PUBLIC
13/03/2025 10:24:00

KOSOVO SPECIALIST CHAMBERS
DHOMAT E SPECIALIZUARA TË KOSOVËS
SPECIJALIZOVANA VEĆA KOSOVA

In:	**KSC-BC-2020-06**
	The 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 Guénaël Mettraux
	Judge Fergal Gaynor, Reserve Judge
Registrar:	Fidelma Donlon
Date:	13 March 2025
Language:	English
Classification:	**Public**

Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Jakup Krasniqi

Specialist Prosecutor
Kimberly P. West

Counsel for Victims
Simon Laws

Counsel for Hashim Thaçi
Luka Mišetić

Counsel for Kadri Veseli
Rodney Dixon

Counsel for Rexhep Selimi
Geoffrey Roberts

Counsel for Jakup Krasniqi
Venkateswari Alagendra

TRIAL PANEL II ("Panel"), pursuant to Article 41(6), (10), and (12) of Law No. 05/L-053 on Specialist Chambers and Specialist Prosecutor's Office, and Rules 56(2) and 57(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence Before the Kosovo Specialist Chambers, hereby renders this decision.

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1. The procedural background concerning the periodic review of the detention of Jakup Krasniqi ("Mr Krasniqi") has been set out extensively in previous decisions.[1] Relevant events since the nineteenth review of Mr Krasniqi's detention on 13 January 2025 ("Nineteenth Detention Decision")[2] include the following.

2. On 21 February 2025, the Specialist Prosecutor's Office ("SPO") filed its submissions on the twentieth review of Mr Krasniqi's detention ("SPO Submissions").[3]

3. The Defence for Mr Krasniqi ("Krasniqi Defence") did not respond to the SPO Submissions.

II. SUBMISSIONS

4. The SPO requests the continuation of Mr Krasniqi's detention.[4] The SPO argues that, absent any change in circumstances since the Nineteenth Detention Decision, Mr Krasniqi's detention remains necessary and reasonable.[5] The SPO also submits that the continued progression of trial through the testimony of the

[1] *See e.g.* F01110, Pre-Trial Judge, *Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Jakup Krasniqi* ("Sixth Detention Decision"), 18 November 2022, confidential, paras 1-15 (a public redacted version was issued on the same day, F01110/RED).
[2] F02824, Panel, *Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Jakup Krasniqi*, 13 January 2025.
[3] F02953, Specialist Prosecutor, *Prosecution Submission Pertaining to Periodic Detention Review of Jakup Krasniqi*, 21 February 2025.
[4] SPO Submissions, paras 1, 29.
[5] SPO Submissions, paras 1, 6.

120th witness, and other developments in the case augment the necessity of his detention.[6]

III. APPLICABLE LAW

5. The law applicable to deciding the present matter is set out in Article 41(6), (10), and (12) and Rules 56 and 57 and has been laid out extensively in earlier decisions.[7] The Panel will apply these standards to the present decision.

IV. DISCUSSION

6. The purpose of the bi-monthly review of detention pending trial pursuant to Article 41(10) is to determine whether reasons justifying detention still exist.[8] A change in circumstances, while not determinative, shall be taken into consideration if raised before the relevant panel or *proprio motu*.[9]

A. ARTICLE 41 CRITERIA

i. Grounded Suspicion

7. Regarding the threshold for continued detention, Article 41(6)(a) requires a grounded suspicion that the detained person has committed a crime within the jurisdiction of the Specialist Chambers ("SC"). This is a condition *sine qua non* for the validity of the detained person's continued detention.[10]

---

[6] SPO Submissions, paras 1, 6.
[7] *See e.g.* Sixth Detention Decision, paras 18-21.
[8] IA022/F00005, Court of Appeals Panel, *Decision on Hashim Thaçi's Appeal Against Decision on Periodic Review of Detention*, 22 August 2022, confidential, para. 37 (a public redacted version was issued on the same day, IA022/F00005/RED).
[9] IA010/F00008, Court of Appeals Panel, *Decision on Hashim Thaçi's Appeal Against Decision on Review of Detention*, 27 October 2021, confidential, para. 19 (a public redacted version was issued on the same day, IA010/F00008/RED).
[10] *See* ECtHR, *Merabishvili v. Georgia* [GC], no. 72508/13, *Judgment*, 28 November 2017, para. 222.

8. The SPO argues that, absent any change in circumstances since the decision confirming the indictment and the decision confirming amendments to the indictment, there remains a grounded suspicion that Mr Krasniqi has committed a crime within the SC's jurisdiction.[11]

9. The Panel recalls that the Pre-Trial Judge determined that, pursuant to Article 39(2), there was a well-grounded suspicion that Mr Krasniqi is criminally liable for a number of crimes against humanity (persecution, imprisonment, other inhumane acts, torture, murder and enforced disappearance) and war crimes (arbitrary detention, cruel treatment, torture and murder) under Articles 13, 14(1)(c) and 16(1)(a).[12] Moreover, the Pre-Trial Judge found that a well-grounded suspicion has also been established with regard to new charges brought by the SPO against Mr Krasniqi.[13] These findings were made on the basis of a standard

[11] SPO Submissions, para. 7 (with further references).
[12] F00026, Pre-Trial Judge, *Decision on the Confirmation of the Indictment Against Hashim Thaçi, Kadri Veseli, Rexhep Selimi and Jakup Krasniqi*, 26 October 2020, strictly confidential and *ex parte*, para. 521(a)(i)-(ii). A confidential redacted version (F00026/CONF/RED), a public redacted version (F00026/RED), and a confidential lesser redacted version (F00026/CONF/RED2) were issued, respectively, on 19 November 2020, 30 November 2020, and 21 September 2023. The SPO submitted the confirmed indictment in F00034, Specialist Prosecutor, *Submission of Confirmed Indictment and Related Requests*, 30 October 2020, confidential, with Annex 1, strictly confidential and *ex parte*, and Annexes 2-3, confidential; F00045/A03, Specialist Prosecutor, *Further Redacted Indictment*, 4 November 2020; F00134, Specialist Prosecutor, *Lesser Redacted Version of Redacted Indictment, KSC-BC-2020-06/F00045/A02, 4 November 2020*, 11 December 2020, confidential. A further corrected confirmed indictment was submitted on 3 September 2021, strictly confidential and *ex parte* (F00455/A01), with confidential redacted (F00455/CONF/RED/A01) and public redacted (F00455/RED/A01) versions. On 17 January 2022, the SPO submitted a confidential, corrected, and lesser redacted version of the confirmed indictment, F00647/A01.
[13] F00777, Pre-Trial Judge, *Decision on the Confirmation of Amendments to the Indictment*, 22 April 2022, strictly confidential and *ex parte*, para. 183. A confidential redacted version (F00777/CONF/RED), a public redacted version (F00777/RED), a confidential lesser redacted version (F00777/CONF/RED2), and a confidential further lesser redacted version (F00777/CONF/RED3) were issued, respectively, on 22 April 2022, 6 May 2022, 16 May 2022, and 21 September 2023. The requested amendments are detailed at para. 11. A confirmed amended indictment was then filed by the SPO on 29 April 2022, strictly confidential and *ex parte* (F00789/A01), with confidential redacted (F00789/A02) and public redacted (F00789/A05) versions. On 30 September 2022, the SPO submitted a confirmed further amended indictment ("Confirmed Indictment"), confidential (F00999/A01), with a public redacted version (F00999/A03). A public lesser redacted version (F01296/A03) and a public further lesser redacted version (F01323/A01) were filed, respectively, on 15 February 2023 and 27 February 2023)

exceeding the grounded suspicion threshold required for the purposes of Article 41(6)(a).[14]

10. Absent any new material circumstances affecting the above findings, the Panel finds that there continues to be a grounded suspicion that Mr Krasniqi has committed crimes within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the SC for the purposes of Article 41(6)(a) and (10).

ii. Necessity of Detention

11. With respect to the grounds for continued detention, Article 41(6)(b) sets out three alternative bases (risks) on which detention may be found to be necessary: (i) risk of flight; (ii) risk of obstruction of the proceedings; or (iii) risk of further commission of crimes.[15] Detention shall be maintained if there are articulable grounds to believe that one or more of these risks will materialise.[16] "Articulable" in this context means specified in detail by reference to the relevant information or evidence.[17] In determining whether any of the grounds provided in Article 41(6)(b) exist, the standard to be applied is less than certainty, but more than a mere possibility of a risk materialising.[18]

---

[14] *See e.g.* IA008/F00004, Court of Appeals Panel, *Decision on Kadri Veseli's Appeal Against Decision on Review of Detention*, 1 October 2021, confidential, para. 21 (a public redacted version was issued on the same day, IA008/F00004/RED).

[15] *Cf.* ECtHR, *Buzadji v. the Republic of Moldova* [GC], no. 23755/07, *Judgment*, 5 July 2016, para. 88; ECtHR, *Zohlandt v. the Netherlands*, no. 69491/16, *Judgment*, 9 February 2021, para. 50; ECtHR, *Grubnyk v. Ukraine*, no. 58444/15, *Judgment*, 17 September 2020, para. 115; ECtHR, *Korban v. Ukraine*, no. 26744/16, *Judgment*, 4 July 2019, para. 155.

[16] IA004/F00005, Court of Appeals Panel, *Decision on Hashim Thaçi's Appeal Against Decision on Interim Release* ("First Appeals Decision on Thaçi's Detention"), 30 April 2021, confidential, para. 19 (a public redacted version was issued on the same day, IA004/F00005/RED).

[17] Article 19.1.31 of the Kosovo Criminal Procedure Code 2022, Law No. 08/L-032 defines "articulable" as: "the party offering the information or evidence must specify in detail the information or evidence being relied upon".

[18] First Appeals Decision on Thaçi's Detention, para. 22.

a) Risk of Flight

12. The SPO submits that Mr Krasniqi's greater knowledge of the scope of the case, including the charges against him and the evidence (to be) presented in relation to these charges, elevates his risk of flight.[19] The SPO argues that this, in combination with the possible imposition of lengthy prison sentence becoming more concrete with the expeditious progression of trial and Mr Krasniqi's means to travel, leads to a sufficiently real possibility that a risk of flight exists with respect to Mr Krasniqi.[20]

13. The Panel notes that the SPO is putting forward substantially the same arguments that this Panel has already considered and rejected in relation to this issue.[21] In this regard, the Panel recalls the finding of the Court of Appeals Panel that the Pre-Trial Judge should not be expected to entertain submissions that merely repeat arguments that have already been addressed in previous decisions.[22] The Panel considers that this principle applies equally to the current stage of the proceedings, and it has not found any additional factor sufficiently compelling to affect the previous finding regarding the risk of flight.[23]

14. The Panel therefore finds that, while the risk of flight can never be completely ruled out, Mr Krasniqi's continued detention may not be justified at this time on the ground of the risk of flight pursuant to Article 41(6)(b)(i).

[19] SPO Submissions, para. 9.
[20] SPO Submissions, para. 9.
[21] Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 13.
[22] KSC-BC-2020-04, IA003/F00005, Court of Appeals Panel, *Decision on Pjetër Shala's Appeal Against Decision on Review of Detention* ("*Shala* Appeal Decision"), 11 February 2022, para. 18.
[23] *See* Nineteenth Detention Decision, paras 12-13; *see also Shala* Appeal Decision, para. 18, holding that a panel may refer to findings in prior decisions if it is satisfied that the evidence or information underpinning those decisions still supports the findings made at the time of the review.

b) Risk of Obstructing the Progress of SC Proceedings

15. With reference to previous findings by the Panel, the SPO submits that Mr Krasniqi continues to present a risk of obstructing the proceedings.[24] The SPO submits that the Krasniqi Defence and Mr Krasniqi has received information concerning upcoming witnesses, which amplify the risk of sensitive information pertaining to witnesses becoming known to members of the public before the witnesses in question testify. According to the SPO, the release of an Accused in this context, would not be conducive to the effective protection of witnesses who are yet to testify.[25] Furthermore, the SPO avers that there continues to be a climate of witness intimidation and interference, as also acknowledged by the Case 4 Trial Panel, which, as held by the Court of Appeals, is a relevant contextual consideration.[26] The SPO also submits, with a reference to the Trial Panel's Decision in Case 7, that the mere fact that the Accused is entitled to disclosure of relevant material does not mean that the risks that come with such disclosure, especially in the context of conditional release, can be ignored.[27]

16. The Panel calls attention to the standard utilised in assessing the risks under Article 41(6)(b), which does not require a "concrete example" of a situation in which Mr Krasniqi has personally intimidated or harassed a witness.[28] Therefore, as previously stated, the fact that the SPO has not produced any evidence which suggests that Mr Krasniqi in fact sought to interfere with any witness, does not mean that a risk under Article 41(6)(b) cannot exist.[29] Importantly, this does not contradict the Panel's previous finding that it is adjudicating this matter against a

[24] SPO Submissions, paras 10-15.
[25] SPO Submissions, paras 13-14.
[26] SPO Submissions, para. 12.
[27] SPO Submissions, para. 15.
[28] *See* F01212, Panel, *Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Jakup Krasniqi* ("Seventh Detention Decision"), para. 23, *referring to* IA003/F00005, Court of Appeals Panel, *Decision on Rexhep Selimi's Appeal Against Decision on Interim Release* ("First Appeals Decision on Selimi's Detention"), 30 April 2021, confidential, para. 59 (a public redacted version was issued on the same day, IA003/F00005/RED).
[29] Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 16.

background of information that a general climate of witness interference persists in Kosovo regarding this case and others before the SC.[30]

17. The Panel has already determined and reiterates that there is a risk of Mr Krasniqi obstructing SC proceedings based on, *inter alia*: (i) his position of influence which, combined with the willingness and ability to obtain access to confidential information inaccessible to the public, which allows for the reasonable conclusion that it is possible for Mr Krasniqi to secure access to confidential information related to matters to which he is currently connected; (ii) his public statements criticising the SC; and (iii) the content of a 24 April 2020 Facebook post targeting "collaborators".[31] Furthermore, the Court of Appeals has confirmed that: (i) there are indications that Mr Krasniqi is, at least, predisposed to witness intimidation, for reasons earlier stated;[32] and (ii) in assessing whether there is a risk that Mr Krasniqi will obstruct the proceedings, if released, it was not unreasonable to take into account, among other factors, Mr Krasniqi's public statements criticising the SC or the Facebook post of 24 April 2020.[33]

18. As previously noted, in light of the ongoing nature of the trial, the names and personal details of certain highly sensitive witnesses have been disclosed to the Krasniqi Defence,[34] and have therefore become known to a broader range of people, including to Mr Krasniqi. The Panel maintains its view that this, in turn, increases the risk of sensitive information pertaining to witnesses becoming

[30] *See* Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 16.
[31] *See e.g.* F00801, Pre-Trial Judge, *Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Jakup Krasniqi* ("Fourth Detention Decision"), 13 May 2022, confidential and *ex parte*, para. 48 (a confidential redacted version, F00801/CONF/RED, and a public redacted version, F00801/RED, were issued on 13 and 24 May 2022, respectively); Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 17.
[32] IA002/F00005, Court of Appeals Panel, *Decision on Jakup Krasniqi's Appeal Against Decision on Interim Release* ("First Appeals Decision on Krasniqi's Detention"), 30 April 2021, confidential, para. 62 (a public redacted version was issued on the same day, IA002/F00005/RED); IA006/F00005, Court of Appeals Panel, *Decision on Jakup Krasniqi's Appeal Against Decision on Review of Detention*, 1 October 2021, confidential, para. 30 (a public redacted version was issued on the same day, IA006/F00005/RED).
[33] First Appeals Decision on Krasniqi's Detention, para. 50.
[34] *See* Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 18.

known to members of the public before the witnesses in question give evidence.[35] In this context, the release of an accused with sensitive information in his possession would not be conducive to the effective protection of witnesses who are yet to testify.[36]

19. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that, taking all factors together, the risk that Mr Krasniqi will obstruct the progress of SC proceedings if released continues to exist.

c) Risk of Committing Further Crimes

20. With reference to the Panel's findings in the Nineteenth Detention Decision, the SPO submits that Mr Krasniqi continues to present a risk of committing further crimes.[37] According to the SPO, the Panel's conclusion that the continuing disclosure of sensitive information presented an unacceptable risk of the commission of further crimes applies even more forcefully as the trial continues to progress.[38] Furthermore, the SPO argues that the extremely serious nature of the charges against Mr Krasniqi needs to be taken into account.[39]

21. The Panel recalls its finding in the Nineteenth Detention Decision that the risk of Mr Krasniqi committing further crimes continues to exist.[40] The Panel finds that the same considerations and factors that were taken into account in relation to the risk of obstruction are relevant to the analysis of the risk of Mr Krasniqi committing further crimes.[41] In light of those, the Panel considers that no new circumstances have arisen since the last detention review that would justify a

[35] F02059, Panel, *Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Jakup Krasniqi*, ("Thirteenth Detention Decision"), 15 January 2024, para. 25.
[36] *See also* Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 18.
[37] SPO Submissions, paras 16-20.
[38] SPO Submissions, para. 20.
[39] SPO Submissions, para. 18.
[40] Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 22.
[41] *See* above, paras 17-19; *See also* Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 21.

different finding in respect of this matter. The Panel further highlights the fact that the trial is ongoing and that any risk of further commission of crimes must be avoided.

22. The Panel considers that, taking all factors together, there continues to be a risk that Mr Krasniqi will commit further crimes as set out in Article 41(6)(b)(iii).

iii. Conclusion

23. The Panel concludes that, at this time, there continues to be insufficient information before it justifying a finding that Mr Krasniqi may abscond from justice. However, the Panel is satisfied, based on the relevant standard, that there continues to be a risk that Mr Krasniqi will obstruct the progress of SC proceedings and a risk that he will commit further crimes against those perceived as being opposed to the Kosovo Liberation Army, including witnesses who have provided or could provide evidence in the case and/or are due to appear before the SC. The Panel will assess below whether these risks can be adequately addressed by any conditions for his release.

B. MEASURES ALTERNATIVE TO DETENTION

24. The SPO submits, with reference to the Panel's previous findings, that: (i) the risks pursuant to Article 41(6)(b) can only be effectively managed at the SC detention facilities ("SC Detention Facilities"); (ii) nothing has occurred since the Nineteenth Detention Decision warranting a different assessment on conditions, either generally or for a discrete period of time; and (iii) rather, the continuation of trial and attendant further disclosure make the underlying risks higher than ever.[42]

[42] SPO Submissions, paras 21-25.

25. When deciding on whether a person should be released or detained, the Panel must consider alternative measures to prevent the risks in Article 41(6)(b).[43] Article 41(12) sets out a number of options to be considered in order to ensure the accused's presence at trial, to prevent reoffending or to ensure successful conduct of proceedings. In this respect, the Panel recalls that detention should only be continued if there are no alternative, more lenient measures reasonably available that could sufficiently mitigate the risks set out in Article 41(6)(b).[44] The Panel must therefore consider all reasonable alternative measures that could be imposed and not only those raised by the Krasniqi Defence or the SPO.[45]

26. Regarding the risk of obstructing the progress of SC proceedings and commission of further crimes, the Panel maintains its view that none of the previously proposed conditions nor any additional measures foreseen in Article 41(12), ordered *proprio motu*, could at this stage in the proceedings sufficiently, and to a degree comparable to that of detention at the SC Detention Facilities, mitigate the existing risks with respect to Mr Krasniqi.[46] Furthermore, the Panel finds that the measures in place at the SC Detention Facilities, viewed as a whole, provide robust assurances against unmonitored visits and communications with family members and pre-approved visitors with a view to minimising the risks of obstruction and commission of further crimes.[47] Moreover,

---

[43] As regards the obligation to consider "alternative measures", *see* KSC-CC-PR-2017-01, F00004, Specialist Chamber of the Constitutional Court, *Judgment on the Referral of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence Adopted by Plenary on 17 March 2017 to the Specialist Chamber of the Constitutional Court Pursuant to Article 19(5) of Law No. 05/L-053 on Specialist Chambers and Specialist Prosecutor's Office* ("SCCC 26 April 2017 Judgment"), 26 April 2017, para. 114. *See also* ECtHR, *Buzadji v. the Republic of Moldova*, para. 87 *in fine*; ECtHR, *Idalov v. Russia* [GC], no. 5826/03, *Judgment*, 22 May 2012, para. 140 *in fine*.

[44] SCCC 26 April 2017 Judgment, para. 114; KSC-CC-PR-2020-09, F00006, Specialist Chamber of the Constitutional Court, *Judgment on the Referral of Amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Evidence Adopted by the Plenary on 29 and 30 April 2020*, 22 May 2020, para. 70. *See also* ECtHR, *Idalov v. Russia [GC]*, para. 140 *in fine*.

[45] First Appeals Decision on Selimi's Detention, para. 86; KSC-BC-2020-05, F00127, Trial Panel I, *Fourth Decision on Review of Detention*, 25 May 2021, para. 24.

[46] Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 28.

[47] Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 26

they offer a controlled environment where a potential breach of confidentiality could be more easily identified and/or prevented.[48]

27. The Panel further maintains its view that it is only through the communication monitoring framework applicable at the SC Detention Facilities that Mr Krasniqi's communications can be restricted in a manner that would sufficiently mitigate the risks of obstruction and commission of further crimes.[49]

28. In light of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the risks of obstructing the proceedings and committing further offences can only be effectively managed at this stage of the proceedings if Mr Krasniqi remains at the SC Detention Facilities. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that there are no alternatives to Mr Krasniqi's continued detention capable of adequately averting the risks in Article 41(6)(b)(ii) and (iii).

C. REASONABLENESS OF DETENTION

29. The SPO argues that, taking all factors into consideration, Mr Krasniqi's detention remains proportional.[50] To that end, the SPO refers to the Panel's previous findings that: (i) Mr Krasniqi is charged with ten counts of serious international crimes in which he is alleged to play a significant role; (ii) if convicted, he could face a lengthy sentence; (iii) the continuing risks under Article 41(6)(b)(ii) and (iii) cannot be sufficiently mitigated by the application of reasonable alternative measures; (iv) the case against Mr Krasniqi is complex; (v) a climate of witness intimidation exists as outlined above; and (vi) the fact that the trial is ongoing.[51]

[48] Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 26.
[49] Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 27.
[50] SPO Submissions, paras 26-28.
[51] SPO Submissions, para. 27.

30. The Panel is cognisant that the duration of time in detention is a factor that needs to be considered, along with the degree of the risks described in Article 41(6)(b), in order to determine whether, all factors being considered, the continued detention "stops being reasonable" and the individual needs to be released.[52]

31. In the Panel's estimation, special features in this case include the following: (i) Mr Krasniqi is charged with ten counts of serious international crimes in which he is alleged to play a significant role;[53] (ii) if convicted, Mr Krasniqi could face a lengthy sentence; (iii) the continuing risks under Article 41(6)(b)(ii) and (iii) cannot be sufficiently mitigated by the application of reasonable alternative measures;[54] (iv) the case against Mr Krasniqi is complex;[55] (v) the climate of witness intimidation outlined above; and (vi) the fact that the trial is ongoing.

32. In light of the above, the Panel finds that Mr Krasniqi's detention for a further two months is necessary and reasonable in the specific circumstances of the case.

33. The Panel notes, however, that Mr Krasniqi has already been in detention for a significant period of time, and that the trial in this case is lengthy. As the Panel previously indicated,[56] this will require the Panel as well as all Parties to be particularly mindful of the need to ensure that the trial proceeds as expeditiously as possible. The Panel will continue to monitor at every stage in these proceedings whether continued detention is necessary and reasonable.

---

[52] Seventh Detention Decision, para. 43, *referring to* First Appeals Decision on Krasniqi's Detention, para. 69.
[53] Confirmed Indictment, paras 10-12, 32, 39-40, 44, 49, 53, 55-57, 176-177.
[54] *See above,* paras 26-28.
[55] *See e.g.* F00978, Pre-Trial Judge, *Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Jakup Krasniqi*, 19 September 2022, confidential, para. 58 (a public redacted version was issued on 23 September 2022, F00978/RED); Fourth Detention Decision, para. 81; Sixth Detention Decision, para. 59.
[56] *See e.g.* F02313, Panel, *Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Jakup Krasniqi*, 15 May 2024, para. 40; Nineteenth Detention Decision, para. 33.

V. DISPOSITION

34. For the above-mentioned reasons, the Panel hereby:

a) **ORDERS** Mr Krasniqi's continued detention; and

b) **ORDERS** the SPO to file submissions on the next review of Mr Krasniqi's detention by no later than **Thursday, 17 April 2025 (at 16:00 hours)**, with subsequent written submissions following the timelines set out in Rule 76.

Judge Charles L. Smith, III
Presiding Judge

Dated this Thursday, 13 March 2025
At The Hague, the Netherlands.