Tuesday, 17 November 2026

[Open session]

[Pronouncement of Trial Judgment]

[The accused entered the courtroom]

--- Upon commencing at 10.00 a.m.

JUDGE GOSNELL: Good morning. Before we begin, we'll let the photographers take a few photographs, please.

Thank you.

Good morning, everyone.

Court Officer, please call the case.

THE COURT OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honour. This is file KSC-BC-2023-12, The Specialist Prosecutor versus Hashim Thaci, Bashkim Smakaj, Isni Kilaj, Fadil Fazliu and Hajredin Kuci.

JUDGE GOSNELL: May we have the appearances, please, starting with the Prosecution.

MS. WEST: Good morning, Your Honour. Good morning, everyone in and around the courtroom. I am Specialist Prosecutor Kim West. And with me this morning is Josh Hafetz, Dirk-Jan Laman, Brent Hicks, behind me, Clare O'Connell, Earl Sullivan, and Illona Linkola. Thank you.

JUDGE GOSNELL: Thank you.

Ms. Menegon.

MS. MENEGON: Good morning, Your Honour. I am Specialist Counsel for Mr. Hashim Thaci. Today I am assisted by Michaela Todd, Megan Hirst, Mischa Gureghian Hall, Lirim Greicevci,

and Colin Barra. Thank you.

JUDGE GOSNELL: Mr. Rees.

MR. REES: [via videolink] Good morning, Your Honour. My name is Jonathan Rees, King's Counsel. I represent Mr. Smakaj. I'm assisted by co-counsel Huw Bowden, who is present in court, as is Derrick Gooden, Matilda Falchetta Hainsworth, Daniel Bowden, and Muharremi Halilaj.

JUDGE GOSNELL: Mr. Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: Good morning, Your Honour. Iain Edwards for Mr. Kilaj, together with co-counsel Joe Holmes, and also assisted by Eva Kalb, Alex Baer; behind me, Omar Soliman, Alex Cumming; and joining us remotely is Admir Berisha.

JUDGE GOSNELL: Mr. Young.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, good morning, Your Honour. I appear for Mr. Fazliu. Mr. Fazliu, as you can see, is in the courtroom, with members of his family in the public gallery. Thank you.

JUDGE GOSNELL: And Mr. Admiraal.

MR. ADMIRAAL: Good morning, Your Honour. I am here on behalf of Mr. Kuci, who is sitting next to me. Thank you.

JUDGE GOSNELL: And I see also that all the other accused are present in the courtroom as well.

I will now deliver a summary of the judgment in this case, which will be made available to the parties at the end of this hearing. What I say now is a summary only of that authoritative written judgment which is rendered today pursuant to Rule 159 of the Rules of

Procedure and Evidence.

Hashim Thaci, Bashkim Smakaj, Isni Kilaj, Fadil Fazliu, and Hajredin Kuci are charged in this case with offences against the administration of justice and public order in relation to a different trial before this Court known as Case 06 in which Mr. Thaci was a defendant.

Each of the accused, with the exception of Mr. Kuci, are charged, pursuant to Article 401(2) of the Kosovo Criminal Code, with attempted obstruction by the common action of a group of public officials in performing official duties. This obstruction is alleged to have been attempted by circumventing Court orders in Case 06 prohibiting contact with Prosecution witnesses by the accused in that case or their Defence teams, except in accordance with specified procedures.

More specifically, Mr. Thaci is alleged to have organised three separate groups with Mr. Fazliu, Mr. Smakaj, and Mr. Kilaj during their separate visits to him at the Court's detention centre here in The Hague in July, September, and October 2023. Each group was to communicate instructions to a Prosecution witness which would, in turn, obstruct the capacity of the Prosecution to prepare and present these witnesses and of the Judges of Trial Panel II to evaluate their testimony.

As those targeted for obstruction included Judges and Prosecutors, the aggravated form of the offence, pursuant to Article 401(5) of the Kosovo Criminal Code, is charged, and Mr. Thaci

is also charged as the leader or organiser of each of the groups, pursuant to Article 401(3).

Mr. Thaci is also alleged to have disclosed confidential information to his visitors about witnesses, thus violating the secrecy of proceedings pursuant to Article 392(1) of the Kosovo Criminal Code. Some of that disclosure concerned a protected witness, Witness 4, for which Mr. Thaci is charged pursuant to Article 392(2).

For these disclosures and for seeking to communicate with Prosecution witness indirectly through his visitors, Mr. Thaci is also charged with contempt of court pursuant to Article 393.

Mr. Fazliu, Mr. Smakaj, and Mr. Kilaj are charged with having participated in the common action of a group to obstruct official persons in performing official duties by conveying Mr. Thaci's instructions to the witnesses. They are also alleged to have assisted or agreed to this common action.

Additionally, they are charged with assisting Mr. Thaci's contempt of court.

Mr. Kuci, who was at the relevant time a member of the Defence team of one of the other accused in Case 06, is charged with contempt of court for having sent a message to a Prosecution witness on 12 April 2023 in violation of the applicable court order, and, secondly, agreeing during a non-privileged visit to Mr. Thaci in September 2023 to convey instructions to three Prosecution witnesses.

This case file was transferred to me from the Pre-Trial Judge on

12 November 2025. The trial commenced with opening statements on 27 February 2026. Evidentiary hearings were closed on 5 August 2026, with closing statements heard on the 10th, 11th, and 14th of September, 2026. The evidence of nine witnesses was heard or received during trial; three for the Prosecution, and six for the Defence.

Other categories of evidence admitted included audio recordings, telecommunications data and messages, detention centre computer and printer records, and other documentary evidence. A total of 241 Prosecution exhibits and 163 Defence exhibits were admitted into evidence.

The main evidence against the accused in this case are audio recordings of five visits between Mr. Thaci and his co-accused at the detention centre. Those audio recordings were judicially authorised. They are almost entirely in Albanian, and an initial transcription and translation of those audio recordings was produced by the Prosecution as required by the Decision on Working Language issued by the Pre-Trial Judge in December 2024.

The Defence vigorously challenges the reliability of the transcription and translation of these audio recordings. Expert evidence from a forensic linguist was presented by the Defence to the effect that the quality of the audio recordings is so low that the Defence could not identify material errors in their transcription.

The Defence's position, and of the expert, was that the audio recordings needed to be re-transcribed in their entirety *de novo* by

neutral transcribers whose knowledge of the case would be limited to what would was specifically provided to them.

I am not persuaded, for the reasons set out in the judgment, that the *inter partes* dispute resolution procedure did not provide the Defence an adequate opportunity to challenge the reliability of the Prosecution's transcriptions and translations. In particular, I do not accept the opinion of the Defence expert, who speaks no Albanian and was not assisted by an Albanian speaker in preparing her report, that the audio recordings are of such a low quality that the Defence could not have identified material errors and raised them with the Court's impartial Language Services Unit. Nor do I accept that once raised, the LSU would have been unable to competently evaluate any such alleged errors. This is the standard procedure before this and other courts dealing with substantial volumes of audio recordings and other evidential material that require translation, and it was not challenged by the Defence throughout the pre-trial phase of proceedings.

Accordingly, the transcripts of those audio recordings and their translation have been relied upon as a reliable record of what was said during those visits.

Challenges were also raised by the Defence to the accuracy of the Prosecution's attribution of words to different speakers during those visits. The Prosecution's speaker attributions have not been accorded any evidential weight as such. Sufficient portions of the audio recordings could be reliably attributed by the Single Judge

based on content alone to differentiate the voices of the speakers throughout each audio recording.

The visits of Mr. Fazliu and Mr. Kuci involved, for the most part, only two speakers; the visit of Mr. Kilaj only three speakers; and one of the two visits of Mr. Smakaj also only three speakers. The exercise did not, therefore, require voice identification against a large number of speakers, let alone the population at large.

I will now discuss the factual findings in relation to each of the visits that are the basis of the charges in chronological order, starting with that of Mr. Fazliu on 2 July 2023.

Mr. Thaci and Mr. Fazliu are charged in Counts 1 and 16, respectively, with attempted obstruction of official duties pursuant to Article 401(2). Mr. Thaci is also charged in Counts 4 and 8 for disclosure of confidential information and contempt of court. Mr. Fazliu is charged in Count 17 with assisting Mr. Thaci's contempt.

It is not disputed that Mr. Fazliu visited Mr. Thaci at the detention centre on 2 July 2023. Mr. Thaci and Mr. Fazliu discuss at some length the imminent testimony of Prosecution Witness Rrustem Mustafa. Mr. Thaci describes Mr. Mustafa as being very decisive and gives Mr. Fazliu a series of messages concerning both the style and the content of his testimony. These messages include, for example, and I quote, "Tell him, be brief, be brief, be brief. Be brief." And, "Tell him do not philosophise." And, "Tell him they have a lot of trust in you, and they can't wait for you to

come because you are decisive and can settle this."

Mr. Thaci then provides guidance on the testimony that he expects from Mr. Mustafa, including that: "You were in charge of that area from the main road"; that "the boss was Demaci"; that he was unhappy because the General Staff "did not help me, they did not help me neither with money or logistics nor with weapons, and I was unhappy"; that "he appointed the military police. There was no SHIK," national intelligence service, "during the war at all."

Mr. Thaci tells Mr. Fazliu repeatedly that he must write down these messages, expressing concern that Mr. Fazliu would forget them. Indicating that these were not mere reminiscences about the war amongst old friends but instructions for onward transmission.

Mr. Thaci warns Mr. Fazliu that, "They will ask him, 'Has anyone called you?'"

This reference to "they" is just one of many examples of Mr. Thaci referring to Prosecution officials and their duties, demonstrating his awareness of how his instructions would impact on and obstruct the official duties of official persons responsible for presenting and assessing witnesses against him in Case 06.

When Mr. Thaci warns Mr. Fazliu not to put himself at risk, Mr. Fazliu proposes that his son Fahri make contact with Mr. Mustafa on the pretext of discussing a reconciliation process related to a recent shooting incident involving friends of the Fazliu and Mustafa families. This reconciliation process may well have been one of the genuine purposes of a meeting between Mr. Fazliu, Fahri, and

Mr. Mustafa on 29 June 2023, prior to Mr. Fazliu's visit. However, Mr. Fazliu's description of that meeting to Mr. Thaci indicates that they also discussed Mr. Mustafa's upcoming testimony before the Court and, in that context, that Mr. Mustafa was willing to receive messages from Mr. Thaci.

The pretextual nature of the reconciliation process is underscored by the fact that the messages conveyed by Mr. Thaci to Mr. Fazliu during the 2 July visit do not concern a reconciliation process but only Mr. Mustafa's anticipated testimony.

The next day, after Mr. Fazliu had returned to Prishtine, and just as contemplated by Mr. Thaci and Mr. Fazliu the day before, Fahri Fazliu reached out to Mr. Mustafa by text message. The text messages show Fahri Fazliu arranging a meeting for himself and his father with Mr. Mustafa and then arriving at the location of their meeting.

Careful consideration has been given, as set out in the judgment, as to whether Fahri Fazliu set up that meeting knowing his father's purpose and intending to participate in the common obstructive action. Considering all the circumstances as more fully set out in the judgment, the inference can safely be drawn that Fahri Fazliu was aware of that purpose.

The form of obstruction alleged in this case is not actual obstruction but attempted obstruction. An attempt takes place, pursuant to Article 28 of the Kosovo Criminal Code, when a person takes action toward the commission of an offence. That threshold was

reached as soon as Fahri Fazliu reached out to Mr. Mustafa on 3 July 2023 and was substantially surpassed once, as the circumstantial evidence establishes, Mr. Thaci's instructions were conveyed to Mr. Mustafa during that meeting.

I am satisfied that the attempted obstruction targeted Prosecutors and Judges involved in the Case 06 proceedings, pursuant to Article 401(5), and that Mr. Thaci was the leader and organiser of the group, pursuant to Article 401(3).

Accordingly, Mr. Thaci and Mr. Fazliu are found beyond reasonable doubt to have attempted by common action to obstruct official duties of official persons as charged in Counts 1 and 16, respectively. Mr. Thaci also committed contempt for his conduct as charged in Count 8, and Mr. Fazliu is found to have assisted this contempt under Count 17.

During the 2 July visit, Mr. Thaci also revealed confidential information about several Case 06 Prosecution witnesses. On the basis of these disclosures, I find beyond reasonable doubt that Mr. Thaci violated the secrecy of proceedings and committed contempt of court as charged in Counts 4 and 8, respectively. However, I am not satisfied that Mr. Fazliu assisted these disclosures, which were accomplished as soon as the disclosures occurred.

I address now the visits of Mr. Smakaj to Mr. Thaci on 9 September and 7 October 2023.

Mr. Thaci and Mr. Smakaj are charged in Counts 2 and 12 respectively, with attempted obstruction of official duties by common

action pursuant to 401(2). Mr. Thaci is also charged in Counts 5 and 10 for violating secrecy of proceedings and contempt through revealing confidential information and breaching the prohibition on contact with Prosecution witnesses.

Mr. Smakaj is charged in Count 13 with assisting Mr. Thaci's contempt.

Mr. Thaci refers to Case 06 Prosecution Witness Bislim Zyrapi by name repeatedly during the first of these visits, going beyond expressions of hope as to how he will testify to expressing imperative instructions that should be conveyed to him. For example, Mr. Thaci says, and here I quote:

"And do not mix up things, man. Do not mix it up. What? What provisional government? Ambition. What intelligence service, man? He has to remove it. There was ambition but they had zones under their command. Commanders, commanders, commanders, commanders. Remove November. There was not staff. They went overseas. This is what the documents say, too. And tell him, simplify it, don't get mixed up. Don't get mixed up, man. Don't talk about how it should have been. Don't talk about how the Bosnian and Yugoslavian armies were set up on paper, because he theorises a lot. Tell him you could not. All the villagers were volunteers."

Passages from the 9 September visit indicate that Mr. Thaci expects these instructions to be communicated by Mr. Smakaj. However, the audio recordings alone, given the extent to which the relevant exchanges are marked "indiscernible," are insufficient to

conclude that Mr. Smakaj agreed to do so during that visit.

When Mr. Smakaj returns on 7 October, this time with only one other visitor, he indicates that he had been in touch with Mr. Zyrapi. He reports that Mr. Zyrapi requests further explanations regarding certain aspects of his testimony. This then triggers a detailed discussion of instructions to be communicated to Mr. Zyrapi, which appears to involve Mr. Thaci and Mr. Smakaj referring to a written document.

Based on what can be heard, it is apparent that either Mr. Smakaj or Mr. Behrami, who was the third visitor, intend to take that document out of the detention centre with them.

On 30 October 2023, Mr. Smakaj's residence was searched and a document was retrieved which, by its content, appears to be a set of instructions for Mr. Zyrapi. For reasons more fully addressed in the judgment, the Prosecution has adequately established that the document was seized from Mr. Smakaj's residence.

Digital evidence from the computer available to Mr. Thaci in his cell at the detention centre establishes that he saved, in digital form, a document identical to that found in Mr. Smakaj's residence two days before Mr. Smakaj's second visit.

The last sentence should end with the word "residence." I'm sorry, let me repeat that phrase.

Digital evidence from the computer available to Mr. Thaci in his cell at the detention centre establishes that he saved, in digital form, a document identical to that found in Mr. Smakaj's residence

two days before Mr. Smakaj's second visit.

On the basis of the digital and circumstantial evidence more fully set out in the judgment, the only reasonable inference is that the document seized from Mr. Smakaj's residence was printed by Mr. Thaci at the detention centre on 7 October 2023.

Telephone records show that Mr. Smakaj and Mr. Zyrapi were in contact between the two visits and shortly after the 7 October visit. Based on circumstantial and telecommunications evidence, I am satisfied that Mr. Smakaj met Mr. Zyrapi on 24 October 2023 and conveyed instructions to him about his upcoming testimony as had been discussed at length with Mr. Thaci during the 7 October visit.

As to whether any third person was involved in the common obstructive action, which is a requirement of Article 401(2) of the Kosovo Criminal Code, Mr. Behrami, who visited Mr. Thaci with Mr. Smakaj on both occasions, deliberately speaks over a whispered conversation between Mr. Thaci and Mr. Smakaj during the 9 September visit in a manner that indicates a conscious effort of concealment. He also encouraged the removal of the document from the detention centre during the 7 October visit. This conduct is sufficient to qualify him as a participant in the obstructive action.

I am also satisfied that the attempted obstruction targeted Prosecutors and Judges pursuant to the aggravated form of the offence under Article 401(5), and that Mr. Thaci was the leader and organiser of the group pursuant to Article 401(3). Accordingly, Mr. Thaci and Mr. Smakaj are found beyond reasonable doubt to have attempted by

common action to obstruct official persons in performing official duties as charged in Counts 2 and 12.

Through these acts, Mr. Thaci committed contempt for his conduct as charged in Count 10, and Mr. Smakaj assisted this contempt under Count 13.

Mr. Thaci also revealed confidential information relating to five other Prosecution witnesses during the 9 September and 7 October visits, thus violating the secrecy of proceedings as charged in Count 5 and committing contempt of court as charged in Count 10.

However, I am not satisfied that Mr. Smakaj assisted these disclosures, which were accomplished as soon as they occurred.

Mr. Kilaj visited Mr. Thaci at the detention centre on 6 October 2023 together with Mr. Kryeziu. Mr. Thaci gave detailed instructions to Mr. Kilaj about how Witness 4, a protected Prosecution witness, should testify. Mr. Kilaj appears to agree during that visit that he would convey these instructions to Witness 4.

Mr. Thaci refers to two prior statements of Witness 4 during the 6 October visit in such a way that suggests that the two statements were in front of him and Mr. Kilaj as they discussed the instructions.

Those two prior statements of Witness 4 were seized during a search of Mr. Kilaj's residence in Prishtine on 2 November 2023. Digital evidence indicates that Mr. Thaci reviewed these documents on his computer just before Mr. Kilaj's visit and staged them for

printing.

There is no reasonable doubt, given all the digital and circumstantial evidence, as well as the direct evidence from the audio recording, that Mr. Thaci gave these prior statements of Witness 4 to Mr. Kilaj during the 6 October visit and that Mr. Kilaj removed them from the detention centre.

However, the evidence does not establish that the third visitor during the 6 October visit, Mr. Kryeziu, participated in the common obstructive action. Mr. Kryeziu does not appear to speak over conversations between Mr. Thaci and Mr. Kilaj for the purpose of concealment, nor encourage the obstructive action, nor otherwise appear to play any role whatsoever. No evidence suggests that Mr. Thaci or Mr. Kilaj expected Mr. Kryeziu to play any such role either during or after the 6 October visit. Furthermore, the evidence does not show that Mr. Kilaj took any steps subsequent to the 6 October visit to make contact with Witness 4.

In these circumstances, I am not satisfied that the requirements for the attempted form of the offence are met nor that the requirements of agreement or assistance are met. Accordingly, I do not find that Mr. Thaci and Mr. Kilaj attempted by common action to obstruct official persons in performing official duties as charged in Counts 13 and 14.

Mr. Thaci did, however, reveal confidential information about six Prosecution witnesses to Mr. Kilaj and Mr. Kryeziu during the visit, including the identity of Witness 4 as a protected Prosecution

witness and his confidential prior statements. For this conduct, I find beyond reasonable doubt that Mr. Thaci violated the secrecy of proceedings and committed contempt of court as charged in Counts 6, 7, and 11.

However, I am not satisfied that Mr. Kilaj assisted these disclosures, which were accomplished as soon as they occurred.

Mr. Kuci is charged with two counts of contempt of court, the first of which relates to sending a message to Mr. Mustafa after his appearance on a television programme commenting on the merits of the case against Mr. Thaci in Case 06. The message reads, and I quote:

"Friend, I congratulate you for your professionalism, for your clear ideas about the country and the war, and for your courage. Bravo."

As innocuous as this message might seem, Mr. Kuci was, at the time, a member of one of the other Case 06 Defence teams and, as such, was prohibited by judicial order from contacting any Prosecution witness. This message could not have been sent, especially given the content of the television programme, without Mr. Kuci being aware that he was reaching out to a Prosecution witness, nor is this accepted to be an act of minor significance within the meaning of Article 11 of the Kosovo Criminal Code, which, in any event, is found inapplicable.

For this conduct, I find beyond reasonable doubt that Mr. Kuci committed contempt of court as charged in Count 19.

Mr. Kuci and Mr. Thaci are also charged for contempt under

Counts 9 and 18 for having agreed that Mr. Kuci would contact three Case 06 Prosecution witnesses on Mr. Thaci's behalf regarding how each should testify during a non-privileged visit at the detention centre. The evidence does not establish, however, that any substantial act was taken towards the commission of the offence.

Accordingly, I am not satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that Mr. Kuci committed this offence as charged under Count 18 or that Mr. Thaci committed this offence as charged under Count 9.

I turn now to sentencing.

The sentencing range for attempted obstruction by common action is one to five years, pursuant to Article 401(3) and 401(5) of the Kosovo Criminal Code; up to three years for revealing information about a protected witness, pursuant to Article 392(2); up to one year for revealing other confidential information, pursuant to Article 392(1); and up to six months for contempt, pursuant to Article 393(1).

These ranges, especially in the aggravated forms under Article 401(3) and (5), already speak to the inherent gravity of the offences that have been committed in this case. Obstruction of official duties relating to ongoing trial proceedings are an attack on the integrity of the judicial system which is an essential foundation of the rule of law. The factors enumerated in Articles 69, 70, and 71 of the Kosovo Criminal Code have been applied and balanced in arriving at an appropriate sentence.

Ultimately, the overarching objective is to arrive at a single

sentence proportional to the gravity of the offences as committed by the convicted person. While the sentencing practice in Kosovo courts for offences under 401 has been carefully considered, many of those cases involve circumstances very different from the present case.

The factors that are taken into consideration in arriving at appropriate sentences, as more fully differentiated in light of the roles of each accused as set out in the judgment, are: The fact that obstruction of official persons was to be achieved through interference with Prosecution witnesses; the comprehensive nature of some of the instructions communicated; and the degree of planning and premeditation in respect of those instructions; the particular risks that arose from the disclosure of Witness 4's information, including by doing so in written form; the absence of any threats, coercion, inducements, or intimidation; and the relatively limited scope of the offending.

The sentences imposed shall, for reasons more fully set out in the judgment, not run concurrent with any sentence imposed by any other Kosovo court in relation to unrelated charges, including those in Case 06, nor shall credit be given for time spent in detention pursuant to an arrest warrant on different charges.

I shall now read out the dispositions and, as applicable, sentences, each of which is issued in the name of the people of Kosovo pursuant to Rule 159(2) of the Rules.

Mr. Hashim Thaci, please stand.

I find you guilty of attempted obstruction of official persons

in performing official duties by common action, pursuant to Article 401(2), (3), and (5), as charged in Counts 1 and 2; guilty of violating the secrecy of proceedings, pursuant to Article 392(1) and (2), as charged in Counts 4, 5, 6, and 7; and guilty of contempt of court, pursuant to Article 393(1), as charged in Counts 8, 10, and 11.

I find you not guilty of attempted obstruction of official persons as charged in Count 3; and not guilty of contempt of court as charged in Count 9.

For the offences of which you are convicted, you are hereby sentenced to a single sentence of 17 months of imprisonment.

You may be seated.

THE ACCUSED THACI: [Microphone not activated].

JUDGE GOSNELL: Mr. Bashkim Smakaj, please stand.

Mr. Smakaj, I find you guilty of attempted obstruction of official persons in performing official duties by common action pursuant to Article 401(2) and (5) and as charged in Count 12; and guilty of contempt of court, pursuant to Article 393, as charged in Count 13.

For these offences, you are hereby sentenced to a single sentence of 12 months of imprisonment. As you have already spent more than this period in detention on the basis of the arrest warrant against you in this case, your sentence is served and you will be discharged at the conclusion of this hearing. Any conditions of release previously issued in this case are hereby terminated, and the

Registry shall arrange for an expeditious return of your financial security.

Mr. Smakaj, you may be seated.

Mr. Kilaj, please stand.

I find you, Mr. Kilaj, not guilty of attempted obstruction of official persons in performing official duties by common action, pursuant to Article 401(2) and (5), as charged in Count 14; and not guilty of contempt as charged in Count 15.

You will be discharged at the conclusion of this hearing, and any conditions of release are hereby terminated. The Registry shall arrange for an expeditious return of your financial security.

You may be seated.

Mr. Fadil Fazliu, please stand.

Mr. Fazliu, I find you guilty of attempted obstruction of official persons in performing official duties by common action, pursuant to Article 401(2) and (5), as charged in Count 16; and guilty of contempt of court pursuant to Article 393 and as charged in Count 17.

For these offences, you are hereby sentenced to a single sentence of 12 months' imprisonment. As you have already spent more than this period in detention on the basis of the arrest warrant in this case, your sentence is served and you will be discharged at the conclusion of this hearing. Any conditions of release previously issued in this case are hereby terminated, and the Registry shall arrange for an expeditious return of your financial security.

You may be seated.

Mr. Kuci, please stand.

Mr. Kuci, I find you not guilty of contempt of court pursuant to Article 393 and as charged in Count 18; and guilty of contempt of court pursuant to Article 393 and as charged in Count 19.

For that offence, you are given a suspended sentence of imprisonment for one month, to be discharged after one year if you do not commit during that period any other offence under the Kosovo Criminal Code. Any conditions previously issued in this case against you are hereby terminated.

You may be seated.

The trial judgment will now be distributed by the Registry to the parties in electronic form, and certified copies of the English versions shall be served on the accused through counsel.

THE COURT OFFICER: Your Honour, the confidential trial judgment has now been notified electronically to the relevant and authorised recipients.

JUDGE GOSNELL: As the judgment is confidential, the copies now served on Mr. Smakaj, Mr. Kilaj, Mr. Fazliu, and Mr. Kuci shall stay with their respective counsel. Arrangements will be made for them to be able to consult the judgment on the premises after this hearing. The Albanian version shall be served once it is ready, and a public redacted version of this judgment shall be issued in due course.

Court is adjourned.

--- Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 10.44 a.m.