



KOSOVO SPECIALIST CHAMBERS
DHOMAT E SPECIALIZUARA TË KOSOVËS
SPECIJALIZOVANA VEĆA KOSOVA

In: KSC-BC-2023-12
**The Specialist Prosecutor v. Hashim Thaçi, Bashkim Smakaj,
Isni Kilaj, Fadil Fazliu and Hajredin Kuçi**

Before: Single Trial Judge
Judge Christopher Gosnell

Registrar: Fidelma Donlon

Date: 29 April 2026

Language: English

Classification: Public

**Public Redacted Version of
Decision on Prosecution Request for Leave to Appeal Decision F00825**

Specialist Prosecutor
Kimberly P. West

Specialist Counsel for Hashim Thaçi
Sophie Menegon
Luka Mišetić

Specialist Counsel for Bashkim Smakaj
Jonathan Rees
Huw Bowden

Specialist Counsel for Isni Kilaj
Iain Edwards
Joe Holmes

Specialist Counsel for Fadil Fazliu
David Young

Specialist Counsel for Hajredin Kuçi
Alexander Admiraal

THE SINGLE TRIAL JUDGE, pursuant to Article 45(2) of Law No. 05/L-053 on Specialist Chambers and Specialist Prosecutor's Office and Rule 77(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence Before the Kosovo Specialist Chambers,¹ hereby issues this decision.

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1. On 27 March 2026, the Single Trial Judge issued his decision on the Specialist Prosecutor's Office's ("SPO") motion for the admission of the expert evidence of Witness 8 ("Impugned Decision").²

2. On 2 April 2026, upon the request of the SPO, the Single Trial Judge granted the SPO an extension of time until 9 April 2026 for the filing of any request for leave to appeal the Impugned Decision.³

3. On 8 April 2026, upon the request of the SPO,⁴ the Single Trial Judge extended the word limit for any request for leave to appeal, as well as any response thereto, to 5,000 words.⁵

4. On 9 April 2026, the SPO filed the request for certification to appeal the Impugned Decision ("Request").⁶

¹ All references to "Article" and "Rule" shall be understood, unless otherwise indicated, as referring to the Law and Rules.

² KSC-BC-2023-12, F00825, Single Trial Judge, *Decision on Specialist Prosecutor's Motion for Admission of Evidence of Witnesses 8*, 27 March 2026, confidential.

³ KSC-BC-2023-12, CRSPD280, Email from Single Trial Judge to the Parties re Decision F00825, 2 April 2026, confidential.

⁴ KSC-BC-2023-12, F00846, Specialist Prosecutor, *Prosecution Request for Variation of Word Limit*, 7 April 2026, confidential.

⁵ KSC-BC-2023-12, F00848, Single Trial Judge, *Decision on Specialist Prosecutor's Request for Variation of Word Limit (F00846)*, 8 April 2026, public, para. 8.

⁶ KSC-BC-2023-12, F00851, Specialist Prosecutor, *Prosecution Request for Leave to Appeal Decision F00825*, 9 April 2026, confidential.

5. On 20 April 2026, the Defence for Hashim Thaçi, Bashkim Smakaj, and Isni Kilaj (collectively, “the Defence”) responded to the Request (“Response”).⁷

6. On 28 April 2026, the SPO replied (“Reply”).⁸

II. SUBMISSIONS

A. REQUEST

7. The SPO requests certification to appeal the following issues:

(i) Whether the Panel erred in considering material that is not admitted or offered for admission, or noticed to the Parties, as relevant to the admissibility of tendered evidence (“First Issue”);

(ii) Whether the Panel erred and/or abused its discretion in its evaluation of expertise for the purpose of Rule 149 (“Second Issue”);

(iii) Whether the Panel erred in concluding that the methods applied in the Report are not sufficiently transparent to permit a meaningful assessment of its probative value (“Third Issue”); and

(iv) Whether the Panel: (i) erred in law in finding Rule 107 authorisation to have been required, and/or (ii) abused its discretion in finding that Witness 8’s refusal to answer questions in the absence of advance Rule 107 authorisation prejudiced the Defence or violated the right of the Accused to examine witnesses against them (“Fourth Issue”), (collectively, “Issues”).

8. The SPO submits that the Issues arise directly from the Impugned Decision and require appellate review for their resolution.⁹ The SPO further submits that

⁷ KSC-BC-2023-12, F00867, Specialist Counsel, *Joint Defence Response to Prosecution Request for Leave to Appeal Decision on the Admission of Expert Evidence of Witness 8*, 20 April 2026, confidential.

⁸ KSC-BC-2023-12, F00885, Specialist Prosecutor, *Prosecution Reply to the Joint Defence Response F00867*, 28 April 2026, confidential.

⁹ Request, paras 8, 15, 20, 28.

the Issues significantly affect the fair and expeditious conduct of proceedings and would materially advance the proceedings.¹⁰

B. RESPONSE

9. The Defence opposes the Request.¹¹ The Defence argues that the Issues merely disagree or misrepresent the Impugned Decision and therefore do not constitute appealable issues.¹² The Defence further argues that the requirements of Rule 77(2) are not met¹³ as certification would significantly impair, rather than facilitate, the fair and expeditious conduct of proceedings.¹⁴ The Defence contends that the Single Trial Judge has broad discretion on issues related to the admission of evidence and that certification to appeal such decisions must therefore be the exception rather than the rule.¹⁵ The Defence argues that, even if the Single Trial Judge would be found to have erred in relation to any one of the Issues, Witness 8's evidence would remain excluded on the basis of the remaining findings.¹⁶ The Defence further argues that the fact that an issue is of general importance or of interest for future proceedings is "insufficient to meet the first test of Rule 77(2)."¹⁷ The Defence asserts that where expert evidence is corroborative in nature, its exclusion has not been found to raise issues which would satisfy the first test under Rule 77(2).¹⁸ As to any remedial measures to be taken by the SPO as a result of the non-admission of Witness 8's evidence, the Defence contends that those measures are purely speculative and would not necessarily meet the requisite legal tests.¹⁹ The Defence argues that granting

¹⁰ Request, paras 29-32.

¹¹ Response, paras 2, 42.

¹² Response, paras 2, 6-25.

¹³ Response, paras 2, 26-39.

¹⁴ Response, paras 26, 40.

¹⁵ Response, para. 27.

¹⁶ Response, paras 29-31.

¹⁷ Response, para. 31.

¹⁸ Response, para. 32.

¹⁹ Response, paras 33, 37.

certification to appeal will delay proceedings, and ultimately jeopardise the Accused's right to be tried within a reasonable time, as the Defence will not be able to close its case while issues concerning the admission of SPO evidence are pending appeal.²⁰ Even if one or more of the Issues meet the requirements of Rule 77(2), the Defence requests that the Single Trial Judge exercise his discretion in denying certification as issues concerning the non-admission of evidence can be addressed in the context of an appeal from judgment.²¹

C. REPLY

10. The SPO replies that the Response fails to address the actual legal questions raised in the Request or to properly apply the certification standard.²² The SPO asserts that the Defence concedes that the First Issue provided an "indicia of doubt" regarding the witness's evidence," thereby confirming its appealability.²³ The SPO asserts that the Defence misrepresents or fails to meaningfully engage with the remaining Issues.²⁴ The SPO argues that those Issues do affect the fairness and expeditiousness of proceedings as they concern matters that impinge on its genuine opportunity to present a case and avoid redundant or unnecessary evidentiary submissions.²⁵ The SPO contends that proceedings can move forward concurrently with an interlocutory appeal thereby ensuring that neither the Defence case nor the proceedings would be derailed.²⁶ Finally, the SPO asserts that, notwithstanding a Panel's discretion, if the criteria for certification are met, then the plain language of Rule 77 confirms that the Parties are entitled to appellate resolution.²⁷

²⁰ Response, paras 34-40.

²¹ Response, para. 40.

²² Reply, para. 1.

²³ Reply, para. 2.

²⁴ Reply, para. 3.

²⁵ Reply, paras 4-6.

²⁶ Reply, para. 6.

²⁷ Reply, para. 7.

III. APPLICABLE LAW

11. Article 45(2) provides that a request for certification to appeal shall be granted “if the decision involves an issue that would significantly affect the fair and expeditious conduct of the proceedings or the outcome of the trial and for which, in the opinion of the Pre-Trial Judge or Trial Panel, an immediate resolution by a Court of Appeals Panel may materially advance the proceedings.”

12. Rule 77(2) adds that the “outcome of the trial” includes cases “where appropriate remedies could not effectively be granted after the close of the case at trial.” In accordance with previous decisions, and based on the plain wording of the text, the Single Trial Judge considers that the following requirements must be met for certification:

- a. the issue at hand would significantly affect
 - i. the fair and expeditious conduct of the proceedings, or
 - ii. the outcome of the trial; and
- b. an immediate resolution by the Court of Appeals Panel may materially advance the proceedings.²⁸

13. The party seeking certification bears the burden of establishing that these requirements are met,²⁹ which includes identifying the issue for which leave to appeal is sought. The issue must emanate from the decision and cannot amount to abstract questions or hypothetical concerns.³⁰ Interlocutory appeals,

²⁸ KSC-BC-2020-07, F00169, Trial Panel II, [Decision on Defence Applications for Leave to Appeal the Decision on the Defence Preliminary Motions](#) (“Decision F00169”), 1 April 2021, public, para. 11.

²⁹ KSC-BC-2020-07, F00423, Trial Panel II, [Decision on SPO Requests for Leave to Appeal F00413 and Suspensive Effect, 8 November 2021](#) (“Decision F00423”), public, para. 13 (“the Party seeking leave to appeal an issue must establish in relation to it the requirements set by the Law and by the Rules to the Panel’s satisfaction.”)

³⁰ [Decision F00169](#), para. 12.

interrupting the continuity of the proceedings, are the exception.³¹ Whether an interlocutory appeal would address fundamental questions of law or fact or would be to the benefit of the Specialist Chambers do not *per se* warrant certifying the appeal.³² The term “significantly” indicates that the effects under the first prong of the test must be significant.³³ “Fair” is generally understood as referencing the general requirement of fairness.³⁴ The “outcome of the trial” requirement involves “a forecast of the consequence of such an occurrence,”³⁵ in particular, whether the “claimed error is likely to impact the outcome of the case.”³⁶

14. Whether the proceedings will be advanced by immediate resolution of the issue is “an additional limiting factor” which requires a determination of whether the “prompt referral of an issue to the Court of Appeals Panel will settle the matter and rid the ‘judicial process of possible mistakes that might taint either the fairness of proceedings or mar the outcome of the trial’ thereby moving the proceedings forward along the right course.”³⁷

15. Certification is not concerned with the correctness of the underlying decision, but whether the standards set out in Article 45(2) and Rule 77(2) are met.³⁸

³¹ [Decision F00169](#), para. 10.

³² [Decision F00169](#), para. 10.

³³ [Decision F00423](#), para. 17.

³⁴ [Decision F00423](#), para. 18.

³⁵ [Decision F00423](#), para. 19; [Decision F00169](#), para. 15.

³⁶ [Decision F00423](#), para. 19; [Decision F00169](#), para. 15.

³⁷ [Decision F00423](#), para. 20.

³⁸ [Decision F00423](#), para. 21; [Decision F00169](#), para. 18.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. FIRST ISSUE: “WHETHER THE PANEL ERRED IN CONSIDERING MATERIAL THAT IS NOT ADMITTED OR OFFERED FOR ADMISSION, OR NOTICED TO THE PARTIES, AS RELEVANT TO THE ADMISSIBILITY OF TENDERED EVIDENCE”

16. The SPO submits that the Single Trial Judge erred in referring to [REDACTED] (“[REDACTED]”) without putting those [REDACTED] to the witness or otherwise raising them with the Parties prior to the Impugned Decision.³⁹ The SPO contends that the Single Trial Judge’s reliance on material not admitted or offered in this case constitutes a departure from the established practice of the Specialist Chambers (“SC”) and patently exceeds the parameters of judicial authority.⁴⁰ The SPO argues that, while the court has wide discretion to rely on extraneous sources when determining questions of law, its ability to do so to make factual findings is curtailed by the need to ensure fairness.⁴¹

17. The Defence responds that the SPO misrepresents the Impugned Decision’s use of the [REDACTED] as a “baseline” for the Single Trial Judge’s assessment of the scope and legitimacy of the confidentiality restrictions surrounding Witness 8’s evidence.⁴² The Defence argues that reference to the [REDACTED] was a preliminary matter invoked by the Single Trial Judge to put in context the inconsistencies in Witness 8’s account of the scope of the confidentiality restrictions.⁴³ The Defence further argues that, by asking the Single Trial Judge to accept the witness’s refusals to answer certain questions at face value, the SPO put the nature and scope of the Witness 8’s confidentiality obligations at issue.⁴⁴

³⁹ Request, paras 3, 7.

⁴⁰ Request, paras 4-5.

⁴¹ Request, para. 6.

⁴² Response, paras 6-8.

⁴³ Response, paras 8-10.

⁴⁴ Response, para. 9.

18. The SPO replies that leave should be granted as the [REDACTED] were treated by the Single Trial Judge as an “‘indicia of doubt’ regarding the witness’s evidence.”⁴⁵

19. The Single Trial Judge does not consider that the First Issue involves an issue that would significantly affect the fair and expeditious conduct of proceedings, nor would its immediate resolution materially advance the proceedings. As is clear from the context of paragraphs 34 through 42 of the Impugned Decision, multiple independent and sufficient considerations informed the view that there was doubt concerning the specific question of whether Witness 8 was accurately representing the confidentiality obligations by which he asserted he was bound. The SPO fails to address the relative weight of this consideration in relation to the other independent and sufficient considerations which were relied upon. Instead of addressing how this issue purportedly affects the fair and expeditious conduct of proceedings, or their outcome, the SPO asserts broadly that the issue has “manifest implications for the parameters of judicial decision-makers”.⁴⁶ Such general concerns or consequences are not, however, a sufficient basis for certification.⁴⁷

20. Accordingly, the First Issue, as formulated by the SPO, does not satisfy either of the conditions for certification pursuant to Rule 77(2).

⁴⁵ Reply, para. 2.

⁴⁶ Request, para. 30.

⁴⁷ [Decision F00169](#), para. 10. See also *Prosecutor v. Al Hassan*, ICC-01/12-01/18-734, [Decision on Defence request for reconsideration and, in the alternative, leave to appeal the ‘Decision on witness preparation and familiarisation’](#), 9 April 2020, para. 13 (“An issue is an identifiable subject or topic requiring a decision for its resolution, not merely a question over which there is disagreement or conflicting opinion. [...] An issue is constituted by a subject the resolution of which is essential for the determination of matters arising in the judicial cause under examination.’ [...] Allegations that the issue for which leave to appeal is sought is of general interest or that it may potentially arise in future proceedings, or that an appeal may be a legitimate or even necessary at some future stage, are equally inadequate to meet the criteria under Article 82(1)(d) of the Statute.”)

B. SECOND ISSUE: “WHETHER THE PANEL ERRED AND/OR ABUSED ITS DISCRETION IN ITS EVALUATION OF EXPERTISE FOR THE PURPOSE OF RULE 149”

21. The SPO submits that the Single Trial Judge erred in his evaluation of Witness 8’s expertise by applying an unduly restrictive standard to evaluate the relevant expertise and conflated the tests concerning the qualification of experts with the evaluation of their evidence.⁴⁸ The SPO argues that, given the Single Trial Judge’s recognition of Witness 8 as a qualified expert in “Striations, Impressions, and Shape Analysis” (“SISA”), with a specialised skill not possessed by the SC, the determinative issue for assessing his report should have been whether its contents fell within the scope of the witness’s expertise.⁴⁹ The SPO further argues that the status of a specific methodology as a recognised or reliable body of knowledge is not dependent on robust academia or acceptance by other courts, particularly when there are other commonly accepted indicia of expertise.⁵⁰ The SPO submits that questions concerning the accuracy of an expert’s opinion, or methods used, more appropriately go to the weight to be assigned to the expert’s evidence rather than the threshold question of whether the witness possesses expertise.⁵¹

22. The Defence responds that the SPO’s contention that the Single Trial Judge weighed competing indicia of Witness 8’s expertise too rigidly amounts to mere disagreement and misrepresents the Impugned Decision.⁵² The Defence argues that the absence of academic literature or the lack of prior judicial recognition were simply factors the Single Trial Judge considered within a holistic assessment of Witness 8’s expert status within the meaning of Rule 149.⁵³ The Defence asserts that the decisions cited by the SPO are inapposite as they

⁴⁸ Request, paras 9, 15.

⁴⁹ Request, paras 10-11.

⁵⁰ Request, paras 11-12.

⁵¹ Request, para. 13.

⁵² Response, paras 11-13.

⁵³ Response, para. 14.

address whether a witness's own lack of prior publications or appearances as an expert disqualify him from being recognised as an expert by the relevant panel.⁵⁴ The Defence further argues that the Single Trial Judge correctly conducted his assessment in relation to "comparative microdot analysis", as opposed to SISA, because that was what the SPO posited as Witness 8's expertise.⁵⁵

23. The Single Trial Judge considers that the Second Issue as defined by the SPO emanates from the Impugned Decision. Whether Witness 8's report, and his related testimony, qualified as an expression of expertise was a precondition for its admission. The Second Issue broadly seeks to challenge the legal standard applied, and the manner of its application to the facts, which the SPO asserts constituted an abuse of discretion. The consequence of an error within the scope of the Second Issue, as the SPO asserts,⁵⁶ would have led to the improper exclusion of Witness 8's evidence. The Single Trial Judge considers that an error in respect of the admission of Witness 8's evidence would not be easily remedied on an appeal from a final judgment, as it forms part of a set of evidence on which the SPO relies for the proposition that certain documents were provided by Mr Thaçi to two of his co-accused which, in turn, is directly relevant to the charges they face. Furthermore, the Single Trial Judge considers that immediate resolution of the Second Issue may materially advance proceedings by ensuring that the case does not proceed to deliberations on the basis of improperly curtailed prosecution evidence.

24. For these reasons, the Single Trial Judge finds that the requirements for certification of the Second Issue are met.

⁵⁴ Response, para. 14.

⁵⁵ Response, para. 15.

⁵⁶ Request, para. 30.

C. THIRD ISSUE: “WHETHER THE PANEL ERRED IN CONCLUDING THAT THE METHODS APPLIED IN THE REPORT ARE NOT SUFFICIENTLY TRANSPARENT TO PERMIT A MEANINGFUL ASSESSMENT OF ITS PROBATIVE VALUE”

25. The SPO asserts that the Impugned Decision “misinterpreted the standard for *prima facie* reliability and imposed a prohibitive expectation of full transparency for expert evidence that finds no discernible support in the Rules or prior practice.”⁵⁷ The SPO argues that recent SC jurisprudence affirms that alleged deficiencies in information regarding source material do not warrant exclusion,⁵⁸ and that other courts have accepted expert reports even where public interest or privacy considerations prevented access to the underlying data.⁵⁹ The SPO submits that, regardless of any confidentiality considerations, Witness 8’s evidence remained testable including through the Defence’s own experts.⁶⁰

26. The Defence responds that the Third Issue merely disagrees with the assessment of the probative value of the Witness 8’s evidence and repeats previously rejected arguments.⁶¹ The Defence argues that the SPO does not contest the serious deficiencies in the transparency of Witness 8’s methodology, but rather repeats its submissions that the Defence could have engaged its own expert to counter such deficiencies.⁶²

27. The Single Trial Judge considers that the Third Issue as formulated by the SPO emanates from the Impugned Decision. If the Single Trial Judge erred in the application of the governing standards of admissibility, then Witness 8’s testimony will have been incorrectly excluded thereby significantly affecting the

⁵⁷ Request, para. 20.

⁵⁸ Request, para. 18.

⁵⁹ Request, para. 18.

⁶⁰ Request, para. 19.

⁶¹ Response, paras 16-18.

⁶² Response, para. 17.

fair and expeditious conduct of proceedings. As stated in respect of the previous issue,⁶³ an error in this regard would not be easily remedied on an appeal from the final trial judgment. In addition, the Single Trial Judge considers that immediate resolution of the Third Issue may materially advance the proceedings by ensuring that the case does not proceed to deliberations on the basis of improperly curtailed prosecution evidence.

28. For these reasons, the Single Trial Judge finds that the requirements for certification of the Third Issue are met.

D. FOURTH ISSUE: “WHETHER THE PANEL (I) ERRED IN LAW IN FINDING RULE 107 AUTHORISATION TO HAVE BEEN REQUIRED, AND/OR (II) ABUSED ITS DISCRETION IN FINDING THAT WITNESS 8’S REFUSAL TO ANSWER QUESTIONS IN THE ABSENCE OF ADVANCE RULE 107 AUTHORISATION PREJUDICED THE DEFENCE OR VIOLATED THE RIGHT OF THE ACCUSED TO EXAMINE WITNESSES AGAINST THEM”

29. The SPO submits that the Single Trial Judge’s findings that Rule 107 authorisation was mandatory under the circumstances, and that the failure to request and obtain this authorisation prejudiced the Defence, are erroneous or unreasonable.⁶⁴ The SPO argues that there is no indication that an advanced Rule 107 application would have clarified the scope or the basis of the witness’s confidentiality restrictions.⁶⁵ The SPO further argues that, in any event, it fell within the power and responsibility of the Single Trial Judge to regulate and oversee the conduct of his testimony and make appropriate rulings in advance of Witness 8’s testimony.⁶⁶ The SPO contends that no restrictions were placed on Defence questioning and therefore the Defence had wider latitude to cross-examine than may have been permitted pursuant to a Rule 107 application.⁶⁷

⁶³ See *supra*, para. 23.

⁶⁴ Request, paras 21-22.

⁶⁵ Request, para. 24.

⁶⁶ Request, paras 23-26.

⁶⁷ Request, para. 27.

The SPO asserts that a possible procedural irregularity is insufficient to establish concrete prejudice.⁶⁸

30. The Defence responds that the Fourth Issue merely disagrees with and misrepresents the Impugned Decision.⁶⁹ The Defence argues that it is not a panel's duty to remedy a party's failure to comply with the Rules in tendering evidence.⁷⁰ The Defence further argues that a prior Rule 107 application would have allowed the relevant organisation to clarify the scope of Witness 8's authorised evidence including through the use of one of their representative during his testimony.⁷¹ The Defence further asserts that the Single Trial Judge's finding of prejudice was also predicated on Witness 8's refusal to answer questions and not just the procedural irregularity of a lack of prior Rule 107 approval.⁷²

31. The Single Trial Judge considers that the Fourth Issue as formulated by the SPO emanates from the Impugned Decision. The Impugned Decision held that the SPO was required to have brought a Rule 107 application prior to the witness's testimony and that the witness's refusal to answer questions in the absence of such an authorisation on matters that were plainly relevant to Witness 8's expert report was prejudicial to the Defence.⁷³ The Single Trial Judge concluded that any probative value was outweighed by the prejudice arising from questions that Witness 8 refused to answer or was unable to address because of the confidentiality obligations he cited, a prejudice which was heightened by the SPO's failure to have brought a Rule 107 application.⁷⁴ This consideration was integral to the reasoning and the determination of the

⁶⁸ Request, para. 27.

⁶⁹ Response, paras 19-22.

⁷⁰ Response, para. 23.

⁷¹ Response, para. 24.

⁷² Response, para. 25.

⁷³ Impugned Decision, para. 49. *See also* Impugned Decision, paras 44, 51, 63.

⁷⁴ Impugned Decision, para. 63.

inadmissibility of Witness 8's testimony in the Impugned Decision. The Single Trial Judge notes that he expressly stated during Witness 8's testimony that one of the remedies that might ensue from Witness 8's refusal to answer questions, depending on the nature of the matters on which he refused to answer questions, would be non-admission of the expert report and his testimony.⁷⁵ This was indeed what occurred in the Impugned Decision, on the basis of the relevance of the questions that Witness 8 refused to answer.

32. As in respect of the Second and Third Issues, the Fourth Issue could not be easily remedied on an appeal from the final trial judgment, for the reasons previously stated.⁷⁶ Moreover, proceedings may be materially advanced by ensuring that deliberations do not proceed on the basis of improperly curtailed prosecution evidence.

33. For these reasons, the Single Trial Judge finds that the requirements for certification of the Fourth Issue are met.

V. CLASSIFICATION

34. The Single Trial Judge notes that the Request, Response, and Reply have been filed confidentially. The Single Trial Judge therefore orders the SPO and the Defence, as the case may be, to request reclassification or file a public redacted version of their respective filings by **Wednesday, 6 May 2026**.

⁷⁵ Transcript of Hearing, 3 March 2026, confidential, p. 554, lines 11-23, p. 567, lines 24-25 to p. 568, lines 1-5. This position was stated in the context of a SPO objection to the nature of Defence questions, and a Defence objection to the witness's refusals to answer questions, respectively.

⁷⁶ See *supra*, paras 23, 27.

VI. DISPOSITION

35. For the foregoing reasons, the Single Trial Judge hereby:

- a) **DENIES** certification to appeal the First Issue;
- b) **GRANTS** leave to appeal the Second, Third and Fourth Issues;
and
- c) **ORDERS** the SPO and the Defence to request reclassification or file public redacted versions of their respective filings by **Wednesday, 6 May 2026.**



Judge Christopher Gosnell
Single Trial Judge

Dated this Wednesday, 29 April 2026

At The Hague, the Netherlands.