

CONTENT

TOPIC 1

Vesna Medenica's Trial Resumes – Delays in Hearings Continue

TOPIC 2

Court Ruling: Sky and Anom App Communications Recognized as Legally Valid Evidence in Montenegro

TOPIC 3

Indictment Upheld for Former Chief Special Prosecutor Katnić and Former Police Official Lazović

TOPIC 4

Prime Minister Requests Urgent Opinion from Venice Commission on the Termination of Judge Dragana Đuranović

TOPIC 5

Lawyers Protest Over Staffing Crisis at the Basic Court in Bar

TOPIC 6

Ahead of the European Commission's New Report on the Rule of Law

TOPIC 7

Constitutional Court Reduces Backlog and Announces Greater Transparency

TOPIC 8

Former Judge Vučković Files New Lawsuit Against the Judicial Council

SHORT NEWS 14



TOPIC 1

VESNA MEDENICA'S TRIAL RESUMES – DELAYS IN HEARINGS CONTINUE

The trial of Vesna Medenica, the former President of the Supreme Court of Montenegro, along with other defendants linked to an organized crime group ([Judicial Monitor No. 1](#)) allegedly formed by her son Miloš, is currently ongoing at the High Court in Podgorica. The case has been combined with that of Nikola Raičević, who is accused of providing fake documents and arranging bribes for Miloš Medenica. Raičević faces charges including the formation of a criminal organization, smuggling, and illegal influence on two occasions.



Hearings scheduled for March 3 and 17 were postponed—first due to the merger of the cases, and the second due to a false bomb threat at the court. On March 18, testimonies from several defendants were read before Judge Vesna Kovačević. Most defendants denied the charges, while Marko and Bojan Popović maintained their earlier statements, admitting to the crimes they are accused of. During Popović's testimony, Miloš Medenica addressed him, saying, "You cried, you will cry," prompting Popović's lawyer to file a criminal report against Medenica for endangering Popović's safety.

The trial of former Supreme Court President Vesna Medenica has started from the beginning due to a change of the presiding judge. She denied guilt at the main hearing.

During the main hearing on March 24, Vesna Medenica denied the accusations, asserting that she is “not a criminal.” She claimed the charges against her were politically motivated and that she had been unfairly portrayed as “proof of the fight against a certain regime.” The trial resumed on March 25, when Petar Milutinović, one of the accused, admitted to being part of Miloš Medenica’s criminal group involved in cigarette smuggling.

Since the indictment against Vesna Medenica was confirmed on February 15, 2023, more than two years have passed, during which the hearings have been postponed over 20 times. HRA presented an analysis of the reasons for these delays and key events in Judicial Monitors Nos. [1](#) and [3](#). The trial continued in March after a change in the presiding judge. Vesna Medenica is accused of abusing her official position and unlawfully influencing court decisions in favor of the criminal group.

TOPIC 2

COURT RULING: SKY AND ANOM APP COMMUNICATIONS RECOGNIZED AS LEGALLY VALID EVIDENCE IN MONTENEGRO

The Appellate Court of Montenegro has determined that communications from the Sky and Anom apps are legally valid evidence in two important cases.



In the first case, the court upheld the conviction from the High Court in Podgorica, which was based on evidence obtained through international legal assistance from the Sky app. Following the conviction, Darko Janjić from Nikšić was sentenced to five years in prison for his involvement in a criminal organization that was planning the murder of Željko Radulović and for drug trafficking. The Appellate Court confirmed the High Court’s judgment, stating that the

The Appellate Court of Montenegro approves correspondence from Sky and Anom applications, obtained through international legal assistance, as evidence in proceedings before Montenegrin courts.

evidence from the once-protected Sky app was supported by both material and personal evidence.

“The Appellate Court concluded that the Sky communications were legally acquired through international legal assistance in criminal matters, in accordance with the applicable laws of France and based on the decision of the competent judicial authority of that country. This aligns with the European Convention on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters of April 20, 1959, and the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime of December 15, 2000,” stated the court’s reasoning.

The court [further explained](#), “The defendant and his defense attorneys were given a genuine opportunity to challenge the validity of the Sky communication evidence in an adversarial process before both the first-instance and appellate courts. They disputed its credibility, objected to its use, and presented their arguments. However, in the opinion of this court, they did not sufficiently raise doubts about the credibility of this evidence.”

In the second case, the Appellate Court ruled that evidence obtained through the Anom app could be used in the judicial process against an eleven-member criminal group allegedly formed by Milan Janković from Bar and Toni Junčaj from Tuzi, as claimed by the Special State Prosecutor’s Office. The court accepted the appeal from the Special State Prosecutor’s Office and rejected the defense’s request to exclude the Anom app communications from the case files as legally invalid evidence.

“To exclude certain evidence, the Appellate Court believes it must be certain that the evidence is legally invalid, as defined in Article 17, Paragraph 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code. This was not the case here. The United States obtained the communication data using international legal assistance from an EU member state, and there is no evidence in the case files to suggest that the national legal order of that country was not respected or that they did not have a valid court order to access the data from the Anom app.”

In January, the High Court in Podgorica had previously ruled to exclude communication evidence obtained through the Anom app, citing concerns about the identity of the foreign country that acquired the communications and provided the data to U.S. authorities. The court noted, “It is unclear whether there was a court order from that country to retrieve data from the server, making it impossible to examine the legality of the procedure by which the data was obtained.”

However, the Appellate Court clarified that “the Montenegrin prosecution authorities obtained this data through a request for mutual legal assistance and included it as evidence in accordance with Article 45 of the Law on International Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters. According to the legal understanding of this court, there is no reason to doubt the legality of the procedure in the country of acquisition, nor is there any basis to conclude that this evidence cannot be used in the case.”

These decisions by the Appellate Court mark the first rulings confirming that communications from previously protected apps, obtained through international legal assistance, are valid evidence in the fight against organized crime. It is critical that the communications were lawfully obtained in accordance with the procedures of the country where they were acquired, as established in both cases. Furthermore, it is important to note that these communications are not the sole basis for the convictions, and the defense was given an opportunity to challenge their credibility.

TOPIC 3

INDICTMENT UPHELD FOR FORMER CHIEF SPECIAL PROSECUTOR KATNIĆ AND FORMER POLICE OFFICIAL LAZOVIĆ

The Higher Court in Podgorica confirmed the indictment against former Chief Special Prosecutor and former Assistant Police Director. They are charged with creating a criminal organization and abuse of official position, among else.

The panel of the High Court in Podgorica has confirmed the indictment filed by the Special State Prosecutor’s Office against former Chief Special Prosecutor Milivoje Katnić and former Deputy Director of the Police Department Zoran Lazović. The court found sufficient evidence in the indictment to establish reasonable suspicion that both individuals committed the alleged criminal offenses.

Key Allegations: Katnić and Lazović are accused of multiple offenses, including:

- Participation in a Criminal Organization: They are alleged to have played a role in forming a criminal organization operating in the interests of the Kavački criminal clan.
- Abuse of Official Position: They are accused of misusing their official capacities to benefit members of the Kavački clan.

In October of last year, the Special State Prosecutor’s Office submitted the indictment, which was initially returned for revision by the High Court in January.



Related Proceedings:

The case has also been consolidated with the proceedings against former Special Prosecutor Saša Čađenović, following a request from the Special State Prosecutor's Office. This request was approved by the Pre-Trial Chamber of the High Court in Podgorica. Judge Veljko Radovanović has been assigned to oversee these proceedings.

Specific Charges:

- **Zoran Lazović:** He is accused of organizing a criminal group in 2020, which included his son Petar, Milivoje Katnić, Saša Čađenović, and other unidentified individuals. They are suspected of collaborating with the Kavački clan, led by fugitive leader Radoje Zvicer.
- **Milivoje Katnić:** He faces charges of abusing his official position in January 2022, along with Čađenović, by facilitating benefits to various individuals, including Petar Lazović, fugitive police officer Ljubo Milović, Radoje Zvicer, Duško Roganović, and seven other members of the criminal organization.
- **Additional Charges:** Both Katnić and Lazović are also charged with money laundering and unauthorized possession of firearms.

TOPIC 4

PRIME MINISTER REQUESTS URGENT OPINION FROM VENICE COMMISSION ON THE TERMINATION OF JUDGE DRAGANA ĐURANOVIĆ

On March 26, Prime Minister Milojko Spajić submitted a request to the Venice Commission for an urgent opinion and recommendations concerning the case of former Constitutional Court judge Dragana Đuranović. Her term



The Venice Commission will try to resolve dilemmas surrounding the termination of the Constitutional Court judge Dragana Đuranović. Prime Minister Milojko Spajić sent a petition to the Venetians with questions from the government and the opposition.

was terminated by a decision of the Montenegrin Parliament in late December 2024. ([Judicial Monitor No. 3](#))

This request follows an agreement signed on March 15 by the Prime Minister and members of the opposition, who had previously boycotted parliamentary proceedings. The agreement was mediated by the European Union Delegation and aims to address the ongoing parliamentary crisis. Part of the agreement includes seeking the Venice Commission's assistance to clarify potential dilemmas within Montenegro's constitutional and legal frameworks.

Key Questions Posed to the Venice Commission

In his request, the Prime Minister included arguments from both the government and the opposition to support their perspectives. The following questions were presented to the Venice Commission:

In the Government's Inquiry

Formulated by Justice Minister Bojan Božović, the government seeks clarification on the following question:

- "Does the function of a Constitutional Court judge terminate when the retirement conditions outlined in Article 154, paragraph 1 of the Constitution are met, even if the Constitutional Court does not officially determine the fulfillment of these conditions during its session as stated in Article 154, paragraph 3? In other words, is the determination of the reason for termination at a Constitutional Court session merely declarative, and did the Constitutional Committee exceed its jurisdiction by concluding, based on a letter from the President of the Constitutional Court regarding the age and years of service of all judges, that Judge Đuranović's retirement conditions had been satisfied?"

The opposition, represented by university professor Miloš Vukčević, sought answers to the following questions:

- “Was Article 154, paragraph 3 of the Constitution of Montenegro violated? Is the action of the Constitutional Committee of the Montenegrin Parliament and the conclusion regarding Judge Đuranović’s retirement formally unconstitutional? Additionally, is the act of the President of the Montenegrin Parliament, which confirmed this decision, unconstitutional?”

Under the agreement signed between Prime Minister Milojko Spajić and the opposition, both parties have committed to taking all necessary steps to fully implement the Venice Commission’s forthcoming opinion. In the meantime, procedures for selecting a new Constitutional Court judge, based on the competition announced by the Constitutional Committee, will be temporarily suspended until the opinion is received.

Expert Perspective

Vesna Simović-Zvicer, a Professor of Labor Law at the University of Montenegro and former President of the Judicial Council, stated in an interview on Radio Montenegro’s “Link” show that there is no doubt Judge Dragana Đuranović met the requirements for retirement. However, she emphasized that the appropriate procedures were not followed in her case.

“The proper procedure was not adhered to because this decision should have been made by the Constitutional Court itself, such as it is, with the participation of those whose rights are at stake. On the other hand, the fact that Judge Đuranović met the conditions for retirement is indisputable. I found it very interesting how these questions were framed. I believe both colleagues Vukčević and Božović are aware that the conditions for Judge Đuranović’s retirement have been met, and there should be no dispute regarding that,” stated Simović-Zvicer.

Dr. Zoran Ivošević, a Professor of Labor Law and retired judge of the Supreme Court of Serbia, [previously shared similar views in response to a request from the Human Rights Action organization](#). He affirmed that Judge Đuranović’s judicial term should conclude in line with the Law on Pension and Disability Insurance, same as other two Constitutional Court judges who met the retirement conditions.

In light of these expert opinions, the Human Rights Action plans to forward this information to the European Commission's rapporteurs.

TOPIC 5

LAWYERS PROTEST OVER STAFFING CRISIS AT THE BASIC COURT IN BAR

Lawyers from Bar protested the inefficiency of the Basic Court in that municipality. Instead of eleven, four judges are currently working on cases.

Lawyers from Bar have expressed their concerns regarding the staffing situation at the Basic Court, where only four judges are currently managing over three thousand cases, instead of the eleven judges recommended by the systematization plan. This staffing shortage is hindering normal court operations and preventing clients from exercising their rights, as highlighted during a protest organized in front of the court on March 7.



“We all acknowledge that this situation cannot persist without serious consequences. If this trend continues, I fear that citizens may be forced to seek justice in the streets—which is completely unacceptable and must be avoided,” stated lawyer Nikola Knežević. The protesting lawyers aimed to draw attention to the alarming state of the Montenegrin judicial system.

“Being a judge is an honorable profession that requires not only knowledge but also the right character. Our current situation shows that, for years, there has been no focus on who can earn the privilege of becoming a judge, how they are selected, or when this process occurs. The results are evident—almost every ongoing case exemplifies a violation of the right to a timely trial. In fact, exceptions have become the rule,” assessed Knežević.

The gathered lawyers called on all relevant institutions, particularly the Judicial Council, to address this pressing issue.

HRA reported on the serious staffing shortages at the Basic Court in Bar in the December issue of [Bulletin No. 3](#). Furthermore, the final criteria for Chapter 23, which are crucial for Montenegro's EU membership, clearly emphasize the need for the judiciary to be adequately staffed and to provide proper working conditions. Only in this manner can the efficiency, integrity, and impartiality of the judicial system be assured, which is fundamental to upholding the rule of law.

TOPIC 6

AHEAD OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S NEW REPORT ON THE RULE OF LAW

The Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers (DG JUST) organized a meeting with the CSOs at the EU Delegation in Podgorica. The topic of discussion was the situation in the Montenegrin judiciary.

On March 19, 2025, the Human Rights Action (HRA) participated in a meeting with representatives of the European Commission at the EU Delegation in Podgorica. Organized by the Directorate-General for Justice (JUST), the meeting focused on the state of the judiciary in Montenegro in preparation for the new Rule of Law Report. Representatives from the civil society sector attended the discussion, highlighting key problems and challenges faced by judges and prosecutors.



HRA emphasized that, despite the election of the President of the Supreme Court in the interim, most of the issues identified in last year's report still persist. While some progress has been noted, decisions regarding the election and promotion of judges and prosecutors remain inadequately justified. Additionally, disciplinary procedures are not yet effective in determining the accountability of judicial officials. The Judicial and Prosecutorial Councils are not fully constituted, and there remains a significant shortage of both judges and prosecutors. Furthermore, the final criteria for Chapter 23, which are essential for Montenegro's EU accession

negotiations, necessitate the establishment of adequate staffing and institutional capacities, as well as efficient mechanisms for holding the judiciary accountable.

Regarding the new Judicial Reform Strategy for 2024-2027, HRA expressed doubts about the feasibility of achieving the goal to fill 90% of judicial positions by the end of this year. The lengthy selection processes for judges, coupled with insufficient motivation for legal professionals to pursue a judicial career, raise concerns about the realization of this objective. Additionally, the planned adoption of a law on the rights of judges and prosecutors has been pushed back until the end of 2026, further disengaging the judicial workforce.

The HRA also noted a troubling trend in the increase of requests for the protection of legality in cases where the law has been violated in favor of the accused. In 2024 and 2025, 14 such requests were approved—more than in the previous four years combined. Discussions also encompassed criminal proceedings against certain judicial office holders, as well as former directors and high-ranking officials of the Police Administration. Both trends underscore the urgent need for a vetting process to ensure the integrity of the judiciary.

Other issues discussed included inadequate salaries for judges and prosecutors, court overload, a lack of administrative staff and advisors, and insufficient office space. Concerning efficiency, it was noted that the CEPEJ report for 2024 is not expected to improve upon the alarming situation highlighted in the 2022 report. Amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC), which are necessary to expedite judicial proceedings, have yet to be adopted. It was also mentioned that the European Commission's comments on the draft amendments were primarily delivered at the end of January, with urgent amendments to the CPC anticipated.

Additionally, there was discussion about frequent political pressures, to which the Judicial and Prosecutorial Councils do not respond consistently.

The meeting with the representatives of the European Commission highlighted that the problems in Montenegro's judiciary persist and that tangible results in line with the final criteria for Chapter 23 should be ensured as soon as possible.

The Constitutional Court of Montenegro reduced the number of pending cases and improved transparency. However, disputable legitimacy persists.

TOPIC 7

CONSTITUTIONAL COURT REDUCES BACKLOG AND ANNOUNCES GREATER TRANSPARENCY

The Constitutional Court of Montenegro has ramped up its efforts and significantly reduced the backlog of pending cases related to constitutional appeals. Additionally, the Court has improved its transparency by publishing session agendas in advance, which was a long-standing request from the Human Rights Action (HRA).



Despite these achievements, over 200 cases remain pending regarding initiatives and proposals for constitutionality reviews. The Court's efficiency is hampered by staff shortages, and its legitimacy is called into question due to the continued presence of two judges—Desanka Lopičić and Budimir Šćepanović—who have met the conditions for retirement long ago.

As of June 1, 2024, the Constitutional Court had 769 cases that were over three years old, including two cases dating back to 2018. "In less than nine months, the Constitutional Court has rendered decisions on nearly 100% of the cases older than three years. Of the aforementioned 769 cases, only two remain undecided due to objective reasons, such as a lack of quorum for addressing recusal requests," stated President of the Constitutional Court, Snežana Armenko, in a notification sent to the Government.

The Court noted that it is currently processing constitutional appeals filed within the last three years, which it claims aligns with standards for constitutional courts in neighboring countries.

Furthermore, the average duration of cases has been reduced to one year and eight months, marking a significant milestone since the effectiveness of constitutional appeals was established.

In her letter to HRA, President Armenko announced that the Court will regularly publish the agendas for upcoming sessions and provide reasoning for prioritizing certain cases. She emphasized plans to publish both monthly and annual work plans, which aim to offer the public better insights into the dynamics of case resolution.

Despite these positive developments, the Constitutional Court continues to grapple with serious staffing issues. Currently, it employs only 31 staff members, whereas current regulations call for 55 positions. Alarmingly, 17 advisory positions remain vacant—of the 33 positions intended for legal professionals, only 14 are currently filled. The President of the Constitutional Court has informed the Government that they anticipate that further strengthening the Expert Service will “enhance the speed and efficiency of the Court’s operations.”

HRA welcomes the efforts to improve timeliness and the announced commitment to transparency by the Constitutional Court. We hope these initiatives will become standard practice. However, it is urgent to secure the Court’s legitimacy by addressing the pending retirement of the judges in question.

TOPIC 8

FORMER JUDGE VUČKOVIĆ FILES NEW LAWSUIT AGAINST THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

On March 12, former judge and acting president of the Supreme Court of Montenegro, Vesna Vučković, filed a new lawsuit against the Judicial Council.

According to media reports, Vučković’s lawsuit alleges that her request for compensation following the end of her term was rejected, despite a ruling from the Administrative Court of Montenegro supporting her claim.

According to the Law on Salaries of Public Sector Employees, judges and prosecutors are entitled to receive compensation equivalent to their last month’s salary for one year after their term ends, regardless of the reason for their departure. This right can be extended for an additional year if the individual becomes eligible for a pension during that time.

In early February, the Administrative Court accepted Vučković’s lawsuit and referred the case back for reconsideration. However, on February 26, the Judicial

Vesna Vučković, the former acting president of the Supreme Court, sued the Judicial Council for the second time. The Council repeatedly rejected her request to receive compensation upon termination of office.

Council rejected her request again, with four members voting in favor and three against (six votes are required for a decision). A similar tie of 4-4 occurred in December of the previous year.

The Judicial Council asserts that compensation is not granted when a judge's term ends at their personal request, as stated by Vučković. In her lawsuit, she argues that the Judicial Council misinterprets the law and violates her fundamental rights.

"The defendant seems to consider itself a court and takes on the role of interpreting the law, which is very concerning. The Judicial Council of Montenegro, although it makes decisions, does not judge or rule and cannot interpret the law or create judicial practices, as it is not a court," the lawsuit states, according to RTCG.



Vučković also emphasized that the Administrative Court previously confirmed that the law is clear and unambiguous, leaving no room for alternative interpretations regarding the entitlement of those who "professionally held the position" to receive compensation for one year post-tenure.

The Judicial Council previously approved compensation even for judges convicted of criminal offenses. For instance, judge Milosav Zekić of the Basic Court in Rožaje, who was convicted of endangering safety and causing minor bodily harm, resigned while still in the process of being removed from office but still received one year of compensation and severance pay. This case was discussed in the ["Analysis of the Procedures for the Selection, Promotion, and Accountability of Judges in Montenegro 2020-2021."](#)

Vesna Vučković was appointed acting head of the Supreme Court in 2021 and resigned from her judicial position in December 2024, after she lost the vote for the president of the Supreme Court.

According to the Center for Investigative Journalism of Montenegro, between 2020 and 2024, judges whose terms ended received a total of €2,172,239 in compensation. Of the 87 judges who received these payments, more than half—49 judges—resigned.

In response to this practice, Human Rights Action (HRA) has proposed amendments to the Law on Public Sector Salaries and the Law on the Judicial Council and Judges to restrict the right to compensation following the termination of employment.

“Resignation is an easy way out for some irresponsible individuals, allowing them to escape all pressure and responsibility while still receiving compensation. If a judge or prosecutor has committed a disciplinary offense, resigning becomes an ideal solution because it immediately ends the disciplinary procedure, and they retain their compensation,” explained Tea Gorjanc-Prelević, Executive Director of the *Human Rights Action*.

| SHORT NEWS

TRIAL SET TO BEGIN IN “TUNNEL” CASE

All conditions are now met for the start of the trial in the case commonly referred to as the “Tunnel.” The court has decided to try three Serbian nationals—Veljko Marković, Milan Marković, and Dejan Jovanović—in absentia, as they remain fugitives.

Among the defendants who will appear in court are Vladimir Erić from Loznica and several residents of Podgorica: Predrag Mirotić, Nikola Milačić, Katarina Baćović, and Marjan Vuljaj. They are charged with participation in a criminal organization and aggravated theft. Additionally, Baćović faces charges of document forgery, while Vuljaj is accused of assisting Baćović after the commission of a criminal offense.

The case centers around a tunnel that was dug in 2023 from a private apartment to the evidence storage facility of the High Court in Podgorica, resulting in the disappearance of various items of evidence. ([Bulletin No. 2](#))

PARLIAMENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEE INTERVIEWS CANDIDATES FOR CONSTITUTIONAL COURT JUDGES

The Constitutional Committee of the Parliament of Montenegro has interviewed all candidates for the selection of two judges to the Constitutional Court. The candidates are as follows: Muhamed Đokaj, Milva Prelević, Zoran Vukićević, Marko Blagojević, Nenad Đorđević, Alija Beganović, Jovan Jovanović, Nerma Dobardžić, Sanja Maslenjak, Jovan Kojičić, Medina Mušović, Mirjana Radović, and Goran Velimirović.

These positions became available following the retirement of judges Milorad Gogić and Dragana Đuranović. Concurrently, a separate procedure is underway based on a public call by the President of Montenegro, Jakov Milatović, to appoint a judge to replace Budimir Šćepanović, who continues to serve despite having reached the mandatory retirement age in May of last year.

The Constitutional Court currently operates with five out of the required seven judges.

Judge Desanka Lopičić has also reached the retirement age, but the Court has yet to make a decision regarding her status.

Judges of the Constitutional Court serve 12-year terms and are appointed and dismissed by the Parliament—two on the proposal of the President and five on the recommendation of the Constitutional Committee.

SUPREME COURT ISSUES OVER 1,000 JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION RULINGS IN FOUR YEARS

The Supreme Court of Montenegro has issued a total of 1,006 rulings regarding the disqualification of judges over the past four years, including the first two months of 2025. Notably, half of these rulings were made in 2022, according to data obtained by the NGO Action for Social Justice (ASJ) under the Law on Free Access to Information.

The Court reported the following breakdown of disqualification rulings:

- **2021**: 101 rulings
- **2022**: 504 rulings

- **2023**: 131 rulings
- **2024**: 218 rulings
- **January/February 2025**: 52 rulings

ASJ requested copies of all disqualification rulings, but the Supreme Court did not provide them. Consequently, the NGO has filed a complaint with the Agency for Personal Data Protection and Free Access to Information.

BASIC COURT IN ŽABLJAK WILL REMAIN OPEN

Despite the initial proposal in the judicial network reorganization plan to close the Basic Court in Žabljak, the court will continue operating. Radoš Žugić, the President of the Municipality of Žabljak, announced that the court will function as a department of the Basic Court in Pljevlja.

Žugić made this announcement following a meeting with Minister of Justice Bojan Božović to discuss the court's future.

“According to the Minister, judges from Pljevlja will serve in Žabljak until a local judge is appointed. A public call for this position is expected soon, once the reorganization plan is implemented,” Žugić stated on his Facebook page.

He also emphasized that all nine employees of the Basic Court in Žabljak will retain their positions, ensuring access to judicial services for all citizens.

Žabljak has been without a judge since October 2023, when Mihailo Anđelić, the then president and sole judge, retired. He had served alone following the retirement of Judge Milovan Jovković.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL CONTINUES TO FILL VACANT JUDGE POSITIONS

The Supreme Court of Montenegro has appointed a new judge, Ljiljana Šoškić, who previously served on the Administrative Court.

Furthermore, the Basic Courts in Podgorica, Kotor, and Danilovgrad have been reinforced with new judges. The Judicial Council has assigned the following judges to the Podgorica Basic Court: Jelena Đurović, Borislav Ivanović, Ina Hrković, Vladimir Piper, Nemanja Adamović, and Ana Žujović. Vukica Jakšić, Nina Bulajić, and Ksenija Baljević

have been assigned to the Kotor court, while Zoran Dragović will serve at the Danilovgrad court.

Following a public call for the appointment of 14 judges in the northern region, the Council has selected Lidija Raičević, Rijalda Zejnelagić, and Samir Murić. They will undergo one year of training at the Judicial and Prosecutorial Training Center.

Additionally, Elza Adrović, Slavica Drašković, Ivana Ćurić, Ana Bulatović, and Dijana Mrdak have been chosen as candidates for misdemeanor court judges, and they will participate in a six-month training program.

NEW HEADS APPOINTED TO BAR AND KOTOR PROSECUTOR'S OFFICES

The Prosecutorial Council has appointed State Prosecutor Radovan Đurišić as the new Head of the Bar Prosecutor's Office and State Prosecutor Tijana Čelanović as the new Head of the Kotor Prosecutor's Office.

Additionally, the Council reviewed various complaints regarding the performance of state prosecutors and heads of state prosecutor's offices. Of the complaints assessed, nine were found to be unfounded, two were upheld, two were partially upheld, and three were referred to higher prosecution offices for further review.