



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's Office

Date: 19 February 2026

Language: English

Classification: Public

Prosecution submission pertaining to periodic detention review of Rexhep Selimi

Specialist Prosecutor's Office

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

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to Article 41 of the Law¹ and Rule 57 of the Rules,² the Specialist Prosecutor's Office ('SPO') makes the following submissions in support of the need for the continued detention of the Accused Rexhep Selimi ('Selimi'). The Pre-Trial Judge, the Court of Appeals, and this Panel have repeatedly held that Selimi's detention is justified on multiple bases, that no conditions short of detention in the Kosovo Specialist Chambers ('KSC') detention facilities would be sufficient to mitigate the risks, and that the detention period—taking all relevant circumstances into account—is reasonable. Since the most recent determination of this Panel on 16 January 2026,³ there has been no change in circumstances that merits deviating from it. Indeed, the continued progression of trial and related developments further buttress the necessity and reasonableness of detention.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

2. As noted by the Panel, the relevant procedural history regarding Selimi's detention has been set out extensively in previous decisions.⁴

3. On 3 April 2023, the trial commenced.⁵

4. On 15 April 2025, the SPO filed its notice of the closing of its case pursuant to Rule 129.⁶

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(s)' are to the Law.

² Rules of Procedure and Evidence Before the Kosovo Specialist Chambers, KSC-BD-03/Rev3/2020, 2 June 2020 ('Rules'). All references to 'Rule' or 'Rules' herein refer to the Rules, unless otherwise specified.

³ Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Rexhep Selimi, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, 16 January 2026 ('Twenty-fourth Detention Decision').

⁴ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.1.

⁵ Transcript (Opening Statements), 3 April 2023.

⁶ Prosecution notice pursuant to Rule 129, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03121, 15 April 2025.

5. On 12 June 2025, the Defence filed a joint Defence motion pursuant to Rule 130.⁷ On 7 July 2025, the SPO filed its response.⁸ On 16 July 2025, the Trial Panel issued an oral decision dismissing the Defence's Rule 130 motion.⁹ Victims' Counsel's witnesses were heard on 16-17 July 2025.

6. The Defence cases commenced on 15 September 2025,¹⁰ and closed on 2 December 2025.¹¹

7. On 19 December 2025, the Panel closed the evidentiary proceedings.¹² The Parties' closing statements and responses were heard between 9-18 February 2026. On 18 February 2026, the Panel declared the case closed.

III. SUBMISSIONS

8. The relevant applicable law is set out in Article 41, and Rules 56 and 57, and has been laid out extensively in earlier decisions.¹³

9. Since the most recent decision, there have been no developments that diminish the factors supporting the need for and reasonableness of detention.

A. GROUNDED SUSPICION

10. Article 41(6)(a) requires a grounded suspicion that the detained person has committed a crime within the jurisdiction of the KSC.¹⁴ There remains a grounded

⁷ Joint Defence Motion Pursuant to Rule 130, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03256, 12 June 2025, Confidential.

⁸ Prosecution Response to Rule 130 Request, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03314, 7 July 2025, Confidential.

⁹ Transcript, 16 July 2025, pp.26190-26195.

¹⁰ Transcript, 15 September 2025, pp.26475-26478.

¹¹ Thaçi Defence Notice pursuant to Rule 131, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03609, 2 December 2025; Krasniqi Defence Notice of the Closure of Its Case Pursuant to Rule 131, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03611, 2 December 2025.

¹² Notice Regarding the Close of Evidentiary Proceedings, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03639, 18 December 2025.

¹³ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.7.

¹⁴ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.9.

suspicion that Selimi has done so.¹⁵ The Confirmation Decision determined there is a suspicion that Selimi is liable for crimes against humanity and war crimes as identified in Articles 13, 14, and 16,¹⁶ to a standard that exceeds the ‘grounded suspicion’ required for detention.¹⁷ The Pre-Trial Judge later also confirmed amendments to the Indictment that added further, similar charges against Selimi.¹⁸ Nothing has occurred since the confirmation decisions that would detract from this determination. Indeed, the Panel has repeatedly confirmed that there remains a well-grounded suspicion that Selimi has committed crimes within the KSC’s jurisdiction.¹⁹

B. DETENTION IS JUSTIFIED UNDER ALL ARTICLE 41(6)(B) FACTORS

11. The Court of Appeals has been clear that, once a grounded suspicion under Article 41(6)(a) is identified, an articulable basis of a single ground under Article 41(6)(b) is sufficient to justify detention.²⁰ The three grounds under Article 41(6)(b) justifying detention are: (i) risk of flight; (ii) potential obstruction; and (iii) risk of additional crimes.²¹ The applicable standard is articulable grounds that support a ‘belief’ that there is a risk of one of the Article 41(6)(b) grounds occurring.²² The ‘belief’ test denotes ‘an acceptance of the possibility, not the inevitability, of a future occurrence’.²³ In other

¹⁵ See Article 41(6)(a); Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, paras 11-12.

¹⁶ Public Redacted Version of Decision on the Confirmation of the Indictment Against Hashim Thaçi, Kadri Veseli, Rexhep Selimi and Jakup Krasniqi, KSC-BC-2020-06/F00026/RED, 26 October 2020 (‘Confirmation Decision’), para.521(a).

¹⁷ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.11.

¹⁸ Public Redacted Version of Decision on the Confirmation of Amendments to the Indictment Against Hashim Thaçi, Kadri Veseli, Rexhep Selimi and Jakup Krasniqi, KSC-BC-2020-06/F00777/RED, 22 April 2022, para.185; *see also* Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.11.

¹⁹ *See, e.g.*, Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.12.

²⁰ *See Specialist Prosecutor v. Gucati and Haradinaj*, Consolidated Decision on Nasim Haradinaj’s Appeals Against Decisions on Review of Detention, KSC-BC-2020-07/IA007/F00004, 6 April 2022, para.49.

²¹ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.13.

²² Decision on Rexhep Selimi’s Appeal Against Decision on Interim Release, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA003/F00005, 30 April 2021 (‘First Appeals Decision’), paras 24-32.

²³ First Appeals Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA003/F00005, para.25.

words, the standard to be applied is less than certainty, but more than a mere possibility of a risk materialising.²⁴ The Panel has noted that ‘articulable’ in this context means specified in detail by reference to the relevant information or evidence.²⁵ In considering whether an accused should be detained or released, the relevant panel must consider whether measures other than detention would sufficiently reduce the risk of the Article 41(6)(b) factors occurring.²⁶

i. Risk of Flight (Article 41(6)(b)(i))

12. Selimi is aware of the serious confirmed charges against him, the possible lengthy prison sentence that may result therefrom, and now has full knowledge of the case against him and the evidence in relation to those crimes. The possible imposition of such a sentence becomes more concrete with the closure of the case and commencement of deliberations. Selimi is also aware of the evidence of conduct that has necessitated modification of his conditions of detention, which the Panel has acknowledged may undermine or undo its prior finding that he has cooperated with relevant authorities.²⁷ In addition, Selimi has the means and influence to abscond from the proceedings. All of the above must be taken into consideration in relation to prior findings concerning Selimi’s

²⁴ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.13; First Appeals Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA003/F00005, para.25; *Prosecutor v. Gucati and Haradinaj*, Public Redacted Version of Decision on Review of Detention of Nasim Haradinaj, KSC-BC-2020-07/F00507/RED, 21 December 2021 (‘Haradinaj Decision’), para.28.

²⁵ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.13 *citing* Article 19.1.31 of the Kosovo Criminal Procedure Code 2012, Law No. 08/L-032 defining ‘articulable’ as: ‘the party offering the information or evidence must specify in detail the information or evidence being relied upon’.

²⁶ 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 the Law no. 05/L-053 on Specialist Chambers and Specialist Prosecutor’s Office, KSC-CC-PR-2017-1/F00004, 26 April 2017, para.14.

²⁷ Decision on Periodic Review of Detention of Rexhep Selimi, KSC-BC-2020-06/F02060, 15 January 2024, para.13.

means to travel. Therefore, the SPO maintains that the combination of all of these factors elevates Selimi's risk of flight to a sufficiently real possibility.

ii. *Risk of Obstruction of Proceedings (Article 41(6)(b)(ii))*

13. Selimi continues to present a risk of obstructing proceedings, consistent with this Panel's recent conclusions.²⁸ The closure of the case does not obviate this risk,²⁹ as Selimi now has knowledge of the full scope of the case against him and witnesses remain at risk of obstruction even after their testimony.³⁰ As noted by the Panel, the risk of interference also includes: (i) any attempt to retaliate against witnesses who have testified in these proceedings; (ii) attempts to incentivise a witness to recant; and (iii) attempts to interfere

²⁸ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.25.

²⁹ *Specialist Prosecutor v. Shala*, Decision on the Seventeenth Review of Detention of Pjetër Shala, KSC-BC-2020-04/F00838, 17 May 2024, paras 23-25; Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.22.

³⁰ In this regard, taking harmful action against a person 'with the intent to retaliate for providing truthful information relating to the commission or possible commission of any criminal offense to police, an authorized investigator, a prosecutor or a judge' is a punishable offence under Article 15(2) of the Law, as read with Article 388 of the 2019 Kosovo Criminal Code (renumbered from Article 396 of the 2012 Kosovo Criminal Code). For examples of such conduct from international courts, at the Special Court for Sierra Leone, five witnesses were subject to unlawful interference from a purported representative of the defence team, after the parties closed their cases and prior to delivery of a trial judgment, to induce them to recant their testimony against Charles Taylor. See SCSL, *Independent Counsel v. Eric Koi Senessie*, SCSL-2011-01-T, Judgment in Contempt Proceedings, 16 August 2012. Similarly, and over a sustained period between 2015-2018 following a final appeal judgment against Mr Augustin Ngirabatware, the accused and a group of his associates engaged in a highly organised scheme intended to manipulate and improperly influence five witnesses heard by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda with the end goal of procuring recantations of their prior testimony. See IRMCT, *Prosecutor v. Nzabonimpa et al.*, MICT-18-116-T, Judgment, 25 June 2021. Similarly, in the SCSL case of *Bangura et al.*, two convicted persons and two of their associates engaged in an initiative to procure the recantation of witness testimony by way of a monetary bribe, with the aim of providing an avenue to seek review. See SCSL, *Independent Counsel v. Bangura et al.*, SCSL-2011-02-T, Judgment in Contempt Proceedings, 25 September 2012. In a recent IRMCT review proceeding, the Appeals Chamber found that financial transactions of Witness HH raised concerns as to the integrity of his purported recantation, such that Mr Ntakirutimana's original convictions were maintained. See IRMCT, *Prosecutor v. Ntakirutimana*, MICT-12-17-R, Review Judgment, 22 November 2024, paras 57, 62.

with witnesses in parallel proceedings.³¹ As recently confirmed by the Appeals Panel, these factors alone support the existence of a risk of obstruction.³²

14. The Panel has previously noted that the disclosure of highly sensitive information to the Selimi Defence necessarily results in it becoming known to a broader range of persons, including the Accused.³³ This amplifies the risk of sensitive information pertaining to witnesses becoming known to members of the public,³⁴ which, in the context of the release of an Accused, would not be conducive to the effective protection of witnesses.³⁵

15. In its most recent detention decision, the Panel reiterated its previous determination that: (i) Selimi enjoys a position of influence, considering his past and recent positions, including as Minister of Internal Affairs and having been elected to the Kosovo Assembly; (ii) there is a persisting climate of intimidation of witnesses and interference with criminal proceedings against former KLA members; and (iii) the proceedings continue to advance and Selimi continues to gain insight into the evidence underpinning the serious charges against him.³⁶

16. Additionally, the persistent climate of intimidation of witnesses and interference with criminal proceedings against former KLA members in Kosovo continues, which the Court of Appeals has agreed is a relevant 'contextual consideration'.³⁷ Similar findings

³¹ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.22.

³² Appeals Panel Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA033/F00006, para.54, fn.140.

³³ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.22.

³⁴ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.22.

³⁵ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.22.

³⁶ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.21. *See also* Appeals Panel Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA033/F00006, para.29.

³⁷ Appeals Panel Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA033/F00006, para.31; Decision of Kadri Veseli's Appeal Against Decision on Request for Provisional Release, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA034/F00005, 13 August 2025, para.44; Decision on Jakup Krasniqi's Appeal Against Decision on Request for Provisional Release and on

were made in the *Mustafa* Trial Judgment³⁸ and the *Gucati and Haradinaj* Appeal Judgment.³⁹ The Trial Panel in *Gucati and Haradinaj* considered that ‘witness protection has continued to be a live and critical issue in Kosovo’,⁴⁰ and credited the testimony of defence expert Robert Reid, who remarked that, in over 20 years in the field, he had never seen witness intimidation on the level that exists in Kosovo.⁴¹ This climate of witness intimidation continues to persist, as noted by the *Shala* Trial Panel,⁴² including well after testimony.⁴³ The closure of the case and impending trial judgment has heightened public scrutiny of the case and increased pressure on witnesses.⁴⁴ The inflammatory and personal nature of such attacks, and the comments they provoke, could endanger the privacy, well-being, and security of future and/or past witnesses.

17. Indeed, this risk has already materialised, causing this Panel to conclude that the standard conditions of detention were insufficient to mitigate the risk of Selimi and other Accused engaging in conduct that could interfere with the proceedings and/or present a

Review of Detention, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA035/F00005, 13 August 2025, para.30; Public Redacted Version of Decision on Hashim Thaçi’s Appeal Against Decision on Review of Detention, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA017/F00011/RED, 5 April 2022, paras 41-48; Public Redacted Version of Decision on Kadri Veseli’s Appeal Against Decision on Remanded Detention Review and Periodic Review of Detention, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA014/F00008/RED, 31 March 2022, para.50; Public Redacted Version of Decision on Rexhep Selimi’s Appeal Against Decision on Remanded Detention Review and Periodic Review of Detention, KSC-BC-2020-06/IA015/F00005/RED, 25 March 2022, para.43.

³⁸ *Specialist Prosecutor v. Mustafa*, Further Redacted Version of Corrected Version of Public Redacted Version of Trial Judgment, KSC-BC-2020-05/F00494/RED3/COR, 16 December 2022, para.57.

³⁹ *Specialist Prosecutor v. Gucati and Haradinaj*, Appeal Judgment, KSC-CA-2022-01/F00114, 2 February 2023, para.438 (quoting KSC-BC-2020-07, Transcript, 18 May 2022, pp.3858-3859).

⁴⁰ *Specialist Prosecutor v. Gucati and Haradinaj*, Public Redacted Version of the Trial Judgment, KSC-BC-2020-07/F00611/RED, 18 May 2022 (‘Case 7 Judgment’), para.579.

⁴¹ Case 7 Judgment, KSC-BC-2020-07/F00611/RED, para.577.

⁴² See *Specialist Prosecutor v. Shala*, Public redacted version of Trial Judgment and Sentence, KSC-BC-2020-04/F00847/RED, 16 July 2024, paras 96-97.

⁴³ See e.g. Prosecution submission pertaining to periodic detention review of Kadri Veseli, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03415, 26 August 2025, fn.44.

⁴⁴ See e.g., Prosecution response to ‘Selimi Defence Request for Rescission of Contact Restrictions’ (F03671), KSC-BC-2020-06/F03675, 11 February 2026, para.13.

risk to the safety and security of witnesses.⁴⁵ To address these risks, the Panel ordered significant modifications to detention conditions.⁴⁶ As the Panel has previously underlined, its finding that it appears Selimi disclosed privileged information to unauthorised third parties supports and reinforces the conclusion that Selimi's release constitutes a risk of obstruction with the progress of KSC proceedings.⁴⁷

18. All of the above demonstrates that the risk of obstruction is not only well-founded, but that Selimi presents an extraordinarily heightened risk of obstructing KSC proceedings to such an extent that even the standard communications restrictions and monitoring of the Detention Centre are insufficient to mitigate.

iii. Risk of Criminal Offences (Article 41(6)(b)(iii))

19. Selimi continues to present a risk of committing further crimes, consistent with this Panel's recent conclusions.⁴⁸

20. In the most recent detention decision, the Panel recalled its previous finding that the risk of Selimi committing further crimes continues to exist, opined that the same factors that were taken into account in relation to the risk of obstruction are relevant to the analysis of the risk of committing further crimes, and concluded that no new

⁴⁵ Further Decision on the Prosecution's Urgent Request for Modification of Detention Conditions for Hashim Thaçi, Kadri Veseli, and Rexhep Selimi, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01977, 1 December 2023 ('Modification Decision'), para.41.

⁴⁶ See Modification Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01977, paras 51-53, 55-60, 62-78, 84(b). See also certain limited adjustments in Decision Reviewing the Conditions of Detention Modified in F01977, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03308, 4 July 2025, paras 71-72, 91-92.

⁴⁷ See Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.23.

⁴⁸ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.28.

circumstances have arisen since the last detention review that would justify a different finding.⁴⁹

21. Moreover, the crimes against humanity and war crimes that Selimi is charged with are extremely serious, they are alleged to have been committed in cooperation with others, and the Confirmation Decision describes Selimi's personal participation in the commission of crimes.

22. This Panel's previous conclusion that the continuing disclosure of sensitive information presents an unacceptable risk for the commission of further crimes applies even more forcefully given the findings regarding Selimi's revelation of confidential information to unauthorised third parties. That Selimi now has specific insight into the overall case and evidence against him, furthers the risk that he may commit additional crimes, including against witnesses.

C. NO MODALITIES OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE ARE ABLE TO SUFFICIENTLY MITIGATE THE RISKS

23. The relevant risks can only be effectively managed at the KSC's detention facilities, as recently reaffirmed by this Panel.⁵⁰

24. Regarding the risks of obstructing the progress of KSC proceedings and committing further crimes, the Panel reiterated that none of the formerly proposed conditions, nor any additional measures foreseen in Article 41(12) could sufficiently mitigate the existing risks.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.27.

⁵⁰ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.33.

⁵¹ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.32.

25. Further, the Panel reiterated that the measures in place at the KSC 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.⁵² Moreover, they offer a controlled environment where a potential breach of confidentiality could be more easily identified and/or prevented.⁵³

26. The Panel has consistently concluded that it is only through the communication monitoring framework applicable at the KSC detention facilities, including those measures recently ordered by the Panel, that Selimi's communications can be restricted in a manner that would sufficiently mitigate the risks of obstruction and commission of further crimes.⁵⁴

27. Nothing has occurred since the previous determination warranting a different assessment on conditions, either generally or for a discrete period of time. Selimi's conduct displays such an extraordinarily heightened risk that even the standard communications restrictions and monitoring at the Detention Centre are insufficient to mitigate, having necessitated the imposition of an even more strict regime by this Panel.⁵⁵ Therefore, especially at such a critical phase of trial, the underlying risks continue.

⁵² Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.32.

⁵³ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.32.

⁵⁴ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.33.

⁵⁵ Further Decision on the Prosecution's Urgent Request for Modification of Detention Conditions for Hashim Thaçi, Kadri Veseli, and Rexhep Selimi, KSC-BC-2020-06/F01977, 1 December 2023; Decision Reviewing the Conditions of Detention Modified in F01977, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03308, 4 July 2025.

D. DETENTION REMAINS PROPORTIONAL

28. Detention remains proportional. At the last detention review, this Panel found that Selimi's detention for a further two months was necessary and reasonable in the specific circumstances of the case.⁵⁶

29. In that regard, the Panel recalled that the reasonableness of an accused's continued detention must be assessed on the facts of each case and according to its special features, which, in this case, include: (i) that Selimi is charged with ten counts of serious international crimes in which he is alleged to play a significant role; (ii) that, if convicted, Selimi could face a lengthy sentence; (iii) that the risks under Article 41(6)(b)(ii)-(iii) cannot be mitigated by any conditions; (iv) that the case against Selimi is complex; (v) the climate of witness intimidation; and (vi) that the trial is ongoing.⁵⁷

30. Here, taking these same, and additional, factors into consideration, Selimi's detention continues to be reasonable, especially in light of the continuing expeditious progression of proceedings, including the recent closure of the case.


IV. CONCLUSION

31. For the foregoing reasons, Selimi should remain detained.

⁵⁶ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.36.

⁵⁷ Twenty-fourth Detention Decision, KSC-BC-2020-06/F03661, para.35.

Word count: 3,233



Kimberly P. West

Specialist Prosecutor

Thursday, 19 February 2026

At The Hague, the Netherlands.