



**REPUBLIKA E KOSOVËS**  
**Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo**  
**Gjykata Kushtetuese / Ustavni sud / Constitutional Court**  
Adresa: Perandori Justinian, PN. Prishtinë  
T: +381 (0)38 220 104; F: +381 (0)38 220 112; [www.gjk-ks.org](http://www.gjk-ks.org)

---

Pristina, 18 October 2010  
Ref. No.: AGJ62/10

**JUDGMENT**

**Cases KI 58/09, 59/09, 60/09, 64/09, 66/09, 69/09, 70/09, 72/09, 75/09, 76/09, 77/09,  
79/09, 3/10, 5/10, 13/10, 78/09**

**CASE OF GANI PROKSHI AND 15 OTHER FORMER EMPLOYEES OF KOSOVO  
ENERGY CORPORATION**

**Against**

**16 Individual Judgments of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kosovo**

**THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO**

Composed of

Enver Hasani, President  
Kadri Kryeziu, Deputy-President  
Robert Carolan, Judge  
Altay Suroy, Judge  
Almiro Rodrigues, Judge  
Snezhana Botusharova, Judge  
Ivan Čukalović, Judge  
Gjyljeta Mushkolaj, Judge and  
Iliriana Islami, Judge

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. This Judgment concerns Referrals made by the Applicants listed below which were lodged with the Constitutional Court by 16 former employees of the Kosovo Energy Corporation (KEK) between November 2009 and March 2010.
2. The present cases are similar– to Case KI No. 40/09, “Imer Ibrahim and 48 other former employees of Kosovo Energy Corporation against 49 Individual Judgments of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kosovo”. The Constitutional Court found that there has been a violation of Article 46 of the Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo (Protection of Property) in conjunction with Article 1 Protocol 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights as well as that there has been violation of Article 31 of the Constitution (Right to Fair and Impartial Trial) in conjunction with Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights with in relation to some of those Applicants. Consequently it was decided to declare invalid the Judgments delivered by the Supreme Court in some of those cases and Remand those cases to the Supreme Court for reconsideration in conformity with the judgment of this Court (see the Judgment of the Constitutional Court of 23 June 2010).

### **The Applicants in the present case are as follows:**

1. Gani Prokshi;
2. Ismet Ratkoceri;
3. Kadri Berisha;
4. Ali Shala;
5. Hasan Ibrahim;
6. Rifat Draga;
7. Avdullah Sadiku;
8. Skender Smaili;
9. Vehbi Gashi;
10. Sardi Hyseni;
11. Sylejman Mustafa;
12. Nexhat Ejupi;
13. Hazir Kadriu;
14. Xhylsime Ymeri;
15. Ibrahim Kelmendi;
16. Ejup Selmani.

3. In this Judgement for ease reference the Applicants have been numbered and may be referred to collectively as the sixteen (16) former employees of Kosovo Energy Corporation (KEK)”.

### **The Applicants challenge the following Judgments of the Supreme Court of Kosovo adopted in the cases of:**

1. Gani Prokshi Rev.no. 208/08 dated 27/01/09;
2. Ismet Ratkocero Rev.no. 260/08 dated 10/02/09;

3. Kadri Berisha Rev.no. 125/08 dated 27/01/09;
4. Ali Shala Rev.no. 55/09 dated 02/02/09;
5. Hasan Ibrahim Rev.no. 209/08 dated 16/06/09;
6. Rifat Draga Rev.no. 341/08 dated 11/02/09;
7. Avdullah Sadiku Rev.no. 488/08 dated 23/02/09;
8. Skender Smaili Rev.no. 176/08 dated 11/02/09;
9. Vehbi Gashi Rev.no. 225/08 dated 11/02/09;
10. Sardi Hyseni Rev.no. 219/08 dated 10/02/08;
11. Sylejman Mustafa Rev.no. 459/08 dated;
12. Nexhat Ejupi Rev.no. 477/08 dated 10/03/08;
13. Hazir Kadriu Rev.no. 204/09 dated 29/06/09;
14. Xhylsime Ymeri Rev.no. 23/02/09 dated 23/02/09;
15. Ibrahim Kelmendi Rev no: 543/08 dated 10/03/09;
16. Ejup Selmani Rev.no. 514/08 dated 11/02/09.

#### **Subject matter**

4. The subject matter of this Referral is the assessment of the constitutionality of the individual Judgments delivered by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kosovo in the sixteen (16) individual cases of the Applicants against KEK as specified above.

#### **Legal basis**

5. The Referral is based on Article 113 of the Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo (hereinafter referred to as the Constitution), Article 20 of the Law No. 03/L-121 on the Constitutional Court of the Republic Kosovo (hereinafter referred to as: the Law) and Section 55 of the Rules of Procedure of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Kosovo (hereinafter referred to as: the Rules of Procedure).

#### **Summary of the facts as alleged by the Parties**

6. The facts of these Referrals are similar to those in “the Case of Imer Ibrahim and 48 others former employees of the Kosovo Energy Corporation v. 49 individual Judgments of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kosovo”, See the Judgement of Constitutional Court of Kosovo, dated 23 June 2010 (hereinafter referred to as “the case of Ibrahim and others”).
7. In the course of 2001 and 2002, each of the Applicants in this Referral, as with the Applicants in the said Judgment of 23 June 2010, signed an Agreement for Temporary Compensation of Salary for Termination of Employment Contract with their employer KEK. These Agreements were, in substance, the same.
8. Article 1 of the Agreements established that, pursuant to Article 18 of the Law on Pension and Invalidity Insurance in Kosovo (Official Gazette of the Social Autonomous Province of Kosovo No 26/83, 26/86 and 11/88) and at the conclusion of KEK Invalidity Commission, the beneficiary (i.e. each of the Applicant) is entitled a temporary compensation due to early termination of the employment contract until the establishment and functioning of the Kosovo Fund on Pension-Invalidity Insurance.

9. Article 2 of the Agreements specified that the amount to be paid monthly to each Applicant was to be 206 German Marks.
10. Article 3 specified that "payment shall end on the day that the Kosovo Pension-Invalidity Insurance Fund enters into operation. On that day onwards, the beneficiary may realize his/her rights in the Kosovo Pension and Invalidity Insurance Fund (the Kosovo Pension Invalidity Fund), and KEK shall be relieved from liabilities to the User as per this Agreement."
11. On 1 November 2002, the Executive Board of KEK adopted a Decision on the Establishment of the Pension Fund, in line with the requirements of UNMIK Regulation No 2001/30 on Pensions in Kosovo. Article 3 of this Decision reads as follows: "The Pension Fund shall continue to exist in an undefined duration, pursuant to terms and liabilities as defined with Pension Laws, as adopted by Pension Fund Board and KEK, in line with this Decision, or until the legal conditions on the existence and functioning of the Fund are in line with Pension Regulations or Pension Rules adopted by BPK."
12. On 25 July 2006, the KEK Executive Board annulled the above mentioned Decision on the Establishment of the Supplementary Pension Fund and terminated the funding and functioning of the Supplementary Pension Fund, with effect from 31 July 2006. According to the Decision of 25 July 2006, all beneficiaries were guaranteed full payment in line with the Fund Statute. Furthermore the total obligations towards beneficiaries were 2, 395,487 Euro, banking deposits were 3,677,383 Euro and asset surplus from liability were 1,281,896 Euro. The Decision stated that KEK employees that are acknowledged as labour disabled persons by the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare shall enjoy rights provided by the Ministry. On 14 November 2006, KEK informed the Central Banking Authority that "decision on revocation of the KEK Pension Fund is based on decision of the KEK Executive Board and the Decision of the Pension Managing Board... due to the financial risk that the scheme poses to KEK in the future."
13. According to the Applicants, KEK terminated the payment stipulated by the Agreements in the summer of 2006 without any notification. The Applicants claim that such an action is in contradiction to the Agreements signed.
14. The Applicants also claim that it is well known that the Kosovo Pension Invalidity Fund has not been established yet.
15. On the other hand, in the original case, KEK contested the Applicants' allegations arguing that it was widely known that the Invalidity Pension Fund had been functioning since 1 January 2004.
16. According to KEK, the Applicants were automatically covered by the national invalidity scheme pursuant to UNMIK Regulation No 2003/40 on Promulgation of the Law on Invalidity Pensions in Kosovo (Law No 2003/23).
17. KEK further argued that on 31 August 2006 it issued a Notification according to which all beneficiaries of the KEK Supplementary Fund had been notified that the Fund was terminated. The same notification confirmed that all beneficiaries were guaranteed complete payment in compliance with the SPF Statute, namely 60

months of payments or until the beneficiaries reached 65 years of age, pursuant to the Decision of the Managing Board of the Pension Fund of 29 August 2006.

18. KEK further argued that the Applicants did not contest the Instructions to invalidity pension and signature for early termination of employment pursuant to the conclusion of the Invalidity Commission.
19. The Applicants sued KEK before the Municipal Court in Prishtina, requesting the Court to order KEK to pay unpaid payments and to continue to pay 105 Euro (equivalent to 206 German Marks) until conditions are met for the termination of the payment.
20. The Municipal Court in Prishtina approved the Applicants' claims and ordered monetary compensation. The Municipal Court of Prishtina found (e.g. the Judgment C. Nr. 321/2006 of 27 July 2007 in the case of the first Applicant Gani Prokshi) that the conditions provided by Article 3 of the Agreements have not been met. Article 3 of the Agreements provides for salary compensation until exercise of the Applicants' right, "which means an entitlement to a retirement scheme, which is not possible for the plaintiff, because he has not reached the age of 65."
21. The Municipal Court further stated in the above quoted judgment that payment of compensation cannot be connected to provisions of the Supplementary Pension Statute, since the Agreements were signed earlier and the Statute has not provided that the Agreements that entered into earlier cases shall cease to be valid. This Court also clarified that according to Article 262 of the Law on Obligations and Contracts the creditor (i.e. an Applicant) was entitled to seek performance of the obligation, while the debtor (i.e. KEK) is bound to perform such obligation.
22. KEK appealed against the judgments of the Municipal Court to the District Court, arguing, *inter alia*, that the Municipal Court judgment was not fair because the Agreements were signed with the Applicants because of the invalidity of the Applicants and that they can not claim continuation of their working relations because of their invalidity.
23. KEK reiterated that the Court was obliged to decide upon the UNMIK Regulation 2003/40 on the promulgation of the Law on Invalidity Pensions according to which the Applicants were entitled to an invalidity pension.
24. The District Court in Prishtina rejected the appeals of KEK and found their submissions ungrounded.
25. KEK submitted a revision to the Supreme Court because of an alleged essential violation of the Law on Contested Procedure and erroneous application of material law (Revision by KEK of 27 January 2009 in the case of the first named Applicant, Gani Prokshi). It repeated that the Applicants were entitled to the pension provided by the 2003/40 Law and that because of humanitarian reasons it continued to pay monthly compensation after the Law entered into force. It argued that the age of the applicant was not relevant but that his invalidity was.
26. The Supreme Court accepted the revisions of KEK, and quashed the judgments of the District Court and the Municipal Court in Prishtina and rejected as unfounded the

Applicants' lawsuits.

27. The Supreme Court argued that the manner of termination of employment was considered lawful pursuant to Article 11.1 of UNMIK Regulation 2001/27 on the Basic Labour Law in Kosovo.
28. In its Judgment in the case of Gani Prokshi, Rev.Nr.208/2008 of 27 January 2009, the Supreme Court stated ): "Taking into account the undisputed fact that the respondent party fulfilled the obligation towards the plaintiff, which is paying salary compensation according to the specified period which is until the establishment and functioning of the Invalidity and Pension Insurance Fund in Kosovo effective from 1 January 2004, the Court found that the respondent party fulfilled the obligation as per the agreement. Thus the allegations of the plaintiff that the respondent party has the obligation to pay him the temporary salary compensation after the establishment of the Invalidity and Pension Insurance Fund in Kosovo are considered by this Court as unfounded because the contractual parties until the appearance of solving condition-establishment of the mentioned fund have fulfilled their contractual obligations..."
29. On 15 May 2009, Kosovo Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare issued the following note: "The finding of the Supreme Court of Kosovo, in its reasoning of e.g. Judgment Rev. I No 208/2008, that in the Republic of Kosovo there is a Pension and Invalidity and Pension Insurance Fund which is functional since 1 January 2004 is not accurate and is ungrounded. In giving this statement, we consider the fact that UNMIK regulation 2003/40 promulgates the Law No 2003/213 on the pensions of disabled persons in Kosovo, which regulates over permanently disabled persons, who may enjoy this scheme in accordance with conditions and criteria as provided by this law. Hence let me underline that the provisions of this Law do not provide for the establishment of a Pension and Invalidity Insurance in the country. Establishment of the Pension and Invalidity Insurance Fund in the Republic of Kosovo is provided by provisions of the Law on pension and Invalidity Insurance funds, which is in the process of drafting and approval at the Government of Kosovo." The same note clarified that at the time of writing that note, the pension *inter alia* existed "Invalidity pension in amount of 45 Euro regulated by the Law on Pensions of Invalidity Persons (beneficiaries of these are all persons with full and permanent Invalidity)" as well as "contribution defined pensions of 82 Euro that are regulated by Decision of the Government (the beneficiaries of these are all the pensioners that have reached the pensions age of 65 and who at least have 15 years of working experience)".

## Complaints

30. The Applicants complain that their rights have been violated because KEK unilaterally annulled their Agreements although the condition prescribed in Article 3, the establishment of the Kosovo Pension-Invalidity Insurance Fund) had not been fulfilled. The Applicants further argued that they have not been able to remedy such violation before the ordinary courts. While all the Applicants do not explicitly complain of a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), it appears from the Applicants' submissions that the subject of the complaints are their property rights (as guaranteed by Article 1 Protocol 1 to the ECHR) as well as their right to fair trial (as guaranteed by Article 6 of the ECHR).

### **Summary of the proceedings before the court**

31. Between November 2009 and March 2010, the Applicants individually, filed the Referrals to the Constitutional Court. The President of the Court appointed Judge Kadri Kryeziu as Judge Rapporteur and appointed a Review Panel of the Court composed of Judges Altay Suroy (Presiding), Enver Hasani and Iliriana Islami.
32. On 25 May 2010, the Constitutional Court notified the Supreme Court, in accordance with Article 26 of the Law, that these applicants challenged individual judgments that the Supreme Court adopted.
33. On the same day the, the Constitutional Court notified KEK as an interested party regarding the submission of the above referrals.
34. The Supreme Court of the Republic of Kosovo on 27 May 2010 has stated that all the comments regarding these cases can be found in the relevant Judgment of the Supreme Court.
35. KEK responded in writing on 2 June 2010, stating that all of the above cases are identical to those of Case KI 40/09 and thus they has previously given its comments in the session for case KI 40/09 held on 30 April 2010.
36. On 12 October 2010 the Review Panel considered the report of the Judge Rapporteur and made a recommendation to the Court on the admissibility of the Referral.
37. The full Court deliberated and voted in a private session on the Referral on 12 October 2010.

### **Admissibility**

38. As was done in the case of Ibrahim and others, already referred to, in order to be able to adjudicate the Applicants' Referral the Constitutional Court needs first to examine whether the Applicants have fulfilled the admissibility requirements laid down in the Constitution.
39. In this connection, the Court refers to Article 113.7 of the Constitution, which provides:

*"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";*

and to Article 47.2 of the Law, stipulating that:

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

40. The Court further has to consider whether Applicants submitted their Referral within the four months time limit prescribed by Article 49 of the Law. In this connection, the Constitutional Court refers to Article 49 of the Law, which stipulates that:

*“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. In all other cases, the deadline shall be counted from the day when the decision or act is publicly announced...”*

41. The Court recalls that in the present case, as in the case of Ibrahim and others case the Applicants still suffer from the unilateral annulment of their Agreements signed by KEK. They raised the same argument as the Applicants in the earlier that it is well known that the Pension and Invalidity Insurance Fund has not been established to date. Therefore, there is a continuing situation. As the circumstance of which the Applicants complain continued, the four months period as prescribed in Article 49 of the Law is inapplicable to these cases.
42. The Constitutional Court is cognizant that one of the Applicants, namely Ejup Selmani was older than 65 years at the time of submitting his Referral to this Court. The Constitutional Court recalls that according to the Note issued by the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare on 15 May 2009 persons who have reached the pensions age of 65 and who have at least 15 years of working experience are entitled to pension in a monthly amount of 82 Euro. The substance of this Note was confirmed by the representative of the Ministry at the public hearing that the Constitutional Court held on 30 April 2010 in the case of Ibrahim and others.
43. It appears consequently that the above listed Applicant Ejup Selmani is entitled for pension from the moment when they reached the age of 65.
44. However, the complaint of Ejup Selmani, to the extent of unpaid compensation for the period prior to that moment, on account of a continuing situation, remains at issue and is partly admissible.
45. With regard to the remaining Applicants, the Constitutional Court does not find any reason for inadmissibility of the Referral.
46. The Court further considers that it is appropriate to join the Referrals pursuant to Rule 36 of the Rules of Procedure.

### **Merits**

47. The Court recalls its Judgement of 23 June 2010 adopted in the earlier KEK case. in which the it found that there has been a violation of Article 46 of the Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo (Protection of Property) in conjunction with Article 1 Protocol 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights as well as that there has been violation of Article 31 of the Constitution (Right to Fair and Impartial Trial) in conjunction with Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights with regard to the same Applicants. Consequently it was decided to declare invalid the judgments delivered by the Supreme Court in the Applicants' cases and remit those judgments to the Supreme Court for reconsideration in conformity with the judgment of this Court.



**i. as regards the Protection of Property**

48. The Applicants complain that their rights have been violated because KEK unilaterally annulled their Agreements although the condition prescribed in Article 3 (i.e. Establishment of the Kosovo Pension-Invalidity Insurance Fund) had not been fulfilled. In substance, the Applicants complain that there has been a violation of their property rights.

49. At the outset, the following legal provisions should be recalled:

**Article 53 of the Constitution,**

*“Human rights and fundamental freedoms guaranteed by this Constitution shall be interpreted consistent with the court decisions of the European Court of Human Rights.”*

**Article 46 [Protection of Property] of the Constitution reads as follows**

1. *The right to own property is guaranteed.*
2. *Use of property is regulated by law in accordance with the public interest.*
3. *No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of property. The Republic of Kosovo or a public authority of the Republic of Kosovo may expropriate property if such expropriation is authorized by law, is necessary or appropriate to the achievement of a public purpose or the promotion of the public interest, and is followed by the provision of immediate and adequate compensation to the person or persons whose property has been expropriated.*

**Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights provides**

*“Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.*

*The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.”*

50. According to the case law of European Court of Human Rights, an Applicant can allege a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 only in so far as the impugned decisions related to his “possessions” within the meaning of this provision.

51. Furthermore, “possessions” can be either “existing possessions” or assets, including claims, in respect of which the applicant can argue that he or she has at least a “legitimate expectation” of obtaining effective enjoyment of a property right. By way of contrast, the hope of recognition of a property right which it has been impossible to exercise effectively cannot be considered a “possession” within the meaning of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, nor can a conditional claim which lapses as a result of the

non-fulfilment of the condition” (see *the case of Ibrahimi and others* (see also Prince Hans-Adam II of Liechtenstein v. Germany, no. 42527/98, paras 82-83, ECHR 2001-VIII; and Gratzinger and Gratzingerova v. the Czech Republic (dec.) [GC], no. 39794/98, para. 69, ECHR 2002-VII).

52. The issue that needs to be examined in each case is whether the circumstances of the case, considered as a whole, confer on the Applicant a title to a substantive interest protected by Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the ECHR. *the case of Ibrahimi and others*
53. The Constitutional Court notes that, at the time of concluding the Agreements between the Applicants and KEK, these type of agreements have been regulated by the Law on Contract and Torts (Law on Obligations) published in Official Gazette SFRJ 29/1978 and amended in 39/1985, 45/1989, 57/1989.

Article 74(3) of the Law on Contract and Torts reads as follows:

*“After being concluded under rescinding condition (raskidnim uslovom) the contract shall cease to be valid after such condition is valid.”*

54. The crux of the matter is therefore whether the rescinding condition under which the Agreements were signed has been met. Answering that question will allow the Constitutional Court to assess whether the circumstances of this Referral, considered as a whole, confer on the Applicants title to a substantive interest protected by Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the ECHR.
55. The Constitutional Court notes that it is clear from the documents and it is undisputable between the parties that the “rescinding condition” under which the Agreements have been signed is the establishment and functioning of the Kosovo Fund on Pension-Invalidity Insurance.
56. In this respect, the Constitutional Court also notes that, according to the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, the establishment of the Pension and Invalidity Insurance Fund, was to be provided by the Law on Pension and Invalidity Insurance Funds. This was in the process of drafting and approval with the Government of Kosovo. .
57. The Constitutional Court considers that the Applicants, when signing the Agreements with KEK, had a legitimate expectation that they would be entitled to the monthly indemnity in the amount of 105 Euro until the Pension and Invalidity Insurance Fund was established.
58. Such legitimate expectation is guaranteed by Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention, its nature is concrete and not a mere hope, and is based on a legal provision or a legal act, i.e. Agreement with KEK (*the case of Ibrahimi and others*) para. 61; also *mutatis mutandis* Gratzinger and Gratzingerova v. the Czech Republic (dec.), no. 39794/98, para 73, ECHR 2002-VII).
59. Therefore, the Constitutional Court considers that the Applicants have a “legitimate expectation” that their claim would be dealt in accordance with the applicable laws, in particular the above quoted provisions of the Law on Contract and Torts and the Law on Pension and Invalidity Insurance in Kosovo, and consequently upheld (*the case*

of *Ibrahimi and others* , cited above para. 62; -III).

60. However, the unilateral cancellation of the Agreements, prior to the rescinding condition having been met, breached the Applicants' pecuniary interests which were recognized under the law and which were subject to the protection of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1. (see *the case of Ibrahimi and others* para. 63).
61. Consequently, the Constitutional Court concludes that there is a violation of Article 46 of the Constitution in conjunction Article 1 of Protocol 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights.

**ii. as regards the right to fair trial**

62. The Applicants further complain that they have not been able to the remedy violation of their property rights before the ordinary courts.

**Article 31 [Right to Fair and Impartial Trial] of the Constitution, reads as follows:**

*1. Everyone shall be guaranteed equal protection of rights in the proceedings before courts, other state authorities and holders of public powers.*

**Article 6 of the European convention on Human Rights**

"In the determination of his civil rights and obligations ... everyone is entitled to a fair ... hearing ... by [a] ... tribunal ..."

63. The Constitutional Court reiterates that it is not its task under the Constitution to act as a court of appeal, or a court of fourth instance, in respect of the decisions taken by ordinary courts, including the Supreme Court. In general, "Courts shall adjudicate based on the Constitution and the law" (Article 102 of the Constitution). More precisely, the role of the ordinary courts is to interpret and apply the pertinent rules of both procedural and substantive law (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *García Ruiz v. Spain* [GC], no. 30544/96, paragraph 28, European Court on Human Rights [ECHR] 1999-I).
64. On the other hand, "The Constitutional Court is the final authority for the interpretation of the Constitution and the compliance of laws with the Constitution" (Article 112. 1 of the Constitution. Thus, the Constitutional Court can only consider whether the evidence has been presented in such a manner and the proceedings in general, viewed in their entirety, have been conducted in such a way that the Applicant had a fair trial (see among others authorities, Report of the Eur. Commission on Human Rights in the case *Edwards v. United Kingdom*, App. No 13071/87 adopted on 10 July 1991).
65. According to the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights, Article 6 paragraph 1 of the ECHR obliges courts to give reasons for their judgments, but cannot be understood as requiring a detailed answer to every argument. The extent

to which this duty to give reasons applies may vary according to the nature of the decision. It is, moreover, necessary to take into account, *inter alia*, the diversity of the submissions that a litigant may bring before the courts and the differences existing in the Contracting States with regard to statutory provisions, customary rules, legal opinion and the presentation and drafting of judgments. Thus the question whether a court has failed to fulfil the obligation to state reasons, deriving from Article 6 of the Convention, can only be determined in the light of the circumstances of the case (see *the case of Ibrahim and others* and *Ruiz Torija v. Spain*, judgment of 9 December 1994, Series A no. 303-A, § 29).

66. In the present case, the Applicants requested the ordinary courts to determine their property dispute with the KEK. The Applicants referred, in particular, to the provision of Article 3 of the Agreements, stating that the Law on Pension that establishes Pension and Invalidity Insurance Fund has not been adopted yet. This fact has been confirmed by the representative of the responsible Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.
67. However, the Supreme Court made no attempt to analyze the Applicants' claim from this standpoint, despite the explicit reference before every other judicial instance. Instead the Supreme Court view was that it was an undisputed fact that the respondent party (KEK) fulfilled the obligation towards the plaintiff, which was paying salary compensation according to specified period which was until the establishment and functioning of the Invalidity and Pension Insurance Fund in Kosovo effective from 1 January 2004.
68. It is not the task of the Constitutional Court to decide what would have been the most appropriate way for the ordinary courts to deal with the Applicants' argument, i.e. fulfilling the rescinding condition of Article 3 of the Agreements, which fulfilment is also regulated by Article 74(3) of the Law on Contract and Torts taken in conjunction with Article 18 of the 1983 Law on Pension and Invalidity Insurance.
69. However, in this Court's opinion, the Supreme Court, by neglecting the assessment of this point altogether, even though it was specific, pertinent and important, fell short of its obligations under Article 6 para 1 of the ECHR. (see the case of *Ibrahim and others*, *mutatis mutandis*, European Court of Human Rights and Judgment of 18 July 2006 in the case *Pronina v. Ukraine*, Application no. 63566/00.)
70. In view of the above, the Constitutional Court concludes that there has been a violation of Article 31 of the Constitution in conjunction with Article 6 of the ECHR.

**FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT UNANIMOUSLY DECIDES AS FOLLOWS:**

**I. TO JOIN THE REFERRALS;**

**II. TO DECLARE AS**

**a) *Admissible* the Referral with regard to the following Applicants:**

1. Gani Prokshi
2. Ismet Ratkoceri
3. Kadri Berisha
4. Ali Shala
5. Hasan Ibrahim
6. Rifat Draga
7. Avdullah Sadiku
8. Skender Smaili
9. Vehbi Gashi
10. Sardi Hyseni
11. Sylejman Mustafa
12. Nexhat Ejupi
13. Hazir Kadriu
14. Xhylsime Ymeri
15. Ibrahim Kelmendi

**b) *Partly admissible* the Referral with regard to the following Applicant:**

16. Ejup Selmani;

**III. TO FIND THAT**

**a) *There has been a violation of Article 46 of the Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo*** in conjunction with Article 1 Protocol 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights, in the cases of all Applicants namely, Gani Prokshi, Ismet Ratkoceri, Kadri Berisha, Ali Shala, Hasan Ibrahim, Rifat Draga, Avdullah Sadiku, Skender Smaili, Vehbi Gashi, , Sardi Hyseni, Sylejman Mustafa, Nexhat Ejupi, Hazir Kadriu, Xhylsime Ymeri and Ibrahim Kelmendi and Ejup Selmani.

**b) *There has been violation of Article 31 of the Constitution*** in conjunction with Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights with regard to the same Applicants who suffered violation of Article 46 of the Constitution

**III. *Declares invalid the judgments delivered by the Supreme Court*** in the following cases:

1. Gani Prokshi Rev.no. 208/08 dated 27.01.09;
2. Ismet Ratkocero Rev.no. 260/08 dated 10.02.09;
3. Kadri Berisha Rev.no. 125/08 dated 27.01.09;

4. Ali Shala Rev.no. 55/09 dated 02.02.09;
5. Hasan Ibrahim Rev.no. 209/08 dated 16.06.09;
6. Rifat Draga Rev.no. 341/08 dated 11.02.09;
7. Avdullah Sadiku Rev.no. 488/08 dated 23.02.09;
8. Skender Smaili Rev.no. 176/08 dated 11.02.09;
9. Vehbi Gashi Rev.no. 225/08 dated 11.02.09;
10. Sardi Hyseni Rev.no. 219/08 dated 10.02.08;
11. Sylejman Mustafa Rev.no. 459/08 dated 10.03.09;
12. Nexhat Ejupi Rev.no. 477/08 dated 10.03.08;
13. Hazir Kadriu Rev.no. 204/09 dated 29.06.09;
14. Xhylsime Ymeri Rev.no. 23/02/09 dated 23.02.09;
15. Ibrahim Kelmendi Rev no: 543/08 dated 10.03.09;
16. Ejup Selmani Rev.no. 514/08 dated 11.02.09.

**IV. REMAND these Judgments to the Supreme Court** for reconsideration in conformity with the judgment of this Court

**V. REMAINS seized of the matter** pending compliance with that Order.

This Judgment shall have effect immediately on delivery to the parties.

Done at Prishtina 18 October 2010

**Judge Rapporteur**  
  
Mr. Sc. Kadri Kryeziu,



**President of the Constitutional Court**

  
Prof. Dr. Enver Hasani