



Strasbourg, 23 March 2026

CDL-REF(2026)009

Engl. only

EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR DEMOCRACY THROUGH LAW
OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE
(VENICE COMMISSION)

SERBIA

EXPLANATORY REPORTS
ON THE 28 JANUARY 2026 AMENDMENTS
TO LAWS GOVERNING THE JUDICIARY
AND THE PROSECUTION

Table of Contents

EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE 3
EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON THE HIGH PROSECUTORIAL COUNCIL 6
EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON ORGANISATION AND JURISDICTION OF GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES FOR SUPPRESSION OF CYBERCRIME 7
EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON JUDGES..... 9
EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON THE SEATS AND TERRITORIAL JURISDICTIONS OF COURTS AND PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICES11

EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

I. CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The constitutional basis for enacting the Law on Public Prosecution is contained in Article 155 paragraph 4 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia (Official Gazette of RS No. 98/06 and 16/22), which lays down that the establishment, organisation and competences of the Public Prosecution shall be regulated by law; Article 155 paragraph 8 of the Constitution, which lays down that hierarchical powers in the management of the Public Prosecution and legal remedies against them shall be further regulated by law; and Article 157 paragraph 5 of the Constitution, which stipulates that a lower public prosecutor or a public prosecutor who considers a binding instruction unlawful or unfounded has the right of objection in accordance with the law.

II. REASONS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The Law on Public Prosecution (Official Gazette of RS, No. 10/23) was adopted in February 2023, with an aim to align it with the Act Amending the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia (Official Gazette of RS, No. 115/21) as endorsed in the national referendum held on 16 January 2022. Having regard to the practical application of this Law, it is necessary to amend certain provisions regarding jurisdiction over deciding on objections against binding instructions for acting in individual cases, objections to substitution and devolution decisions, objections to the annual allocation of tasks in the Public Prosecution, decisions on secondment of prosecutors to other Public Prosecutions, as well as provisions on the number of terms of office for chief public prosecutors. Reasons for the amendments are to create conditions for more efficient functioning of the Public Prosecution and additional alignment with constitutional and other legal provisions.

III. EXPLANATION OF THE MAIN LEGAL MECHANISMS AND SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

Provisions of Articles 1 to 5 of the Draft Law amend Articles 18 to 22 of the Law on Public Prosecution.

Article 22 paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Law on Public Prosecution lay down that objections against binding instructions for acting in individual cases, substitution decisions, and devolution decisions shall be decided by a Commission of the High Prosecutorial Council, composed of five members elected by the High Prosecutorial Council from among public prosecutors, for a five-year term without the possibility of re-election. This provision is inadequate in terms of exercising hierarchical powers within the Public Prosecution. The Law does not specify from which level of Public Prosecutions, members of the Commission may be elected. Consequently, the objections against binding instructions for acting in individual cases, substitution decisions, and devolution decisions may be decided by prosecutors-Commission members from a public prosecution of a lower level than the chief prosecutor who issued the binding instruction or decisions, thus undermining the hierarchical order in the Public Prosecution. To correct this anomaly, Article 5 of the Draft Law proposes an amendment to Article 22 of the Law on Public Prosecution. The proposed solution provides that objections against binding instructions for acting in individual cases, substitution decisions, and devolution decisions shall be decided by the Chief Public Prosecutor of the immediately higher Public Prosecution; while objections to acts issued by the Prosecutor General shall be decided

by the Collegium of the General Public Prosecution in a special, closed session. This fully restores the hierarchical authority of chief public prosecutors over public prosecutors and of immediate higher chief prosecutors over lower public prosecutors. The proposed solution is consistent with Article 15 of the Law on Public Prosecution, which regulates accountability within the Public Prosecution and which lays down that Chief Public Prosecutor shall be accountable for the work of the public prosecution and for their own work to the Prosecutor General and to the immediate higher Chief Public Prosecutor in accordance with the law, and that the Public Prosecutor shall be accountable to the Chief Public Prosecutor in accordance with the law.

Similarly, Article 7 of the Draft Law intervenes in Article 39. It provides that objections by a public prosecutor to the decision on annual allocation of tasks in the Public Prosecution, which is made by the Chief Public Prosecutor, shall be decided by the immediately higher public prosecutor instead of the High Judicial Council, as envisaged by the currently applicable legal provision. With regard to the decision on annual allocation of tasks in the General Public Prosecution, the objections are decided by the Collegium of the General Public Prosecution. The proposed solution is in line with Article 15 of the Law on Public Prosecution regulating the accountability matters in the public prosecution.

Article 6 of the Draft Law supplements the provision of Article 31 point 4 of the Law on Public Prosecution which introduces the competences of the General Public Prosecution to perform international cooperation duties of significance to the Public Prosecution. This proposed supplement requires the General Public Prosecution to obtain the consent of the Ministry of Justice when carrying out these duties. This supplement is necessary because international cooperation may entail the assumption of international obligations that could have implications for the Republic of Serbia and its international position. Accordingly, such cooperation must be conducted with the consent of the ministry in charge of justice.

Article 8 of the Draft Law amends Article 41 of the Law on Public Prosecution, which regulates acting General Public Prosecutor and Chief Public Prosecutor. A novelty is the solution whereby the same person may be reappointed as acting Chief Public Prosecutor, for a period of up to three years. This solution is proposed in order to prevent the blockage of the work of the Public Prosecution, particularly in smaller Public Prosecutions with a limited number of public prosecutors.

For the same reason, Article 9 of the Draft Law amends Article 62 paragraph 1 of the Law on Public Prosecution, allowing a Chief Public Prosecutor to be re-elected in the same office within the same Public Prosecution.

Article 10 of the Draft Law amends Article 69 of the Law on Public Prosecution, which regulates secondment. For the purpose of ensuring more efficient functioning of the Public Prosecution and better management of its human resources, the possibility of repeated secondment of a public prosecutor to another Public Prosecution for a period of up to three years is proposed. Given that this concerns a status-related matter affecting the position of public prosecutors, it is proposed that the decision on secondment be made by the High Prosecutorial Council, rather than by the Prosecutor General, as this is more appropriate in view of the competences of these two authorities. It is also provided that, prior to adopting a decision on secondment, the opinion of the Chief Public Prosecutor of the Public Prosecution to which the secondment is to be made must be obtained.

Article 11 of the Draft Law amends Article 128 of the Law on Public Prosecution, which prescribes the competences of the Collegium of the Public Prosecution. This amendment removes the competences of the Collegium of the Public Prosecution to provide opinions on the draft annual report on the work of the Public Prosecution for the previous year and on the draft plan and programme of work for the following year, since, pursuant to Article 15

paragraph 1 of the Law on Public Prosecution, the Chief Public Prosecutor is accountable for the work of the Public Prosecution and for his or her own work to the Prosecutor General and to the immediate higher public prosecutor in line with the law. Therefore, the preparation of the report, plan and programme is within the exclusive competence of the Chief Public Prosecutor.

Article 12 of the Draft Law is a transitional provision regulating the cessation of the Commission of the High Prosecutorial Council which decides on objections against binding instructions for acting in individual cases, substitution decisions and devolution decisions, having regard to Article 5 of the Draft Law, as well as the handling of cases already initiated before the Commission.

Article 13 of the Draft Law is a final provision regulating the entry into force of the Law.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

No funds from the Budget of the Republic of Serbia are required for the implementation of this Law.

V. REASONS FOR ADOPTION UNDER URGENT PROCEDURE

In line with Article 167 of the Rules of Procedure of the National Assembly, it is proposed that the Draft Law be adopted under urgent procedure, since failure to do so may result in adverse consequences for the functioning of the public prosecution.

EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON THE HIGH PROSECUTORIAL COUNCIL

I. CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The constitutional basis for enacting this Law is contained in Article 97 point 16 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, which lays down that the Republic of Serbia shall regulate and ensure the organisation, jurisdiction and functioning of the public authorities. Furthermore, Article 162 paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia lays down, inter alia, that the High Prosecutorial Council shall decide on other matters concerning the position of the Prosecutor General, Chief Public Prosecutors and Public Prosecutors and shall exercise other competences prescribed by the Constitution and law.

II. REASONS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The enactment of this Law is necessitated by the need to ensure alignment with the proposed amendments to the Law on Public Prosecution, which relate to the competences of a Commission of the High Prosecutorial Council to decide on objections against binding instructions for acting in individual cases, objections to substitution and devolution decisions. Bearing in mind that the Draft Law on Amendments and Supplements to the Law on Public Prosecution proposes that these matters be directly decided by the immediate higher chief public prosecutor, it is necessary to also introduce corresponding amendments to the Law on the High Prosecutorial Council, with a view to harmonising the two laws.

III. EXPLANATION OF THE MAIN LEGAL MECHANISMS AND SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

Article 1 of the Draft Law amends Article 17 of the Law on the High Prosecutorial Council, which regulates the competences of the High Prosecutorial Council. Considering the proposed amendments to the Law on Public Prosecution, it is necessary to delete current point 7 that lays down that the High Prosecutorial Council shall elect members of a Commission for deciding on objections against binding instructions for acting in individual cases, objections to substitution and devolution decisions.

The necessary harmonisation must also be carried out in Article 19, paragraph 1 of the Law on the High Prosecutorial Council, which prescribes the working bodies of the High Prosecutorial Council (Article 2 of the Draft Law).

Article 3 of the Draft Law regulates the entry into force of the Law.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

No funds from the Budget of the Republic of Serbia are required for the implementation of this Law.

V. REASONS FOR ADOPTION UNDER URGENT PROCEDURE

It is proposed that the Law be adopted under an urgent legislative procedure, since failure to do so may result in adverse consequences for the functioning of state authorities, public prosecution offices.

EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON ORGANISATION AND JURISDICTION OF GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES FOR SUPPRESSION OF CYBERCRIME

I. CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The constitutional basis for enacting the Law on Amendments to the Law on the Organization and Jurisdiction of State Authorities for Combating High-Tech Crime is contained in Article 155, paragraph 4 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia (Official Gazette of RS, Nos. 98/06 and 16/22), which lays down that the establishment, organisation and competences of the Public Prosecution shall be regulated by law.

II. REASONS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The Law on the Organization and Jurisdiction of State Authorities for Combating High-Tech Crime (hereinafter: Law) governs the formation, organization, jurisdiction and powers of special organizational units of state authorities for the detection, criminal prosecution of and trials for high-tech crimes. This Law has established, within the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade, a Special Department for Suppression of High-Tech Crime, which is competent to act in cases of high-tech criminal offences for the entire territory of the Republic of Serbia. However, the status of that Department within the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade and its relationship with other public prosecution offices in terms of jurisdiction is not precisely defined. For this reason, it is necessary to amend this Law in order to resolve the problems in the functioning of the Special Department for Suppression of High-Tech Crime of the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade, which have arisen due to the imprecision of applicable legal provisions.

III. EXPLANATION OF THE MAIN LEGAL MECHANISMS AND SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

Articles 1 to 4 of the Draft Law amend provisions in the section of the Law relating to the Special Department for Suppression of High-Tech Crime of the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade.

Article 1 of the Draft Law amends the title of Section 1 of Chapter II of the Law by replacing the existing section title "Special Public Prosecutor's Office" with the title "Special Department of the Public Prosecutor's Office for Suppression of High-Tech Crime". This amendment more precisely defines the status of this Department, since in this specific case, it is a department of the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade, rather than a special public prosecution office.

Articles 2 to 4 of the Draft Law amend Articles 4 to 6 of the Law. For the reasons stated in the explanatory note to Article 1 of the Draft Law, an amendment was made regarding the abbreviated name of the Special Department used in the remainder of the text of the Law, as provided for in the new Article 4 of the Law. Similarly, in the new Article 5 of the Law, for the same reason, the abbreviated title of the Head of the Special Department has been amended. In addition, it is stipulated that the Head of the Special Department shall be appointed by the Chief Public Prosecutor of the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade, thereby further defining his/her position as the Head of the Special Department within the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade. For the same reasons, the new Article 6 of the Law lays down that the Head of the Special Department shall be responsible for the work of the Special Department and for one's own actions to the Chief Public Prosecutor of the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade, in accordance with the law. It also lays down that the Chief Public Prosecutor of the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade shall regulate the

operation of the Special Department in more detail and may directly request the Prosecutor General to transfer a case to the jurisdiction of the Special Department.

Articles 5 and 6 of the Draft Law introduce technical amendments to Articles 9, 12, and 13 of the Law, made necessary by the amendments envisaged in Articles 1 and 2 of the Draft Law.

Article 7 of the Draft Law is a transitional provision that regulates the deadline for appointing the Head of the Special Department for Suppression of High-Tech Crime of the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade in accordance with the proposed legal provisions, the transitional operational regime of the Special Department until the appointment of its Head, and the deadline for adopting an act by the Chief Public Prosecutor of the Higher Public Prosecution Office in Belgrade which regulates the work of the Special Department in more detail.

Article 8 of the Draft Law is a final provision that regulates the entry into force of the Law.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

No funds from the Budget of the Republic of Serbia are required for the implementation of this Law.

V. REASONS FOR ADOPTION UNDER URGENT PROCEDURE

In accordance with Article 167 of the Rules of Procedure of the National Assembly, it is proposed that the Draft Law be adopted under an urgent legislative procedure, since failure to do so may result in adverse consequences for the functioning of the public prosecution.

EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON JUDGES

I. CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The constitutional basis for enacting this Law is contained in Article 97 point 16 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, which lays down that the Republic of Serbia shall regulate and ensure the organisation, jurisdiction and functioning of the public authorities. Furthermore, Article 145 paragraph 1 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia lays down that the conditions for the election of judges, as well as the conditions governing the election and tenure of lay judges, shall be regulated by law.

II. REASONS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The amendments to the Law on Judges propose introducing the possibility for a court president, upon expiry of his or her term of office, to be re-elected to the same position for one additional term. This proposal is made having regard to the fact that, in the preceding period, such a solution produced positive results in practice.

The proposed solution is grounded in the need to ensure continuity in the exercise of one of the most significant managerial functions within the judicial system. The president of a court is not merely the formal head of the court, but exercises extensive competences of key importance for the court's internal functioning.

The president of a court is responsible for adopting acts on the internal organisation and job classification, for the assignment of judges and judicial assistants, and for ensuring the optimal functioning of court departments and of the court as a whole.

Continuity in the performance of these duties is of essential importance, given that these are processes with long-term effects and require in-depth knowledge of the internal needs of the court, capacities of human resources, and the specific characteristics of case allocation and workload.

The role of the president of a court in human resources matters is of particular significance — ranging from monitoring and evaluating the performance of judges and civil servants within the court, proposing measures to enhance efficiency, to implementing training and professional development activities. Allowing one additional term, as proposed, constitutes a legal mechanism for preserving good practice and maintaining the positive effects achieved during the preceding term of office, where the High Judicial Council assesses that the president of the court contributed to improvements in the quality and efficiency of judicial work.

The replacement of court leadership after a single term, without the possibility of continuing the work of presidents whose performance has been demonstrably successful, may result in the interruption of ongoing processes and the loss of institutional knowledge. The introduction of the possibility of an additional term ensures stability and consistency in the implementation of reform objectives.

The possibility of re-election of a court president depends exclusively on the assessment by the High Judicial Council regarding the results achieved, commitment, organisational capacity, and personal integrity of the office-holder. In this manner, only those presidents who have demonstrated a high level of professional competence, efficiency and responsibility during their term of office may be afforded the opportunity to continue in that role.

The proposed amendment introduces a necessary degree of flexibility into the functioning of the judicial branch. It does not undermine the principle of appointment and oversight of the work of presidents of courts; on the contrary, it raises standards, since re-election of a court

president is contingent upon a positive assessment of their performance by the High Judicial Council.

Permitting an additional term for a court president constitutes an instrument for strengthening efficiency, stability and continuity in the internal governance of courts.

III. EXPLANATION OF THE MAIN LEGAL MECHANISMS AND SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

Article 1 of the Draft Law proposes an amendment to Article 77 paragraph 1 of the Law on Judges. Specifically, the existing legal provision, which limits the mandate of a court president to a single term without the possibility of re-election, is amended so as to provide that a court president shall hold office for a term with the possibility of one further re-election.

This solution contributes to the stability of internal court governance, particularly in relation to human resource planning, the organisation of judges and court staff, the drafting and implementation of acts on internal organisation and job classification, and the continuation of reform and organisational activities which might otherwise be disrupted by a mandatory change of leadership.

Accordingly, the introduction of the possibility of one additional term ensures better institutional stability, consistency and accountability in the performance of the function of court president, while maintaining the control role of the High Judicial Council in deciding on re-election.

Article 2 of the Draft Law regulates the entry into force of the Law.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

No funds from the Budget of the Republic of Serbia are required for the implementation of this Law.

V. REASONS FOR ADOPTION UNDER URGENT PROCEDURE

It is proposed that the Law be adopted under an urgent legislative procedure, since failure to do so may result in adverse consequences for the functioning of the courts.

EXPLANATORY REPORT ON THE LAW ON THE SEATS AND TERRITORIAL JURISDICTIONS OF COURTS AND PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICES

I. CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

Constitutional basis for the adoption of this Law is contained in Article 143, paragraph 1 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia which provides that the establishment, abolition, types, jurisdiction, territorial jurisdiction and seats of courts, the composition of courts and procedure before courts shall be regulated by law, as well as in Article 155, paragraph 4 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, which stipulates that the establishment, abolition, organisation and jurisdiction of the Public Prosecutor's Office shall be regulated by law.

II. REASONS FOR ENACTING THE LAW

The adoption of this Law is necessitated by the need to enhance the efficiency, accessibility and functionality of the judicial system through the alignment of the court and prosecutorial network with actual demographic, territorial, economic and organisational conditions. This Law constitutes a necessary and systemically justified step towards alleviating the caseload burden of courts and public prosecutor's offices in Belgrade, ensuring conditions for efficient proceedings and preparing the judicial system for a significant increase in the number of cases, particularly in light of the forthcoming activities related to Expo 2027. Taking into account all the aforementioned circumstances, the adoption of this Law is indispensable for the enhancement of legal certainty in the work of judicial authorities.

The excessive workload of the existing Third Basic Court in Belgrade constitutes one of the principal reasons necessitating the establishment of a new Fourth Basic Court in Belgrade. In 2024, the Third Basic Court in Belgrade received 7,778 new cases, and in 2025 it received 6,815 new cases, with a significant increase in claims lodged against banks recorded in September 2025. These figures relate exclusively to newly registered cases and do not include the substantial number of pending cases originating from a period when a single judge of the civil department was assigned nearly 5,000 cases, which represents an objective systemic limit of efficiency.

The anticipated increase in caseload in the territory of Surčin, as a consequence of the Expo 2027 project, also constitutes a criterion for intervention within the judicial network in Belgrade. The forthcoming international event EXPO 2027 entails exceptionally intensive development in the municipality of Surčin, which will serve as the central location for the majority of infrastructure, urban development, residential, commercial and business projects. The following are expected:

- a substantial volume of new construction ("new square metres");
- an increase in construction and property-law proceedings;
- a rise in administrative disputes relating to building permits, expropriation and urban planning instruments;
- an increase in civil and non-contentious cases arising from rapid urbanisation and investment activities.

All of the above indicates that Surčin will, in the coming years, become one of the most judicially burdened areas in Serbia, thereby necessitating the timely adjustment of the court network.

In accordance with the principles of rationality, accessibility and efficiency of the judicial system, as well as the alignment of the prosecutorial network with the court network, it is provided that the seat of the current Basic Public Prosecutor's Office be relocated from Vladičin Han to Surdulica, where a Basic Court already exists, where more favourable

infrastructure and logistical conditions are available, where there is a larger population, better transport connectivity and a higher anticipated inflow of cases.

The establishment of a court unit in Kosjerić is based on criteria relating to territorial distance, access to justice, population size, caseload volume, economic activity and the need to ensure that citizens of Kosjerić are able to exercise their right to a hearing before a court within a reasonable time and to legal certainty.

III. EXPLANATION OF THE MAIN LEGAL MECHANISMS AND SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

Article 1 of the Draft Law amends Article 3 of the Law on the Seats and Territorial Jurisdictions of Courts and Public Prosecutor's Offices, which governs the seats and territorial jurisdictions of Basic Courts. The territory of the municipality of Novi Beograd is removed from the existing jurisdiction of the Third Basic Court in Belgrade and a Fourth Basic Court in Belgrade is established, with its seat in Belgrade and territorial jurisdiction over the municipality of Novi Beograd. The amendment also clarifies the jurisdiction of the First Basic Court in Belgrade in respect of international legal assistance, by authorising that court to provide international legal assistance in matters falling within the jurisdiction of the First, Second, Third and Fourth Basic Courts in Belgrade, instead of the previously existing three courts. This Article further provides for the establishment of a court unit in Kosjerić within the Basic Court in Požega, in order to facilitate access to justice for citizens in that territory.

Article 2 of the Draft Law aligns Article 4 of the Law on the Seats and Territorial Jurisdictions of Courts and Public Prosecutor's Offices relating to the jurisdiction of the Higher Court in Belgrade, by aligning the number of Basic Courts whose territories fall within the jurisdiction of that court with the amendments introduced by Article 1 of the Draft Law. Namely, instead of referring to the First, Second and Third Basic Courts, the provision now stipulates that the Higher Court in Belgrade shall have jurisdiction over the territories of all four Basic Courts in Belgrade. This is a necessary consequence of the establishment of the new court.

Article 3 of the Draft Law amends Article 9 of the Law on the Seats and Territorial Jurisdictions of Courts and Public Prosecutor's Offices, which regulates the seats and territorial jurisdictions of public prosecutor's offices. A Fourth Basic Public Prosecutor's Office in Belgrade is established, with jurisdiction over the territory of the municipality of Novi Beograd, thereby aligning the prosecutorial network with the new court organisation. Furthermore, with a view to rationalising the prosecutorial network and aligning it with the court network, the Basic Public Prosecutor's Office in Vladičin Han shall cease operations and a Basic Public Prosecutor's Office in Surdulica shall be established, with jurisdiction over the territory of the Basic Court in Surdulica.

Article 4 regulates the transitional regime until the commencement of the application of the Law. It is provided that the Third Basic Court in Belgrade and the Third Basic Public Prosecutor's Office in Belgrade shall continue to operate within their current scope until the newly established Fourth Basic Court and Fourth Basic Public Prosecutor's Office commence operations. Also, it is provided that upon the commencement of operations of the newly established authorities, the existing bodies shall directly transfer all pending cases which, according to territorial jurisdiction, fall within the competence of the new court and public prosecutor's office.

Article 5 regulates the status of judges and the appointment of an Acting President of the Court. The incumbent President of the Third Basic Court in Belgrade shall continue to perform that function until the election of the President of the Fourth Basic Court. From the date of commencement of operations of the Fourth Basic Court, one of its judges shall be appointed as Acting President pending the election of a President in accordance with the law. Judges who, at the time of entry into force of the Law, were performing judicial office in the Third Basic

Court and whose posts are transferred to the newly established Fourth Basic Court shall continue to perform judicial office in that court without re-election.

Article 6 Of the Draft Law regulates the status of Chief Public Prosecutors and Public Prosecutors. It is provided that one of the Public Prosecutors of the Fourth Basic Public Prosecutor's Office shall be appointed as Acting Chief Public Prosecutor pending the conduct of the regular election procedure. It is further provided that the Chief Public Prosecutor and Public Prosecutors of the Basic Public Prosecutor's Office in Vladičin Han shall continue to perform their duties in the newly established Basic Public Prosecutor's Office in Surdulica.

Article 7 of the Draft Law regulates the transfer of property, equipment, archives, cases and personnel. The newly established authorities shall assume the appropriate operational resources, equipment, archives, pending and other cases from the existing authorities, as well as employees in the court and prosecutorial administration, in accordance with the regulations governing civil servants and employment relations. The competent authorities are granted a period of 30 days from the entry into force of the Law to adopt new or amend existing acts on internal organisation and job classification.

Article 8 provides that this Law shall enter into force on the eighth day following its publication in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia, and that its application shall commence on 1 July 2026, in order to ensure sufficient time for all organisational and technical preparations.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

No funds from the Budget of the Republic of Serbia are required for the implementation of this Law.

V. REASONS FOR ADOPTION UNDER URGENT PROCEDURE

It is proposed that the Law be adopted under an urgent legislative procedure, since failure to do so may result in adverse consequences for the functioning of the courts.