

Case: *Skočić* (indictee Sima Bogdanović and others)
Higher Court in Belgrade
War Crimes Chamber
Case number: K.Po2. 42/10

Main trial: December 4, 2012

Report: Marina Kljaić, attorney to injured party Zijo Ribić

Because he obstructed order in the courtroom, the indictee Zoran Đurđević was removed from the courtroom until the end of the presentation of testimonies.

The Office of the War Crimes Prosecutor submitted an amended indictment to the Court. The new indictment included five more victims who lost their lives. According to the facts established during the investigation, the acts performed by the indictees during these war crimes against civilians were differentiated, so all the indictees were accused of inhumane treatment, and the indictees Zoran Stojanović, Zoran Alić, Zoran Đurđević and Đorđe Šević also for large-scale destruction of property, infliction of bodily injuries, rape and murder of 27 Roma civilians, among which were seven children under the age of 14. The indicted Tomislav Gavrić was also accused of rape, and the indicted Dragana Đekić of large-scale destruction of property and infliction of bodily injuries.

Testimony by expert witness Branko Mandić

During the judicial proceedings the expert made a psychiatric evaluation of the indictee Zoran Stojanović, and together with expert Ana Najman, psychologist, an evaluation of the protected witnesses „Alpha“, „Beta“ and „Gamma“. During the day's testimony, he stood by his earlier findings. He mentioned that he confirmed alcoholic addiction in the case of the indictee Zoran Stojanović, but that the addiction did not cause deterioration of his intellectual capabilities, or the appearance of pathological states.

Testimony by expert witness Ana Najman

The expert Ana Najman stayed by her earlier findings. She explained that the protected witness „Alpha“ was a simple personality, so she had more primitive mechanisms of defense, like suppression, withdrawal and negation. In a situation when she recollected a traumatic incident she did not make new images of it, but simply recalled the incident as it was and therefore became traumatized again. The expert rejected the possibility that the protected witness „Alpha“ spoke about the traumatic incident in a certain way under the influence of an authority, because she was a simple person. She also said that, during the evaluation, „Alpha“ demonstrated consistency and authenticity, which led to the conclusion that the witness did not show a tendency toward manipulation. A traumatic incident would not lead to witness „Alpha“ making exaggerations about that event.