SUPREME COURT of KOSOVO

Supreme Court of Kosovo
Ap.-Kz. No. 250/2011
Prishtinë/Priština
12 June 2012

The Supreme Court of Kosovo held a panel session pursuant to Article 26 paragraph (1) of the Kosovo Code of Criminal Procedure (KCCP), and Article 15.4 of the Law on Jurisdiction, Case Selection and Case Allocation of EULEX Judges and Prosecutors in Kosovo (LoJ) on 11 June 2012 in the Supreme Court building in a panel composed of EULEX Judge Gerrit-Marc Sprenger as Presiding Judge, EULEX Judge Elka Filcheva-Ermenkova and Kosovo Supreme Court Judges Salih Toplica, Nesrin Lushta and Marije Ademi panel members
And with EULEX Legal Officer Holger Engelmann as recording clerk,

In the presence of the

Public Prosecutor Judit Tatrai, Office of the State Prosecutor of Kosovo (OSPK)

Defense Counsel Av. Skender Musa for the defendant S[redacted] V[redacted]

Legal Representative of the injured party Ms. S[redacted] Q[redacted] Av. Jakup Gurmani

In the criminal case number AP-KZ 250/2011 against the defendant:

S[redacted] V[redacted] born on [redacted]1 in the village of Kocilari/Crkvino, Municipality of Titov Veles in the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), Kosovo Albanian, citizen of FYROM and Kosovo, last known residence [redacted] o. 56. Illirida Quarter, Mitrovice/Mitrovica, fathers name [redacted], mother's maiden name [redacted]a, literate, completed eight years of primary school, physical worker, average economic situation, married, father of two children, continuously in detention since 06 August 2010;

In accordance to the Verdict of the first instance District Court of Prizren in the case no. P. Nr. 160/10 dated 23 March 2011 and registered with the Registry of the District Court of Prizren on the same day, **the defendant was found guilty:**

Because on 09 August 1999 in unknown place between Prizren and Karaçicë/Karačica, Municipality of Shtime/Štimlje, acting for personal gain, consisted in taking away

victim's vehicle red Audi 80 plated 183 – KSD – 207, the defendant took A[redacted] Q[redacted]s life whose remains were found on 10 July 2002 in Karaçicë/Karačica village, thus the defendant committed a criminal offence of Murder pursuant to Article 30, par. 2 subparagraph 3 of Criminal Law of the Socialist Autonomous Province of Kosovo (CLK) in conjunction with Article 38, paragraph 2 of Criminal Code of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (CC SFRY),

And was convicted to 17 (seventeen) years of imprisonment, thus crediting the time spent in detention from 06 August 2010 until 23 March 2011, but relieving him of the duty to reimburse entirely the costs of criminal proceedings.

The Defense Counsel of the accused timely filed an appeal dated 08 June 2011 against the Verdict. It was asserted that the Verdict contains essential violations of the criminal procedure, erroneous and incomplete establishment of the factual state, violation of the criminal code and that the punishment imposed upon the accused was to be challenged. It was proposed to annul the Judgment and to acquit the defendant as not guilty or remand the case to the same Court for re-trial and re-decision.

The Representative of the injured party by written appeal dated 06 June 2011 timely appealed the Judgment as well, being unsatisfied with the decision upon conviction, since the punishment would be too low and therefore inadequate in comparison to the guilty find.

The District Public Prosecutor of Prizren timely appealed the Judgment on 10 June 2011 on the account of criminal sanction, since the Court had failed to consider all relevant circumstances when determining the level of punishment. It was proposed that due to the absence of mitigating circumstances but considering the presence of aggravating circumstances instead the punishment should be upgraded to 20 years of imprisonment.

The OSPK, with a response dated 10 January 2012 and registered with the Registry of the Supreme Court of Kosovo on the same day has challenged the 1st Instance judgment incomplete and erroneous establishment of facts and an erroneous assessment of evidence. It was proposed to assess whether the 1st Instance Court has fulfilled its obligations arising from the principles of presumption of innocence, *in dubio pro reo* and *favor rei*.

Based on the written Verdict in case P, Nr. 160/10 of the District Court of Prizren dated 23 March 2011 (filed with the Registry of that Court on the same day), the submitted written appeal of the Defense Counsel on behalf of the defendant, the appeals of the injured party trough her Legal Representative and of the District Public Prosecutor in Prizren, the opinion of the OSPK as well as the relevant file records and the oral submissions of the parties during the session on 11 June 2012, together with an analysis of the applicable law, the Supreme Court of Kosovo, following the deliberations on 11 June 2012, hereby issues the following:

RULING

(1) The appeal of the defense counsel filed on behalf of the defendant [redacted] against the judgment of the District Court of Prizren P. No. 160/2010, dated 23 March 2011, is GRANTED. The Judgment of the court of first instance is ANNULLED and the case is RETURNED FOR RETRIAL and decision.

(2) The appeals of the prosecution and the representative of the injured party filed against the aforementioned Judgment are not considered in the merits and are set aside.

(3) The request of the defense counsel on behalf of the defendant S[redacted]V[redacted] to terminate detention on remand is REJECTED AS UNGROUNDED.

REASONING

Procedural History

On 03 June 2008, the District Public Prosecutor in Prizren issued a Ruling on Initiation of Investigation (HP no.143/08) against the defendant [redacted] for the criminal offence of Aggravated Murder (to the purpose of obtaining material benefit) pursuant to Article 147 paragraph 7 of the Provisional Criminal Code of Kosovo, punishable by imprisonment of at least 10 years or long-term imprisonment (equivalent to Article 30 of the CLK).

On 27 April 2009, the Pre-Trial Judge issued two separate rulings by which he rejected a request for arrest of the defendant and an application for detention on remand against him, whereas on 08 May 2009 the EULEX Pre-Trial Judge of the District Court of Prizren, deciding upon a motion of the District Public Prosecutor in Prizren for extention of investigations, ruled to extend investigations against [redacted] until 02 June 2009.

On 20 May 2009 a Three-Judge panel of the same Court annulled the ruling of the Pre-Trial Judge to reject the arrest of the defendant and returned the request to the Pre-Trial Judge for re-consideration. The appeal against the ruling on detention on remand was dismissed as belated. As a consequence, the Pre-Trial Judge issued an order for arrest against the defendant on 28 May 2009 and – on the same day – granted extension of investigations against him until 02 December 2009.

The EULEX District Prosecutor issued a ruling on suspension of investigations against the defendant on 09 July 2009.

On 29 September 2009 upon request of the EULEX District Prosecutor and pursuant to Article 544 and 547 of the KCCP the Pre-Trial Judge filed a request on issuance of an International Wanted Notice against the defendant to the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG), which was issued on 22 October 2009.

After on 12 June 2010 the defendant was arrested at the border crossing Bajakova in Croatia, the EULEX District Prosecutor on 22 June 2009 filed a request to the Kosovo Ministry of Justice for petition of transfer of [redacted] Kosovo, based upon which the defendant was extradited to Kosovo on 06 August 2010. S.V.

On 06 August 2010 the District Prosecutor in Prizren resumed investigations against [redacted]; who – after undergoing a hearing in front of the Pre-Trial Judge on 07 August 2010 - was put in detention on remand. S.V.

Dated 10 September 2010 the District Public Prosecutor filed an Indictment (HP. No. 143/08; HEP no. 118/08) against the defendant [redacted] for the criminal offence of Murder pursuant to Article 30 paragraph 2 item 3 of the CLK In accordance with Article 38 paragraph 2 of the CC SFRY, which was confirmed by the Confirmation Judge on 04 October 2010. S.V.

After the Indictment as well as the Confirmation Ruling have been unsuccessfully appealed by the defendant and his Defense Counsel, the District Court of Prizren commenced the Main Trial through altogether eight sessions on 09, 10 December 2010, 24, 25 January, 4 February, 17, 21 and 23 March 2011, when the latter the appealed Judgment was pronounced. With a separate decision the detention of the defendant has been extended until the verdict becomes final.

During the main trial, the First Instance Court examined the accused, [redacted]. Then, the following witnesses were questioned: [redacted] and [redacted] (09 December 2010), [redacted] and [redacted] (10 December 2010), [redacted] (25 January 2011), [redacted] (04 February 2011) and [redacted] (17 March 2011).

In addition the following evidence from the files was taken into consideration and read out in accordance with Article 368 paragraph 3 of the KCCP: Crime Scene summary drafted by Kosovo Police dated 17 March 2005; sketch of the place where remains of the victim [redacted] were found by [redacted]; Confirmation of Identity as issued by the Office of Missing Persons and Forensics (OMPF) dated 05 December 2002; autopsy report EX2002-126 of the OMPF (FZX01/001BP/MPU 2000) (identification of the remains of the victim); information of the Kosovo Vehicle Information System regarding the vehicle Audi 80 red color in the name of the owner [redacted] dated 15 January 2004; contract on purchase the respective Audi 80 between the victim [redacted] and

the first owner of the vehicle, [redacted]i dated 17 July 1998; contract on purchase the respective Audi 80 between [redacted] and company "[redacted]" dated 20 November 2001; vehicle registration documents of the red Audi 80; pictures of the vehicle red Audi 80 as taken by police and the documents sent from the vehicle registration office of Ferizaj/Urosevac.

11. Based on its findings, on 23 March 2011, the District Court announced the verdict and found the accused guilty of the criminal offence of Murder pursuant to Article 30 paragraph 2 sub-paragraph 3 of the CLK in conjunction with Article 38, paragraph 2 of the CC SFRY as pointed out above. Consequently, the Court imposed on the accused the punishment as also specified above.

The Defense Counsel of the accused timely filed an appeal dated 08 June 2011 against the Verdict and asserted and proposed as pointed out before.

The Representative of the injured party by written appeal dated 06 June 2011 timely appealed the Judgment as well, being unsatisfied with the decision upon conviction, as pointed out before.

The District Public Prosecutor of Prizren timely appealed the Judgment on 10 June 2011 on the account of criminal sanction, as pointed out before.

The OSPK, with a response dated 10 January 2012 has challenged the 1st Instance Judgment for incomplete and erroneous establishment of facts as pointed out before.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT

The Supreme Court finds that the challenged Judgment and the conduct of evidence assessment as provided by the District Court of Prizen give numerous reasons to anul the Judgment and send the case back for re-consideration. However, only the main problems of the challenged Judgment shall be highlighted here, which the latter are reflected in both areas of re-consideration, i.e. substantial violation of the provisions of Criminal Procedure and erroneous and incomplete establishment of the factual situation.

A. Substantial violation of the provisions of the Criminal Procedure

I. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 403 PARAGRAPH 1 ITEM 8 OF THE KCCP:

The Defense Counsel of the defendant [redacted] S.V. - up to a certain point supported by the opinion of the OSPK - has stressed that the defendant was found guilty without confirming his guilt with material evidence, since in fact there had been no material evidence relating the defendant with the crime he was charged with. Instead, the

challenged Judgment would be grounded upon confused witness statements such as from the witness [redacted] and upon indications such as the absence of a written contract on purchase between the victim and the defendant regarding the vehicle, but without considering the specific conditions in Kosovo during the time period, when the killing of the victim allegedly occurred. Therefore, Article 403 paragraph 1 item 8 of the KCCP would be violated.

The Supreme Court of Kosovo finds that the reference of the Defense Counsel to Article 403 paragraph 1 item 8 of the KCCP is without merits, since no indication can be established that the evidence referred to by the 1st Instance Court is inadmissible.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 403 PARAGRAPH 1 ITEM 12 OF THE KCCP:

S.V.

Moreover, the Defense Counsel of [redacted] has stressed that the enacting clause of the challenged 1st Instance Judgment would be in contradiction with its content, since decisive grounds and facts as to how, when and where exactly the alleged crime was committed, were not presented in the reasoning part. Instead, the enacting clause of the challenged Judgment would be completely based upon certain witness statements, whilst on the other hand the court had failed to summons and hear other witnesses, who would have stated in favor of the defendant. In particular, the witnesses [redacted] had not been heard by the Court. Therefore, Article 403 paragraph 1 item 12 of the KCCP would be violated.

The Supreme Court in the first place finds that indeed the case file contains numerous strong indications for the defendant being involved into the disappearance (and maybe even the death) of the victim [redacted] Many of these indications are also addressed by the challenged Judgment, such as that the defendant [redacted] has joined the victim during his allegedly last trip on 09 August 1999 from Prizren to Prishtinë/Priština in the red Audi 80 of the victim, which later was found in the possession of the defendant. Moreover, investigations have established that the defendant was quite familiar with the terrain, where the remains of the victim later were found. It is also worth noticing that the defendant allegedly was good and close friends with the victim at the time, when he was hospitalized and immediately after, but did not care at all again regarding the whereabouts of the victim, after [redacted] disappeared on 09 August 1999. According to the defendant's statement on 17 March 2011 in front of the District Court of Prizren, he got aware of the disappearance of the victim for the very first time in 2004, when he was arrested by police. As to the consideration of the Supreme Court, the question of the wealth of the defendant in August 1999 may give an indication as to a possible motive of the defendant to harm the victim and take his vehicle, but is of subsidiary relevance, given that both, the price the defendant allegedly has paid for the vehicle of the victim as well as the price he later has charged from the next buyer are quite low.

However, the Supreme Court finds that by far not all details of the killing [redacted] have been established by the District Court. Although generally the latter is not necessary in order to prove the commission of a Murder by a certain perpetrator, in the case of absence of direct evidence linking the perpetrator to the crime the chain of circumstantial evidence and indications must be closed. This is not given in the case at hand.

S.V.

The 1st Instance Court has based its opinion that only the defendant [redacted] can have killed the victim during the trip to Prishtinë/Priština on 09 August 1999 upon two main arguments. The District Court according to the reasoning of the challenged Judgment has drawn the *"unavoidable conclusion that the perpetrator of the murder of [redacted]ti is the defendant [redacted] was the last person seeing the victim alive" (p. 17 of the challenged Judgment in its English version).* The District Court then continues interpreting the statement of the witness [redacted] according to which on the day before the incident the defendant on the way back from Zatriq village during a stop in a restaurant in Malishevo *has "told to the witness that the subsequent day he would go with [redacted] Prishtina, he would take his vehicle and we would finish with him because [...] [redacted] was not a good person" (p.8, 12 and 17 of the challenged Judgment in its English version).*

The District Court then draws additional conclusions such as that the intent of the defendant to kill the victim [redacted] was underlined by the defendant not allowing [redacted] to go with him and the victim to Prishtinë/Priština on 09 August 1999, since the defendant just had been led by the intent not to have any witnesses with him that day. Based upon this, the Court concludes that the defendant was simply lying when he stated that the victim left with two or three other persons.

The District Court at least should have assessed contradicting evidence and included into the reasoning of the Judgment why it has followed one version of what allegedly has happened on the crucial day, but not the other. In particular, the 1st Instance Court has carefully conducted an individual analysis of evidence (p.9-16 of the challenged Judgment in its English version), which nevertheless is not fully reflected in the general assessment of evidence as provided on p.17-18 of the same Judgment.

1. **Question as to how many people accompanied the victim on his last trip:**

The District Court did not give too much weight to the statement of the witness [redacted] the owner of the [redacted] station between Prizren and Gjakova/Djakovica, who meant to have seen the victim together with two other persons in his vehicle Audi 80, since the witness was not sure about the exact day of his observations anymore. Nevertheless, the District Court has established as factual findings that "[t]*he victim left for Prishtina on board of his vehicle Audi 80, red in color, chassis no. WAUZZZ8AZLA000130, plate no. PE 660-22 together with the defendant [redacted] and at least a third person" (p.8 of the challenged Judgment in its English version).*

Indeed, the respective statement of the witness [redacted] is supported by statements of the witness S[redacted]C[redacted] the victim's wife, as given on 09 December 2010 in front of the Court (p.6 and 7) as well as to the police before, according to which the witnesses [redacted] told her that on 09 August 1999 her husband had left to Prishtine/Pristina together with two other persons, [redacted] It is worth noticing in this regard that the wife of the victim [redacted] positively knew the name of J[redacted] M[redacted] who in front of UNMIK Police admitted that he was an active UCK fighter as of 1998, but claimed that he never ever has operated in the Prizren area and that after the war he joined the TMK. This together with the fact that [redacted] was interrogated by the police twice, once on 21 January 2001 and once on 25 March 2002, both times by UNMIK Police and that according to a protocol of the UNMIK Police Station in Prizren dated 25 January 2001 investigations regarding the whereabouts of [redacted] were started due to the reference to him by the complainant and witness [redacted] should have caused the District Court at least to summons and hear him as a witness. Also a look into his TMK records in order to find out about his duty stations at the crucial time period could be of help in order to bring more light into his role regarding the case.

Although the District Court did not trust too much the statement of the witness [redacted] given in front of the Court, also this witness has talked about the victim [redacted] leaving with two other person on the crucial day (Witness statement dated 25 January 2011,p.14 and 16).

However, the 1st Instance Court has never lost a word regarding the question who that third person might have been and whether or not a possibility was seen for that person to have participated in the alleged crime. Also no initiative was taken to hear [redacted] as a witness or conduct investigations against him. Instead, the challenged Judgment reads in this regard that "[t]*he victim's wife did not know in whose company her husband had left to Pristina the critical day* [...and that...] *allegedly she had received this information later on*". Therefore, "[t]*he testimony of this witness did not bring any important knowledge in determining of the factual state [...]" (p.13 of the challenged Judgment in its English version).*

2. Interpretation of the defendant's announcement to 'take' the victim's vehicle to 'finish with him':

The District Court has based its Judgment mainly upon the statement of the witness [redacted] as given during the hearing on 10 December 2010, according to which the defendant, while having a break in a restaurant in Malishevë/Mališevo, had told to the witness that on the subsequent day (the 09 August 1999) *"he would go with [redacted] to Prishtina, he would take his vehicle and we would finish with him, because* [...] [redacted] *s not a good man".*

The District Court has interpreted this witness statement in the way that the defendant on this occasion has announced his intent to kill the victim for the purpose to take his

vehicle, just disregarding the interpretation of the witness, according to which the defendant wanted to express that he was going to come to an end about the negotiations with the victim in order to buy his car. Although the interpretation and final assessment of facts is under the discretion of the 1st Instance Court, the District Court in the case at hand has failed to carefully analyze the statement of the witness and discuss other possible interpretations on the background of other available (circumstantial) evidence.

Despite the fact that according to witness [redacted] the victim on the way to Prishtinë/Priština has said that he wanted to sell the car and that the defendant had replied he would find him a buyer, particularly the minutes of the Main Trial dated 17 March 2011 are very talkative in this regard. Nevertheless, they are not fully reflected in the challenged Judgment. In the course of this hearing, the defendant and his Defense Counsel have stressed at several occasions that the defendant had bought the vehicle of the victim, the red Audi 80, and in exchange had handed an amount of 2.100 Euros to the victim in a "Café Kosova" near to the hospital in Prizren. A person named [redacted] who allegedly lives in Ferizaj/Uroševac and was known by face and surname to the defendant, had witnessed this procedure. The same [redacted] moreover had been present, when the victim after having sold the vehicle to the defendant, had left the place in company of two or three persons unknown to the defendant. Although the details given in this context are quite vague the Court, being obliged to prove the guilt of the defendant, could have pushed the defendant and his Defense Counsel to figure out the whereabouts of the alleged witness [redacted] in order to have him interrogated in front of the Court.

3. Site inspection

Of much more weight and importance is the need to establish the details on how allegedly the victim came to death. It deems to be of utmost importance to establish or at least discuss whether or not [redacted] was killed/died at the place where a part of his remains (a flemur) finally was found, allegedly on a rock near Karaqice village, and in case he came to death elsewhere, whether it would have been possible for the defendant to transport his body to the respective rock near Karaqice village, either by vehicle or walking and without anybody witnessing him. In this regards it needs to be taken into consideration that the defendant [redacted] at that time allegedly had passed a surgery of his leg only four days before and therefore might have been affected in his health conditions and his ability to walk and put weight on his wounded leg. Since moreover not only the case files as such but also a research on Google Earth shows that the area around Karaqice village is extremely lonesome and rural also today, a side inspection of the place where the remains of the victim have been found and as it was proposed by the Defense Counsel of the defendant in the session on 17 March 2011 could have brought much more light into the case.

4. Motive

Why should the defendant have intended to kill a man who he got to know, while he was hospitalized and who did nothing else that to help and support the defendant, to find him an accommodation for good, to socialize with him and visit the coffee bars almost every day with him and who on several occasions provided vehicle trips to the defendant, who the latter did not have a vehicle himself? Numerous constellations can be imagined: Was the defendant led by greed in that he wanted to deprive the victim of his life just in order to get his vehicle (about which many people knew since 1998 that it belonged and was registered to the victim)? Was it ethnical hatred that made the defendant decide to kill the victim after he might have got to know that the victim belonged to the community of Torbesh? Did the defendant hand the money to the victim in exchange for the vehicle as described during the Main Trial session on 17 March 2011, but then travelled back with him and deprived him of his life in order to take the money back but keep the vehicle nevertheless? Or did the ominous unknown two to three people exist as described by the defendant on 17 March 2011, with who the victim had left the coffee bar after selling his vehicle to the defendant? And if so, could it have been a motive also for them to kill the victim, after they had observed that the victim received a bigger amount of money from the defendant?

Although it is completely clear to the Supreme Court that the vast majority of these questions never can be finally answered anymore after the long time that elapsed since the incident in question, the District Court has had at least the obligation the discuss them and give a proper reasoning on why the situation and as to the participation and the responsibilities of the defendant regarding the alleged crime was interpreted in the way as it was laid down in the reasoning of the challenged Judgment, but not in a different – also possible – manner.

B. Erroneous and incomplete determination of the factual situation

S. V.

The Defense Counsel o[redacted]has stressed moreover that the 1st Instance Court had erroneously established the factual situation, since it was not taken into consideration that at the time of the alleged Murder of the victim the health conditions of the defendant had not been good. In particular the defendant at that time had to walk based on crutches only, which would have prevented him to carry the victim (dead or alive) over a distance of about 7-8 kilometers from the street to the village of Karaqice, where in 2002 the remains of the victim where found. In addition the 1st Instance Court had failed to clarify in which circumstances the victim was deprived of his life. and how the alleged Murder has been conducted. It also should have more thoroughly assessed the financial situation of the defendant at the time of the disappearance of [redacted]It appears that the defendant, in contradiction of what the District Court of Prizren has established, had by far enough money to buy the vehicle from the victim. Therefore, Article 405 paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the KCCP had been violated.

Full reference is made to what was already pointed out under point A. of this Judgment. The incomplete establishment of the factual situation is already reflected by an incomplete and contradictory reasoning of the challenged Judgment as elaborated before.

Although the Supreme Court of Kosovo has pointed out several times that, the Supreme Court of Kosovo in this context has pointed out that the assessment of evidence at firsthand as a rule is under the discretion of the 1st Instance Court (case of *Runjeva, Axgami and Dema (Supreme Court of Kosovo, AP-KZ 477/05 dated 25 January 2008, page 20) and many others thereafter),* this does not prevent the 1st Instance Court from a proper, careful and full-fledged collection, analysis and assessment of all evidence, whether it is direct or only circumstancial evidence.

C. Substantial violation of the Criminal Law and decision on the punishment

Although the Defense Counsel of the defendant [redacted] S.V. has challenged the 1st Instance judgment also for an alleged violation of the criminal law and both the Defense Counsel at one side and the Legal Representative of the injured party and the District Prosecutor of Prizren at the other side have stressed that they are not satisfied with the imposed punishment, the Supreme Court does not see any need to go deeper into these allegations, given that the violations as established before necessarily cause a re-assessment also of these aspects of the challenged Judgment.

D. The request to terminate detention on remand

The court had to reject the request to terminate detention on remand as ungrounded since the reasons for detention on remand continue to exist and no alternative, more lenient measures would suffice to guarantee the presence of the accused and to ensure the unobstructed progress of the criminal proceedings. In accordance with Articles 424 paragraph 6, 287 paragraph 3 and 431 paragraph 4 of the KCCP, no appeal is permitted against this part of the decision.

Since after the annulment of the first instance Judgment the case is now returned to the procedural stage after the filing of the indictment and before the conclusion of the main trial, for further extensions of the detention on remand the District Court shall adhere to the procedure prescribed by Article 287 paragraph 2 of the KCCP.

For the foregoing reasons the Supreme Court decided as in the enacting clause.

Members of the panel:

Marije Ademi
Supreme Court Judge

Elka Filcheva-Ermenkova
EULEX Judge

Nesrin Lushta
Supreme Court Judge

Salih Toplica
Supreme Court Judge

Presiding Judge:

Recording Clerk

Gerrit-Marc Sprenger
EULEX Judge

Holger Engelmann
EULEX Legal Officer

SUPREME COURT OF KOSOVO
Ap.-Kž. No. 250/2011
Prishtinë/Priština
12 June 2012

Legal Remedy

Pursuant to Article 431 paragraph 4 of the KCCP, no appeal is possible against this Ruling.