

DOSSIER:

**«THE POLITICAL TRIAL OF THE
CATALAN INDEPENDENCE LEADERS»**

**#Make
a move**

Self-determination is
a right, not a crime

Makeamove.cat

assemblea

Everything You Need to Know About the Political Case against the Catalan Referendum on Independence Held in Catalonia on 1 October 2017

The Accused and the Accusations

In total there are 22 accused, 12 of whom are to be tried by the Spanish Supreme Court. Six more, those accused only of contempt of court, will finally be tried in the Spanish High Court in Catalonia (TSJC). And Major Trapero and the former leadership of the Mossos (the Catalan police) are being tried by Spain's National Court. Here are the names of all of them along with the charges made by the Public Prosecutor's office (in parenthesis, the charges made by the Spanish Legal Service).

AT THE SPANISH SUPREME COURT IN MADRID:

Oriol Junqueras: Rebellion and misappropriation of public funds. 25 years in prison and 25 years of complete disqualification from public office. (Spanish Legal Service: 12 years in prison and disqualification for sedition and misappropriation of public funds.)

Jordi Sànchez: Rebellion. 17 years in prison and 17 years of complete disqualification. (Spanish Legal Service: 8 years in prison for sedition.)

Jordi Cuixart: Rebellion. 17 years in prison and 17 years of complete disqualification. (Spanish Legal Service: 8 years in prison for sedition.)

Carme Forcadell: Rebellion. 17 years in prison and 17 years of complete disqualification. (Spanish Legal Service: 10 years in prison for sedition.)

Jordi Turull: Rebellion and misappropriation of public funds. 16 years in prison and 16 years of complete disqualification. (Spanish Legal Service: 11 and a half years in prison and disqualification for sedition and misappropriation.)

Raül Romeva: Rebellion and misappropriation of public funds. 16 years in prison and 16 years of complete disqualification. (Spanish Legal Service: 11 and a half years in prison and disqualification for sedition and misappropriation of funds.)

Joaquim Forn: Rebellion and misappropriation of public funds. 16 years in prison and 16 years of complete disqualification. (Spanish Legal Service: 11 and a half years in prison and disqualification for sedition and misappropriation.)

Josep Rull: Rebellion and misappropriation of public funds. 16 years in prison and 16 years of complete disqualification. (Spanish Legal Service: 11 and a half years in prison and disqualification for sedition and misappropriation.)

Dolors Bassa: Rebellion and misappropriation of public funds. 16 years in prison and 16 years of complete disqualification (Spanish Legal Service: 11 and a half years in prison and disqualification for sedition and misappropriation of funds)

Carles Mundó: Misappropriation and gross contempt of court. 7 years in prison and 16 years of complete disqualification. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: 10 years in prison and disqualification for misappropriation and gross contempt of court.)

Meritxell Borràs: Misappropriation and gross contempt of court. 7 years in prison and 16 years of complete disqualification. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: 10 years in prison and disqualification for misappropriation and gross contempt of court.)

Santi Vila: Misappropriation and gross contempt of court. 7 years in prison and 16 years of complete disqualification. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: 10 years in prison and disqualification for misappropriation and gross contempt of court.)

AT THE SPANISH HIGH COURT IN BARCELONA:

Mireia Boya: Gross contempt of court. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: fine of 8 months and 1 year and 4 months of disqualification for gross contempt of court.)

Lluís Maria Coromines: Gross contempt of court. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: fine of 10 months and 1 year and 8 months of disqualification for gross contempt of court.)

Lluís Guinó: Gross contempt of court. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: fine of 10 months and 1 year and 8 months of disqualification for gross contempt of court.)

Anna Simó: Gross contempt of court. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: fine of 10 months and 1 year and 8 months of disqualification for gross contempt of court.)

Ramona Barrufet: Gross contempt of court. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: fine of 10 months and 1 year and 8 months of disqualification for gross contempt of court.)

Joan Josep Nuet: Gross contempt of court. Fine of 10 months with a daily fee of 100 euros. (Spanish Legal Service: fine of 8 months and 1 year and 4 months of disqualification for gross contempt of court.)

AT THE SPANISH NATIONAL COURT IN MADRID:

Josep-Lluís Trapero: Rebellion. 11 years in prison and 11 years of complete disqualification.

Pere Soler: Rebellion. 11 years in prison and 11 years of complete disqualification.

Cèsar Puig: Rebellion. 11 years in prison and 11 years of complete disqualification.

Teresa Laplana: Sedition. 4 years in prison.

ORIOI JUNQUERAS

Rebellion and misappropriation

25 YEARS

12 years

CARME FORCADELL

Rebellion

17 YEARS

10 years

JORDI SÀNCHEZ

Rebellion
17 YEARS
8 years

JORDI CUIXART

Rebellion
17 YEARS
8 years

JORDI TURULL

Rebellion and misappropriation
16 YEARS
11 and a half years

DOLORS BASSA

Rebellion and misappropriation
16 YEARS
11 and a half years

JOAQUIM FORN

Rebellion and misappropriation
16 YEARS
11 and a half years

JOSEP RULL

Rebellion and misappropriation
16 YEARS
11 and a half years

RAÜL ROMEVA

Rebellion and misappropriation
16 YEARS
11 and a half years

MERITXELL BORRÀS

Misappropriation and gross contempt of court
7 YEARS
10 years

CARLES MUNDÓ

Misappropriation and gross contempt of court
7 YEARS
10 years

SANTI VILA

Misappropriation and gross contempt of court

7 YEARS

10 years

MIREIA BOYA

Gross contempt of court

Fine of 10 months

(daily fee of 100 euros)

ANNA SIMÓ

Gross contempt of court

Fine of 10 months

(daily fee of 100 euros)

LLUÍS COROMINAS

Gross contempt of court

Fine of 10 months

(daily fee of 100 euros)

LLUÍS GUINÓ

Gross contempt of court

Fine of 10 months

(daily fee of 100 euros)

RAMONA BARRUFET

Gross contempt of court

Fine of 10 months

(daily fee of 100 euros)

JOAN JOSEP NUET

Gross contempt of court

Fine of 10 months

(daily fee of 100 euros)

JOSEP-LLUÍS TRAPERO

Rebellion

11 YEARS

PERE SOLER

Rebellion

11 YEARS

CÈSAR PUIG

Rebellion

11 YEARS

TERESA LAPLANA

Rebellion

11 YEARS

THE INVENTION OF VIOLENCE: FIVE POINTS TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THE NONSENSE OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

President Puigdemont Does Not Appear in the Bills of Indictment because Germany Denied that Rebellion had Taken Place

The Spanish state today confirmed its intention of making an example of the independence movement's leaders awaiting trial for the events of 1 October last year. The script is as expected: the Public Prosecutor accuses the political prisoners of rebellion, and calls for draconian sentences: 25 years for Oriol Junqueras, 17 for Carme Forcadell, Jordi Cuixart and Jordi Sànchez and 16 for Rull, Turull, Romeva, Forn and Bassa. To these must be added the call for 11 years of prison for Major Trapero, former Director of the Mossos Pere Soler, and former Director General at the Ministry of the Interior, Cèsar Puig. The Public Prosecutor accuses Senior Police Executive Teresa Laplana of sedition, calling for 4 years of prison. Former Ministers Meritxell Borràs, Carles Mundó and Santi Vila, accused of misappropriation of funds and contempt of court, would serve 7 years.

In addition, the Spanish Legal Service has also brought charges including sedition, misappropriation and contempt of court, with sentences of 11 years of prison. The state operation against the independence movement, exactly one year after the imprisonment of Oriol Junqueras and Joaquim Forn, is continuing, resolving procedural terms in record time for a case of this magnitude, complexity and historic dimensions. This pace has led to the violation of guarantees of the accused's defences, given that so much of the evidence requested for inclusion in the summary has been disallowed. However, the bills of indictment published today make clear the irregularities and incongruencies that have dogged this process from the start.

And the Violence?

In spite of the change at the head of the Spanish Public Prosecutor's office with the appointment by Pedro Sánchez' government of María José Segarra, she has maintained the script prepared by her predecessors under Mariano Rajoy: the charge of rebellion. The narrative has been retained intact, from the charges of José Manuel Maza, followed first by Judge Carmen Lamela's writ of admission, then by Judge Pablo Llarena's indictment. All of them, including the Supreme Court, the National Court and the Public Prosecutor's office judges, agree on the same narrative: that there was a violent uprising aimed at declaring independence.

But how do they justify a violence that never existed, if the violence during these days was exercised by the Spanish police and the Guardia Civil? Rebellion, described in the penal code in articles 472 to 484, is punished with prison sentences of up to 30 years. Although those responsible for drawing up these articles have repeatedly stated that this crime does not extend to the events of one year ago, and in spite of German justice refusing to extradite Puigdemont for rebellion, and warnings from hundreds of lawyers throughout Spain, the Public Prosecutor issued charges of rebellion, in these terms: 'In full knowledge that the state would not accept the

situation, the secessionist plan anticipated the use of all resources needed to reach its objective, including the violence required to achieve the criminal result intended. This also included the use of coercive force, represented on the one hand by the tumultuous action taken in the huge civic mobilisations they instigated and encouraged, and on the other, by the use of the Mossos d'Esquadra as an armed police force of approximately 17,000 officers who would exclusively obey their instructions (as in fact they did) and who, had the situation arisen, could have defended their criminal objectives by force, so neglecting to perform their real function of guarding and preserving the constitutional order.'

The Public Prosecutor justified this accusation of rebellion - which never happened - by saying that it might have happened. Rebellion requires armed violence; the Penal Code makes this clear in the articles where it associates rebellion with soldiers and armed groups. In fact, the original wording in 1995 was designed to cover a military uprising. Since this was not the case here, the Public Prosecutor recast the Mossos d'Esquadra as an armed force that could potentially have taken action, and the huge, peaceful mobilisations as the ammunition of rebellion. He went back as far as the period 2012 - 2015 to claim that such social mobilisation 'became the most decisive and effective instrument for bending the will of the state.'

They went so far as to make an accusation of a violence that did not exist, but which could have existed. As the Public Prosecutor stated literally in the following text: '[The accused] were fully conscious of the illicit nature of the secession process that they were piloting, of the obvious illegality of their referendum initiative, and of the very high likelihood that there would be violent incidents.'

The 'Civil War'

It is startling to see the extent to which the Public Prosecutor, like Pablo Llarena so often before him, constructs a version of the facts that has nothing to do with the facts, but serves to adapt them to the arguments required to sustain the accusation of rebellion. But even so, the 'violent' armed rising fails to materialise. One example of this is the concentration of 20 September in front of the economy ministry. He starts by accusing the Mossos of passivity, in spite of explanations by Major Trapero warning that it was unwise for riot police to charge tens of thousands of demonstrators, as the Public Prosecutor suggests in his writ. And claims that Jordi Sànchez and Jordi Cuixart took on the role of spokesmen and go-betweens with the police for the demonstrators, trying to 'impose conditions' that were unacceptable. However, the appeals both men shouted to the peaceful demonstration were clearly audible. So how can accusation of committing violent acts that must be punished with sentences for rebellion, be sustained?

It is stated, for example, of Jordi Cuixart: 'He addressed the assembled crowd and demanded that all prisoners should be freed. Although praising the peaceful nature of the demonstration, he also mentioned the determination shown in the Spanish Civil War (using the expression "No pasarán!" - they shall not pass) and challenged the state to confiscate material prepared for the referendum, hidden in specific locations.' As one of Cuixart's lawyers, Benet Salellas, has remarked:

Since the arrival at the site of the accused Jordi Cuixart, several times both addressed the crowd to direct their action. So, on the afternoon of the 20th, Jordi Cuixart addressed the crowd and demanded the freeing of all prisoners. In spite of emphasising the peaceful nature of the mobilisation, he also appealed to the determination shown in the Civil War (using the expression “¡no pasaran!”), and dared the State to come and confiscate the material that had been prepared for the referendum and that they had hidden in ...

Tweet

salellas advocats @salellasadv

Today more than ever the accusation against @jcuixart appeals to us all. The Public Prosecutor uses the term “no pasarán” (they shall not pass) in one account as an element of incrimination. The Public Prosecutor of the SC seems to belong to 1940.

2.386

12:23 - 2 Nov. 2018

The Public Prosecutor refers to the moment when they climbed onto the car of the Guardia Civil and called on the crowd to demonstrate the following day at the TSJC to demand the freedom of people detained that day. But not a word about the fact that they asked permission before climbing up, nor about their appeal for a peaceful mobilisation.

The other decisive day is 1 October when, like Llarena, the Public Prosecutor minimised the police violence and the hundreds of injured citizens but magnified the injuries of some agents, many of which were caused by hitting out with their battens. For example, one of the most violent charges of the Guardia Civil at Sant Carles de la Ràpita is explained in the writ as ‘a multitude that impeded the agents’ action’; and in spite of the injuries they caused, it only states ‘one agent was hit by a coin in their right eye.’ What then happened to the hundreds of people injured at all the voting stations? It says: ‘The Generalitat submitted a figure of approximately one thousand injured, which was manipulated to magnify police repression. It has been shown that a high percentage of cases of medical attention were just the result of fainting or panic attacks, and not injuries caused by police officers.’

And Puigdemont?

One thing that stands out in the bill of indictment is that the name of Carles Puigdemont hardly appears in the hundred-plus pages where the Public Prosecutor gives its version of the facts and sets out the accusation. Neither Puigdemont nor the rest of the exiled politicians can be accused because they have not been extradited to the Spanish state. Judge Llarena withdrew the Arrest Warrants of Clara Ponsatí and Marta Rovira when he learned that Germany was refusing to extradite Puigdemont for rebellion, and that Belgium had dismissed the European Arrest Warrants against Comín, Puig and Serret. This is one of the most significant facts, highlighting the incongruence of the entire accusation: the President, leader and main force behind the referendum and the whole independence process, cannot be included in this narrative because in his case the German judiciary did not accept the crime of rebellion, nor perceive any violence. President Puigdemont is therefore free in Europe because Germany did not perceive rebellion, while members of his government imprisoned in Spain are currently accused, and at least in the case of Vice-President Junqueras, facing prison sentences of up to 25 years.

Deliberate Confusion: the Spanish Legal Service isn't Lowering the Charges but Extending Them

During the last few days, the leading Spanish media have been preparing a narrative by which Pedro Sánchez would reduce the charges made by the Public Prosecutor and accuse the prisoners of sedition instead of rebellion. This possibility had been leaked, allowing the media, the PP and Ciudadanos to present the Spanish Legal Service's charges as a surrender 'to the "golpistas" (coup leaders)' because it was not accusing them of rebellion. But in fact, up to now the Spanish Legal Service's position in this case had been to echo the charges of misappropriation already brought by the Public Prosecutor, specifically for this crime because in principle, the Spanish Legal Service has to ensure that public assets are safeguarded. But not only has it issued an indictment for misappropriation although documentary evidence presented by former Finance Minister, Cristóbal Montoro demonstrates that there was no misappropriation, it has also added the charge of sedition, a crime which requires 'a tumultuous uprising'. Far from reducing the original charges, the Spanish Legal Service has if anything extended them.

As regards the charge of misappropriation brought by the Public Prosecutor and the Spanish Legal Service, the most surprising aspect is that in the indictment they even admit that one year later, 'there is no sign' of any misappropriated funds. This has been remarked on by lawyer Gonzalo Boye:

Up to now, the amount of public funds assigned to this activity has not been established, but obviously not all these actions could have been free, as they involve a series of things that could only be contracted from third parties, like reservation of the domain name, lodging in servers with sufficient capacity to cope with what would probably be very intensive traffic, the web site design, the creation of apps if required, maintaining system stability etc., necessarily involving the spending of public money for things that could only be done by private bodies outside the Centre itself like registering the name, or at least an illegal assignation of public resources to illegal activities that could be financed by means of the funds of this public body.

Tweet

Gonzalo Boye

@boye_g

The real gem is this: one year after the investigation started there is no trace of anything "misappropriated", but they are still filing accusations of misappropriation... if it wasn't so serious I'd say it was a piece of nonsense

9.915

13:23 - 2 Nov 2018

The Role of Vox: the Court will Decide

Whatever happens, as lawyer Jaume Alonso-Cuevillas said to VilaWeb, it doesn't matter what the Spanish Legal Service says, even if it means fewer years in prison than the Public Prosecutor is asking for; 'it's pointless', because after the court's decision it can impose a sentence of as many years of prison as it sees fit, ranging from absolution to the highest sentence that the charges allow. It is highly probably that the highest sentence will be requested by the private prosecution, the ultra-right-wing Vox party, possibly as much as 30 years for all the accused. According to Alonso-Cuevillas this is not the most likely scenario because for a court to overstep the Public Prosecutor and accept the demands of a people's prosecution would be unusual and hard to justify. But in this case many molds have already been broken, like the precedent of the Supreme Court siding with extreme right-wing Vox and deciding to keep Joaquim Forn in prison against

the judgement of the Public Prosecutor. When the trial ends, the prosecuting parties will present their definitive conclusions, with their definitive petition for sentencing, which may differ from what has been published today.]

Who will Form Part of the Court

Seven magistrates will try the political prisoners and the rest of the accused. The president and person who will deliver the sentence is Manuel Marchena, a confidant of José María Aznar when he was Spanish prime minister. Marchena and four more magistrates were challenged by the prisoners' defence lawyers, but the Supreme Court dismissed those challenges.

Manuel Marchena, a Man of the PP, Heads the Panel of Judges Against the 1-O

Manuel Marchena is the judge who will pass the sentence. A prosecutor during the toughest years of José María Aznar's prime ministership between 2003 and 2004, he was the right-hand man of the Public Prosecutor, the ultraconservative Jesús Cardenal. Later he was appointed magistrate of the Supreme Court and from 2014 onwards he presided over the Second Chamber, thanks to the conservative majority of the General Council of the Judiciary. Marchena also passed the sentence against the ex-Speaker of the Basque Parliament, Juan María Atutxa, who was disqualified for refusing to dissolve the Sozialista Abertzaleak group after the illegalisation of Batasuna. Last year, the Strasbourg Court condemned Spain for this disqualification. Also during Marchena's presidency of one of its chambers, the Supreme Court closed the file on the complaints of CDC against the former Spanish Minister of the Interior, Jorge Fernández Díaz, and the former Director of the Antifraud Office in Catalonia, Daniel de Alfonso, for revealing confidential information, perversion of justice, and misappropriation in the course of 'Operation Catalunya' which conspired against the independence movement.

Andrés Martínez Arrieta:

From December onwards he will be second magistrate of the Supreme Court, having control of the activities of the National Intelligence Centre (CNI). He was one of the judges of the chamber of the Supreme Court who in 2011 absolved the four Guardia Civil officers who had tortured Igor Portu and Martín Sarasola, who had been convicted for the Barajas Airport attack. The officers had previously been given prison sentences and been disqualified by the High Court of Gipuzkoa for torture and serious injury, but the Supreme Court absolved them. This year, the European Court of Human Rights ordered the Spanish state to compensate Portu and Sarasola for non-material damage and for not having investigated the torture.

Juan Ramón Berdugo:

He is a member of the most conservative sector of the Professional Association of the Magistracy, another of the judges who formed part of the Supreme Court chamber that acquitted the Guardia Civil torturers.

Luciano Varela:

The founder of the 'Judges for Democracy' association, he took part in the lawsuit against former judge Baltasar Garzón for investigating crimes committed by the Franco regime. Varela went so far as to indicate what the lawyers of the Falange and Manos Limpias ought to do to in order to take Garzón to trial.

Antonio del Moral:

He has been a magistrate of the Supreme Court since 2012 and is known for his strong connection with Opus Dei. He has taken part in several activities of the organisation, such as closing a conference in 2002 on the centenary of Opus Dei's founder. Antonio del Moral passed the sentence that condemned Iñaki Urdangarin to 5 years and 10 months in prison, reducing the sentence that the High Court in Palma de Majorca had previously issued of 6 years and 3 months.

Ana María García Ferrer:

She has been magistrate of the second chamber of the Supreme Court since 2014, having previously been the examining magistrate in the Roldán case and presiding over the National Court in Madrid.

Andrés Palomo:

He joined the second chamber of the Supreme Court in 2014. One fact that should invalidate him for the 1-O trial is that he was the investigating judge of the lawsuit brought against the former Catalan Minister of the Presidency, Francesc Homs, for the 9-N referendum.

A Televised Trial?

The defence trusts that the trial will be shown on television. The decision will depend in the last resort on the Supreme Court, although there is no objective argument against it. "It is essential that it is televised so that it can be seen by the public and everyone can see what is going on", one of the lawyers told VilaWeb (an online newspaper) a few days ago. This could have two effects. On the one hand, enabling the public to see how it develops. On the other, giving direct access to the arguments of the Public Prosecutor, of the people's prosecution, of the defence lawyers, as well as to the pleas of the accused.

The Location of the Trial

The Supreme Court is not a court designed to hold trials, and certainly not macro-trials like this one. It is housed in an old building which is small and has plenty of technical limitations, starting with the impossibility to project videos. That is why it had been suggested that the trial be held in the Spanish National Court or somewhere else in Madrid more suitable for macro-trials. However, the trial will be held in the Plenary Chamber of the Supreme Court, where the hearing with the lawyers on previous questions has already been held.

The Timing and the Conditions

The Supreme Court wants to complete the trial as rapidly as possible so that it does not interfere with the electoral calendar. They therefore suggest that it should last two or three months, starting at the end of January or early February and ending in March or April, before the European, municipal and autonomous community elections on 26 May. If that were to happen, the sentences would be made public in June or July.

According to sources at the Spanish Supreme Court, the court sessions will be concentrated between Tuesday and Thursday, from 10 in the morning to approximately 6 in the evening, with an hour and a half for lunch. This decision has been taken for two reasons. On one hand, to avoid transfers from the prison to the Supreme Court 5 times a week. And on the other, to leave 2 days per week for members of the court to make progress in their deliberations towards issuing the judgement.

Jordi Pina, the lawyer of Jordi Sànchez, Jordi Turull and Josep Rull, told RAC1 (a radio station): "We will be having lunch in a bar across the road and they will have to have a sandwich and water in a cell measuring 4m2. For 2 months, non-stop, every day! And when they go back to court, they will need to be calm, with all their senses alert. They cannot be allowed to be exhausted, but trials are exhausting. Being on trial from 10 am to 6 pm, where the prosecution is demanding 10, 15 or 30 years in prison, is not funny. You cannot disconnect, not even for half an hour. They need to concentrate and take notes. These conditions would make it difficult for the prisoners to pay full attention, as they must. Which is why we have said that our clients ought to be in the same kind of conditions as if they were free."

All this would make the conditions under which the prisoners give evidence even more deplorable. During the trial, they will be held in a prison in Madrid. And every day during the

months that the trial lasts, they will be transported from prison to the court and from court back to prison, handcuffed.

Request for Witnesses

The lawyers of the 12 accused have until 14 January to present their applications in which they can ask for witnesses. It is envisaged that hundreds will be requested, including victims of police charges, police officers and former high-ranking figures like the former Spanish prime minister, Mariano Rajoy, the former deputy prime minister, Soraya Sáenz de Santamaria, and the former finance minister, Cristóbal Montoro. Vox (a right-wing political party), which acts as the people's prosecution, has already asked for all three to appear before the court. It is also envisaged that the defence lawyers will ask for the appearance of the spokesperson of the PP in the Spanish Senate, José Ignacio Cosidó, in connection with the controversial designation of Manuel Marchena as president of the CGJP, a post which he finally relinquished,

Court sources say that they will summon almost all of the witnesses proposed by the defence lawyers, provided that they are well justified and it is shown that their presence is the subject of evidence.

The Documents

Here is the Public Prosecutor's bill of indictment for the Spanish Supreme Court:

(https://issuu.com/vilaweb/docs/conclusiones_provisionales_tribunal)

Also the Public Prosecutor's bill of indictment for the Spanish National Court:

(https://issuu.com/vilaweb/docs/conclusiones_provisionales_audienci)

And the Supreme Court's opening statement for the trial:

(https://issuu.com/vilaweb/docs/auto_confirma_conclusio_n_sumario_p)

<Original article, published in VilaWeb: <https://www.vilaweb.cat/noticies/judici-1-o-tribunal-suprem-proces-presos-politics-acusacions-fiscalia-jutges-advocats-defensa-calendari/>>

<Inserted article, published in VilaWeb: <https://www.vilaweb.cat/noticies/la-invencio-de-la-violencia-5-punts-per-entendre-el-desproposit-de-la-fiscalia/>>

<Updated article, published in VilaWeb on January, 8: <https://www.vilaweb.cat/noticies/judici-1-o-tribunal-suprem-presos-politics/>>

[Translated by: Aline Vanmaelsacke and Joyce McFarlane]