and resource constraints exist in all judicial institutions and it is legitimate for a Trial Chamber to ensure that the proceedings do not suffer undue delays and that the trial is completed within a reasonable time. However, the Appeals Chamber stresses that these considerations should never impinge on the rights of the parties to a fair trial.<sup>10</sup>

An accused who has been granted adequate time to prepare for trial, may be expected to conduct a more focused case which consumes fewer hours of (expensive) court time.<sup>11</sup> Ill-preparation by the defence will lead to constant requests for adjournment, a feature that marred the *Krajišnik* trial.<sup>12</sup>

14. Lastly, in setting a date for trial, a Trial Chamber must not take into account the Tribunal's "completion strategy". This is a political instrument which cannot fairly add weight to an independent judicial determination of the requirements of a fair trial. Its exclusion from consideration is covered by the above-cited statement of the Appeals Chamber.<sup>13</sup>

### **III. Time still required by the defence for adequate trial preparation**

15. All the tasks identified below must be completed before the trial commences. Once the trial begins, there will be not enough time for such tasks. The defence team will be dealing with additional prosecution disclosure, reacting to revelations during witness examination, fine-tuning cross-examination, etc.

<sup>10</sup> *Ngirabatware* Decision, par. 31.

<sup>11</sup> *Prlić* Order, par. 7.

<sup>12</sup> *Krajišnik* Trial Judgement, par. 1237, 1242, 1252.

<sup>13</sup> President Robinson has said that the exit strategy can play no part in decisions affecting the rights of the accused: *Popović* Decision. See also *Karemera* Decision, par. 24.

16. For the purposes of this motion, Dr Karadžić is assumed to work 7.5 effective hours per day, excluding weekends and holidays. This is the standard which was set in the *Krajišnik* case and accepted by the Appeals Chamber.<sup>14</sup>

17. *Disclosure to date.* As of 18 August 2009, the prosecution had disclosed over 938,000 document pages. While the disclosure process began shortly after Dr Karadžić's initial appearance, the bulk of disclosure has occurred relatively recently – almost half (48 per cent) of all documents, including 81 per cent of Rule 65 ter documents, have been disclosed since mid-May 2009.

<b>Prosecution disclosure</b>	<b>No. of documents</b>	<b>No. of pages</b>
Rule 65 ter	43,741	384,514
Rule 66(A)(i)	1,119	45,056
Rule 66(A)(ii)	9,338	181,801
Rule 66(B)	3,407	127,250
Rule 68	15,029	199,964
<b>Total</b>	<b>72,634</b>	<b>938,585</b>

18. *Reading prosecution witness material.* Reading all of the prosecution's disclosures, at a native speaker's rate of 60 pages per hour, would take 15,643 hours (or 2,086 person days). It is therefore impossible for the defence team to systematically read all of the disclosed material.

19. Instead, the defence must be selective. It must read all documents relating to prosecution witnesses – particularly prior testimony and the documents the witnesses will refer to during direct examination. The defence must also locate documents to be used during cross-examination. This would mean reading all documents disclosed under Rules 65 ter and 66(A)(ii). It must then conduct selective word and topic searches among the exculpatory material and other disclosures. This would add an estimated 25,000 pages – for a total of 591,315

<sup>14</sup> *Krajišnik* 1st Decision, par. 7; *Krajišnik* 2nd Decision, par. 2; and *Krajišnik* Interlocutory Decision, par. 23.

pages. At a fast-paced native-speaker reading speed of 60 pages per hour, this task requires **9,855 hours** [A].<sup>15</sup>

20. *Investigating prosecution witnesses.* Defence investigators will be tasked to find documents and witnesses to refute the prosecution's case. On average, this would take about 20 hours per prosecution witness. It is a task to be completed in the pre-trial stage. However, it will be assumed here that only *50 per cent* of this work will be completed before the trial starts. Given 542 prosecution witnesses, these investigation hours total  $10,840 \div 2 =$  **5,420 hours** [B].

21. *Interviewing prosecution witnesses.* The defence will interview consenting prosecution witnesses. To date, 46 *viva voce* witnesses have been contacted, of whom 32 have consented. 21 reside in the former Yugoslavia, 11 elsewhere. The defence has requested interviews with 85 *viva voce* witnesses altogether. Assuming that the consent rate does not change, about 59 such interviews will take place.

22. The defence has also requested 200 Rule 92 *bis* interviews. Of the 47 witnesses contacted so far, 24 have consented. 18 reside in the former Yugoslavia, 6 elsewhere. Assuming an unvaried consent rate, about 102 interviews will take place.

23. Interview time is estimated as 12 hours of preparation and 3 hours of interview. The defence will need to travel to meet witnesses. Average travel time per witness is estimated at 8 hours. However, to achieve the most conservative overall estimate, the assumption here is that one-third of interviews will be conducted over the telephone; average travel time will thus be reduced to five hours across all witnesses. Total time to conduct the interviews therefore comes to **3,220 hours** [C].

24. *Interviewing other witnesses.* The defence needs to interview other potential witnesses in the context of its investigation of the prosecution's case. Dr Karadžić estimates about 150 witnesses from the region and 25 international witnesses will need to be interviewed. Using the same average time as above (20 hours per witness), the time required for this task is **3,500 hours** [D].

<sup>15</sup> This extremely conservative estimate does not include some 300 days of audio/video material in BCS which has been provided to Dr. Karadzic so that he may hear the original testimony in his native language.

25. *Defence experts.* An average liaison time of 10 hours with each defence expert is estimated. Given 15 defence experts, the task would take **150 hours** [E].

26. *Total time for trial preparation* = [A]+[B]+[C]+[D]+[E] = **22,145 hours** [F].

27. Several important pre-trial tasks (e.g. responding to new motions, following up non-responding states, preparing the opening statement, attending meetings with the prosecution, etc.) are not factored into this total.

28. *Defence team strength.* OLAD has denied a defence request/offer that all members bill/work 240 hours per month. Accordingly, team members (except as indicated below) will be able to work only 160 hours per month. From September 2009 onwards, the defence will have available the following staff hours:

<b>Defence team</b>	<b>Hours per month</b>
Dr Karadžić	110 <sup>16</sup>
Peter Robinson (LA)	90 <sup>17</sup>
Goran Petronijević (LA)	160
Marko Sladojević (LA)	160
Mladen Magdelinić (LA)	160
Enrico Boninsegna (CM/Inv./LA)	160
Aleksandar Vujić (CM/Inv./LA)	160
Milovoje Ivanisević (Inv.)	160
Milomir Savčić (Inv.) <sup>18</sup>	160
Interns	80
<b>Total hours per month [G]</b>	<b>1,400</b>

29. *Defence time already spent on trial preparation.* A detailed examination of the hours worked by the members of the defence team on trial preparation from the date of Dr Karadžić's transfer to the Tribunal through August 2009 reveals a total of **7,974 hours** [H] spent on trial preparation.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup>At 7.5 hours per working day, Dr. Karadzic has available 150-160 hours/month. This has been reduced to 110 hours for trial preparation proper, given that he has a substantial coordinating role in the defence team.

<sup>17</sup>Not available for the full 160 hours due to low rate of pay which requires other employment.

<sup>18</sup>Background checks are still ongoing at time of writing.

<sup>19</sup>Copies of invoices can be provided on an *ex parte* basis which document this figure.

30. *Estimated time still required for trial preparation* is therefore  $([F] - [H]) \div [G] = 10.1$  months. This total assumes that the defence team will spend 100 per cent of its time on trial preparation.

31. In addition to these calculations, there are other factors which also require time to resolve such as the pending appeal of the Holbrooke Agreement motion, obtaining documents from States pursuant to Rule 54 bis and conducting investigation once those documents are obtained, obtaining access to confidential information from other cases, and access to data and evidence by defence expert witnesses who are checking the work of the prosecution's experts.

32. Many difficulties of a technical nature that Dr Karadžić and his defence team are encountering are not detailed in this motion. Dr Karadžić would be glad to elaborate on these in writing or orally.

#### **IV. Relief requested**

33. Dr Karadžić is presenting the Chamber with an accurate estimate, as far as may be given in this context, of the time he still needs for trial preparation. He and his defence team have, since the start of the proceedings, conducted themselves in a diligent and professional manner. Dr Karadžić has no incentive to delay the trial unnecessarily. However, he cannot look forward to a trial for which he has had no proper opportunity to prepare.

34. For the 95 individuals who have had their cases go to trial at the ICTY, the average time between arrest/surrender and commencement of trial is nearly two years (1.9 years). The median time is about the same.<sup>20</sup> Dr. Karadžić was transferred to the Tribunal approximately one year ago. Because his case is amongst the largest and most complex the Tribunal has handled, an even stronger argument exists that it should not be squeezed into a shorter-than-average pre-trial period.

35. For all the above reasons, Dr. Karadžić requests that his trial not commence for 10 months so that he can be adequately prepared.

<sup>20</sup> See Annex I.

Word count: 2999

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Radovan Karadžić', written over a horizontal line.

Radovan Karadžić<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Dr. Karadžić wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the contribution of Dr. Alexander Zahar of Griffith Law School (Australia), Roman Graf of the University of Lausanne (Switzerland), and Legal Interns Björn Elberling, legal trainee at the Hanseatic High Court of Hamburg (Germany), Alexandra Lampert of Stanford University (USA) and Juan Gonzales of the London School of Economics (United Kingdom) to the research and preparation of this motion.

**ANNEXES**

**Annex I**  
*ICTY pre-trial lengths*

Accused	Arrested/ Surrendered	Trial Commenced	Length (yrs)
Prcać	5-Mar-00	28-Feb-00	-0.02 <sup>22</sup>
Vuković	23-Dec-99	20-Mar-00	0.24
Furundžija	18-Dec-97	8-Jun-98	0.47
Simić, Blagoje	12-Mar-01	10-Sep-01	0.49
Dokmanović	27-Jun-97	19-Jan-98	0.56
Kovač	2-Aug-99	20-Mar-00	0.63
Kupreškić, Vlatko	18-Dec-97	17-Aug-98	0.66
Sikirica	25-Jun-00	19-Mar-01	0.73
Jelišić	22-Jan-98	30-Nov-98	0.86
Josipović	6-Oct-97	17-Aug-98	0.86
Šantić	6-Oct-97	17-Aug-98	0.86
Kupreškić, Zoran	6-Oct-97	17-Aug-98	0.86
Kupreškić, Mirjan	6-Oct-97	17-Aug-98	0.86
Papić	6-Oct-97	17-Aug-98	0.86
Milošević, Slobodan	1-Apr-01	12-Feb-02	0.86
Delić, Hazim	2-May-96	10-Mar-97	0.86
Landžo	2-May-96	10-Mar-97	0.86
Mucić	18-Mar-96	10-Mar-97	0.98
Delalić	18-Mar-96	10-Mar-97	0.98
Kovačević, Milan	10-Jul-97	6-Jul-98	0.99
Stakić	23-Mar-01	16-Apr-02	1.06
Pavković	25-Apr-05	10-Jul-06	1.21
Blaskić	1-Apr-96	24-Jun-97	1.23
Popović	14-Apr-05	14-Jul-06	1.25
Lukić	4-Apr-05	10-Jul-06	1.27
Krstić	2-Dec-98	13-Mar-00	1.28
Borovčanin	1-Apr-05	14-Jul-06	1.29
Pandurević	23-Mar-05	14-Jul-06	1.31
Nikolić	15-Mar-05	14-Jul-06	1.33
Miletić	24-Feb-05	14-Jul-06	1.39
Gvero	24-Feb-05	14-Jul-06	1.39
Došen	25-Oct-99	19-Mar-01	1.40
Lazarević	3-Feb-05	10-Jul-06	1.44
Orić	1-Apr-03	10-Jun-04	1.49
Kordić	6-Oct-97	12-Apr-99	1.52
Čerkez	6-Oct-97	12-Apr-99	1.52
Aleksovski	8-Jun-96	6-Jan-98	1.58
Đorđević	17-Jun-07	27-Jan-09	1.61
Vasiljević	25-Jan-00	10-Sep-01	1.63
Limaj	18-Feb-03	15-Nov-04	1.74
Musliu	17-Feb-03	15-Nov-04	1.74
Bala	17-Feb-03	15-Nov-04	1.74
Jokić	15-Aug-01	14-May-03	1.75
Kos	28-May-98	28-Feb-00	1.75
Beara	9-Oct-04	14-Jul-06	1.76

<sup>22</sup> Negative length of pretrial because he was joined to trial in progress when arrested.

Blagojević	10-Aug-01	14-May-03	1.76
Kolundžija	7-Jun-99	19-Mar-01	1.78
Žigić	16-Apr-98	28-Feb-00	1.87
Kvočka	8-Apr-98	28-Feb-00	1.89
Radić	8-Apr-98	28-Feb-00	1.89
Naletilić	18-Oct-99	10-Sep-01	1.89
Galić	20-Dec-99	3-Dec-01	1.95
Haradinaj	9-Mar-05	5-Mar-07	1.99
Balaj	9-Mar-05	5-Mar-07	1.99
Brahimaj	9-Mar-05	5-Mar-07	1.99
Kunarac	4-Mar-98	20-Mar-00	2.04
Prlić	5-Apr-04	26-Apr-06	2.06
Stojić	5-Apr-04	26-Apr-06	2.06
Praljak	5-Apr-04	26-Apr-06	2.06
Petković	5-Apr-04	26-Apr-06	2.06
Čorić	5-Apr-04	26-Apr-06	2.06
Pušić	5-Apr-04	26-Apr-06	2.06
Boškosi	24-Mar-05	16-Apr-07	2.06
Tarčulovski	14-Mar-05	16-Apr-07	2.09
Martinović	9-Aug-99	10-Sep-01	2.09
Milošević, Dragomir	3-Dec-04	11-Jan-07	2.11
Strugar	4-Oct-01	16-Dec-03	2.20
Tadić, Duško	12-Feb-94	7-May-96	2.24
Gotovina	7-Dec-05	11-Mar-08	2.26
Hadžihasanović	2-Aug-01	2-Dec-03	2.33
Kubura	2-Aug-01	2-Dec-03	2.33
Šljivančanin	13-Jun-03	11-Oct-05	2.33
Delić, Rasim	28-Feb-05	9-Jul-07	2.36
Krnojelac	15-Jun-98	30-Oct-00	2.38
Talić	25-Aug-99	23-Jan-02	2.41
Radić	21-Apr-03	11-Oct-05	2.47
Brđanin	6-Jul-99	23-Jan-02	2.55
Lukić, Sredoje	16-Sep-05	9-Jul-08	2.81
Lukić, Milan	8-Aug-05	9-Jul-08	2.92
Halilović	25-Sep-01	31-Jan-05	3.35
Mrkžić	15-May-02	11-Oct-05	3.41
Milutinović	20-Jan-03	10-Jul-06	3.47
Zarić	24-Feb-98	10-Sep-01	3.54
Perišić	7-Mar-05	2-Oct-08	3.57
Tadić, Miroslav	14-Feb-98	10-Sep-01	3.57
Simić, Milan	14-Feb-98	10-Sep-01	3.57
Martić	15-May-02	13-Dec-05	3.58
Krajišnik	3-Apr-00	4-Feb-04	3.84
Čermak	11-Mar-04	11-Mar-08	4.00
Markač	11-Mar-04	11-Mar-08	4.00
Šainović	2-May-02	10-Jul-06	4.19
Ojdanić	25-Apr-02	10-Jul-06	4.21
Šešelj	23-Feb-03	7-Nov-07	4.71
Stanišić, Jovica	13-Mar-03	28-Apr-08	5.13
Simatović	13-Mar-03	28-Apr-08	5.13

**Annex II**  
*Cited cases with abbreviations*

<b>Full citation</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<i>Prosecutor v. Delalić et al.</i> , Decision on the Applications for Adjournment of the Trial Date, Trial Chamber, 3 February 1997	<i>Delalić Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Karemera et al.</i> , Decision on Appeals Pursuant to Rule 15 bis (D), Appeals Chamber, 20 April 2007	<i>Karemera Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Krajišnik</i> , Decision on Defence Motion for Adjournment (Written Reasons), Trial Chamber, 21 September 2004	<i>Krajišnik 1st Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Krajišnik</i> , Decision on (Second) Defence Motion for Adjournment, Trial Chamber, 4 March 2005	<i>Krajišnik 2nd Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Krajišnik</i> , Decision on Interlocutory Appeal of Decision on Second Defence Motion for Adjournment, Appeals Chamber, 25 April 2005	<i>Krajišnik Interlocutory Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Krajišnik</i> , Judgement, Trial Chamber, 27 September 2006	<i>Krajišnik Trial Judgement</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Krajišnik</i> , Judgement, Appeals Chamber, 17 March 2009	<i>Krajišnik Appeal Judgement</i>
<i>Mayzit v. Russia</i> , Judgment, European Court of Human Rights, 20 January 2005	<i>Mayzit Judgment</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Mrkšić et al.</i> , Decision on joint defence motion for postponement of trial, Trial Chamber, 22 September 2005	<i>Mrkšić Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Naletilić and Martinović</i> , Decision on the Accused Naletilić's Motion to Continue Trial Date, Trial Chamber, 31 August 2001	<i>Naletilić Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Ngirabatware</i> , Decision on Augustin Ngirabatware's Appeal of Decisions Denying Motions to Vary Trial Date, Appeals Chamber, 12 May 2009	<i>Ngirabatware Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Orić</i> , Interlocutory Decision on Length of Defence Case, Appeals Chamber, 20 July 2005	<i>Orić Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Popović et al.</i> , Decision on Motion for Joinder, Separate Opinion of Judge Robinson, Trial Chamber, 21 September 2005	<i>Popović Decision</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.</i> , Scheduling Order, Trial Chamber, 27 September 2007	<i>Prlić Order</i>
<i>Prosecutor v. Tadić</i> , Appeal Judgement, 15 July 1999	<i>Tadić Appeal Judgement</i>