



# BAR ASSOCIATION OF SERBIA

Dečanska 13, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia  
Telephone: +381 11 32-39-072 Fax: +381 11 32-32-203  
e-mail: [a.k.srbije@gmail.com](mailto:a.k.srbije@gmail.com)

No.: 219/2017  
Date: 06.04.2017.

**Attn: CCBE PRESIDENCY  
Mr RUTHVEN GEMMEL WS, CCBE PRESIDENT**

Distinguished Mr. President,

As the representative of the Bar Association of Serbia with the CCBE, and still the president of the Bar, I regret to be in the position to inform you as follows about the situation in and problems faced by the legal profession of Serbia, which may jeopardise its independent and autonomous status:

**A) Disputes between the Bar Association of Serbia and the Bar Association of Belgrade**

In the period from 2010 to the time of submission of this memorandum, the Bar Association of Belgrade (hereinafter also referred to as "BAB") and the attorneys-at-law Mr Slobodan Šoškić, Mr Radoslav Nedić and Mr Nebojša Avlijaš instituted against the Bar Association of Serbia (hereinafter also referred to as "BAS") more than 20 court proceedings, without trying to resolve the underlying problems amicably, whereby they undermined the independence of the profession through interference of the judicial branch in the internal matters of the legal profession. In the case before the Higher Court in Belgrade No. P 1071/2015, the Judgement of 2 October 2015 annulled the decision of the BAS Assembly held on 11 February 2012, which had confirmed the mandates of the president, vice-president, members of the Supervisory Board, disciplinary prosecutor and deputy disciplinary prosecutor, the president, deputy president and judges of the BAS Disciplinary Court, and of the elected member of the BAS Council, i.e. the mandates of the members of the bodies and offices of the BAS who had been elected at the said Assembly session by a secret and direct vote. It was in those elections that I was elected BAS President and attorney-at-law Zoran Jevrić was elected BAS Vice-President. This Judgement became final as the Appellate Court in Belgrade, by its Judgement Gž 1492/16 of 31 March 2016, dismissed the appeal of the Bar Association of Serbia. The Bar Association of Serbia received the Judgement of the Appellate Court in Belgrade on 19 May 2016. Interestingly, the same judge of the Higher Court in Belgrade who delivered the Judgment No. P 1071/2015 of 2 October 2015 had previously made a ruling whereby the Higher Court in Belgrade declared a lack of subject-matter jurisdiction to hear the case brought by the Bar Association of Belgrade and Msrs Slobodan Šoškić, Radoslav Nedić and Nebojša Avlijaš, but the said ruling was changed by a decision of the Supreme Court of Cassation, which found that the Higher Court was competent to hear the case. The annulment of the decision of the Bar Association of Serbia of 11 February 2012 resulted in the restoration of the legal situation that was effective before the said decision was made, and the mandates of all the above bodies and offices of the Bar Association of Serbia, including those of the president and vice-president, were annulled (it should be noted in particular that my mandate, which was annulled by this Judgement, had begun on 11 February 2012 and expired on 11 February 2016, while the said Judgement became final no sooner than three months after the expiry of my full term in office, during which innumerable decisions were

made concerning the status of the profession, as well as second-instance decisions in administrative proceedings and disciplinary proceedings).

In the present situation, after the Judgement of the Higher Court in Belgrade No. P 1017/2015 of 2 October 2015 became final, conditions were met for the application of Articles 26, para. 3, Article 38, para. 3, and Article 40, para. 3, of the BAS Statute, which provide that the rights and duties of the incumbent bodies will be effective until the mandates of newly-elected president/members of the Supervisory Board/disciplinary bodies have been confirmed.

Until 11 February 2012, I performed the duty of President of the Bar Association of Serbia as the candidate who was elected by a secret and direct vote in the elections conducted by the Assembly on 20 June 2009, and as of 7 June 2016 I have performed this duty on the basis of Article 26, para. 3, of the BAS Statute until the confirmation of mandate of the newly-elected president in order to ensure continuity of operations of the Bar Association of Serbia.

It should also be noted that at the time when the first-instance Judgement of the Higher Court in Belgrade was delivered the BAS Management Board had already made a decision to initiate the election procedure and had called the elections for Assembly members, Vice-President, Management Board, disciplinary bodies and the elective member of the BAS Council; this took place on 29 September 2015. After the Judgement of the Higher Court in Belgrade No. P 1071/2015 became final, the BAS Management Board, acting pursuant to the said Judgement, also passed a decision to call the election for the President of the Bar Association of Serbia.

Having found out that I still perform the duty of President of the Bar Association of Serbia under Article 26, para. 3, of the BAS Statute, the attorney-at-law Slobodan Šoškić, also acting in the capacity as the representative of the Bar Association of Belgrade, and attorney-at-law Nebojša Avlijaš, filed two new cases against the BAS before the Higher Court in Belgrade. In the case No. 5 Π<sub>1</sub> 157/16 heard before the Higher Court in Belgrade, Messrs Slobodan Šoškić and Nebojša Avlijaš and the Bar Association of Belgrade have sought the annulment of the mandate of the President of the Bar Association of Serbia in the period between 2009 and 2012. In the case No. 12 Π 1265/16 heard before the Higher Court in Belgrade, Messrs Slobodan Šoškić and Nebojša Avlijaš and the Bar Association of Belgrade have sought the annulment of the decision of the BAS Management Board calling the election for the President of the Bar Association of Serbia. These two cases are still ongoing.

Besides the court proceedings instituted by Messrs Slobodan Šoškić, Radoslav Nedić and Nebojša Avlijaš against the Bar Association of Serbia, these attorneys-at-law also instituted a series of proceedings against the Bar Association of Belgrade in the same period. In the case No. P 683/2012 heard before the Higher Court, the decision of the BAB Verification Commission No. 1576/2011 of 10 October 2011 was annulled; the annulled decision was the one confirming the mandates of the President, Vice-President, members of the Management and Supervisory boards, and of the disciplinary bodies of the Bar Association of Belgrade. This Judgement was used by Mr Slobodan Šoškić to reassume the presiding over the BAB, although the entire election procedure, as conducted in the BAB on 22 May 2010 when Mr Šoškić was elected President, was annulled by the final Judgement of the Higher Court in Belgrade No. P 21058/2010. It should be emphasised that the Judgement of the Higher Court in Belgrade in the case No. P 683/2012 has not authorised the attorney-at-law Slobodan Šoškić to preside over the BAB. In an attempt to create legal grounds for presiding over the Bar association of Belgrade, Mr Šoškić filed a motion before the Higher Court in Belgrade in the case No. P 683/2012 seeking a provisional measure that would address the disputed situation and, *inter alia*, declare that he performs the function of President of the Bar Association of Belgrade; this motion was denied by a ruling of this Court on 22 May 2013.

Bearing in mind the abovementioned Judgements whereby the election procedures conducted both in 2010 and 2011 were annulled, it is clear that there is a problem with legality of the management of the Bar Association of Belgrade. At the same time, it should be noted that even if there were no judgements annulling the elections conducted in the BAB in 2010 and 2011, the mandates of the BAB bodies elected on 22 May 2010 and confirmed by the decision of the Verification Commission of 1 June 2010 expired on 1 June 2014, and it is these mandates that Mr Šoškić relies on to claim that he is President of the Bar Association of Belgrade.

Unfortunately, elections in the Bar Association of Belgrade have not yet been conducted, nor has that Bar elected its representatives to the Assembly and the Management Board of the Bar Association of Serbia.

The failure to conduct the elections in the Bar Association of Belgrade is the one and only reason for the blockade of the overall election procedure in the Bar Association of Serbia. The Bar Association of Serbia is the national Bar whose constituent members are the Bar Association of Belgrade, the Bar Association of Vojvodina, the Bar Association of Niš, the Bar Association of Čačak, the Bar Association of Šabac, the Bar Association of Kragujevac, the Bar Association of Požarevac, and the Bar Association of Zaječar. Representatives to the Assembly and the Management Board of the Bar Association of Serbia are elected by these constituent bars. All the constituent bars of the Bar Association of Serbia except the Bar Association of Belgrade elected their representatives to the Assembly and the Management Board of the Bar Association of Serbia as early as in 2015. It is up to the Bar Association of Belgrade, as the largest constituent bar of the BAS, counting more than 4,100 members, to elect 46% of the total number of representatives in the Bar Association of Serbia. After the new Assembly of the Bar Association of Serbia is established, its duty is to elect the President, Vice-President, members of the Management Board, disciplinary bodies and the elective member of the BAS Council for the next term.

The Statute of the Bar Association of Serbia provides that the Assembly of the Bar is constituted upon verification of all its representatives (Article 20), wherefore it is not possible to constitute the BAS Assembly without the representatives of the BAB, or to conduct elections for the bodies of the BAS.

Without any legal grounds Mr Slobodan Šoškić has taken over the presiding over the Bar Association of Belgrade, and he continues to do so arbitrarily; since April 2014 and as at 12 March 2017, the Bar Association of Belgrade has not paid any membership contribution to the Bar Association of Serbia. Thus, the BAB owes the BAS an amount of RSD 36,267,386.00, which is equivalent to EUR 292,621.35.

#### B) Disputes between the Bar Association of Serbia and the Bar Association of Vojvodina

The disputes between the Bar Association of Serbia and the Bar Association of Vojvodina (hereinafter also referred to as "BAV") date back to November 2015, when the latter bar stopped paying the membership contribution. In the initial period, from November 2015 to June 2016, the BAV contested the duty to pay membership contribution as provided for by the Legal Profession Act and the BAS Statute, because the BAS Assembly did not adopt financial plans for the years 2015 and 2016. While it is not disputed that the BAS Assembly did not adopt financial plans for 2015, 2016 and 2017, it is also true that Assembly was convened three times and that it was never held due to the lack of quorum. It would be interesting to note that out of the 30 delegates of the BAV, as many as 29 failed to show up when invited to attend the Assembly session on two of those occasions, and the one delegate who attended the Assembly and who works at the law office of attorney-at-law Mr Srđan Simikić, the President of the Bar Association of Vojvodina, refused to sign the list of attendants. When the third invitation was sent, 7 of the 30 delegates of the Bar Association of Vojvodina attended the Assembly.

The Bar Association of Vojvodina has not paid the membership contribution since June 2016, with an explanation that the contribution invoices are signed by an unauthorised person, ignoring the fact that Article 26, para. 3, of the BAS Statute provides for the duty of the incumbent president of the BAS (of the previous term) to exercise his/her rights and duties until the president-elect has been confirmed.

Curiously enough, the terms in office of the President and the bodies of the Bar Association of Vojvodina expired on 18 January 2017, and the Electoral Assembly of that Bar has not yet been convened. However, the President and the Secretary of the Management Board of the Bar Association of Vojvodina rely on direct application of the Statute of the Bar Association of Serbia in the part concerning the duty of the incumbent president to exercise his/her rights and duties until the confirmation of mandate of the president-elect, despite the fact that an extraordinary session of the BAV Assembly was held on 13 March 2017 whereat it was ordered to the Management Board and the President of the Bar to convene the Electoral Assembly for 13 May 2017; yet, they contest this duty with regard to the presiding over and representing of the Bar Association of Serbia by the incumbent BAS President from the previous term. The Statute of the Bar Association of Vojvodina does not contain provisions as to the duty of the incumbent president to exercise the rights and duties within his/her ambit until the confirmation of mandate of the president-elect, wherefore the BAV as a constituent bar of the Bar Association of Serbia directly applies the relevant provisions of the BAS Statute.

The invoices for the previous period, which are contested by the Bar Association of Vojvodina, were issued to the amount of membership contributions payable to the Bar Association of Serbia by its constituent bars as determined in March 2013; the amount has not been changed as at the day of submitting this memorandum.

The amount the Bar Association of Vojvodina owes to the Bar Association of Serbia as at 12 March 2017 is RSD 9,773,110.05, which is equivalent to EUR 78,834.24.

### C) Disputes between the Bar Association of Serbia and the Bar Association of Kragujevac

The Bar Association of Kragujevac (hereinafter also referred to as "BAK") stopped paying the membership contribution in September 2015. The cause for such a decision of the BAK President was a request of the BAS Management Board to re-examine whether the candidate Dragan Bogdanović, a former President of the Municipal Court of Velika Plana, had the integrity ("worthiness") required for entry in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law. The BAS Management Board decided to re-examine whether the candidate Dragan Bogdanović met the requirements for entry into the Register of Attorneys-at-Law at the initiative of the Bar Association of Požarevac, as it had claimed since 2000, when the said candidate applied for entry for the first time, that Dragan Bogdanović was not worthy of the practice of law because of his treatment of attorneys-at-law at the time he was the President of the Municipal Court of Velika Plana, whose seat was in the territory of the Bar Association of Požarevac. At that time, Dragan Bogdanović as the President of the Municipal Court ordered the court security to search and/or deny access to the court building to all attorneys-at-law who defended the accused in the criminal cases instituted against members of the *Resistance* /Serbian: *Otpor!* movement who called for the change of the then government and President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Slobodan Milošević. After the elections of 2000, Dragan Bogdanović was retired on the grounds of age, whereupon he applied to the Bar Association of Šabac for entry in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law for the first time on 4 December 2001, and the Bar made a decision denying the entry. Dragan Bogdanović appealed the decision made in the said proceedings, and subsequently instituted an administrative dispute before the competent court; the case ended by a final decision dismissing his lawsuit. During the course of the administrative proceedings conducted before the Bar Association of Šabac, on 31 January 2002 Dragan Bogdanović applied for entry in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law of the Bar Association of Vojvodina; the Bar denied his application for entry after receiving

an opinion of the Bar Association of Požarevac. Dragan Bogdanović did not appeal this decision, nor did he file an administrative lawsuit against it. On 13 September 2002, during the course of the proceedings before the Bar Association of Šabac and the Bar Association of Vojvodina, Dragan Bogdanović was entered in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law of Montenegro, and remained registered there until 7 July 2006 when his entry was deleted at personal request. After the deletion from the Register of Attorneys-at-Law of Montenegro, Mr Bogdanović applied for entry in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law of the Bar Association of Belgrade and was entered in the Register on 10 July 2006 on the grounds of relocating his law office. Bearing in mind that Montenegro became an internationally recognised independent state and that it is not possible to relocate a law office from a foreign country, the Bar Association of Serbia exercised its right of official supervision and annulled the decision of the BAB Management Board whereby Dragan Bogdanović was entered in the BAB Register of Attorneys-at-Law on the grounds of relocation of legal practice. Dragan Bogdanović instituted an administrative dispute concerning the BAS Management Board decision, and the Supreme Court dismissed his lawsuit. During 2006 and 2007, Dragan Bogdanović was registered in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law of Kosovo, while the address of his law office was in Velika Plana, where he worked for the entire time since 2002 and his entry in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law of Montenegro. Then, Dragan Bogdanović obtained entry in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law of the Bar Association of Kragujevac; the entry was contested by the Bar Association of Požarevac and a group of attorneys-at-law of Velika Plana, and the BAS Management Board annulled this decision of the Bar Association of Kragujevac on the grounds that Mr Bogdanović did not meet the worthiness requirement for the practice of law. As the Administrative Court annulled the relevant decision of the BAS Management Board with a reasoning that the second-instance body could not conduct presentation of additional evidence to establish whether the requirements for entry into a register of attorneys-at-law were met, the Bar Association of Kragujevac was requested to repeat the assessment procedure and find, on the basis of the entire documentation and especially the remarks made by the Bar Association of Požarevac, whether Dragan Bogdanović met all the requirements for entry into the register of attorneys-at-law as provided for by the Legal Profession Act. The Bar Association of Kragujevac refused to act upon this request and stopped paying the membership contribution with an explanation that the fees would not be paid until the professional status of Dragan Bogdanović was resolved.

As of October 2016, the Bar Association of Kragujevac has refused to pay the membership contribution, asserting that the membership contribution invoices were signed by an unauthorised person.

The total amount the Bar Association of Kragujevac owes to the Bar Association of Serbia as at 12 March 2017 is RSD 2,777,704.00 (EUR 22,417.24).

#### D) Problems with covering the operating costs of the Bar Association of Serbia

In relation to the above, we may conclude that in this manner certain constituent bars of the Bar Association of Serbia unlawfully deprive the Bar Association of Serbia of funds any time they are dissatisfied with a decision made by the Bar Association of Serbia as the second-instance body in administrative proceedings, which puts at risk the exercise of public powers entrusted to it under the law and places the legal profession as a whole on the verge of direct interference by the executive power, which could well take advantage of the behaviour described above.

The information provided above clearly shows the existence of problems in the financing of activities conducted by the Bar Association of Serbia. The Legal Profession Act provides that the manner of financing is regulated by the Statute of the Bar Association of Serbia. The Statute envisages that the constituent bars pay a membership contribution to the Bar Association of Serbia that is proportional to the number of attorneys-at-law. The amount of membership contribution payable by the constituent bars of the Bar Association of Serbia was determined in

March 2013 and it equals RSD 350.00 per attorney-at-law per month (EUR 2.82); the amount has not changed since then.

Based on the decision on the amount of membership contribution made in March 2013, the Bar Association of Serbia issued the regular monthly membership contribution invoices for the month of March 2017 to all the constituent bars of the BAS; the total amount payable is RSD 3,182,900.00 (EUR 25,687.34); the share of the invoiced amount that is payable by the Bar Association of Belgrade, the Bar Association of Vojvodina and the Bar Association of Kragujevac is RSD 2,334,850.00 (EUR 18,843.22), i.e. the fees payable by these three bar associations, proportionally to the number of attorneys-at-law as their respective members, comprise 74% of the total amount invoiced for covering the operating costs of the Bar Association of Serbia. There are 9,040 attorneys-at-law registered in the Register of Attorneys-at-Law of the Bar Association of Serbia; this is the total number of all attorneys-at-law entered in the registers of attorneys-at-law of the constituent bars of the Bar Association of Serbia; attorneys-at-law are concurrently members of their respective local bar association and the Bar Association of Serbia. As at 23 March 2017, the number of attorneys-at-law entered in the BAS Register of Attorneys-at-Law is 9,040. Out of that number, 4,265 attorneys are in the Register of the Bar Association of Belgrade, 1,967 in the Register of the Bar Association of Vojvodina, and 439 in the Register of the Bar Association of Kragujevac.

The total amount payable by these three bars (BAB, BAV and BAK) to the Bar Association of Serbia as at 12 March 2017 is RSD 48,827,209.91 (EUR 393,872.83). The above amount payable and the fact that at present the Bar Association of Serbia is unable to collect almost 75% of the planned income clearly shows that the Bar operates in difficult conditions.

A particular problem in our operations is in that the conflicts between the bar associations come as a result of personal relationships. This is compounded by the fact that in the two largest constituent bars of the Bar Association of Serbia there are tendencies towards obstructing the election process (in the Bar Association of Belgrade since 2010, and for a much shorter time in the Bar Association of Vojvodina - since October 2016). Instead of the bodies and offices of the bar associations functioning normally, personal relationships between some of the officials in the bars block or impair the governance of institutions, which may result in a complete collapse of the organisation of legal profession in Serbia. The system of accountability of bodies and offices in the bar associations is dysfunctional and there are serious divisions and conflicts of opinions between the membership of a certain bar and its officials.

#### E) Exercising public powers

The Serbian Constitution guarantees the right of citizens to legal assistance provided by the legal profession as an independent and autonomous service, and by legal assistance offices established in the units of local self-government.

Under the Legal Profession Act, which entered into force on 17 May 2011, the exercise of public powers in the first instance has been entrusted to the constituent bars of the Bar Association of Serbia and to the Bar Association of Serbia in the second instance, whereas the following public powers have been entrusted exclusively to the Bar Association of Serbia: deciding on applications for entry in and on deletion and annulment of entries in the register of law partnerships, registering changes in and keeping of the register of law partnerships; regulating the content and manner of keeping the registers of attorneys-at-law, joint law offices and law trainees, and their uniform keeping in the entire territory of the Republic of Serbia; adopting programmes for and planning the organisation and manner of taking the attorney exam; adopting the Code of Professional Ethics of Attorneys-at-Law; adopting the tariff for the work of attorneys-at-law and determining the costs of entry in the register of attorneys-at-law.

The Bar Association of Belgrade and the Bar Association of Vojvodina, as the first-instance bodies in administrative proceedings, instituted a number of administrative disputes against decisions made by the Bar Association as the second-instance body in administrative proceedings, which the said bars were displeased with, but the Administrative Court rejected all such lawsuits as impermissible. However, despite the facts that the two bar associations were unsuccessful in these administrative disputes and that the decisions of the Bar Association of Serbia were final and enforceable, they have refused to comply with them, thus harming the parties to the proceedings and preventing the Bar Association of Serbia from exercising the public powers entrusted to it under the Legal Profession Act, to the detriment of citizens and attorneys-at-law. After the administrative lawsuits filed by the Bar Association of Belgrade and the Bar Association of Vojvodina were rejected as impermissible by the Administrative Court, it has been observed that the Bar Association of Vojvodina as the first-instance body in administrative proceedings started returning to the Bar Association of Serbia the decision it made in the second instance, with the reasoning that it cannot act pursuant to them because they contained "formal deficiencies" or were signed by an "unauthorised person". Such conduct, primarily on the part of the Bar Association of Vojvodina, contravenes the rules of administrative procedure in that a first-instance body unlawfully and without judicial review assesses the regularity of decisions made by a second-instance body.

Besides personal relationships, another factor to be considered in the analysis of possible causes of these problems is the relevant provisions of the Legal Profession Act. Specifically, in the Legal Profession Act that was effective from 1998 to 17 May 2011 the exercise of public powers was entrusted solely to the Bar Association of Serbia, which regulated the procedure for exercising these public powers in its Statute. The Legal Profession Act that entered into force on 17 May 2011 has entrusted the exercise of certain public powers in the first instance directly to the constituent bars of the Bar Association of Serbia, while providing for the competence and responsibility of the Bar Association of Serbia for the legality and regularity of exercise of these public powers and authorising it to take measures so as to remedy any irregularities in their exercise. However, the Constitutional Court found the legal provision that envisaged the competence and responsibility of the Bar Association of Serbia for lawful and regular exercise of the public powers and the authority of this Bar to take measures to remedy any irregularities in the exercise of the public powers to be in contravention of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, and this provision ceased to be effective. It is my opinion that such legal regulation of the matter, combined with the decision of the Constitutional Court, resulted in the strengthening of ideas that find it unnecessary to have a national bar within the structure of professional associations of attorneys-at-laws and propose that regional bars may associate among themselves on the bases of their respective interests and to the extent that suits each of them. Such a position is not prevalent in the constituent bars of the Bar Association of Serbia or among attorneys-at-law in Serbia. According to the available information, most of the attorneys-at-law of Serbia are in favour of having a strong, well-organised national bar association as the only way of preserving and protecting an independent, self-regulating and autonomous legal profession.

As noted above, the Serbian Constitution guarantees the right of citizens to legal assistance provided by the legal profession as an independent and autonomous service. In accordance with the constitutional status of the legal profession, the bars as mandatory professional associations of attorneys-at-law have been entrusted with public powers. However, the Law on State Administration provides that the relevant body of the state administration - in this case the Ministry of Justice - supervises the implementation of tasks entrusted to the holders of public powers. If after repeated warnings a holder of public powers (in this case a bar association) does not proceed with implementing the entrusted tasks, or fails to perform them in a proper and timely manner, the supervisory body of the state administration may take over the performance of the tasks for a period up to 120 days. Our bar associations have not yet been warned of unlawful conduct and failure to exercise the public powers in accordance with the law, but in a situation where the election process has been obstructed for a long time in the largest constituent

bar of the Bar Association of Serbia and where the Bar Association of Belgrade and the Bar Association of Vojvodina refuse to comply with decisions of the second-instance body, there is a real threat of undermining the independence and autonomy of the legal profession, and of interference of the Ministry of Justice with a view to removing the obvious obstacles to lawful conduct of certain bar associations.

Finally, it is my understanding that if the legal profession is independent and autonomous as it should be, and if the bar associations are the guarantors of independence and autonomy of the legal profession in the provision of legal assistance, then it is unacceptable to have courts regulate relations within the legal profession and to have interpersonal conflicts resolved by court decisions, rather than by decisions of the bodies of the bar association.

A fundamental problem here can be recognised in the following relationships: Dragoljub Đorđević - Slobodan Šoškić - Srđan Sikimić (the Presidents of the Bar Association of Belgrade and the Bar Association of Vojvodina, whose term in office has expired and they refrain from calling elections) - Zvonko Marković, President of the Bar Association of Kragujevac; in other words: interpersonal relationships instead of institutional ones, which clearly shows that attorneys-at-law as the fighters for the rule of law can do quite the opposite when mesmerised by offices they hold.

I sincerely hope that elections will be conducted this year in the Bar Association of Belgrade and the Bar Association of Vojvodina, and immediately thereafter in the Bar Association of Serbia, and that it should be a steady way towards resolving the most serious crisis that ever befell the legal profession in Serbia.

Still, dear Colleagues, bearing in mind that the legal profession of Serbia holds the role of CCBE in high regard, we are of the opinion that your mediation at this juncture would be very useful and that a meeting of all presidents of the regional bars and the president of the Bar Association of Serbia with your mediators could significantly contribute to a final return to institutional order in the legal profession of Serbia and to the resolution of all these problems.

PRESIDENT  
OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF SERBIA

  
Dragoljub Đorđević, attorney-at-law