Ovčara case Trial for the war crimes against the war prisoners War Crimes Chamber of the District Court in Belgrade, Serbia Number of case: K.V. br.1/2003

Trial Chamber: Vesko Krstajić (the presiding judge), Gordana Božilović-Petrović (judge) and Vinka Beraha-Nikićević (judge).

Prosecutor: Deputy War Crimes Prosecutor Dušan Knežević.

Defendants: Miroljub Vujović, Stanko Vujanović, Jovica Perić, Ivan Atanasijević, Predrag Madžarac and Milan Vojnović, Serbs from Croatia.

Report: Nataša Kandić and Dragoljub Todorović, victims representatives

21 April 2005

The witness, Dr. **Bratislav Jovanović**, MD, said that he had been questioned in 1999 by a military investigative judge. In the fall of 1991 he had been the head of the Medical Corps of the Guards brigade. He said that his Medical Corps company was stationed in Negoslavci, in a school where the surgery and the operating theater were organized; it was there that the wounded were kept until their evacuation to the Military Medical Academy. He said that in Negoslavci they had had hospital medical charts; they did not have hospital release forms for patients taken care of in Negoslavci. At the time of the evacuation of the Vukovar hospital, on 16 and 17 November, he had not been in Vukovar; he had accompanied the patients to Belgrade. The witness said that he had not entered Vukovar, that he did not know whether his company had been ordered to evacuate the Vukovar hospital.

Expert witness, Dr. Jančić Miloš, a specialist of general surgery and traumatology employed by the Clinical and Hospital Center Dragiša Mišević in Belgrade, an expert witness on a permanent basis, said that he had submitted his written findings and opinion about the nature of the injuries, about the health condition and a general state of the defendant, Vujo Zlatar, for the period between 20 and 21 November 1991. He said he had been at the MMA, that he had checked medical records. He said that he had ascertained that, on 31 October 1991, the defendant suffered multiple wounds in his right hand genitalia, the right hand, in the upper part of the left leg. He was admitted at MMA on the same day; the wound had been initially treated in Negoslavci. At MMA a diagnosis was made; the nature of the wound demanded that the vein be tied up with no lasting effects on the vitality of the limb, although there was a painful swelling which contributed to a general trauma of the day. The defendant had remained at MMA until 18 November 1991 when he was trnsferred to Selters Spa, near Mladenovac, for rehabilitation. He said that on 18 November, at admission in Mladenovac, a hypotrophy of the muscles in the area of the cut in the upper part of the leg was determined, which meant that until that time the person had been either lying or immobilized. The expert witness said that he had determined, on the basis of the documents, that the defendant had been at the rehabilitation institute from 18 November to 18 December 1991. He said that, in his opinion, and taking everything into account, the defendant, between 18 and 21 November 1991, could not have moved around all by himself without the help of other persons; he had been passively ambulatory with the help of an orthopedic aid. On 18 November 1991, the wound, after being stitched, was swollen, painful; with time, the swelling receded, but still taxed the wound. The expert witness said that the

stitches might have been removed from the wound on or about the time the defendant had been released from MMA (8 to 10 days after the wound had been stitched), but he had failed to state that in the medical records.

Ċ