

In:

KSC-CA-2023-02

Name:

The Specialist Prosecutor v. Salih Mustafa

Before:

Judge Michèle Picard, Presiding

Judge Kai Ambos

Judge Nina Jørgensen

Registrar:

Dr. Fidelma Donlon

Date:

27 October 2023

Classification:

PUBLIC REDACTED

## [IN COURT REDACTION ORDER]

The Panel of the Court of Appeals Chamber FINDS that the following blacked out text contains confidential information and ORDERS this information shall be removed/ edited from the PUBLIC broadcast/streaming, audio visual recording and transcripts in all three languages *Albanian/ English/ Serbian*. Hearing of 27 October 2023, transcript reference transcript reference Page 20 Line 14 to Page 20 Line 15, (time code from 10:21:19 to 10:21:32), Page 20 Line 19, (time code 10:22:00), Page 20 Line 21 to Page 21 Line 22, (time code from 10:22:09 to 10:22:13).

20:13	you and, indeed, everybody back to the start of the trial phase in	10:21:15
14	which we initially heard some of the	10:21:19
15	in this case testifying about their plight.	10:21:32
16	The first witness, Witness 03593, underwent four days of	10:21:33
17	examination in court. Nearly a day and a half were given to the	10:21:43
18	Defence to conduct a hugely testing cross-examination. It was hugely	10:21:48
19	testing the land the Trial Panel equally because this	10:22:00
20	was the assertion made, the Trial Panel took nearly half a day to put	10:22:05
21	additional questions to this witness. Indeed,	10:22:09
22	were most thoroughly examined by not just the parties but	10:22:13
23	also the Judges.	10:22:22
24	It wasn't that their testimony was just waived through. Far	10:22:25
25	from it. It was tested and tried as it must be done in search of	10:22:29
		DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSON NAMED IN
21:1	fully establishing what happened and of the truth, but this mustn't	10:22:37
21:1	fully establishing what happened and of the truth, but this mustn't be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any	10:22:37 10:22:42
21:1 2 3		
21:1 2 3 4	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any	10:22:42
21:1 2 3 4 5	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any double standards. The Judges were very critical in each and every	10:22:42 10:22:51
2 3 4	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any double standards. The Judges were very critical in each and every situation with each and every witness.	10:22:42 10:22:51 10:23:01
2 3 4	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any double standards. The Judges were very critical in each and every situation with each and every witness.  This trial and the way it's been conducted has provided the	10:22:42 10:22:51 10:23:01 10:23:03
2 3 4	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any double standards. The Judges were very critical in each and every situation with each and every witness.  This trial and the way it's been conducted has provided the Defence and Salih Mustafa with ample opportunity to put their case,	10:22:42 10:22:51 10:23:01 10:23:03 10:23:17
2 3 4 5 6 7	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any double standards. The Judges were very critical in each and every situation with each and every witness.  This trial and the way it's been conducted has provided the Defence and Salih Mustafa with ample opportunity to put their case, that their case wasn't convincing is a different matter entirely.	10:22:42 10:22:51 10:23:01 10:23:03 10:23:17 10:23:18
2 3 4 5 6 7	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any double standards. The Judges were very critical in each and every situation with each and every witness.  This trial and the way it's been conducted has provided the Defence and Salih Mustafa with ample opportunity to put their case, that their case wasn't convincing is a different matter entirely.  Another point that was raised by the Defence, and this I only	10:22:42 10:22:51 10:23:01 10:23:03 10:23:17 10:23:18 10:23:26
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any double standards. The Judges were very critical in each and every situation with each and every witness.  This trial and the way it's been conducted has provided the Defence and Salih Mustafa with ample opportunity to put their case, that their case wasn't convincing is a different matter entirely.  Another point that was raised by the Defence, and this I only want to mention in passing before I can already draw to a close, but	10:22:42 10:22:51 10:23:01 10:23:03 10:23:17 10:23:18 10:23:26 10:23:30
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	be forgotten, and this is why it's wrong to state that there were any double standards. The Judges were very critical in each and every situation with each and every witness.  This trial and the way it's been conducted has provided the Defence and Salih Mustafa with ample opportunity to put their case, that their case wasn't convincing is a different matter entirely.  Another point that was raised by the Defence, and this I only want to mention in passing before I can already draw to a close, but a point that directly affects the interest of victims is the	10:22:42 10:22:51 10:23:01 10:23:03 10:23:17 10:23:18 10:23:26 10:23:30 10:23:39

Judge Michèle Picard Presiding Judge

Registry implementation: \	Yes 🗆	No 🗆	Feed Terminated $\square$	Time From	_to
AV: Name		Signature:		Time From	to

PUBLIC
Date original: 27/10/2023 15:23:00
Date public redacted version: 27/10/2023 15:23:00

In:

KSC-CA-2023-02

Name:

The Specialist Prosecutor v. Salih Mustafa

Before:

Judge Michèle Picard, Presiding

Judge Kai Ambos

Judge Nina Jørgensen

Registrar:

Dr. Fidelma Donlon

Date:

27 October 2023

Classification:

PUBLIC REDACTED

## [IN COURT REDACTION ORDER]

The Panel of the Court of Appeals Chamber FINDS that the following blacked out text contains confidential information and ORDERS this information shall be removed/ edited from the PUBLIC broadcast/streaming, audio visual recording and transcripts in all three languages *Albanian/English/Serbian*. Hearing of 27 October 2023, transcript reference Page 33 Line 1, (time code from 11:23:21), Page 33 Line 4, (time code 11:23:35), Page 33 Line 5 to Page 33 Line 6, (time code from 11:23:44 to 11:23:54).

32:25	him, and we asked the question specifically, from who did you hear	11:23:16
33:1	that then. And he answered to that question it was from	11:23:21
. 2	I will give you the reference, which I will give in a minute, but I	11:23:30
3	do have the specific reference for that, Your Honour.	11:23:33
4	And answered to that question, when he was asked the	11:23:35
5	specific question on that murder victim's name,	11:23:44
6	That's basically what it	11:23:49
7	was, what he said in answer to that. So 4600 cannot it cannot be	11:23:55
В	possibly part of the evidence that we relate to hearsay evidence and	11:24:02
9	that hearsay evidence remaining even uncorroborated evidence,	11:24:11
10	uncorroborated from the alleged source of this particular thing was	11:24:18
11	being told to 4600.	11:24:27
12	Therefore, Your Honour the basis upon which this entire	11:24:32
13	causation was based was based on presumptions, and the most important	11:24:51
14	presumption was left aside here by the Trial Panel. And that is the	11:25:00
15	presumption of innocence. We need to make sure from the basic proper	11:25:07
16	start of any approach to a criminal case, we presume that this person	11:25:15
17	is innocent, and only when there is clear and unequivocal evidence to	11:25:22
18	the contrary then one can be found guilty. But on the basis of these	11:25:29

Judge Michèle Picard Presiding Judge

Registry implementation: Yes $\Box$	□ No □	Feed Terminated $\square$	Time From	to
AV: Name	Signature	:	Time From	to

PUBLIC
Date original: 27/10/2023 15:23:00
Date public redacted version: 27/10/2023 15:23:00

In:

KSC-CA-2023-02

Name:

The Specialist Prosecutor v. Salih Mustafa

Before:

Judge Michèle Picard, Presiding

Judge Kai Ambos

Judge Nina Jørgensen

Registrar:

Dr. Fidelma Donlon

Date:

27 October 2023

**Classification:** 

PUBLIC REDACTED

## [IN COURT REDACTION ORDER]

The Panel of the Court of Appeals Chamber FINDS that the following blacked out text contains confidential information and ORDERS this information shall be removed/ edited from the PUBLIC broadcast/streaming, audio visual recording and transcripts in all three languages *Albanian/English/Serbian*. Hearing of 27 October 2023, transcript reference Page 33 Line 1, (time code from 11:23:21), Page 33 Line 4, (time code 11:23:35), Page 33 Line 5 to Page 33 Line 6, (time code from 11:23:44 to 11:23:54).

9 10 11 12 13		11:56:47 11:57:41 11:57:41 11:57:41 11:57:41 11:57:42
14 15	that was my hearsay evidence which, in the view of the Defence, was	11:57:45
16		11:57:49
		11:57:54
17	Thank you very much.	11:57:59
19		11:58:01
	PRESIDING JUDGE PICARD: Thank you. There will be questions, Yes.	11:58:03
	Yes. MR. YON BONE: Yes.	11:58:04
21		11:58:05
22	JUDGE JORGENSEN: I had a question, but it I'll perhaps	11:58:09
23		11:58:13
24	MR. VON BONE: Okay.	11:58:16
25	JUDGE JORGENSEN: I'm afraid it goes back to the murder charge.	11:58:19
46:1	There was an outstanding question relating to omissions.	11:58:23
2	So I just wanted some clarification on how, focusing on	11:58:27
3	liability for omissions rather than conduct, there was both positive	11:58:33
4	acts and omissions or simply positive acts.	11:58:39
5	If we focus on omissions, how would that overcome the question	11:58:43
6	of a possible intervening new act if the new act could also have been	11:58:46
7	said to cause the death? And then related to that, how would the	11:58:52
8	intent for murder then be framed in the context of an omission?	11:59:00
	I'm Darry Titt.	
9	MR. BAARLINK: To answer your first question. As we've	11:59:03
9 10	NK. BARKLINK: 10 answer your list question. As we've submitted yesterday, the causal contribution here under the ordinary	11:59:03

Judge Michèle Picard Presiding Judge

Registry implementation: Yes		No 🗆	Feed Terminated $\square$	Time From	to
AV: Name	:	Signature:		Time From	to