



**USAID** | **KOSOVO**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# PROPERTY RIGHTS PROGRAM (PRP)

CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS  
CASES IN THE BASIC COURTS

SEPTEMBER 2015

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Tetra Tech.

The Property Rights Program (PRP) Task Order is being implemented under USAID Contract No. AID-OAA-I-12-00032/AID-167-TO-14-00006, Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights (STARR) IQC.

Prepared by: Ronald M. Stout, Ph.D.  
Consultant Specialist in Differentiated Case Management  
ronstout@optimum.net  
Tel: +1 914-739-1088

Tetra Tech Contacts: Brian Kemple, Chief of Party  
Bedri Pejani Street, Building 3, Floor 3  
10000 Pristina, Kosovo  
Tel: +381 (0) 38 220 707 Ext.112  
Email: brian.kemple@prpkos.com

John (Jack) Keefe, Senior Technical Advisor/Manager  
159 Bank Street, Suite 300  
Burlington, Vermont 05401  
Tel: +1 (802) 495-0282  
Email: jack.keefe@tetrattech.com

Don Cuizon, Deputy Chief of Party  
Bedri Pejani Street, Building 3, Floor 3  
10000 Pristina, Kosovo  
Tel: +381 (0) 38 220 707  
Email: don.cuizon@tetrattech.com

# PROPERTY RIGHTS PROGRAM (PRP)

CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT FOR PROPERTY  
RIGHTS CASES IN THE BASIC COURTS

SEPTEMBER 2015

## **DISCLAIMER**

This report is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of Tetra Tech and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>3.0 SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>4.0 NEXT STEPS AND ACTION PLAN</b> .....	<b>7</b>
ACTION PLAN TO INSTITUTE A CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT SYSTEM .....	8
<b>5.0 METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>10</b>
CLOSED CASE ANALYSIS .....	10
DEFINITION OF DATA ELEMENTS .....	10
COLLECTION AND PRESENTATION OF DATA.....	11
<b>6.0 DETAILED INTERIM FINDINGS AND ANALYSES</b> .....	<b>13</b>
INTERIM FINDINGS REGARDING DISPOSITIONS .....	19
INTERIM FINDINGS REGARDING CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT - THE COURTS DO NOT APPEAR TO HAVE A STRUCTURE OR PROCESSES TO SUPPORT MODERN CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES .	21
<b>7.0 APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>23</b>
APPENDIX 1: CASE CATEGORIES, DISPOSITIONS, AND CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT COMPONENTS .....	23
APPENDIX 2: INSTRUCTIONS FOR ENTERING DATA INTO SPREADSHEETS .....	27
APPENDIX 3: KOSOVO JUDICIARY PROCESSING STATUS SHEET.....	34

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CoM	Court of Merit
DCM	Differentiated Case Management
DCS	Data Collection Surveyors
JRS	Judicial Reform Specialist
KJC	Kosovo Judicial Council
NTS	National Time Standard
PRP	Property Rights Program
STARR	Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

# 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Report presents the findings from the first phase of research conducted by the USAID/Kosovo Property Rights Program (PRP) in four pilot courts (Courts of Merit – CoM) in Kosovo. That research has been directed at identifying case flow and case management bottlenecks arising in the adjudication of property cases, with the ultimate aim of designing and introducing improvements to courts’ processes and to procedural law in order to enable courts to adjudicate property claims more efficiently.

PRP designed and applied a methodology of Differentiated Case Management (DCM) to develop substantive and procedural data elements with which to disaggregate and analyze court procedures to process and resolve property cases in order to formulate recommendations to improve efficiency and court performance. PRP applied this analysis to a total of 1, 276 property rights cases that were filed and disposed within a 30-month period (2013-2015).

PRP has found that on average these cases were disposed over a considerable length of time that far exceeds international standards. PRP has also found that the courts are not using basic case management techniques for managing their caseload.

Based on these findings, PRP has identified the Next Steps to be undertaken – to introduce basic case management techniques and methods within the CoM, which will then make it possible to apply a more refined DCM analysis to the courts’ caseload and develop further specific recommendations for improving the efficiency of the CoM in adjudicating property cases.

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

The USAID/Kosovo Property Rights Program supports the Kosovo Judicial Council (KJC) to develop improved court processes to more efficiently and effectively resolve property claims and disputes. The PRP assisted the KJC to identify and establish four Courts of Merit (CoM) where specific procedures to improve court performance will be developed, piloted and tested before being replicated in all courts in Kosovo.

PRP developed a Differentiated Case Management methodology to conduct systemic and comprehensive closed case review of all property cases in the four CoM to identify specific caseflow and case management bottlenecks and constraints that impede the efficient resolution of property claims and disputes. Caseflow management is generally recognized as the most fundamental component of court management. Effective caseflow management controls the progress of cases from filing to disposition, which is the primary function of a court.

The objective of DCM is to assign cases to “tracks” depending upon substantive legal and procedural characteristics of the cases that have been shown to affect the amount of time required to dispose of cases. Each track has a National Time Standard (NTS) within which it is expected that each case in that track will be disposed.

Under this first phase of the DCM analysis, Consultant and the PRP Judicial Reform Specialist held consultative meetings with judges and registry office managers in the four CoM to identify issues affecting the processing and disposition of property rights cases. This led to the development of three areas of data elements to be collected: Categories of Property Rights Cases, Disposition Times, and Caseflow Management Components (please see Appendix 1 for a detailed definitions of these data elements). PRP then analyzed the data elements to produce statistical reports that informed development of preliminary recommendations for reforms and an implementation plan. Under the second phase of the assignment, NTS will be assigned to case tracks, the implementation plan will be finalized and court guidelines and/or legislative provisions will be developed to implement proposed reforms.

This report is divided into the following sections: Summary of Preliminary Findings, Next Steps and Action Plan, Methodology, Detailed Interim Findings and Analyses.

# 3.0 SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

1. The closed case analysis of 1,276 property rights cases in the four CoM demonstrates that the mean (average) time from registration to the judge's issuing a final written decision to dispose the case is 1,289 days; and that the median time for these cases is 1,142 days. The KJC designates as a "backlog" case any case that has been in process for over 2 years. Of the cases reviewed, 914, or 71.6 percent constitute backlog cases. Note that the KJC standard of two years substantially exceeds the standard applied to the most difficult civil cases in the US NTS, which is usually in the range of 1.25 to 1.5 years.
2. Although only a few cases were sent to mediation (23 out of 1,276), all of those sent to mediation were successfully disposed through the mediation process.
3. This closed case analysis of 1,276 property rights cases has not identified any characteristics that suggest a development of case tracks. Stated another way, there does not appear to be significant differences in time to disposition among the case characteristics and data elements analyzed.

As noted, the analysis of examined case characteristics and data elements focuses on those that have typically affected disposition times and informed development of DCM/NTS throughout the world. Nonetheless, all cases analyzed in the CoM -- regardless of characteristics such as case types, number of parties, number of attorneys, number of parties living outside of Kosovo, types of dispositions, and the bases of dispositions -- have been disposed within approximately the same time range.

4. The courts do not appear to have a structure or processes to support modern caseflow management. Data was not captured and displayed in to make key dates in processing cases easily available, such as assignment to a judge, schedules for future actions and appearances, and the elapsed amount of time from registration to the current date.
5. Analysis to date has not identified and defined any specific caseflow patterns that would inform development of a coherent DCM/NTS. Therefore, the development of the DCM/NTS for the CoM requires as a first step analyzing the current status of caseflow management in the courts. (See Section 4.0, "Next Steps and Action Plan.")

# 4.0 NEXT STEPS AND ACTION PLAN

The Consultant will visit the CoM during the week of September 21, 2015 to review and determine the extent to which two basic components of caseflow management are being used by the courts.

These two basic components consist of general caseflow management systems, augmented by additional components that have been found to be of relevance to the processing of property rights cases in the Kosovo Judiciary. The effective use of these components will both improve caseflow management and continue to provide the data necessary for the development of DCM and time standards:

1. Judges and participants in cases must clearly understand that once a case is filed with a court and assigned to a judge, the assigned judge has the authority and responsibility for the timely processing and disposition of the case.
2. A case must be controlled upon filing with a court. This requires the receiving court to promptly register the case and assign the case to a judge by entering case identification information into a case management system, either manual or automated. Thereafter, it is the responsibility of the assigned judge and staff to actively monitor and control the processing of the case from filing to disposition, including the timely scheduling of preliminary hearings and main hearings. The following information should be developed and maintained for each case:
  - a. The assignment of a unique court control number (registration number)
  - b. The date the case was registered (filed with the court)
  - c. A code for the category of the case
  - d. The name of the assigned judge
  - e. The date the case was assigned to the judge
  - f. A history of changes in the assigned judge
  - g. If the case is a retrial because of the return of a case from the appellate courts, the former case numbers
  - h. The name of each party to a case, the attorney name for each party, and whether the party resides outside of Kosovo
  - i. The date of the appointment of a defendant representative or a temporary representative.
  - j. A history of notices issued to establish jurisdiction and ensure compliance with court orders
  - k. A history of scheduled events, and the outcome of those events, including rescheduling. **NOTE: EVERY PENDING CASE MUST HAVE A FUTURE SCHEDULED DATE FOR AN APPEARANCE OR SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTS**
  - l. A history of the judicial documents that disposed of a case

Three possible findings from this review will inform further reform steps:

- The CoM lack a coherent caseload management system;
- A rudimentary caseload management system is in place, but may not provide the standard elements of caseload management;
- A caseload management system exists, but is not in use.

In the event a caseload management system is available to the CoM but not in use, PRP should assess the reasons it is not being used and develop a training plan to change attitudes and behaviors and build capacity to fully utilize the system, including production of regular internal and external status reports to monitor and guide effective caseload management.

In the event a sufficient caseload management system is not available, the following Action Plan should be implemented immediately to institute a system to introduce basic, standard elements of caseload management in the CoM:

## **ACTION PLAN TO INSTITUTE A CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

The system is based on two forms. The first form is titled KOSOVO JUDICIARY CASE PROCESSING STATUS SHEET (contained in Appendix 3). This form should be initiated for each case at the time the case is registered with the court. The form is attached to the case folder that is created at registration, and remains with the folder. Data is entered as the case is processed.

The second form is titled KOSOVO JUDICIARY CASE INVENTORY SHEET (also contained in Appendix 3). This form is maintained by the assigned judge. Data is entered as received. The column NEXT SCHEDULED DATE is changed to keep current with the processing of the case. This form is suitable for use in a word processing program to facilitate updating the scheduled date and the date disposed. This updated form should be sent at the end of each week to the President of the Court.

Steps in the process:

1. Install and train judges and staff in the use of the CASE PROCESSING STATUS SHEET and the CASE INVENTORY SHEET. If there are automated systems in use in other courts that could appropriately be installed and/or adapted for collecting the items listed in the basic component of caseload management described above, develop a plan to accomplish this.
2. Conduct an inventory of all pending property rights cases, using the CASE PROCESSING STATUS SHEET and the CASE INVENTORY SHEET.
3. With the KJC and the President Judges of the CoM, and using the data from the STATUS sheets, develop an action plan for an intensive effort to dispose of the cases, oldest case first. Although the action plans may vary, items for consideration could include:
  - a. Clearly assign to a specific individual the responsibility for the maintenance of the file system and the cross-reference.
  - b. Ensure that each newly registered case is assigned to a judge no later than 5 working days after it is registered. It is essential that a specific judge receive responsibility for each case as soon as possible.

- c. Determination of the status of service to the defendant. If it has been more than 60 days from the sending of the notice to defendant with no response, schedule the appointment of a temporary representative for the defendant within 10 days.
- d. Schedule a Preliminary Hearing for 30 days from the appointment of the temporary representative, or 30 days from the day of review of the case, if a temporary appointment is not necessary. The notice of the Preliminary Hearing must clearly state that all pleadings and all evidence must be brought to the court, and that the possibility of the use of mediation will be determined.
- e. At the conclusion of the Preliminary Hearing, the Main Hearing should be scheduled for no later than 30 days in the future. All parties should be advised that except for extraordinary reasons, a decision will be rendered at the conclusion of the Main Hearing, based on the evidence available.
- f. If it is necessary for rescheduling of a session, the reason for rescheduling and the date of the new session must be stated in court and recorded on the STATUS SHEET and the INVENTORY SHEET.
- g. EVERY PENDING CASE MUST HAVE A FUTURE SCHEDULED EVENT. File the cases by future scheduled event, and then by date registered.
- h. A weekly status report of all cases property rights cases disposed.

# 5.0 METHODOLOGY

## CLOSED CASE ANALYSIS

A closed case data analysis methodology was employed in the CoM. The CoM were selected by the PRP in close consultation with the (KJC, applying criteria agreed with the KJC. The CoM serve as agents of change where improved procedures, reforms, and “ways of doing business” will be developed, tested, piloted and then replicated in other courts.

The Courts of Merit are:

- Pejë/Peć Basic Court
- Gjilan/Gnjilane Basic Court
- Ferizaj/Uroševac Basic Court
- Shtërpcë/Štrpce, a branch of the Ferizaj/Uroševac Basic Court

The closed case analysis was limited to a two-year period. The starting date for this period of time was determined to be the date the case was entered into the CoM Court Registry. The end date was defined as the date of the last written document issued by the judge to dispose of the case. This will be referred to as the Time to Disposition throughout this report. Cases registered and disposed during the period January 28, 2013 to July 31, 2015 were included in this closed case review.

## DEFINITION OF DATA ELEMENTS

The statutes governing property rights cases were reviewed by the Consultant and PRP Judicial Reform Specialist (JRS). Consultative meetings were then held with judges and registry office managers in the four CoM to identify issues affecting the processing and disposition of property rights cases. This led to the development of three areas of data elements to be collected: Categories of Property Rights Cases, Disposition Times, and Caseflow Management Components (please see Appendix 1 for a detailed definitions of these data elements).

The Categories of Property Rights Cases were determined by the substantive legal issues involved in the case. Dispositions that end a case have been categorized as follows:

- Decision to dismiss on procedural grounds (Decision)
- Judicial agreement (Agreement)
- Judgment based on the substantive merits of the case (Judgment)

Caseflow Management Components are related to specific events in a case along the process to disposition.

A number of sub-categories under each data element were developed to help identify case processing patterns that would inform development of DCM tracks and NTS. Sub-categories include: appointment of temporary representatives, parties residing outside Kosovo, number of attorneys, number and ethnicity of parties, number of days between hearings, number of days to serve process, among others.

These sub-categories were then utilized in “queries” that analyzed the effect of these and other variables had on times to disposition. Statistics generated by these queries are discussed below in Section 5, Detailed Interim Findings and Analyses.

## COLLECTION AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

PRP contracted five Data Collection Surveyors (DCS) to obtain and capture data from CoM case registers, case folders and judicial assignment notebooks.

The case register contains the case number and registration date, information on the substance of the case (such as a brief description of the complaint, in a civil proceeding), the names of individuals, and the outcome of the case. PRP has produced for its own use a compendium of spread sheets containing the specifics of registers used in the CoM.

The case folder contains a narrative history of the case, from the filing of a claim with a court to final disposition and receipt of judgment by the parties to the case. The case folder also indicates whether the case was reviewed and returned from the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court for retrial. Retrials are recorded at the Basic Court as a new case, with reference to the case number of the earlier trial.

**Content of the case folder:** Pre-printed areas for writing information about the case.

The cover page includes:

- Case number - consecutive number of case and year e.g. 222/15 (222 /2015)
- Court
- Judge (Name)
- Plaintiff
- Defendant
- Type of dispute
- Archive date
- Retention period
- Hearing table

The edge of file folder also contains the case number.

The inside of the folder on both sides include:

- Consecutive number of action (written decision, minutes, expert document)
- Date of action
- Short description of the action
- Number of annexes
- Number of pages
- Remarks

Data captured by the DCS and used to produce the statistical analysis and findings provided below are compiled and maintained in a master spreadsheet (an Excel Workbook titled “KOSOVO CLOSED CASE ANALYSIS REVISED 01-08-2015”).

Each DCS uses a template of the spread sheet on a laptop. The data entered by the DCS is transmitted to the Consultant and PRP JRS on a daily basis, where it is consolidated into the master project spread sheet. Instructions for entering data into the spread sheet and transmitting the spread sheet are contained in APPENDIX 2 of this report.

It should be noted that the file folders do not have areas for recording case processing dates, such as registry date, scheduled appearances, and disposition date. This has constrained efficient data collection because long narratives from decisions had to be read by the DCS to obtain basic data related to caseload management such as hearing dates. The effect of this constraint is described in more detail in the analysis, findings and recommendations below.

# 6.0 DETAILED INTERIM FINDINGS AND ANALYSES

The table below titled Table 1 below lists Times to Disposition times for all cases, by category and court. Caution is needed in interpreting the measurements in categories 5, 6 and 7, because of the low number of cases. (Please refer to Appendix 1 for a description of the case categories.)

Table 1: Times to Disposition

<b>TIMES TO DISPOSITION IN DAYS – REPORTED THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2015</b>									
<b>CATEGORIES</b>									
	<b>ALL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>FERIZAJ / UROŠEVAC</b>									
<b>Mean</b>	1,509	1,434	1,998	957	1,968	3,383	0	236	317
<b>Median</b>	1,585	1,583	2,074	542	2,079	3,383	0	80	66
<b>Minimum</b>	1	44	28	5	279	3,383	0	1	8
<b>Maximum</b>	4,035	4,007	3,645	3,851	4,035	3,383	0	1,342	1,854
<b>Number of Cases</b>	291	35	149	44	17	1	0	23	22
<b>SHTËRPCË / ŠTRPCE</b>									
<b>Mean</b>	625	621	708	555	262	896	1,291	6	77
<b>Median</b>	196	192	350	152	175	896	1,291	6	77
<b>Minimum</b>	3	21	3	6	3	387	1,291	6	77
<b>Maximum</b>	4,100	4,100	2,954	2,720	585	1,404	1,291	6	77
<b>Number of Cases</b>	81	12	41	17	6	2	1	1	1
<b>GJILAN / GNJILANE</b>									
<b>Mean</b>	1,134	1,516	1,162	1,031	1,016	481	0	892	138
<b>Median</b>	1,125	1,354	1,162	1,133	901	229	0	786	202
<b>Minimum</b>	0	298	0	1	72	200	0	22	8
<b>Maximum</b>	5,087	3,872	5,087	4,937	2,417	1,015	0	1,985	203
<b>Number of Cases</b>	478	15	369	57	17	3	0	14	3
<b>PEJË / PEĆ</b>									
<b>Mean</b>	1,437	1,439	1,462	932	1,425	1,704	2,731	1,612	946
<b>Median</b>	1,144	1,176	1,156	848	1,057	1,188	2,731	1,202	833
<b>Minimum</b>	6	371	6	369	536	694	2,731	396	474
<b>Maximum</b>	4,926	4,406	4,926	1,795	4,361	3,552	2,731	4,273	1,948
<b>Number of Cases</b>	426	62	301	13	29	6	1	5	9
<b>TOTAL REPORTED THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2015</b>									
<b>Mean</b>	1,289	1,368	1,391	934	1,357	1,403	2,011	604	456
<b>Median</b>	1,142	1,176	1,237	715	1,057	1,061	2,011	243	196
<b>Minimum</b>	0	21	0	1	3	200	1,291	1	8
<b>Maximum</b>	5,087	4,406	5,087	4,937	4,361	3,552	2,731	4,273	1,948
<b>Number of Cases</b>	1,276	124	860	131	69	12	2	43	35

### **In Ferizaj/Uroševac, Gjilan/Gnjilane and Pejë/Peć, the Overall Times to Disposition are Extraordinarily Long**

This finding is especially pertinent in case categories 1 through 4, which constitute 93% of the cases. The mean and the median are reasonably close, meaning that the mean is a relatively fair and accurate measure of the time to disposition.

As a point of comparison, the American Bar Association has a standard for Time to Disposition of civil cases as of 90% within three months, 98% within six months, and 100% within 12 months. The National Center for State Courts has a standard of 75% within 180 days, 90% within 365 days, and 98% within 540 days. (Model Time Standards for the State Trial Courts, National Center for State Courts, August 2011).

There are 1,195 closed cases in the Ferizaj/Uroševac, Gjilan/Gnjilane, and Pejë/Peć data collection. Setting the standard at 540 days, 991 cases – or 83% of the closed cases would be in excess of this standard. Even using the 730 day standard (two years, over which is considered to be “in backlog” in Kosovo), 914 cases – or 76% of the cases would be in “backlog”, or over the standard.

### **In Shtërpcë/Štrpce, the Times to Disposition are of Concern**

This finding is especially pertinent in case categories 1 through 4, which constitute 93% of the cases. The mean and the median are reasonably close, meaning that the mean is a relatively fair and accurate measure of the time to disposition.

While the times to disposition are considerably less than those in Ferizaj/Uroševac, they are still of concern. There are 81 closed cases in the Shtërpcë/Štrpce data collection. Setting the standard at 540 days, 30 cases – or 37% of the closed cases would be in excess of this standard. Even using the 730 day standard (two years, over which is considered to be “in backlog” in Kosovo), 25 cases – or 31% of the cases would be in “backlog”, or over the standard.

### **There is a Marked Difference in the Mean Time to Disposition in Shtërpcë/Štrpce, compared with Ferizaj/Uroševac, Gjilan/Gnjilane and Pejë/Peć**

In Shtërpcë/Štrpce, the times to disposition are about half of the times to disposition in the other courts. Although the numbers of cases in Shtërpcë/Štrpce are low, this warrants monitoring. If the differences remain after the data collection is complete, a careful comparative examination of caseload practices between the four Courts of Merit needs to be conducted. This may lead to identification of “best practices” in caseload management.

### **In Spite of the Significant Delays in Disposition of Property Cases, the CoM Appear to be Keeping Current in Processing All Civil Cases**

The table below shows that the number of pending cases has decreased in the period beginning of 2014 through June 2015. The “clearance rate” is positive, meaning that more cases were disposed than were filed in that period. This table was based on data provided by the courts and the KJC.

However, a positive clearance rate is not the only measure of an efficient and effective court system. It has been observed in other countries that when attention is paid to the newly filed cases, courts keep current with inflow, and even reduce the overall pending caseload, but at the same time allow previous pending cases to become increasingly older. Consequently, judges may believe that the judiciary is

improving overall. This may partially explain the extreme age of the property rights cases identified in this report.

Therefore, for the purposes of implementing next steps, it is important to conduct an inventory of all pending property rights cases.

Table 2: All Civil Cases in CoM -- 2014 through June 2015

ALL CIVIL CASES IN CoM - 2014 THROUGH JUNE 2015								
Court	Transferred from previous years	New filings within 2014	Disposed within 2014	New filings within 2015-January	Disposed within 2015-June	Total pending July 1.2015	Judges assigned in 2014	Judges assigned in 2015
		Pending	Disposed	Pending	Disposed			
Gjilan / Gnjilane	2,649	959	1,095	374	562	1,886	5	5
Pejë / Peć	2,967	1,211	2,292	1,886	576	1,774	7	7
Ferizaj / Uroševac	2,523	827	1,073	367	353	2,334	3	5
Shtërpçë / Štrpce	118	76	120	68	26	63	1	1

**Remarks:** Judges report working on both contested and non-contested claims simultaneously.

### The Need to Appoint a Temporary Representative Does Not Affect Time to Disposition

Anecdotally, this is a particularly difficult type of case. The judge must appoint a Temporary Representative to act in the absent party's stead. However, the data does not support this assumption. A total of 158 such cases were identified in the 1,276 closed cases. These cases had an average time from registration to the last written document of 1,281 days. This compares with the average of all 1,276 cases of 1,289 days to final disposition.

Table 3: The Number of Parties from Both Plaintiffs and Defendants Do Not Have an Observable Consistent Effect on the Time to Disposition

	1 PARTY	2 PARTIES (Ps)	3 Ps	4 Ps	5 Ps	6 Ps	7 Ps	8 Ps	9 Ps
Mean	1,382	1,300	1,247	1,066	1,171	1,434	1,122	1,493	2,003
Median	1,240	1,139	1,199	936	1,057	1,206	1,006	1,198	1,695
Minimum	21	0	0	0	1	2	44	15	398
Maximum	2,972	5,087	4,371	3,575	4,321	4,695	3,040	3,011	3,645
Count	7	640	271	123	81	59	20	18	11
	10 Ps	11 Ps	12 Ps	13 Ps	14 Ps	15 Ps	16 Ps	17 Ps	18 Ps
Mean	1,513	2,925	1,920	762	1,032	3,778	1,574	1,478	2,266
Median	1,331	2,942	1,990	888	1,032	4,187	1,574	1,478	1,806

<b>Minimum</b>	367	1,499	85	132	713	2,874	1,574	1,478	1,280
<b>Maximum</b>	4,100	4,268	3,974	1,267	1,350	4,273	1,574	1,478	3,711
<b>Count</b>	15	5	7	3	2	3	1	1	3
	<b>20 Ps</b>	<b>21 Ps</b>	<b>23 Ps</b>	<b>43 Ps</b>					
<b>Mean</b>	215	1,169	1,881	1,079					
<b>Median</b>	215	1,169	1,881	1,079					
<b>Minimum</b>	79	1,169	993	1,079					
<b>Maximum</b>	350	1,169	2,769	1,079					
<b>Count</b>	2	1	2	1					

Table 3 calculates the statistics for cases of all categories, sorted by the number of parties reported in the case file. It is clear that the number of parties does not establish a consistent pattern that affects the time to disposition.

### **The Number of Parties Residing Outside Kosovo Does Not Have an Observable Consistent Effect on the Time to Disposition**

The table below shows the measures of time to disposition for the cases with at least one party residing outside Kosovo.

*Table 4: The Number of Parties Residing Outside Kosovo Does Not Have an Observable Consistent Effect on the Time to Disposition*

	<b>1 P</b>	<b>2 Ps</b>	<b>3 Ps</b>	<b>4 Ps</b>	<b>5 Ps</b>	<b>6 Ps</b>	<b>8 Ps</b>	<b>9 Ps</b>	<b>11 Ps</b>	<b>22 Ps</b>
<b>Mean</b>	1,351	1,343	1,159	1,088	2,131	1,499	1,689	2,107	85	993
<b>Median</b>	1,189	1,171	1,074	1,049	2,031	1,259	1,689	2,181	85	993
<b>Minimum</b>	3	27	15	15	191	20	1,689	1,267	85	993
<b>Maximum</b>	4,382	4,371	3,851	2,469	4,100	3,219	1,689	2,874	85	993
<b># of Cases</b>	188	47	22	15	8	3	1	3	1	1

The mean of the 188 cases with one party overseas is 1,351, compared with the overall mean of 1,289 for all cases. However, the mean decreases for cases with 2, 3 and 4 parties. The number of cases with five or more parties is too small to develop a meaningful finding.

### **The Number of Attorneys Appears to Have an Inconsistent Effect on the Time to Disposition**

*Table 5: The Number of Attorneys Appears to Have an Inconsistent Effect on the Time to Disposition*

	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	1,382	1,200	1,312	965	1,762	1,479
<b>Median</b>	1,302	1,057	1,040	785	1,762	1,479
<b>Minimum</b>	1	0	5	50	1,310	1,479
<b>Maximum</b>	4,926	5,087	4,695	2,843	2,214	1,479
<b># of Cases</b>	536	585	144	8	2	1

While the mean of the cases without an attorney is somewhat higher than the overall mean, cases with one attorney is lower than the overall mean of all cases, and higher again with two attorneys.

### **The Ethnicity of Plaintiffs or Defendants Does not have an Observable Effect on the Time to Disposition**

In the 1,276 cases, there were 1,814 plaintiffs and 2,559 defendants, for a total of 4,373. Virtually all of the ethnicities reported were Albanians and Serbs. There were 205 Serbian plaintiffs and 25 other ethnicities. There were 355 Serbian defendants and 43 other ethnicities. Sorting cases by ethnicity for either plaintiffs or defendants showed no difference in the time to disposition.

### **The Type of Property Ownership Does not have a Meaningful Effect on the Time to Disposition**

Four types of ownership were reported: Private (1,227) Time to Disposition 1,282, Social Property (41) Time to Disposition 1,438, Social Property Permanent Use (1) and Social Property Temporary Use (3). Although the time to disposition for Social Property is 12 percent higher than the mean for all cases, there are only 41 of these types of cases. The mean Time to Disposition for all cases in the four CoM is 1,289 days.

### **The Type of Property does not have a Significant Effect on the Time to Disposition**

The analysis is as follows:

*Table 6: The Type of Property does not have a Significant Effect on the Time to Disposition*

<b>Type of Property</b>	<b>Mean Time to Disposition (Mean for All Case Types – 1,308)</b>
1 – House	1,361
2 – Flat/Apartment	1,513
3 – Shop	1,600
4 – Agricultural Land	1,281
5 – Urban Land	1,089
6 – Forest	1,154

## INTERIM FINDINGS REGARDING DISPOSITIONS

These findings are based on analysis of the data regarding the types and substance of dispositions recorded from the closed case files.

### **Mediation, While Infrequently Used, Appears to be Effective**

Of the 1,276 cases, 23 were sent to Mediation, and 29 positive agreements were reported. No negative agreements were reported. All but one of the cases sent to mediation were in Categories 1 and 2, the other case being a Category 4.

There are two possibilities accounting for the discrepancy of the number of positive agreements and the number of cases sent to mediation. First, case file records could have been incomplete, failing to note the date sent to mediation. Second, the parties could have gone to a mediator on their own after the registration of a case, reached an agreement, and reported the agreement to the judge.

### **The Mean Time for Decisions to Dismiss on Procedural Grounds is Unusual**

The data on the types of dispositions is as follows:

*Table 7: Dispositions by Type*

<b>DISPOSITIONS BY TYPE</b>			
	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Agreement</b>	<b>Judgement</b>
<b># of Dispositions</b>	853	48	375
<b>% of Total Dispositions</b>	67	4	29
<b>Mean Time to Disposition</b>	1,401	770	1,098

The mean time to disposition for decisions to dismiss on procedural grounds is greater than the mean time for all types of dispositions. It is also approximately the same for all types of cases. Why judges did not identify grounds for dismissal earlier in the proceedings warrants further investigation. Additionally, while it is not unusual for dispositions by agreement to be shorter than dispositions by judgment, the mean times for both of these types of dispositions are excessive.

### **The Majority of Decisions to Dismiss are for Withdrawing a Suit, Failure to Appear, Failure to Pay a Fee, or Failure to Correct a Defect**

A total of 594 dismissals were based on these reasons, or 70%. It is important to note that while the mean time to disposition for dismissal varies, the majority of the times were clustered around the mean time of disposition of all cases. This indicates that conditions that led to dismissal were not detected until well into the pendency of a case.

The underlying reasons for why such conditions were not detected until years after the registration of a case need to be determined. This may be as a result of the lack of utilizing caseflow management processes to secure the presence of the parties at scheduled sessions.

It is interesting to note that 37 cases were “dismissed” because the plaintiffs and defendants reached an agreement outside of court. It is not clear why the decisions in these cases were announced by the court in a Decision, rather than an Agreement.

Finally, although anecdotally there is a problem with missing Cadastral records, only three cases were dismissed for this reason.

## **INTERIM FINDINGS REGARDING CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT - THE COURTS DO NOT APPEAR TO HAVE A STRUCTURE OR PROCESSES TO SUPPORT MODERN CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES**

These findings are based on observation of the information entered into the case registers and case file folders, together with analysis of data from the closed case review. Both the case registers and the file folders have areas for entering the substance of a case (plaintiff, defendant, claim, orders). However, they do not appear to have a structure for recording scheduled and completed case processing components. For example, the DCS had to read the text of minutes and orders to determine if and when the assignment to a judge took place, when sessions of Preliminary Hearings and Main Hearings took place, the outcome of each hearing, and the reason for rescheduling a session.

We believe that once a case is assigned to a judge, the file folder is in the possession of the judge until the final written case closing document is delivered to the parties to a case. It is only then that the file folder is returned to the Registry Office. That practice is relatively normal, but there does not appear to be a case control and scheduling system in place by examining the case file folder.

We understand that previous USAID projects may have developed caseflow management systems, but they do not appear to be in use in the CoM. The apparent lack of a case control and scheduling system needs to be confirmed by the PRP staff visiting multiple judges' offices and directly observing systems for control. Additionally, there are several observations that result from the analysis of the closed case data that supports this concern.

### **Data was not consistently available for the date that a case was assigned to a judge.**

There are cases in which the assignment date could not be determined. Also, there are instances where the number of days from registration to assignment is over 2,000. This data, however, may be incomplete and inaccurate. We learned that cases were assigned, and then reassigned, as a result of a process of reappointing judges and recruiting new judges. Tracking that information was very difficult because these assignment actions are recorded in internal notebooks.

The lack of prompt and consistent assignment of judges is troublesome. A key component of effective caseflow management is the early assignment of responsibility of a case to a judge.

### **Data was not consistently available for the date on which a defendant received a copy of the complaint, as reported to the court.**

Only 554 entries were made out of the 1,276 cases analyzed. The average number of days from registration to when the court was notified was 679. As with other data availability, it is not clear whether information about the date of the defendant notification was complete.

### **Data on notices sent to participants was relatively complete.**

A total of 12,145 notices were sent in processing 1,276 cases, for an average of 9.5 notices per case. Court messengers served 8,158, of which 514 failed, or approximately 6 percent. The Post Office was used to send 3,230 notices, of which 846 failed, or 26 percent.

Further inquiries need to be made regarding the indicated lack of success in notices to defendants, as well as the number of notices required by legislation.

**There are an unacceptable number of days from registration to the first session.**

There is an average of 683 days from registering a case to the first session. The maximum number of days was 4,237. This is somewhat alleviated by the median wait of 404 days.

The number of Preliminary Hearing Sessions and Main Hearing Sessions appears to be reasonable. However, there are some enormous spans of time between the first and last sessions.

There were 998 sessions of Preliminary Hearings, less than one per case. This is explainable by some cases moving directly to a Main Hearing, or parties reaching an agreement before the first session. The longest span from the first to the last preliminary session was 3,730 days.

Of the 998 preliminary hearing sessions, 872 were rescheduled sessions. The most common reasons were:

Absence of a defendant:	235
Appointment of an expert	103
Property examination	93
Correction of claim	81
Absence of a plaintiff	73
Non-notification of death of Defendant	50

It is important to note that 358 times, a case had to be rescheduled because of the absence of a plaintiff or defendant, or the lack of notification of the death of a defendant. This is 41 percent of the total reported reasons for rescheduling, which is a significant proportion. Further investigation of the circumstances leading to the need for rescheduling is warranted. For example, is there a fault or problem in sending notices for scheduled appearances?

There were 1,834 sessions of Main Hearings, or about 1.4 sessions per case. The longest span was 4,905 days.

Of the 1,834 main hearing sessions, 1,235 were rescheduled sessions. The most common reasons were:

Absence of a defendant:	274
Property examination	153
Appointment of an expert	146
Proposal for a hearing witness	122
Absence of the plaintiff	116
Collection of new evidence	99
Correction of claim	69
Absence of attorney	69

It is important to note that 459 times, a case had to be rescheduled because of the absence of a plaintiff, defendant, or attorney. This is 25 percent of the total reported reasons for rescheduling. Further investigation of this is warranted to determine if stronger sanctions are needed to ensure the parties to the case, especially lawyers, appear before the court and do not capriciously delay the proceedings. Further investigation of the correction of claims is also indicated, to determine if this can be accomplished in a more efficient manner and earlier in the proceedings.

# 7.0 APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1: CASE CATEGORIES, DISPOSITIONS, AND CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT COMPONENTS

### Categories of Property Rights Cases

#### 1. Acquisition of rights on property based on inheritance law

This occurs when one of the heirs was not recognized as the legal heir and did not inherit any property. This category also includes cases in which the property of the deceased is currently in ownership of a third party based on contract on sale, but at the time of death the heirs were not aware of the transaction. In addition, a few disputes are related to the portion of the inheritance property based on the amount of contribution by heirs for maintaining the property during the time where the deceased was alive and had family property or joint ownership.

#### 2. Acquisition of rights on property based in contracts

This includes issues of contract on sale, contract on gifts, contract on life custody, and adverse possession.

#### 3. Interruption of possession

This includes access to the property, property boundaries (e.g., as a result of non-definition of land borders), and parties interrupting each other's free use and possession of the property.

#### 4. Illegal occupation or possession of the property

This is related to parties that have possession of the property without any legal basis. The claimants (the legal owners) ask the court to issue a judgment to obligate the defendant to return the property to the legal owner and also compensate the cost of repairing any damage resulting from the illegal occupation.

#### 5. Constitution of Servitudes rights (Easements)

Claimants are asking the court to allow parties for different pathways across two or more pieces of property or allowing an individual that is not an owner temporary or permanent use of property.

#### 6. Reimbursement of expropriated property

This includes a claim that a municipality or the national government is using property for the general interest of society and failed to compensate the owner for the use, or did not properly evaluate the value of the property.

#### 7. Temporary measures/security measures included in claim

#### 8. Temporary measures/security measures without another claim

Temporary Measures are the most frequent cases, in which a party with that has an interest in a specific property asks the court to issue an order to forbid and/or freeze the property from any transaction or use by anyone until a dispute related to that property is resolved.

When a temporary measure/security measure is included within a broader claim, it results in recording an “additional” Case under Category 7. When a temporary measure/security measure is filed by itself an additional Case is recorded under Category 8.

## **Dispositions**

- Mediation
  - Number of cases sent to mediation
  - Number of agreements
  
- RCodes for Decisions and Judgments
  - Act-decision (procedural dismissing decision)
  - 1. Aktvendim mbi terheqjen e padise nga paditesi-t/ Act-decision based on plaintiffs withdraw from the suit
  - 2. Aktevendim per mos rregullimin e padise apo kerkese padites nga paditesi/ Act-decision for non-correction of the suit or claim requests
  - 3. Aktevendim per mospjesmarrje te paditesit ne shqyrtim gjyqsore/ Act-decision based on attendance of the plaintiff on hearing
  - 4. Aktvendim per mos pagesen e takses gjyqsore/ Act-decision as result of non-payment of court fee
  - 5. Aktvendim mbi zgjidhjen jashtegjyqsore te kontestit nga ana e paditesit / Act-decision based on plaintiffs dispute resolution outside of the court

### Aktgjykimin/ Judgment

1. Aktgjykimi i pjeseshëm / Partial Judgment
2. Aktgjykimi ne baze te pohimit / Judgment based on affirmation of the defendant related to the plaintiffs claim
3. Aktgjykimi ne baze te heqjes dore nga kërkesëpadia / Judgment based on plaintiffs withdraw from the requests on claim
4. aktgjykimi për shkak të padëgjueshmerisë / mosbindjes/ judgment based on disobedience of parties
5. Aktgjykimi për shkak të mungesës/ Judgment based on absence of the parties
6. aktgjykimi pa shqyrtim kryesor te çështjes/ Judgment without review of the main hearing subject matters

## **Case Processing Components**

- Time from Case Registration to Assignment of Judge
- Whether a case was appealed
- Property identification (are there multiple cases concerning one property)
- Ownership of property
  1. Private Property
  2. Social Property
  3. Social Property Permanent Use
  4. Social Property Temporary Use
- Type of Property
  1. House
  2. Flat/Apartment

3. Shop
  4. Agricultural Land
  5. Urban Land
  6. Forest
- Plaintiffs
    - Number
    - Number of males
    - Number of females
    - Number outside of Kosovo
    - Ethnicity
      1. Albanian
      2. Serbian
      3. Turkish
      4. RAE
      5. Other
      6. Multiple
    - Number of attorneys
    - Number of Plaintiff Representatives
    - Number of Legal Entities
  - Defendants
    - Number
    - Number of males
    - Number of females
    - Number outside of Kosovo
    - Ethnicity
      1. Albanian
      2. Serbian
      3. Turkish
      4. RAE
      5. Other
      6. Multiple
    - Number of attorneys
    - Number of Defendant Representatives
    - Temporary Representative
    - Number of Legal Entities
  - Notices
    - Number of cases of no indication of defendant receiving notice of complaint
    - Number of days between Registration to Receipt of Notice by Defendant
    - Number of notices sent by court messenger
    - Number of failures of notices by court messenger
    - Number of notices sent by post service
    - Number of failures of notices by post service
  - Session Information
    - Elapsed time from registration to first session
    - Number of sessions
    - Initial reasons for rescheduling for both preliminary and main hearing sessions
      - Dismissed on Procedural Grounds
      - For Plaintiff
      - For Defendant
    - Reasons for rescheduling for both preliminary and main hearing sessions
      1. Përmirësimi – plotësimi i padisë/ correction of claim

2. Njoftim i parregullt/mosnjoftim i të paditurit për padinë/ non notification of defendant with suit
3. Paditësi nuk ka ardhur në séance/ absence of the plaintiff in hearing
4. I padituri nuk ka ardhur në séance/ absence defendant in hearing
5. Caktimi i përfaqësuesit të përkohshëm/ appointment of the Legal Temporary Representative
6. Vendshikim/ property examination- filed work
7. Caktimi i ekspertit/ appointment of expert
8. Mbledhja dhe prezentimi i provave të reja/ collection and presentation of new evidences
9. Propozimi për dëgjim të dëshmitarëve/ proposal for hearing witnesses
10. Dëshmitari nuk ka ardhur/ absence of witness
11. Dërguar për ndërmjetësim / case send to mediation
12. Kërkesa e të dy palëve për të diskutuar marrëveshjen / proposal by plaintiff and defendant for discussing the possible agreement
13. Avokati mungon / Absence of the Attorney
14. Gjyqtari mungon / absence of Judge
15. Eksperti nuk ka ardhur ose nuk e ka dorëzuar raportin/ absence of Expert or non-delivery of the expert report
16. Zyra e kadastrit nuk ka ardhur ose nuk e ka dorëzuar dokumentin e kërkuar / Absence of Cadaster Office Representative or non-delivery of the required information
17. Zyra e regjistrat civil nuk ka ardhur ose nuk e ka dorëzuar dokumentin e kërkuar / Absence of the Civil Registry Office Representative or non-delivery of the required information
18. Kërkesë për përjashtim të gjyqtarit/ request for dismissal of the judge from the case
19. Kërkesë për përjashtim të gjykatës/ request for dismissal of the court on proceeding with the case
20. Ndërprerja e seancës për 180 ditë kur i padituri është person juridik / hold of the hearing on 180 days in cases where the defendant is state agency
21. Vdekja e palës-udhëzim për përfundimin e trashëgimisë/ death of the party and advise for determination the legal hear for continuation of the preceding
22. Per shkak te festave/ because of official holidays ( the hearing was scheduled on holiday time)
23. Per pagesen e takses gjyqesore-ekspertit per ekspertize/non -payment of the experts fee
24. Autorizimi per perfaqesim I vertetuar ne gjykatën paralele ne Serbi / lack of power of attorney ( some attorneys has the power of attorney certified in Serbia which is not recognized by Kosovo)
25. Paditësi/I padituri është I semure / due the sickness of parties
26. Me kerkese te dy paleve: paditesit dhe te paditurit per shtyerje/ request by plaintiff and defendant for postponement

## APPENDIX 2: INSTRUCTIONS FOR ENTERING DATA INTO SPREADSHEETS

### KOSOVO PROPERTY RIGHTS PROGRAM

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING AND E-MAILING CASE PROCESSING DATA COLLECTION EXCEL SPREAD SHEETS REVISED 23 JUNE 2015

1. On your computer, find and open KOSOVO CLOSED CASE ANALYSIS – TEMPLATE. This file will open in Excel.
2. When the TEMPLATE is opened, click on **File**.
3. Click on **Save As**.
4. Delete the word **TEMPLATE**. Replace with your last name and today's date in yyyy-mm-dd format. For example, if Enver is opening and preparing a file for work on 19 June 2015, the opened file will appear as:

KOSOVO CLOSED CASE ANALYSIS-TEMPLATE REVISED 01-08-2015

Enver would rename the TEMPLATE file, and the **Saved As** file name would be:

**KOSOVO CLOSED CASE ANALYSIS REVISED 01-08-2015 – FEJZULLAHI 2015-06-19**

5. Enter the data from the case files directly into the spread sheet.
6. Save the file.
7. At the end of each day, attach the file to an e-mail and send to three people:
  - a. Enver Fejzullahi: [Enver.Fejzullahi@prpkos.com](mailto:Enver.Fejzullahi@prpkos.com)
  - b. Ronald Stout: [ronstout@optimum.net](mailto:ronstout@optimum.net)
  - c. Fadil Sadiku: [fadil.sadiku@prpkos.com](mailto:fadil.sadiku@prpkos.com)
8. **DO NOT delete any daily file unless directed to do so by Enver.**
9. Repeat from Step One for the next day's work.

## KOSOVO PRP CASE PROCESSING DATA COLLECTION DEFINITIONS, CODING INSTRUCTIONS, AND DATA ENTRY INTO SPREAD SHEET

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT: Standardize the entry of information into the KOSOVO PRP CLOSED CASE ANALYSIS spread sheet.

### CASE IDENTIFICATION

NAME OF COURT – Example: FERIZAJ BC

CASE NUMBER – Assigned by court

CATEGORIES OF CASE – Enter the number code only

#### 1. **Acquisition of rights on property based on inheritance law**

This occurs when one of the heirs wasn't recognized as the legal heir and didn't inherit any property. This sub-category also includes cases in which the property of the deceased is currently in ownership of a third party based on contract on sale, but at the time of death the heirs were not aware of the transaction. In addition, a few disputes are related to the portion of the inheritance property based on the amount of contribution by heirs for maintaining the property during the time where the deceased was alive and had family property or joint ownership.

#### 2. **Acquisition of rights on property based in contracts**

This sub-category includes contract on sale, contract on gifts, contract on life custody, adverse possession, etc.

#### 3. **Interruption of possession**

These types of disputes between parties are mainly concerning access to the property, disputes over property boundaries (e.g., as a result of non-definition of land borders), and parties interrupting each other's free use and possession of the property.

#### 4. **Illegal occupation or possession of the property**

These cases are related to parties that have possession of the property without any legal basis. The claimants (the legal owner) ask the court to issue a judgment to obligate the defendant to return the property to the legal owner and also compensate the cost of repairing any damage resulting from the illegal occupation.

#### 5. **Constitution of Servitudes rights (Easements)**

Claimants are asking the court to allow parties for different pathways across two or more pieces of property or allowing an individual that is not an owner temporary or permanent use of property.

#### 6. **Reimbursement of expropriated property**

Cases in which the claim is that a municipality or the national government is using property for the general interest of society and failed to compensate the owner for the use, or did not properly evaluate the value of the property.

#### 7. **Temporary measures/security measures included in claim**

**8. Temporary measures/security measures without another claim**

Temporary Measures are the most frequent cases, in which a party, regardless if is an owner or third party that has an interest in a specific property, asks the court to issue an order to forbid and freeze the property from any transaction or use by anyone until a dispute related to that property is resolved.

When a temporary measure/security measure is included within a broader claim, create an additional Case Processing Form and enter Category 7. When a temporary measure/security measure is filed by itself create an additional Case Processing Form and enter Category 8.

GROUND FROM CLAIM – Enter short description from the claim

DATE REGISTERED – enter date that case was registered in the intake office

DATE ASSIGNED TO JUDGE – enter date that case was assigned to a judge

RETRIAL FROM APPELLATE COURT CASE #'S – If the case has been appealed and returned to the Basic Court for retrial, the case will be assigned a new case number. Enter the original case numbers of the Basic Court.

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

NAME OF LOCATION OF PROPERTY – Enter the name of the village and municipality in which the property is located.

PROPERTY # - Enter the lot number of the property from the Cadaster Office

OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY – Enter the number code only.

1. Private Property
2. Social Property
3. Social Property Permanent Use
4. Social Property Temporary Use

TYPE OF PROPERTY – Enter the number code only.

1. House
2. Flat/Apartment
3. Shop
4. Agricultural Land
5. Urban Land
6. Forest

**PLAINTIFFS AND DEFENDANTS**

PLAINTIFFS AND DEFENDANTS column headings:

PLAINTIFFS:

MALE – enter number

FEMALE – enter number

PLAINTIFFS OUTSIDE KOSOVO - If the plaintiff lives in a foreign country, enter the number of the plaintiffs.

ETHNICITY – Enter the number code only.

1. Albanian
2. Serbian
3. Turkish
4. RAE
5. Other
6. Multiple

PLAINTIFF ATTORNEYS - Enter number of attorneys

PLAINTIFF REPRESENTATIVE – enter number

LEGAL ENTITY – if a legal entity, enter the number.

DEFENDANTS:

MALE – enter number

FEMALE – enter number

DEFENDANTS OUTSIDE KOSOVO - If the plaintiff lives in a foreign country, enter the number of the plaintiffs.

ETHNICITY – Enter the number code only.

1. Albanian
2. Serbian
3. Turkish
4. RAE
5. Other
6. Multiple

DEFENDANT ATTORNEYS - Enter number of attorneys

DEFENDANT REPRESENTATIVE – enter number

LEGAL ENTITY – if a legal entity, enter the number.

TEMPORARY REPRESENTATIVE – If the defendant is absent, the judge appoints a legal representative - Y/N

## NOTICES

DATE COMPLAINT RECEIVED BY DEFENDANT AS REPORTED TO COURT

ALL OTHER NOTICES – Enter

- Total number of notices,
- Number served by Court Messenger
- Number not answered
- Number served by Post Office
- Number not answered

TOTAL # OF EXPERTS – Enter the total number of all expert witnesses called during the case.

#### MEDIATION

DATE SENT TO MEDIATION – enter the date that the judge ordered the case to mediation

DATE RETURNED FROM MEDIATION – enter the date that the court received the decision of the mediation.

MEDIATION AGREEMENT – Y/N

#### BASIC COURT DECISION – JUDICIAL AGREEMENT – JUDGMENT

##### DECISION DATE

DECISION – enter the code number

1. Aktvendim mbi terheqjen e padise nga paditesi-t/ Act-decision based on plaintiffs withdraw from the suit
2. Aktevendim per mos rregullimin e padise apo kerkese padites nga paditesi/ Act-decision for non-correction of the suit or claim requests
3. Aktevendim per mospjesmarrje te paditesit ne shqyrtim gjyqsore/ Act-decision based on attendance of the plaintiff on hearing
4. Aktvendim per mos pagesen e takses gjyqsore/ Act-decision as result of non-payment of court fee
5. Aktvendim mbi zgjidhjen jashtegjyqsore te kontestit nga ana e paditesit / Act-decision based on plaintiffs dispute resolution outside of the court
6. Aktvendim - Nderprehet procedura per shkak te vdekjes se paditesit/te paditurit/ Decision – Interruption of the trial due to the death of one of the parties
7. Aktvendim - Aprovohet padia/kerkesepadia (per rastet e pengim posedimit)/Decision – The Claim is approved (also for cases of Interruption of Possession)
8. Aktvendim -Refuzohet padia/kerkesepadia (per rastet e pengim posedimit)/ The Claim is not approved (also for cases of Interruption of Possession)
9. Aktvendim – Nderprehet seanca per shkak te gjyqvaresise/ The proceeding is interrupted due to litispence
10. Aktvendim- Gjykata shpallet inkompetente/ Decision – The court is declared incompetent
11. Aktvendim- padia hidhet poshte - si e parregullt / e pasafatshme/ Decision – the claim is rejected as being irregular/untimely
12. Gje e Gjykuar - Res Judicata
13. Mungon Historiati Kadastral- Librat jane ne Serbi/ Cadastre records missing, Cadastre Registry Books are in Serbia
14. Nderpritet procedura sipas Nenit 278 / Proceeding is interrupted pursuant to Article 278
15. Aktvendim –Lejohet/Aprovohet Masa e Sigurise/e Perkohshme/ Decision – Security/Temporary Measure is approved
16. Aktvendim – Refuzohet Masa e Sigurise/ e Perkohshme/ Decision – Security/Temporary Measure is refused
17. Aktvendim – Nderpritet Procedura me kerkesen e paleve/ The proceeding is interrupted upon the request of the parties

WRITTEN DECISION DATE

JUDICIAL AGREEMENT DATE

WRITTEN JUDICIAL AGREEMENT DATE

JUDGMENT DATE

JUDGMENT – enter code

1. Aktgjykimi i pjeseshëm / Partial Judgment
2. Aktgjykimi ne baze te pohimit / Judgment based on affirmation of the defendant related to the plaintiffs claim
3. Aktgjykimi ne baze te heqjes dore nga kërkesëpadia / Judgment based on plaintiffs withdraw from the requests on claim
4. aktgjykimi për shkak të padëgjueshmerisë / mosbindjes/ judgment based on disobedience of parties
5. Aktgjykimi për shkak të mungesës/ Judgment based on absence of the parties
6. aktgjykimi pa shqyrtim kryesor te çështjes/ Judgment without review of the main hearing subject matters
7. Aktgjykim- aprovohet padia/kerkesepadia/ Judgment – the claim is approved
8. Aktgjykim-refuzohet padia/kerkesepadia/ Judgment – the claim is not approved (refused)

#### PRELIMINARY HEARING SESSION

DATE THE FIRST SESSION WAS STARTED

DATE THE LAST SESSION WAS ENDED

NUMBER OF SESSIONS – enter the number of sessions

RESCHEDULE REASON CODE – FOR BOTH PRELIMINARY AND MAIN SESSIONS – Enter the number of times each code was used, as follows:

1. Përmirësimi – plotësimi i padisë/ correction of claim
2. Njoftim i parregullt/mosnjoftim i të paditurit për padinë/ non notification of defendant with suit
3. Paditësi nuk ka ardhur në séance/ absence of the plaintiff in hearing
4. I padituri nuk ka ardhur në séance/ absence defendant in hearing
5. Caktimi i përfaqësuesit të përkohshëm/ appointment of the Legal Temporary Representative
6. Vendshikim/ property examination- filed work
7. Caktimi i ekspertit/ appointment of expert
8. Mbledhja dhe prezentimi i provave të reja/ collection and presentation of new evidences
9. Propozimi për dëgjim të dëshmitarëve/ proposal for hearing witnesses
10. Dëshmitari nuk ka ardhur/ absence of witness
11. Dërguar për ndërmjetësim / case send to mediation
12. Kërkesa e të dy palëve për të diskutuar marrëveshjen / proposal by plaintiff and defendant for discussing the possible agreement
13. Avokati mungon / Absence of the Attorney
14. Gjyqtari mungon / absence of Judge
15. Eksperti nuk ka ardhur ose nuk e ka dorëzuar raportin/ absence of Expert or non-delivery of the expert report

16. Zyra e kadastrit nuk ka ardhur ose nuk e ka dorëzuar dokumentin e kërkuar / Absence of Cadaster Office Representative or non-delivery of the required information
17. Zyra e regjistrit civil nuk ka ardhur ose nuk e ka dorëzuar dokumentin e kërkuar / Absence of the Civil Registry Office Representative or non-delivery of the required information
18. Kërkesë për përjashtim të gjyqtarit/ request for dismissal of the judge from the case
19. Kërkesë për përjashtim të gjykatës/ request for dismissal of the court on proceeding with the case
20. Ndërprerja e seancës për 180 ditë kur i padituri është person juridik / hold of the hearing on 180 days in cases where the defendant is state agency
21. Vdekja e palës-udhëzim për përfundimin e trashëgimisë/ death of the party and advise for determination the legal hear for continuation of the preceding
22. Per shkak te festave/ because of official holidays ( the hearing was scheduled on holiday time)
23. Per pagesen e takses gjyqesore-ekspertit per ekspertize/non -payment of the experts fee
24. Autorizimi per perfaqesim I vertetuar ne gjykatën paralele ne Serbi / lack of power of attorney ( some attorneys has the power of attorney certified in Serbia which is not recognized by Kosovo)
25. Paditesi/I padituri eshte I semure / due the sickness of parties
26. Me kerkese te dy paleve: paditesit dhe te paditurit per shtyerje/ request by plaintiff and defendant for postponement
27. Per shkak te kushteve atmosferike-vendngjarje/ Due to weather condition on site inspection
28. Pengim I procedurës nga pjesëmarrësit/ Impediment of the proceeding by other participants

#### MAIN HEARING SESSIONS

DATE THE FIRST SESSION WAS STARTED

DATE THE LAST SESSION WAS ENDED

NUMBER OF SESSIONS – enter the number of sessions

RESCHEDULE REASON CODE – Enter the number of times each code was used. Select from list for PRELIMINARY HEARING SESSIONS, above.



(METHOD: C FOR COURT MESSENGER, M FOR MAIL)  
 (TABLE CAN BE EXPANDED OR USE CONTINUATION TABLES AS EXPERIENCE DICTATES)

SCHEDULED EVENTS								
DATE	PURPOSE	OUTCOME	DATE	PURPOSE	OUTCOME	DATE	PURPOSE	OUTCOME

(DATE IS SCHEDULED DATE)  
 (PURPOSE CAN INCLUDE MEDIATION, PRELIMINARY HEARING, MAIN HEARING, EXPERT REPORT DUE)  
 (OUTCOME CAN INCLUDE DECISION, JUDICIAL AGREEMENT, JUDGMENT, OR USE RESCHEDULE REASON CODES)  
 (TABLE CAN BE EXPANDED OR USE CONTINUATION TABLES AS EXPERIENCE DICTATES)

JUDICIAL DOCUMENT							
TYPE	DECISION CODE	DATE	DATE DELIVERED	TYPE	DECISION CODE	DATE	DATE DELIVERED

(TYPE CAN INCLUDE DECISION, JUDICIAL AGREEMENT, JUDGMENT)  
 (THIS CAN BE EXPANDED AS EXPERIENCE DICTATES)



**U.S. Agency for International Development**

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

**[www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)**