Supreme Court of Kosovo
Prishtinë/Priština
Case File No. Api-Kzi 1/2010

IN THE NAME OF THE PEOPLE

SUPREME COURT OF KOSOVO in the panel composed of
Maria Giuliana Civinini EULEX Supreme Court Judge and Presiding Judge
Martti Harsia EULEX Judge – panel member
Marije Ademi Supreme Court Judge - panel member
Emine Mustafa Supreme Court Judge - panel member
Nesrin Lushta Supreme Court Judge – panel member

assisted by EULEX Legal Officer Maria Rosa del Valle Lopez as recording officer, EULEX court recorders Natasa Malesevic and Tsvetelina Zhekova and EULEX interpreters Anila Shehu and Edmond Laska.

In the presence of EULEX Prosecutor Jakob Willaredt, defense counsel Teki Bokshi and defendant Sh M

In the session held on 26 November 2010 at 11a.m. at the Supreme Court of Kosovo in the criminal case against the defendant:

Sh M, born on 19 in village, father's name G M, moder's maiden name Z G, Kosovo Albanian, former Kosovo Police Officer, residing on R street in Podujeveë/Podujevo;

Charged with the criminal offences of aggravated murder and attempted aggravated murder [Article 30 paragraph 2 item 2 and 6 of the Criminal Law of Kosovo (CLK) in conjunction with Articles 19 and 22 of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Criminal Code (SFRYCC)],

unlawful possession of weapons [Sections 8.2 and 8.6 of UNMIIK-Regulation 2001/7 in conjunction with Article 22 SFRYCC] and unlawful possession of weapons [Article 328 paragraph 2 of the Provisional Criminal Code of Kosovo –PCCK-].

Deciding on the appeals against the judgment of the Supreme Court dated 27 January 2010 (Ap-Kz. No. 190/09) filed by (1) the defense counsel Teki Bokshi on 8 March 2010 in representation of the defendant, (2) G M , father of the defendant, on 18 March 2003 and (3) the defendant himself on 12 April 2010.

Issues the following:

JUDGMENT

To **REJECT** as unfounded the appeal filed by the defense counsel Teki Bokshi on 8 March 2010 in representation of the defendant.
To **DISMISS** as inadmissible the appeal filed by G M , father of the defendant, on 18 March 2003.
To **REJECT** as unfounded the appeal filed by the defendant himself on 12 April 2010.

REASONING

Procedural history

The District Court of Prishtinë/Priština issued on 9 November 2007 the judgment P. No. 203/2005 and found Sh. M guilty of the following charges:

Aggravated murder, committed with others, contrary to Article 30 paragraph 2 item 2 and 6 of the Criminal Law of Kosovo (CLK) in conjunction with Article 22 of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Criminal Code (SFRYCC).

Attempted murder, committed with others, contrary to Article 30, paragraph 2 itme 2 and 6 of the CLK in conjunction with Articles 19 and 22 of the SFRYCC.

Unlawful possession of weapons, committed with others, contrary to Section 8.2 in conjunction with Section 8.6 of the UNMIK-Regulation No. 2001/7 in conjunction with Article 22 of the SFRYCC.

Unlawful possession of weapons contrary to Section 8.2 in conjunction with Section 8.6 of UNMIK-Regulation No. 2001/7.

Unlawful possession of weapons contrary to Article 328 paragraph 2 PCCK.

Pursuant to Article 48 SFRYCC the panel imposed onto the accused the aggregate punishment of **thirty (30) years** of imprisonment.

The judgment No. 203/2005 of 9 November issued by the District Court of Prishtinë/Priština was appealed by (1) G M , father of the defendant, (2) the defendant himself and (3) by the defense counsel of the defendant.

The Supreme Court of Kosovo issued a judgment on 27 January 2010, Ap.-Kz. No. 190/2010, solving the appeals and found:

The appeal filed by G M dismissed as inadmissible.
The appeal filed by Sh M rejected as unfounded.
The appeal filed by the defense counsel of the defendant rejected as unfounded.

The verdict of the District Court of Prishtinë/Priština, P. No. 203/2005 of 9 November 2007 was modified as follows:

> *"The qualifications of criminal offence committed against the International Police Officer Possible K E (UNMIK CIVPOL), and local Police Officer A R (KPS) and of the criminal offence committed against the local Police Officer B M (KPS) and language assistant K Z (UNMIK) (changes a) and b) in the enacting clause of the verdict of the District Court of Prishtinë/Priština, P. No. 203/2005, dated 9 November 2007) are one count of Aggravated Murder and one count of Attempted Aggravated Murder as per Article 30 paragraph (2) item 6) of the Criminal Law of Kosovo (CLK), in relation with Article 19 and 22 of the Criminal Code of the Socialist Federal*

Republic of Yugoslavia (CC SFRY).

The punishment imposed for the two counts of Aggravated Murder and Attempted Aggravated Murder is thirty (30) years of imprisonment. The aggregated punishment for all counts is thirty (30) years of imprisonment.

The twelve (12) years of imprisonment imposed on Shkumbin Mehmeti by the verdict of the District Court of Pejë/Pec, P. No. 126/2005, dated 3 August 2005, affirmed by the Supreme Court of Kosovo on 30 March 2006, is included in the aggregated punishment of thirty (30) years of imprisonment.

The judgment of the District Court of Prishtinë/Priština, P. No. 203/2005 dated 9 November 2007 is AFFIRMED in the remaining parts.

The costs of the proceeding of second instance will be born by the defendant"

The judgment of the Supreme Court of Kosovo dated 27 January 2010, Ap.-Kz. No. 190/2010 has been appealed according to Article 430 KCCP (1) on 8 March 2010 by the defense counsel Teki Bokshi in representation of the defendant, (2) on 18 March 2003 by G M , father of the defendant and (3) on 12 April 2010 by the defendant himself.

On 14 July 2010 the EULEX Prosecutor/OSPK issued an opinion on the second appeals (Ref. PPA Nr. 01/2010).

The present judgment resolves the above mentioned appeals against the judgment of the Supreme Court dated 27 January 2010, Ap.-Kz. No. 190/2010.

Summary of the main facts relevant to this appeal.

According to the judgments of first and second instance the following main facts can be established beyond reasonable doubt:

In the evening of 23 March 2004, a few days after the so-called March riots, the accused Sh M the late A S . and at least two (2) other persons were armed, dressed in military-like uniforms and in possession of masks nearby the main road Podujevë/Podujevo to Prishtinë/Priština near the village Shakovicë.

About 21.40hrs an UNMIK police vehicle, white and red colour (a so-called Coca-Cola-Car) was driving on the main road from Podujevë/Podujevo to Prishtinë/Priština, direction Prishtinë/Priština. Inhabitants of the car were four (4) members of a mixed national/international police team, located at the police station in Podujevë/Podujevo, the former duty station of the accused Sh M The driver of the car was the international police officer Possible K (UNMIK CIVPOL) from Ghana. Police officer A R (KPS) was sitting in the passenger's seat. Police Officer B M (KPS) was sitting in the back seat on the right side. Language assistant R Z (KPS employee) was sitting in the back seat on the left.

The police car slowly approached the area where Sh M and his companions were waiting. At this moment Sh M A S and two (2) other unidentified persons ran towards the police car, each of them carrying at least one (1) automatic weapon AK-47, loaded and ready for use. They surrounded the very slowly moving police vehicle in a half-circle. Sh M . and the other three (3) assailants started firing bursts of shots –at least one hundred and five (105) bullets in total- from their automatic weapons at the police car. Possible K E was immediately hit by several bullets and lethally wounded. In total ten (10) bullets pierced his body and skull, causing multiple fractures of the skull, severe brain lacerations, perforating injuries of right and left lung, heart, liver and stomach, fractures of three (3) ribs as well as fractures of other bones. He was no able to control the car any longer, which slowly turned to the left and came to halt beside the road. Also A R . in the passenger seat was hit by several bullets and lethally wounded. He was hit by bullets in particular in the left lower part of the back, causing a fracture of one (1) rib, a perforating injury of the left lung and of the aorta abdominalis. He managed to open the passenger door of the car and fell out of the car on the ground where he died from a loss of blood within a few minutes after the attack. R Z ducked between the backrest of the front seat and the backseat. That way he managed to escape most of the bullets and to survive. However, he got hit by a bullet in his left shoulder, and metallic particles got stuck in his head.

At the time the attack started, police officer B M who was afraid that there would be no way out, opened the rear door on the right side of the car and, in an attempt to escape, jumped out of the car. He came to lie on the ground, pulled his revolver and started shooting at the four (4)

assailants. Two (2) of his shots hit assailant A. S. . Two (2) of his companions grabbed him by his arms and dragged him away.

Two (2) of the assailants where to a vehicle Opel Vectra, opened the door and yelled at the persons inside to get out of the car. The car occupants left the car and the armed perpetrators entered the Opel, made a U-turn with the car and left the scene, heading towards Podujevë/Podujevo. The other two (2) assailants took another car in order to flee the scene. They also yelled at the occupants of a Mercedes vehicle to get out of the car, the two (2) perpetrators got inside, made a U-turn and drove away towards Podujevë/Podujevo.

Less than an hour after the attack, around 22.15 hrs, the highjacked Mercedes with three (3) persons inside was seen by three police officers who were driving on a KPS police car and had been already informed about the ambush. The Mercedes, in an obvious attempt to escape, took a sharp turn left into a narrow dead end road. The police officers followed. Three (3) persons wearing military-looking uniforms left the car. Two (2) persons who held weapons stated shooting at the police officers. The third person fired a grenade from a rocked launcher over the roof of the Mercedes at the police officers. None of the police officers got injured and the three (3) perpetrators turned around and disappeared in the dark.

During the inspection of the Mercedes, it was found the official handheld police radio assigned to Sh. . M at the time he was a police officer.

Investigations started immediately, including the telephone interception of S . M. Based on the information gained by the telephone interception, investigators expected Sh. M to travel by car from Prishtinë/Priština to Pejë/Pec on 7 April 2004. The information was accurate. About 15.40 hours, Sh. M was inside a car that passed the first checkpoint established by the Police. After a persecution, Sh. M was detained (he got shot in the leg by one of the police officer). At the time of the arrest he was in possession of three (3) hand grenade, a 40mm calibre single barrel revolver system grenade launcher, loaded with three (3) 40mm phosphorus grenades, additional three (3) 40mm high explosive (HE) grenades and three (3) 40mm phosphorus grenades. The SIM-Card with the telephone number

intercepted was also sized from Sh. M

Reasoning

Inadmissibility of the appeal filed by G M father of the defendant.

According to the appeal filed by G M *"I, father of the defendant Sh M have the right to submit an appeal in his interest, based in Article 360 par. 2 of the Law on Criminal Procedure of the former FR of Yugoslavia (...). The critical incident for which my son is accused, has happened when that law was in force, therefore I have the right to use my interests and privileges established from that law (...)".*

In this regard, the date when the facts occur is not what determines the procedural law applicable to a case. In order to determine the applicable law that governs a proceeding, we must take into consideration the *"Transitional and Final Provisions"* of the latest procedural code approved, in this case, the Kosovo Criminal Code of Procedure (KCCP - UNMIK/REG/2003/26).

In this respect, according the *"Transitional and Final Provisions"* of the KCCP:

> The date of entry into force of the KCCP is 6 April 2004 (Article 557 KCCP).
> For those cases already ongoing on 6th April 2004 (Article 550 KCCP): (a) if the indictment, summary indictment or private charge was filed before 6 April 2004 the previous procedural law will be applicable and (b) if the indictment, summary indictment or private charge was filed after 6 April 2004 the KCCP will be applicable.

In this particular case, the events took place on 23rd March 2004 but the first indictment was filed after 6th April 2004. Therefore, the applicable procedure law is KCCP and not the Criminal Procedural Law of the Former Yugoslavia as claimed by the G M father of the defendant.

Once we have determined that the procedural law applicable to the case is the KCCP, whether the appeal filed by the father of the defendant is admissible or not, has been correctly decided by the judgment of the second instance, Ap.-Kz. N. 190/2009 dated 27 January 2010, page 3, paragraph 8 of the English version: "*the appeal of G. M , father of the accused, is not admissible because he has not the right to appeal being not an authorized person (according to article 399.1 KCCP).*"

The appealed judgment doesn't give reasons why the liability initially attributed to 13 people was transferred to Sh M .

The defendant, Sh M has his own criminal liability based in the evidence found against him during the proceeding; there is no transfer of liability to the defendant from any other co-accused. The first and second instance judgments have established the criminal liability of the defendant beyond any reasonable doubt. The scope of this appeal is the conviction of the defendant and not the reasons why the other co-accused were acquitted of the charges in the first instance.

The reasoning of the judgment is in contradiction with the evidence given that the interpreter is not an official person who was exercising his duties for public safety and law enforcement.

Language Assistant R Z injured in the attack to UNMIK police vehicle was on official duty when the events took place; he was assisting the international and national police officers in the performance of official duties. Language assistants are essential support in an international context with mixed teams of national and international police officers; language assistants play an instrumental role of capital importance in the performance of official duties. Therefore, the Language Assistant R Z enjoys the same protection than the official persons and the aggravating circumstance is applicable.

Whether the hearing held in the facilities of Dubrava Prison was regular.

In order to determine whether the hearing in Dubrava Prison was in accordance to law first it is necessary to assess whether the change of venue was properly decided by the proper authority. In this regard, on 9 June 2006 the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) approved the change on venue in order to celebrate the hearing in Dubrava Prison. In this respect, the SRSG is the proper authority for such approval according to UNMIK Regulation 1/1999 Section 1: *"All legislative and executive authority with respect to Kosovo, including the administration of the judiciary, is vested in UNMIK and is exercised by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General".*

Furthermore, the second instance judgment in page 3 of the English version has correctly assessed that all guarantees for a fair trial foreseen in the KCCP and the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) were present during the hearing held in Dubrava Prison (e.g. access for public and press including family-members of the victims and/or the accused, contact between defense counsel and accused was granted, the parties could exercise their right of defense).

The composition of the trial panel was not in compliance with the law given that the exclusion of the President of the District Court of Prishtinë/Priština was denied by the Deputy President of the District Court of Prishtinë/Priština.

This issue has been correctly resolved by the second instance judgment, page 4, paragraph 2: *"The composition of the Trial Panel was legal and the disqualification request was legally ruled upon by the Deputy President of the District Court of Pristina in the absence (on leave) of the President of the District Court (decision dated 31 August 2006, P. No. 155/2006, Judge Mejdi Dehari, rejecting the disqualification request based on Art. 43, paragraph 1 KCCP."*

In this respect, when the President is absent from the court, (e.g. on leave), someone from the court must replace the President in order to maintain the normal operativity of the court; the judge that replaces the President (in this case the Deputy President) has exactly the same powers and functions than the President and exercises exactly the same duties. Is "Acting President".

The charges against the defendant Sh. M are not proved.

The Supreme Court if of the opinion that the charges against the defendant Sh. M . nave been fully proved by clear and overwhelming evidence. It has been proved beyond any doubt that the defendant Sh. M and at least three more perpetrators killed International Police Officer Possible K E (UNMIK CIVPOL) and Local Police Officer A R and injured Local Police Officer B M and Language Assistant P Z . In this regard, the main evidence that support the charges against Sh. M . is the following:

The radio Motorola found in the vehicle Mercedes used to escape after the ambush was assigned to the defendant when he was KPS Police Officer; this information led the investigators to intercept the mobile telephone of the defendant 044403051.

The information provided by the interception of number 044403051 made the investigators expect Sh' M to travel by car from Pristine/Pristina to Peje/Pec on 7 April 2004; hence, two police checkpoints were set up. That information was actually accurate and led to the arrest of the defendant that very same day. The fact that the conversations of number 044403051 led to the detention of the defendant himself, and not to the detention of any other person, absolutely proves that the defendant himself is the voice behind the telephone conversations of number 044403051.

Furthermore, and just as corroboration, the mobile phone with the SIM-card number 044403051 was sized from Sh' M when he was arrested.

In the same sense, and again as corroboration, a former KPS Police Officer colleague of the defendant, witness G K , also indentified his voice in the interceptions. The allegations that the witness conspired with Serbs forces in order to secure the conviction of the defendant for political reasons hasn't been supported by any element of evidence; however, the fact that the defendant was the person using number 044403051 has already been proved beyond any doubt and the testimony of this witness is not essential.

In the same line, the defendant indentifies himself by his name on a conversation intercepted on 6 April 2004 at 19:57 hrs with lawyer called Besime.

In the second instance, allegation was raised that the radio Motorola was sold by the defendant to the deceased A S six month before the events and that the defendant was not in possession of the radio at the time of the ambush. The allegation is contradicted by the facts: the Motorola radio was the starting element to track the defendant and set up the interception of his cell phone and the interception allowed his capture and arrest. The allegation is also not proved: the written statement of the brother of the deceased A S has not the value of an evidence; if the defendant wanted to prove the circumstance, he and his defense counsel should have requested timely during the first instance trial to hear him as a witness. The reason for not having done so (the respect for the memory of A S is inconsistent and not credible.

Once that it is clear that the defendant Sh M is the person behind number 044403051, the Supreme Court has analyzed whether there is evidence enough that proves the commission of the crimes by the defendant. In this sense, there is also conclusive and categorical evidence that proves the execution of the crimes by the defendant Sh M :

A high number of phone calls from number 044403051 to number +4155283329 that belongs to a

female residing in Switzerland that the defendant had a love affairs with; in particular, **during a conversation held on 25 March 2004, at 9:20 hours the defendant Sh M confessed that he had been of the perpetrators:** *"when I think that everybody could be dead there (...) it should be me or him* (A S *because only me and him were near (...) and he paid with his life"*.

There are also other telephone interceptions that clearly corroborate the confession; in particular, on 25 March 2004 at 10.23 hors the defendant affirms that *"He* (A S *) died in my hands"*.

A number of conversations also confirm the knowledge of details and information regarding the facts and circumstances of the crimes; in this respect, e.g., on 30 March 2004 at 16.45hrs *"they took the head of the family* (G M *and they found everything (...) the ones you had, they found them"*; on 25 March 24 at 9.25hrs *"I fell into the water whilst running away, because we were blocked surrounded (...) somehow we got out. We survived."*, on 6 April 2004 at 19.57 hrs Sh M indicated to a lawyer called Besime (number 238550710) that his father G M (detained) was innocent and he was the one who was wanted by the police.

It is clear that the defendant Sh M speaks freely on the phone –mainly with his lover and also with other persons-, he affirms that is one of the perpetrators of the ambush and openly describes circumstances and facts relating to the crimes.

Request made by the defense counsel of the defendant for a voice-expertise in order to determine whether the defendant is the person using number 044403051 .

As indicated above, the Supreme Court believes that there are enough elements of evidence to affirm that the defendant Sh M is the person behind the telephone interceptions of number 044403051 and it is not necessary a voice-expertise in this regard.

Request made by the defense counsel to remove the telephone conversation between a lawyer called Besime and the defendant Sh. M .

This issue has already been resolved in the second instance judgment, page 4, paragraph 4 of the English version: *"The defence does not give the correct interpretation of the applicable rules in particular with regard to the interception of the telephone conversation between client-defense counsel. In this case the Sh. M , phoned a lawyer indeed by this lawyer was NOT his defense counsel, instead he was the one of a other person."*

In this second appeal, the defense counsel of the defendant alleges in addition that *"It is not relevant that the lawyer was not the defense counsel of the defendant Sh. n. She remained in this matter and the juridical interests of the defendant Sh. and her client were identical".*

In this regard, the exceptions to the rule are linked to the very especial relation client/lawyer, which is the relation between the defendant and the lawyer that is representing him in the proceeding; that especial relation doesn't occur between all defendants with all lawyers involved directly or indirectly in the subject-matter. Being a lawyer doesn't entail immunity from telephone interceptions. The exception to the rule is meant to protect that special relation client/lawyer and not to serve to the shared interests of the parties.

Whether the telephone interception are in compliance with the European Convention on Human Rights.

The protection of the fundamental right of private life and correspondence, how the public authorities may interfere in the private communications of citizens, the manner of its exercise and how to protect individuals against arbitrary interference is a matter of capital importance.

In this respect, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) has drawn the attention to this point in a number of occasions and has developed a consistent jurisprudence regarding the interception of communications for the purpose of police investigations. In this sense, the ECHR has established that the law regulating the interceptions must be sufficiently clear regarding the circumstances and conditions on which public authorities are empowered to interfere with the right of private life and correspondence. The law governing the telephone interceptions must indicate the scope of discretion, procedures and conditions and provide individuals with adequate legal remedies against arbitrary actions. In this respect, ECHR Case of Bykov v. Russia (Application no. 4378/02) Judgment 10 March 2009 and the judgments referred to:

> *"The Court has consistently held that when it comes to the interception of communications for the purpose of a police investigation, "the law must be sufficiently clear in its terms to give citizens an adequate indication as to the circumstances in which and the conditions on which public authorities are empowered to resort to this secret and potentially dangerous interference with the right to respect for private life and correspondence" (see Malone v. the United Kingdom, 2 August 1984, § 67, Series A no. 82). In particular, in order to comply with the requirement of the "quality of the law", a law which confers discretion must indicate the scope of that discretion, although the detailed procedures and conditions to be observed do not necessarily have to be incorporated in rules of substantive law. The degree of precision required of the "law" in this connection will depend upon the particular subject-matter. Since the implementation in practice of measures of secret surveillance of communications is not open to scrutiny by the individuals concerned or the public at large, it would be contrary to the rule of law for the legal discretion granted to the executive – or to a judge – to be expressed in terms of an unfettered power. Consequently, the law must indicate the scope of any such discretion conferred on the competent authorities and the manner of its exercise with sufficient clarity to give the individual adequate protection against arbitrary interference (see, among other authorities, Huvig v. France, 24 April 1990, §§ 29 and 32, Series A no. 176-B; Amann v. Switzerland [GC], no. 27798/95, § 56, ECHR 2000-II; and Valenzuela Contreras v. Spain, 30 July 1998, § 46. Reports of Judgments and Decisions 1998-V)".*

In order to determine the compliance with the jurisprudence of the ECHR, it is necessary to examine whether the legislation in Kosovo regarding telephone interception fulfil the above-mentioned requirements.

In this regard, the covert and technical measures of surveillance and investigations are regulated in Chapter XXIX of the KCCP and UNMIK Regulations 2002/6 *"On Covert and Technical Measures of Surveillance and Investigation"*, UNMIK Regulation 2003/3 and UNMIK Regulation 2004/6. Both the KCCP and UNMIK Regulations are perfectly in line with the above-mentioned requirements of the ECHR; this legislation regulates in detail, among others, the preconditions for ordering a measure, the procedure for requesting the order, the nature and content of the order, the modification and extension of orders and the admissibility of evidence obtained by the measures. The Kosovo legislation is in full compliance with the requirements established by the ECHR.

And regarding the question whether the procedure carried out in the first instance for the telephone interceptions was in compliance with the legal requirements established by the Kosovo legislation, it is clear that the first instance panel took especial care for not to affect the right of privacy of the defendant. In this respect page 40 of the English version of the judgment: *"To avoid any interpretation of the interception order that would prove detrimental to the accused Sh. M and his right to privacy, the panel admitted into evidence only the result of those telephone interceptions for the telephone number 044 implemented from 00:00 hours on 25 March 2004 onwards".*

The telephone interceptions carried out during the investigation of the crimes are in compliance with the European Convention of Human Rights, with the Kosovo legislation and are perfectly valid evidence in this proceeding.

Erroneous application of the punishment: the second instance judgment modified the first instance judgment and considers the aggravated murders and the attempted aggravated murder as one count which should have been reflected in the reduction of the punishment.

After the death penalty was removed as possible sanction by UNMIK Regulation 24/1999, the penalty for the most serious crimes was established by UNMIK Regulation 2000/59, Section 1.6. *"For each offence punishable by the death penalty under the law in force in Kosovo on 22 March 1989, the penalty will be a term of imprisonment between the minimum as provided for by the law for that offence and a maximum of forty (40) years."*

Taking into account the possibility of imposing a punishment of forty (40) years of imprisonment and the fact the defendant is convicted for the crimes of aggravated murder and attempted aggravated murder together with three counts of unlawful possession of weapons, the aggregated punishment of thirty (30) years is lawful and in accordance with the extreme gravity of the crimes.

SUPREME COURT OF KOSOVO
On 26 November 2010, Case File No. Api-Kzi 1/2010

Presiding judge:

Maria Giuliana Civinini
EULEX Judge

Panel member:

Martti Harsia
EULEX Judge

Panel member:

Marije Ademi
Supreme Court Judge

Panel member:

Nesrin Lushta
Supreme Court Judge

Panel member:

Emine Mustafa
Supreme Court Judge