

**UNITED
NATIONS**



International Residual Mechanism
for Criminal Tribunals

Case No.: MICT-13-56-ES

Date: 20 August 2026

Original: English

THE PRESIDENT OF THE MECHANISM

Before: Judge Graciela Gatti Santana, President

Registrar: Mr. Abubacarr M. Tambadou

Decision of: 20 August 2026

PROSECUTOR

v.

RATKO MLADIĆ

PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION FOR EARLY RELEASE
OF RATKO MLADIĆ**

Counsel for Mr. Ratko Mladić:

Mr. Dragan Ivetić
Mr. Branko Lukić

1. I, Graciela Gatti Santana, President of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (“President” and “Mechanism”, respectively), am seised of a request filed by Mr. Ratko Mladić (“Mladić”) on 18 August 2026, seeking conditional early release on compelling humanitarian grounds.¹

I. BACKGROUND

2. On 26 May 2011, Mladić was arrested in the Republic of Serbia (“Serbia”) and, on 31 May 2011, he was transferred to the United Nations Detention Unit (“UNDU”) in The Hague, Kingdom of the Netherlands (“Netherlands”).²

3. On 22 November 2017, Trial Chamber I of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (“Trial Chamber” and “ICTY”, respectively) convicted Mladić of: (i) genocide; (ii) persecution, extermination, murder, deportation and inhumane acts (forcible transfer) as crimes against humanity; and (iii) murder, terror, unlawful attacks on civilians and taking of hostages as violations of the laws or customs of war.³ The Trial Chamber sentenced him to life imprisonment.⁴

4. On 8 June 2021, the Appeals Chamber of the Mechanism (“Appeals Chamber”) affirmed Mladić’s convictions and sentence.⁵

5. Mladić has since remained at the UNDU, awaiting the designation of, and his transfer to, a State where he will serve the remainder of his sentence. At this point, Mladić has served just over 15 years of his life sentence.

II. APPLICATION AND RELEVANT MATERIAL

6. Given the President’s supervisory role over the conditions of detention of the persons under the authority of the Mechanism at the UNDU, as well as Mladić’s particular circumstances, Mladić’s healthcare involves a strict monitoring regime with regular reports to the President.⁶ The

¹ Urgent Defence Motion Seeking Conditional Early Release of Mr. Ratko Mladić Based on Humanitarian Grounds, 18 August 2026 (confidential) (“Application”), paras. 2, 22, p. 10.

² *Prosecutor v. Ratko Mladić*, Case No. IT-09-92-T, Judgement, 22 November 2017 (public with confidential annex) (“Trial Judgement”), para. 5222.

³ Trial Judgement, para. 5214.

⁴ Trial Judgement, para. 5215.

⁵ *Prosecutor v. Ratko Mladić*, Case No. MICT-13-56-A, Judgement, 8 June 2021 (public redacted) (“Appeal Judgement”), para. 592.

⁶ Public Redacted Version of “Third Order on Medical Reports” of 15 September 2022, 19 October 2023; Further Order on Medical Reports, 3 August 2022 (confidential); Order on Medical Reports, 18 January 2022 (confidential).

monitoring and reporting is done by the UNDU Medical Service and independent medical experts and remains ongoing.⁷

7. In the context of this reporting regime, on 14 August 2026, I received an interim medical report prepared by the UNDU Medical Officer on 13 August 2026 pursuant to Rule 49(2) of the Rules of Detention⁸ (“Rule 49(2) Report”), which was communicated to Mladić’s Counsel the following day and filed on the record on 17 August 2026.⁹ The UNDU Medical Officer reports, *inter alia*, that “Mladić’s overall condition has rapidly declined” and he “has now entered the final phase of life”, and that, following a multidisciplinary review by the medical team at the prison hospital, it was decided that “the focus of care is now primarily on comfort and relief of the suffering”.¹⁰ The UNDU Medical Officer’s clinical assessment is that Mladić’s death “may occur at any time” and “is expected within approximately the next [REDACTED] weeks”.¹¹

8. On 18 August 2026, Mladić filed the Application, requesting conditional early release on compelling humanitarian grounds, subject to his direct transfer to a designated hospital or palliative-care facility in Serbia, continued supervision by the Serbian authorities, and any additional conditions imposed by the President.¹² The Application is accompanied, *inter alia*, by [REDACTED] in relation to Mladić’s prior application for release.¹³ On 18 August 2026, [REDACTED].¹⁴

9. In reaching my conclusion with regard to the Application, I have consulted with Judge Alphons Orie as a Judge of the Trial Chamber and Judge Prisca Matimba Nyambe, Judge Aminatta Lois Runeni N’gum, Judge Seymour Panton, and Judge Mustapha El Baaj as

⁷ Registrar’s Submission in Relation to the “Third Order on Medical Reports” of 15 September 2022, 17 August 2026 (confidential), Annex (“Independent Medical Expert Report of 17 August 2026”) (original filed in Dutch on 12 August 2026, *see* Registrar’s Submission in Relation to the “Third Order on Medical Reports” of 15 September 2022, 12 August 2026 (confidential), Annex); Registrar’s Submission in Relation to the “Third Order on Medical Reports” of 15 September 2022, 5 August 2026 (confidential), Annex; Registrar’s Submission in Relation to the “Third Order on Medical Reports” of 15 September 2022, 28 May 2026 (confidential), Annex.

⁸ Rules Governing the Detention of Persons Awaiting Trial or Appeal Before the Mechanism or Otherwise Detained on the Authority of the Mechanism, 5 November 2018 (“Rules of Detention”).

⁹ Registrar’s Submission in Relation to the “Third Order on Medical Reports” of 15 September 2022, 17 August 2026 (confidential), Annex, Registry Pagination (“RP”) 2293-2292. *See* E-mail communication from the Office of the Registrar to the Office of the President, 14 August 2026.

¹⁰ Rule 49(2) Report, RP 2293.

¹¹ Rule 49(2) Report, RP 2293.

¹² Application, paras. 2, 22, 31, p. 10.

¹³ Application, para. 15, Annex C. *See* Urgent Defence Motion Seeking (Alternatively) Provisional or Early Release of Mr. Ratko Mladić Based on Humanitarian Grounds, 23 April 2026 (confidential), paras. 8, 26, Annex D.

¹⁴ *See* [REDACTED].

Judges of the Appeals Chamber,¹⁵ in line with Rule 150 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Mechanism (“Rules”) and paragraphs 16 and 17 of the applicable Practice Direction.¹⁶

III. APPLICABLE LAW

10. Pursuant to Article 26 of the Statute of the Mechanism (“Statute”), there shall only be pardon or commutation of sentence if the President so decides on the basis of the interests of justice and the general principles of law. While Article 26 of the Statute, like the equivalent provisions in the Statutes of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (“ICTR”) and the ICTY, does not specifically mention requests for early release of convicted persons, the Rules reflect the President’s power to deal with such requests, which is consistent with the longstanding practice of the ICTR, the ICTY, and the Mechanism.

11. Rule 150 of the Rules provides that the President shall, upon receipt of a direct petition from the convicted person, determine whether pardon, commutation of sentence, or early release is appropriate, in consultation with: (i) any Judges of the sentencing Chamber who are Judges of the Mechanism; or (ii) at least two other Judges, if none of the Judges who imposed the sentence are Judges of the Mechanism.

12. The general standards for granting early release are set out in Rule 151 of the Rules, which provides that, in making a determination on pardon, commutation of sentence, or early release, the President shall take into account, *inter alia*, the gravity of the crime or crimes for which the prisoner was convicted, the treatment of similarly-situated prisoners, the prisoner’s demonstration of rehabilitation, and any substantial cooperation of the prisoner with the Office of the Prosecutor (“Prosecution”).

13. Paragraph 19 of the Practice Direction specifies that the President shall determine whether early release is to be granted on the basis of the interests of justice and the general principles of law, having regard to the criteria specified in Rule 151 of the Rules, and any other information, as well as the views of the Judges consulted in accordance with Rule 150 of the Rules.

14. Paragraph 21 of the Practice Direction states, *inter alia*, that in cases of extreme urgency, the President may dispense with the procedural steps set forth in the Practice Direction to the extent

¹⁵ See generally Trial Judgement; Appeal Judgement.

¹⁶ Practice Direction on the Procedure for the Determination of Applications for Pardon, Commutation of Sentence, or Early Release of Persons Convicted by the ICTR, the ICTY, or the Mechanism, MICT/3/Rev.4, 1 July 2024 (“Practice Direction”).

required to meet the urgency, accelerate the consultation with other Judges, and, if necessary, issue a decision with reasons to follow.

IV. ANALYSIS

A. Standards for Granting Early Release

15. In the context of an early release application, serving two-thirds of a sentence has been described by the Mechanism’s jurisprudence as being “in essence, an admissibility threshold”.¹⁷ Having served just over 15 years of his life sentence,¹⁸ Mladić has not yet reached the eligibility threshold for early release.¹⁹

16. However, the Mechanism’s jurisprudence provides that compelling or exceptional circumstances could also arise in specific instances prior to the two-thirds threshold having been reached, which, in the exercise of my discretion as President, may overcome any eligibility concerns.²⁰ Further, I recall that, if a particular situation requires the release of a convicted person based on compelling humanitarian grounds, it is immaterial whether any of the factors set out in Rule 151 of the Rules weigh in favour of or against the convicted person’s early release.²¹ In such a scenario, it is the specific and prevailing circumstances, often due to the convicted person’s health condition, that will dictate whether the person should be released in accordance with the Mechanism’s legal framework.²²

17. As Mladić’s submissions are exclusively based on compelling humanitarian grounds, my determination of the Application is solely guided by whether the information before me indicates

¹⁷ *Prosecutor v. Augustin Ngirabatware*, Case No. MICT-12-29-ES.1, Decision on the Application for Commutation of Sentence or Early Release of Augustin Ngirabatware, 11 August 2026 (“*Ngirabatware Decision*”), p. 3; *Prosecutor v. Jean Kambanda*, Case No. MICT-13-32-ES.1, Decision on the Application for Early Release of Jean Kambanda, 23 July 2026 (“*Kambanda Decision*”), p. 3; *Prosecutor v. Paul Bisengimana*, Case No. MICT-12-07, Decision of the President on the Early Release of Paul Bisengimana and on Motion to File a Public Redacted Application, 11 December 2012 (public redacted), para. 19.

¹⁸ See *supra* para. 5.

¹⁹ See Decision on the Application for Release of Ratko Mladić, 14 May 2026 (public redacted) (“*Decision of 14 May 2026*”), para. 25, fn. 36.

²⁰ *Ngirabatware Decision*, p. 3; *Kambanda Decision*, p. 3; *Prosecutor v. Laurent Semanza*, Case No. MICT-13-36-ES, Decision of the President on the Early Release of Laurent Semanza, 9 June 2016 (public redacted), para. 18.

²¹ *Prosecutor v. Dominique Ntawukulilyayo*, Case No. MICT-13-34-ES, Decision on the Application for Early Release of Dominique Ntawukulilyayo, 18 February 2026 (public redacted) (“*Ntawukulilyayo Decision*”), para. 42; *Prosecutor v. Nebojša Pavković*, Case No. MICT-14-67-ES.2, Reasons for the 26 September 2025 Decision on the Application for Early Release of Nebojša Pavković, 8 October 2025 (public redacted) (“*Reasons for Pavković Decision*”), para. 24; *Prosecutor v. Radoslav Brđanin*, Case No. MICT-13-48-ES, Reasons for the 3 September 2022 Decision on the Application for Early Release of Radoslav Brđanin, 26 September 2022 (public redacted) (“*Reasons for Brđanin Decision*”), para. 37.

²² *Ntawukulilyayo Decision*, para. 42; *Reasons for Pavković Decision*, para. 24; *Reasons for Brđanin Decision*, para. 37.

that the circumstances surrounding Mladić's health and imprisonment demand his early release for humanitarian reasons.

B. Humanitarian Considerations

18. Mladić submits that his current medical condition has materially changed since the Decision of 14 May 2026 denying him release. Specifically, the Rule 49(2) Report confirms that he is expected to die within [REDACTED] weeks and demonstrates a documented transition in the actual goals of care, with treatment now focusing primarily on comfort and relief from suffering.²³ He also submits that his condition eliminates any realistic flight risk²⁴ and that a transfer to Serbia would permit “substantially greater and more continuous presence of his closest family than can be accommodated at [T]he Hague”, which has “greater humanitarian significance” in view of the shifted objective of care.²⁵ Finally, Mladić requests immediate adjudication of the Application to avoid further deterioration that renders the requested relief impossible.²⁶

19. I have considered Mladić's submissions, as well as the updated medical information concerning the evolution of his condition and treatment plan as reflected in the Rule 49(2) Report. Following a multidisciplinary meeting on 13 August 2026, the decision was made to focus Mladić's care primarily on comfort and relief from suffering as his frailty and comorbidities now exceed what medical intervention could meaningfully achieve.²⁷ [REDACTED].²⁸ While it has been clear for some time that Mladić is approaching the end of his life,²⁹ the current information in the Rule 49(2) Report suggests that his death, which could occur at any time, is expected within approximately the next [REDACTED] weeks.³⁰ Notwithstanding the difficulty of accurately predicting life expectancy, this prognosis follows a multidisciplinary assessment conducted by medical professionals with extensive knowledge of Mladić's condition and treatment. Consequently, it is accorded significant weight.

20. At the outset, it must be emphasised that Mladić does not seek release on the basis that recent developments in his health or changes to his treatment plan prevent compassionate or comprehensive care, including end-of-life care, that has been consistently provided by the UNDU,

²³ Application, paras. 2, 5-12, 14, 17-20, 23, 27, 29-30, 32.

²⁴ Application, paras. 2, 26.

²⁵ Application, paras. 22-25, 31, 34.

²⁶ Application, paras. 3, 13, 28, 33.

²⁷ Rule 49(2) Report, RP 2293.

²⁸ Rule 49(2) Report, RP 2293.

²⁹ Decision of 14 May 2026, para. 39.

³⁰ Rule 49(2) Report, RP 2293.

the prison hospital, and civilian hospitals available to him in the Netherlands.³¹ Nor does he submit that transfer to Serbia would provide better or more appropriate end-of-life medical care or assistance for activities of daily living than that presently available to him in the Netherlands.³² Similarly, the Rule 49(2) Report does not articulate that the UNDU, the prison hospital, and available medical care facilities are unable to uphold Mladić's dignity in light of changes in his specific condition and planned treatment. In sum, there is no suggestion that, on the basis of the care available to Mladić, his continued presence in the prison hospital would be cruel, inhuman, or an affront to his dignity.

21. Instead, Mladić's request for humanitarian release is premised primarily on two grounds: (i) he should be released given the credible imminence of his death;³³ and (ii) his transfer to Serbia will ensure substantially greater and more continuous presence of his closest family, a relevant factor in end-of-life care, when compared to opportunities available to him in The Hague.³⁴

22. With respect to the first consideration, neither the interests of justice nor general principles of law establish an automatic right to release when the convicted person's anticipated life expectancy is very short. Each request must be considered on a case-by-case basis. Past decisions, including those I have issued granting conditional early release based on acute terminal illness and a life expectancy of a very short duration, are not dispositive in the specific circumstances of this case.³⁵ Likewise, there is no suggestion that Mladić's continued presence in the prison hospital exacerbates the vulnerabilities arising from his condition.³⁶

23. As previously indicated, the question of whether humanitarian or compassionate considerations demand release cannot be based solely on Mladić's health situation, but also the circumstances in the prison setting and whether they sufficiently safeguard his health and human dignity.³⁷ Mladić's circumstances have changed since I last denied his request for release on humanitarian grounds: there is now a higher degree of certainty that he will die imminently and his treatment is being adapted accordingly. This reality, undoubtedly, carries significant humanitarian weight. However, this interfaces with another undisputed reality: Mladić continues to benefit from a

³¹ See e.g. Application, para. 30 ("The Defence does not contend that the medical personnel presently caring for Mr. Mladić are failing to provide conscientious care.").

³² See e.g. Application, paras. 22-23, 29, 31-32.

³³ Application, paras. 7-8, 12, 14.

³⁴ Application, paras. 22-23, 31, 34.

³⁵ *Contra* Reasons for *Brdanin* Decision, paras. 53-54, 57.

³⁶ *Contra* *Ntawukulilyayo* Decision, paras. 56-59, 65; Reasons for *Pavković* Decision, paras. 26-28, 33; *Prosecutor v. Ljubiša Beara*, Case No. MICT-15-85-ES.3, Public Redacted Version of 7 February 2017 Decision of the President on the Early Release of Ljubiša Beara, 16 June 2017, paras. 34-36, 38-49.

³⁷ Decision of 14 May 2026, paras. 28, 33.

care-centred approach that includes comprehensive support for all activities of daily living and extraordinary palliative care focused on ensuring his maximum comfort.³⁸

24. As detailed in the Decision of 14 May 2026, the exceptional level and nature of care Mladić is able to receive, and receives, in the prison hospital rebut all presumptions that, in general, might lead to the assumption that continued imprisonment of a person with Mladić's poor prognosis is, or inevitably will be, cruel, inhuman, or degrading.³⁹ Mladić is permanently housed, under the UNDU's supervision, in the recently built, state-of-the-art prison hospital facility equipped to provide multidisciplinary care for prisoners with complex medical conditions and comprehensive support for all activities of daily living.⁴⁰

25. Indeed, notwithstanding the evolution in his condition, Mladić recently expressed that he is "very satisfied with the contact and attitude of the physicians and nursing staff".⁴¹ There is no indication that transfer to Serbia would provide better or more appropriate end-of-life care. I am therefore satisfied that his continuous presence in the prison hospital and under the UNDU's authority respects Mladić's health, human dignity, and fundamental rights. The expected imminence of his passing does not, in itself, render his continued imprisonment incompatible with those rights.

26. It also bears repeating that Mladić's request for release must be examined in the context of the unique and significant penological goal underpinning sentences imposed on persons convicted of international crimes: the sentence, beyond deterrence, is intended to reflect the international community's condemnation of the behaviour in question and its unwillingness to tolerate serious violations of international humanitarian law and human rights.⁴² In this broader context, and particularly when Mladić's continued incarceration involves a high level of comprehensive and compassionate care far beyond minimum international standards, his request for release to spend his final days in Serbia reflects a preference rather than an outcome dictated by the interests of justice and general principles of law.

27. I now turn to Mladić's submissions that humanitarian release is warranted in view of the increasing significance of family contact for him and the barriers his continued incarceration present to it. Mladić stresses that, notwithstanding the exceptional visitation regime afforded to him,

³⁸ Decision of 14 May 2026, paras. 34-35, 44.

³⁹ Decision of 14 May 2026, paras. 32, 34-38.

⁴⁰ Decision of 14 May 2026, paras. 34-35.

⁴¹ Independent Medical Expert Report of 17 August 2026, RP 2286. *See also* Decision of 14 May 2026, para. 35 and references contained therein.

⁴² *See e.g.* Decision of 14 May 2026, para. 39; Decision on the Application for Release of Ratko Mladić, 29 July 2025 (public redacted), fn. 54.

his wife is elderly and international travel imposes physical strain and health risks that are exacerbated due to “an emotionally overwhelming end-of-life crisis”.⁴³ Mladić further submits that transfer to a Serbian medical facility would permit his closest family – which also includes his daughter-in-law and three grandchildren – to remain meaningfully and more continuously present during the limited time remaining, whereas the UNDU would only permit his son and spouse to be with him.⁴⁴ Mladić contends that even the exceptional visitation regime at the UNDU cannot provide the sustained presence of his wife, son, and closest family “that a Serbian medical facility could permit during a final period measured in days or weeks”.⁴⁵

28. As set forth previously, Mladić benefits from an exceptional visitation regime that has allowed him extended in-person and remote contact with his family members and friends.⁴⁶ This includes the possibility of in-person visits on short notice and overnight stays.⁴⁷ I am sympathetic to the hardships Mladić’s wife, in particular, and his other immediate family members face in order to provide comfort to Mladić in the final phase of his life. However, in view of the established visitation possibilities, the prospect of more visitation by more family members if released to Serbia does not demonstrate a violation of Mladić’s rights or require humanitarian release. Mladić has received multiple in-person visits from his son, wife and grandchildren within the past year.⁴⁸ The UNDU has facilitated additional family visitation since the filing of the Application and expects to facilitate additional visitation in the immediate future.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, I will instruct the Registrar of the Mechanism (“Registrar”) to continue to facilitate visitation requests to the maximum extent possible for the purpose of ensuring sufficient family contact in view of the current prognosis in the Rule 49(2) Report.

29. In light of the above, I am not persuaded that humanitarian considerations warrant the exceptional measure of early release, even subject to strict conditions. The interests of justice and general principles of law do not require release because death is expected to be imminent. Considering the level and nature of care available to Mladić, as well as the possibilities available for family contact, Mladić’s continued incarceration will not cause suffering to him beyond what a sentence of imprisonment inherently carries. Also bearing in mind the particular penological

⁴³ Application, paras. 23-24.

⁴⁴ Application, para. 23.

⁴⁵ Application, para. 24.

⁴⁶ See Decision of 14 May 2026, paras. 36-37.

⁴⁷ See Decision of 14 May 2026, paras. 36-37. See also Email communication from the Registrar to the President, dated 19 August 2026 (confidential).

⁴⁸ See Email communication from Registry Senior Legal Officer to *Chef de Cabinet* and Principal Legal Advisor to the President, dated 18 March 2026 (confidential).

⁴⁹ See Email communication from Registry Legal Officer to *Chef de Cabinet* and Principal Legal Advisor to the President, dated 20 August 2026 (confidential).

interests surrounding Mladić's life sentence, I likewise do not consider that the proper administration of criminal justice requires the humanitarian remedy of release. To the contrary, Mladić's human dignity, to which everyone is entitled, is fully respected in the current circumstances.

V. CONSULTATION

30. In coming to my decision on whether to grant the Application, I consulted with five other Judges of the Mechanism, each having ruled on Mladić's sentence.⁵⁰ Judge N'gum, Judge Panton, and Judge El Baaj expressed the view that they would have denied the Application, whereas Judge Orié and Judge Nyambe support granting it.

31. Judge N'gum stresses that the Defence has not shown that the risks associated with travel will not cause severe harm or death to Mladić. Instead, she submits that his interests and welfare are best served by his continued presence in the prison hospital, where he is cared for by staff who have treated him for years. In her view, there is no evidence demonstrating that his conditions are cruel, inhuman, or degrading, and she adds that the visitation regime facilitates sufficient family contact. Judge Panton considers that Mladić's humanitarian needs are supported by the excellent care he receives, and the inconvenience of family visitation does not justify early release on humanitarian grounds. Judge El Baaj likewise considers that Mladić's presence in the prison hospital respects his human dignity and fundamental rights even during his final days. He considers that an anticipated very short life expectancy does not give rise to an automatic right to release and emphasises that there is no evidence that a transfer to Serbia would provide better end-of-life care.

32. Judge Orié is of the view that the Application should be granted as the imminence of Mladić's death is the decisive humanitarian consideration and that the availability of excellent medical care does not outweigh it. He considers that, while the interests of justice and general principles of law do not require release, they equally do not preclude it. It is his view that retribution as an inherent interest of justice concludes in the final hours of a convicted person's life, which should be spent in a family environment rather than one that highlights that the person has been convicted of crimes. He also has concerns that restrictions inherent to the visitation practice at the prison hospital could hypothetically prevent the family's presence at the moment of Mladić's death. At the same time, he raises practical considerations concerning the safety of a transfer to Serbia that could justify denying the Application. Judge Nyambe concurs entirely with Judge Orié's views and favours granting the Application.

⁵⁰ See *supra* para. 9.

33. I am very grateful for my Colleagues' views on these matters and for providing them on exceptionally short notice. I have carefully reflected upon their observations and have taken them into consideration in my ultimate assessment of the Application. They have been essential to the fair and expeditious resolution of this matter.

VI. CONCLUSION

34. The differing views of the sentencing Judges reflect the range of discretion inherent in answering such a difficult question. I have paid particular attention to the views of my two Colleagues who are in favour of granting the Application. They stress that the credible imminence of Mladić's death constitutes a unique humanitarian consideration of decisive weight in favour of release no matter how exceptional the care that he receives is. In the particular circumstances of this case, I respectfully disagree. I am bound to uphold the interests of justice and general principles of law. Mladić must be kept in conditions that uphold his human dignity. The comprehensive and compassionate medical care and assistance in relation to all activities of daily living that is provided to him as well as the exceptional visitation regime allowing meaningful family contact accomplish this. Given this, as well as the particular penological interest inherent in Mladić's life sentence, I do not consider that the proper administration of criminal justice is fulfilled through the humanitarian remedy of early release. Moreover, and since the filing of the Application, the UNDU has facilitated family visitation and expects to facilitate additional visits in the immediate future. Given my decision to deny Mladić's request, I will continue to assume my responsibility and take any necessary action to ensure continuous protection of his fundamental rights and human dignity.

VII. DISPOSITION

35. For the foregoing reasons, and pursuant to Article 26 of the Statute, I hereby **DENY** the Application.

36. The Registrar is hereby **DIRECTED** to:

- i. facilitate visitation requests to the maximum extent possible for the purpose of ensuring sufficient family contact in view of the current prognosis in the Rule 49(2) Report; and

- ii. provide the Prosecution with the public redacted version of this decision as soon as possible.

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

Done this 20th day of August 2026,
At The Hague,
The Netherlands.



Judge Graciela Gatti Santana
President



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 :	Prosecutor v. Ratko Mladić		Case Number/ Affaire n° :	MICT-13-56-ES
Date Created/ Daté du :	20 August 2026	Date transmitted/ Transmis le :	21 August 2026	Number of Pages/ Nombre de pages : 12
Original Language/ Langue de l'original :	☒ English/ Anglais	☐ French/ Français	☐ Kinyarwanda	☐ B/C/S
	☐ Other/Autre (specify/ préciser):			
Title of Document/ Titre du document :	DECISION ON THE APPLICATION FOR EARLY RELEASE OF RATKO MLADIĆ			
Classification Level/ Catégories de classification :	☒ Public/ Document public	☐ Confidential/ Confidentiel	☐ Ex Parte Defence excluded/ Défense exclue ☐ 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 ☒ Decision/ Décision ☐ Order/ Ordonnance ☐ Judgement/ Jugement/Arrêt ☐ Submission from parties/ Écritures déposées par des parties ☐ Submission from non-parties/ Écritures déposées par des tiers ☐ Book of Authorities/ Recueil de sources ☐ Affidavit/ Déclaration sous serment ☐ Indictment/ Acte d'accusation ☐ Warrant/ Mandat ☐ Notice of Appeal/ Acte d'appel			

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):