In:	KSC-BC-2023-10
	The Prosecutor v. Sabit Januzi and Ismet Bahtijari
	KSC-BC-2023-11
	The Prosecutor v. Haxhi Shala
Before:	Pre-Trial Judge
	Judge Nicolas Guillou
Registrar:	Dr Fidelma Donlon
Filing Participant:	Specialist Counsel for Sabit Januzi
Date:	19 January 2024
Language:	English
Classification:	Public

Public Redacted Version of Response to Prosecution Request for Joinder F00132 and Submission of Joint Indictment with confidential Annexes 1 and 2 F00146

**Specialist Prosecutor** 

Kimberly P. West

**Counsel for Sabit Januzi** 

Jonathan Elystan Rees KC Huw Bowden

**Counsel for Ismet Bahtijari** Dr Felicity Gerry KC

**Counsel for Haxhi Shala** Toby Cadman

## I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. On 13 December 2023, the Prosecution filed a request for joinder ('Request')<sup>1</sup>, requesting that the accused in Case KSC-BC-2023-10 (BAHTIJARI and JANUZI) and the accused in Case KSC-BC-2023-11 (SHALA) be joined in a single indictment.
- 2. On 14 December 2023, the Pre-Trial Judge ordered the SPO to file a proposed joint indictment and Rule 86(3) outline for the same by 12 January 2024, and provided that the Defence had until 19 January 2024 thereafter to respond to the 'Request'<sup>2</sup>.
- 3. On 12 January 2024, the Prosecution filed their proposed joint indictment and Rule 86(3) outline<sup>3</sup>.
- 4. The Accused (JANUZI) hereby objects to joinder as per the proposed joint indictment and responds as follows.
- II. **SUBMISSIONS**
- 5. Contrary to the submission of the Prosecutor<sup>4</sup>, the proposed joint indictment seeks to include new charges.
- 6. The question whether a proposed amended indictment includes new charges is not confined to whether it contains new "counts"<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00132, Prosecution request for joinder, Prosecution, 13 December 2023, Public

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10, In Court – Oral Order, 14 December 2023, Public

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00146, Submission of Joint Indictment with confidential Annexes 1 and 2, Prosecutor, 12 January 2024, Public

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00146, Submission of Joint Indictment with confidential Annexes 1 and 2, Prosecutor, 12 January 2024, Public at paragraph 1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Archbold on International Criminal Law § 6-202 referring to Prosecutor v Kajelijeli, Decision on Prosecutor's Motion to Correct the Indictment Dated 22 December 2000 and Motion for Leave to File an KSC-BC-2023-10 19/01/2024 1

- 7. Instead, the key question is whether the proposed amendment "introduces a basis for conviction that is factually and/or legally distinct from any already alleged in the indictment"6.
- 8. The proposed joint indictment seeks to introduce new charges in that:
  - a. It introduces an alternative legal and factual basis for conviction on count 3, namely use of a promise of a gift or any other form of benefit;
  - b. It introduces an alternative factual basis for conviction on count 2, namely common action to use a promise of a gift or any other form of benefit; and
  - c. It introduces an alternative factual basis for conviction on count 1, namely the use of a promise of a gift or any other form of benefit as a form of threat<sup>7</sup>.
- 9. One consequence of the Prosecution's request to introduce these new charges is that the procedural steps in Article 39(8) of the Law<sup>8</sup> and Rules 86(3)(a), 86(4), (5), (7) and 97 are engaged<sup>9</sup>.
- 10. Importantly, the new charges that the Prosecution seeks to introduce at this stage have previously been dismissed by the Pre-Trial Judge on 2 October 2023 at the confirmation stage<sup>10</sup>.

Amended Indictment: Warning to Prosecutor's Counsels Pursuant to Rule 46(A), 25 January 2001, para.30 <sup>6</sup> Prosecutor v Halilović, IT-01-48-PT, Decision on Prosecutor's Motion Seeking Leave to Amend the Indictment, Trial Chamber, 17 December 2004 at para.30

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00146, Submission of Joint Indictment with confidential Annexes 1 and 2, Prosecutor, 12 January 2024, Public at footnote 4; KSC-BC-2023-10/F00146/A01, Annex 1 to Submission of Joint Indictment, Prosecutor, 12 January 2024, Confidential at paragraph 16, 22, 23, and 24(ii)

<sup>8</sup> Law No.04/L-274

<sup>9</sup> KSC-BD-03/Rev3/2020

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00008/CONF/RED, Confidential Redacted Version of the Decision on the Confirmation of the Indictment, Pre-Trial Judge, 2 October 2023, Confidential at paragraph 90, 149, and 155(b) KSC-BC-2023-10 2

- 11. Whereas Rule 86(9) provides that the non-confirmation of any charge in an indictment shall not preclude the Specialist Prosecutor from including the same charge in a new or amended indictment, *where supported by new evidentiary material*<sup>11</sup>, these charges are not supported by new evidentiary material.
- 12. Firstly, Rule 86(3)(a), which requires any evidentiary material supporting the material facts to be filed together with the indictment, has not been complied with at all.
- 13. Secondly, the only evidence referred to in the Rule 86(3)(b) outline<sup>12</sup> to support these charges is (i) the transcript of a recording dated 12 April 2023, and (ii) the transcript of the interview of Witness 1 dated 20 April 2023; both dated well before dismissal of these charges by the Pre-Trial Judge on 2 October 2024<sup>13</sup>. No evidentiary material has been referred to which might support a conclusion that, despite the date stated on each item, either item is *new*.
- 14. The Practice Direction on Files and Filings KSC-BD-15 at Article 40(a) and (c) requires the grounds in support of a request and all relevant legal and factual arguments, with specific reference to the applicable law relied upon to be articulated in the initial Request (to permit a meaningful response).
- 15. The Request itself makes no attempt to address Rule 86(9) and provides no grounds for the application of Rule 86(9) in the present case.
- 16. Accordingly, and for the reasons above, the Prosecutor is precluded from seeking to re-introduce these charges and the request for joinder should be refused.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Not merely 'additional' (Article 39(2) of the Law) but 'new' (Rule 86(9) of the Rules) as in 'not available at the time of [the earlier ruling] and could not have been discovered with the exercise of due diligence' (per Rule 181(3) re 'additional material' on appeal).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> KSC-BC-2023-10/F00146/A01, Annex 2 to Submission of Joint Indictment, Prosecutor, 12 January 2024, Confidential at footnote 46, 50 and 76

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Note: no evidentiary material has been referred to that explains the origin, authenticity or chain of custody in relation to the transcript of a recording dated 12 April 2023

- 17. Finally, it is observed that there remains outstanding litigation in case KSC-BC-2023-10 in relation to [REDACTED]<sup>14</sup>. The outcome of that litigation will determine whether or not [REDACTED]<sup>15 16</sup>. Despite the fact that a decision remains outstanding, [REDACTED] (the final submission in relation to which was filed on 15 December 2023) should be determined without delay and before the Request for Joinder.
- III. CONCLUSION
- 18. The Request should be refused.
- 19. The [REDACTED] should be determined without delay and before the Request.

Word count: 1165 words

JONATHAN ELYSTAN REES KC

Specialist Counsel for Mr Januzi

HUW BOWDEN

Specialist Co-Counsel for Mr Januzi

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> [REDACTED]
<sup>15</sup> [REDACTED]
<sup>16</sup> [REDACTED]
KSC-BC-2023-10

19 January 2024

Cardiff, UK