



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-04-74-T  
Date: 19 December 2008  
Original: ENGLISH  
French

**IN TRIAL CHAMBER III**

**Before:** Judge Jean-Claude Antonetti, presiding  
Judge Árpád Prandler  
Judge Stefan Trechsel  
Reserve Judge Antoine Kesia-Mbe Mindua

**Registrar:** Mr Hans Holthuis

**Decision of:** 19 December 2008

**THE PROSECUTOR**

v.

**Jadranko PRLIĆ  
Bruno STOJIĆ  
Slobodan PRALJAK  
Milivoj PETKOVIĆ  
Valentin ČORIĆ  
Berislav PUŠIĆ**

***PUBLIC***

**CORRIGENDUM TO THE ORDER ON MODALITIES OF THE HEARING  
OF EXPERT WITNESS MILAN CVIKL**

**The Office of the Prosecutor:**

Mr Kenneth Scott  
Mr Douglas Stringer

**Counsel for the Accused:**

Mr Michael Karnavas and Ms Suzana Tomanović for Jadranko Prlić  
Ms Senka Nožica and Mr Karim A.A. Khan for Bruno Stojić  
Mr Božidar Kovačić and Ms Nika Pinter for Slobodan Praljak  
Ms Vesna Alaburić and Mr Nicholas Stewart for Milivoj Petković  
Ms Dijana Tomašegović-Tomić and Mr Dražen Plavec for Valentin Čorić  
Mr Fahrudin Ibrišimović and Mr Roger Sahota for Berislav Pušić

**TRIAL CHAMBER III** (“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”);

**NOTING** the Order on Modalities of the Hearing of Expert Witness Milan Cvikl, rendered publicly by the Chamber on 10 December 2008 (“Order of 10 December 2008”),

**CONSIDERING** that on page 5 of the Order of 10 December 2008, the last Considering reads as follows:

“**CONSIDERING** that with regard to the cross-examination conducted by the Praljak, Petković and Stojić Defence, the Chamber follows the same principle that in the absence of any specific and reasoned request pursuant to paragraph 16 of the Decision of 24 April 2008, it will adhere to the Chamber’s practice of allotting to”

**CONSIDERING** that the Chamber notes that an error slipped into the last Considering on page 5 of the Order of 10 December 2008,

**CONSIDERING** that the last Considering on page 5 of the Order of 10 December 2008 should read as follows:

“**CONSIDERING** that with regard to the cross-examination conducted by the Praljak, Petković and Stojić Defence, the Chamber follows the same principle that in the absence of any specific and reasoned request pursuant to paragraph 16 of the Decision of 24 April 2008, it will adhere to the Chamber’s practice of allotting to the Defence teams for their cross-examination half the time allocated for the direct examination and re-examination,<sup>1</sup>”

**CONSIDERING** furthermore that footnotes 10 and 11 of the Order of 10 December 2008 read as follows:

“<sup>10</sup> Bruno Stojić’s Notice pursuant to Rule 94 (B) to Cross-Examine Prlić Defence Expert Witness Milan Cvikl, 10 November 2008 (“Stojić Notice”)” and

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision of 24 April 2008, para. 15.

“<sup>11</sup> Prosecution Notice Pursuant to Rule 94 (B) regarding the Accused Prlić’s Expert Witness Milan Cvikl, 26 November 2008 (“Prosecution Notice”),”

**CONSIDERING** that the Chamber notes that two errors slipped into footnotes 10 and 11 of the Order of 10 December 2008,

**CONSIDERING** that footnotes 10 and 11 of the Order of 10 December 2008 should read as follows:

“<sup>10</sup> Bruno Stojić’s Notice pursuant to Rule 94 *bis* to Cross-Examine Prlić Defence Expert Witness Milan Cvikl, 10 November 2008 (“Stojić Notice”)” and

“<sup>11</sup> Prosecution Notice Pursuant to Rule 94 *bis* regarding the Accused Prlić’s Expert Witness Milan Cvikl, 26 November 2008 (“Prosecution Notice”),”

**FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS,**

**PURSUANT TO** Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence,

**ORDERS** that the last Considering on page 5 of the Order of 10 December 2008 be amended as follows:

“**CONSIDERING** that with regard to the cross-examination conducted by the Praljak, Petković and Stojić Defence, the Chamber follows the same principle that in the absence of any specific and reasoned request pursuant to paragraph 16 of the Decision of 24 April 2008, it will adhere to the Chamber’s practice of allotting to the Defence teams for their cross-examination half the time allocated for the direct examination and re-examination,<sup>2</sup>”

**ORDERS** that footnotes 10 and 11 of the Order of 10 December 2008 be amended as follows:

“<sup>10</sup> Bruno Stojić’s Notice pursuant to Rule 94 *bis* (B) to Cross-Examine Prlić Defence Expert Witness Milan Cvikl, 10 November 2008 (“Stojić Notice”)” and

---

<sup>2</sup> Decision of 24 April 2008, para. 15.

“<sup>11</sup> Prosecution Notice Pursuant to Rule 94 *bis* (B) regarding the Accused Prlić’s Expert Witness Milan Cviki, 26 November 2008 (“Prosecution Notice”),”

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

*/signed/*

---

Judge Jean-Claude Antonetti

Presiding Judge

Done this nineteenth day of December 2008

At The Hague

The Netherlands

**[Seal of the Tribunal]**