



Security Council

Distr.: General
14 October 2011

Resolution 2013 (2011)

Adopted by the Security Council at its 6632nd meeting, on 14 October 2011

The Security Council,

Taking note of the letter to the President of the Council from the Secretary-General dated 30 September 2011 (S/2011/609), attaching a letter from the President of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (“the International Tribunal”) dated 26 September 2011,

Recalling its resolutions 955 (1994) of 8 November 1994, 1503 (2003) of 28 August 2003 and 1534 (2004) of 26 March 2004, and its previous resolutions concerning the International Tribunal,

Recalling also its resolution 1966 (2010) of 22 December 2010, establishing the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (“the Mechanism”) and requesting the International Tribunal to take all possible measures to expeditiously complete all its remaining work no later than 31 December 2014, prepare its closure and ensure a smooth transition to the Mechanism,

Noting that, upon the completion of the cases to which they are assigned, four permanent judges will be redeployed from the Trial Chambers to the Appeals Chamber and two permanent judges will leave the International Tribunal,

Urging the International Tribunal to take all possible measures to complete its work expeditiously as requested in resolution 1966 (2010),

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. *Decides*, in light of the exceptional circumstances, that notwithstanding article 12 bis, paragraph 3, of the Statute of the International Tribunal, Judge Bakhtiyar Tuzmukhamedov may work part-time and engage in another judicial occupation until 31 December 2011, and *takes note* of Judge Tuzmukhamedov’s commitment to ensuring timely delivery of judgment in the two cases in which he is currently involved;

2. *Underscores* that this exceptional authorization shall not be considered as establishing a precedent. The President of the International Tribunal shall have the responsibility to ensure that this arrangement is compatible with the independence and impartiality of the judge, does not give rise to conflicts of interest and does not delay the delivery of the judgment;

3. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

