



United Nations  
Nations Unies



International  
Criminal Tribunal  
for the Former  
Yugoslavia

Court  
Management and  
Support Services  
Section

Tribunal Pénal  
International pour  
l'ex-Yougoslavie

Section des  
Services  
d'administration et  
d'appui judiciaire

A 8

<b>CASE/AFFAIRE NO.</b>	IT-95-5/18-AR73.12 (R. KARADŽIĆ)	<b>DATE</b>	05 September 2013
-------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------------

<b>FROM/DE</b>	RAM DORAISWAMY, COURT OFFICER
----------------	-------------------------------

<b>TO/A</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> President/Président	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosecutor/Procureur	<input type="checkbox"/> Defense Counsel/Conseil de la Défense
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice President/Vice-Président		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeals Chamber/ Chambre d'appel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Manager/ Commis aux affaires	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Self-representing Accused/ Accusé assurant lui-même sa défense MR. R. KARADŽIĆ (1)
<input type="checkbox"/> Trial Chamber I/ Chambre de 1ère instance I		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal Advisers/ Conseillers juridiques MR. P. ROBINSON MR. M. SLADOJEVIĆ MR. A. STEVANOVIĆ
<input type="checkbox"/> Trial Chamber II/ Chambre de 1ère instance II		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standby Counsel MR. R. HARVEY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trial Chamber III/ Chambre de 1ère instance III (FOR INFO)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Embassy/Ambassade		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro Se Legal Liaison Officer/Juriste chargé de la liaison avec l'accusé MS. V. TASEVA		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other/Autre		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Registrar/Deputy Registrar/Greffier/Greffier adjoint	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VWS Coordinator/Coordinateur de la SVT	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Senior Legal Officer/Juriste hors-classe SLO AC MS. N. GUIBERT (FOR INFO)	<input type="checkbox"/> UNDU / QPNU	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communications Service/Service Communication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OLAD	

**PLEASE FIND ATTACHED/VEUILLEZ TROUVER CI-JOINT**

<input type="checkbox"/> Order/Warrant/Decision issued by Appeals Chamber or Trial Chamber or a Judge on/ Ordonnance/Mandat/Décision émis(e) par la Chambre d'appel ou les Chambres de 1ère instance ou un Juge le ___/___/___
<input type="checkbox"/> Order/Decision issued by the President on/Ordonnance/Décision émise par le Président le ___/___/___
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Motion/Request/Application submitted by Prosecution/Defence Counsel/Accused/Third party on Motion/Requête/Demande présentée par l'Accusation/le Conseil de la défense/ Accusé le <u>05/09/2013</u> <b>CERTIFIED APPEAL</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Response/Reply/Brief submitted by Prosecution/Defence Counsel/Accused on/Third party on Réponse/Réplique/Mémoire présenté(e) par l'Accusation/le Conseil de la défense/ Accusé le ___/___/___
<input type="checkbox"/> Decision of the Registrar on/Décision du Greffier le ___/___/___
<input type="checkbox"/> Other/Autre

<b>RECEIVED/RECU</b>	<b>FILED/ENREGISTRE</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Office hours/heures ouvrables Date: <b>05/09/2013</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Office hours/heures ouvrables Date: <b>05/09/2013</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Outside Office hours/en dehors des heures ouvrables Date: ___/___/___ Time/Heure: ___h___	<input type="checkbox"/> Outside Office hours/en dehors des heures ouvrables Date: ___/___/___ Time/Heure: ___h___

For guidelines regarding filing procedures, please see the Directive for the Court Management and Support Services Section Judicial Services Section Registry, IT/121/Rev.2, Part XI: Provision of Documents.  
Pour les procédures concernant le dépôt des documents, voir la Directive relative à la Section d'administration et d'appui judiciaire, Services judiciaires, Greffe, IT/121/Rev.2, Titre XI: Communication des documents.

Churchillplein 1, 2517 JW The Hague. P.O. Box 13888, 2501 EW The Hague. Netherlands  
Churchillplein 1, 2517 JW La Haye. B.P. 13888, 2501 La Haye. Pays-Bas  
Tel.: 31-70-512 5738 Or 512 8751 Fax: 31-70-512 8558

**Notice of confidentiality applicable to fax**

This facsimile transmission contains United Nations proprietary information that is strictly confidential and/or legally privileged, and is intended solely for the use of officials of the United Nations and/or the named recipient hereof. Any unauthorized disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of the information herein is strictly prohibited. If you have erroneously received this facsimile transmission, please notify the United Nations immediately.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL  
FOR THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

CASE No. IT-95-5/18-AR73.12

IN THE APPEALS CHAMBER

Before: A bench of the Appeals Chamber

Registrar: Mr. John Hocking

Date: 5 September 2013

THE PROSECUTOR

v.

RADOVAN KARADZIC

*Public*

---

CERTIFIED APPEAL OF DECISION ON REMAND  
OF COUNT ONE

---

The Office of the Prosecutor:  
Mr. Alan Tieger  
Ms. Hildegard Uertz-Retzlaff

The Accused:  
Dr. Radovan Karadzic

1. Dr. Radovan Karadzic hereby appeals, with certification, from that portion of the Trial Chamber's *Decision on Accused's Motion to Sever Count One and for Suspension of Defence Case* (2 August 2013) which held that:

In the Chamber's view, the Appeal Judgement is unequivocal in making a final determination on the Rule 98 *bis* Ruling. With this understanding, the Chamber therefore considers that the Appeals Chamber did not direct it to consider the Accused's motion for acquittal anew when it remanded "the matter for further action consistent with this Judgement". Instead, the Chamber was simply instructed to take necessary and appropriate action with regard to the defence case, with Count 1 having been reinstated.<sup>1</sup>

2. Dr. Karadzic contends that the Trial Chamber failed to comply with the instructions of the Appeals Chamber in its *Judgement*. He requests that the Trial Chamber's decision be reversed.

#### **Procedural History**

3. On 11 July 2013, the Appeals Chamber issued its *Judgement* in this case, reversing the Trial Chamber's acquittal of Dr. Radovan Karadzic, reinstating Count One of the Indictment, and remanding the matter to the Trial Chamber for further action consistent with the *Judgement*.<sup>2</sup>

4. Following the judgement, Dr. Karadzic filed a *Motion to Sever Count One*. In that motion, Dr. Karadzic contended that the *Judgement* had reversed findings of the Trial Chamber on two aspects of the *actus reus* of genocide and one aspect of *mens rea*, reinstated Count One, and remanded the matter for the Trial Chamber to decide the Motion for Judgement of Acquittal anew, in light of the guidance provided in the *Judgement*.<sup>3</sup>

5. Dr. Karadzic found support for his interpretation of the *Judgement* from two aspects of its reasoning.

6. First, in declining to address the prosecution's ground of appeal concerning alternative modes of liability under Count One, the Appeals Chamber said that "the relevant analysis, including the analysis of the remaining modes of liability, will necessarily be reconsidered by the Trial Chamber in light of the present Judgement."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> para. 14

<sup>2</sup> *Judgement* at para. 117

<sup>3</sup> *Motion to Sever Count One* (16 July 2013) at paras. 7-11

<sup>4</sup> *Judgement* at para. 107

7. Second, in declining to address Dr. Karadzic's principal contention that there was no confluence of *actus reus* and *mens rea* and therefore no genocide in the municipalities of Bosnia in 1992, the Appeals Chamber said that having reversed findings of the Trial Chamber on genocidal intent, serious bodily harm, and conditions of life calculated to destroy, "it would be premature for the Appeals Chamber to consider Karadzic's submissions."<sup>5</sup>

8. In the *Prosecution Response to Karadzic's Motion to Sever*, the prosecution put forth a different interpretation of the *Judgement*. It contended that the Appeals Chamber decided the Motion for Judgement of Acquittal itself, denying the motion, and that the references to further action pertain to the decision on Count One to be made by the Trial Chamber in connection with the final judgement.<sup>6</sup>

9. Dr. Karadzic filed a *Motion for Clarification* with the Appeals Chamber on 22 July 2013 requesting that the Appeals Chamber clarify the disposition of the *Judgement*. The prosecution filed its *Prosecution Response to Karadzic Motion for Clarification and Request for Urgent Relief* on 23 July 2013. On 1 August 2013, the Appeals Chamber denied the motion.<sup>7</sup>

10. On 2 August 2013, the Trial Chamber issued the Impugned Decision, interpreting the *Judgement* as having denied the Motion for Judgement of Acquittal on Count One and leaving it no discretion to further consider the motion.<sup>8</sup> The Trial Chamber ordered the trial to resume on 28 October 2013 including Count One.

11. On 7 August 2013, Dr. Karadzic filed a direct appeal of the decision<sup>9</sup> as well as an application to the Trial Chamber for certification to appeal the Impugned Decision.<sup>10</sup>

12. On 9 August 2013, the prosecution responded to the appeal.<sup>11</sup> Dr. Karadzic replied on 13 August 2013.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> *Judgement* at para. 112

<sup>6</sup> *Prosecution Response to Karadzic's Motion to Sever* (19 July 2013) at paras. 2-6

<sup>7</sup> *Decision on Motion for Clarification* (1 August 2013)

<sup>8</sup> *Decision on Accused's Motion to Sever Count One and for Suspension of Defence Case* (2 August 2013)

<sup>9</sup> *Appeal of Decision on Remand of Count One* (7 August 2013)

<sup>10</sup> *Application for Certification to Appeal Decision on Remand of Count One* (7 August 2013)

<sup>11</sup> *Prosecution Response to Karadzic's Appeal of Decision on Remand of Count One* (9 August 2013)

<sup>12</sup> *Reply Brief: Appeal of Decision on Remand of Count One* (13 August 2013)

13. The prosecution opposed certification to appeal.<sup>13</sup> However, on 3 September 2013, the Trial Chamber granted certification.<sup>14</sup>

14. This certified appeal repeats the arguments made in the direct appeal, omitting the discussion of jurisdiction. However, Dr. Karadzic urges the Appeals Chamber to decide the issue of whether an appeal of right lies from a Trial Chamber's interpretation of the Appeals Chamber's instructions.

### **The Merits**

15. There is little point in arguing over whether the Appeals Chamber intended to deny the Motion for Judgement of Acquittal on Count One or intended that the Trial Chamber reconsider the motion in light of the guidance provided in the Appeals Chamber's *Judgement*. The Appeals Chamber knows what it intended,

16. From Dr. Karadzic's perspective, the grounds upon which he claimed that he should be acquitted on Count One have not been addressed by the Appeals Chamber's *Judgement*.

17. Before the Trial Chamber, Dr. Karadzic's Legal Advisor Peter Robinson argued that:

Genocide is not simply the sum of killings on the one hand, the *actus reus*, and expressions such as the Muslims should disappear on the other hand, that being part of *mens rea*, but instead genocide is a confluence of those acts and intent so that the killings can be said to be committed not only because of hatred or revenge but with the special intent to actually destroy the group or a significant part thereof.<sup>15</sup>

18. Dr. Karadzic never disputed before the Trial Chamber that there was evidence which, at its highest, could establish the element of *actus reus* of genocide, such as killings. He never disputed before the Trial Chamber that there were statements which, at their highest, could establish the element of *mens rea* or genocidal intent. His point was that the acts which occurred were not the product of the expressions from which one could infer genocidal intent.

19. In its decision on the Motion for Judgement of Acquittal, the Trial Chamber came to the same conclusion. It held that:

---

<sup>13</sup> *Prosecution Response to Karadzic's Application for Certification to Appeal Decision on Remand of Count One* (9 August 2013)

<sup>14</sup> *Decision on the Accused's Application for Certification to Appeal Count One* (3 September 2013)

<sup>15</sup> T28570

The Chamber has heard evidence of culpable acts systematically directed against Bosnian Muslims and/or Bosnian Croats in the municipalities and of the repetition of discriminatory acts and derogatory language. However, the nature, scale, and context of these culpable acts, be it in all the municipalities covered by the indictment or the seven municipalities in which genocide is specifically alleged, do not reach the level from which a reasonable trier of fact could infer that they were committed with genocidal intent.<sup>16</sup>

the Chamber finds that notwithstanding the statements of the accused, there is no evidence upon which, if accepted, a reasonable trier of fact could find that the acts of killing, serious bodily or mental harm, and conditions of life inflicted on the Bosnian Muslims and/or Bosnian Croats were perpetrated with the *dolus specialis* required for genocide.<sup>17</sup>

20. In responding to the prosecution's appeal, Dr. Karadzic again conceded that there was evidence from which both the *actus reus* and *mens rea* of genocide could separately be inferred, but that there was no evidence that the acts were the product of genocidal intent. In a section of his brief entitled "Genocidal Rhetoric but no Genocide", Dr. Karadzic contended that the Trial Chamber had correctly concluded that notwithstanding expressions which at their highest could satisfy the requirement of genocidal intent, the acts in the municipalities were not carried out with that intent. He stated that:

The Trial Chamber acknowledged the existence of the *actus reus* of killings and infliction of serious harm, and the existence of statements that the Muslims should disappear. However, it recognized that genocide is the *confluence* of *actus reus* and *mens rea*, where such acts and statements are not viewed in isolation, but are viewed in their totality to determine if the prohibited acts were committed with the intent to destroy the group.<sup>18</sup>

21. At the Appeals Hearing, Dr. Karadzic's Legal Advisor Peter Robinson once again conceded that there was evidence from which the *actus reus* and *mens rea* of genocide could separately be inferred, but that the acts were not the product of an intent to destroy the group.

22. Mr. Robinson argued:

The Prosecution says we have *actus reus* and we have *mens rea* and therefore we have genocide. The fallacy behind that is that genocide is

---

<sup>16</sup> T28768

<sup>17</sup> T28769

<sup>18</sup> *Respondent's Brief* (5 November 2012) at para. 233

the confluence of those two ingredients, not the mere existence of two separate elements.

In his book "Unimaginable Atrocities," Professor Schabas explained the words *mens rea* and *actus reus* come from a Latin maxim that holds there to be no punishable act that is not the result of a guilty mind. An act that is not the result of a guilty mind is not a crime. And just because you have evidence of *actus reus* and *mens rea* does not mean you have a genocide. There has to be a result. The act has to result from the *mens rea* or from the intent.

I can have a loaf of bread, I can have a package of ham, I don't have a ham sandwich. There has to be a confluence in order for you to have a genocide.<sup>19</sup>

23. In its Judgement, the Appeals Chamber found that the Trial Chamber had erred in its assessments of the *actus reus* and the *mens rea*. But it only addressed Dr. Karadzic's argument as follows:

As an initial matter, the Appeals Chamber finds unconvincing Karadzic's assertion that the Trial Chamber's decision to acquit him of genocide in the Municipalities was premised on the lack of a confluence between killings and other harmful acts against Bosnian Muslims and/or Bosnian Croats and genocidal intent. The Judgement of Acquittal was based on the Trial Chamber's separate findings, *inter alia*, that Karadzic and other alleged members of the JCE did not possess genocidal intent and that no evidence on the record indicated that Bosnian Muslims and/or Bosnian Croats suffered serious bodily or mental harm or conditions of life calculated to destroy. In any event, the Appeals Chamber recalls again that it has reversed the Trial Chamber's findings with respect to genocidal intent, serious bodily or mental harm, and conditions of life calculated to destroy. **In this context, it would be premature for the Appeals Chamber to consider Karadzic's submissions regarding the confluence between genocidal intent and the alleged genocidal acts.**<sup>20</sup> (emphasis added)

24. Dr. Karadzic believes that the Appeals Chamber, having reversed the Trial Chamber's findings with respect to genocidal intent, serious bodily or mental harm and conditions of life calculated to destroy, reinstated Count One and put the parties back where they were before the Trial Chamber granted the motion for judgement of acquittal. The Trial Chamber then had the duty to decide the motion consistent with the Trial Chamber's judgement. By failing to do this, the Trial Chamber erred.

---


<sup>19</sup> T41

<sup>20</sup> *Judgement* (11 July 2013) at para. 112

25. Dr. Karadzic respectfully requests that the Appeals Chamber reverse the Impugned Decision and direct the Trial Chamber to make a decision on the Motion for Judgement of Acquittal consistent with the Appeals Chamber's Judgement.

Word count: 2015

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Radovan Karadzic', written in a cursive style.

Radovan Karadzic