STL Close-up

The Special Tribunal for Lebanon (STL) is the first tribunal of international character to have jurisdiction over the crime of terrorism in times of peace. It was established by United Nations (UN) Security Council Resolution 1757, which was adopted on 30 May 2007. The STL began its work on 1 March 2009.

Mandate

The primary mandate of the Tribunal is to hold trials for the people accused of carrying out the attack of 14 February 2005 in Beirut which killed 22 people, including the former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri, and injured many others. The Tribunal also has jurisdiction over:

- attacks carried out in Lebanon between 1 October 2004 and 12 December 2005 if they are connected with the attack of 14 February 2005 and are of a similar nature and gravity;
- crimes carried out on any later date, decided by the parties and with the consent of the UN Security Council, if they are connected to the 14 February 2005 attack.

History and establishment

Following the attack on 14 February 2005, the UN Secretary-General sent a fact-finding mission to Beirut in March 2005 to enquire into the circumstances, causes and consequences of the attack. The group, led by Peter Fitzgerald, recommended the establishment of an independent international investigation into the attack; subsequently, the UN Security Council established the UNHIC in April 2005 by Resolution 1595. On 13 December 2005, following a series of other killings and bombings in Lebanon, the Lebanese government requested the UN to establish a tribunal of international character to try all those who are found responsible for the attack of 14 February 2005 and other attacks. On 23 January 2007, the UN and the Lebanese government signed an agreement on the establishment of the STL, which was not ratified by the Lebanese parliament. Referring to the letter of the Lebanese Prime Minister to the UN Secretary-General, which recalled that the parliamentary majority expressed its support for the Tribunal, the UN brought the provisions of the agreement into force through UN Security Council Resolution 1757. Guided by considerations such as fairness and justice, administrative efficiency and security, the STL opened on 1 March 2009 in Leidschendam, near The Hague, Netherlands. It also has an office in Beirut and a Liaison Office in New York.

Jurisdiction

The STL applies provisions of the Lebanese Criminal Code (LCC) consistent with the highest standards of international criminal procedure, including the prosecution and punishment of acts of terrorism and crimes and offences against life and personal integrity. A convicted person may be given a maximum sentence of life imprisonment; unlike under Lebanese law, there is no death penalty at the STL.

A terrorism trial

The STL is the first tribunal of its kind to deal with terrorism as a distinct crime, which has been described by UN Security Council Resolution 1757 as a "threat to international peace and security". The STL applies the Lebanese legal definition of terrorism, of which an element is the use of means that are "liable to create a public danger" (Art. 314 of LCC), such as explosive devices, inflammable materials, toxic or corrosive products and infectious or microbial agents. The STL Appeals Chamber ruled on 16 February 2011 that the list of means is
Illustrative, rather than exhaustive. It also defined terrorism as an international crime for the first time.

**Trials in absentia**

A trial in absentia occurs when the accused is not participating in or present for the proceedings. In accordance with Lebanese law and that of other states with a civil law tradition, the STL statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence allow trials in absentia under strict conditions:

- if the accused has waived his right to be present;
- if the accused has not been handed over to the Tribunal by the state authorities concerned;
- if he has fled or cannot be found.

An absent accused must be represented by a defense counsel before the Tribunal; the Defence Office will assign counsel to any accused who fails to appoint one. An absent accused who later on appears before the Tribunal has guaranteed rights including the right to request a retrial.

The Procedure of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon – A Snapshot provides an overview of the procedure at the STL, highlighting its specific features. The Snapshot can be found on the Tribunal’s website: [www.stl-tl.org](http://www.stl-tl.org/en/about-the-stl/the-four-phases).

---

**Structure of the STL**

The STL is a hybrid, or internationalised, court, which is composed of both Lebanese and international judges and staff. The Tribunal has four organs: the Chambers, the Office of the Prosecutor, the Defence Office and the Registry.

**Chambers**

This organ comprises three distinct chambers: a Pre-Trial Chamber of one international judge, a Trial Chamber of three judges (one Lebanese and two international, plus two alternate judges, one of whom is Lebanese and the other international), and an Appeals Chamber of five judges (two Lebanese and three international). The Presiding Judge of the Appeals Chamber, Judge David Baragwanath, is the President of the Tribunal. In the President’s absence his duties are fulfilled by the Vice-President, Judge Ralph Richter.

- The Pre-Trial Judge has wide-ranging powers for the preparation of a fair and expeditious trial. He is a member of the Trial Chamber, but has an important role earlier in the legal process. Amongst other things, he reviews and confirms indictments, issues arrest warrants and transfer requests, and rules on the disclosure of information. In exceptional circumstances, he can gather evidence which, without his intervention, could not be obtained. The STL Pre-Trial Judge is Daniel Fanian.

**Office of the Prosecutor (OTP)**

The Office of the Prosecutor investigates and prosecutes the persons responsible for the crimes falling within the Tribunal’s jurisdiction. The OTP is led by an international Prosecutor, who is assisted by a Lebanese Deputy Prosecutor, as well as lawyers, investigators, forensic experts and analysts. The Prosecutor’s decisions to investigate, file indictments, prosecute or file appeals are based on sound legal criteria and the evidence available. The STL Prosecutor is Norman Farrell.

**Defence Office**

The STL is the first tribunal of its kind to have an independent Defence Office, which is responsible for protecting and promoting the rights of suspects, accused and their counsel, thus ensuring the highest standards of fairness in the proceedings before the Tribunal. The Defence Office does not represent, or give instructions from, any suspect or accused. The Head of the STL Defence Office is François Rauzes.

- An independent defence counsel, appointed from the list of counsels maintained by the Defence Office, represents the accused before the STL.

**Registry**

The Registry is responsible for the administration of the Tribunal. It is led by the Registrar, who has an external liaison and diplomatic function, besides preparing the Tribunal’s budget and securing the necessary funds. Amongst other things, the Registrar oversees the Victims and Witnesses Unit, the Victims’ Participation Unit, the Court Management Services Section and the Language Services Section, which provides interpretation and translation in the Tribunal’s three official languages – English, Arabic and French. The Registrar also supervises the Safety and Security Section and the Detention Facility of the Tribunal in the Netherlands. Through the Public Information and Communications Section, the Registry fosters public understanding of the Tribunal and its work. The STL Registrar is Daryl A. Mundis.

Learn more about the STL judges and senior officers on the STL website: [www.stl-tl.org](http://www.stl-tl.org/en/about-the-stl/biographies).

---

[www.stl-tl.org](http://www.stl-tl.org)

Dokter van der Stammstraat 1, 2265 BC Leidschendam, Netherlands  •  PO Box 115, 2260 AC Leidschendam, Netherlands.

For more information please contact the Public Information and Communications Section: stl-pressoffice@un.org; tel: +31 (0) 70 808 3550 / 1808 and +31 (0) 20 759 1000 (Brussels)

About the STL

The Special Tribunal for Lebanon is a tribunal of international character. The STL was inaugurated on 1 March 2009 and has four organs:

- Chambers
- The Office of the Prosecutor
- The Defence Office
- Registry

The STL’s headquarters are on the outskirts of The Hague, the Netherlands and the tribunal also has an office in Beirut, Lebanon.

Its primary mandate is to hold trials for the people accused of carrying out the attack of 14 February 2005 which killed 23 people, including the former prime minister of Lebanon, Rafik Hariri, and injured many others.

The tribunal was established following a request by the government of Lebanon to the United Nations. The agreement between Lebanon and the UN was not ratified, and the UN brought its provisions into force through UN Security Council Resolution 1757.

It is an independent, judicial organisation composed of Lebanese and international judges. It is neither a UN court nor part of the Lebanese judicial system. It does, however, try people under Lebanese criminal law. The tribunal is also the first of its kind to deal with terrorism as a discrete crime.

Voluntary contributions make up 51 per cent of its funding and 49 per cent comes from Lebanon.

Jurisdiction of the tribunal

The tribunal has jurisdiction over persons responsible for the attack of 14 February 2005 resulting in the death of the former Lebanese prime minister Rafik Hariri and in the death or injury of other persons (Article 1, STL statute).

The tribunal also has jurisdiction over other attacks in Lebanon between 1 October 2004 and 12 December 2005 if it is proven that they are connected to the events of 14 February and are of similar nature and gravity. The mandate also allows the tribunal to have jurisdiction over crimes carried out on any later date, decided by the parties and with the consent of the UN Security Council, if they are connected to the 14 February 2005 attack.

To seek jurisdiction for these cases, the Office of the Prosecutor must submit prima facie evidence of a connection such as:

- criminal intent
- the purpose behind the attacks
- the nature of the victims targeted
- the pattern of the attacks (modus operandi)

Contacts

General inquiries

For more information on STL please contact the information desk:

STL press office @ UN
Tel: +31 (0) 70 800 3900
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Special Tribunal for Lebanon
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Office of Beirut
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STL Press Office – Arabic and English
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Chambers

Chambers is one of the four organs of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon. It operates independently of the other three: the Office of the Prosecutor, the Defence Office and the Registry.

Chambers is composed of 11 judges, who are divided into three sections:

- the chief chamber, one international judge
- two chambers, one Lebanese, one international, plus two alternates (one Lebanese, one international) who can serve in addition to or as replacements to the STL judges
- appeal chambers, two Lebanese and three international judges

This mixture of Lebanese and international judges means that Lebanese law is applied correctly whilst guaranteeing the impartiality of the proceedings. The considerable experience of the tribunal’s judges ensures that the highest international standards of criminal justice are followed.

Role of Chambers

The judges of the STL are independent - they are not linked to the investigations carried out by the prosecution, nor are they members of governments or international organisations. It is the duty of all judges at the tribunal to protect the rights of the accused and the victims who are participating in the trials. Ultimately, they rule on the guilt or innocence of the accused.

Appointing the Judges

Selecting the judges is a careful and thorough process. They must be "persons of high moral character, impartiality and integrity" as required by the tribunal's statute. They serve for three years and are eligible for re-appointment. The UN secretary-general appoints the judges in consultation with the Lebanese government and upon the recommendation of a selection panel.

Lebanese Judges

The Lebanese Supreme Council of the Judiciary compiles a list of 12 nominees, which is submitted to the UN secretary-general by the Lebanese government.

International Judges

The process is different for international judges. Nominations are received from UN member states or competent persons and submitted to the selection panel. The nominees must have extensive and diverse legal backgrounds.

President of the STL
Timeline of events

The Special Tribunal for Lebanon opened on 1 March 2009 in Leidschendam, the Netherlands. Here are some of the important events that led up to its foundation.

14 February 2005

On 14 February 2005 a large explosion near the St George Hotel in downtown Beirut killed 23 people, including the former Lebanese prime minister, Rafik Hariri, and injured many others. The blast was so powerful that it left a crater at least 10-metres wide and two metres deep on the street.

There was swift national and international condemnation of the explosion. "The secretary-general condemns in the strongest terms those who instigated, planned and executed this callous political assassination", said the UN secretary-general, Kofi Annan, on 14th February 2005.
15 February 2005

On 15 February 2005 the United Nations Security Council issued this statement about the killing of Rafiq Hariri and others: "The council calls on the Lebanese government to bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of this heinous terrorist act, and noting the Lebanese government's commitments in this regard. The council urges all states, in accordance with its Resolutions 1566 (2004) and 1373 (2001), to cooperate fully in the fight against terrorism."

25 February 2005

The UN secretary-general sent a fact-finding mission to Beirut to enquire into the causes, circumstances and consequences of the attack. The group led by Peter Fitzgerald arrived in Beirut on 25 February 2005 and delivered its report on 24 March 2005. The report recommended the establishment of an independent international investigation into the attack.

April 2005

The UN International Independent Investigation Commission (UNIIIC) was
established by UN Security Council Resolution 1595 in April 2005. The purpose of the commission was to gather evidence and to assist the Lebanese authorities in their investigation of the attack of 14 February 2005. The UNIIC's mandate was later expanded to include the investigation of other assassinations that took place before and after the Hariri attack.

13 December 2005
On 13 December 2005, following a series of other killings and bombings in Lebanon, the Lebanese government requested that the UN create a tribunal of "international character".

15 December 2005
The UN Security Council acknowledged the request on 15 December 2005 in Resolution 1644.

26 March 2006

The UN Security Council gave the secretary-general a mandate to negotiate an
agreement with the Lebanese government on 26 March 2006.
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23 January 2007

The UN and the Lebanese government signed an agreement for the Special Tribunal for Lebanon on 23 January 2007. The agreement was handed to the Lebanese parliament to ratify.

The speaker of parliament refused to convene parliament to hold a vote on its ratification. The Lebanese sent a petition signed by a majority of MPs to the UN secretary general requesting that the security council form the tribunal.

The Special Tribunal for Lebanon was established in 2007 by Resolution 1757.

1 March 2009

The tribunal opened on 1 March 2009 in Leidchendam, near The Hague, the
Netherlands. It is an independent, judicial organisation not a UN court.
The UN International Independent Investigation Commission (UNIIIC) and the STL
are separate organisations. The UNIIIC's mandate ended on 28 February 2009.
Jurisdiction was transferred to the STL and the information gathered was handed over
to the STL's Office of the Prosecutor.
One of the first acts of the STL was to order the release of four Lebanese generals who
had been detained by the Lebanese authorities in connection with the Hariri
investigation. This decision was made after the STL's pre-trial judge ruled that on the
basis of the information available to the tribunal there was no cause to hold them.
Image credit: Special Tribunal for Lebanon
The Office of the Prosecutor

The Office of the Prosecutor is one of the four organs of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon. The Prosecutor is Norman Farrell (Canada). The other three organs are Chambers, the Defence Office and the Registry.

A two-fold mandate
The Office of the Prosecutor both investigates and prosecutes persons suspected to be responsible for the crimes falling within the tribunal’s jurisdiction, including:

- the attack of 14 February 2005 killing Rafiq Hariri and others
- attacks in Lebanon between 1 October 2004 and 12 December 2005 that are connected and are of a similar nature and gravity to the Hariri attack; and
- attacks on any date after 12 December 2005 as decided by Lebanon and the United Nations with the consent of the UN Security Council if these attacks are connected and are of a similar nature and gravity to the attack of 14 February 2005.

Independence and integrity
Mr. Farrell was appointed by the UN secretary general upon consultation with the Security Council. The prosecutor acts entirely independently. He does not seek or receive instructions from any source. His decisions are based on sound legal criteria; his only guide is the evidence.

The prosecutor’s decisions are guided by the STL statute, rules of procedure and evidence, internationally recognised legal standards and the evidence.

Mr Farrell’s decisions to investigate, prosecute or file an appeal are predicated on sound legal criteria and based on evidence available. No one may order the prosecutor to file an indictment, refrain from doing so or file an appeal. Political or other external factors are not taken into consideration.

Structure of the OTP
The prosecutor is supported by a Lebanese deputy prosecutor, Joyce Tabet, who works from the tribunal’s office in Beirut. The Office of the Prosecutor is organised on the basis of multi-disciplinary teams with staff hailing from 35 countries, and with offices in Leidschendam and Beirut.

The prosecutor is assisted by Lebanese and international professionals including police officers, forensic experts, analysts and lawyers to help carry out the investigation and prosecution. They work in the following sections:

- The Immediate office
- The investigation division
- The prosecution division

Mission statement:
- Bringing terrorists to justice
- Bringing justice to victims
- Helping end impunity in Lebanon
Defence counsel

All suspects and accused persons have the right to be represented by counsel. Such counsel are independent from the Tribunal. Defence counsel are responsible for all aspects of the case. The procedures and criteria for assignment of defence counsel are laid out in the Directive on the Assignment of Counsel.

Types of Assignment

An accused who is paying for his or her own defence is entitled to choose his or her own counsel, within the minimum requirements set forth in Rule 54. Such privately retained counsel will be formally appointed to represent his client by the Head of the Defence Office, after he has verified the counsel-client relationship.

If the trial is conducted in absentia, the Head of Defence Office will select, from the same list, and assign counsel to represent the accused.

Counsel who are assigned under legal aid or to represent an accused in absentia are able to select a team of people to assist them with the defence.

Criteria for Assignment

Any defence counsel appearing before the court must be admitted to the practice of law in a recognized jurisdiction. Professors of law may also appear before the court, but only in the capacity of co-counsel. Moreover, any defence counsel must possess oral and written proficiency in French or English, and fulfill requirements of good standing.

In order to be admitted to the list of counsel as lead counsel, in addition to the above criteria that apply to all counsel, a person must have a minimum number of 10 years of relevant experience in criminal law or seven years in case of co-counsel. Before counsel may be admitted to the list, they shall be interviewed by an admission panel.

The Defence Office continues to welcome applications to be admitted to the list of counsel.

The Head of Defence Office has assigned counsel to protect the rights and interest of the accused in the case Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al (STL-11-01) who are being tried in absentia. You may find more information about the assignment decision and the counsel here.

Read the biographies of the appointed defence counsel.
François Roux, a distinguished defence lawyer in the field of international justice, joined the Tribunal as Head of Defence Office.

Mr Roux, a French citizen, has been an attorney for 38 years and is influenced by the life and thinking of Mahatma Gandhi, who was also a lawyer.

Since the late 1970s, he has defended Polynesian and New Caledonian Kanak separatists in the French Pacific Territories. In that capacity, he played a role in the peace agreements between the Kanak Liberation Movement and the French Government which resulted in the 1988 Matignon Agreements and the Nouméa Accord of 1998. In 1994, he also represented the Tuareg rebels during the peace agreements with the Government of Niger.

Since 1999, Mr Roux has represented several accused and suspects before various international criminal jurisdictions, including the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Criminal Court, and he represented Duch before the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia.

Mr Roux was a consultant to the American defence team assigned to represent Zacarias Moussaoui following the attacks of 11 September 2001 and, with his American colleague Gerald Zerkin, argued against the death penalty.

In France, he has defended José Bové, an anti-globalisation farmer and trade unionist, against the fast-food company McDonald's, as well as representing the French agricultural trade union Confédération Paysanne and the Mouvement des faucheurs volontaires anti-OGM, a group of citizens who use civil disobedience to express their opposition to genetically modified organisms.

He has acted in various cases before the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg and the United Nations Human Rights Committee in Geneva.

He is a Knight of the National Order of Merit and of the Légion d'Honneur.

Mr Roux has written several articles on human rights which have appeared in leading French newspapers, including Le Monde and Libération. He was the head of a French law firm in Montpellier in the south of France specialising in criminal law, international relations, the law of persons, public law, mediation and human rights.

His motto is "it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness".
**Charges (as set out in the indictment)**

- Conspiracy aimed at committing a terrorist act;
- Committing a terrorist act by means of an explosive device;
- Intentional homicide of Rafiq Hariri with premeditation by using explosive materials;
- Intentional homicide of 21 other persons with premeditation by using explosive materials;
- Attempted intentional homicide of 226 persons with premeditation by using explosive materials.

The Accused, charged with the crimes detailed in the indictment, is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt.

**Biographical information (as set out in the indictment)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>6 April 1961</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td>Al-Ghobeir, Beirut (Lebanon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Lebanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of the indictment</td>
<td>28 June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest warrant</td>
<td>Delivered confidentially to the Lebanese authorities on 28 June 2011 and, most recently, on 9 August 2013. International arrest warrant issued on 8 July 2011 and, more recently, on 9 August 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current situation</td>
<td>Mr Badreddine remains at large. On 1 February 2012, the STL Trial Chamber decided to try Mr Badreddine and the three other Accused in the Ayyash et al. case in absentia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of commencement of trial</td>
<td>16 January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alleged criminal acts**

The indictment states that the former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri was assassinated on 14 February 2005, at 12:55 on Rue Minet el Hosn in Beirut, as a result of a terrorist act in which a suicide bomber detonated a large quantity of high explosives concealed in a van. In addition to killing Rafiq Hariri, the explosion killed 21 other persons and injured 226.

Mr Badreddine is accused of having participated in a conspiracy with others aimed at committing a terrorist act to assassinate Rafiq Hariri. The indictment further alleges that Mr Badreddine monitored the physical perpetration of the attack. Mr Badreddine is also accused of having monitored and coordinated, together with Salim Jamil Ayyash, the surveillance of Rafiq Hariri in preparation for the attack and the purchase of the van used during the attack. Mr Badreddine is further accused of having been implicated in the preparation of the false claim of responsibility for the purposes of shielding the real perpetrators of the bombing.
Key judicial developments

16 February 2011 - The Appeals Chamber renders its interlocutory decision on the applicable law interpreting, inter alia, terrorism, conspiracy and modes of liability under international and Lebanese law.

28 June 2011 - The Pre-Trial Judge confirms the indictment against Messrs Ayyash, Badreddine, Oneissi and Sabra submitted by the Prosecutor on 17 January 2011.

30 June 2011 - The indictment is transmitted to the Lebanese authorities, who have an obligation to report to the measures taken in searching for, arresting, detaining and transferring the Accused to the seat of the Tribunal within 30 days. Reporting obligations are ongoing.

8 July 2011 - International arrest warrants are issued against the four Accused, including Mr Badreddine. Subsequent international arrest warrants have been issued on 9 August 2013 following the amendment of the indictment.

1 February 2012 - The Trial Chamber decides to try the four Accused in the Ayyash et al. case in absentia.

2 February 2012 - The Head of the Defence Office assigns 8 counsel to represent the interest and rights of the four Accused.

24 October 2012 - The Appeals Chamber dismisses the defence appeals against the Trial Chamber decision upholding the jurisdiction and legality of the Tribunal.

19 December 2012 - Following the Pre-Trial Judge’s decisions of 8 May, 3 September, 28 November and 19 December 2012, the total number of victims participating in the proceedings is 66.

Terrorism

The STL is the first tribunal of an international character to deal with terrorism as a distinct crime committed outside the context of an armed conflict. The Tribunal was established by UN Security Council Resolution 1757 (2007), which reaffirmed that the attack of 14 February 2005 and its implications constituted a “threat to international peace and security”. In its decision of 16 February 2011 on the law to be applied by the Tribunal, the STL’s Appeals Chamber clarified that the Tribunal applies Lebanese domestic law including the crime of terrorism stipulated in Article 314 of the Lebanese Criminal Code — in consonance with international conventional and customary law. The Appeals Chamber’s decision also defined terrorism as a crime under customary international law for the first time.

Composition of the Trial Chamber

Judge David Re, Presiding Judge
Judge Micheline Braidi
Judge Janet Noworthy
Judge Walid Aloum, Alternate Judge
Judge Nicola Lettieri, Alternate Judge

Representation of the Office of the Prosecutor
Mr Norman Farrell, Prosecutor
Mr Edoardo Wuthnow, Senior Trial counsel
Mr Cameron GSmeke, Senior Trial counsel
Mr Alexander Hugh Milne, Senior Trial counsel

Defence Counsel for Musafir Amine Badreddine
Ms Antoine Korkmaz, Lead counsel
Mr John Jones, Co-counsel
Mr Iain Edwards, Co-counsel

21 February 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge vacates 25 March 2013 as a tentative date for the start of trial. The decision is in response to the Defence Counsel for the four Accused asking the Pre-Trial Judge to postpone the trial date. The Pre-Trial Judge found that certain disclosure obligations had not been met, which the Prosecution recognised.

31 July 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge authorises the amendment of the indictment. The amended indictment of 31 July 2013 becomes the operative indictment without significant additional or modifications to the charges.

15 August 2013 - Following the Pre-Trial Judge’s decisions of 14 March and 15 August 2013, 29 victims can participate in the proceedings confidentially, without having their identities disclosed to the public.

28 October 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge completes the transfer of the entire Ayyash et al. case to the Trial Chamber, marking the start of transition from the pre-trial to trial phase.

16 January 2014 - The Ayyash et al. trial starts.

11 February 2014 - The case against Hassan Habib Merehi is joined to the Ayyash et al. case.

16 June 2014 - The Ayyash et al. trial resumes after it was adjourned upon the request of the Merhi Defence.

Defence Office
Mr François Roux, Head of the Defence Office

Legal Representatives of the Victims
Mr Peter Hayes, Lead Legal Representative
Ms Mohammad Mattar, Co-legal Representative
Ms Nada Abdelkader-Ahmad, Co-legal Representative

The biographies of STL senior officers are available on the Tribunal’s website:
www.stl-tlot.org/en/about-the-stl/the-four-phases
www.stl-tlot.org/en/about-the-stl/biographies
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Charges (as set out in the indictment)

- Conspiracy aimed at committing a terrorist act;
- Being an accomplice to the felony of committing a terrorist act by means of an explosive device;
- Being an accomplice to the felony of intentional homicide of Raïq Hariri with premeditation by using explosive materials;
- Being an accomplice to the felony of intentional homicide of 21 other persons with premeditation by using explosive materials;
- Being an accomplice to the felony of attempted intentional homicide of 226 persons with premeditation by using explosive materials.

The accused, charged with the crimes detailed in the indictment, is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt.

Biographical information (as set out in the indictment)

Date of birth: 12 December 1965
Place of birth: Beirut, Lebanon
Nationality: Lebanese
Confirmation of the indictment: 31 July 2013
Arrest warrant: Delivered sealed to the Lebanese authorities on 6 August 2013.
Current situation: Mr. Merhi remains at large. On 20 December 2013, the STL Trial Chamber decided to try Mr. Merhi in absentia.

Date of commencement of trial in the Ayyash et al. case: 16 January 2014
Date of joinder to the Ayyash et al. case: 11 February 2014

Alleged criminal acts

The indictment states that the former Lebanese Prime Minister Raïq Hariri was assassinated on 14 February 2005, at 12:55 on Rue Minet el Hosn in Beirut as a result of a terrorist act in which a suicide bomber detonated a large quantity of high explosives concealed in a van. In addition to killing Raïq Hariri, the explosion killed 21 other persons and injured 226.

Hassan Habib Merhi is accused of having participated in a conspiracy with others aimed at committing a terrorist act to assassinate Raïq Hariri. Mr. Merhi is accused of having coordinated, together with Mustafa Amine Badreddine, the preparation of the false claim of responsibility, and, at times, to have been in contact with Salim Jamil Ayyash in relation to the preparations for the 14 February 2005 attack. Additionally, prior to the attack, Mr. Merhi is believed to have coordinated the activities of Hussein Hassan Oneissi and Assad Hassan Sabra in order to identify a suitable individual (later identified as Ahmad Abu Adass) to make a video-taped false claim of responsibility for the attack. Immediately following the attack, Mr. Merhi is alleged to have coordinated the activities of Messrs. Oneissi and Sabra to ensure the delivery of the video to the Al-Jazeera office in Beirut, and its broadcast.
Key judicial developments

16 February 2011 - The Appeals Chamber renders its interlocutory decision on the applicable law interpreting, inter alia, terrorism, conspiracy and modes of liability under international and Lebanese law.

28 June 2011 - The Pre-Trial Judge confirms the indictment submitted by the Prosecutor on 17 January 2011 against Messrs. Ayyash, Badreddine, Oneissi and Sabra.

1 February 2012 - The Trial Chamber decides to try the four Accused in the Ayyash et al. case in absentia.

24 October 2012 - The Appeals Chamber dismisses the Defence appeals against the Trial Chamber decision upholding the jurisdiction and legality of the Tribunal.

19 December 2012 - Following the Pre-Trial Judge’s decisions of 8 May, 3 September, 28 November and 19 December 2012, the total number of victims participating in the proceedings is 65.

31 July 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge confirms a scaled indictment submitted by the Prosecutor (on 5 June 2013) against Mr. Merhi. The indictment is made available in a public redacted form in October 2013.

20 December 2013 - The Trial Chamber issues a decision to try Mr. Merhi in absentia.

20 December 2013 - Head of the Defence Office assigns Defence counsel to represent the interests and rights of Mr. Merhi.

30 December 2013 - The Prosecution files an application to the Trial Chamber in the Ayyash et al. case to join Mr. Oneissi.

16 January 2014 - The trial in the Ayyash et al. case starts with the opening statements of the Prosecution, the Legal Representatives of Victims and Defence counsel for Messrs. Badreddine and Oneissi.

11 February 2014 - The Trial Chamber joins the case against Hassan Habib Merhi to the Ayyash et al. proceedings.

The work of the STL is divided into four phases: investigation and indictment, pre-trial, trial and appeal. An overview of these procedural stages is available on the STL website: www.stl-tsl.org/en/about-the-stl/the-four-phases

Terrorism

The STL is the first tribunal of an international character to deal with terrorism as a distinct crime committed outside the context of an armed conflict. The Tribunal was established by UN Security Council Resolution 1757 (2007), which reconfirmed that the attack of 14 February 2005 and its implications constituted a “threat to international peace and security”. Its decision of 16 February 2011 on the law to be applied by the Tribunal, the STL’s Appeals Chamber clarified that the Tribunal applies Lebanese domestic law – including the crime of terrorism stipulated in Article 314 of the Lebanese Criminal Code – in consonance with international conventional and customary law. The Appeals Chamber’s decision also defined terrorism as a crime under customary international law for the first time.

Composition of the Trial Chamber
Judge David Re, Presiding Judge
Judge Micheline Braidi
Judge Janet Nosworthy
Judge Walid Akoury, Alternate Judge
Judge Nicola Lettieri, Alternate Judge

Representation of the Office of the Prosecutor
Mr. Norman Farrel, Prosecutor
Ms. Joyce Tabet, Deputy Prosecutor
Mr. Ekkehard Wittekind, Senior Trial counsel
Mr. Cameron Graeme, Senior Trial counsel
Mr. Alexander Hugh Milne, Senior Trial counsel

Defence Counsel for Hassan Habib Merhi
Mr. Mohamed Aouni, Lead counsel
Ms. Dorothée Le Frape, Co-counsel
Mr. Jad Khalil, Co-counsel

Defence Office
Mr. François Roux, Head of the Defence Office

Representation of the Registry
Mr. Daryl Mundis, Registrar
Ms. Amelie Zinzius, Deputy Registrar

Legal Representatives of the Victims
Mr. Peter Haynes, Lead Legal Representative
Mr. Mohammad Mattar, Co-legal Representative
Ms. Nada Abdelaziz-Abusamra, Co-legal Representative

The biographies of STL senior officers are available on the Tribunal’s website: www.stl-tsl.org/en/about-the-stl/biographies
Hussein Hassan
Oneissi
Ayyash et al.
(Case number STL-11-01)

Charges (as set out in the indictment)

- Conspiracy aimed at committing a terrorist act;
- Being an accomplice to the felony of:
  - Committing a terrorist act by means of an explosive device;
  - Intentional homicide of Rafiq Hariri with premeditation by using explosive materials;
  - Intentional homicide of 21 other persons with premeditation by using explosive materials;
- Attempted intentional homicide of 226 persons with premeditation by using explosive materials.

The Accused, charged with the crimes detailed in the indictment, is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt.

Biographical information (as set out in the indictment)

Date of birth 11 February 1974
Place of birth Beirut (Lebanon)
Nationality Lebanese
Confirmation of the indictment 28 June 2011

Arrest warrant Delivered confidentially to the Lebanese authorities on 28 June 2011 and, most recently, on 9 August 2013. International arrest warrant issued on 8 July 2011 and, more recently, on 9 August 2013.

Current situation Mr Oneissi remains at large. On 1 February 2012, the STL Trial Chamber decided to try Mr Oneissi and the three other Accused in the Ayyash et al. case in absentia.

Date of commencement of trial 16 January 2014

Alleged criminal acts

The indictment states that the former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri was assassinated on 14 February 2005, at 12:55 on Rue Minet El Hosn in Beirut, as a result of a terrorist act in which a suicide bomber detonated a large quantity of high explosives concealed in a van. In addition to killing Rafiq Hariri, the explosion killed 21 other persons and injured 226.

Mr Oneissi, also known as “Hussein Hassan Issa”, is accused of having participated in a conspiracy with others aimed at committing a terrorist act to assassinate Rafiq Hariri. Mr Oneissi, along with Assad Hassan Sabra, is also accused of having participated prior to the attack in the selection of a suitable individual, later identified as Ahmed Abu Adas, to make a false claim of responsibility; and in his disappearance. The indictment further alleges that Mr Oneissi and Mr Sabra acted together immediately after the assassination in order to disseminate statements falsely attributing responsibility for the attack, and to ensure the delivery and subsequent broadcast of the videotaped false claim of responsibility to the Al-Jazeera office in Beirut.
Key judicial developments

16 February 2011 - The Appeals Chamber renders its interlocutory decision on the applicable law interpreting, inter alia, terrorism, conspiracy and modes of liability under international and Lebanese law.

28 June 2011 - The Pre-Trial Judge confirms the indictment against Messrs Ayash, Badreddine, Oneissi and Sabra submitted by the Prosecutor on 17 January 2011.

30 June 2011 - The indictment is transmitted to the Lebanese authorities, who have an obligation to report on the measures taken in searching for, arresting, detaining and transferring the Accused to the seat of the Tribunal within 30 days. Reporting obligations are ongoing.

8 July 2011 - International arrest warrants are issued against the four Accused, including Mr Oneissi. Subsequent international arrest warrants have been issued on 9 August 2013 following the amendment of the indictment.

1 February 2012 - The Trial Chamber decides to try the four Accused in the Ayash et al. case in absentia.

2 February 2012 - The Head of the Defence Office assigns 8 counsel to represent the interest and rights of the four Accused.

16 January 2014 - The Ayash et al. trial starts.

16 February 2014 - The case against Hassan Habib Merhi is joined to the Ayash et al. case.

16 June 2014 - The Ayash et al. trial resumes after it was adjourned upon the request of the Merhi Defence.

21 February 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge vacates 25 March 2013 as a tentative date for the start of trial. The decision is in response to the Defence Counsel for the four Accused asking the Pre-Trial judge to postpone the trial date. The Pre-Trial Judge found that certain disclosure obligations had not been met, which the Prosecution recognised.

31 July 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge authorises the amendment of the indictment. The amended indictment of 21 June 2013 becomes the operative indictment with no significant additions or modifications to the charges.

15 August 2013 - Following the Pre-Trial Judge’s decisions of 14 March and 15 August 2013, 29 victims can participate in the proceedings confidentially, without having their identities disclosed to the public.

28 October 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge completes the transfer of the entire Ayash et al. case to the Trial Chamber, marking the start of transition from the pre-trial to trial phase.

Composition of the Trial Chamber:
- Judge David Re, Presiding Judge
- Judge Micheline Braidi
- Judge Janet Nwosu
- Judge Walid Akour, Alternate Judge
- Judge Nicola Lettieri, Alternate Judge

Representation of the Office of the Prosecutor:
- Mr. Norman Fardell, Prosecutor
- Mr. Ekelhard Withof, Senior Trial Counsel
- Mr. Cameron Graeme, Senior Trial Counsel
- Mr. Alexander Hugh Milne, Senior Trial Counsel

Representation of the Office of the Prosecutor:
- Mr. Vincent Courcelle-Labrousse, Lead Counsel
- Mr. Yaser Hassan, Co-counsel
- Mr. Philippe Larochelle, Co-counsel

Terrorism

The STL is the first tribunal of an international character to deal with terrorism as a distinct crime committed outside the context of an armed conflict. The Tribunal was established by UN Security Council Resolution 1275 (2000), which reaffirmed that the attack of 14 February 2005 and its implications constituted a “threat to international peace and security”. In its decision of 16 February 2011 on the law to be applied by the Tribunal, the STL’s Appeals Chamber clarified that the Tribunal applies Lebanese domestic law – including the crime of terrorism stipulated in Article 314 of the Lebanese Criminal Code – in consonance with international conventional and customary law. The Appeals Chamber’s decision also defined terrorism as a crime under customary international law for the first time.

Defence Office:
- Mr. François Roux, Head of the Defence Office

Representation of the Registry:
- Mr. Daryl Mundis, Registrar
- Ms. Amelie Zinzius, Deputy Registrar

Legal Representatives of the Victims:
- Mr. Peter Haynes, Lead Legal Representative
- Mr. Mohammad Matan, Co-Legal Representative
- Ms. Nada Abdelater-Abusamra, Co-Legal Representative

The biographies of STL senior officers are available on the Tribunal’s website:
www.stl-tel.org/en/about-the-stl/biographies
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Ooster van der Stroomstraat 1, 2265 BC Leidschendam, Netherlands
PO Box 115, 2260 AC Leidschendam, Netherlands.
For more information please contact the Public Information and Communications Section: stl-pressoffice@un.org Tel: +31 (0) 70 809 1560 / 3818 and +4911 4 538 100 (Beirut)
Twitter: @stl_lebanon Facebook: www.facebook.com/stlebanon YouTube: www.youtube.com/stlebanon Flickr: www.flickr.com/stlebanon
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**Charges (as set out in the indictment)**

- Conspiracy aimed at committing a terrorist act;
- Being an accomplice to the felony of:
  - Committing a terrorist act by means of an explosive device;
  - Intentional homicide of Rafiq Hariri with premeditation by using explosive materials;
  - Intentional homicide of 21 other persons with premeditation by using explosive materials;
  - Attempted intentional homicide of 226 persons with premeditation by using explosive materials.

*The Accused, charged with the crimes detailed in the indictment, is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt.*

**Biographical information (as set out in the indictment)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>15 October 1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td>Beirut (Lebanon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Lebanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of the indictment</td>
<td>28 June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest warrant</td>
<td>Delivered confidentially to the Lebanese authorities on 28 June 2011 and, most recently, on 9 August 2013. International arrest warrant issued on 8 July 2011 and, more recently, on 9 August 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current situation</td>
<td>Mr Sabra remains at large. On 1 February 2012, the STL Trial Chamber decided to try Mr Sabra and the three other Accused in the Ayyash et al. case in absentia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of commencement of trial</td>
<td>16 January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alleged criminal acts**

The indictment states that the former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri was assassinated on 14 February 2005, at 12:55 on Rue Minet el Hosn in Beirut, as a result of a terrorist act in which a suicide bomber detonated a large quantity of high explosives concealed in a van. In addition to killing Rafiq Hariri, the explosion killed 21 other persons and injured 226.

Mr Sabra is accused of having participated in a conspiracy with others aimed at committing a terrorist act to assassinate Rafiq Hariri. Mr Sabra, along with Hussein Hassan Oneissi, is also accused of having participated prior to the attack in the selection of a suitable individual, later identified as Ahmed Abu Adass, to make a false claim of responsibility. The indictment further alleges that Mr Sabra and Mr Oneissi acted together immediately after the assassination in order to disseminate statements falsely attributing responsibility for the attack, and to ensure the delivery and subsequent broadcast of the video-taped false claim of responsibility to the Al-Jazeera office in Beirut.

---

*This document is also available on the STL website (www.stl-tel.org) and on Scribd (www.scribd.com/stlbeirut). All the judicial filings are available on the Tribunal's website at the following address: www.stl-tel.org/en/filings-all-cases. Before throwing away this document, give it to a friend who is interested in learning about the Tribunal.*
Key judicial developments

16 February 2011 - The Appeals Chamber renders its interlocutory decision on the applicable law interpreting, inter alia, terrorism, conspiracy and modes of liability under international and Lebanese law.

28 June 2011 - The Pre-Trial Judge confirms the indictment against Mses Ayyash, Badreddine, Ouedissi and Sabra submitted by the Prosecutor on 17 January 2011.

30 June 2011 - The indictment is transmitted to the Lebanese authorities, who have an obligation to report on the measures taken in searching for, arresting, detaining and transferring the Accused to the seat of the Tribunal within 30 days. Reporting obligations are ongoing.

8 July 2011 - International arrest warrants are issued against the four Accused, including Mr Sabra. Subsequent international arrest warrants have been issued on 9 August 2013 following the amendment of the indictment.

1 February 2012 - The Trial Chamber decides to try the four Accused in the Ayyash et al. case in absentia.

2 February 2012 - The Head of the Defence Office assigns 8 counsel to represent the interest and rights of the Accused.

24 October 2012 - The Appeals Chamber dismisses the Defence appeals against the Trial Chamber decision upholding the jurisdiction and legality of the Tribunal.

19 December 2012 - Following the Pre-Trial Judge’s decisions of 8 May, 3 September, 28 November and 19 December 2012, the total number of victims participating in the proceedings is 66.

Terrorism

The STL is the first tribunal of an international character to deal with terrorism as a distinct crime committed outside the context of an armed conflict. The Tribunal was established by UN Security Council Resolution 1777 (2007), which reaffirmed that the attack of 14 February 2005 and its implications constituted a "threat to international peace and security". In its decision of 16 February 2011 on the law to be applied by the Tribunal, the STL's Appeals Chamber clarified that the Tribunal applies Lebanese domestic law — including the crime of terrorism stipulated in Article 314 of the Lebanese Criminal Code — in consonance with international conventional and customary law. The Appeals Chamber's decision also defined terrorism as a crime under customary international law for the first time.

Composition of the Trial Chamber:
Judge David Re, Presiding Judge
Judge Micheline Braidi
Judge Janet Nowotny
Judge Walid Alouan, Alternate Judge
Judge Nicola Lettieri, Alternate Judge

Representation of the Office of the Prosecutor
Mr Norman Farrell, Prosecutor
Mr Ebehard Witter, Senior Trial counsel
Mr Cameron Green, Senior Trial counsel
Mr Alexander Hugh Milne, Senior Trial counsel

Defence Counsel for Assaad Hassan Sabra:
Mr David Young, Lead counsel
Mr Gaëtan Meuraz, Co-counsel
Mr Geoff Roberts, Co-counsel

21 February 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge vacates 25 March 2013 as a tentative date for the start of trial. The decision is in response to the Defence Counsel for the four Accused asking the Pre-Trial Judge to postpone the trial date. The Pre-Trial Judge found that certain disclosure obligations had not been met, which the Prosecution recognised.

31 July 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge authorises the amendment of the indictment. The amended indictment of 21 June 2013 becomes the operative indictment with no significant additions or modifications to the charges.

15 August 2013 - Following the Pre-Trial Judge's decisions of 14 March and 15 August 2013, 29 victims can participate in the proceedings confidentially, without having their identities disclosed to the public.

28 October 2013 - The Pre-Trial Judge completes the transfer of the entire Ayyash et al. case to the Trial Chamber, marking the start of transition from the pre-trial to trial phase.

16 January 2014 - The Ayyash et al. trial starts.

11 February 2014 - The case against Hassan Habib Merhi is joined to the Ayyash et al. case.

16 June 2014 - The Ayyash et al. trial resumes after it was adjourned upon the request of the Merhi Defence.

The work of the STL is divided into four phases: investigation and indictment, pre-trial, trial and appeal. An overview of these procedural stages is available on the STL website:
www.stl-tle.org/en/about-the-stl/the-four-phases

www.stl-tle.org
Rokin van der Stammstraat 1, 2265 BC Leidschendam, Netherlands • PO Box 115, 2260 AC Leidschendam, Netherlands.
For more information please contact the Public Information and Communications Section: stl.pressoffice@un.org Tel: +31 (0) 70 800 3560 / 3828 and +961 4538 100 (Beirut)
www.twitter.com/stlbannon • www.facebook.com/stlbannon • www.youtube.com/stlbannon • www.flickr.com/stlbannon
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Redacted Version of the Prosecution Submission of Consolidated Indictment, Witness and Exhibit Lists
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I. INTRODUCTION

1. In compliance with the Trial Chamber’s oral decision of 12 February 2014¹ and its subsequent written decision of 25 February 2014,² the Prosecution files its consolidated Indictment, Witness List and Exhibit List as ordered, following the joinder of the cases against Ayyash et al. and Merhi.³

2. During its preparation of the consolidated Indictment, the Prosecution considered the clarifications sought by Defence counsel for Mr. Merhi as outlined in the Preliminary Motion on Defects in the Form of the Indictment, which was filed before the Trial Chamber on 14 February 2014.⁴ The Prosecution also noted several areas in which amendments could enhance the clarity of the indictment through the removal of unnecessary evidential information, the addition of more precise information and by clarifying the roles of the Accused. Accordingly, the Prosecution respectfully requests leave of the Trial Chamber to amend the Indictment of 7 March 2014 in the case against Ayyash et al., pursuant to Rule 71(A)(iii) of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence (Rules). The consolidated Indictment with proposed amendments is attached as Annex A.

3. In addition to preparing consolidated Rule 91 Witness and Exhibit Lists, the Prosecution respectfully requests the amendment of its Rule 91 Witness and Exhibit Lists. The Prosecution seeks to add one witness and has updated the information in the Rule 91 Witness list, such as witness summaries, and references to counts/paragraphs of the indictment, the total number of witnesses, and mode of testimony pursuant to its obligation under Rule 91(G)(ii)(b), (c), (d) and (e). The Prosecution hereby files the name of one additional witness as confidential Annex B and its updated Rule 91 Witness List as confidential Annex C.

---

¹ STL, Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al., STL-11-01/T/TC, Transcript of 12 February 2014, pp. 25-26, 121.
³ Ibid.
⁴ STL, Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al., Case No. STL-11-01/PT/TC, Preliminary Motion on Defects in the Form of the Indictment, 14 February 2014 (“Preliminary Motion on Defects of 14 February 2014”).
4. Additionally, the Prosecution provides notice that it will withdraw 25 exhibits for the reasons set out below. These exhibits are listed in confidential Annex D. The Prosecution also seeks to add 76 exhibits. The majority of this evidence underlies two updated expert reports related to: a) attribution of Merhi’s phones and b) a [Redacted] that incorporates details related to all five Accused. Further justification for adding these exhibits are set out below and in confidential Annex E. The Prosecution files its updated Rule 91 Exhibit List, as confidential Annex F, which reflects the consolidation and the amendments requested in this Motion.

II. SUBMISSIONS

A. Consolidated Indictment

5. The consolidated Indictment has been formulated using the confirmed Indictment in the case of Ayyash et al.\textsuperscript{5} with the incorporation of all relevant parts of the confirmed Merhi Indictment.\textsuperscript{6} The changes mainly involve the addition of Merhi’s name at relevant paragraphs or constitute stylistic changes in order to retain the paragraph numbers. The changes are described in detail below:

a) Additions/deletions of Merhi’s name and personal information: the addition of Merhi’s name at paragraphs 1(a), 1(c), 54, 64, 64(d), 66, 66(d), 68, 68(f), 70, 70(f); the addition of name and personal information and/or description of roles at paragraphs 1(e), 3(e), 44(a), (d), (g) and (h); and, deletion of Merhi’s name where no longer applicable at paragraphs 3 and 54(a);

b) Stylistic changes: Merhi’s name has been added in bold uppercase throughout the Indictment; integers from zero to nine are spelled out in words at paragraphs 13, 15(a) and (b), 17, 23(a), (b), (c) and (d), 35, 39(b), 42 and 44; integers greater than nine are expressed in numerals at paragraphs 15(e), 54, 56(a) and (f), 58(a), 60(a) and (b), 62(a), 64(a) and (b), 66(a) and (b), 68(a) and (b), 70(a) and (b); the addition of sub-paragraphs under paragraphs 3 and

\textsuperscript{5} STL, Prosecutors v. Ayyash et al., STL-11-01/PT/PTJ, Prosecution’s Filing of the Signed Version of the Amended Indictment in Compliance with the Pre-Trial Judge’s Decision of 31 July 2013 & Request for Amended Arrest Warrants and Orders Requests for Transfer and Detention, 2 August 2013.

\textsuperscript{6} STL, Prosecution v. Merhi, STL-13-04/I/PTJ, Indictment, 5 June 2013.
44; and, sub-paragraphs under 64(e) have been changed to Roman numerals for consistency with other sub-sections in the indictment

e) The number of Accused has been updated from ‘four’ to ‘five’ at paragraphs 3 and 44.

B. Consolidated Witness List

6. The consolidated witness list has been formulated using the witness list from the Ayyash et al. case with the incorporation of any witnesses that featured on the witness list of the Merhi case which were not already included. This has resulted in the addition of one witness, PRH 675.

C. Consolidated Exhibit List

7. The consolidated exhibit list has been formulated using the exhibit list from the Ayyash et al. case with the incorporation of any exhibits that featured on the exhibit list of the Merhi case which were not already included. This has resulted in the addition of 4 exhibits. The consolidated Exhibit List together with proposed additions is provided as Confidential Annex F.

D. Request for Leave to Amend the Consolidated Indictment

8. Pursuant to Rule 71(A)(iii), the Prosecutor may amend an indictment after the assignment of the case to the Trial Chamber, with the leave of the Trial Chamber, after having heard the Parties.

9. As noted by the Pre-Trial Judge, "Rule 71(B) of the Rules provides that an indictment may only be amended if there is "prima facie evidence to support the proposed amendment" and if "[...] the amendment would not result in improper prejudice to the accused." The proposed amendments to the Consolidated Indictment of 7 March 2014 are consistent with these Rule 71(B) requirements, and, therefore, the Trial

---

5 R91-805128, R91-805129, R91-805130 and R91-400215.

8 STL, Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al., Case No. STL-11-01/PT/PTJ, Decision relating to the Prosecution Requests of 8 November 2012 and 6 February 2013 for the Filing of an Amended Indictment, 12 April 2013, para. 17 (Decision of 12 April 2013).
Chamber should grant leave to amend the Consolidated Indictment of 7 March 2014 as provided in Annex A.

10. The proposed amendments clarify the existing charges and do not contain any new charges or counts. Furthermore, some amendments address issues raised in the Preliminary Motion on Defects of 14 February 2014 filed by the Defence Counsel for Mr Merhi. Given that the amendments provide clarification of the existing charges, they will not result in any delay to the proceedings, and will facilitate the Defence’s preparations for trial.

11. The amendments proposed in Annex A consist of:

a) Changes that address issues raised in the Preliminary Motion on Defects of 14 February 2014;

b) Removal of information that is evidentiary in nature; and

c) Amendments that add precision and/or clarify the indictment.

12. First, the Prosecution seeks to amend the indictment in response to clarifications sought by the Merhi Defence concerning the role of Merhi in relation to the false claim of responsibility, the disappearance of Ahmad Abu Adass and the conspiracy as a whole. In particular, the Prosecution seeks to amend paragraphs 3(c) and 3(d), which provide an explanation of the roles of Oneissi and Sabra. The suggested amendments clarify that Merhi coordinated all the activities of Oneissi and Sabra.

13. In the interest of clarity, the Prosecution also seeks to add an explanatory sentence at the beginning of paragraph 19(a), as follows:

The Green Network was a coordination network used exclusively by three co-conspirators – BADREDDINE, AYYASH, and MERHI – to exchange information regarding all aspects of the conspiracy and coordinate the acts done in furtherance of the conspiracy.

---

9 Preliminary Motion on Defects of 14 February 2014.
10 Ibid., paras 12, 23-28.
14. Further, at paragraph 19(c) additional information has been added to clarify that Ayyash and Merhi were in contact in relation to preparations for the attack on Hariri, "including the false claim of responsibility."

15. Second, the Prosecution seeks to remove references to some extraneous and unnecessary evidence from the indictment. Paragraphs 2(a) and 2(b) provide descriptive information about the Accused Badreddine and Ayyash that is no longer necessary to include. The Prosecution seeks to remove references to two other names associated with Badreddine's identity, namely 'Mustafa Youssef Badreddine' and 'Elias Fouad Saab.' Furthermore, the Prosecution seeks to remove the latter part of paragraph 2(a), which provides a description of the activities of 'Elias Fouad Saab' in Kuwait in 1983. Similarly, paragraph 2(b) contains extraneous and unnecessary evidence concerning the Hajj passport number of the Accused Ayyash.

16. The remaining amendments are intended to provide a measure of precision and clarity, as follows:

a) Paragraph 18 provides an explanation of the table which lists the relevant phones of the Accused and unidentified others. Due to the numbers of phones that aid in attribution of the Accused's phones, the Prosecution wishes to clarify that the table does not list all of the phones attributed to the Accused. Rather, the table lists the main phones used by the Accused "at and around the material time."

b) Paragraph 19 provides an explanation of the diagram of interconnected phone groups. The Prosecution seeks to replace the words "pictorial representation" with the word "diagram" as a more appropriate descriptor.

c) The diagram titled "Interconnected Phone Groups," has been amended to remove the subject numbers of the Accused, which are no longer utilized by the Prosecution.

d) At paragraphs 42, 56, 58(e)ii, 60(h), 61(g) the Prosecution seeks to more precisely describe the quantity of explosives used in the attack by stating that the quantity of explosives was "equivalent to approximately 2500 kilogrammes of TNT." This expression more accurately reflects the scientific
approach to such a calculation, as explained by the Prosecution in the opening statement.

e) Paragraphs 44 to 45 represent a consolidation of the *Ayyash et al.* and *Merhi* indictments. Due to this consolidation, some of the content became redundant or required additional language to link paragraphs together in an orderly manner. For example, an explanatory sentence has been added to the end of paragraph 44 to note that the following subparagraphs describe a sequence of events. In addition, to preserve the paragraph numbering of the indictment, the latter portion of paragraph 44 e) was moved to paragraph 45. The latter paragraph was redundant and has been removed.

17. At paragraph 60(m)(13), information pertaining to the death of a victim has been removed as it does not accurately reflect the evidence that he died on 14 February 2005.

1. The proposed amendments are beneficial for the Defence and the Trial Chamber

18. As noted by the Pre-Trial Judge, when ruling on amendments to a confirmed indictment, “two elements should be considered: on the one hand, the delays in the proceedings which might result from an amendment of the indictment and, on the other hand, the benefit that the accused and the judges might derive from it.”

19. The proposed amendments do not cause any improper prejudice to the Accused and will not unduly delay the proceedings. Amendments which clarify and provide further details regarding the material facts and/or the elements of the charges underpinning an indictment, such as those proposed by the Prosecution in this request, do not prejudice the ability of an accused to prepare his defence. Rather, such amendments facilitate the defence’s understanding of the charges. Given this, the proposed amendments will not result in any delay in the proceedings.

---

11 Decision of 12 April 2013, para.17.
12 See e.g., ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Hadžić*, Case No. IT-04-75-PT, Decision on Motion for Leave to Amend the First Amended Indictment, 14 March 2012, paras.13-15, 22, 25-27, 31, 34 (finding that “these revisions provide further specificity and clarification as to the category of victims of the crimes charged in the First Amended Indictment, thereby informing Hadžić clearly of the nature and cause of the charges and enabling him to adequately prepare a defence”, para.15); ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Mladić*, Case No. IT-
E. Request for Leave to further Amend the Rule 91 Witness List

20. As previously held by the Trial Chamber and the Pre-Trial Judge, a Chamber may, in the interests of justice, allow a party to amend its witness and exhibit lists. The Chamber must balance the Prosecution’s interest in presenting any available evidence

09-92-1, Decision on Amendment of Indictment, 27 May 2011, paras.13, 16 (noting that “a clearer and more specific indictment benefits the accused [...] because the accused can tailor their preparations to an indictment that more accurately reflects the case they will meet, thus resulting in a more effective defence”, para.13 and holding that since a number of the proposed amendments would “clarify and further particularize the Prosecution’s allegations,” they “may lead to a clearer and more specific indictment, allowing the Accused to more effectively prepare his defence”, para.16); ICTY, Prosecutor v. Stanislić et al., Case No. IT-08-91-PT, Decision on Motion and Supplementary Motion for Leave to Amend the Indictment, 28 April 2009, paras.18-20 (The Chamber granted the Prosecution’s amendments concerning mens rea, holding that “these proposed additions are consistent with the jurisprudence and clarify rather than alter the Prosecution case.”, para.18; The Chamber further noted that, “These proposed amendments do not affect the substance of the allegations against the Accused. They add more clarity to the pleading of mens rea. The Chamber is satisfied that the proposed amendments will facilitate the determination of the issues in the case”, para.20); ICTY, Prosecutor v. Boškoski et al., Case No. IT-04-82-PT, Decision on Prosecution's Motion to Amend the Indictment and Submission of Proposed Second Amended Indictment and Submission of Proposed Amended Pre-Trial Brief, 26 May 2016, ("Boškoski Decision"), paras.14, 48 ("Moreover, the Trial Chamber considers that a clear and understandable indictment is likely to have a beneficial impact on future proceedings, particularly as it may reduce or prevent possible future challenges to the operative indictment. In this regard, the Trial Chamber reiterates that it is established practice that a Trial Chamber will usually exercise its discretion to permit an amendment to an indictment where that is sought to ensure that the real issues in the case will be determined and the amendment will not prejudice the accused unfairly", para.14; The Trial Chamber further noted that a proposed amendment that “clarifies the scope of [the accused’s] alleged responsibility [...] assists the Defence in the preparation of their defence, and, as such, enhances the fairness of the trial”, para.48); ICTY, Prosecutor v. Haradinaj et al, Case No. IT-04-84-PT, Decision on Motion to Amend the Amended Indictment, 12 January 2007, para.12 ("A Chamber enjoys wide discretion in granting leave to amend an indictment, and will typically grant such leave where the amendment in question has the prospect of helping 'to ensure that the real issues in the case will be determined'. The Trial Chamber has examined the amendments proposed in the Revised Second Amended Indictment and considers that, on the whole, they serve to clarify the scope of the Prosecution's case against the Accused. The great majority of the proffered changes are merely structural, terminological, or typographical, and seek merely to rectify minor, non-substantive errors and ambiguities"); ICTY, Prosecutor v. Haradinaj et al, Case No. IT-04-84-PT, Decision on Motion to Amend the Indictment and on Challenges to the Form of the Indictment, 25 October 2006, para.9 ("The Trial Chamber has examined the amendments proposed in the Amended Indictment and considers that, on the whole, they serve to clarify the scope of the Prosecution's case against the Accused. It is accordingly inclined to grant leave to make such amendments, provided the following two conditions are fulfilled: the inclusion of the amendments must not result in unfair prejudice to the Accused; and those amendments which are material must be supported by documentation meeting the prima facie standard in Article 19 of the Statute").

STL, Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al., Case No. STL-11-01/PT/TC, Decision Authorising the Prosecution to Amend its Exhibit List and to Redact Exhibit 55, 19 November 2013, (Trial Chamber Decision of 19 November 2013), para 4, STL, Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al., Case No. STL-11-01/PT/PTI, Decision on the Prosecution Submission Pursuant to Rule 91(G)(ii) and (iii), 18 September 2013, para.11, and STL, Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al., Case No. STL-11-01/PT/PTI, Decision on Two Prosecution Submissions in Relation to Amending the Prosecution Rule 91 Filings, 5 August 2013, para.20.
against the rights of an accused person to adequate time and facilities to prepare for trial.\textsuperscript{14}

21. The Prosecution seeks to add one witness, PRH687, whose statement was inadvertently removed from the exhibit list and was therefore omitted from the Witness List. [Redacted]. Such evidence is relevant and probative; however, it does not relate to the acts and conduct of the Accused.

22. The Prosecution also provides notice that four witnesses will no longer be called upon and the Prosecution will seek leave to remove these witnesses from the Witness List in due course.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{F. Request for Leave to further Amend the Rule 91 Exhibit List}

23. In accordance with Rule 91(G), the Prosecution hereby gives notice that it no longer intends to rely on 25 exhibits and requests that these exhibits be removed from the Rule 91 Exhibit List. The exhibits in which the Prosecutions seeks to withdraw relate to three categories: (a) [Redacted];\textsuperscript{16} (b) seven exhibits identified as duplicates; and (c) 13 other exhibits on which the Prosecution does not intend to rely.

24. The proposed removals are in the interest of preparing for an efficient and expeditious trial and the Defence teams will not be prejudiced by the withdrawal of these exhibits. The list of exhibits noted for removal is provided as confidential Annex D.

25. The Prosecution seeks to add 76 to the consolidated Rule 91 Exhibit List, listed in confidential Annex E. The large majority of exhibits stem from the addition of two updated expert reports, which the Prosecution also seeks to add. In accordance with the Trial Chamber’s decision of 24 January 2014,\textsuperscript{17} requiring the Prosecution to notify the Defence in advance of any application to amend its witness or exhibit list if it is

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{15} Witnesses PRH252, PRH311, PRH380 and PRH568 will be withdrawn in due course.

\textsuperscript{16} STL, \textit{Prosecutor vs. Ayyash et al.}, Case No. STL-11-01/T/TC, Decision authorising the Prosecution to amend its Exhibit List, 20 February 2014 ("Decision of 20 February 2014").

\textsuperscript{17} STL, \textit{Prosecutor vs. Ayyash et al.}, Case No. STL-11-01/T/TC, Decision authorising the Prosecution to Amend its Witness and Exhibit Lists, 24 January 2014, Disposition ("Decision of 24 January 2014").
proposing to obtain new or updated expert evidence, the Prosecution has undertaken the following steps:

a) During the joinder hearing of 11 February 2014\(^{18}\), the Prosecution gave notice that two new or updated expert reports, one on chronology and one on attribution, that relate to Mr Merhi, would be filed by the end of the month. Both reports in question were disclosed on 28 February 2014.\(^{19}\)

b) In its filing of 4 March 2014,\(^{20}\) the Prosecution gave notice of two new statements by two existing expert witnesses for which, by 7 March 2014, leave of the Trial Chamber would be sought to add those statements to its Rule 91 exhibit list.

1. Phone Attribution-related Exhibits

26. The Prosecution seeks leave to add a recently received expert report related to communications evidence titled [Redacted].\(^{21}\) The amended report is authored by witness PRH230 and pertains to the third part of the Prosecution's case. The majority of the modifications to the report originated from the integration of the underlying evidence in the body and in the footnotes of the reports. The amended report is relevant, as further detailed in confidential Annex E, and has been disclosed to the Defence as of the date of filing. The Trial Chamber has previously granted leave to amend the Rule 91 Exhibit List to replace original reports with their amended version in similar circumstances.\(^{22}\)

27. The Prosecution respectfully requests leave to add a further 47 exhibits related to the attribution of phones to the Accused, of which 42 constitute underlying exhibits footnoted in the [Redacted]. Most of the underlying material has been extracted from sources or databases from which other extracts on the Rule 91 Exhibit List originated.

\(^{18}\) STL, Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al, STL-11-01/7/TC, Transcript of 11 February 2014, pp. 61-62.

\(^{19}\) ERN D0353460-D0353600 and ERN D0352989-D0353446 were disclosed to the Defence on 28 January 2014 via Legal Workflow.

\(^{20}\) STL, Prosecutor v. Ayyash et al., Case No. STL-11-01/7/TC, Updated Prosecution Notice of Expert Witnesses and their Statements, 4 March 2014, para.3.

\(^{21}\) ERN D0353460-D0353600.

\(^{22}\) Decision of 20 February 2014.
For the remaining five exhibits, the Prosecution has identified materials relevant to further attribution points. Most of the exhibits were received after the November 2012 Rule 91 Submission. In two instances, the Prosecution has identified materials that should have been included on the Rule 91 Exhibit List in November 2012, but were inadvertently omitted.

28. The material is relevant, as further detailed in Annex E, and as of the date of filing, all of the proposed exhibits have now been disclosed to the Defence. The Trial Chamber has previously held that similar circumstances qualify as good cause for the Prosecution not having earlier sought to add the exhibits to its Rule 91 Exhibit List. The Prosecution respectfully submits that, at the current stage of proceedings, granting their addition to the Rule 91 Exhibit List is in the interest of justice.

2. Communications and Chronology-related Exhibits

29. The Prosecution seeks to add one recently received expert report related to communications evidence titled [Redacted]. The amended report is authored by witness PRH147. The majority of the modifications to the report originated from the joinder of the Merhi case to the Ayyash et al. case. The amended report is relevant, as further detailed in Annex E, and has been disclosed to the Defence as of the date of filing. The Trial Chamber has previously granted leave to amend the Rule 91 Exhibit List to replace original reports with their amended version in similar circumstances.

30. The Prosecution respectfully requests leave to add a further 13 exhibits related to the chronology, of which three exhibits are footnoted in the [Redacted]. The underlying material has been extracted from sources or databases from which other extracts on the Rule 91 Exhibit List originated. For the remaining ten exhibits, the Prosecution has identified materials relevant to further chronology-related points. Most of the

---

23 ERNs D0334553-D0334585, 60290742-60290752, 60291860-60291867 and 60292891-60292939.
24 ERNs 60171661-60171774 and 60249931-60249946.
26 ERN D0352989-D0353446.
27 Decision of 20 February 2014.
28 ERNs D0359298-D0359298, D0359299-D0359299 and D0359300-D0359300.
exhibits are newly created Call Sequence Tables\textsuperscript{29} with the exception of two newly extracted Subscriber Notes.\textsuperscript{30}

31. The material is relevant, as further detailed in Annex E, and as of the date of filing, all of the proposed exhibits have been disclosed to the Defence. The Trial Chamber has previously held that similar circumstances qualify as good cause for the Prosecution not having earlier sought to add the exhibits to its Rule 91 Exhibit List.\textsuperscript{31} The Prosecution respectfully submits that, at the current stage of proceedings, granting their addition to the Rule 91 Exhibit List is in the interest of justice.

3. Exhibits related to the False Claim of Responsibility

32. The Prosecution seeks leave to add three exhibits to the Rule 91 Exhibit List, which relate to (i) the purchase of the Mitsubishi Canter van, and (ii) the false claim of responsibility. The exhibit related to the purchase of the Mitsubishi Canter van was received after the November 2012 Rule 91 Submission.\textsuperscript{32} The two exhibits proposed in relation to the false claim of responsibility are extracts of exhibits already on the Rule 91 Exhibit List.\textsuperscript{33}

4. Witness Statements

33. The Prosecution seeks leave to add five Rule 155 compliant witness statements.\textsuperscript{34} The Prosecution is in the process of converting certain investigator notes currently on the Rule 91 Exhibit List into Rule 155 compliant witness statements. The content of the documents remains unchanged; the Prosecution has only amended the format of the documents to comply with the Practice Direction on the Procedure for Taking Depositions under Rules 123 and 157 and for Taking Witness Statements for

\textsuperscript{29} ERNs D0358289-D0359137, D0359138-D0359295, D0351189-D0351189, D0351190-D0351190, D0351191-D0351191, D0351192-D0351192, D0351193-D0351193 and D0351194-D0351194.

\textsuperscript{30} ERNs D0359296-D0359296 and D0359297-D0359297.

\textsuperscript{31} Decision of 24 January 2014.

\textsuperscript{32} ERN 60292826-60292835.

\textsuperscript{33} ERNs 50011058-50011063 and 50011525-50011527.

\textsuperscript{34} ERNs 60288855-60288867, 60288856-60288874, 60282527-60282545, 60288875-60288885 and 60289313-60289329.
Admission in Court under Rule 155. The Investigators Notes were disclosed previously, and remain in the possession of the Defence.

34. The Prosecution further seeks to add one witness whose anticipated evidence is relevant to [Redacted]. The additional witness was identified as necessary during the updating of the [Redacted], which was completed in December 2013; however, this statement had been inadvertently withdrawn in September 2013. Due to its previous inclusion on the Exhibit List, this statement has already been disclosed.

35. Additionally, the Prosecution seeks to add six witness statements providing chain of custody information on evidence relevant to the Prosecution’s case, as further detailed in Annex E. These proposed additional exhibits have been disclosed to the Defence as of the date of filing and offer clarification concerning existing Rule 91 exhibits or other exhibits also listed in Annex E.
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37 EIRNs 60293028-60292064, 60292062-60292065, 60293964-60293968, 60293974-60293977, 60293970-60293973 and 60293552-60293557.
III. RELIEF REQUESTED

36. For the above reasons, the Prosecution respectfully requests the Trial Chamber to:

   a. GRANT the Prosecution leave to amend the Consolidated Indictment of 7 March 2014 as described in this filing and provided in Annex A;

   b. GRANT leave to amend the Rule 91 Witness List by adding the witness listed in Annex B;

   c. GRANT leave to amend the Rule 91 Exhibit List by removing the 25 exhibits listed in Annex D, and adding the 76 exhibits listed in Annex E.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]
Norman Farrell
Prosecutor

Dated this 10th day of March 2014
Leidschendam, The Netherlands

Word Count: 4319
Judicial developments

On 3 March, Defence counsel for Mr Merhi and Mr Sabra concluded the cross-examination of Mr Ghaleh El-Chammas via video-conference link. Mr El-Chammas testified about the statement he gave to the United Nations International Independent Investigation Commission (UNIIIC) in 2005 and about his knowledge of payments allegedly made to Brigadier-General Ghazi Kanaan. Mr El-Chammas could not confirm such payments, as he did not deal with them himself. Mr El-Chammas also gave evidence based on his previous witness statement to the UNIIIC regarding the construction works in the Beirut St. Georges area prior to February 2005. Mr El-Chammas confirmed that after the assassination, many people came to him and provided information on the construction work there. Mr El-Chammas did not verify the details of this information himself, but told the UNIIIC. Mr El-Chammas also testified about his recollection of a commemoration ceremony held in October 2002, where the former Lebanese Prime Minister (PM), Mr Rafiq Hariri, honored Mr Ghazi Kanaan, the former Chief of the Syrian Military Intelligence in Lebanon who was replaced by Mr Rustem Ghazaleh, by handing him the key to the city of Beirut. When asked by Defence counsel what this gesture means, Mr El-Chammas responded that Mr Hariri was dealing with the Syrian presence in Lebanon as if it was "a matter of fact" and "a reality" with which he had to deal to maintain good relations with Syria. Counsel for Mr Sabra questioned the witness about the possibility of Mr Hariri having hired staff from the
On 13 March, the Office of the Prosecutor presented documentary evidence that was already admitted into evidence by the Trial Chamber. The documents related to a large number of mobile phones including 18 phones associated with nine subscribers creating the so-called set of green network phones that the Prosecution alleges were used to direct the attack against PM Hariri. The Prosecution requested the Lebanese Government to confirm 51 names attributed to various phone numbers. Some individuals were identified and interviewed and it is alleged that their identities were attributed to phone numbers without their knowledge. In other cases, the persons whose identities were attributed to phone numbers simply do not exist.

Syria. In the recording, Mr Ghazaleh is heard saying that Mr Hariri used to tell him that Lebanon could not be ruled without Syria’s consent. Prime Minister Hariri is heard saying that there should be co-ordination between the two countries, but Lebanon should have a bigger role in ruling itself. The Taif Agreement was subsequently discussed between the three men. PM Hariri could be heard arguing that the implementation of the Taif Agreement should serve as a basis for Syrian-Lebanese relations. He could also be heard saying that he will not be opposing the new electoral law if it would be adopted by the executive power and later by the legislative power. In the same meeting, former PM Hariri is also heard discussing with Mr Ghazaleh the referral of the October 2004 assassination attempt against the Member of the Lebanese Parliament, Mr Marwan Hamadeh, to the Lebanese Judicial Council.

Dr Youssif provided his commentary on the content of the audio recording by asserting that the purpose of the meeting was for Mr Ghazaleh to remind Mr Hariri that he came to power with Syria’s consent and that Lebanon could not be governed and ruled against Syria’s will. When asked to explain why it would be Mr Ghazaleh who would refer the attempted assassination of Mr Hamadeh to the Judicial Council, Dr Youssif responded that the Lebanese Ministers at that time used to implement orders given by Mr Ghazaleh.

On 16 March, Mr Bassem El-Sabeh, Deputy President of the Future Movement and a long-time friend, confidant, and political ally of Mr Rafiq Hariri, testified before the Trial Chamber. Mr El-Sabeh was an elected member of the Lebanese Parliament in 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005. Mr El-Sabeh’s evidence focused on certain meetings Mr Hariri held with Syrian officials in 1999, 2003, and 2004, and the developing ideas that emerged during the Bristol Group meetings.
which he had attended. Mr El-Sabeh told the Trial Chamber that he had accompanied Mr Hariri during his first meeting with Mr Bashar Al-Assad in Damascus in 1999, describing a sense of unease and uncertainty that the former PM had felt after meeting with Mr Bashar Al-Assad, who would later become the Syrian President. In particular, the witness recalled PM Hariri's words following the 1999 meeting: "Syria will be ruled by a child [...] [T]hings will not be comfortable in the future". Mr El-Sabeh also testified about another meeting held between PM Hariri and President Bashar Al-Assad in December 2003. That particular meeting had been attended by Syrian officials Brigadier-General Ghazi Kanaan, Lieutenant-General Rustam Ghazaleh, and Brigadier-General Mohammed Khalilouf. Some specific requests were made to Prime Minister Hariri relating to the extension of the mandate of President Lahoud, the Premier's shares in An Nahar newspaper and his advisor on patriarchal affairs and his ties with the opposition (Qanun Shehwan). PM Hariri had then informed Mr El-Sabeh of the accusations against him and the overall feeling of insult he felt during that meeting. Mr El-Sabeh subsequently discussed the meeting held between PM Hariri and President Bashar Al-Assad in August 2004. According to the witness, Mr Rafiq Hariri had interpreted President Al-Assad's comments during the meeting as clear instructions to Mr Hariri regarding the extension of Lebanese President Lahoud's term. Mr El-Sabeh then spoke about former PM Hariri's decision to, on the one hand, support the extension of President Lahoud's mandate, and, on the other hand, become part of the opposition through the Bristol Group. The Bristol Group was considered at that time as a form of national reconciliation project which had aimed to reject the Syrian presence in Lebanon and request a strong, democratic parliamentary system in the country.

On 17 March, Mr El-Sabeh continued his testimony. He was asked to provide specific comments on a press article published in the Lebanese daily Al-Mustaqbal on 3 February 2005, which in part reported the results of what had occurred during the third Bristol Group meeting. The witness explained that the opposition represented at the Bristol Group had been supportive of international resolutions, including UNSC Resolution 1559. Mr El-Sabeh also stated that UNSC Resolution 1559 had created a crisis between the Lebanese government and the UNSC. Mr El-Sabeh then commented on a video of an event held at the Maronite archbishopric on 10 February 2005. After the meeting, PM Hariri expressed his position towards the upcoming elections and sent a clear political message to support the opposition. Commenting on a picture of Mr Hariri and himself in the Parliament on the day of former PM's assassination, Mr El-Sabeh said that Mr Hariri had sought to show up at the Parliamentary session with a big smile to prove to his opponents that his bloc was at ease. When asked by Judge Lettieri about the role of the Hezbollah in the political discussions with PM Hariri, Mr El-Sabeh said that Hezbollah had not been at the forefront of the political confrontation with PM Hariri at the time; rather, they had been engaged in a dialogue, the witness testified.

On 17, 18 and 19 March, Mr El-Sabeh was cross-examined by the Defence counsel for Mr Sabra. The Defence mainly focused on Mr Rafiq Hariri's relationship with former President Lahoud and Mr El-Sabeh's knowledge of Al-Abass and its link to the Syrian-Lebanese security apparatus. Mr El-Sabeh was also asked to provide additional information about the media campaign that had allegedly been organised by President Lahoud and Mr Janel El Sayed, the Director-General of General Security in Lebanon, against Mr Hariri in 2004 to prevent his victory at the upcoming elections.

On 20 March, the cross-examination of Dr Youssef, who had initially testified before the Trial Chamber in the week commencing 9 March, was concluded by the Defence counsel for Mr Ayash, Mr Badreddine and Mr Sabra. After the conclusion of the cross-examination, the Trial Chamber heard further submissions by the parties in relation to a motion filed by Counsel for Mr Sabra on 8 January 2015 requesting the Trial Chamber to make a finding of non-compliance to the Government of Lebanon.

Mr Fouad Siniora, a former Prime Minister of Lebanon, testified before the Trial Chamber in person from 23 until 26 March. Mr Siniora was a long-time friend and political ally of Mr Rafiq Hariri. He had served as Minister in each of Mr Hariri's cabinets from 1992 to 2004 before becoming PM from 2005 until 2009.

In his testimony on 23 March, Mr Siniora described Mr Hariri's relationship with the Syrian regime during the Presidencies of Hafez Al-Assad and Bashar Al-Assad, and the formation of Mr Hariri's third cabinet in 1997. Mr Siniora testified that Mr Hariri had considered the Syrian Intelligence Service's interference in the cabinet formation process in Lebanon unacceptable.

On 24 March, Mr Siniora told the Trial Chamber about an event that had happened in either late 2003 or early 2004, during which Mr Hariri said that he

---

4 The Bristol group consisted of Mr Hariri's allies who were opposed to the extension of the mandate of the former President Emile Lahoud.
had been the target of several assassination attempts by Hezbollah.

Mr Siniora was then questioned by the Legal Representative of the Victims (LRV). The LRV asked the witness about the importance of the establishment of the Special Tribunal for the victims, his role as PM in the creation of the STL and the atmosphere in Lebanon following the 14 February 2005 attack.

Mr Siniora was cross-examined by the Defence for Mr Badreddine, Mr Oweis, Mr Sabra and Mr Merhi from 24 to 26 March. The Defence asked about Mr Hariri’s development projects in Downtown Beirut, Mr Hariri’s meetings with Hezbollah representatives and the establishment of the Special Tribunal. With regard to the Special Tribunal, Mr Siniora denied the assertion by the Defence that he had used it as a tool to achieve a Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon in his contacts with influential States such as the US, France, the UK, Russia and China.

Mr Siniora also testified that the decision to transfer certain telecommunication data to the UNICIC had been taken by Mr Marwan Hamade, the Minister of Telecommunications at that time with the knowledge of the Cabinet. In addition, Mr Siniora was questioned about the supervision of the crime scene of the 14 February 2005 attack and allegations that the Syrian-Lebanese security apparatus had tampered with it, the possible tapping of Mr Hariri’s phones, Mr Hariri’s access to security-related documents, the arrest of four Lebanese Generals following Mr Hariri’s assassination and his knowledge of President Lahoud’s security arrangements during his Presidency.

Mr Siniora denied any knowledge of a meeting described in a leaked American diplomatic cable between the then Justice Minister Charles Rizk and the then US Ambassador to Lebanon Jeffrey Feltman, in which both men had discussed the legal maneuvering required to deflect the blame from Mr Siniora’s government should the Generals be released. Mr Siniora was then asked by Defence counsel whether he was aware of the alleged arbitrary nature of the detention of the four Generals and whether he had taken practical measures to bring about their release, especially after the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights issued a memorandum in November 2007 which declared the detention of two of the Generals as arbitrary. In response, Mr Siniora told the court that some indeed thought their detention had been arbitrary, but he was relying on the opinion of the Lebanese judiciary, which had ordered their arrest.

On 26 March, Mr Siniora’s cross-examination was adjourned. He will return to complete his testimony at a later date.

In the Contempt Case against Al-Jadeed (Ch) S.A.L. (NEW TV) S.A.L. (N.TV) and Ms Karima Mohammed Tahhan Al Khayat (STL-14-05)

On 4 March 2015, the Contempt Judge, Judge Nicola Lettieri, granted the Amicus Curiae Prosecutor’s (Amicus) motion and admitted into evidence the audio-visual recording and written transcript of Ms Khayat’s suspect interview.

On 12 March, the Contempt Judge issued a decision allowing the Amicus to amend the witness and exhibits lists. The Contempt Judge dismissed the Amicus’ motion and the motion’s addendum in all other respects.

On 13 March, the Amicus submitted on behalf of the parties a table of agreed facts, listing 22 facts related to the indictment which the Amicus and the Defence agreed may be taken as proven. On 20 March, the Amicus applied for protective measures for three witnesses and requested that their identities be protected from disclosure and that their testimony be heard in closed session. On 30 March, the Defence responded that they did not oppose the use of pseudonyms for the three witnesses and that identifying information related to these witnesses be redacted from public documents. The Defence, however, opposed the Amicus’ request for the witnesses to provide their testimony in closed session arguing that there are no proper grounds to justify such testimony.

On 25 March, the Amicus requested the Contempt Judge to order the redaction from its exhibits all names, email addresses or other internet accounts and telephone numbers of actual or former STL employees. He also sought the redaction of all names and signatures of persons employed by the Tribunal with the exception of those whom the Amicus intends to call to testify and the names of senior STL officials.

Document provided by the Public Information and Communications Section of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon.
who are public figures and whose involvement in these matters is known or reasonably presumed. The Amicus further requested the redaction of all names and signatures of persons employed by the Tribunal appearing on witness statements and the transcripts of suspect interviews.

The Amicus also requested that:

- all parts of the Al Jaded broadcasts of 5 to 10 August 2012, during which the identities of purported witnesses are exposed, be played in closed session and redacted from the transcripts of these broadcasts;

- all identifying information of these alleged witnesses be mentioned in closed session and redacted from public records;

- all identifying information of the alleged confidential Tribunal’s witnesses be redacted from Al Akhbar’s articles of 15 and 19 January 2013 and the Lebanese National News Agency article.

In order to facilitate the proper administration of the contempt trial which is due to start on 16 April 2015, on 26 March the Contempt Judge gave detailed directions on the conduct of the proceedings in accordance with Rule 130 A) of the Tribunal’s Rules of Procedure and Evidence (RPE).

In the Contempt Case against Akhbar Beirut S.A.L. and Mr Ibrahim Mohamed Ali Al Amin (STL-L-14-06)

On 5 March 2015, the Amicus filed his pre-trial brief (PTB), together with the witness and exhibit lists in the case against Akhbar Beirut S.A.L. (Akhbar) and Ibrahim Mohamed Ali Al Amin. In his PTB, the Amicus argued that by publishing identifying information on purported confidential witnesses in the Ayash et al. case, the Accused committed contempt and obstruction of justice, punishable under Rule 60 bis (A) of the RPE.

On the same day, pursuant to Rules 149 and 155 of the RPE, the Amicus requested the Contempt Judge to admit into evidence the statements of four witnesses in lieu of viva voce testimony and the associated exhibits.

On 9 March, counsel appointed to represent Akhbar and Mr Al Amin responded to the Amicus’ motion, filed on 27 February 2015, seeking permanent non-disclosure of parts of the statements of two witnesses to the Defence and the interim non-disclosure of these witnesses’ identities to the Defence. The Defence requested the Contempt Judge to dismiss the Amicus motion in all points and grant the Defence a reasonable time to prepare its case following the Prosecution’s disclosure pursuant to Rule 110 of the RPE.

On the same day, counsel requested the Contempt Judge to order the Amicus to disclose to the Defence the Amicus’ confidential and ex parte reports referred to in the Decision of 31 January 2014 which would be useful for the preparation of the defence case. The Defence further requested the Contempt Judge to order the Amicus to review the reclassification of all confidential and ex parte documents, as soon as possible. In the event that the request is denied, the Defence requested the Contempt Judge to certify the request for appeal. On 17 March, the Amicus filed the response to the Defence motion requesting disclosure of the Amicus’ confidential and ex parte reports referred to in the Decision of 31 January 2014. The Amicus requested that the Contempt Judge dismiss the Defence motion.

On 20 March, the Contempt Judge granted the Amicus’ confidential application for non-disclosure filed on 19 February 2015 (first motion). In this respect, Judge Lettieri permitted the Amicus:

- to withhold from the Defence the identities of the witnesses identified in the respective annex to the first motion until further order; and

- to redact the statements of the said witnesses as proposed in the respective annex.

The Contempt Judge dismissed the first motion in all other respects.

The Contempt Judge further granted the Amicus’ application for non-disclosure of portions of witness statements and postponement of disclosure, filed on the 27 February 2015 (second motion). He ordered that the Amicus was permitted:

- to permanently withhold from the Defence certain parts of the statements of the two witnesses referred to in the second motion

- to permanently redact these parts of the statements of the witnesses as proposed in the respective confidential and ex parte annex to the second motion;
• to withhold from the Defence the identities of the two witnesses referred to in the second motion until further order;

• to further redact the statements of these witnesses as proposed in the respective confidential and *ex parte* annex to the second motion until further order;

The *Amicus* was ordered to provide the redacted statements of the two witnesses to the Defence immediately.

The Contempt Judge dismissed the second motion in all other respects.

On 23 March, counsel appointed to represent Akbar and Mr Al Amin responded to the *Amicus* motion for Admission of Written Statements under Rule 155 of the RPE, which sought the admission of four witness statements *in lieu* of their oral testimony. Counsel requested the Contempt Judge to reject the *Amicus* motion or, alternatively, to grant the Defence the possibility to cross-examine these four witnesses.

On 30 March, counsel for Akbar and Mr Al Amin filed its PTB, in which it argues, as a preliminary matter, that the statements of many key Prosecution witnesses have still not been disclosed to it in non-redacted form which hinders its preparations before trial. The Defence also argues that the Prosecution has not disclosed any evidence to support the contempt charge brought against both the Accused under Rule 60 bis (A).

**News and Visits**

On 28 February, the STL submitted its sixth annual report to the United Nations Secretary-General and to the Government of Lebanon. The report details the Tribunal’s activities, achievements and challenges over the period 1 March 2014-28 February 2015 and its objectives in the coming reporting year.

The full report can be found on the Tribunal’s website.

On 25 March, the STL hosted a group of visitors from the Maghreb/Mashreq working group of the European Union (MaMa) with the assistance of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The visitors were briefed by the President, Prosecutor, Head of the Defence Office and the Registrar on the work of their respective Organ.

In March, the STL hosted groups of visitors from Vives University in Belgium, the Center for Transnational Legal Studies in the US, L’Haute Ecole des Avocats Conseils based in Versailles, France and the Luiss Guido Carli University of Rome.
Unique features - A terrorism trial

The STL is the first tribunal of its kind to deal with terrorism as a distinct crime which is described by the United Nations Security Council as a “threat to international peace and security”.

The tribunal is applying the Lebanese legal definition of terrorism, an element of which is the use of a means “liable to create a public danger”, such as explosive devices, inflammable materials, toxic or corrosive products and infectious or microbial agents. The STL appeals chamber ruled on 16 February 2011 that the list of means of attack is illustrative, rather than exhaustive.

In the same ruling the appeals chamber defined terrorism as an international crime for the first time.
Unique features - The participation of victims

Victims who have suffered harm in the attacks may participate in the trial to present their views and concerns. The statute does not allow them to seek compensation at the STL, although once the case is over they are free to pursue their claims through national courts on the basis of a judgement by the STL. This is different from the Lebanese system which allows victims to claim damages from the criminal court during a trial.

Victims can become involved in the STL once the investigation phase is over and the indictments have been confirmed. The STL statute aims to balance the rights of victims to participate in proceedings with the rights of the accused and the Office of the Prosecutor's strategy.
Leidschendam, 9 May 2012 – The Pre-Trial Judge has determined that 58 of the 73 victims of the 14 February 2005 attack who applied to do so can now participate in the Ayyash et al. proceedings.

Judge Daniel Fransen has reviewed the 73 victim applications he has received, 15 of which were deemed to be incomplete. The Pre-Trial judge has said that he would require additional information before granting the incomplete applications.

Having thoroughly reviewed the applications of the 58 successful applicants, Judge Fransen has found no reason to divide the victims into different groups. In his decision, Judge Fransen said that he is "required to ensure that the proceedings are not unduly delayed, and to take any measures necessary to prepare the case for a fair and expeditious trial."

According to the Tribunal's Rules, it is now up to the Registrar to designate a legal representative to represent the victims during trial, and as many co-counsel as the Registrar feels is appropriate to assist the legal representative.

Although Judge Fransen's decision is public, the names and identities of the victims will continue to remain confidential unless and until there is a further court order to the contrary.

Victims of the 14 February 2005 attack who have not yet applied to participate in the proceedings can still apply through the Tribunal's Victim Participation Unit. All future applications will also be subject to review by the Pre-Trial Judge.
Unique features - Trials in absentia are allowed

A trial in absentia means that a trial takes place without the accused being present or in the custody of the tribunal. This has not happened in other contemporary international courts. The rationale is clear. Justice must not be thwarted by the will of the accused or the intent of a state which refuses to hand him over.

Under the STL statute, trials in absentia are possible under strict conditions:

- If the accused has waived the right to be present
- If the accused has fled or cannot be found
- If the state concerned has not handed the accused over to the tribunal

It is important to note that an absent accused must be represented by defence counsel before the tribunal. If the accused does not appoint counsel, counsel will be assigned by the Defence Office. An accused who does not appear for trial has guaranteed rights including:

- the right to appear in court once the trial has started
- asking for a retrial once the case is over.
Unique features - An autonomous pre-trial judge

The pre-trial judge is unique in international criminal justice. Whilst he is not an investigating judge, the pre-trial judge has a critical role in the review of indictments and the preparation of cases for trial.

At the STL the pre-trial judge is an independent office. He does not sit on the trial bench but has an important role earlier in the legal process. He reviews indictments submitted by the Office of the Prosecutor and if needed he can request that the charges are revised. The pre-trial judge can also collect evidence – including at the request of the prosecution or defence, or a victim taking part in the proceedings.
A Decisive Moment for Lebanon - International Herald Tribune

By ANTONIO CASSESE

The Lebanese authorities have received indictments and accompanying arrest warrants relating to the murder of former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri and 21 others in a huge blast in Beirut.

An important milestone in bringing to justice those responsible for the terrible events of Feb. 14, 2005, has been reached. As we wait for the people accused to be arrested let us reflect soberly on the work of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon.

This is a decisive moment for the Lebanese, their state and for international justice. It is also a decisive moment for the region. Recent events across the Middle East show that the desire for justice and human dignity is universal. Over the past decades political assassinations in Lebanon have killed scores of people. The terrorism of the streets is indiscriminate — it kills political leaders and civilians alike — and can only be fought in the courtroom.

As president of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, I appreciate that this is a lengthy and sometimes painful process for people in Lebanon, in particular for the victims of the crimes. To them I apologize for how long this is taking and I thank them for their patience.

Justice is undoubtedly slow, but not because those engaged in international tribunals do not work with placidity. It is because the cases are very complex, the investigations must be meticulous and the judicial procedures must be absolutely unflawed and free. Justice is also methodical and relentless, as the recent arrest of Rafik Al-Hadi, 15 years after he was indicted, and the opening of the second trial for the Khiam Rouge crimes show.

Our unflinching determination to establish the truth behind what happened on Feb. 14, 2005, will continue whatever the prevailing political environment in Lebanon, the region or internationally. We are of course aware that in Lebanon, as elsewhere, justice has to operate within a political environment, which inevitably leads to baseless accusations of judicial bias.

Some claim that our pursuit of justice will threaten the stability of Lebanon. This is wrong, for true stability can only be reached when those responsible for horrific crimes are called to account and the animosity of the various sectarian groups is laid to rest. It is the international character of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon that shields the judicial proceedings from Lebanon's political struggles and also allows this court to maintain a long-term perspective on the need for justice as a foundation for lasting peace and stability.

It was Lebanon, a proud founding member of the United Nations, which requested a tribunal of international character to pursue two fundamental aims: first, to uphold and to practice the principle of judicial accountability for those who grossly deviated from the rules of human decency; second, to entrench the notion that democracy cannot survive without the rule of law, justice and respect for fundamental human rights for all, including the right to life and security.

I wish to remind the government of Lebanon of its international obligations, which are unambiguous.
Attachment
Statute of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon

Having been established by an Agreement between the United Nations and the Lebanese Republic (hereinafter “the Agreement”) pursuant to Security Council resolution 1664 (2006) of 29 March 2006, which responded to the request of the Government of Lebanon to establish a tribunal of an international character to try all those who are found responsible for the terrorist crime which killed the former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and others, the Special Tribunal for Lebanon (hereinafter “the Special Tribunal”) shall function in accordance with the provisions of this Statute.

Section I
Jurisdiction and applicable law

Article 1
Jurisdiction of the Special Tribunal

The Special Tribunal shall have jurisdiction over persons responsible for the attack of 14 February 2005 resulting in the death of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and in the death or injury of other persons. If the Tribunal finds that other attacks that occurred in Lebanon between 1 October 2004 and 12 December 2005, or any later date decided by the Parties and with the consent of the Security Council, are connected in accordance with the principles of criminal justice and are of a nature and gravity similar to the attack of 14 February 2005, it shall also have jurisdiction over persons responsible for such attacks. This connection includes but is not limited to a combination of the following elements: criminal intent (motive), the purpose behind the attacks, the nature of the victims targeted, the pattern of the attacks (modus operandi) and the perpetrators.

Article 2
Applicable criminal law

The following shall be applicable to the prosecution and punishment of the crimes referred to in article 1, subject to the provisions of this Statute:

(a) The provisions of the Lebanese Criminal Code relating to the prosecution and punishment of acts of terrorism, crimes and offences against life and personal integrity, illicit associations and failure to report crimes and offences, including the rules regarding the material elements of a crime, criminal participation and conspiracy; and

(b) Articles 6 and 7 of the Lebanese law of 11 January 1958 on “Increasing the penalties for sedition, civil war and interfaith struggle”.

Article 3
Individual criminal responsibility

1. A person shall be individually responsible for crimes within the jurisdiction of the Special Tribunal if that person:
(a) Committed, participated as accomplice, organized or directed others to commit the crime set forth in article 2 of this Statute; or

(b) Contributed in any other way to the commission of the crime set forth in article 2 of this Statute by a group of persons acting with a common purpose, where such contribution is intentional and is either made with the aim of furthering the general criminal activity or purpose of the group or in the knowledge of the intention of the group to commit the crime.

2. With respect to superior and subordinate relationships, a superior shall be criminally responsible for any of the crimes set forth in article 2 of this Statute committed by subordinates under his or her effective authority and control, as a result of his or her failure to exercise control properly over such subordinates, where:

(a) The superior either knew, or consciously disregarded information that clearly indicated that the subordinates were committing or about to commit such crimes;

(b) The crimes concerned activities that were within the effective responsibility and control of the superior; and

(c) The superior failed to take all necessary and reasonable measures within his or her power to prevent or repress their commission or to submit the matter to the competent authorities for investigation and prosecution.

3. The fact that the person acted pursuant to an order of a superior shall not relieve him or her of criminal responsibility, but may be considered in mitigation of punishment if the Special Tribunal determines that justice so requires.

**Article 4**

**Concurrent jurisdiction**

1. The Special Tribunal and the national courts of Lebanon shall have concurrent jurisdiction. Within its jurisdiction, the Tribunal shall have primacy over the national courts of Lebanon.

2. Upon the assumption of office of the Prosecutor, as determined by the Secretary-General, and no later than two months thereafter, the Special Tribunal shall request the national judicial authority seized with the case of the attack against Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and others to defer to its competence. The Lebanese judicial authority shall refer to the Tribunal the results of the investigation and a copy of the court's records, if any. Persons detained in connection with the investigation shall be transferred to the custody of the Tribunal.

3. (a) At the request of the Special Tribunal, the national judicial authority seized with any of the other crimes committed between 1 October 2004 and 12 December 2005, or a later date decided pursuant to article 1, shall refer to the Tribunal the results of the investigation and a copy of the court's records, if any, for review by the Prosecutor;

(b) At the further request of the Tribunal, the national authority in question shall defer to the competence of the Tribunal. It shall refer to the Tribunal the results of the investigation and a copy of the court's records, if any, and persons detained in connection with any such case shall be transferred to the custody of the Tribunal;
(c) The national judicial authorities shall regularly inform the Tribunal of the progress of their investigation. At any stage of the proceedings, the Tribunal may formally request a national judicial authority to defer to its competence.

Article 5
Non bis in idem

1. No person shall be tried before a national court of Lebanon for acts for which he or she has already been tried by the Special Tribunal.

2. A person who has been tried by a national court may be subsequently tried by the Special Tribunal if the national court proceedings were not impartial or independent, were designed to shield the accused from criminal responsibility for crimes within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal or the case was not diligently prosecuted.

3. In considering the penalty to be imposed on a person convicted of a crime under this Statute, the Special Tribunal shall take into account the extent to which any penalty imposed by a national court on the same person for the same act has already been served.

Article 6
Amnesty

An amnesty granted to any person for any crime falling within the jurisdiction of the Special Tribunal shall not be a bar to prosecution.

Section II
Organization of the Special Tribunal

Article 7
Organs of the Special Tribunal

The Special Tribunal shall consist of the following organs:

(a) The Chambers, comprising a Pre-Trial Judge, a Trial Chamber and an Appeals Chamber;

(b) The Prosecutor;

(c) The Registry; and

(d) The Defence Office.

Article 8
Composition of the Chambers

1. The Chambers shall be composed as follows:

(a) One international Pre-Trial Judge;

(b) Three judges who shall serve in the Trial Chamber, of whom one shall be a Lebanese judge and two shall be international judges;

(c) Five judges who shall serve in the Appeals Chamber, of whom two shall be Lebanese judges and three shall be international judges;
(d) Two alternate judges, one of whom shall be a Lebanese judge and one shall be an international judge.

2. The judges of the Appeals Chamber and the judges of the Trial Chamber, respectively, shall elect a presiding judge who shall conduct the proceedings in the Chamber to which he or she was elected. The presiding judge of the Appeals Chamber shall be the President of the Special Tribunal.

3. At the request of the presiding judge of the Trial Chamber, the President of the Special Tribunal may, in the interest of justice, assign the alternate judges to be present at each stage of the trial and to replace a judge if that judge is unable to continue sitting.

Article 9
Qualification and appointment of judges

1. The judges shall be persons of high moral character, impartiality and integrity, with extensive judicial experience. They shall be independent in the performance of their functions and shall not accept or seek instructions from any Government or any other source.

2. In the overall composition of the Chambers, due account shall be taken of the established competence of the judges in criminal law and procedure and international law.

3. The judges shall be appointed by the Secretary-General, as set forth in article 2 of the Agreement, for a three-year period and may be eligible for reappointment for a further period to be determined by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Government.

Article 10
Powers of the President of the Special Tribunal

1. The President of the Special Tribunal, in addition to his or her judicial functions, shall represent the Tribunal and be responsible for its effective functioning and the good administration of justice.

2. The President of the Special Tribunal shall submit an annual report on the operation and activities of the Tribunal to the Secretary-General and to the Government of Lebanon.

Article 11
The Prosecutor

1. The Prosecutor shall be responsible for the investigation and prosecution of persons responsible for the crimes falling within the jurisdiction of the Special Tribunal. In the interest of proper administration of justice, he or she may decide to charge jointly persons accused of the same or different crimes committed in the course of the same transaction.

2. The Prosecutor shall act independently as a separate organ of the Special Tribunal. He or she shall not seek or receive instructions from any Government or from any other source.
3. The Prosecutor shall be appointed, as set forth in article 3 of the Agreement, by the Secretary-General for a three-year term and may be eligible for reappointment for a further period to be determined by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Government. He or she shall be of high moral character and possess the highest level of professional competence, and have extensive experience in the conduct of investigations and prosecutions of criminal cases.

4. The Prosecutor shall be assisted by a Lebanese Deputy Prosecutor and by such other Lebanese and international staff as may be required to perform the functions assigned to him or her effectively and efficiently.

5. The Office of the Prosecutor shall have the power to question suspects, victims and witnesses, to collect evidence and to conduct on-site investigations. In carrying out these tasks, the Prosecutor shall, as appropriate, be assisted by the Lebanese authorities concerned.

Article 12
The Registry

1. Under the authority of the President of the Special Tribunal, the Registry shall be responsible for the administration and servicing of the Tribunal.

2. The Registry shall consist of a Registrar and such other staff as may be required.

3. The Registrar shall be appointed by the Secretary-General and shall be a staff member of the United Nations. He or she shall serve for a three-year term and may be eligible for reappointment for a further period to be determined by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Government.

4. The Registrar shall set up a Victims and Witnesses Unit within the Registry. This Unit shall provide, in consultation with the Office of the Prosecutor, measures to protect the safety, physical and psychological well-being, dignity and privacy of victims and witnesses, and such other appropriate assistance for witnesses who appear before the Special Tribunal and others who are at risk on account of testimony given by such witnesses.

Article 13
The Defence Office

1. The Secretary-General, in consultation with the President of the Special Tribunal, shall appoint an independent Head of the Defence Office, who shall be responsible for the appointment of the Office staff and the drawing up of a list of defence counsel.

2. The Defence Office, which may also include one or more public defenders, shall protect the rights of the defence, provide support and assistance to defence counsel and to the persons entitled to legal assistance, including, where appropriate, legal research, collection of evidence and advice, and appearing before the Pre-Trial Judge or a Chamber in respect of specific issues.
Article 14
Official and working languages

The official languages of the Special Tribunal shall be Arabic, French and English. In any given case proceedings, the Pre-Trial Judge or a Chamber may decide that one or two of the languages may be used as working languages as appropriate.

Section III
Rights of defendants and victims

Article 15
Rights of suspects during investigation

A suspect who is to be questioned by the Prosecutor shall not be compelled to incriminate himself or herself or to confess guilt. He or she shall have the following rights of which he or she shall be informed by the Prosecutor prior to questioning, in a language he or she speaks and understands:

(a) The right to be informed that there are grounds to believe that he or she has committed a crime within the jurisdiction of the Special Tribunal;

(b) The right to remain silent, without such silence being considered in the determination of guilt or innocence, and to be cautioned that any statement he or she makes shall be recorded and may be used in evidence;

(c) The right to have legal assistance of his or her own choosing, including the right to have legal assistance provided by the Defence Office where the interests of justice so require and where the suspect does not have sufficient means to pay for it;

(d) The right to have the free assistance of an interpreter if he or she cannot understand or speak the language used for questioning;

(e) The right to be questioned in the presence of counsel unless the person has voluntarily waived his or her right to counsel.

Article 16
Rights of the accused

1. All accused shall be equal before the Special Tribunal,

2. The accused shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing, subject to measures ordered by the Special Tribunal for the protection of victims and witnesses.

3. (a) The accused shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the provisions of this Statute;

(b) The onus is on the Prosecutor to prove the guilt of the accused;

(c) In order to convict the accused, the relevant Chamber must be convinced of the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt.

4. In the determination of any charge against the accused pursuant to this Statute, he or she shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality:
(a) To be informed promptly and in detail in a language which he or she understands of the nature and cause of the charge against him or her;

(b) To have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his or her defence and to communicate without hindrance with counsel of his or her own choosing;

(c) To be tried without undue delay;

(d) Subject to the provisions of article 22, to be tried in his or her presence, and to defend himself or herself in person or through legal assistance of his or her own choosing; to be informed, if he or she does not have legal assistance, of this right; and to have legal assistance assigned to him or her, in any case where the interests of justice so require and without payment by him or her in any such case if he or she does not have sufficient means to pay for it;

(e) To examine, or have examined, the witnesses against him or her and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his or her behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him or her;

(f) To examine all evidence to be used against him or her during the trial in accordance with the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Special Tribunal;

(g) To have the free assistance of an interpreter if he or she cannot understand or speak the language used in the Special Tribunal;

(h) Not to be compelled to testify against himself or herself or to confess guilt.

5. The accused may make statements in court at any stage of the proceedings, provided such statements are relevant to the case at issue. The Chambers shall decide on the probative value, if any, of such statements.

Article 17
Rights of victims

Where the personal interests of the victims are affected, the Special Tribunal shall permit their views and concerns to be presented and considered at stages of the proceedings determined to be appropriate by the Pre-Trial Judge or the Chamber and in a manner that is not prejudicial to or inconsistent with the rights of the accused and a fair and impartial trial. Such views and concerns may be presented by the legal representatives of the victims where the Pre-Trial Judge or the Chamber considers it appropriate.

Section IV
Conduct of proceedings

Article 18
Pre-Trial proceedings

1. The Pre-Trial Judge shall review the indictment. If satisfied that a prima facie case has been established by the Prosecutor, he or she shall confirm the indictment. If he or she is not so satisfied, the indictment shall be dismissed.
2. The Pre-Trial Judge may, at the request of the Prosecutor, issue such orders and warrants for the arrest or transfer of persons, and any other orders as may be required for the conduct of the investigation and for the preparation of a fair and expeditious trial.

Article 19
Evidence collected prior to the establishment of the Special Tribunal

Evidence collected with regard to cases subject to the consideration of the Special Tribunal, prior to the establishment of the Tribunal, by the national authorities of Lebanon or by the International Independent Investigation Commission in accordance with its mandate as set out in Security Council resolution 1595 (2005) and subsequent resolutions, shall be received by the Tribunal. Its admissibility shall be decided by the Chambers pursuant to international standards on collection of evidence. The weight to be given to any such evidence shall be determined by the Chambers.

Article 20
Commencement and conduct of trial proceedings

1. The Trial Chamber shall read the indictment to the accused, satisfy itself that the rights of the accused are respected, confirm that the accused understands the indictment and instruct the accused to enter a plea.

2. Unless otherwise decided by the Trial Chamber in the interests of justice, examination of witnesses shall commence with questions posed by the presiding judge, followed by questions posed by other members of the Trial Chamber, the Prosecutor and the Defence.

3. Upon request or proprio motu, the Trial Chamber may at any stage of the trial decide to call additional witnesses and/or order the production of additional evidence.

4. The hearings shall be public unless the Trial Chamber decides to hold the proceedings in camera in accordance with the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

Article 21
Powers of the Chambers

1. The Special Tribunal shall confine the trial, appellate and review proceedings strictly to an expeditious hearing of the issues raised by the charges, or the grounds for appeal or review, respectively. It shall take strict measures to prevent any action that may cause unreasonable delay.

2. A Chamber may admit any relevant evidence that it deems to have probative value and exclude such evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the need to ensure a fair trial.

3. A Chamber may receive the evidence of a witness orally or, where the interests of justice allow, in written form.

4. In cases not otherwise provided for in the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, a Chamber shall apply rules of evidence that will best favour a fair determination of the matter before it and are consonant with the spirit of the Statute and the general principles of law.
Article 22
Trials in absentia

1. The Special Tribunal shall conduct trial proceedings in the absence of the accused, if he or she:
   (a) Has expressly and in writing waived his or her right to be present;
   (b) Has not been handed over to the Tribunal by the State authorities concerned;
   (c) Has absconded or otherwise cannot be found and all reasonable steps have been taken to secure his or her appearance before the Tribunal and to inform him or her of the charges confirmed by the Pre-Trial Judge.

2. When hearings are conducted in the absence of the accused, the Special Tribunal shall ensure that:
   (a) The accused has been notified, or served with the indictment, or notice has otherwise been given of the indictment through publication in the media or communication to the State of residence or nationality;
   (b) The accused has designated a defence counsel of his or her own choosing, to be remunerated either by the accused or, if the accused is proved to be indigent, by the Tribunal;
   (c) Whenever the accused refuses or fails to appoint a defence counsel, such counsel has been assigned by the Defence Office of the Tribunal with a view to ensuring full representation of the interests and rights of the accused.

3. In case of conviction in absentia, the accused, if he or she had not designated a defence counsel of his or her choosing, shall have the right to be retried in his or her presence before the Special Tribunal, unless he or she accepts the judgement.

Article 23
Judgement

The judgement shall be rendered by a majority of the judges of the Trial Chamber or of the Appeals Chamber and shall be delivered in public. It shall be accompanied by a reasoned opinion in writing, to which any separate or dissenting opinions shall be appended.

Article 24
Penalties

1. The Trial Chamber shall impose upon a convicted person imprisonment for life or for a specified number of years. In determining the terms of imprisonment for the crimes provided for in this Statute, the Trial Chamber shall, as appropriate, have recourse to international practice regarding prison sentences and to the practice of the national courts of Lebanon.

2. In imposing sentence, the Trial Chamber should take into account such factors as the gravity of the offence and the individual circumstances of the convicted person.
Article 25
Compensation to victims

1. The Special Tribunal may identify victims who have suffered harm as a result of the commission of crimes by an accused convicted by the Tribunal.

2. The Registrar shall transmit to the competent authorities of the State concerned the judgement finding the accused guilty of a crime that has caused harm to a victim.

3. Based on the decision of the Special Tribunal and pursuant to the relevant national legislation, a victim or persons claiming through the victim, whether or not such victim had been identified as such by the Tribunal under paragraph 1 of this article, may bring an action in a national court or other competent body to obtain compensation.

4. For the purposes of a claim made under paragraph 3 of this article, the judgement of the Special Tribunal shall be final and binding as to the criminal responsibility of the convicted person.

Article 26
Appellate proceedings

1. The Appeals Chamber shall hear appeals from persons convicted by the Trial Chamber or from the Prosecutor on the following grounds:

   (a) An error on a question of law invalidating the decision;

   (b) An error of fact that has occasioned a miscarriage of justice.

2. The Appeals Chamber may affirm, reverse or revise the decisions taken by the Trial Chamber.

Article 27
Review proceedings

1. Where a new fact has been discovered that was not known at the time of the proceedings before the Trial Chamber or the Appeals Chamber and that could have been a decisive factor in reaching the decision, the convicted person or the Prosecutor may submit an application for review of the judgement.

2. An application for review shall be submitted to the Appeals Chamber. The Appeals Chamber may reject the application if it considers it to be unfounded. If it determines that the application is meritorious, it may, as appropriate:

   (a) Reconvene the Trial Chamber;

   (b) Retain jurisdiction over the matter.

Article 28
Rules of Procedure and Evidence

1. The judges of the Special Tribunal shall, as soon as practicable after taking office, adopt Rules of Procedure and Evidence for the conduct of the pre-trial, trial and appellate proceedings, the admission of evidence, the participation of victims, the protection of victims and witnesses and other appropriate matters and may amend them, as appropriate.
2. In so doing, the judges shall be guided, as appropriate, by the Lebanese Code of Criminal Procedure, as well as by other reference materials reflecting the highest standards of international criminal procedure, with a view to ensuring a fair and expeditious trial.

Article 29
Enforcement of sentences

1. Imprisonment shall be served in a State designated by the President of the Special Tribunal from a list of States that have indicated their willingness to accept persons convicted by the Tribunal.

2. Conditions of imprisonment shall be governed by the law of the State of enforcement subject to the supervision of the Special Tribunal. The State of enforcement shall be bound by the duration of the sentence, subject to article 30 of this Statute.

Article 30
Pardon or commutation of sentences

If, pursuant to the applicable law of the State in which the convicted person is imprisoned, he or she is eligible for pardon or commutation of sentence, the State concerned shall notify the Special Tribunal accordingly. There shall only be pardon or commutation of sentence if the President of the Tribunal, in consultation with the judges, so decides on the basis of the interests of justice and the general principles of law.
Composition of the Trial Chamber

**Presiding Judge (Australian)**

From 1986 to 2001 Judge Re worked in Australia as a barrister, a prosecutor, a solicitor in private practice and in criminal law reform research for the Attorney General’s Department. Since 2002, Judge Re has worked internationally as a senior prosecuting trial attorney at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in The Hague, and as an international judge of the Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina in its War Crimes Chamber in Sarajevo. Judge Re joined the STL as a Trial Chamber judge in 2010 and was elected Presiding Judge on 7 September 2013.

**Judge Janet Nosworthy (Jamaican)**

Judge Nosworthy has significant experience at the international level as the ICTY and at the national level as a prosecutor and defence counsel. Judge Nosworthy was sworn in as a judge of the STL Trial Chamber in 2009. From 1990, she practiced as a mediator in alternate resolution and as of 2000 as a Court-appointed mediator under a project in the Jamaican Supreme Court designed to foster settlement of pending cases and a reduction in the backlog of outstanding cases.

**Judge Micheline Braidy (Lebanese)**

Before joining the STL in 2009, Judge Braidy served as a judge in the Criminal Chamber of the Court of Appeal of Mount Lebanon. Since 2005, she has been a judge at the Lebanese Court of Cassation. From 1995 to 2005, she served as a judge in the Criminal Chamber of the Court of Appeal of Mount Lebanon. From 1990 to 1993, Judge Braidy served as a judge in the Service des Législations et des Consultations at the Lebanese Ministry of Justice.

**Judge Walid Akoun, Alternate Judge (Lebanese)**

At the time of his appointment as alternate judge to the STL Trial Chamber in 2011, Judge Akoun was a member of the Court of Cassation in Beirut. In addition to his judicial activities, Judge Akoun has experience in both international and domestic human rights law. In 1997, he was appointed as an investigative judge in Beirut. In 2002, he presided over the Indictment Chamber of South Lebanon. In 2005, he presided over the Court of Media and the Court of Appeal for Misdemeanors in Beirut.

**Judge Nicola Lettieri, Alternate Judge (Italian)**

Prior to joining the STL as a Trial Chamber Alternate Judge in January 2014, Judge Lettieri served as Deputy Attorney General at the Supreme Court of Cassation in Italy (since 2010). From 2004 until 2010, Judge Lettieri represented Italy to the Council of Europe. Since 2010 Judge Lettieri has been an ad hoc judge at the European Court of Human Rights. On 31 January 2014, he was appointed contempt judge on the basis of the existing roster of judges.

Representation of the OTP

**Norman Farrell, Prosecutor (Canadian)**

Norman Farrell was appointed Prosecutor of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon on 29 February 2012, after having served as Deputy Prosecutor at the ICTY for almost five years. Prior to that, he was Senior Counsel in various capacities at the ICTY and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR). Mr Farrell was also a prosecutor in Canada for 10 years. In addition, he lectured and trained judges of the Indonesian Supreme Court in international humanitarian law, judges at the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) in the law and procedure of international tribunals, and members of the Co-Prosecutor’s office at the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC).

**Joyce F. Tabet, Deputy Prosecutor (Lebanese)**

Following consultations with the UN Secretary-General and the Prosecutor of the STL, Ms Tabet was appointed to the post of Deputy Prosecutor in June 2009. In 1992, she became the first woman to hold office as an investigative judge in Beirut. Ten years later she was appointed advocate-general at the Court of Cassation assisting the Public Prosecutor in criminal cases of an international character. Throughout her career Madame Tabet has played an active role in restructuring national legislation and drawing up treaties and conventions between Lebanon and other countries.

**Eckehard Witschop, Senior Trial counsel (German)**

Mr Witschop joined the Office of the Prosecutor (OTP) of the STL in 2009 where he currently serves as the Acting Chief of Prosecutions. Prior to that, Mr Witschop was a Senior Trial Lawyer within the OTP of the International Criminal Court (ICC) and a Senior Trial Attorney within the OTP of the ICTY. Mr Witschop also served as a prosecutor and as a judge in Germany.

**Graeme Cameron, Senior Trial counsel (Canadian)**

Mr Cameron joined the OTP of the STL in 2013 where he currently serves as a Senior Trial Counsel. Prior to joining the STL, he was a prosecutor of criminal offences in Canada for 23 years in areas relating to organised crime, public corruption and commercial fraud. Mr Cameron has also consulted, lectured and worked as a barrister in complex cases.

**Alexander Milne, Senior Trial counsel (British)**

Mr Milne joined the OTP of the STL in 2013 where he currently serves as a Senior Trial Counsel. Mr Milne, an English barrister and QC, joined the STL after 25 years practice at the Bar in London, specialising in criminal law and appearing before public inquiries. Mr Milne has handled cases of different natures throughout his career.
For Salim Jamil Ayyash

Eugene O’Sullivan, Lead counsel (Canadian)
Mr. O’Sullivan has been authorised to appear before the ECCC as a foreign lawyer and was admitted to the list of defence counsel before the ICTY in 1996. Mr. O’Sullivan defended a number of accused persons before the ICTY prior to being assigned lead Defence counsel for Mr Ayyash.

Emile Aoun, Co-counsel (Lebanese)
Mr. Aoun was admitted to the Beirut Bar Association in 1995. He has also worked as an official trainer at the Institute for Human Rights of the Beirut Bar Association since 2006 in the field of international law and human rights. Mr. Aoun is currently preparing his PhD at the Université de Paris II on the perspective of the principle of equality of arms in international criminal tribunals.

Thomas Hannity, Co-counsel (American)
From 1989 until 2001, Mr. Hannity served as a federal prosecutor in the Phoenix US Attorney’s Office. He worked as a Trial Attorney and a Senior Trial Attorney at the ICTY from 2001 until 2012. Prior to his appointment as a co-counsel for the Ayyash Defence on 31 December 2013, Mr. Hannity worked as a consultant contractor for the Ayyash Defence team.

For Mustafa Amine Badreddine

, Lead counsel (French and Lebanese)
Mr. Korkmaz has more than 20 years of experience as an attorney in private and public international law, telecommunications networks law, and in the field of international arbitration. Mr. Korkmaz is a founding attorney and partner of the professional partnership of attorneys Robin & Korkmaz in Paris.

John Jones, Co-counsel (British)
Mr. Jones is a UK-based barrister specialising in war crimes, counter-terrorism and extradition. He has practiced at the ICTY, ICTR and SCSL. Mr. Jones, QC, has published and lectured extensively on war crimes law. He has advised governments and international organisations on war crimes issues. He has also taught international criminal law at the London School of Economics.

Iain Edwards, Co-counsel (British)
Iain Edwards is a British barrister, called to the Bar in 2000, and a member of 1 Mitre Court Buildings in London. He is a specialist criminal defence advocate before national and international courts. Internationally, he has worked for the defence of three accused persons before the ICTR. Mr. Edwards was a consultant in the Defence team for Mr Badreddine before being assigned co-counsel in December 2013.

For Husein Hassan Oneissi

Vincent Courcelle-Labrousse, Lead counsel (French)
Mr. Courcelle-Labrousse has built a strong reputation as a defence lawyer in both the national and international jurisdictions. Mr. Courcelle-Labrousse is a member of the Paris Bar and partner at the Godin Associates firm in Paris. He is also admitted to the list of Defence counsel at the ICC and ICTR.

Esser Hassan, Co-counsel (Egyptian)
Mr. Hassan is an attorney at law in the Egyptian Cassation Court with 24 years of experience and a counsel member of the International Criminal Bar. The cases in which he has been involved include the defence of radical political groups, political kidnapping and torture. Mr. Hassan has experience working as a defence lawyer in Lebanon, Syria and the United Arab Emirates.

Philippe Larochelle, Co-counsel (Canadian)
Philippe Larochelle is a partner in the law firm Roy Larochelle Avocats, of Canada. Since being called to the Quebec Bar in 1998 Mr. Larochelle has acquired wide-ranging legal experience, practicing before the Canadian and international courts. He is admitted to the List of Counsel at the ICC and ICTR, where he defended accused individuals.

For Assad Hassan Sabra

David Young, Lead counsel (British)
Mr. Young is a Barrister, with a Scottish background, who was admitted to the Bar of England and Wales in 1986. He has extensive experience as a trial lawyer, defending persons accused of involvement in international terrorism. He is a member of Chambers at 9 Bedford Row in London, and has been admitted to the ICC and ICTR lists of Counsel.

Guénaël Mettraux, Co-counsel (Swiss)
Since 2003, Dr. Mettraux has appeared as a co-counsel and legal consultant before international criminal jurisdictions, including the ICTY, ICC and ECCC. Dr. Mettraux has published extensively in the field of international criminal law, including three books and many law review articles. He holds a PhD from the London School of Economics.

Geoff Roberts, Co-counsel (British)
Geoff Roberts was admitted to the New York Bar in 2006. Mr. Roberts practices internationally, almost exclusively before international and hybrid courts and tribunals. He has previously worked as a legal assistant or legal consultant at the ICTY, the ICC and the ECCC.
For Hassan Habib Merhi

Mohamed Aouini, Lead Counsel (Tunisian)
Mr. Aouini was called to the National Bar in Tunis in 1986. He acted as Defence counsel before the ICTR in the past. In Tunisia, Mr. Aouini was a magistrate from 1980 to 1985. He was elected a Member of the Tunisian Parliament and Chair of the Legislative Committee for three consecutive terms. Mr. Aouini was also elected Vice-President of the Arab Parliament in Cairo and Damascus from 2005 to 2009.

Dorothée Le Fraper du Hellen, Co-counsel
(French)
Ms. Dorothée Le Fraper du Hellen has been registered at the Montpellier Bar, France, since 1993. She has defended an accused individual before the ICTR and is admitted to the list of counsel at the ICC. Ms Le Fraper du Hellen has more than 20 years experience in the fields of international and criminal law, and has been responsible for a number of applications before the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg.

Jad Khalil, Co-counsel (Lebanese)
Mr. Jad Khalil has been a member of the Beirut Bar since 1990, and was admitted to the List of Defence Counsel at the STL in 2012. Mr. Khalil is co-founder of the legal practice Khalil’s Law Office in Beirut. He specialises in general criminal law, private, public and international law. He has authored and co-authored numerous articles published in legal and academic journals. He has been admitted to the list of counsel at ICC.

Legal Representatives of the Victims

Peter Haynes, Lead Legal Representative
(British)
Mr. Haynes has practiced as an advocate in criminal courts throughout his career. Internationally, Mr. Haynes, an English barrister and QC, has defended genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity cases. He was appointed STL Lead Legal Representative of Victims in 2012. Mr. Haynes is a member of the Criminal Bar Association and the Association of Defence Counsel of the ICTY, where he is Chair of the Amicus Committee.

Nada Abdelkader-Abusamra, Co-Legal Representative
(Lebanese)
Ms Nada Abdelkader-Abusamra is the Co-Legal Representative for Victims at the STL. Ms Abdelkader-Abusamra is admitted to practice in the courts of New York state and is a member of the Beirut Bar. Throughout her years of experience she has handled major national and international transactions, lawsuits and arbitrations. Ms. Abdelkader-Abusamra is active in the academic and civil society circles in Lebanon.

Mohammad F. Mattar, Co-Legal Representative
(Lebanese)
Mr. Mohammad F. Mattar is the Co-Legal Representative for Victims at the Special Tribunal for Lebanon. Mr. Mattar is a founding partner of the Levant Law Practice Firm and was a partner at Mattar and Mattar Law Firm from 1983 till 2002. Mr. Mattar’s principal focus is arbitration and international criminal law cases as well as advising on regional transactions in the Middle East and West Africa.

Representation of the Defence Office

François Roux, Head of the Defence Office
(French)
Since 1999, Mr. Roux has acted on behalf of defendants before various international criminal jurisdictions including the ICTR, the ICC and the ECCC. Mr. Roux was appointed Head of the STL Defence Office in March 2009. Among many other key cases he handled in the past, he was a consultant to the American defence team assigned to represent Zacarias Moussaoui following the attacks of 11 September 2001. Mr. Roux has acted in various cases before the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg and the United Nations Human Rights Committee in Geneva.

Hélène Ufloc, Deputy Head of the Defence Office
(French)
Ms Ufloc was appointed Deputy Head of Defence Office in May 2014. After being admitted to the bar in 1996, Ms Ufloc worked as an attorney in France and has worked for the Defence of accused individuals before various international criminal tribunals, in particular the ICTR, the ECCC, the SCSL and the mixed tribunals in Kosovo. She first joined the Special Tribunal for Lebanon in March 2010.

Registrar (American)
Dr. Mundis has more than 15 years of experience in international criminal law and has previously served in the ICTY Chambers and OTP in various capacities. Dr. Mundis first joined the STL in 2009 as Chief of Prosecutions. He was appointed Deputy Registrar in January 2013 and became Acting Registrar in April 2013. In July 2013 he was appointed as STL Registrar. Dr. Mundis holds a PhD on the law of naval exclusion zones in international law.

Amelie Zinzius, Deputy Registrar (Canadian)
Ms. Zinzius was appointed STL Deputy Registrar in December 2013. She has been a lawyer since 1992, in addition to having acquired a degree in Project Management. Prior to joining the Tribunal, Ms. Zinzius worked at the Crimes against Humanity and War Crimes Section of the Department of Justice in Canada, as well as at the SCSL.

Learn more about the STL judges and senior officers on the STL website: http://www.stl-ml.org/en/about-the-stl/biographies