



SPECIALIST PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE
ZYRA E PROKURORIT TË SPECIALIZUAR
SPECIJALIZOVANO TUŽILAŠTVO

In: KSC-BC-2020-06
Specialist Prosecutor v. Hashim Thaçi, Kadri Veseli, Rexhep Selimi and Jakup Krasniqi

Before: Trial Panel II
Judge Charles L. Smith, III, Presiding Judge
Judge Christoph Barthe
Judge Guénaél Mettraux
Judge Fergal Gaynor, Reserve Judge

Registrar: Dr Fidelma Donlon

Filing Participant: Specialist Prosecutor

Date: 7 June 2024

Language: English

Classification: Public

**Public redacted version 'Prosecution second motion for judicial notice of adjudicated facts'
with public redacted Annex 1**

Specialist Prosecutor's Office

Kimberly P. West

Counsel for Victims

Simon Laws

Counsel for Hashim Thaçi

Luka Mišetić

Counsel for Kadri Veseli

Ben Emmerson

Counsel for Rexhep Selimi

Geoffrey Roberts

Counsel for Jakup Krasniqi

Venkateswari Alagenda

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to Article 21(4)(d) of the Law,¹ and Rule 157(2) of the Rules,² the Specialist Prosecutor's Office ('SPO') requests the Trial Panel ('Panel') to take judicial notice of facts relevant to this case which have been adjudicated in the *Mustafa* case³ before the Kosovo Specialist Chambers ('KSC'). The facts for which the SPO is seeking judicial notice are listed in Annex 1 to this motion (collectively, 'Proposed Facts'). Taking judicial notice of the Proposed Facts will promote judicial economy, will enable a full and informed judgment in this case, is in the interests of justice, and respects the right of the Accused to a fair and expeditious trial.

II. SUBMISSIONS

2. Rule 157(2) provides the Trial Panel with discretionary power, upon request by a Party or *proprio motu*, to take judicial notice of adjudicated facts from, *inter alia*, other KSC proceedings, with a view to promoting judicial economy⁴ and harmonising judgments of this court,⁵ while ensuring an appropriate balance with the fundamental

¹ Law No.05/L-053 on Specialist Chambers and Specialist Prosecutor's Office, 3 August 2015 ('Law'). Unless otherwise indicated, all references to 'Article' or 'Articles' are to the Law.

² Rules of Procedure and Evidence Before the Kosovo Specialist Chambers, KSC-BD-03/Rev3/2020, 2 June 2020 ('Rules'). Unless otherwise indicated, all references to 'Rule' or 'Rules' are to the Rules.

³ *Specialist Prosecutor v. Mustafa*, KSC-BC-2020-05 and KSC-CA-2023-02 ('*Mustafa* Case'). The Proposed Facts are based on findings in the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment. See *Specialist Prosecutor v. Mustafa*, Trial Judgment, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00494, 16 December 2022, Confidential ('*Mustafa* Trial Judgment'). See also *Specialist Prosecutor v. Mustafa*, Appeal Judgment, KSC-CA-2023-02/F00038, 14 December 2023, Confidential ('*Mustafa* Appeal Judgment'). The Panel, Parties, and participants have been granted access to the confidential versions of the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment and *Mustafa* Appeal Judgment. See Decision on Prosecution Request Concerning Access to Confidential Versions of Judgments from Case KSC-BC-2020-05, KSC-BC-2020-06/F02276, 30 April 2024, para.15.

⁴ Rule 157(2) ('in the interests of a fair and expeditious trial'). See also Decision on Prosecution Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicated Facts, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, 17 May 2023 ('*Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision'), para.12; *Specialist Prosecutor v. Mustafa*, Decision on judicial notice of adjudicated facts, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, 7 September 2021 ('*Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision'), para.9; ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, IT-95-5/18-T, Decision on Fifth Prosecution Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicated Facts, 14 June 2010 ('*Karadžić* Decision on Fifth Motion for Judicial Notice'), para.12; ICTR, *Prosecutor v. Karemera et al.*, ICTR-98-44-AR73(C), Decision on Prosecutor's Interlocutory Appeal of Decision on Judicial Notice, 16 June 2006 ('*Karemera* Appeals Decision'), para.39.

⁵ See similarly ICTR, *Prosecutor v. Setako*, ICTR-04-81-A, Judgement, 28 September 2011, para.200.

right of the Accused to a fair trial.⁶ By taking judicial notice of adjudicated facts, the Panel establishes a presumption of accuracy of the relevant facts, which do not have to be proven at trial.⁷ The other party may, however, present evidence to rebut this presumption.⁸

3. As elaborated in further detail below, the Proposed Facts satisfy all relevant criteria. The Proposed Facts: (i) relate to matters at issue in the current proceedings; (ii) do not relate to the acts and conduct of the Accused as charged in the Indictment; (iii) are distinct, concrete, and identifiable;⁹ (iv) as formulated, do not differ in any substantial way from the formulation of the original judgment;¹⁰ (v) are not unclear or misleading in the context in which they are placed in the moving party's motion;¹¹ (vi) do not contain legal findings or characterisations;¹² (vii) are not based on an agreement

⁶ See *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.9; ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Nikolić*, IT-02-60/1-A, Decision on Appellant's Motion for Judicial Notice, 1 April 2005 ('*Nikolić Appeals Decision*'), para.12; *Karemera Appeals Decision*, para.39.

⁷ This does not impact the Prosecution's burden to prove the charges. See *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.26.

⁸ *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.13; *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.11; *Karemera Appeals Decision*, para.42.

⁹ *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.11(i); *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.10(ii); ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, IT-95-5/18-T, Decision on Accused's Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicated Facts Related to Count One, 21 January 2014 ('*Karadžić Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One*'), para.6(b); ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Mladić*, IT-09-92-AR73.1, Decision on Ratko Mladić's Appeal against the Trial Chamber's Decisions on the Prosecution Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicated Facts, 12 November 2013 ('*Mladić Appeals Decision*'), para.25(ii); ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Popović et al.*, IT-05-88-T, Decision on Prosecution Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicated Facts, 26 September 2006 ('*Popović Adjudicated Facts Decision*'), para.6. Proposed facts must be identified with adequate precision by the moving party. See *Karadžić Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One*, para.6(e); *Mladić Appeals Decision*, para.25(v); *Popović Adjudicated Facts Decision*, para.9; ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Kupreškić et al.*, IT-95-16-A, Decision on the Motions of Drago Josipović, Zoran Kupreškić and Vlatko Kupreškić to Admit Additional Evidence pursuant to Rule 115 and for Judicial Notice to Be Taken pursuant to Rule 94(B), 8 May 2001, para.12.

¹⁰ *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.11(ii); *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.10(iii); *Karadžić Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One*, para.6(c); *Mladić Appeals Decision*, para.25(iii); *Popović Adjudicated Facts Decision*, para.7.

¹¹ *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.11(iii); *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.10(iv); *Karadžić Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One*, para.6(d); *Mladić Appeals Decision*, para.25(iv); *Popović Adjudicated Facts Decision*, para.8.

¹² *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.11(iv); *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.10(v); *Karadžić Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One*, para.6(f); *Mladić Appeals Decision*, para.25(vi); *Popović Adjudicated Facts Decision*, para.10.

between the parties to the original proceedings;¹³ and (vi) are not subject to pending appeals.¹⁴

4. Accordingly, and noting that the majority of the evidence concerning crimes at Zllash/Zlaš in April 1999 has not yet been presented in this trial, judicial notice of the Proposed Facts ensures an appropriate balance between judicial economy and the fundamental right of the Accused to a fair and expeditious trial.¹⁵

A. THE PROPOSED FACTS RELATE TO MATTERS AT ISSUE IN THE CURRENT PROCEEDINGS

5. The Proposed Facts relate ‘to a material issue’ in the case, as found in the Indictment.¹⁶ For each Proposed Fact, Annex 1 includes a reference to corresponding Pre-Trial Brief¹⁷ and Indictment¹⁸ paragraphs, demonstrating the relevance thereof.¹⁹

¹³ *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.11(v); *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.10(vi); *Karadžić* Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One, para.6(g); *Mladić* Appeals Decision, para.25(vii); *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.11.

¹⁴ *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.11(vi); *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.10(vii); *Karadžić* Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One, para.6(i); *Mladić* Appeals Decision, para.25(ix); *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.14.

¹⁵ See *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.9; *Nikolić* Appeals Decision, para.12; *Karemera* Appeals Decision, para.39.

¹⁶ See Rule 157(2); *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.10(i); *Karadžić* Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One’, para.6(a); *Mladić* Appeals Decision, para.25(i); *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.5; *Karadžić* Decision on Fifth Motion for Judicial Notice, para.18; ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Prlić et al.*, IT-04-74-AR73.13, Decision on Jadranko Prlić’s Consolidated Interlocutory Appeal against the Trial Chamber’s Orders of 6 and 9 October 2008 on Admission of Evidence, 12 January 2009, para.17; ICTR, *Prosecutor v. Semanza*, ICTR-97-20-A, Judgement, 20 May 2005, para.189.

¹⁷ Lesser Redacted Version of ‘Confidential Redacted Version of Corrected Version of Prosecution Pre-Trial Brief’, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01594/A03, 9 June 2023, Confidential (‘Pre-Trial Brief’).

¹⁸ Amended Indictment, KSC-BC-2020-06/F00999/01, 30 September 2022, Confidential (‘Indictment’).

¹⁹ Such citations are not intended to be exhaustive.

6. The Proposed Facts primarily²⁰ relate to the BIA Guerrilla unit commanded by Salih MUSTAFA and crimes committed in Zllash/Zlaš in April 1999, which are charged in this case.²¹

B. THE PROPOSED FACTS DO NOT RELATE TO THE ACTS AND CONDUCT OF THE ACCUSED

7. Consistent with Rule 157(2), the Proposed Facts do not relate to the acts and conduct of the Accused as charged in the Indictment.²² As noted by this Panel, ‘the ICTY and ICTR found that the categorical prohibition on taking judicial notice of facts concerning acts and conduct of the accused does not extend to facts related to, for example, the conduct of physical perpetrators or the existence and activity of a joint criminal enterprise or its members (other than the Accused).’²³ Rather, as emphasised by ICTY and ICTR Chambers, ‘[t]his exclusion focuses narrowly on the deeds, behaviour, and mental state of the accused – that is, on the conduct of the accused fulfilling the physical and mental elements of the form of responsibility through which he or she is charged with responsibility.’²⁴

8. The Proposed Facts do not concern the deeds, behaviour, or mental state of the Accused. Rather, the Proposed Facts were reached in the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment, which exclusively concerned the responsibility of Salih MUSTAFA, an alleged subordinate of the Accused in this case, for crimes committed at Zllash/Zlaš in April 1999, and taking judicial notice is in the interests of justice, judicial economy, and the

²⁰ A limited number of Proposed Facts relate to the Llap Operational Zone (which encompassed Zllash/Zlaš) and Brigade 153 (which was also based in Zllash/Zlaš at the relevant time), and are therefore also related to issues in this case. See e.g. Pre-Trial Brief, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01594/A03, paras 202-218.

²¹ Indictment, KSC-BC-2020-06/F00999/01, paras 75, 109, 160, pp.59 (#10.4), 67 (#25), 70 (#2).

²² Rule 157(2); *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.24; *Mustafa* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00191, para.10(i); *Karadžić* Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One, para.6(h); *Mladić* Appeals Decision, paras 25(viii), 80; *Karemera* Appeals Decision, paras 50, 52; *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.12.

²³ *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.24.

²⁴ *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.13 (emphasis added). See also *Mladić* Appeals Decision, paras 82-87; *Karemera* Appeals Decision, para.52.

fair and expeditious conduct of the proceedings.²⁵ Doing so will enable the Panel, Parties, and participants to focus the presentation of evidence on the responsibility of the Accused in this case, including for the crimes committed in Zllash/Zlaš in April 1999.

C. THE PROPOSED FACTS ARE DISTINCT, CONCRETE, AND IDENTIFIABLE

9. The Proposed Facts are distinct, concrete, and identifiable, when examined in the context of the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment, with ‘specific reference to the place referred to in the judgment and to the indictment period of that case.’²⁶ The Proposed Facts reflect the factual findings resulting from the assessment of the evidence introduced in the *Mustafa* case, not discussions of evidence²⁷ or subjective qualifications.²⁸ In keeping with the language of the findings, certain Proposed Facts do not explicitly include reference to precise names, dates, or geographical locations; however, in context, this information is identifiable and available by reference to, *inter alia*, the temporal and geographical scope of the relevant charges addressed in each judgment, as well as from surrounding Proposed Facts, which provide context.

D. THE PROPOSED FACTS DO NOT DIFFER IN ANY SUBSTANTIAL WAY FROM THE FORMULATION OF THE *MUSTAFA* TRIAL JUDGMENT

10. The Proposed Facts do not carry a ‘substantially different meaning than the adjudicated fact in the original judgment’.²⁹ In certain cases, Proposed Facts were

²⁵ See also Section II.I below.

²⁶ *Karadžić* Decision on Fifth Motion for Judicial Notice, para.23; *Karadžić* Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One, para.12; *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.6.

²⁷ ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Mladić*, IT-09-92-PT, First Decision on Prosecution Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicated Facts, 28 February 2012 (*‘Mladić First Decision’*), para.24.

²⁸ *Mladić* First Decision, para.27.

²⁹ *Karadžić* Decision on Fifth Motion for Judicial Notice, para.29.

reformulated to render them clearer. As reformulated, they remain consistent with the meaning intended by Trial Panel I.³⁰

11. As noted above, the Proposed Facts are taken from the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment. On appeal, these facts were either not contested or, if challenged, were upheld by the Court of Appeals.³¹

E. THE PROPOSED FACTS ARE NOT UNCLEAR OR MISLEADING IN THE CONTEXT IN WHICH THEY ARE PLACED IN THIS MOTION

12. Having regard to the surrounding Proposed Facts,³² the Proposed Facts are neither unclear, nor misleading as extrapolated from the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment, and placed in the context of this motion.³³ They are clear and consistent with the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment and with each other, in the context in which they are placed.

F. THE PROPOSED FACTS DO NOT CONTAIN LEGAL FINDINGS OR CHARACTERISATIONS

13. The Proposed Facts – which must be considered on a case-by-case basis³⁴ – are findings of fact. They do not contain findings or conclusions of an essentially legal nature and they are not used in the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment in such a way as to render the facts essentially legal in nature.³⁵

³⁰ *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.7; *Karadžić* Decision on Fifth Motion for Judicial Notice, paras 29, 31.

³¹ *Mustafa* Appeal Judgment, KSC-CA-2023-02/F00038.

³² See *Karadžić* Decision on Fifth Motion for Judicial Notice, para.40; *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.8.

³³ *Popović* Adjudicated Facts Decision, para.8; *Karadžić* Decision on Fifth Motion for Judicial Notice, paras 40-43.

³⁴ *Mustafa* Appeal Judgment, KSC-CA-2023-02/F00038, para.61.

³⁵ *Mustafa* Appeal Judgment, KSC-CA-2023-02/F00038, para.61; *Karadžić* Decision on Fifth Motion for Judicial Notice, paras 46-47; *Mladić* First Decision, para.37; *Karadžić* Decision on Judicial Notice Related to Count One, para.8.

G. THE PROPOSED FACTS ARE NOT BASED ON AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE *MUSTAFA* PARTIES

14. None of the Proposed Facts are based on an agreement between the *Mustafa* Parties; rather, they reflect factual findings made by Trial Panel I, with the *Mustafa* Parties able to confront and challenge witnesses and documentary evidence concerning the underlying facts.

H. THE PROPOSED FACTS ARE NOT SUBJECT TO PENDING APPEALS

15. The *Mustafa* Appeal Judgment was issued on 14 December 2023, *inter alia*, rejecting all appeal grounds challenging the Trial Panel's factual findings.³⁶ As no other 'ordinary' remedies are available under the Law, the factual findings in the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment are final³⁷ and, subject to relevant requirements, ripe for judicial notice under Rule 157(2).

16. The pending *Mustafa* Defence request for protection of legality³⁸ and other legal remedies under Article 48 are extraordinary, follow 'final' judgments, and are not intended to create another, general avenue of appeal.³⁹ In this respect, a request for protection of legality cannot be filed on the ground of an erroneous or incomplete determination of the facts of the case.⁴⁰ Accordingly, pending or potential, future

³⁶ The Court of Appeals Panel affirmed *Mustafa's* convictions. The only grounds of appeal granted (in part) related to the sentence and did not disturb Trial Panel I's factual findings. See *Mustafa* Appeal Judgment, KSC-CA-2023-02/F00038, paras 483-484.

³⁷ A decision or judgment is final 'when no further ordinary remedies are available or when the parties have exhausted such remedies or have permitted the time-limit to expire without availing themselves of them'. See Decision on Kadri Veseli's Request for Protection of Legality, KSC-BC-2020-06/PL001/F00008, 15 August 2022 ('Veseli Legality Decision'), para.18 (and sources cited therein).

³⁸ *Specialist Prosecutor v. Mustafa*, Defence Request for Protection of Legality, KSC-SC-2024-02/F00011, 14 March 2024.

³⁹ Article 48(2), (6); *Specialist Prosecutor v. Gucati and Haradinaj*, Decision on Requests for Protection of Legality, KSC-SC-2023-01/F00021, 18 September 2023 ('*Gucati* Legality Decision'), para.9; Veseli Legality Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/PL001/F00008, para.21. See also *Specialist Prosecutor v. Gucati and Haradinaj*, Judgment on the Referral by Nasim Haradinaj to the Specialist Chamber of the Constitutional Court, KSC-CC-2023-22/F00011, 31 May 2024, para.68.

⁴⁰ Rule 193(3); *Gucati* Legality Decision, KSC-SC-2023-01/F00021, para.10.

requests for extraordinary remedies relating to the final judgments in *Mustafa* do not impact on this Panel's authority under Rule 157(2).

I. THE PROPOSED FACTS WILL FACILITATE FAIR AND EXPEDITIOUS PROCEEDINGS

17. As also set out above, judicial notice of the Proposed Facts will promote judicial economy and ultimately advance the fair and expeditious conduct of these proceedings. If judicial notice is taken, the Panel will be able to assign weight to and take into consideration the findings of Trial Panel I, which has – in the context of a case that exclusively concerned crimes at the Zllash/Zlaš detention site – evaluated evidence of factual matters relevant to this case.

18. As reflected in its Pre-Trial Brief, and witness and exhibit lists, the SPO intends to present evidence on many of the same matters concerned by the Proposed Facts, and in particular the crime site of Zllash/Zlaš.⁴¹ The SPO bears the burden of proof and, considering the Defence's right to present reliable and credible evidence to rebut the Proposed Facts, the SPO has a corresponding right to seek to produce evidence to prove the Proposed Facts, even if judicially noticed.⁴² Indeed, in many cases, the same evidence is relevant not only to proof of the Proposed Facts, but also other matters at issue in this case, and provide additional detail and context to the Proposed Facts. The Panel's ability to consider the Proposed Facts (particularly when they are in dispute⁴³)

⁴¹ See also paras 5-6 above.

⁴² ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Tolimir*, IT-05-88/2-A, Judgement, 8 April 2015, paras 24-25; IRMCT, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, MICT-13-55-A, Judgement, 20 March 2019, paras 128-133, 452-453, 459. See also ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Karadžić*, IT-95-5/18-T, Judgement, 24 March 2016, paras 27-31 (setting out its approach to adjudicated facts, including that it considered the totality of the record (including adjudicated facts and evidence) and recalling that it did not serve the interests of justice to preclude the Prosecution from bringing witnesses to give evidence that overlapped with the content of adjudicated facts because the Defence could challenge any and all of the adjudicated facts during its case).

⁴³ While the SPO previously requested the Defence to confirm whether it agrees with, does not contest, or will seek to rebut factual findings in relevant paragraphs of the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment, the Defence has, to date, not confirmed its position. In relation to adjudicated facts previously noticed by the Panel (see KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534/A01), the Defence has indicated that it is not in a position to assess whether it will seek to rebut them.

together with any evidence presented on the same or related matters will ultimately serve the interests justice and ensure that all relevant facts and evidence are available to the Panel when reaching its judgment in light of the totality of the record.⁴⁴

19. Without compromising the Panel's ability to fully assess the charges, judicial notice of the Proposed Facts would enable the SPO to take various measures that would streamline these proceedings. For example, if this motion is granted and subject to consideration of the decision and circumstances as they exist at that time, the SPO anticipates that it will be in a position to: (i) remove [REDACTED] from the Witness List;⁴⁵ and (ii) tender [REDACTED]'s evidence pursuant to Rule 153.⁴⁶ Of the ten crime-base witnesses for the April 1999 Zllash/Zlaš detention site currently on the Witness List, the SPO – if this motion is granted and subject to circumstances as they exist at the time of the decision – would only propose to call Rule 154 witnesses [REDACTED], who are currently estimated for a combined total of 3 hours of direct examination.⁴⁷

III. CLASSIFICATION

20. This filing is confidential as it identifies potential changes to the witness list, which are conditional on the outcome of this request and confidential at this time to protect witness well-being and security. Annex 1 is confidential as it contains information redacted from the public version of the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment.

IV. RELIEF REQUESTED

21. For the foregoing reasons, the Panel should take judicial notice of the Proposed Facts pursuant to Rule 157(2).

⁴⁴ *Thaçi* Judicial Notice Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01534, para.26.

⁴⁵ Confidential Redacted Version of 'Amended List of Witnesses', KSC-BC-2020-06/F01594/A02, 9 June 2023, Confidential ('Witness List').

⁴⁶ [REDACTED] is currently proposed under Rule 154 on the Witness List.

⁴⁷ The SPO intends to tender the evidence of the remaining witnesses under Rules 153 or 155.

Word count: 3218



Kimberly P. West

Specialist Prosecutor

Friday, 7 June 2024

At The Hague, the Netherlands.