



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova – Republic of Kosovo
ORGANI SHQYRTUES I PROKURIMIT
TELO ZA RAZMATRANJE NABAVKE
PROCUREMENT REVIEW BODY

Psh. No.414/26

The Review Panel, appointed by the Acting President of the PRB, pursuant to Article 105, 106, and 117 of the Law on Public Procurement of the Republic of Kosova (Law No. 04/L-042, supplemented and amended by Law 04/L-237, Law 05/L-068, supplemented and amended by Law 05/L-092) composed of: Vedat Poterqoi - President, Batisha Ibrahim and Kimete Gashi - Member, deciding according to the complaint of EO "AUTOTRADE" SH.P.K., against the Decision to cancel the procurement procedure related to the procurement activity "SUPPLY OF PARTS FOR TOYOTA LAND CRUISER 150 VEHICLES OF THE KP" with procurement number 214/30400-25-10109-1-1-1, initiated by the contracting authority (CA) - KOSOVA POLICE, on the 07/08/2026 has issued this:

DECISION

1. Approved, as partly grounded the complaint of the EO "AUTOTRADE " SH.P.K. with no. 2026/0414 , dated 24/06/2026, regarding the procurement activity "SUPPLY OF PARTS FOR KP'S TOYOTA LAND CRUISER 150 VEHICLES", with procurement number 214/30400-25-10109-1-1-1, initiated by the contracting authority - KOSOVA POLICE.
2. Cancelled, B58 Notice on the Decision of the Contracting Authority - KOSOVA POLICE for the procurement activity "SUPPLY OF PARTS FOR TOYOTA LAND CRUISER 150 VEHICLES OF THE KP", with procurement number 214/30400-25-10109-1-1-1 and the case is returned for re-evaluation.
3. Within 10 days, the CA must inform the PRB of all actions taken regarding this procurement activity, otherwise, the PRB has the right to take measures against the CA for non-compliance with the decision as provided for in the provisions of Article 131 of the LPP.
4. The complainy's fee is refunded to the complaining EO, in accordance with the PRB's Rules of Procedure.

REASONING

-Procedural facts and circumstances -

KOSOVA POLICE, in the capacity of the Contracting Authority on date: 05.11.2025 has published Contract Notice B05 regarding the procurement activity "SUPPLY OF PARTS FOR TOYOTA LAND CRUISER 150 VEHICLES OF THE KP" with procurement number 214/30400-25-10109-1-1-1.

The Contracting Authority in this case has developed an open procurement procedure type of contract for work with an estimated contract value of: 500,000.00 €.

CA on the: 04.02.2026, has published the Notice on the decision for the rejection as unfounded of the request for review of EO "AUTOTRADE" SH.P.K.

EO "AUTOTRADE" SH.P.K. on the: 28.01.2026 has submitted a request for review against the Notice on the Decision of the Contracting Authority for the contract award. CA on date 18.06.2026 has rejected the request for review of the EO.

Against the decision cited above on date 24.06.2026, EO "AUTOTRADE" SH.P.K. has submitted to the PRB complaint no. 2026/0414, attacking the Decision cited above of the CA, for the contract award.

-On the preliminary review phase –

The PRB has found that the complaint in the present case was filed in accordance with Article 109.1 of the LPP, according to which, against any decision taken by the CA, any interested party may file a complaint after the implementation of the preliminary procedure for the resolution of disputes, as provided for in Article 108/A of this Law. Since the complainant has the status of an interested party as defined in Article 105, paragraph 1, in conjunction with Article 4, paragraph 1.26 of the LPP, and the complaint contains the essential elements provided for in Article 111 of the cited Law, which means that the same meets the conditions in terms of the cited provisions and falls under the competences of this body in terms of Article 105, of the LPP, in conjunction with Article 9, of the Regulation on the Work of the PRB. The Review Panel analyzed all the documents of this case, including all the acts and/or actions of the parties, as described above (facts and procedural circumstances), the elements for preventing conflict of interest do not exist, as required in the sense of Article 11 of the PRB Rules of Procedure, in connection with paragraph 1.75, Article 4 of the LPP and at the same time analyzed all the documents of this case, including all the acts and actions of the parties and considered that there is no need to convene hearings with the parties as provided for in paragraph 1, Article 24 of the PRB Rules of Procedure.

(b)Based on the actions described above, the PRB has appointed the Review Panel pursuant to Article 111, paragraph 5 (ii) of the LPP and has engaged the review expert in accordance with Article 111, paragraph 5 (i) of the LPP, with the task of conducting the initial review of the file and the complaint claims, regarding this procurement activity, within the meaning of Article 113 and 114 of the LPP in connection with Article 17 and 19 of the cited Regulation. In this regard,

on 07.07.2026 the review expert has submitted the Evaluation Report with recommendations which are described as follows:

The claims of the complaining economic operator, EO "AUTOTRADE" SH.P.K., in report no. 2026/0414, are presented as follows:

CLAIMS

On the 07.11.2025, through the electronic e-procurement platform, we were notified of the decision of the CA, where the Group of EO "AUTOBUQA" SH.P.K. & GLOBAL Teile L.L.C. was recommended for contract, while we were announced as an eliminated tenderer with the justification that the prices we offered were higher than the market prices. Against the notification of the decision of the aforementioned CA, we have submitted a request for review to the contracting authority, which was rejected by the CA, and then we continued with a complaint to the PRB. In relation to our complaint, an expertise was issued with no. 2025/1157, dated 11.12.2025, while on 13.02.2026, the decision of the review panel with no. 2025/1157 was issued, with which decision our complaint was approved as partially grounded, while the notification of the CA's decision was canceled and the case was returned for reassessment. After the reassessment, the contracting authority again issued a notification on its decision on 13.03.2026, where it had canceled the procurement activity, while again eliminating us. Against the notification on the decision of the aforementioned CA, we again submitted a request for review to the contracting authority, which was rejected by the CA, and then we continued with a complaint to the PRB. In relation to our complaint, an expertise was issued with no. 2026/0096, dated 03.03.2026, while on 31.03.2026, the decision of the review panel with no. 2026/0096 was also issued, with which decision our complaint was approved as grounded, while the notification on the decision of the CA was canceled and the case was returned for reassessment. Now, after the third evaluation, the CA has again issued a notification on the CA's decision on 12.06.2026, where the same has again canceled the procurement activity. Initially, it should be clarified that on 16.04.2026, we were requested additional clarifications by the CA regarding the prices at which we bid, while on 20.04.2026, we responded to the CA where we clarified that the prices at which we bid are market prices, while with the response we have also attached some invoices that have been issued to our clients, where we have proven with concrete facts that our prices are not high prices but are market prices. We are once again clarifying that the CA's reasoning for our elimination, as we have also stated in previous requests for reconsideration and complaints submitted to the PRB, is untenable due to the fact that we have provided the requested clarifications to the contracting authority, where we have confirmed that the prices we have bid at are market prices. Furthermore, within the framework of the submitted clarifications, we have also attached concrete invoices issued to our clients, which clearly and verifiably prove that our prices are real market prices and that they cannot be considered as high prices or outside the market level. Furthermore, we have now also attached concrete invoices which clearly show that the prices we have bid at are market prices and are not high prices as the CA has claimed. In our response we have explained that: In order to prove to you that the KOSOVA POLICE is an exclusive client, and that it always receives the best discounts on the market, for all the requested items, we have attached the prices that you can find in the TOYOTA Online systems, as well as

the prices that were offered to you with a discount for the KOSOVA POLICE. We have analyzed our offer in its entirety, based on the list of requested positions and the technical specifications of each part. During the preparation of the offer, all relevant factors that affect the price were taken into account, including the supply of original parts, their source through authorized channels, as well as the market conditions for this category of products. The prices offered by us are the result of a careful assessment and are in accordance with the real market level for original parts. In this sense, any price comparison should be made based on products with the same characteristics, namely original parts with the same technical specifications. If you want comparative prices, and the research to be as accurate and fair as possible, we prefer you to send a request to the Toyota representative for original parts anywhere in the region or in the world for the parts and you will confirm that the prices offered by us are cheaper/lower. To prove the fact that our prices are not higher than market prices, we are attaching some invoices issued to our customers, through which it is proven that the prices we have offered are in accordance with market prices and do not exceed them, and the discount for the KOSOVA POLICE as a customer is exclusive as we have mentioned. Therefore, we do not understand how the CA concluded that our prices are higher than market prices, since the prices were provided by the manufacturer, while we also made a discount for the contracting authority. At the same time, we have bid within the estimated value, so the reasoning of the contracting authority is untenable, because if there were still any dilemmas, it could have requested additional clarifications from our manufacturer. Also, the CA has not provided any justification as to why it did not take into account the invoices submitted by us, which present concrete evidence of real transactions with our clients and prove that the bid prices are in line with market prices. Also, the contracting authority did not take into account the invoices that we have issued to our clients, where it is clearly seen that our bid prices are not high prices, therefore this action of the contracting authority cannot be considered anything other than intentional discrimination against our company. In relation to this reason for elimination, we clarify that there is no legal basis and there is no factual support because we have provided in detail the manufacturer's prices for original equipment and the discounts that were offered to us. The CA only states that we have offered prices higher than market prices, but has not provided any argument or evidence as to what the market prices are, therefore, on this basis it results that the reason for elimination is unfounded and not supported by any concrete evidence, but this reason remains only contrary to the assumptions of the CA. On the other hand, we have presented concrete evidence in the form of invoices issued to our clients, which prove that our prices are normal market prices and that the CA's claim of high prices is not based on any analysis or objective evidence. There may eventually be cheaper prices on the market than our offer, but those prices may be for non-original parts, while for original Toyota parts there is no possibility of having cheaper prices than our offer. The CA's reference to Article 4.1 point C of Regulation No. 002/2024 supplementing and amending Regulation No. 001/2022 does not coincide with the specific case because there is no evidence that the contracting authority has been provided that the price offered by us is outside market prices, therefore the reason for the elimination is unfounded. On the contrary, we have clarified and proven that the price offered by us is a real market price, while if the CA had the will to prove this fact, it could have easily verified our price by requesting clarification from the manufacturer anywhere in Europe or the region, but such a will was lacking, which makes us suspect that the CA's actions are biased in

relation to our company, considering the fact that the evidence presented with additional clarifications was not taken into account at all. It should be noted that the explanations presented by us clearly show that we are the EO responsible in this procurement activity, while the fact that our explanations are in harmony with the legal provisions has also been confirmed by the PRB review panel, where the same has supported the report of the review expert. When we consider all the above-mentioned facts, it is clearly understood that the contracting authority, in addition to the fact that it has discriminated against us as the only EO responsible in this procurement activity, has also not respected the last two decisions of the PRB, while in this case we consider that we are dealing with non-implementation of the decisions of the PRB and disregard of the decisions of the PRB, therefore this action is part of serious violations according to Article 97.1 point (h) of the RRPP No. 001/2022. In this case, we also have a violation of Article 131 of the LPP, therefore we request the PRB to impose a fine on the contracting authority and request the revocation of the procurement officer's certificate, since in this procurement activity we are being eliminated for three consecutive times with completely unfounded justifications and not based on legal provisions. We will once again attach the clarifications that we have made on the occasion of the response to the clarifications of the CA, therefore we request the contracting authority to analyze the same in detail and then issue a concrete decision regarding our bid, since with the clarifications that we have provided, the decisions of the PRB and the expertise of the review expert it has been clearly established that we are the responsible EO in this procurement activity. On 18.06.2026, we accepted the decision rejecting the request for reconsideration, on the grounds that it is unfounded, but in no way has it proven with concrete facts the opposite of our complaining claims. In relation to our complaint claims for the violation of Articles 1, 7, 52, 59, 60, 62, 72 of the LPP, Articles 40 and 43 of the RRPP, as well as the non-compliance with the decisions of the PRB, the CA justified that it had not committed any legal violation, stating that all economic operators were treated equally, that it had carried out the reassessment in accordance with the LPP, that it had requested clarifications from us, conducted market research and found that the prices offered by the EO "AUTOTRADE" were many times higher than the real market prices, for which the offer was considered irresponsible and the activity was cancelled. This reasoning of the CA is unsustainable both in factual and legal terms. Initially, the CA throughout the procedure only claims that our prices are "many times higher than market prices", but in no part of the decision does it present concrete evidence, comparative analysis, reference offers, official catalogues or verifiable documents that would support this claim. It is neither a fact nor an argument for the CA to declare that it has conducted market research, since it is obliged to specifically indicate what the sources of the research were, which operators were contacted, what the reference prices were and how the comparison with our offer was made. In the absence of this data, the CA's claim remains only a general finding and not an objective assessment based on concrete evidence. Furthermore, the CA claims that we have not provided convincing evidence regarding our prices, while completely ignoring the fact that on 20.04.2026 we submitted detailed explanations along with actual invoices issued to our customers, which prove that the prices offered are real market prices for genuine Toyota parts. In the decision to reject the request for reconsideration, no justification was given as to why these invoices were not accepted as evidence, their content was not analyzed and their authenticity was not contested. Failure to evaluate the evidence submitted by us constitutes a serious deficiency in the evaluation

process and violates the principle of fair and transparent treatment and at the same time shows the discrimination being made against our company as the sole responsible EO in this procurement activity. Also, the CA continues to compare our prices with the so-called “market prices”, without proving that the comparison was made with original Toyota parts with identical technical characteristics. If the research was based on alternative, replacement or non-original parts, then such a comparison is legally and technically unacceptable, because the same products are not being compared. Also, it is contradictory that the CA on the one hand admits that it has requested clarifications under Article 72 of the LPP and that we have submitted responses within the deadline, while on the other hand it does not take them into account at all without providing any professional analysis or concrete justification. If the CA still had uncertainties regarding the source or level of prices, it had the opportunity to request additional verifications from the manufacturer, authorized distributor or other official sources, but did not take any such action, intentionally or unintentionally, we do not know. Regarding the CA's claim that the activity was canceled because no bid was responsive, this conclusion is entirely based on the erroneous assessment that our bid is irresponsible. Since the CA has not managed to prove with objective evidence that our prices are outside the market level and at the same time has not addressed our concrete evidence, then there is no legal basis for the elimination of our bid and consequently for the cancellation of the procurement activity. Regarding our complaint allegation that the CA did not respect the decisions of the PRB, the CA justified that it did not violate Article 131 of the LPP, since it returned the case for reassessment as requested by the PRB decisions. This reasoning does not hold, due to the fact that although formally the CA has returned the case for re-evaluation, in substance it has continued to rely on the same previous reasoning for our elimination, without effectively addressing the observations and findings of the review expert and the PRB panel. The fact that after two PRB decisions the CA has again come to the same result, without providing new evidence and without addressing the evidence presented by us, shows that the re-evaluation was not carried out according to the findings noted in the PRB decisions. Respecting a PRB decision does not only mean returning the case for re-evaluation, but developing a real, objective re-evaluation based on the findings of that decision. In this case, the CA has not proven that it has eliminated the deficiencies identified earlier, therefore our claim for non-effective implementation of the PRB's decisions remains fully founded. Even after three re-evaluations and after two PRB decisions, the CA is continuing to deliberately discriminate against our company just so that it is not recommended for the award of the contract. It should be noted that we have bid within the estimated contract value, we have provided sufficient and concrete evidence regarding our prices, while through additional clarifications we have proven that the prices offered are real market prices. Moreover, this has also been confirmed by the review expert and the PRB review panel, who have twice annulled the CA's decisions and returned the case for re-evaluation. However, the CA continues to issue decisions for our elimination without presenting any additional evidence, without providing concrete justifications and in complete contradiction with the provisions of the LPP. This clearly demonstrates that the CA is not conducting an objective re-evaluation of our bid, but is acting in a discriminatory and biased manner towards our company. Based on the evidence and facts mentioned above, it results that the action was taken in violation of Article 59 of the LPP and at the same time the main criterion for awarding the contract was not respected, which was the

responsive tender with the lowest price, according to Article 60 paragraph 1.1 of the LPP. Also, the cancellation of this tender was done in violation of Article 62 of the LPP and Article 43.5 and 43.7 of the RRPP No. 001/2022, because none of the conditions set out in these provisions were met. Also, Article 7 of the LPP was not respected, where even though we have met all the requirements of the TDS and the contract notice, we were not recommended for the contract. Paragraph 1 of Article 7 of the LPP clearly stipulates that “The contracting authority shall treat economic operators equally and non-discriminatory and shall act in a transparent manner”, but the CA has not complied with this legal provision either, because it has eliminated us without any legal basis and without any concrete evidence, therefore this is open discrimination. The contracting authority has also not taken into consideration Article 1 of the LPP, since it is known that the purpose of this law is to ensure the most efficient, most transparent and fair way of using public funds, public resources and all other funds and resources of contracting authorities in Kosovo.

-Administration and evaluation of evidence -

Based on Article 111 paragraph 5 in connection with Articles 113 and 114 of the LPP, the Review Panel on date: 26.06.2026 authorized the review expert to conduct the initial review of the file and the claims according to the complaint with no. 2026/0414, which was submitted on date 07.07.2026.

Regarding the claims of EO "AUTOTRADE" SH.P.K., the review expert through report no. 2026/0414 has assessed as follows:

Response to the Claims

The Contracting Authority has published the Contract Notice (B05), dated: 05.11.2025, on the E-Procurement platform, (complaint PRB: 2026/0096, among others now more well-known), the request for Reconsideration by the complaining EO was submitted on 17.06.2026, while the decision on the request for Reconsideration by the CA was issued on 18.06.2026, EO “"AUTOTRADE " SH.P.K.”- Prishtina on date: 24.06.2026, has filed a complaint with no.: 2026/0414, During the analysis of the procurement activity, the Expert issued the following recommendations: Communications (Inter Partes) The Contracting Authority, after having returned the case for reassessment based on Article 72 of the LPP, regarding with article 41 of the RRPP, on 16.04.2026, requested additional clarifications through the electronic platform E-procurement, while on 20.04.2026, the EO uploaded the clarifications, despite the EO uploading the clarifications, the CA was not convinced by the clarifications and on 13.05.2026, it formed a market research commission, while this commission is composed of 3 members, who, according to the documents, I consider to have conducted the market research according to their respective duties. Also on 05.06.2026, the Market Price Assessment Commission submitted the report on the market price research: As can be seen, the market price assessment commission conducted the research from 3 sources, according to the explanatory documents sent by the CA to the expert, and came to this conclusion. After reviewing all the evidence and relevant documents in this procedure, the review expert clarifies that the price assessment is fair and discredits the

Contracting Authority itself, according to the documents it is alleged that the CA has conducted a market analysis, and at the same time I assess that the CA has acted in accordance with Article 61 of the LPP, paragraph 4, Article 4.1 letter c, of the Public Procurement Regulation 001/2022 consolidated version 11.11.2024, and Article 41 of this RRPP. Regarding the claim by the EO about how the CA arrived at the abnormally low/high price assessment, it is clear that the CA has researched the market. Therefore, the claim is unfounded.

Recommendation to the review expert;

The PRB has appointed the Review Panel pursuant to Article 111, paragraph 5 (ii) of the LPP and has engaged the review expert in accordance with Article 111, paragraph 5 (i) of the LPP, with the task of conducting the initial review of the file and the complaint claims, regarding this procurement activity, in accordance with Article 113 and 114 of the LPP in connection with Article 17 and 19 of the cited Regulation.

The review expert on 26.06.2026 received the report, and on 07.07.2026, submitted the Evaluation Report with recommendations no. 2026/0414; The Review Expert proposes to the Review Panel that the complaint of the complaining EO be rejected as unfounded and that the decision of the Contracting Authority remain in force.

- Findings of the Review Panel –

The Rules of Procedure of the Public Review Body, which is published on the PRB website, in Article 20, paragraph 2 of the Rules, stipulates the requirements for the Contracting Authority and the Economic Operator that all information and notices must be submitted and communicated through the public communication platform, if possible. Based on the documents in this case, the Panel considers that in relation to the issue in the concrete case, there is no need to convene a hearing with the parties, within the meaning of Article 24, paragraph 1 of the PRB Rules of Procedure, taking into account the fact that the claims of the parties and their submissions, the evidence and the report of the review expert provide sufficient data to decide on the merits.

The Review Panel assesses that the Review Expert Report, drafted at the request of the Panel regarding the dispute in this case of public procurement activity, contains the essential elements of such a document as foreseen by the provision of Article 113 in conjunction with Article 114 of the LPP, according to which the expert is required to review all procurement documentation, including all complaint claims and to provide the Panel and all parties to the dispute with an independent and professional assessment of the procurement activity and the validity of the complaining claims.

However, it should be noted that the legal fact that the expert report is not binding on the Review Panel and that any such report is assessed and/or analyzed in the overall context of the case files, the alleged facts and any other possible evidence, taking into account the nature of the possible violations, the course, nature and purpose of the procurement activity, therefore, the fact in which cases and for what, the Panel relies or not, on the expert report and/or any of the recommendations, is a matter of his/her independent and professional judgment, as these

responsibilities are addressed in the sense of Article 98, 99 in conjunction with Article 105 of the Public Procurement Law.

In this case, the Review Panel cannot support the assessment of the review expert, because, The Review Panel does not accept the conclusion of the review expert that the Contracting Authority has correctly implemented Article 61 of the Law on Public Procurement, since the expert's report did not address this fundamental discrepancy between the requirements of the Tender Dossier and the methodology used during the market research, which directly affected the legality of the decision-making of the Contracting Authority.

The Review Panel finds that in the specific case there is a discrepancy between the requirements set out by the Contracting Authority itself in the Tender Dossier and the methodology followed during the analysis of market prices within the framework of the implementation of Article 61 of the Law on Public Procurement.

From the documentation of the procurement activity it results that the Contracting Authority has requested as a qualification criterion that economic operators prove that they have authorization from the manufacturer's authorized service, where the complaining EO has presented authorization respectively from the authorized Toyota service, considering this requirement as an essential element for the execution of the contract. By establishing this criterion, the Contracting Authority itself has determined the technical and professional standard that the economic operators participating in the procedure must meet.

However, during the evaluation of the economic operator's offer and the analysis of the claim for an abnormally low price, the Contracting Authority has based the market research on prices obtained from the free market, without proving that the subjects taken for comparison are authorized service of the manufacturer or that they provide services under the same technical, professional and contractual conditions required in the Tender Dossier.

The Panel considers that such an action is not in accordance with the fundamental principles set out in Article 7 of the Law on Public Procurement, according to which the Contracting Authority is obliged to ensure equal, proportionate and transparent treatment throughout the procurement procedure. Likewise, a price analysis based on data that is not comparable with the requirements set out in the tender documents does not meet the standard required by Article 59 of the LPP, which obliges the Contracting Authority to base the evaluation of tenders on the criteria and requirements set out in advance in the tender documentation.

The Panel considers that the provisions of Article 61 of the LPP, which regulate the treatment of tenders with an abnormally low price, require that the Contracting Authority's analysis be based on objective, verifiable and comparable data with the subject matter of the procurement and with the conditions set out in the Tender Dossier. Consequently, if the Contracting Authority has requested that the services be provided by an authorized service of the manufacturer, then the market analysis should also be based on the prices and conditions applied by the authorized services, and not on the prices of free market operators who are not subject to the same technical and contractual standards.

Consequently, the Panel assesses that the market research conducted by the Contracting Authority was not based on comparable parameters and, as such, cannot be considered a sufficient and objective basis to conclude that the economic operator's offer is abnormally low. This discrepancy undermines the credibility of the analysis conducted and is contrary to the principles of transparency, proportionality and equal treatment set out in the Law on Public Procurement.

Therefore, the Review Panel, based on Article 1, 7, 59 and 61 of the LPP, decides to cancel the notification of the decision of the CA Kosovo Police regarding the procurement activity entitled: “SUPPLY OF PARTS FOR TOYOTA LAND CRUISER 150 VEHICLES OF THE KP” with procurement number: 214/30400-25-10109-1-1-1 and the case to be returned for re-evaluation.

Therefore, acting on the basis of the fundamental principles of procurement review procedures, which, among other things, are specifically sanctioned by the provision of Article 104 of the LPP and at the same time analyzing the documents of this case in relation to the facts and circumstances described above, and especially paying due attention to the nature and purpose of the complaint claims, the Review Panel took into consideration all the allegations of the complainant, the acts and actions taken by the CA, the report of the review expert and carefully analyzed all the documents of this case and considers that the complaint allegations of the complaining EO are sustainable as provided in the panel's finding and have grounds to return this procurement activity for re-evaluation.

Therefore, acting in accordance with the powers cited above and Article 104 paragraph 1 and 4 of the LPP, according to which the procurement review procedure shall be implemented and carried out in a prompt, fair and non-discriminatory manner, aimed at the legal and effective resolution of the case, as well as referring to Article 117 of the LPP, and in the evidence presented above, the Review Panel decided as in the provision of this decision.

From what was said above, it has been decided as in the provision of this decision.

President of the Review Panel

Mr. Vedat Poterqoi

Legal advice:

An appeal is not allowed against this decision, but the dissatisfied party can appeal to the Commercial Court, to the Department for Administrative Affairs for annulment of the decision within 30 days from the date of acceptance of the decision.

Decision to be submitted to:

1x1 CA – **KOSOVA POLICE;**

1x1 EO – **AUTOTRADE SH.P.K.;**

1x1 Archive of the PRB