

**In:** KSC-BC-2023-10  
**Specialist Prosecutor v. Sabit Januzi, Ismet Bahtijari and Haxhi Shala**

**Before:** Pre-Trial Judge  
Judge Marjorie Masselot

**Registrar:** Dr Fidelma Donlon

**Filing Participant:** Specialist Counsel for Haxhi Shala

**Date:** 1 July 2024

**Language:** English

**Classification:** Public

---

**Supplement to Reply to Prosecution Response to F00329**

---

**Specialist Prosecutor**

Kimberly P. West

**Counsel for Sabit Januzi**

Jonathan Elystan Rees KC

**Counsel for Ismet Bahtijari**

Dr. Felicity Gerry KC

**Counsel for Haxhi Shala**

Toby Cadman

1. The Defence for Mr. Haxhi Shala (“Defence”) hereby seeks to make a correction to the Reply to Prosecution Response to F00329 (“Reply”)<sup>1</sup> which the Defence filed on 24 June 2024.
2. The fourth sentence of paragraph 18 was incorrect. It reads: “In fact, now as a consequence of the Decision on Januzi Request for Extension of Time and the Decision on Request for Leave to Appeal F00294<sup>2</sup> the date for transmission will be 8 July.<sup>3</sup>”
3. On 27 May 2024, Mr. Januzi filed Submissions pursuant to F00294 on whether a well-grounded suspicion is established in relation to the new charge of intimidation on the basis of “promise of a gift or any other form of benefit” (“Januzi Submissions”).<sup>4</sup> In this filing he submitted that there was no well-grounded suspicion for the amendments to the Indictment which the SPO had been granted leave to make on 17 May 2024 (“Indictment Amendments”).<sup>5</sup>
4. On 20 June 2024, in Decision on Januzi Request for Extension of Time<sup>6</sup> the Pre-Trial Judge set the new tentative date for transmitting the case file to the Trial

---

<sup>1</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00349.

<sup>2</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00347, 24 June 2024, confidential.

<sup>3</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00345, para. 19.

<sup>4</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00304, confidential.

<sup>5</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00294, Decision on Prosecution Request to Amend the Indictment, 17 May 2024, confidential, para. 46(b).

<sup>6</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/ F00345.

Panel to fourteen days following notification of the Decision on the Indictment Amendments.<sup>7</sup>

5. At the time of filing of the Reply the Pre-Trial Judge had not issued the Decision on the Indictment Amendments.
6. Therefore the fourth sentence of paragraph 18 of the Reply should have read:  
"In fact, now as a consequence of the Decision on Januzi Request for Extension of Time the date for transmission has been further postponed, although no explicit date has been set as it is dependent on the Pre-Trial Judge issuing a separate ruling in respect of amendments to the indictment."<sup>8</sup>

**Word Count: [315 words]**



---

**Toby Cadman**

**Specialist Counsel**

**1 July 2024**

**At London, United Kingdom**

---

<sup>7</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00345, para. 20(c).

<sup>8</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00345, para. 20(c).