

**SUPREME COURT OF KOSOVO**  
**GJYKATA SUPREME E KOSOVËS**  
**VRHOVNI SUD KOSOVA**

**KOSOVO PROPERTY AGENCY (KPA) APPEALS PANEL**  
**KOLEGJI I APELIT TË AGJENICISË KOSOVARE TË PRONËS-AKP-së**  
**ŽALBENO VEÇE KOSOVSKE AGENCIJA ZA IMOVINU-KAI**

GSK-KPA-A-048/15

Prishtinë/Priština

2 November 2016

In the proceedings of:

**B. P. (son of the deceased M. P.)**

Street “Çergaska no79”

**Appellant**

vs.

**A. K.**

Representative: B. L, lawyer

**Appellee**

The KPA Appeals Panel of the Supreme Court of Kosovo, composed of Sylejman Nuredini, Presiding Judge, Krassimir Mazgalov and Beshir Islami, Judges, deciding on the Appeals against the Decision of the Kosovo Property Claims Commission KPCC/D/A/228/2014 dated 13 March 2014 (case files registered at the KPA under numbers KPA93327, KPA93335 and KPA93353), after deliberation held on 2 November 2016, issues the following

## JUDGMENT

1. The Appeals of B. P., registered under the numbers GSK-KPA-A-048/2015, GSK-KPA-A-054/2015 and GSK-KPA-A-60/2015, are joined in a single case under the number GSK-KPA-A-048/2015.
2. The Appeals of B. P., filed against Decision of KPCC/D/A/228/2014 (case files registered at the KPA under numbers KPA93327, KPA93335 and KPA93353), dated 13 March 2014, are rejected as unfounded.
3. The Decision of the Kosovo Property Claims Commission KPCC/D/A/228/2014 dated 13 March 2014, as far as it regards to KPA93327, KPA93335, and KPA93353 is confirmed.

### Procedural and factual background

1. On 23 March 2007, M. P. (hereinafter: the Claimant) filed two Claims at the Kosovo Property Agency (hereinafter: KPA) seeking for confirmation of the Ownership Right and Repossession over the cadastre parcel no 91/1, cultivated land with the surface of 5.99.99 ha (initially claimed at the KPA under the Claim No KPA32129) and cadastral parcel no 90/1, meadow with the surface of 1.27.15 ha (initially claimed at the KPA under the Claim No KPA32127) both parcels located at the place called "Piskote" at Municipality of Gjakova/Đakovica (hereinafter: the claimed properties).
2. The Claimant declared that the possession over the claimed properties initially was lost due to the armed conflict, indicating 15 June 1999 as the date of loss, but later on he had authorized A. K.(hereinafter: the Respondent) to divide the claimed properties and create new cadastral parcels with purpose of selling them. The Respondent misused the Power of Attorney No 463/2004 certified before Municipality of Kragujevac on 9 October 2004 that was given to him and he manipulated with the claimed properties.
3. Together with the Claim the Claimant provided the KPA with the following documents:

- Transcription of the Possession List no 1013 issued by Geodesic Authority of Republic of Serbia, Municipality of Gjakova/Đakovica, listing the claimed properties on the Claimant's name. The transcript of the Possession List does not contain the date of issuance.
  - Written Statement of the Claimant, dated 23 March 2007 through which he declared that the Respondent, in his capacity of an owner of the Real Estate Agency "Kontakti" from Peja/Peč through Ms. M. M., the owner of the Real Estate Agency "Horizont" from Kragujevac, contacted him and offered his services for mediation and sale of the claimed properties. According to the statement the Claimant agreed with the Respondent to sell the claimed properties for the price 1000 euro per each ar. The first sale on the Claimant's account was made by the Respondent on 28 December 2004. Later on the Claimant revoked the power of Attorney that was given to the Respondent but the Respondent abused with the revoked Power of Attorney and has sold a part of the properties. Besides selling the properties without the Claimant's consent, the Respondent usurped the rest of properties and so far the Claimant is not aware what the Respondent did with the properties.
  - Death Certificate no 203-790/2014 issued by Civil Registration Office of Arandelovac on 23 May 2014 showing M. P. passed away on 13 May 2014. The Death Certificate was submitted by B. P., the son of M. P.
4. From the findings of the Executive Secretariat of the KPA (Verification Reports dated on 7 and 13 February 2014) it is concluded that the claimed properties (cadastral parcel 90/1 and cadastral parcel 91/1) were divided into the new cadastral parcels as well as there were created new claims. The new number Claims and Cadastral Parcels claimed by the Claimant are registered as follows:

<b>Appeal and KPA Case number</b>	<b>Data concerning the claimed parcel</b>
GSK-KPA-A-048/15 (Initial claim no KPA32129, new claim no KPA93327)	Parcel no. 91/58 at the place called "Piskote", with a surface of 00.20.02 ha
GSK-KPA-A-054/15 (Initial claim no KPA32127, new claim no KPA93335)	Parcel no. 91/50 at the place called "Piskote", with a surface of 0.20.02 ha
GSK-KPA-A-060/15 (initial claim no KPA32127)	Parcel no. 91/44 at the place called "Piskote", with a surface of 00.15.00 ha

new claim no KPA93353)	
------------------------	--

5. The notification of the claimed properties was performed on 12 November 2013. It was found out that on the cadastral parcel no 91/58 exists a house which was under construction and the rest of the claimed properties were found to be occupied by the Respondent who was not present during the process of the Notification.
6. The Verification Report, dated on 7 February 2014 shows that the division of the cadastral parcels was done based on Cadastral Ruling No 952-02-347/04 dated on 11 October 2004 which was issued upon the Request of an authorized person. Regarding the claimed properties the officials of the Department of the Cadaster of the Municipality of Gjakova/Đakovica confirmed that the properties have undergone many changes. The changes relate to the numbers and surfaces of the parcels because there were created new cadastral parcels as well as the new owners because the claimed properties were sold.
7. With its Decision KPCC/D/A/228/2014 dated 13 March 2014, the Kosovo Property Claims Commission (hereinafter: KPCC) dismissed the claims. In its reasoning, the KPCC stated that the Claimant did not lose possession over the claimed properties as a result of the 1998-1999 conflict, but as a result of the voluntary disposal after the conflict, consequently, the claims fall outside of the Commissions jurisdiction.
8. The Claimant passed away on 13 May 2014 after the KPCC Decision was issued. The Decision was served on the Claimant's son, B. P on 25 August 2014. On 22 September 2014, B. P. (hereinafter: the Appellant) filed an appeal against the KPCC Decision. The appeal was served to A. K. (hereinafter: the Appellee) on 12 February 2014. He responded to the Appeal on 6 March 2015.

### **The allegations of the parties**

#### **The Appellant**

9. The Appellant alleges that the KPCC Decision contains fundamental errors and serious violation of the substantive law and that the Decision rests on erroneous and incomplete determination of facts.
10. The Appellant asserts that the claimed properties belonged to his father (M.P.) and now belongs to him as a successor. The reasoning of the KPCC Decision stating that his deceased father voluntary alienated the claimed properties to the third party does not stand because the alienation occurred in illegal manner, thus, the civil and criminal proceedings have been initiated and they are still ongoing.
11. Finally, the Appellant seeks the KPA Appeals Panel of the Supreme Court of Kosovo not to allow further alienation of the claimed properties until the civil and criminal proceedings are over, meaning not to dismiss his claims.

### **The Appellee**

12. The Appellee's response refers to the KPCC Decision no KPCC/D/A/227/2014 dated on 13 March 2014 (the Appellee was in the capacity of the Appellant while appealing the Decision KPCC/D/A/227/2014 dated on 13 March 2014). The Appellee denied the allegations of the Appellant by declaring the Appellant had sold the claimed properties through him as a representative.
13. The Appellee has confirmed that regarding the same issue the Appellant has initiated Civil Proceedings that relate to the compensation of the value of the real estate. The proceeding is ongoing before Basic Court of Peja/Peč. Further, the Appellee gives the detail explanations relating to the stages of the court proceedings. He seeks from the Supreme Court to reject the appeals of the Appellant as ungrounded. According to the Appellee, the Supreme Court should declare itself incompetent on the grounds of litispence because there is already a civil case C. No. 196/12 pending at the Basic Court in Pejë/Peč with the claimed properties as well as the parties being the subject of that procedure.
14. To support his response to the appeal, the Appellee submitted the following documents:
  - A Power of Attorney No 463/2004 certified before Municipality of Kragujevac on 9 October 2004 through which the Appellant authorized the Real Estate Agency "Kontakt" from Pejë/Peč respectively its owner, A. K., to undertake all actions for measuring and

physical division of claimed parcels 90/1 and 91/1 with a total surface of 07.27.14 ha registered in the Possession List no. 1013 at the Cadastral Zone Jahoc/Jahoc, Municipality of Gjakovë/Đakovica.

- A Letter Confirmation of the Municipal Assembly of Gjakova/Đakovica dated on 22 April 2005 giving its consent for division of the properties.
- The Decision No 952-02-347/04 issued by the Directorate of Cadaster of the Municipality of Gjakovë/Đakovica, dated 25 April 2005, for approving the request of the Appellant for physical division of parcels 90/1 and 91/1 and creation of new parcels. The request contains as well as the claimed properties as described at the table of paragraph 4 of the Judgment.
- The Lawsuit filed by before Municipal Court of Gjakova/Đakovica on 18 December 2006. The Lawsuit was filed by the Appellant against the Appelle for payment of debt at the amount of 155.00.00 Euro.
- Various other documents (powers of attorney minutes of the Courts) which are not relevant for the case.

### **Legal reasoning**

#### **Admissibility of the appeal**

15. The appeals are admissible. They have been filed within the period of 30 days prescribed in Section 12.1 of UNMIK Regulation 2006/50 on the Resolution of Claims Relating to Private Immovable Property, Including Agricultural and Commercial Property, as amended by Law No. 03/L-079.

#### **Joining of appeals**

16. According to section 13.4 of UNMIK Regulation 2006/50 as amended by Law No. 03/L-079, the Supreme Court can decide on joined or merged appeals, when such joining or merger of claims has been decided by the Commission pursuant to Section 11.3 (a) the law. This section allows the Commission to take into consideration the joining or merger of

claims in order to review and render decisions when there are common legal and evidentiary issues.

17. The provisions of Law on Civil Procedure that are applicable in the proceeding before the Appeals Panel of the Supreme Court pursuant to Section 12.2 of UNMIK Regulation 2006/50, as amended by Law No. 03/L-079, as well as provision of Article 408.1 as read with Article 193 of the Law No. 03/L006 on Contested Procedure, provide for the possibility of joining of all claims through a ruling if that would ensure court effectiveness and efficiency of the case.
18. In the text of appeals filed by the Appellant, the Supreme Court observes that apart from a different case number for which the respective appeal is filed, the facts, the legal grounds and the evidentiary issues are exactly the same in three cases. Only the cadastral parcels, subject of the property right which is alleged in each claim, is different. The appeals are based on the same explanatory statement and on the same documentation. Moreover, the KPCC's legal reasoning for the claims is the same one.
19. The appeals registered under the numbers GSK-KPA-A-048/15, GSK-KPA-A-054/15, GSK-KPA-A-060/15 are joined in a single case under the number GSK-KPA-A-048/15

### **Jurisdiction**

20. According to Section 3.1 of the Law 03/L-079, the KPCC has the competence to resolve conflict related claims involving circumstances directly related to or resulting from the armed conflict that occurred in Kosovo between 27 February 1998 and 20 June 1999. Thus, a Claimant is not only to provide his ownership right over a private immovable property but also to show that he or she is not now able to exercise such property rights by reason of circumstances directly related to or resulting from the armed conflict.
21. The KPCC decided that the matter is not in its jurisdiction since the loss of possession does not derive from the circumstances of the armed conflict but as a result of the voluntary disposal after the conflict.
22. The Supreme Court also concludes that the Ownership Right and Possession over the claimed properties is not lost because of the armed conflict of 1998-1999 in Kosovo. This conclusion is based on the confirmation of the cadastral officials that cadastral records were

updated on the name of the new owners. Moreover, the Appellant's father, through his written statement dated on 23 March 2007, confirms that the Appellee, contacted him and offered his services for mediation and SALE of the claimed properties. The Appellant's father agreed with the Appellee to sell the claimed properties for the price 1000 euro per each ar. Based on the written statement the first sale on the Appellant's father account was performed by the Appellee on 28 December 2004. This uncontested by the parties fact proves that the Appellant voluntarily disposed of the claimed properties.

23. The Appellant also indirectly confirmed the sale by alleging that the alienation of the claimed properties occurred in illegal manner, thus, he has initiated Civil Proceedings for the compensation of the value of the real estate.
24. The Supreme Court considers that the above mentioned facts lead to conclusion that the loss of the possession over the claimed properties does not derive from the armed conflict occurred during 1998 -1999. The allegation of the Appellant regarding the validity of the alienation of the claimed properties cannot be assessed in these proceedings by the KPA Appeals Panel of the Supreme Court due to the lack of jurisdiction.
25. The challenged Decision of KPCC was issued in full and fair determination of the factual situation and on such ground both the material and procedural law was properly applied.
26. Therefore, the Supreme Court concludes that KPCC by dismissing the claim as falling outside its jurisdiction has rendered a correct decision. Consequently, the appeal has to be rejected as unfounded.
27. In the light of foregoing, pursuant to Section 13.3 under (c) of the Law 03/L-079, it was decided as in the enacting clause of this Judgment.
28. This Judgment is without prejudice of the right of the Appellant to pursue its alleged right before the competent court, if he considers it necessary.

### **Legal Advice**

29. Pursuant to Section 13.6 of the Law 03/L-079, this Judgment is final and enforceable and cannot be challenged through ordinary or extraordinary remedies.

**Sylejman Nuredini, Presiding Judge**

**Krassimir Mazgalov, EULEX Judge**

**Beshir Islami, Judge**

**Sandra Gudaityte, EULEX Registrar**