



International Tribunal for the
Prosecution of Persons
Responsible for Serious Violations
of International Humanitarian Law
Committed in the Territory of the
former Yugoslavia since 1991

Case No.: IT-95-5/18-T

Date: 18 March 2010

Original: English

IN THE TRIAL CHAMBER

Before: Judge O-Gon Kwon, Presiding Judge
Judge Howard Morrison
Judge Melville Baird
Judge Flavia Lattanzi, Reserve Judge

Registrar: Mr. John Hocking

Decision of: 18 March 2010

PROSECUTOR

v.

RADOVAN KARADŽIĆ

PUBLIC

WITH CONFIDENTIAL AND EX PARTE (THE ACCUSED) ANNEX A

**DECISION ON THE PROSECUTION'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL RULE 65 TER EXHIBIT LIST**

Office of the Prosecutor

Mr. Alan Tieger
Ms. Hildegard Uertz-Retzlaff

The Accused

Mr. Radovan Karadžić

Appointed Counsel

Mr. Richard Harvey

THIS TRIAL CHAMBER of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991 (“Tribunal”) is seised of the Prosecution’s “Motion for Leave to File a Supplemental Rule 65 *ter* Exhibit List with Confidential Appendix A, Public Appendix B and Confidential and *Ex Parte* Appendix C”, filed on 14 December 2009 (“Motion”), and hereby renders its decision thereon.

I. Background and Submissions

1. On 18 May 2009, the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”) filed its “Submission Pursuant to Rule 65 *ter* (E)(i)-(iii)” (“Initial Exhibit List”), with partly confidential Appendix III, containing a list of exhibits which it intended to offer into evidence in these proceedings. On 8 October 2009, the Trial Chamber rendered its “Decision on the Application of Rule 73 *bis*” in which it ordered the Prosecution to file a revised Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list after removing those exhibits related to the 62 witnesses removed from its witness list.¹ In compliance with this decision, the Prosecution filed the “Prosecution’s Submission of its Revised 65 *ter* Exhibit List with Confidential Appendix A” on 19 October 2009 (“Revised Exhibit List”).

2. In the Motion, the Prosecution requests the Trial Chamber’s permission to amend its Revised Exhibit List. In particular, the Prosecution seeks leave to add 737 proposed exhibits listed in Appendix A and Appendix C, and to change the Rule 65 *ter* numbers for 15 exhibits listed in Appendix B. It submits that making these changes to its exhibit list “will enable the Prosecution to present a more complete set of material relevant and probative to the allegations in the Indictment” and would not cause any prejudice to the Accused because “this request is filed well before the resumption of the trial”.²

3. According to the Prosecution, the additional proposed exhibits that it seeks to include in its exhibit list fall into at least one of six different categories: (a) items referred to in the Pre-Trial Brief, in previous motions filed pursuant to Rules 92 *bis* and 92 *quater* of the Tribunal’s Rules of Procedure and Evidence (“Rules”), or in Rule 92 *ter* submissions the Prosecution has already filed or is preparing; (b) items referred to in footnotes of reports of experts to be called by the Prosecution pursuant to Rule 94(B); (c) items obtained by the Prosecution after 18 May 2009, when it filed its Initial Exhibit List, or for which translations could be obtained only after this date; (d) other items which came to the Prosecution’s attention after the filing of the Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list on 18 May 2009; (e) items that were contained in the Revised Exhibit List but in

¹ Decision on the Application of Rule 73 *bis*, 8 October 2009, para. 10.

² Motion, para. 1.

a different version; and (f) items that were contained in the Revised Exhibit List with a different exhibit number.³ The Prosecution then gives a number of reasons for the late addition of the items falling into these categories.

4. In support of its Motion, the Prosecution asserts that it has “diligently selected only documents for addition that provide significant value related to the likely contested issues in this case, such as the Accused’s command and control over Bosnian Serb forces . . . , notice of criminal conduct to the Accused and the Accused’s participation in joint criminal enterprises”.⁴ The Prosecution further submits that all items proposed to be added have already been disclosed to the Accused.⁵

5. In his “Response to Prosecution Motion to File Supplemental Exhibit List”, filed on 21 January 2010 (“Initial Response”), the Accused claims that it is impossible for him to respond to the Motion in substance as a result of the decision of the Tribunal’s Office of Legal Aid and Detention Matters (“OLAD”) to reduce the funding of his defence team. Upon receiving additional time to respond, the Accused filed his “Second Response to Prosecution Motion to File Supplemental Exhibit List” on 11 March 2010 (“Second Response”), in which he asserts that although “the Prosecution has not shown good cause for the addition of those exhibits that were in its possession prior to the deadline for submission of the Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list—such as inadvertent omissions and its continuing analysis of material”, he “does not believe that justice would be served by precluding the prosecution from adding the documents to its exhibit list”.⁶ The Accused therefore submits that “he has no objection in principle to the motion”.⁷ However, the Accused “requests that the Trial Chamber defer its decision on the documents contained in *ex parte* Appendix C until those documents are disclosed to him”.⁸

II. Applicable Law

6. Rule 54 of the Rules is the general rule authorising a Trial Chamber to issue orders in preparation for trial. Rule 54 provides that

At the request of a party or *proprio motu*, a Judge or a Trial Chamber may issue such orders . . . as may be necessary for purposes of an investigation or for the preparation or conduct of the trial.

³ Motion, para. 7.

⁴ Motion, para. 13.

⁵ Motion, para. 14.

⁶ Second Response, para. 2.

⁷ Second Response, para. 3.

⁸ Second Response, para. 4.

7. Rule 65 *ter* (E)(iii) provides, *inter alia*, that the Prosecution shall file the list of exhibits it intends to offer within a time-limit set by the pre-trial Judge and not less than six weeks before the Pre-Trial Conference. The primary purpose of Rule 65 *ter*(E)(iii) is to ensure that the presentation of evidence during the trial is efficiently prepared, and to allow the Defence to prepare its case.⁹ If the Prosecution requests the addition of some items to its exhibit list later than six weeks before the Pre-Trial Conference, the Trial Chamber may authorise this addition in the exercise of its inherent discretion to manage the trial proceedings, and if satisfied that this is in the interests of justice.¹⁰

8. When exercising this discretion, the Trial Chamber examines whether the Prosecution has shown good cause for its request and whether the items sought to be added are relevant and of sufficient importance to justify their late addition.¹¹ The Trial Chamber may also take into account other factors which militate in favour of or against a requested addition,¹² including whether the proposed evidence is *prima facie* relevant and of probative value to the charges against an accused,¹³ the complexity of the case, on-going investigations, and translation of documents and other materials.¹⁴ Finally, the Trial Chamber must carefully balance any amendment to the Prosecution's exhibit list with an adequate protection of the rights of the accused.¹⁵ That is, the Trial Chamber must be satisfied that amendments to the exhibit list at that stage of the proceedings provide an accused sufficient notice, and do not adversely affect his ability to prepare for trial.¹⁶

9. The Chamber notes that there is a clear difference between the addition of an item to the Prosecution's list of potential exhibits pursuant to Rule 65 *ter* of the Rules and the admission of an item into evidence as an actual exhibit. By adding an item to its list of exhibits, the

⁹ *Prosecutor v. Stanišić & Simatović*, Case No. IT-03-69-T, Decision on Prosecution Motion for Leave to Amend Its Rule 65 *ter* Exhibit List (Confidential), 8 May 2008, para. 5 (“*Stanišić & Simatović* Decision”). See *Prosecutor v. Bošković & Tarčulovski*, Case No. IT-04-82-T, Decision on Prosecution's Fifth Motion to Amend Its Exhibit List and on Its Second Motion to Remove Witnesses From Its Witness List (Confidential), 20 April 2007, para. 3 (“*Bošković & Tarčulovski* Decision”).

¹⁰ *Prosecutor v. Popović et al.*, Case No. IT-05-88-AR73.1, Decision on Appeals Against Decision Admitting Material Related to Borovčanin's Questioning, 14 December 2007 (“*Popović et al.* Appeal Decision”), para. 27; *Prosecutor v. Perišić*, Case No. IT-04-81-PT, Decision on Prosecution Motion for Leave to File a Fifth Supplemental Rule 65 *ter* Exhibit List with Annex A (Confidential), 29 August 2008, para. 10 (“*Perišić* Decision”); *Prosecutor v. Dragomir Milošević*, Case No. IT-98-29/1-T, Decision on Prosecution's Third Motion for Leave to Amend Its Rule 65 *ter* Exhibit List, 23 April 2007, p. 3 (“*Dragomir Milošević* Decision”).

¹¹ *Popović et al.* Appeal Decision, para. 37; *Stanišić & Simatović* Decision, para. 6.

¹² *Stanišić & Simatović* Decision, para. 6.

¹³ *Dragomir Milošević* Decision, p. 3; *Prosecutor v. Popović et al.*, Decision on Prosecution's Motions for Leave to Amend Rule 65 *ter* Witness List and Rule 65 *ter* Exhibit List (Confidential), 6 December 2006, p. 7 (“*Popović et al.* Decision”).

¹⁴ *Popović et al.* Decision, p. 7.

¹⁵ *Stanišić & Simatović* Decision, para. 6.

¹⁶ *Dragomir Milošević* Decision, p. 3.

Prosecution gives notice to the Defence that it intends to rely on that item at trial, which will allow the Defence to prepare its case accordingly. Thus, in deciding whether to grant leave to add a particular item to the Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list the Trial Chamber need not assess its relevance and probative value in the same way as it would when determining its admission at trial. However, the Prosecution should not be granted leave to add to its list of exhibits items that are obviously irrelevant and would, therefore, ultimately be denied admission into evidence.¹⁷

III. Discussion

10. As a preliminary matter, the Trial Chamber notes that the deadline set by the Pre-trial Judge for the filing of the Prosecution's Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list was 18 May 2009. The Prosecution filed its Initial Exhibit List within this deadline, and made no motion to supplement that list until the filing of the present Motion in December 2009. Moreover, the Prosecution's Motion was filed after the Pre-Trial Conference on 6 October 2009, well after the expiry of the time-limit prescribed by Rule 65 *ter*, and indeed after the commencement of the trial itself on 26 October 2009.¹⁸

11. Nonetheless, the Chamber must take into account that the Motion was filed following the adjournment of the trial proceedings after the Prosecution's opening statement, and approximately two and a half months before the Accused's opening statement on 1 March 2010. The Accused will have had the period between the filing of the Motion and the commencement of the hearing of evidence to examine the proposed items and further prepare himself.

12. In addition to these circumstances, in determining whether the addition of the proposed exhibits is in the interests of justice, the Chamber will pay close attention to the reasons provided by the Prosecution for its late request, the relevance of each proposed exhibit to the issues in this case, the dates of disclosure to the Accused, and the number and size of the additional proposed exhibits. The discussion below is therefore divided into seven sections grouped by the reason given by the Prosecution for the late addition of each item to its Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list.

¹⁷ *Stanišić & Simatović* Decision, para. 7; *Prosecutor v. Rasim Delić*, Case No. IT-04-83-T, Decision on Urgent Prosecution Motion for Leave to Amend its Exhibit List, 17 October 2007, p. 4; *Boškoski & Tarčulovski* Decision, para. 3.

¹⁸ See *Stanišić & Simatović* Decision, para. 14. Although the commencement of the trial had been postponed a number of times, the Chamber found that the prosecution's motion was filed very late in the proceedings. (Trial was initially scheduled to start on 10 March 2008 and the prosecution filed its motion to amend its Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list on 26 February 2008).

(i) Items omitted in error from the Initial Exhibit List

13. The Prosecution seeks to add 317 items, listed in Appendix A and Appendix C to the Motion,¹⁹ which it states were simply erroneously omitted from the Initial Exhibit List.²⁰ Given the protective measures currently in place, a discussion of the three items described confidentially and *ex parte* (the Accused) in Appendix C is set out in Confidential and *Ex Parte* Annex A to this Decision. The Chamber notes here, however, that contrary to the assertion of the Accused, these three items have already been disclosed to him and are each less than five pages in length. The remaining 314 proposed exhibits in this category include, *inter alia*, documents, photographs, medical certificates, and video clips relevant to the command structure and control of Serb forces, SDS elections and policies, the conditions in detention facilities, propaganda, and witnesses' statements and transcripts submitted pursuant to Rule 92 *ter*. Having reviewed the descriptions of these items provided by the Prosecution, the Trial Chamber considers that they appear generally relevant to the issues in this case.

14. Of the 314 proposed exhibits in this category, the Prosecution only provides a greater degree of specificity as to why they were omitted in error from the Initial Exhibit List in relation to three items.²¹ It also does not explain why none of the items were requested to be added to the Initial Exhibit List at an earlier stage, such as when they were disclosed to the Accused. Most of these items were disclosed to the Accused on or before 24 July 2009, although 27 were only disclosed in October or December 2009.

15. The Chamber accepts that some errors are inevitable and that the fact that certain items were omitted in error from a Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list is not, by itself, a reason to refuse to allow their subsequent addition to that list. However, 314 items is not an insignificant number, and the Chamber must assess whether it would be fair to the Accused to allow these to be added to the Prosecution's Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list at this stage. For those items disclosed prior to October 2009, the Chamber considers that the Accused had sufficient notice that the documents might form part of the Prosecution's case against him and adequate time to analyse them. For the

¹⁹ Because the document with Rule 65 *ter* number 21668 was publicly disclosed to the Accused pursuant to the Trial Chamber's "Decision on the Accused's Motion for Disclosure of Confidential and *Ex Parte* Appendix C to the Prosecution's Motion for Leave to Supplement Its Rule 65 *ter* Exhibit List" filed on 20 January 2010, it is grouped with the other publicly disclosed exhibits listed in Appendix A that were omitted from the Initial Exhibit List in error.

²⁰ Included in this category is an intercept with Rule 65 *ter* number 32720, the omission of which is not explained by the Prosecution.

²¹ These three documents have Rule 65 *ter* numbers 21217, 21248, and 21250, which are said to be referenced in or supplemental to expert reports disclosed to the Accused early in the proceedings. Two of these documents are referenced in Dorothea Hansen's expert report but mistakenly not cited with ERN numbers in the footnotes. The third document outlines five corrections to Eva Tabeau's expert report and was not assigned a Rule 65 *ter* number due to an oversight.

remaining 27 items, disclosed only in October or December 2009, the Chamber would normally consider the size or length of these items in assessing whether the Accused has had sufficient time to analyse them, as well their relevance to the Prosecution's case. It is unable to do so for 23 of these items, as they have not been made available to the Chamber through the e-court system or otherwise. However, in light of the fact that the Accused has not argued that his rights would be prejudiced by the addition of these items to the exhibit list, the Trial Chamber is satisfied that it is in the interests of justice to permit the Prosecution to add all of the items listed in this first category to its Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list. It therefore grants the Motion insofar as it pertains to the 317 items in this first category.

(ii) Items determined to be relevant on the basis of continued analysis

16. The Prosecution seeks to add 122 items to its Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list that were received before the filing of the Initial Exhibit List but only subsequently determined to be relevant to its case on the basis of "continued analysis". The proposed exhibits in this category include, *inter alia*, videos, maps, reports, intercepts, letters, orders, and decisions relevant to events alleged in the Indictment and to the Accused's alleged command and control of Bosnian Serb forces and paramilitary units. Having reviewed the descriptions of these items provided by the Prosecution, the Chamber considers that they appear generally relevant to the issues in this case.

17. Once again, the Chamber considers that while it may be inevitable that certain items are only found to be relevant to the Prosecution's case at a late stage in its trial preparations, these cases should be exceptional, particularly when the Prosecution has been in possession of the items in question for a long time. The Chamber must assess whether it would be fair to the Accused to allow the 122 items in this category to be added to the Prosecution's Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list at this stage. Most of these 122 items were disclosed to the Accused in or prior to July 2009. However, 46 of them were only disclosed to him in October or November 2009.

18. For those items disclosed to the Accused prior to October 2009, the Chamber considers that he would have been put on notice, by their disclosure, that they might form part of the Prosecution's case against him and that he has had sufficient time to analyse them. For the remaining 46 items disclosed only in October or November 2009, the Chamber would normally consider the size or length of these items in assessing whether the Accused has had sufficient time to analyse them, as well as consider their relevance to the Prosecution's case. Again, it is unable to do so for 41 of these items, as they have not been made available to the Chamber through the e-court system or otherwise. However, in light of the fact that the Accused has not argued that his rights would be prejudiced by the addition of these items to the exhibit list, the

Trial Chamber is satisfied that it is in the interests of justice to permit the Prosecution to add all of the items listed in this second category to its Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list. It therefore grants the Motion insofar as it pertains to the 122 items in this second category.

(iii) Items determined to be significant after a witness interview was conducted or a translation completed

19. The Prosecution seeks to add 16 items that were received before the filing of the Initial Exhibit List and subsequently determined to be relevant following the completion of translations or witness interviews conducted after the filing of the list. The proposed exhibits in this category include, *inter alia*, reports, memoranda, orders, articles, and intercepts relevant to events alleged in the Indictment and to the Accused's alleged command and control of Bosnian Serb forces and paramilitary units. Having reviewed the descriptions of these items provided by the Prosecution, the Trial Chamber considers that they appear generally relevant to the issues in this case.

20. The Chamber accepts that there may be circumstances, such as the absence of translations of documents or ongoing witness interviews, in which the Prosecution might only determine the relevance of a particular item to its case after the filing of its Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list. All of the items listed in this category were disclosed to the Accused prior to the filing of the Motion and most were disclosed in or prior to July 2009, providing him with notice that they were likely to become part of the Prosecution's case against him. However, six documents were only disclosed in October 2009. The Chamber considers that this is a limited number, and the late disclosure of these items may have been unavoidable if their relevance to these proceedings was only determined by the Prosecution following receipt of translations or due to ongoing witness interviews. In these circumstances, the Trial Chamber is satisfied that the addition of these documents would not prejudice the Accused, and it grants the Motion insofar as it pertains to the 16 items in this third category.

(iv) Items received shortly before the filing of the Initial Exhibit List

21. The Prosecution seeks to add 61 items²² that it received shortly before the filing of the Initial Exhibit List. The proposed exhibits in this category include, *inter alia*, orders, letters, decisions, reports, agreements, and videos relevant to events alleged in the Indictment and to the Accused's alleged command and control. All of these items were received by the Prosecution at most three months before the filing of the Initial Exhibit List. While the Prosecution could have

²² Given the dates the Prosecution received the items below, they will be listed in this category rather than the preceding one: 21996, 21998, 45418, and 45419.

sought addition of these documents sooner, the Trial Chamber is satisfied that receipt of items shortly before the filing of the Initial Exhibit List could constitute good cause for seeking to add them to the list at a later stage. Having reviewed the descriptions of these items provided by the Prosecution, the Chamber considers that they appear generally relevant to the issues in this case.

22. Most of these 61 items were disclosed to the Accused in July 2009, providing him with notice that they were likely to become part of the Prosecution's case against him. However, 16 of them were disclosed in October 2009, more than five months after their receipt by the Prosecution. The Chamber must consider whether it would be fair to the Accused to allow the addition of these 16 items to the Prosecution's Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list at this stage of the proceedings. Once again, as none of them have been made available to it through the e-court system or otherwise, and no indication has been given by the Prosecution as to their size, the Chamber cannot make the necessary assessment as to fairness to the Accused. However, in light of the fact that the Accused has no objections to the addition of these items, the Trial Chamber finds that their addition would not unduly prejudice him. The Chamber therefore grants the Motion insofar as it pertains to the 61 items included in this fourth category.

(v) Items received after the filing of the Initial Exhibit List

23. The Prosecution seeks to add 45 items²³ that it received after the filing of the Initial Exhibit List. The proposed exhibits in this category include, *inter alia*, orders, reports, articles, diary entries, photos, maps, videos, and evidence to be submitted pursuant to Rule 92 *ter* relevant to events alleged in the Indictment and the Accused's alleged knowledge or involvement in such events. The Trial Chamber accepts that receipt of relevant, new items following the filing of a Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list can constitute good cause for the late addition of those items to the list. Having reviewed the descriptions of these items provided by the Prosecution, the Chamber considers that they appear generally relevant to the issues in this case.

24. Of the 45 items in this category, 41 are not yet available in the e-court system. Without access to these documents, the Trial Chamber is unable to examine their nature, relevance, and size in any detail. Although three of the four documents available in e-court are of a considerable page length, they are of a limited number. Moreover, most of the documents were disclosed to the Accused in July 2009, providing him with notice that they were likely to become part of the Prosecution's case against him. In light of these circumstances, and the absence of objection from the Accused, the Trial Chamber is satisfied that the addition of these documents would not

²³ Given the dates the Prosecution received the items below, they will be listed in this category rather than the preceding one: 21320, 21321, 21436, 21957, 21959, 21960, 21961, and 45372.

prejudice the Accused. The Chamber therefore grants the Motion insofar as it pertains to the 45 items included in this fifth category.

(vi) Items already listed in the Initial or Revised Exhibit List in a different format

25. The Prosecution seeks to add 174 items, which it claims are different versions of exhibits already included in the Initial or Revised Exhibit List, which require additional Rule 65 *ter* numbers. The proposed exhibits in this category include a witness statement, videos, and intercepts being provided in a new or different format from the versions in the Initial or Revised Exhibit List. Having reviewed the descriptions of these items provided by the Prosecution, the Trial Chamber considers that they appear generally relevant to the issues in this case.

26. Without an indication as to which items on the Initial or Revised Exhibit Lists these 174 items are new versions of, the Chamber cannot assess for itself the extent to which the new versions are indeed merely different copies, in a clearer or more legible form, of the earlier versions. Nonetheless, it must proceed on the basis that they do not contain any new or additional evidence from that contained in items previously listed in the Initial or Revised Exhibit lists. Although many of these new versions were disclosed to the Accused in December 2009, and therefore very late in the proceedings, the Trial Chamber does not consider them to be additional items, and finds that the Accused had sufficient notice that the Prosecution would seek to rely upon the substance of these documents in its case against him. The Trial Chamber therefore grants the Motion insofar as it pertains to the 174 items included in this sixth category.

(vii) Items with revised 65 *ter* numbers

27. The Prosecution seeks to change the Rule 65 *ter* numbers for 17 video clips, intercepts, and a witness statement listed in Appendix A and Appendix B to the Motion, which it asserts are relevant to events alleged in the Indictment and to the Accused's alleged knowledge or involvement in such events. Having reviewed the descriptions of these items provided by the Prosecution, the Chamber considers that they appear generally relevant to the issues in this case.

28. The reason given by the Prosecution for changing the Rule 65 *ter* numbers for items already listed in the Initial or Revised Exhibit List is to ensure that each item is numbered in accordance with its system of categorisation of exhibits.²⁴ The Chamber considers revising Rule 65 *ter* numbers to improve clarity for the parties sufficient cause for changing the Rule 65 *ter* lists, so long as it is clear to the Accused what the previous and corresponding new numbers are. In these circumstances and because these items were already included in the Prosecution's

²⁴ Motion, para. 12.

exhibit list, the Trial Chamber does not consider them additional items and is satisfied that changing their Rule 65 *ter* numbers would not prejudice the Accused. The Chamber therefore grants the Motion insofar as it pertains to the 17 items included in this seventh category.

IV. Disposition

29. For the reasons set out above, and pursuant to Articles 20(1) and 21(4)(b) of the Statute and Rules 54 and 65 *ter* of the Rules, the Trial Chamber hereby

GRANTS leave to the Prosecution to supplement its Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list as requested in the Motion, including the three items listed in confidential and *ex parte* Appendix C; and

ORDERS the Prosecution to file a consolidated Rule 65 *ter* exhibit list by 31 March 2010, which shall include all the proposed exhibits listed in the Revised Exhibit List and those added in accordance with the present Decision, and all existing witness statements and transcripts admitted, or which will be offered for admission, pursuant to Rules 92 *bis*, *ter*, and *quater*, and to ensure that all items on the new Rule 65 *ter* list are available to the Chamber through the e-court system.

Done in English and French, the English text being authoritative.



Judge O-Gon Kwon,
Presiding

Dated this eighteenth day of March 2010
At The Hague
The Netherlands

[Seal of the Tribunal]