

**UNITED
NATIONS**



International Residual Mechanism
for Criminal Tribunals

Case No.: MICT-23-129-Misc.1

Date: 20 November 2025

Original: English

THE PRESIDENT OF THE MECHANISM

Before: Judge Graciela Gatti Santana

Registrar: Mr. Abubacarr M. Tambaou

Date: 20 November 2025

**IN THE MATTER OF VOJISLAV ŠEŠELJ, MILJAN DAMJANOVIĆ,
MIROLJUB IGNJATOVIĆ, LJILJANA MIHAJLOVIĆ, AND
OGNJEN MIHAJLOVIĆ**

PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION

SEVENTH MONITORING REPORT

Monitor

Ms. Dagmara Albrecht

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On 22 April 2025, the Registrar of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (“Mechanism”) appointed me as monitor¹ to observe and report on the progress of contempt proceedings against Mr. Vojislav Šešelj, Mr. Miljan Damjanović, Mr. Miroljub Ignjatović, Ms. Ljiljana Mihajlović, and Mr. Ognjen Mihajlović (“Accused”), referred to the Republic of Serbia (“Serbia”) by a Single Judge pursuant to Articles 1(4), 6(2), and 6(4) of the Statute of the Mechanism and Rule 14 of the Mechanism’s Rules of Procedure and Evidence.²
2. This Seventh Monitoring Report, which I respectfully submit to the President through the Registrar in accordance with the applicable Terms of Reference,³ covers the period from 17 September to 20 November 2025.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

3. The First Monitoring Report outlined the relevant procedural history of this case, from the indictment of the Accused through the referral of this proceeding to Serbia, up until 20 November 2024.⁴
4. The four subsequent Monitoring Reports covered the relevant procedure and monitoring activities for the period from 20 November 2024 to 14 July 2025.⁵
5. The Sixth Monitoring Report covered the period between 15 July and 16 September 2025.⁶

¹ *In the Matter of Vojislav Šešelj, Miljan Damjanović, Miroljub Ignjatović, Ljiljana Mihajlović, and Ognjen Mihajlović*, Case No. MICT-23-129-I, Order Appointing a Monitor, public, 22 April 2025 (“Appointment Order”).

² *Prosecutor v. Vojislav Šešelj, Miljan Damjanović, Miroljub Ignjatović, Ljiljana Mihajlović, and Ognjen Mihajlović*, Case No. MICT-23-129-I (“Šešelj et al.”), Decision on Referral of the Case to the Republic of Serbia, public, 29 February 2024.

³ The Terms of Reference were agreed upon by an exchange of memoranda between the Registrar and the President, concluded on 4 October 2024, and further amended on 15 January 2025, providing for a bi-monthly reporting regime until the start of proceedings, unless an important development warrants an earlier report.

⁴ *In the Matter of Vojislav Šešelj, Miljan Damjanović, Miroljub Ignjatović, Ljiljana Mihajlović, and Ognjen Mihajlović*, Case No. MICT-23-129-Misc.1, First Monitoring Report, confidential, dated 20 November 2024, public redacted version filed on 4 March 2025 (“First Monitoring Report”).

⁵ *In the Matter of Vojislav Šešelj, Miljan Damjanović, Miroljub Ignjatović, Ljiljana Mihajlović, and Ognjen Mihajlović*, Case No. MICT-23-129-Misc.1, Second Monitoring Report, confidential, dated 20 December 2024, public redacted version filed on 4 March 2025, covered the period of 20 November through 20 December 2024; Third Monitoring Report, confidential, dated 20 February 2025, public redacted version filed on 12 March 2025, covered the period of 20 December 2024 through 20 February 2025; Fourth Monitoring Report, public, dated 16 May 2025, filed on 21 May 2025, covered the period from 22 April to 16 May 2025 (“Fourth Monitoring Report”); Fifth Monitoring Report, confidential, dated 14 July 2025, public redacted version filed on 16 July 2025, covered the period between 17 May and 14 July 2025.

III. REPORT

6. On 7 October 2025, I sent an e-mail to the Embassy of the Republic of Serbia to the Kingdom of the Netherlands (“Embassy”), following up on my earlier request for facilitating communication with the Serbian Ministry of Justice (“Ministry of Justice”) point of contact for the *Šešelj et al.* case.⁷ I informed the Embassy of my intention to undertake a monitoring mission to Belgrade. I also informed the Embassy that I will be reaching out directly to the Serbian authorities in Belgrade, and that a formal notification from the Registry of the Mechanism will follow. I have not received any response to my e-mail.
7. On 10 October 2025, I sent an e-mail to the Public Prosecutor’s Office for War Crimes (“Prosecutor’s Office of Serbia”) advising of the planned dates of my next monitoring mission to Belgrade and requesting an opportunity to meet with a representative of the Prosecutor’s Office of Serbia to introduce myself and discuss the status of the *Šešelj et al.* case. I sent similar communications to the Higher Court in Belgrade (“Higher Court”) and the Ministry of Justice.
8. On the same day, I received an e-mail from [REDACTED], Head of the Group for Cooperation with the Mechanism at the Ministry of Justice, confirming that my request will be relayed to the Assistant Minister in the Sector for International Cooperation and Strategic Planning.
9. In the following weeks, I continued to reiterate my requests for meetings through direct communications to the Prosecutor’s Office of Serbia, the Ministry of Justice, and the Higher Court.⁸
10. On 27 October 2025, the Registry of the Mechanism sent a *Note Verbale* to the Embassy, requesting assistance in formally communicating the details of the forthcoming mission to the relevant Serbian authorities and facilitating the scheduling of meetings.
11. On 28 October 2025, a representative of the Higher Court responded to my requests and a meeting was scheduled for 19 November 2025.

⁶ Sixth Monitoring Report, confidential, dated 16 September 2025, public redacted version filed on 17 September 2025 (“Sixth Monitoring Report”).

⁷ See Sixth Monitoring Report, para. 11.

⁸ More specifically, I contacted the Ministry of Justice on 20 October 2025. On 22 October 2025, I again reached out, via e-mail, to the Prosecutor’s Office of Serbia and the Higher Court.

12. I continued to pursue my requests for meetings with other interlocutors in Serbia and ultimately secured a meeting at the Ministry of Justice.⁹
13. While travelling to Belgrade on 17 November 2025, I was contacted by the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia, and we scheduled a meeting for the next day.
14. On 18 November 2025, I was received at the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia by [REACTED] and [REACTED], Public Prosecutors (altogether "Prosecutors").¹⁰ It was confirmed to me that [REACTED] mandate as Acting Chief of the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia expired on 15 May 2025. The appointment of a new Chief of the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia has not yet been finalised. As the Prosecutors explained, this has somewhat impacted the operational capacity of the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia and also resulted in their delayed response to my requests for updates and meetings, for which they expressed regret.
15. In relation to the current status of the *Šešelj et al.* case, I was informed that the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia has requested a preliminary opinion from the Ministry of Justice¹¹ on whether the prerequisites prescribed in article 7 subparagraphs (4) and (5) of the Serbian Law on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters - that is whether the matter does not refer to a political offence or whether pursuing the case would not infringe Serbia's sovereignty, security, public order or other interests of essential significance - have been satisfied. The request was submitted on 10 February 2025 and is still pending with the Ministry of Justice, whose opinion will determine the further course of proceedings. The Prosecutors stated that the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia will be able to continue working on the *Šešelj et al.* case only if the Ministry of Justice decides that the preconditions from article 7 mentioned above have been met. A negative opinion of the Ministry of Justice will preclude further work on the case.
16. While awaiting a response from the Ministry of Justice, the team previously established within the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia by the former Acting Chief continued to review materials in the *Šešelj et al.* case, and to assess the legal issues related to the proceedings

⁹ I directly contacted the Ministry of Justice and the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia on 7 and 10 November 2025, respectively. On 12 November 2025, the Ministry of Justice responded positively to my request for a meeting.

¹⁰ To facilitate communication, during all my meetings in Belgrade I was accompanied by a BCS-English interpreter contracted by the Mechanism.

¹¹ In this respect, reference was made to article 4 of the Law on Cooperation of Serbia and Montenegro with the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed on the Territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991 ("ICTY").

under the indictment submitted by the Mechanism.¹² Prosecutor [REDACTED] is also a member of this team.

17. [REDACTED.]

18. On 19 November 2025, I met with [REDACTED], Assistant Minister, Sector for International Cooperation and Strategic Planning at the Ministry of Justice. [REDACTED], Head of the Group for Cooperation with the Mechanism at the Ministry of Justice was also present. Referring to the information provided by the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia the day before, I inquired about the status of the *Šešelj et al.* case and the pending preliminary opinion of the Ministry of Justice. [REDACTED] explained that the Ministry of Justice is the central authority for all requests for mutual or international legal assistance in criminal matters. It also serves as the intermediary for communication between the Mechanism and the Serbian judiciary. [REDACTED] further clarified that in relation to article 7 of the Law on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, only two of the preconditions listed in this provision fall within the authority of the Minister of Justice. A competent judicial authority or court shall determine if the other prerequisites listed in this provision are met. If the judicial authority determines that these preconditions have not been met, the Ministry of Justice will not be required to provide an opinion on the remaining two preconditions. At this point, the Ministry of Justice has not been asked for an opinion in relation to the *Šešelj et al.* case. I have reiterated that, based on information provided by the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia, the matter was referred to the Ministry of Justice for an opinion in February this year. [REDACTED] assured me that he will investigate the matter further and inform me accordingly.

19. Also on 19 November 2025, I was welcomed at the Higher Court by [REDACTED] the President of the Department for War Crimes and Organized Crime (the "President" and "Department", respectively). The President confirmed that the proceedings in the referred *Šešelj et al.* case will only be initiated before the Higher Court following a submission of an indictment. To date, no indictment has been filed by the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia. The Department has not received any information from the Ministry of Justice or the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia in relation to the *Šešelj et al.* case.

20. At the Higher Court, I also met with [REDACTED] from the Service for Assistance and Support to Victims and Witnesses of the Higher Court ("Service"), who provided an

¹² See Fourth Monitoring Report, para. 9.

overview of the role of the Service, from establishing contact with victims and witnesses ahead of their testimony and clarifying procedural matters, to assessing the individual needs of witnesses and victims and providing appropriate support. The Service does not provide witness protection but notifies judges if such protection is required and police involvement is necessary. The role of the Service effectively ends when witnesses leave the premises of the Higher Court. Nevertheless, the Service will reach out to witnesses post-testimony and refer them to appropriate organizations, if they need any additional support.

21. After the meetings, I had the opportunity to see two modernly equipped courtrooms (out of four available) and their associated facilities, including translation booths, rooms for protected witnesses, and the media centre.¹³

IV. CONCLUSION

22. Based on the information collected during the current reporting period, the *Šešelj et al.* case is still at an early stage in Serbia. In the next reporting period, I intend to clarify with the Ministry of Justice and the Prosecutor's Office of Serbia the exact status of the ongoing examination under article 7 of the Law on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters.
23. I remain available to provide any additional information at the President's direction.

Respectfully submitted,



Dagmara Albrecht
Monitor

Done this 20th day of November 2025,
At The Hague,
The Netherlands.

¹³ See First Monitoring Report, para. 15.



TRANSMISSION SHEET FOR FILING OF DOCUMENTS / FICHE DE TRANSMISSION POUR LE DÉPÔT DE DOCUMENTS

I - FILING INFORMATION / INFORMATIONS GÉNÉRALES

To/ À :	IRMCT Registry/ Greffe du MIFRTP		☐ Arusha/ Arusha	☒ The Hague/ La Haye
From/ De :	☐ President/ Président	☐ Chambers/ Chambre	☐ Prosecution/ Bureau du Procureur	☐ Defence/ Défense
			☐ Registrar/ Greffier	☒ Other/ Autre
Case Name/ Affaire :	In the Matter of Šešelj et al.		Case Number/ Affaire n° :	MICT-23-129-Misc.1
Date Created/ Daté du :	20 November 2025		Date transmitted/ Transmis le :	27 November 2025
				6
Original Language/ Langue de l'original :	☒ English/ Anglais	☐ French/ Français	☐ Kinyarwanda	☐ B/C/S
	☐ Other/Autre (specify/ préciser):			
Title of Document/ Titre du document :	SEVENTH MONITORING REPORT			
Classification Level/ Catégories de classification :	☒ Public/ Document public	☐ Ex Parte Defence excluded/ Défense exclue		
	☐ Confidential/ Confidentiel	☐ Ex Parte Prosecution excluded/ Bureau du Procureur exclu		
		☐ Ex Parte Rule 86 applicant excluded/ Article 86 requérant exclu		
		☐ Ex Parte Amicus Curiae excluded/ Amicus curiae exclu		
		☐ Ex Parte other exclusion/ autre(s) partie(s) exclue(s) (specify/ préciser) :		
Document type/ Type de document :	☐ Motion/ Requête ☐ Judgement/ Jugement/Arrêt ☐ Book of Authorities/ Recueil de sources ☐ Warrant/ Mandat ☐ Decision/ Décision ☐ Submission from parties/ Écritures déposées par des parties ☐ Affidavit/ Déclaration sous serment ☐ Notice of Appeal/ Acte d'appel ☐ Order/ Ordonnance ☒ Submission from non-parties/ Écritures déposées par des tiers ☐ Indictment/ Acte d'accusation			

II - TRANSLATION STATUS ON THE FILING DATE/ ÉTAT DE LA TRADUCTION AU JOUR DU DÉPÔT

☐ Translation not required/ La traduction n'est pas requise
☒ Filing Party hereby submits only the original, and requests the Registry to translate/ La partie déposante ne soumet que l'original et sollicite que le Greffe prenne en charge la traduction : (Word version of the document is attached/ La version Word du document est jointe)
☐ English/ Anglais ☐ French/ Français ☐ Kinyarwanda ☒ B/C/S ☐ Other/Autre (specify/préciser):
☐ Filing Party hereby submits both the original and the translated version for filing, as follows/ La partie déposante soumet l'original et la version traduite aux fins de dépôt, comme suit :
Original/ Original en : ☐ English/ Anglais ☐ French/ Français ☐ Kinyarwanda ☐ B/C/S ☐ Other/Autre (specify/ préciser):
Traduction/ Traduction en : ☐ English/ Anglais ☐ French/ Français ☐ Kinyarwanda ☐ B/C/S ☐ Other/Autre (specify/ préciser):
☐ Filing Party will be submitting the translated version(s) in due course in the following language(s)/ La partie déposante soumettra la (les) version(s) traduite(s) sous peu, dans la (les) langue(s) suivante(s):
☐ English/ Anglais ☐ French/ Français ☐ Kinyarwanda ☐ B/C/S ☐ Other/Autre (specify/préciser):