



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

Psh. No.742/23

Review Panel, appointed by the President of the PRB, Pursuant to the article 105, article 106, and 117 of the Law on Public Procurement of the Republic of Kosovo (Law no. 04/L-042, supplemented and amended by Law 04/L-237, Law 05/L-068, supplemented and Law 05/L-092), in the composition of Isa Hasani - President, Agon Ramadani - member and Vedat Poterqoi - member, deciding according to the complaint of EO ISUF MUSLIU B.I., against the Decision on contract award or a design competition related to the procurement activity “Food services (supply, preparation and serving) for the needs of the KP” with procurement number 214-23-6749-2-1-1, initiated by the contracting authority (CA) - KOSOVA POLICE, on the 10/11/2023, has issued this:

DECISION

1. Refused, as ungrounded the complaint of the EO NTP “GLOBAL PARAJSA” - Vushtrri, with no.742/2023 of the 29/09/2023, and the decision of the CA “Kosova Police” is confirmed related to the procurement activity: “Food services (supply, preparation and serving) for the needs of the KP” with procurement number 214-23-6749-2-1-1.
2. In accordance with Article 31 point 5, of the Rules of Procedure of the PRB, the complaining economic operator is confiscated the complaint’s fee in the amount deposited when the complaint is submitted, while the funds go to the Budget of the Republic of Kosova.

REASONING

- Procedural facts and circumstances –

On the 07.07.2023, “Kosova Police” in the capacity of the Contracting Authority has published the Contract Notice B05 related to the procurement activity with title “Food services (supply,

preparation and serving) for the needs of the KP”. While on the 12.09.2023 B58 has published the Notice on the decision of the Contracting Authority where it has awarded a contract to EO "Beni Dona Plast" SH.P.K.

This procurement activity was developed through an open procedure with the type of service contract and with an estimated contract value of 5,500,000.00 €.

On the 18.09.2023, EO NTP “GLOBAL PARAJSA” - Vushtrri submitted a Request for Reconsideration, against the aforementioned decision of CA. On the 19.09.2023, the Contracting Authority rejected the request for reconsideration as ungrounded.

On the 29.09.2023, PRB received the complaint from EO NTP “GLOBAL PARAJSA” - Vushtrri with no. 742/23 related to the activity “Food services (supply, preparation and serving) for the needs of KP” with procurement number 214-23-6749-2-1-1.

-On the stage of preliminary review-

The Review Panel has concluded that the complaint contains all the elements defined through Article 111 of the LPP and as such was submitted within the legal term in accordance with Article 109 paragraph 1 of the LPP after the preliminary procedure for resolving disputes in the sense of Article 108/A of the LPP, from the economic operator who is an interested party according to article 4 paragraph 1 sub-paragraph 26 of the LPP. In this way, the Review Panel has concluded that it is competent to review this complaint according to Article 105 of the LPP and there is no procedural obstacle to proceed with reviewing the complaint in a meritorious manner.

Complaint of the Economic Operator NTP "GLOBAL PARAJSA-Vushtrri

The complaining Economic Operator, NTP "GLOBAL PARAJSA-Vushtrri in his complaint claims as follows" ... The contracting authority did not respect article 61 of the LPP and article 41 of Regulation No. OI/2022 for Public Procurement because it did not analyze the prices offered by the EO recommended for the contract, nor did it request additional clarifications from this economic operator. Article 61.1 clearly defines: If an economic operator submits a tender that is or appears to be abnormally low, the contracting authority will send a written request to the tenderer where the tenderer is required to submit in writing: (i) a division of the constituent elements of the tender (the (u) explanations regarding the basis of the tender, according to paragraph 2. of this article. So the contracting authority did not follow any legal procedure regarding the abnormally low prices offered by the EO recommended for the contract. As can be seen from the price analysis, it results that for different packages he has offered at lower prices 118 0/0, 87%, 68 0/0, 48 0/0, 47 0/0, 45 0/0, 44% etc. . It is strange why clarifications were not requested and package prices were not analyzed, but the contracting authority unilaterally favored the EO recommended for the contract. What should be the lowest price for the contracting authority to consider it an abnormally low price? or clarifications are required! There is no practical or legal possibility for this Economic Operator to implement this contract at these prices.

It is disturbing how the contracting authority has not expressed any will to analyze these prices, but they have recommended for the contract an EO that is clearly seen to have offered abnormally low prices. Likewise, the members of the evaluation committee are not professionals in terms of prices and food preparation, therefore the evaluation report is not professional and should not have been taken into account by the procurement official. The evaluation committee had to take into account the estimated values for food packages and the prices offered per package by the EO recommended for the contract. It was also necessary to take into account the market prices and the prices offered by the tenders passed by this economic operator and compare them with the current prices. We accepted the decision to reject the request for reconsideration on dt. 19.09.2023. In this decision, the contracting authority only crossed the articles that you claimed were violated without justifying them. Regarding the abnormally low prices, the contracting authority has considered that all prices are reliable prices and that there is no price that would negatively affect the performance of the implementation of this contract. The contracting authority defends the prices as if it were the EO recommended for the contract, or rather, it tries to reason even more than the EO itself was recommended for the contract. How can the price offered for 118%, 87%, 78% etc. not have a negative impact, compared to the analysis of the prices made by the contracting authority, let alone that these prices are even lower (in percentage terms) than current market prices. We ask the PRB expert to first analyze the prices that the contracting authority has issued and predicted, then the prices offered by the EO recommended for the package contract and to analyze the market prices to have a clear overview about with the EO offer recommended for the contract.

On the part of the contracting authority, the main criterion for awarding the contract was not respected, which was the responsible tender with the lowest price, as provided for in article 60 paragraph 1.2 of the LPP, because an irresponsible economic operator was recommended for the contract, which has offered NOT normally low prices. Article 7 of the LPP was also not respected, because the economic operator recommended for the contract was favored by being recommended for the contract even though he did not meet all the requirements of the TDS and the contract notification, while we were discriminated against not declaring us the winner even though you have fulfilled all the requirements of the TDS and the contract notice. Paragraph 1 of Article 7 of the LPP clearly foresees that the Contracting Authority will treat economic operators equally and non-discriminatory and will act in a transparent manner. Likewise, paragraph 6 of article 7 of the LPP foresees that during the management of procurement activities, all contracting authorities will ensure; that (vi) that the selected tender complies with all substantive aspects of the relevant conditions, criteria and specifications, but in this case the CA has not complied with this legal provision either. Article 1 of the LPP was also not taken into consideration, since it is known that the purpose of this law is to ensure the most efficient, transparent and fair way of using public funds, public resources as well as all funds and resources other contracting authorities in Kosovo. Considering all the factual and legal reasons that were mentioned above, we ask the PRB to take a decision to approve the complaint of NTP "GLOBAL PARAJSA-Vushtrri" as grounded and to cancel the notification on the decision of the CA (B58) and the subject of returns to re-evaluation".

The review expert's report dated 17.10.2023

Relying on article 111 paragraph 5 related to articles 113 and 114 of the LPP, the Review Panel dated 04/10/2023 has authorized the expert to conduct the initial review of the file and claims according to complaint no. 742/23, while on 17/10/2023 the expert's report with no. 2023/0742, as follows;

Procurement activity "Food services (supply, preparation and serving) for the needs of KP" with no. of procurement: "214-23-6749-2-1-1", initiated by the Contracting Authority (CA) - KOSOVO POLICE, started with the publication of the contract notice dated 03.07.2023, with an open procedure, the opening of offers was made on 04.08.2023, and the decision on the recommendation was published on 14.09.2023. After the rejection of the request for reconsideration, the complaining EO filed a complaint with the PRB on 28.09.2023, claiming that the recommended EO does not meet the criteria, and the CA did not evaluate the offers in accordance with Article 1, 7, 59, 60, 61, 69 of the LPP as well as article 40 and 41 of Regulation no. 01/2022 on Public Procurement." The complaining EO was declared unsuccessful by the CA. Further, the same claims that the recommended EO has offered abnormally low prices, respectively for packages with no. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. The review expert, while analyzing and examining the claims of the complaining EO, comparing them with the documents in e-procurement, in order to remain as objective as possible, requested clarifications by e-mail dated 12.10.2023 from the complaining EO related to evidence and facts. The complaining EO has attached to the e-mail the evidence (list) for which the CA- the requesting unit has provided a price list of the packages, which was sent to the e-mail to the bidders as a sample related to the price forecast. Further, the reviewing expert, taking into account the testimonies and facts of the complaining EO regarding the prices offered by the recommended EO, considers that the CA should return the case to re-evaluation, requesting additional clarifications from the recommended EO, due to the fact that the CA has provided a price list for bidders which contradicts the prices of the recommended EO, and therefore in accordance with article 61 of the LPP, namely article 41, par: 41.6, 41.7, 41.8, 41.9, 41.10, 41.11 of the guide no. 002/2023 for public procurement, the matter is returned to re-evaluation and the CA is recommended to make the re-evaluation process conform to the legal provisions of the LPP, guide no. 001/2023 for PP as well as regulation no. 002/2023 for PP. Based on the above-mentioned clarifications, the review expert proposes to the review panel that the complaint of the complaining EO be approved as grounded, the contract award notice be canceled, and recommends that the matter be reassessed.

According to the above, the examining expert has dealt with the claims of the complaining economic operator NTP "GLOBAL PARAJSA" - Vushtrri. The argumentation in the expert's report is entirely based on the relevant documents that refer to the procurement activity. The findings in the experts' report can be confirmed through the tender file as well as the documents with which the tenderers have bid. Consequently, the Review Panel regarding the claims of the complaining economic operator has given full confidence to the expert's report. In this way, it has been found that the claims of the complaining economic operator NTP "GLOBAL PARAJSA" - Vushtrri are grounded.

The expertise report has been properly accepted by all procedural parties, EO declares that it agrees with the review expert's recommendation".

Answer of the CA- Police of Kosovo, in the Report of the review expert.

The Contracting Authority-Kosova Police on the 18.10.2023 presents a written response regarding the review expert's report dated 17.10.2023, as follows" The Kosova Police strongly opposes and disagrees with the opinion of the review expert as there is no conducts a fair examination of the complaint, complaint claims for the procurement activity; "Food Services (supply, preparation, serving) for the needs of KP, procurement number 214/23/6749/211.

We inform the reviewing expert that the Kosova Police Contracting Authority has handled this procurement activity in full harmony with the LPP in Regulation No. 001/2022.

The contracting authority has not considered the EO's offer recommended for contracts with abnormally low prices.

The finding that the expert has presented in the report where it says: "The complaining EO has attached to the e-mail the evidence (list) for which the CA - the requesting unit has predicted a price of the food packages, which was sent to the BIDDERS by e-mail as MOSTER related to price forecasting. This finding does not hold since all offers and communications were made through the E-procurement system. The contracting authority for each initiation of the procurement activity conducts market research, based on preliminary contracts, market research at the time of initiation and based on this research unit prices are planned for each item and from which the estimated value of the contract is derived. . This finding that the reviewing expert has presented in the report does not hold and the CA asks the PRB to deal with this finding in the final session, since the Contracting Authority Kosovo Police has not made any communication outside the E-procurement system as the Expert claims through e-emails.

According to ROGPP Article 41 Abnormally Low Tenders paragraph 41.1 The concept of abnormally low tender refers to tenders that for the contracting authority at first glance appear to be unreliable if compared to the object of the contract and accordingly, and which is likely to have a negative impact on contract implementation performance. The authority has not considered any price of the financial offer of the EO recommended for contracts as not normally LOW and therefore this article has not been applied, for which you recommend CA to apply article 61 of the LPP article 41 paragraph 41.6, 41.7, 41.8, 41.9, 41.10, 41.11 of ROGPP. It is the responsibility of the CA to assess an abnormally low price.

41.3 The contracting authorities will ask the economic operators to explain the price offered for responsible tenders, when all the following conditions are met:

- i. the price offered is more than 30% lower than the average price of responsible tenders;
- ii. the price offered is more than 10% lower than the price or costs of the second lowest tender;
- iii. at least 3 (three) tenders have been submitted.

41.4 When the tenders appear to be abnormally low for other reasons (there are no other reasons for the Kosova Police Contracting Authority to treat it as an abnormally low tender) than those provided for in paragraph 41.3 of this regulation, the contracting authorities may to assess the reliability of such tenders and consequently to request explanations in accordance with the following paragraphs and article 61 of the LPP.

41.5 When a tender is considered abnormally low in accordance with Article 61 of the LPP and paragraph 41.3 or 41.4 of this regulation, such a tender cannot be rejected without investigation and consideration of the important elements that cause the especially low tender.

The authority has not considered any prices of the financial offer of the EO recommended for contracts as not normally LOW, therefore this article for which you claim to be applied has not been applied. It is the responsibility of the CA to assess an abnormally low price”.

1. Table of price comparisons, CA as follows:

Fshimi i kësaj sekcione									
A		5,500,000		80%		3,300,000.00			
B		5,500,000		30%		1,650,000.00			
C		5,500,000		10%		550,000.00			
Lista e përshkimit të çmimit									
Fjese A 30 00									
Pako	AK	Global	Beni Dona	Vlera për pako	Beni Dona	Global	Ndëryshimi në sasi të pakos	Diferencancë Euro	
Pako 1	6.39	6.80	6.39	412,500.00	64,553.99	60,661.76	3,892.23	24,871.32	
Pako 2	4.90	4.80	4.40	412,500.00	93,750.00	85,937.50	7,812.50	34,375.00	
Pako 3	5.50	5.40	5.40	412,500.00	76,388.99	76,388.99	-	-	
Pako 5	6.94	6.49	4.30	412,500.00	98,214.29	63,559.32	34,654.96	143,550.85	
Pako 8	7.71	7.50	5.90	412,500.00	69,915.25	55,000.00	14,915.25	88,000.00	
Pako 9	6.41	6.30	4.20	412,500.00	98,214.29	65,456.19	32,758.10	130,500.00	
Pako 13	7.68	7.45	5.50	412,500.00	75,000.00	55,369.13	19,630.87	107,969.80	
Pako 15	6.98	6.80	4.75	412,500.00	86,842.11	60,661.76	26,180.34	124,356.62	
TOTALI	52.9	5154	40.74	3,300,000.00	662,879.81	523,054.56	139,824.25	662,623.59	
Lista e përshkimit të çmimit									
Fjese B 30 00									
Pako	AK	Global	Beni Dona	Vlera për pako	Beni Dona	Global	Ndëryshimi në sasi të pakos	Diferencancë Euro	
Pako 4	6.2	6.05	5.9	235,714.29	39,951.30	38,961.04	990.26	5,844.16	
Pako 6	7.54	7.4	4.5	235,714.29	52,380.95	31,853.28	20,527.67	92,374.52	
Pako 7	6.81	6.7	4.75	235,714.29	49,634.06	35,181.24	14,442.82	68,603.41	
Pako 10	7.61	7.5	5.49	235,714.29	42,915.21	31,428.57	11,506.64	63,171.43	
Pako 11	7.51	7.3	4.47	235,714.29	52,732.30	32,199.63	20,442.67	91,379.65	
Pako 12	6.31	6.2	4.65	235,714.29	50,691.25	38,018.43	12,672.81	58,928.57	
Pako 16	7.08	6.95	4.76	235,714.29	49,519.81	33,915.73	15,604.08	74,275.44	
TOTALI	48.06	43.1	34.52	1,850,000.00	337,835.35	241,647.92	96,187.43	454,577.15	
Lista e përshkimit të çmimit									
Fjese C 20 00 550.000€ 110.000€									
Pako	AK	Global	Beni Dona	Vlera për pako	Beni Dona	Global	Ndëryshimi në sasi të pakos	Diferencancë Euro	
Pako 14	6.98	6.9	4.16	110,000.00	26,442.3	15,942.0	10,500.28	43,681.36	
Pako 17	5.76	5.5	3.5	110,000.00	31,428.6	20,000.0	11,428.57	40,000.00	
Pako 18	6.66	6.4	3.56	110,000.00	30,998.9	17,187.5	13,711.38	48,812.50	
Pako 19	3.7	3.65	1.7	110,000.00	64,705.9	30,137.0	34,568.90	58,767.12	
Pako 20	3.2	3.15	1.7	110,000.00	64,705.9	34,920.6	29,785.25	50,634.92	
TOTALI	28.3	25.0	14.02	550,000.00	218,181.52	118,187.15	99,994.37	241,895.79	
							totali i ndryshimit në sasi të pakos	totali në vlerë financiare për këto pako	
							336,006.06	1,359,096.47	

- Administration and evaluation of evidence -

In order to fully verify the factual situation, the review panel administered as evidence the submissions and documents of the complainant, the letters and documents of the contracting authority, the expert's report, the opinions of the parties regarding the expert's report, the relevant documents related to the procurement activity as well as all the evidence proposed by the procedural parties.

Regarding the complainant's claims:

- Paragraph 1 of Article 7 of the LPP clearly foresees that the Contracting Authority will treat economic operators equally and non-discriminatory and will act in a transparent manner.

The review panel notes that in the tender dossier of the CA - Kosova Police, with no. 214-23-67492-1-1, dated 03.07.2023, it has determined the tender procedures, contractual conditions and necessary documents which are necessary for the application of tenderers, and which was public and transparent for all interested bidders. We did not notice that the recommended EO had other conditions according to the TDS, but that they were the same. The complainant did not present what is the distinguishing basis of discrimination, and also did not present a single piece of evidence to prove his claim of discrimination by the CA, but only cited Article 7 of the LPP. The review panel finds his claim of discrimination as ungrounded, in the absence of relevant arguments and facts.

- Article 59, of the LPP, that the members of the evaluation commission are not professionals in terms of prices and food preparation, therefore the evaluation report is not professional and should not have been taken into account by the procurement official. It is disturbing how the contracting authority has not expressed any will to analyze these prices, but they have recommended for the contract an EO that is clearly seen to have offered abnormally low prices.

The review panel related to this appeal claim emphasizes that according to Article 59 of the LPP, it is within the competence and legal responsibility of the contracting authorities to establish an Evaluation Commission for the examination, evaluation and comparison of the offers, which at the same time take full individual responsibility for the evaluation of the offer.

The Panel also finds that it is not within the Panel's responsibility and legal mandate to assess the competence and professionalism of the members of the various commissions which are established by contracting authorities, therefore the complaint is unfounded, as it exceeds the legal authorizations of the Panel.

The panel also related to the complaining assertion for not analyzing the prices, notes that, in its response dated 17.10.2023, the CA states that for each initiation of the procurement activity, it conducts market research, based on preliminary contracts, research the market at the time of initiation and based on this research unit prices are planned for each item and from which the estimated value of the contract is derived, as well as through a table the CA has presented price comparisons between the two bidders according to the package and in the total amount, according to which he selected the bidder with the lowest bid price for 32%, for more see page 7, Table of price comparisons, CA, therefore this complaining claim is unfounded.

Also according to the LPP, in cases of the lowest price, by weighing the prices, the weighted prices are based on the price offered by the individual Economic Operators, therefore it is not allowed to determine the points by comparing the prices of different bidders.

- The contracting authority did not comply with Article 61 of the LPP and Article 41 of Regulation No. OI/2022 for Public Procurement because it did not analyze the prices offered by the EO recommended for the contract, nor did it request additional clarifications from this economic operator.

The review panel, based on the fact of the value of the tender with an open procedure and the recommendation for the contract with EO, with a Normally Low value of the price, according to article 61 of the LPP, it is determined that if an economic operator submits a tender that is or appears to be abnormally low, the contracting authority may request explanations and information from the tenderer and this remains in the assessment, the conviction and the legal responsibility of the price assessment.

The panel, according to point 2 of the provision of this decision, has requested from the CA "Kosovo Police", according to the legal authorizations specified in article 63. point 1.2.3 of the LPP, from the EO, to request the guarantee for ensuring the execution of the service contract, in case of breach of contract by EO.

The review expert's report dated 17.10.2023

The review panel has carefully analyzed the review expert's report, which mostly includes the EO's complaints regarding his assertions about the violations of legal provisions by the CA. The main part of the appeal claim concerns the offer of lower prices offered by the recommended EO. The panel notes that the expertise lacks a comparative elaboration between the prices offered by the two operators, which will then lead to an assessment of how realistically the lowest price between these operators is, in order to be able to estimate that do we have high and irrelevant values for these services. It would also help this report a lot if a market research was done, to get information about the real market value of the products with which EO applied, to create a more realistic overview of the evaluation of the complaining claims.

The review panel, after analyzing the facts and information contained in this evidence, evaluates it as insufficient, as it does not contain sufficient facts related to the issue of the complaining assertions "low and non-market prices" and this has resulted in issuing the recommendation of which does not coincide with the situation of this economic process, therefore and finally the Panel cannot take it as a fact and does not grant the trust of the evidence in this administrative matter.

CA- Kosova Police, response to the review expert's report.

The review panel has analyzed the response of the CA-Police of Kosovo, which opposes the findings respectively found in the report of the review expert. CA emphasizes that all offers and communications with EO were made through the E-procurement system and did not make any communication outside of the E-procurement system as claimed by the Expert through e-mails. Also, the CA in response provides clarifications that for each initiation of the procurement

activity, market research is carried out, based on preliminary contracts, market research at the time of initiation and on this research unit prices are planned for each item and from which it derives also the estimated value of the contract and does not consider the EO's offer recommended for contracts with prices that are not normally low. The Kosova Police Contracting Authority finally emphasizes that this procurement activity has been handled in full harmony with the LPP in Regulation No. 001/2022.

The review panel after analyzing the response of the CA- Kosova Police, in the review expert's report, found that detailed clarifications based on the law and regulations were given, in opposition to this report, which prove that the evidence on which the report was built are insufficient and this has resulted in issuing a recommendation, which does not coincide with the situation of this economic process. Therefore, the review panel evaluates as grounded and well-known fact, the opposition of the CA in this administrative issue.

- Findings of the Review Panel -

The review panel independently and objectively, conscientiously and professionally evaluated all the case evidence one by one as written above. In this way, it was found that the Contracting Authority has acted in accordance with the legal provisions for public procurement and the requirements of the Tender Dossier regarding the activity of "Food services (supply, preparation and serving) for the needs of KP" with procurement number 214-23-6749-2-1-1.

The review panel recalls that the allegations related to abnormally low prices, raised by EO, emphasize that the primary purpose of drafting the legislation that defines and determines the procedures of abnormally low prices is to divert the possibilities of price manipulation through non- - correct with non-market prices, thus enabling the discrimination of EOs who compete with market prices and the like, which from the practice so far these issues have been encountered in framework contracts, and especially when the indicative quantities are not are known and it is offered with a quantity of 1 for each position, with scoring and weighting of the prices where the weight of the tender evaluation is set, etc.

Based on the data of this activity, of the type of open procedure, the Review Panel finds that the actions taken and the clarifications provided in this regard, the complaining EO has not provided evidence, arguments and concrete data that prove the claim or its classification as based, while it remains at the discretion of the CA (according to the provisions of the LPP) in this case, taking into account the legal instruments that it can use before and during the implementation of the contract, such as the increase in insurance execution, its management according to the standard criteria and quantities determined in advance, and also based on the offered prices to create the conviction that the offer of the recommended EO has no room for manipulations as well as the creation of difficulties in the implementation of the contract.

Panali recalls that all public authorities, officials who carry out or are involved in a procurement activity, asking such persons to bring following the principle of the most efficient, cost-effective, transparent and fair use of funds and public resources while strictly adhering to Hg^{if}'s essential procedures and conditions

Likewise, Article 6 Economy and Efficiency of the LPP determines that all contracting authorities are obliged to ensure that public funds and public resources are used in the most economical way, simultaneously taking into consideration the purpose and subject of the procurement.

Therefore, finally, based on all that was said above, the SHP concludes that it has reached the decision-making as in the provision of this decision, where in this case the complaining EO has failed to testify sufficiently and to argue regarding proved the responsibility of the recommended EO, against which it raised claims that, according to the panel, did not lead to any decision-making, however, the panel assesses that in case of doubt on the part of the CA regarding the difficulties in the implementation of the contract, the CA can act applying article 63, LPP, for ensuring the execution of the contract, which are left under the responsibility of the CA as legal actions that it can undertake, in cases of breach of the contract by the economic operator.

The Review Panel has decided in accordance with the legal powers in the sense of Article 104 paragraph 1 in relation to Article 103, Article 105 and Article 117 of the LPP for the implementation of the procurement review procedure in a fast, fair, non-discriminatory manner, in order to legal and effective resolution of the case. The review panel in accordance with Article 117 of the LPP, as well as based on the evidence presented above, decided as in the provision of this decision.

President of the Review Panel

Mr. Isa Hasani

Legal advice:

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

Decision to be submitted to:

1x1 CA – **Kosova Police**;
1x1 EO – **“ISUF MUSLIU B.I**;
1x1 Archive of the PRB;
1x1 For publication on the website of the PRB.