



REPUBLIKA E KOSOVËS - РЕПУБЛИКА КОСОВО - REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO

**GJYKATA KUSHTETUESE
УСТАВНИ СУД
CONSTITUTIONAL COURT**

Prishtina, 07 September 2020
Ref. no.: RK 1617/20

This translation is unofficial and serves for information purposes only

RESOLUTION ON INADMISSIBILITY

in

Case No. KI76/20

Applicant

Kujtim Zarari

**Constitutional review of Decision AD. No. 01/2020
of the Basic Prosecution in Gjakova, of 5 February 2020,
and Notification AD. No. 03/2020 of the Office of Chief State Prosecutor,
of 25 February 2020**

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO

composed of:

Arta Rama-Hajrizi, President
Bajram Ljatifi, Deputy President
Bekim Sejdiu, Judge
Selvete Gërxhaliu-Krasniqi, Judge
Gresa Caka-Nimani, Judge
Safet Hoxha, Judge
Radomir Laban, Judge
Remzije Istrefi-Peci, Judge, and
Nexhmi Rexhepi, Judge

Applicant

1. The Referral was submitted by Kujtim Zarari, residing in Gjakova (hereinafter: the Applicant).

Challenged decision

2. The Applicant challenges: *a)* Decision AD. No. 01/2020, of the Basic Prosecution in Gjakova of 5 February 2020, signed by the Deputy Chief Prosecutor (hereinafter: Decision of the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution); and *b)* Notification AD. No. 03/2020, of the Office of Chief State Prosecutor of the Republic of Kosovo, of 25 February 2020 (hereinafter: the Chief State Prosecutor).

Subject matter

3. The subject matter is the constitutional review of the challenged decisions, which allegedly violate the Applicant's rights guaranteed by Article 32 [Right to Legal Remedies] of the Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo (hereinafter: the Constitution).

Legal basis

4. The Referral is based on paragraph 7 of Article 113 [Jurisdiction and Authorized Parties] of the Constitution, Articles 22 [Processing Referrals] and 47 [Individual Requests] of Law No. 03/L-121 on the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Kosovo (hereinafter: the Law) and Rule 32 [Filing of Referrals and Replies] of the Rules of Procedure of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Kosovo (hereinafter: the Rules of Procedure).

Proceedings before the Constitutional Court

5. On 5 May 2020, the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Kosovo (hereinafter: the Court) received the Applicant's Referral which he submitted by mail service on 28 April 2020.
6. On 19 May 2020, the President of the Court appointed Judge Bekim Sejdiu as Judge Rapporteur and the Review Panel composed of Judges: Gresa Caka-Nimani (Presiding) Bajram Ljatifi and Safet Hoxha (members).
7. On 1 June 2020, the Court notified the Applicant about the registration of the Referral and requested him to submit to the Court *i)* the Referral Form of the Court, and *ii)* the appeal submitted to the Office of the Chief State Prosecutor against Decision AD. No. 01/2020, of 05 February 2020.
8. On the same date, the Court notified the Basic Prosecution and the State Prosecution about the registration of the Referral.
9. On 10 June 2020, the Court received the requested documents from the Applicant.
10. On 22 July 2020, the Review Panel considered the report of the Judge Rapporteur and unanimously recommended to the Court the inadmissibility of the Referral.

Summary of facts

11. The Court first notes that the Applicant has submitted to the Constitutional Court two Referrals, namely Referral KI 77/20, as well as the current Referral KI 76/20. In these two Referrals, the Applicant challenges various decisions and procedures, of criminal and disciplinary nature, but which are interrelated. The subject of the Referral under review, KI 76/20, is a disciplinary procedure, but due to the interrelation of these two procedures, the Court considers it important to present both.

Criminal proceedings in which the Applicant was a party in the capacity of the injured party

12. The Applicant is employed at the Main Family Medicine Center in Gjakova (hereinafter: the MFMC).
13. On 12 June 2014, the Applicant was attacked in the MFMC facility by the person M.Gj., also employed in the MFMC, in which case the Applicant suffered bodily injuries.
14. On 10 September 2018, the Basic Prosecution in Gjakova filed an indictment against the person M.Gj., for committing the criminal offense of light bodily injury, according to Article 188, paragraph 1, item 1.4 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kosovo No. 04/L-082, of 13 July 2012 (hereinafter: the CCRK).
15. On 7 November 2019, the Basic Court in Gjakova (hereinafter the Basic Court), by Judgment P. No. 621/18, found guilty the person M.Gj., for the criminal offense of minor bodily injury under Article 188, paragraph 1, item 1.4 of the CCRK, imposing a fine with a certain amount of money. By this Judgment, the Basic Court for the realization of the legal property claim instructed the Applicant (in the capacity of the injured party), to a civil dispute.
16. Against Judgment P. No. 621/18 of the Basic Court, the Applicant filed an appeal due to the decision regarding the criminal sanction and re-qualification of the criminal offense, requesting that the person M.Gj. be punished to a more severe sentence. Also, the Kosovo Appellate Prosecution, by submission PPA/II no. 1559/2019, proposed to approve as grounded the complaint of the Applicant regarding the aggravation of the sentence against the person M.Gj.
17. On 2 March 2020, the Court of Appeals, by Judgment PA1. No. 1547/2019, rejected the appeal submitted by the Applicant as ungrounded and upheld Decision P. No. 621/18 of the Basic Court.
18. As explained above, the Applicant challenged this procedure in the Court through Referral KI77/20.

Disciplinary proceedings initiated against the prosecutor who filed an indictment against the person M.Gj.

19. On 30 December 2019, the Ombudsperson, by letter No. 2265/2019, submitted the *"notice-submission of a disciplinary character"* to the Basic Prosecution, according to the complaint of the Applicant against the state prosecutor B.K. In this letter it was alleged that the prosecutor in question, in relation to the indictment for which the above-mentioned criminal procedure was conducted, has committed a disciplinary violation and that in relation to the legal qualification of the offense for which the person M.Gj. was accused. This is because the indictment against the person M.Gj., does not reflect the allegations of the Applicant as an injured party, that the person M.Gj., with his actions has consumed the criminal offense *"Attacking official persons performing official duties"*, according to Article 410 of the CCRK, having in mind that both the Applicant and the person M.Gj., are official persons and employees in the same institution.
20. On 5 February 2020, The Basic Prosecution, namely the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of this Prosecution, by Decision AD. No. 01/2020, assessing the allegations of the Applicant and the position of the State Prosecutor B.K., concluded that in the present case *"we are not dealing with any disciplinary violations"* provided by Law No. 06/L-057 on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors (hereinafter: the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors) and, therefore, did not refer the case for initiating investigations in the Kosovo Prosecutorial Council (hereinafter: KPC).
21. On 13 February 2020, the Applicant, against Decision AD. No. 01/2020 of the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, filed a complaint with the State Prosecution, due to incorrect application of the law, procedural violations and erroneous determination of factual situation. The Applicant alleged that the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, according to the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors, may dismiss the complaint when it is *"evidently unfounded"*, or when the complaint appears *"frivolous"*. Therefore, according to the Applicant, since the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution did not treat the case as *"evidently unfounded or frivolous"*, he had the obligation to comply with Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Law on Disciplinary Liability Judges and Prosecutors to initiate disciplinary investigations against prosecutor B.K.
22. On 25 February 2020, the State Prosecution, by Notification AD. No. 03/2020, notified the Applicant that *"In the present disciplinary case, [...], the provision of Article 15 paragraph 1 of the Law on Disciplinary Liability [...] does not provide the legal possibility that the party, in this case you, appeal against the decisions of the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, but the right to appeal is recognized to the party only against the disciplinary decisions of [KPC]. So in this case since we are not dealing with any disciplinary decision taken by [KPC], but we are dealing with a decision taken on behalf of the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, in this factual legal situation, an appeal against that decision is not allowed and we are dealing with a final decision"*.

Applicant's allegations

23. In his Referral (KI 76/20) the Applicant challenges the decisions taken in the disciplinary procedure initiated against the state prosecutor B.K., who filed an indictment against the person M.Gj., alleging that the challenged decisions violated his rights guaranteed by Article 32 [Right to legal Remedies] of the Constitution.
24. In this regard, he states that *"The Basic Prosecution [...], acting in contradiction with the legal procedure defined by the Law on Disciplinary Liability [...], has undertaken the investigation procedure and then resolved the merits of the case"*. He further adds that *"on the basis of the Law on Disciplinary Liability [...], in Article 9 paragraph 6 of that law it is clearly defined that the competent authority, in this case the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution can reject the appeal only in cases when the request is clearly unfounded or when the complaint appears to be frivolous. In this case, the prosecution did not reject the appeal, but resolved the latter on merits"*.
25. Therefore, he alleges that pursuant to Article 12 of the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors, the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, in the present case, should have requested the KPC to initiate disciplinary investigations taking into account that there is a reasonable suspicion that the prosecutor against whom a complaint was filed, has committed the alleged offense.
26. The Applicant further states that, in the capacity of the injured party in this case, he has been violated the equal status of the party as the person M.Gj. erroneously and in non-compliance with the factual situation is accused of having committed the criminal offence of light bodily injury and with the enacting clause of the indictment and the actions of the person M.Gj., the elements of the criminal offense of *"assault on an official person"* were consumed during the performance of official duties, under Article 410 of the CCRK.
27. He adds that in relation to this submission, he addressed the prosecutor of the case requesting to change the legal qualification of the criminal offense, but these allegations were not taken into account by the prosecutor in question on the grounds that *"here we are dealing with two persons employed in the same institution who both have the status of official person"*.
28. Therefore, the Applicant regarding the challenged decisions alleges that *"Based on the Decision [of the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of] the Basic Prosecution AD. No. 01/2020 of 05.02.2020 and [Notification] of the Office of the Chief State Prosecutor AD. No. 03/20 of 25.02.2020, the Applicant was denied the right to Appeal, which right is guaranteed and protected by Article 32 [...] the right to Legal Remedies. There can be no decision of a first instance body, by which it decided on the merits of the case and does not allow the party the right to Appeal."*

29. Finally, the Applicant requests the Court to annul Decision AD. No. 01/2020 of the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, of 5 February 2020; and Notification AD. No. 03/2020, of the Office of the Chief State Prosecutor of 25 February 2020.

Relevant legal provisions

Law No. 06/L-057 on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors

“Article 9

Complaints against judges and prosecutors for disciplinary offenses

1. *Natural and legal persons may submit complaints against a judge or prosecutor concerning an allegation of a disciplinary offense to the following authorities (hereinafter the “Competent Authority”):*
[...]
 - 1.5. *The Chief Prosecutor concerning alleged disciplinary offences of prosecutors employed at the prosecution office for which the Chief Prosecutor is responsible.*
[...]
2. *When the complaint is sent to the non-competent authority, such authority shall transfer the complaint to the competent authority, in accordance with the Law on the General Administrative Procedure.*
3. *Natural and legal persons may also submit complaints against a judge or prosecutor to the Ombudsperson.*
[...]
6. *The Competent Authority pursuant to Article 9, paragraph 1, shall review the complaint within thirty (30) days from the day it has received the complaint and shall proceed in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2 unless it determines that the complaint is evidently frivolous, unsubstantiated, not related to a disciplinary offence or subject to statutory limitation. The Competent Authority shall immediately inform the person who has submitted the complaint in writing of its decision. A copy of the decision shall also be submitted to the respective Council, and in cases provided for in paragraph 3 to this Article, also to the Ombudsperson.*
[...].

Article 12

Investigation procedure

1. *The Council shall initiate disciplinary procedures based on a request submitted pursuant to Article 9, paragraph 1 of this Law.*
2. *A Competent Authority shall request the Council to initiate disciplinary investigations based on a complaint submitted by a natural or legal persons which is not dismissed according to Article 9, paragraph 6 of this Law, or ex-officio when it has reasonable grounds to believe that a judge or a prosecutor has committed a disciplinary offence.*

[...].

Article 15
Complaint against disciplinary decisions

1. *Parties shall have the right to appeal against the disciplinary decisions of the Council, directly to the Supreme Court of Kosovo, within fifteen (15) days from the day of receipt of the decision. Other courts in Kosovo shall not have competence to review and decide on the disciplinary procedure against judges and prosecutors.”*
[...]

Admissibility of the Referral

30. The Court first examines whether the Referral has fulfilled the admissibility requirements established in the Constitution, and further specified in the Law and foreseen in the Rules of Procedure.
31. In this respect, the Court refers to paragraphs 1 and 7, of Article 113 [Jurisdiction and Authorized Parties] of the Constitution which establish:

*“1. The Constitutional Court decides only on matters referred to the court in a legal manner by authorized parties.
[...]
7. Individuals are authorized to refer violations by public authorities of their individual rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, but only after exhaustion of all legal remedies provided by law”.*
32. The Court also examines whether the Applicants have met the admissibility requirements required by Articles 47 [Individual Requests], 48 [Accuracy of the Referral] and 49 [Deadlines] of the Law, which stipulate:

Article 47
[Individual Requests]

“1. Every individual is entitled to request from the Constitutional Court legal protection when he considers that his/her individual rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution are violated by a public authority.

2. The individual may submit the referral in question only after he/she has exhausted all the legal remedies provided by the law.”

Article 48
[Accuracy of the Referral]

“In his/her referral, the claimant should accurately clarify what rights and freedoms he/she claims to have been violated and what concrete act of public authority is subject to challenge”.

Article 49
[Deadlines]

“The referral should be submitted within a period of four (4) months. The deadline shall be counted from the day upon which the claimant has been served with a court decision [...]”.

33. As to the fulfillment of the abovementioned criteria, the Court finds that the Applicant is an authorized party; has exhausted the available legal remedies; has clarified the act of the public authority which constitutionality he challenges and the constitutional rights which he claims to have been violated; as well as submitted the Referral within the legal deadline.

34. In addition, the Court also must examine whether the Applicant has met the admissibility criteria set out in Rule 39 [Admissibility Criteria] of the Rules of Procedure. Rule 39 (2) of the Rules of Procedure stipulates that:

“(2) The Court may consider a referral as inadmissible if the referral is manifestly ill founded because the Applicant has not sufficiently proved and substantiated the claim”.

35. In this regard, the Court recalls that the Applicant alleges a violation of his constitutional rights, namely the right to legal remedies guaranteed by Article 32 of the Constitution, which stipulates that:

“Every person has the right to pursue legal remedies against judicial and administrative decisions which infringe on his/her rights or interests, in the manner provided by law.”

36. The Court recalls that The Applicant alleged that the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution has no obligation to request the KPC to initiate investigations against prosecutors only if it finds that the Referral is “*evidently unfounded*” or “*frivolous*”. But, according to him, in this case, since the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution did not reject the case as clearly unfounded or frivolous, according to Article 12 of the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors, there was an obligation to request the KPC to start investigations regarding disciplinary violations by prosecutor B.K. Therefore, he alleges that he was denied the right to legal remedies guaranteed by Article 32 of the Constitution, as the Deputy Chief Prosecutor, contrary to the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors, did not request the KPC to initiate disciplinary investigations against prosecutor B.K.

37. The Court recalls once again that Article 32 of the Constitution guarantees the right to use legal remedies against court and administrative decisions which infringe on his/her rights or interests, but emphasizes that this must be done “*in the manner prescribed by law*”.

38. In this regard, the Court refers to Article 9 [Complaints against judges and prosecutors for disciplinary violations], of the Law on Disciplinary Responsibility of Judges and Prosecutors, which stipulates that the competent

authority, in this case the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, “shall review the complaint within thirty (30) days from the day it has received the complaint and shall proceed in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2 unless it determines that the complaint is evidently frivolous, unsubstantiated, not related to a disciplinary offence or subject to statutory limitation”.

39. Whereas Article 12, paragraph 2 of the abovementioned Law provides that “A Competent Authority shall request the Council to initiate disciplinary investigations based on a complaint submitted by a natural or legal persons which is not dismissed according to Article 9, paragraph 6 of this Law, or ex-officio when it has reasonable grounds to believe that a judge or a prosecutor has committed a disciplinary offence.”
40. The Court notes that according to the abovementioned provisions, the case should not be proceeded before the KPC to initiate disciplinary investigations if the Competent Authority, in this case the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, deems that: a) the complaint is evidently frivolous; b) unfounded, c) is not related to any disciplinary violation; or d) is statute-barred. In this case, the decision of the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution is final as the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors does not provide for the possibility of appeal.
41. Therefore, one of the reasons why the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution may not request the KPC to conduct an investigation, as explained above, is the case where he/she finds that the complaint “does not relate to any disciplinary violation”.
42. In this regard, the Applicant’s complaint against the State Prosecutor B.K. was addressed through Decision AD. no. 01/2020 of the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, who after assessing the Applicant’s allegations and the position of the State Prosecutor B.K., clarified that: “Based on the evidence presented in the case file where we have only a medical report and based on the guilty plea, his repentance, the promise that in the future he will not repeat such an act, the apology to the injured party for the injuries sustained, his correct behavior before the court, since for the first time he is against the law, I think that the imposition of a fine is adequate in this case and therefore I have not seen find it reasonable to appeal in this case to the Court of Appeals as to the length of the sentence. Taking into account that this case with the complaint of the injured party is in the Court of Appeals, if I as a Prosecutor erred in qualifying the criminal offense or the Court has given an undeserved sentence, the Court of Appeals will decide, which has not yet decided on this case”. Therefore, the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution decided that in the present case “we are no longer dealing with any disciplinary violation” provided by the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors and consequently did not refer the case to initiate investigations in the KPC.
43. Whereas, the State Prosecution, by Notification AD. No. 03/2020, notified the Applicant that “according to the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and

Prosecutors (Law No. 06/L-057), there is no legal possibility for a party to appeal against the decisions of the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, but the right to appeal is recognized to the party only to the disciplinary decisions of Kosovo Prosecutorial Council. Thus, in this case since we are not dealing with any disciplinary decision taken by the Kosovo Prosecutorial Council, but we are dealing with a decision taken on behalf of the legal competencies of the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, in this factual legal situation no appeal is allowed against that decision, and that we are dealing with a final decision of the Basic Prosecution.

44. Consequently, the Applicant's allegation that according to the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors, the Deputy Chief Prosecutor, having not dismissed the complaint either as "*evidently unfounded*" or as "*frivolous*", had the obligation to request the initiation of an investigation against the prosecutor B.K., from the KPC, is not grounded.
45. In this regard, the Court recalls that the effectiveness of legal remedies provided by Article 32 of the Constitution, in accordance with the case law of the ECtHR, is not determined on the basis of whether the Applicant by using them, has managed to achieve his purpose in the way he had intended, but if he had had the opportunity with the legal remedy he used to present his arguments to be examined by the competent authorities (see the case of the ECtHR *Soering v. the United Kingdom*, Judgment of 7 July 1989, paragraph 120).
46. Furthermore, the Court notes that according to the case law of the ECtHR, although everyone has the right to use legal remedies against administrative and judicial decisions, the ECHR does not guarantee the right of appeal unless provided for by domestic law (see, *mutatis mutandis*, case of the ECtHR *Darnay v. Hungary*, Application No. 36524/97, Decision of 16 April 1998).
47. The Court notes that in the present case, the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution and the State Prosecution, in accordance with the legislation in force, have assessed the facts and interpreted and applied the legal provisions regarding the Applicant's request. As the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution has concluded that in the case of the Applicant's complaint filed through the Ombudsperson "*we are no longer dealing with any disciplinary violation*" provided by the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors, in accordance with that Law did not refer the case to the KPC for initiation of investigations. Also, the Office of the Chief State Prosecutor concluded, also based on the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors that since we are not dealing with a disciplinary decision taken by the KPC, but we are dealing with a decision taken on behalf of the legal competencies of the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, according to the abovementioned Law appeal against that decision is not allowed and that we are dealing with a final decision of the Basic Prosecution.
48. The Court further notes that the Applicant has had the opportunity, as required by the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors and in accordance with Article 32 of the Constitution, to present his case with regard

to his complaints for disciplinary violation by the prosecutor of the case B.K., before the Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution. His complaint, submitted through the Ombudsperson, was reviewed by the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution, who acted in accordance with the competencies provided by the Law on Disciplinary Liability of Judges and Prosecutors. In this case, the Applicant also referred to the Office of the Chief State Prosecutor. The Court notes that the decision of the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution as well as the decision of the Chief State Prosecutor were taken after a detailed examination of all the arguments submitted by the Applicant.

49. The Court further notes that the Applicant repeats before the Court the same arguments he had submitted in the proceedings before the State Prosecutor's Office, in particular regarding the verification of factual situation and the legality of the decision of the Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Basic Prosecution.
50. In this respect, the Court wishes to emphasize its principled position that it is not the task of the Constitutional Court to deal with errors of fact or law allegedly committed by the regular courts when establishing facts or applying the law (legality), unless and in so far as they may have infringed rights and freedoms protected by the Constitution (constitutionality). In fact, it is the role of regular courts to interpret and apply the pertinent rules of both procedural and substantive law (see the case of the Constitutional Court KI129/19, Applicant: *Ramadan Koçinaj*, Resolution on Inadmissibility, of 7 November 2019, paragraph 55; see also case KI40/17 Applicant *Muharrem Bytyqi* and others, Resolution on Inadmissibility, of 5 July 2017, paragraph 35).
51. The role of the Constitutional Court is only to ensure for the rights guaranteed by the Constitution (see the case of the Constitutional Court KI129/19, Applicant: *Ramadan Koçinaj*, Resolution on Inadmissibility, of 7 November 2019, paragraph 56 and the case of Constitutional Court KI86/11, Applicant: *Milaim Berisha*, Resolution on Inadmissibility, of 5 April 2012, paragraph 33).
52. In conclusion, the Court finds that the Applicant has not substantiated the allegations that the proceedings conducted in the Basic Prosecution of Gjakova and the Chief State Prosecutor, have caused in any way, a violation of his right to legal remedies, guaranteed by Article 32 of the Constitution.
53. Therefore, the Court concludes that the Referral is manifestly ill-founded on constitutional basis and is to be declared inadmissible pursuant to Rule 39 (2) of the Rules of Procedure.

FOR THESE REASONS

The Constitutional Court, in accordance with Article 113.7 of the Constitution, Article 20 of the Law and in accordance with Rule 39 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, on 22 July 2020, unanimously

DECIDES

- I. TO DECLARE the Referral inadmissible;
- II. TO NOTIFY this Decision to the Parties;
- III. TO PUBLISH this Decision in the Official Gazette, in accordance with Article 20.4 of the Law;
- IV. This Decision is effective immediately.

Judge Rapporteur

President of the Constitutional Court

Bekim Sejdiu

Kopje e vërtetuar
Overena kopija
Certified Copy

Arta Rama-Hajrizi

This translation is unofficial and serves for information purposes only