

UNITED
NATIONS



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-04-81-PT
Date: 24 September 2007
Original: English

IN THE TRIAL CHAMBER

Before: Judge Patrick Robinson, Pre-Trial Judge

Registrar: Mr. Hans Holthius

Decision of: 24 September 2007

PROSECUTOR

v.

MOMČILO PERIŠIĆ

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

DECISION ON DEFENCE MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

The Office of the Prosecutor:

Mr. Mark Harmon

Counsel for Momčilo Perišić:

Mr. James Castle
Mr. Novak Lukić

I, Patrick Robinson, Judge 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 (“International Tribunal”),

BEING SEIZED of the “Motion for Extension of Time to File Defence Response to Prosecution’s Motion for Leave to File Motion Pursuant to Rule 92 Quarter [sic] with Confidential Annexes A, B, C, D, and E”, filed on 18 September 2007 by counsel for Momčilo Perišić (“Defence” and “Request”, respectively), whereby the Defence requests an extension of time within which to file its response to the motion filed by the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”) requesting the admission of Mr. Deronjić’s statements and transcripts, pursuant to Rule 92 *quater* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Tribunal (“Prosecution’s Motion” and “Rules,” respectively);¹

NOTING that the Defence requests that it be granted an extension of time to file its response to the Prosecution’s Motion no later than 1 October 2007;²

NOTING that the Defence submits that it has been hindered from filing a timely response to the Prosecution’s Motion due to travel requirements and other case related commitments;³

NOTING Article 126*bis* of the Rules which provides that responses to motions are to be filed within fourteen days following the filing of the latter, unless ordered otherwise;

CONSIDERING that in light of the arguments put forth by the Defence and of the fact that no date has yet been set for the commencement of the trial proceedings, granting the Request will not cause any undue delay to the proceedings;

CONSIDERING further that the Prosecution does not oppose the Request;⁴

¹ See “Motion for Leave to File Motion Pursuant to Rule 92*quater* with Confidential Annexes A, B, C, D and E”, 4 September 2007 (“Prosecution’s Motion”).

² Request, par. 3.

³ *Ibid.*, par. 4.

⁴ Request, par. 5.

PURSUANT TO Rule 126*bis* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence,

HEREBY GRANT the Motion and **AUTHORISE** the Defence to file its response to the Prosecution's Motion no later than 1 October 2007.

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



Patrick Robinson
Pre-Trial Judge

Dated this twenty-fourth day of September 2007
At The Hague
The Netherlands

[Seal of the Tribunal]