

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

“ARCHIBALD REISS DAYS”

Belgrade, 2-3 October 2018

**THEMATIC CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
OF INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE**

VOLUME I

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies
Belgrade, 2018

Publisher

ACADEMY OF CRIMINALISTIC AND POLICE STUDIES

Belgrade, 196 Cara Dušana Street (Zemun)

Editor-in-Chief

DARKO SIMOVIĆ, PhD

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

Editors

BILJANA SIMEUNOVIĆ-PATIĆ, PhD

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

SLAVIŠA VUKOVIĆ, PhD

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

ÖBRAD STEVANOVIĆ, PhD

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

BRANKICA POPOVIĆ, PhD

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

SMILJA TEODOROVIĆ, PhD

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

ZORICA VUKAŠINOVIĆ RADOJIĆIĆ, PhD

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

NENAD KOROPANOVSKI, PhD

Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

Thematic Proceedings Reviewers

IMRE RUDAS, PhD, Obuda University, Budapest, Hungary

SLOBODAN SIMONOVIĆ, PhD, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada

NIKOLA DUJOVSKI, PhD, University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Bitola, Macedonia

ĐORĐE ĐORĐEVIĆ, PhD, Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies

JOVAN ĆIRIĆ, LLD, Constitutional Court Judge, Serbia

Computer Design

JOVAN PAVLOVIĆ

DRAGOLJUB MILUTINOVIĆ

Impression

200 copies

Print

Službeni glasnik, Belgrade

THE CONFERENCE AND THE PUBLISHING OF PROCEEDINGS WERE SUPPORTED
BY THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL
DEVELOPMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA

© 2018 Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies, Belgrade

ISBN 978-86-7020-404-1

ISBN 978-86-7020-190-3

HONORARY COMMITTEE

Goran Bošković, PhD, Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies, Belgrade, **President**
Sima Avramović, LL.D, Dean of the Faculty of Law, Belgrade
Ivica Radović, PhD, Dean of the Faculty of Security, Belgrade
Major-General Mladen Vuruna, PhD, Rector of the University of Defence, Belgrade
Branislav Đorđević, PhD, Director of the Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade

International members

Olivier Ribaux, PhD, Director of the School of Criminal Justice, University of Lausanne, Switzerland
Norbert Leitner, PhD, President of the Association of European Police Colleges,
Director of SIAK, Vienna, Austria
General Cao Shiquan, PhD, President of the Chinese National Police University,
Beijing, People's Republic of China
Hao Hongkui, PhD, President of the Criminal Investigation Police University of China,
Shenyang, People's Republic of China
Major-General Andrey Kochin, PhD, Acting Head of the St. Petersburg University
of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation
Major-General Vladimir Tretyakov, PhD, Chief of the Volgograd Academy
of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation
Police Colonel Roman Blaguta, PhD, Rector of the Lviv State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine
Major-general Vladimir Bachila, PhD, Head of the Academy of the Interior Ministry of the Republic of Belarus
José García Molina, PhD, Director of Spanish Police Academy, Avila
Police Colonel Marek Faldowski, PhD, Commandant-Rector of Police Academy, Szczytno, Poland
Lucia Kurilovská, PhD, Rector of the Academy of the Police Force, Bratislava, Slovakia
Major-General Panagiotis Kordolaimis, Commander of the Hellenic Police Academy, Athens, Greece
Yilmaz Çolak, PhD, President of the Turkish National Police Academy, Ankara
Adrian Iacob, PhD, Rector of the Police Academy "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Bucharest, Romania
Simion Carp, PhD, Rector of the Academy "Ștefan cel Mare",
Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Moldova, Kishinev
Zoltán Rajnai, PhD, Dean of the Donát Bánki Faculty of Mechanical and Safety Engineering,
Óbuda University, Hungary
Andrej Sotlar, PhD, Dean of the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, Ljubljana, Slovenia
Nikola Dujovski, PhD, Dean of Faculty of Security, Skopje, Macedonia
Predrag Čeranić, PhD, Dean of the Faculty of Security Science, University of Banja Luka, BiH
Nedžad Korajlić, PhD, Dean of the Faculty for Criminal Justice, Criminology and Security Studies,
University of Sarajevo, BiH
Velimir Raškočević, PhD, Dean of the Faculty of Law, Podgorica, Montenegro
Boban Šaranović, Director of Police Academy, Danilovgrad, Montenegro

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Biljana Simeunović-Patić, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade, **President**
Aleksy Bashan, PhD, Academy of MoI of Belarus
Andy Bécue, PhD, University of Lausanne, Switzerland
Jay Dawes, PhD, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, USA
Gorazd Meško, PhD, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, Ljubljana,
University of Maribor, Slovenia
Jozef Meteňko, PhD, Academy of Police Force, Bratislava, Slovakia
Imre Rudas, PhD, Obuda University, Budapest, Hungary
Slobodan Simonović, PhD, Western University, London, Canada
David D. Stephens, M.S., Forensic Science Consultants, Inc., USA
John Winterdyk, PhD, Mount Royal University, Calgary, Canada
Đorđe Đorđević, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Zoran Đurđević, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Stevo Jaćimovski, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Saša Mijalković, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Dragan Mladan, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Obrad Stevanović, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Dane Subošić, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Slaviša Vuković, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Petar Čisar, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Smilja Teodorović, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Jelena Radović-Stojanović, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Dragoslava Mićović, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Darko Simović, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade, **President**
Saša Milojević, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Aleksandar Bošković, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Valentina Baić, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Nenad Koropanovski, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Aleksandra Ljuština, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Nikola Milašinović, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade
Brankica Popović, PhD, UCIPS, Belgrade

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic I

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS OF CRIME

Djuradj Stakic, Zoran Ilic HELP ME TELL YOU WHAT REALLY HAPPENED: FORENSIC INTERVIEW WITH CHILDREN VICTIMS AND WITNESSES	3
Dusko Dimitrijevic MONEY LAUNDERING AND TERRORIST FINANCING ON INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL LEGAL LEVEL	15
Snezana Mojsoska, Nikola Dujovski THE NEW DIGITAL CURRENCY - BITCOIN	27
Vladimir Ristanovic SHADOW ECONOMY – IMPOTENCE OR LIFESTYLE	37
Predrag Terzic, Aleksandar Milosavljevic ACTORS OF A POLITICAL PROCESS IN THE WASTELAND OF CHALLENGES IN COMBATING POLITICAL CORRUPTION	51
Dragana Coric PERSPECTIVES OF FOUCAULT’S PANOPTICISM IN 21ST CENTURY – IS THERE VOLUNTARY BREACH OF PRIVACY ?	63
Darko Dimovski, Dragan Djurdjevic, Aleksandar Mihajlovic, Miomira Kostic ECONOMIC VICTIMISATION OF WOMEN IN THE LABOUR MARKET	73
Zoran Kesic, Darko Bikarevic DEPRIVATION OF LIFE CAUSED BY POLICE ACTS – DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN LEGAL AND ILLEGAL ACTS	83
Dragomir Jovicic, Gojko Setka INFLUNCE OF DEMOCRACY CRISIS ON SECURITY	95
Mile Sikman, Velibor Lalic METAMORPHOSIS OF TERRORISM – FROM TYRANNICIDE TO THE GLOBAL JIHADIST MOVEMENT	103
Angelina Stanojoska, Julija Jurtoska WOMEN IN PRISON: BANGKOK RULES, PRISONER’S RIGHTS AND MACEDONIAN REALITY	115
Dragan Cvetkovic, Marija Micovic, Marta Tomic FORENSIC ACCOUNTING AND CRIMINAL ACTS IN BUSINESS COMMUNITY	127
Ana Batricevic SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS OF ENVIRONMENTAL CRIME.....	137
Nikola Paunovic CHILD GROOMING THROUGH THE INTERNET.....	149

Laura Maria Stanila ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: A CHALLENGE FOR CRIMINAL LAW	163
Jelena Kupresanin INFLUENCE OF THE PRISON SENTENCE ON THE HOMEOSTASIS OF THE FAMILY SYSTEM	176
Aleksandar Sakač PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE PROSTITUTION MISDEMEANOR FROM ARTICLE 16 OF THE LAW OF PUBLIC ORDER AND PEACE IN PRACTICE IN PS SAVSKI VENAC.....	185
Topic II	
CRIMINALISTIC AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASPECTS IN SOLVING AND PROVING OF CRIMINAL OFFENCES	
Ramiro Herranc Latorre THE TREATMENT OF GENDER VIOLENCE IN SPAIN: ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT SITUATION	201
Dragana Kolaric NEW CRIMINAL OFFENCES IN THE CRIMINAL CODE OF SERBIA AND THE GUARANTEE FUNCTION OF CRIMINAL LAW.....	217
Sava Aksic JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE AS A CONDITION OF A RULE OF LAW	227
Valentina Baic, Zvonimir Ivanovic, Milan Oljaca BELIEFS OF CONVICTS ON THE VALIDITY OF THE POLYGRAPH.....	237
Katerina Krstevska Savovska, Marina Malis Sazdovska, Ljupco Todorovski THE RIGHT TO EXAMINE WITNESSES - CASES VERSUS MACEDONIA IN FRONT OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	247
Jelena Matijasevic-Obradovic, Ivan Joksic SPECIAL EVIDENTIARY ACTIONS IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ANSWER TO THE MOST DIFFICULT CONTEMPORARY FORMS OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES	259
Aleksandar Chavleski, Nikola Mickovski, Aleksandar Markoski ASSET CONFISCATION IN EU CRIMINAL LAW: STATUS PRAESENS	271
Marko Dimitrijevic THE ROLE OF EUROPEAN ANTI-FRAUD OFFICE IN PREVENTING FINANCIAL CRIMES: A NEW FRAMEWORK.....	283
Zdravko Grujic, Dragan Blagic INCRIMINATIONS AGAINST SECURITY OF COMPUTER DATA –EFFECTIVENESS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE MECHANISM DIRECTED ON CYBER CRIME	293
Dragana Cvorovic, Ivan Djokic CRIMINAL PROTECTION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (pre crime concept and the doctrine of the European Court of Human Rights)	305
Sasa Markovic VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR AT SPORTS EVENTS – LEGAL THEORY AND PRACTICAL ASPECTS.....	317

Elisabetta Bosio, Mara Mignone, Elisa Norio THE NEW DEAL OF FENTANYL: A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE U.S AND THE EUROPEAN CRIMINAL MARKETS	329
Zeljko Nincic STATE OF CRIME AS A SECURITY ASSESSMENT COMPONENT	345
Dijana Jankovic CRIMINAL LEGAL PROTECTION OF FOETUS IN THE CASE OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE OF MEDICAL MALPRACTICE	359
Jasmina Igracki, Marija Maljkovic REAL POSSIBILITIES OF PRISON INSTITUTIONS IN RESOCIALISATION OF DELINQUENTS AND PREVENTION OF CRIMINALITY	373
Natasa Markovic IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAW ON E-GOVERNMENT GOVERNED BY THE SERBIAN MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	383
Minja Blazic Pavicevic REQUEST FOR THE PROTECTION OF LEGALITY AT CRIMINAL ACTS OF ORGANIZED CRIME	393
Milan Belic, Slavica Belic THE APPLICATION OF SPECIFIC EVIDENTIAL ACTIONSIN THE PREVENTION OF ASSASSINATION ATTEMPTS –CASE STUDY „BARON“	407
Katarina Zivanovic EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPORTANCE OF THE DEFENDANT’S PRIVILEGE IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS– <i>NE BIS IN IDEM, BAN REFORMATIO</i> <i>IN PEIUS, BENEFICIUM COHAESIONIS</i>	421
Neda Savic THE FACTORS OF “GREEN” CRIME	433
Mojca Rep EXECUTION OF JUDGMENTS OF THE ECHR - A CRITERION FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SLOVENIAN JUDICIAL SYSTEM	443
Dijana Savic Bozic CYBERSTALKING - EFFICIENCY OF THE CURRENT LEGISLATION	455
Ilija Racic, Neda Nakic STRATEGIC APPROACH OF THE MINISTRY OF INTERIOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA TO COMBATING ORGANIZED CRIME	465

Topic VII

FORENSIC LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES

Svetlana Zdravkovic, Slobodan T. Jovicic STRESS AND EMOTIONS IN VOICE AND SPEECH: A FORENSIC VIEW	477
Vesna Trajkovska, Sase Gerasimoski ANALYSING MACEDONIAN TRANSLATIONS OF ENGLISH TERMS RELATED TO SOCIAL PATHOLOGY	491
Vojislav Jovanovic TEACHING MODAL VERBS IN ENGLISH AS THE LSP STUDIED AT THE ACADEMY OF CRIMINALISTIC AND POLICE STUDIES.....	501

VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR AT SPORTS EVENTS – LEGAL THEORY AND PRACTICAL ASPECTS¹

Sasa Markovic, PhD²

University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies, Belgrade

Abstract: The paper analyses the implementation of legal provisions pertaining to perpetrators of offences against public order at sports events. Conceived in such a way, the research uses methodologically appropriate procedures in order to identify and scientifically describe crucial problems in the actions of state authorities responsible for preventing and combating violence in sports events. The paper also analyses the actions of state authorities which pronounce, implement and supervise the implementation of the protective measures prohibiting attendance at certain sports events for those who commit criminal offences of this nature. The paper applies the method of content analysis, statistical method, comparative and formal-logical analyses, in order to analyze a number of examples from the practice of courts, the public prosecutor's office and the Ministry of the Interior, offering at the same time an analysis of the findings of current theoretical research and relevant legal acts and regulations. The following problems have been identified as crucial in exerting control over the above-mentioned measures, and these have been noted to occur in the procedures of: pronouncing and determining prescribed sanctions and measures, their implementation and control over their implementation. The conclusions drawn from these findings have confirmed that the main causes of the described problems include: a) discrepancy and frequent modifications of legal regulations, 2) frequent use of the principle of opportunity and lenient sanctioning policy of the courts, 3) poor coordination among state authorities which participate in suppressing this phenomenon, and 4) complicated procedures for sanctioning the persons who violate the protective measure. The consequence of the noted problems is a low level of achieving the goals of general and special prevention, and therefore absence of efficiency and effectiveness in the prevention and suppression of this phenomenon.

Keywords: violence, sports events, public gathering, criminal offence, protective measure.

INTRODUCTION

The Council of Europe (hereinafter: CoE) adopted the European Convention on Spectator Violence and Misbehaviour at Sports Events and in particular at Football Matches (hereinafter: the Convention) in Strasbourg as far back as 1985. The Convention represented a response of European states to the tragedy which had taken place at the Belgian stadium Heysel on 29

¹ The paper resulted from research within the project «Criminality in Serbia and Instruments of Government Reaction» implemented by the Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies in Belgrade, 2015-2019 scientific research cycle.

² The University of Criminalistics and Police, Belgrade, sasamarkovic975@gmail.com

May 1985.³ The adoption of the Convention was preceded by several significant documents of CoE, among which the most prominent place belongs to the Recommendation of the Parliamentary Assembly of 1983. It especially emphasizes the significance of prevention through a range of educational and cultural measures aimed at reducing violence in the society.

The main objective of the Convention was to encourage all member states of the CoE and other states-signatories to the Convention to take appropriate measures and, in accordance with their constitutional powers, include provisions which could prevent unlawful conduct at sports events in their respective legislation (С. Марковић, 2015:603-620).

The Convention pertains to three main areas: prevention, cooperation and judicial actions. Preventive measures encompass cooperation between police and sports clubs in the preparatory stages of international matches, organizing consultations between interested parties two weeks prior to a scheduled game at the latest, measures of physical separation of supporters of different teams, control of access to the stadium and prohibition of alcohol and potentially hazardous things. The Convention also stresses the need to ensure that the design and physical features of the stadia provide for the safety of the visitors; it envisages constructing barriers or fences and facilitating actions of law enforcement forces. As for cooperation, it envisages that relevant security authorities should establish contacts before international matches in order to identify and prevent possible dangers and minimize possible risks. As far as judicial measures are concerned, it envisages cooperation among judicial authorities, i.e. ensuring the insight in court records of persons against whom procedures for violence have been initiated (С. Марковић, 2016:135).

The Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia ratified the Convention in 1990.⁴ It was a basis for passing the 2003 Act on Prevention of Violence and Misbehaviour at Sport Events (hereinafter: APV) which was subject to multiple amendments and additions due to its (in) efficient implementation (2005, 2007, 2009 and 2013). It was, at the same time, the first act of this kind in Serbia. It adopted certain solutions suggested in the Convention and other documents adopted by the European Union.

Upon the adoption of the Law on Amendments and Additions to the Criminal Code (hereinafter: LAACC) in September 2009, Article 20 of the APV ceased to apply and, at the same time, an incrimination was introduced for the criminal offence of violent behavior during sports events in Article 344a CC. The extent to which the modifications and amendments of 2009 were inappropriate (Д. Коларић, 2015:12-13) and populist was soon indicated by new amendments and additions to the CC⁵ in December 2009 when the title of the offence was changed to '*violent behavior at sporting event or public gathering*'. The basic form pertains to all public gatherings and not only sport manifestations. According to some authors, this amendment was fully justified because such conduct, although now present at sports events, is likely to occur and has already occurred at other public gatherings (political and other rallies, concerts, manifestations), and it would be completely illogical to treat the same conduct at sports events and at other public gatherings with the same or similar possible outcome differently and to stipulate different kinds of liability and different sanctions (Ђ. Ђорђевић, 2010:35).

³ The final match of the 1985 European Cup was played in Heysel Stadium, Brussels, between Liverpool and Juventus. Supporters of Liverpool provoked disorder at the spectator stands in the stadium and the incident claimed the lives of 39 Juventus fans and injured around 800.

⁴ Закон о ратификацији Европске конвенције о насиљу и недоличном понашању гледалаца на спортским приредбама, посебно на фудбалским утакмицама, *Службени лист СФРЈ - Међународни уговори*, no. 9/1990.

⁵ *Службени гласник РС* no. 111/09

THE NOTION OF A SPORTS EVENT AND PUBLIC GATHERING

The Act on Sport defines the notion of sports event as a specific, planned, prepared and undertaken sport event limited in time for which there is public interest and in which several athletes participate.⁶ Sports events are organized in the form of sport manifestations (festivals, conventions, reviews, games, etc.) and sports competitions.⁷ The sports events as defined in the APV also include sports competitions and sporting manifestations. As we shall see later, it can be inferred from existing court decisions that friendly games without spectators or training matches are not deemed to be sporting events.

At the moment when the amendments and additions to the 2009 CC expanded the definition of this criminal offence, the notion of ‘public assembly’ was defined in the Public Assembly Act.⁸ A public assembly was deemed to encompass “organizing and holding a meeting or other type of gathering in a location adequate for the purpose”. However, the Constitutional Court passed a ruling IY3-204/2013 on 9 April 2015 which established that the Act was not in keeping with the Constitution. The Act ceased to be valid on 23 October 2015, on the date of publication of the decision in Official Gazette of the RS. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the Act continued to be implemented for more than six months after its unconstitutional nature had been established, and that no law applied to or regulated this area within the legal framework of Serbia for more than three months after the decision had been published Official Gazette of the RS. A new Act on Public Assembly⁹ came into force on 5 February 2016. It does not define the notion of public assembly but rather the notion of public gathering. However, sections 11, 13 and 15 refer to the term ‘assembly’. Regardless of the interpretations of the provisions of the new act from which it can be deduced that the legislator deems an assembly to denote gathering of citizens, we find it necessary to harmonize the concept with the criminal offence from Article 344a CC. Discrepancies in legal provisions and terminology lead to major problems in practice. We shall here mention, e.g., acquittals resulting from the fact that violence occurred during a friendly game of football without spectators, that is, a public assembly. A crucial question that the court had to decide on was whether the friendly game is a form of sports event or a public assembly. Namely, the authorities in charge of criminal proceedings in each case have to establish whether the action of criminal offence was perpetrated at a sports event or a public assembly because it is a mandatory element in defining the criminal offence. This leads to different interpretations of the provisions of the Public Assembly Act. Public assembly, in terms of the Act, is considered to be the gathering of more than 20 persons for the purpose of expressing, achieving and promoting state, political, social, and national beliefs and objectives, other freedoms and rights in a democratic society, as well as other forms of gathering the purpose of which is to further religious, cultural, humanitarian, sport, entertainment and other interests.

⁶ Закон о спорту (Sports Act), *Службени гласник РС*, no. 10/2016, Article 3.

⁷ *Ibid*, Article 156.

⁸ *Службени гласник РС*, nos. 51/92, 53/93, 67/93, 17/99, 33/99, 48/94, *Службени лист СРЈ*, no. 21/2001 - Одлука Савезног уставног суда, *Службени гласник РС*, nos. 29/2001, 101/2005, 88/2015 - Одлука Уставног суда.

⁹ *Службени гласник РС*, no. 6/2016

THE CRIMINAL OFFENCE OF 'VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR AT SPORTING EVENTS OR PUBLIC GATHERINGS'

The basic form of the criminal offence defined in paragraph one of Article 344a CC stipulates that whoever physically assaults or engages in an affray participants in a sporting event or public gathering perpetrates violence or causes damage to property of substantial value when arriving to or departing from a sports event or a public gathering; brings into a sports facility or throws onto the sports grounds, among spectators or participants in a public gathering objects, pyrotechnical articles or other explosive, inflammable or harmful substances that may cause bodily injury or jeopardize the participants in a sports event or a public assembly; make an unauthorized entry to the sports grounds or a section of the stadium intended for supporters of the opposing team and provokes violence, damages the sports facility, its equipment, devices and installations; behaves in a way or uses slogans at a sporting event or a public gathering to provoke national, racial, religious or some other type of hatred or intolerance based on some other ground for discrimination which results in violence or a physical altercation with participants.

The protected object of the criminal offence of violent behavior at sporting events or public gatherings are not the lives and bodies of the individuals who attend a sporting event or a public gathering, but the safety and security of all participants in the sporting event and protection against violence which could endanger all the participants in the sporting event or the public gathering, which distinguishes this criminal offence from criminal offences against life and body.

The act of perpetration consists of the following activities: 1) physical assault or physical fight with participants in a sports event or public gathering, 2) committing violence, 3) damage to property of substantial value when arriving to or departing from the sports event or public gathering, 4) bringing to a sports facility and throwing among viewers of objects, pyrotechnic articles or other explosive, inflammable or harmful substances which can cause bodily injury or endanger the health of participants in a sporting event or a public gathering, 5) unauthorized entry into the sports field and a part of the theater intended for opposing fans and provoking violence, 6) damage to a sports facility, its equipment, devices and installations, and 7) certain behaviour or use of slogans at a sporting event or a public gathering provoking national, racial, religious or other hatred or intolerance based on a discriminatory criterion resulting in violence or physical confrontation among the participants.

The perpetrator can be any other person, which means even a participant in a sporting event or a public assembly. The relevant form of liability is *mens rea*, direct or possible. For the perpetration of the basic form of the criminal offence the law stipulates the sentence of six months' to five years' imprisonment and a fine. Thus in the court decision *Кж. 1-5836/10* of 27th January 2011, the Appellate Court in Kragujevac expressed the view that if a participant in a sporting event (in the specific case, the coach of a football club) commits the criminal offence in question, it shall represent an aggravating circumstance. Namely, after the injured party, referee D. M., had signalled the end of the game, he stood at the centre of the pitch, waiting for the players to leave for the changing rooms; the defendant approached him, addressing him with multiple insults, swore, grabbed his face and the neck and caused him light bodily injuries in the form of lacerations under the eyelid and on the right side of the mandible, and then slapped him in the face three times. The court of the first instance pronounced a suspended sentence. The Appellate Court in Kragujevac changed this decision granting the appeal of the prosecutor and sentenced the defendant to imprisonment. The rationale of the decision stated that "the court of the first instance failed to give adequate significance to the circumstances which to a certain extent aggravate the criminal offence of which the defen-

dant had been convicted as compared to other criminal offences of this kind. The Court did not sufficiently acknowledge the gravity of the perpetrated act, the persistence and insolence shown by the offender, the fact that the defendant is a coach and that he was obliged to pay special attention to his behaviour since in this capacity he is responsible for upbringing of footballers and is obliged to critically evaluate their possible bad conduct. The defendant neglected this obligation of his and instead of acting in an exemplary way, he attacked the injured party in his capacity as a football referee without any cause or reason.”¹⁰

For the existence of this criminal offence it is necessary that the defendant undertakes the incriminating action at a sports event or a public gathering, but not in a situation when no viewers, i.e. no spectators, are present at a friendly football match.¹¹ The same view was taken in the ruling of the Appellate Court in Belgrade. In this case, the first-instance decision of the Higher Court in Valjevo imposed a suspended sentence and a fine on the defendant. However, acting upon an appeal, the Appellate Court took a different view. A friendly football match played on an auxiliary pitch where only members of the two football clubs were present, which was not announced to the sports association and had no referees delegated by the sports association for this game, where no delegates were present at the match and no minutes were taken could not be regarded as a sports event or a public gathering in terms of Article 2 paragraph 1 of the APV nor could the defendant and the damaged be treated as participants in the sporting event in terms of section 2 paragraph 4 of the mentioned law.¹²

The legal description of the criminal offence in Article 344a para.1 CC implies that criminal offence is perpetrated also by a person who among other things commits violence or damages property of greater value when arriving to or leaving a sports event or a public gathering, hence the observed criminal offence exists regardless of whether the action was undertaken in the stadium or outside it. In the specific case, it was a unique situation and the indictment submitted by the public prosecutor charged the defendants stating that it was actually upon departing from the event that they committed the criminal offence in question, which implies that the actions of the criminal offence could have been taken both in the stadium and in its vicinity, or upon leaving the stadium where the sports event had taken place. Thus the Appellate Court in Nis has taken a view contrary to the view of the first-degree court which had acquitted the defendants because they had perpetrated the act outside the stadium where the sports event had taken place. The decision stated that “... the view of the first-instance court is completely unacceptable, as well as the related vague reasons pertaining to crucial facts which were subject to proving, that the charges against the defendant S. were rejected because throwing a rock in the direction of a police officer was undertaken outside the stadium, therefore there was no evidence that he had committed the criminal offence of violent conduct at a sports event as per Article 344a paragraph 1 CC.”¹³

10 The ruling of the High Court in Kraljevo (Пресуда Вишег суда у Краљеву) 2К. 186/10 dtd 27/9/2010 and the ruling of the Appellate Court in Kragujevac (пресуда Апелационог суда у Крагујевцу) Кж. 1-5836/10 dtd 27/1/2011 - *Bulletin of the High Court in Kraljevo* (Билтен Вишег суда у Краљеву), no. 1/2011, Интермех, The author of the sentence: Milan Davidovic, judge of the High Court in Kraljevo.

11 The ruling of the Appellate Court in Novi Sad (Пресуда Апелационог суда у Новом Саду) КЖ. 1 552/15 dtd 2 October 2015 confirming the ruling of the High Court in Novi Sad (пресуда Вишег суда у Новом Саду) К 124/13 dtd 19 March 2015 – *Bulletin of the High Court in Novi Sad* (Билтен Вишег суда у Новом Саду), no. 6/2015, Интермех, Београд. The author of the sentence: Biljana Delic, judge of the High Court in Novi Sad.

12 The ruling of the Appellate Court in Belgrade (Пресуда Апелационог суда у Београду) Кж1-221/13 dtd 05 February 2013 – The ruling of the High Court in Valjevo (Пресуда Вишег суда у Ваљеву) К.бр.81/12 dtd 12 December 2012 – *Bulletin of the Appellate Court in Belgrade* (Билтен Апелационог суда у Београду) no. 5/2013, Интермех, Београд. The author of the sentence: Nebojsa Pavlovic, senior court associate of the Appellate Court in Belgrade.

13 The decision of the Appellate Court in Nis (Решење Апелационог суда у Нишу), Кж. 54/14 dtd 2 July 2014.

Article 344a paragraph 2 provides for the first aggravated form of the criminal offence of violent behaviour at a sports event or a public assembly which exists whenever the offence is committed in a group. This aggravated form of the offence is punishable by one to eight years of imprisonment. The aggravating circumstance is acting in a group and this circumstance must be encompassed by the mens rea of the perpetrator. The group comprises at least three persons who have joined together to commit criminal offences either continuously or occasionally and which does not have to have predefined roles of its members, continuity of membership or a complex structure (Article 112 para. 22 CC RS).

Paragraph 3 of this section stipulates the second aggravated form the criminal offence of violent behaviour at a sporting event or a public gathering. It is the situation in which an individual commits the said offence as a ringleader of a group which perpetrates the criminal offence of violent behaviour of at a sporting event or a public gathering. The punishment prescribed for the ringleader (the person who leads the group in actions) is imprisonment of three to twelve years. In order to establish liability for this form of criminal offence, it is necessary for the perpetrator of the criminal offence at the time of perpetration to be aware that he/she is the ringleader of the group and that he/she wants to act as the ringleader. The necessary prerequisite of the mens rea includes this circumstance (as a qualifying circumstance).

Article 344a para. 4 CC also envisages the third aggravated form of the criminal offence of violent behaviour at a sporting event or a public gathering which exists if the perpetration of the basic form of the criminal offence of violent behaviour at a sporting event or public gathering has led to riots during which any person sustains grave bodily injury or any property of substantial value is damaged. The law prescribes that the offender in such cases shall be punished with imprisonment of two to ten years. Grave bodily harm may be inflicted either to the person against whom violence at a sports event is directed or to another person who may be a participant in the sports event, but also to an accidental passer-by. With respect to causing grave bodily harm, for establishing the guilt of the perpetrator, it is necessary to prove negligence (З. Стојановић, Н. Делић, 2013:303).¹⁴ As regards damage to property of a substantial value, in order to establish liability of the perpetrator it is necessary that at the moment of perpetration there is negligence on the part of the perpetrator regarding the damage to property resulting from violence at a sports event.

We find that if grave bodily injury is inflicted with premeditation but during riots resulting from the perpetration of the basic form of the criminal offence from section 344a, there is a joinder of two criminal offences, grave bodily injury and the basic form of violent behaviour at a sports event or a public gathering. Such view was also taken by the High Court of Cassation. When grave bodily injury results from the actions of the defendant, with direct intent to inflict injury to the injured party, who is a participant in a sports event and during the event, and without causing disorder then the defendant has committed the criminal offence of violent behaviour at a sports event or public gathering under Article 344a para. 1 CC and the criminal offence of causing grave bodily injury under Article 121 para. 1 CC in a joinder.¹⁵ However, there are instances of different court decisions. Thus, in another case, the Appellate Court in Nis in a similar situation, when the defendant inflicted grave bodily injury with premeditation at a sports event and was convicted in the first instance for the commitment of the criminal act from Article 344a para. 4 in relation to para. 1 CC, changed the decision and convicted the defendant only of perpetrating the criminal offence from Article 121 CC, justifying the decision by stating that in order to establish the existence of the aggravated form of the

¹⁴ For further reading on grave bodily harm aggravated by death see: Д. Коларић; Кривично дело убиства, Службени гласник, Београд, 2008, pp. 174-188.

¹⁵ The ruling of the Supreme Court of Cassation (Пресуда Врховног касационог суда) Кзз 1123/2014 dtd 20 November 2014, verified at the session of the Criminal Division of the Supreme Court of Cassation of 6 June 2016.

criminal offence of violent behaviour at a sports event as per Article 344a para 4 in relation to para. 1 CC a necessary prerequisite was the that there was a consequence reflected in causing riots and that the grave bodily injury was inflicted on another person as result of causing riots at the sports event. Since invoking riots was absent from the actions of the defendant who had caused grave bodily injury to another person, only legal features of the criminal offence of grave bodily injury under Article 121 para. 1 CC were present.¹⁶

Paragraph 5 of Article 344a CC envisages a special form of the criminal offence of violent behaviour at a sporting event or a public gathering which exists if an officer or a liable person, upon organizing the sports event or public gathering, fails to implement appropriate security measures in order to prevent or stop riots, and therefore endangers the life and limb of people or property of substantial value. The law provides that the perpetrator of this special form of criminal offence shall be punishable by imprisonment from three months to three years and a fine.

PROTECTIVE MEASURE OF ‘BAN ON ATTENDING CERTAIN SPORTING EVENTS’

A perpetrator of the criminal offence committed at a sports event faces a mandatory measure which means imposing a ‘ban on attending certain sporting events.’ It is the criminal sanction introduced by the Law on Amendments and Additions to the Criminal Code in September 2009 in order to prevent violence at sporting events (Д. Коларић, 2014:491).

It is implemented in such a way that the perpetrator of the criminal offence is obliged to personally report to an official in the local police service prior to the beginning of certain sporting events, or in a police station in the area where the perpetrator finds himself and to stay on their premises for the duration of the sporting event. In relation to this, question arises concerning the principal, organizational and technical nature. Firstly, this actually represents a kind of preventive police detention. ‘To stay’ actually in this case means to be deprived of liberty. Secondly, the accommodation facilities in police departments or stations are limited, and the presence of other persons on the premises may interfere with their normal operation (З. Стојановић, 2013:367). A special problem may arise from making a register of the implementation of this measure given the possibility to report to any local police department (station) in the country (in the area where a person finds himself) (Ђ. Ђорђевић, 2011:162).

The court determines the duration of the measure, which cannot be shorter than one or longer than five years, effective two days after the decision’s coming into force, but not including the time spent in prison.¹⁷ The latest amendments to the CC in 2016 in Article 340a CC incriminated the violation of or failure to enforce a final court decision of the ban as a preventive measure, prescribing a fine or punishment of imprisonment of up to six months. This criminal offence was introduced because of our negative experience and problems anticipated in practice (Д. Коларић, 2017:27) but the dilemma remains whether we have achieved the objective with it.

In the justification of incriminating this criminal offence in the Bill AACC it was stated “... that the objective is to ensure sanctioning of the violation of the ban which certain protective measures contain. According to the existing law, there are no sanctions for violating certain prohibitions deriving from some protective measures. For violating other prohibitions, a cer-

¹⁶ The ruling of the Appellate Court of Nis (Пресуда Апелационог суда у Нишу) Кж бр. 1041/14 dtd 23 October 2014 – *Bulletin* of the High Court in Nis (Билтен Вишег суда у Нишу), no. 33/2015, Интермех, Београд

¹⁷ CC, Article 89.b

tain type of sanctioning is reflected in the fact that the court - upon imposing a suspended sentence - may rule that it will be revoked if the convict violates the ban implied in the protective measure (Articles 85 and 86 CC). However, there is the need to incriminate such a criminal offence in cases where the courts do not impose suspended sentences.”¹⁸

Namely, as far as the protective measure of “a mandatory ban on attending certain sporting events” is concerned, whenever the court pronounces a suspended sentence, it is obliged to rule that the sentence shall be revoked if the perpetrator violates the prohibition on attending certain sporting events, or if he fails to fulfill his duty to report to the probation officer in the local police department or a police station.¹⁹ However, in practice, the procedure for revoking suspended sentences is very rarely initiated regardless of numerous violations of the protective measure, probably because it is complicated.²⁰ The police, who are in charge, based on the court decision, to supervise the execution of the protective measure, when they establish that the defendant has failed to report to the police station at the appointed time or if they establish that the defendant has violated the protective measure and attended a sporting event at the time of the prohibition, should notify the relevant court and the responsible public prosecutor’s office about it. The public prosecutor’s office may address the court of the first instance with a request to initiate revocation. The court, after holding a session, may decline the prosecutor’s request if it finds that there are no grounds for revoking the suspended sentence and in doing so it may in its official capacity warn the defendant who does not fulfill the obligations of protective supervision or extends the duration of protective supervision or replace previous obligations with others. This means that the court can decline the request in case when it establishes that the convicted person does not comply with obligations from the court ruling. Thus on 2 October 2016, during a football match, the injured party – a player who got the yellow card for foul play was physically attacked by the defendant – the player of the opposing team who had approached him from behind and hit him with closed fist in the face, resulting in grave bodily injuries including “a fractured nose bone with dislocation and scratching, with a bruise in the inner corner of the eye and in the region of the left cheekbone”. The Higher Court in Valjevo in its decision K.бp.31/17 of 13 September 2017 convicted R. J. from Valjevo because of committing the criminal offence under Article 344a paragraph 1 CC and sentenced him to a six months’ imprisonment suspended for two years and a fine in daily amounts (30 daily amounts – the amount being 500 dinars) and the protective measure of “a ban on attending certain sporting events, that is, football matches of the FC M. for the duration of one year”. After pronouncing the sentence the parties waived the right to appeal so that the decision became effective on the same day. The decision was forwarded to the Police Department in Valjevo on 9 October 2017 for the purpose of implementing the security measure. A police officer interviewed the convict on 19 October 2017 and warned him about the prohibition and duties arising from the decision. On 5 November 2017 the convict failed to report to the Police Department of Valjevo before and during the game played by the football club M from Valjevo. The responsible public prosecutor’s office and the court were duly notified about it. The Higher Public Prosecutor’s office filed a request for the revocation of the suspended sentence. The Higher Court in Valjevo, although it established that the convict R. J. had not fulfilled the duty envisaged in the abovementioned decision, declined the request and extended the duration of the security measure for additional six months.²¹

18 *Предлог закона о измени и допунама КЗ* (The Bill on Amending the Criminal Code), adopted at the 17th session of the Republic of Serbia Government, on 9 November 2016

19 CC, Article 89.b

20 See: CPC, Articles 545-551.

21 The ruling of the High Court of Valjevo (Пресуда Вишег суда у Ваљеву), К.бp.5/18 dtd 26 March 2018.

It is obvious from the above example that the convict had perpetrated the criminal offence of violent behaviour at a sporting event or a public gathering under Article 344a paragraph 1 CC and the criminal offence of causing grave bodily injury as stipulated in Article 121 paragraph 1 CC in a joinder. However, the views that are indisputable in legal theory, but also taken by the decisions of appellate courts, are not always implemented in practice of higher courts and public prosecutors' offices.

The court can also adopt the request to initiate revocation of the suspended sentence and enforce the punishment determined upon conviction. Thus the suspended sentence pronounced to the defendant T. M., convicted by the decision of the Higher Court in Valjevo K.6p.29/15 of 12 November 2015 of the criminal offence under Article 344a para. 1 CC because of the failure to fulfill obligations from Article 545 para. 1 item 1 of the CPC in relation to Article 89b para 4 in relation to para 2 CC, was revoked, imposing at the same time the sentence of six months' imprisonment which the defendant was to serve upon effectiveness of the decision.²² Namely, the Police Department of Valjevo in its written communication 05-88/16-5 of 24 October 2016 notified the Higher Public Prosecutor's Office in Valjevo that the defendant T. M. had violated the protective measure by failing to report in the police station on 23 October 2016 before the beginning of the football match which he was not allowed to attend and committed the offence from the Act on Public Order by insulting the players. In this way he failed to fulfill the duty arising from the pronounced protective measure and violated the ban. The Higher Public Prosecutor's office filed a request for revoking the suspended punishment which was ruled by the court.

In the period of two years (2015-2016) 273 reports were submitted for the perpetration of the criminal offence under Article 344a CC. Out of this number, 23 were filed against unknown perpetrators, and 24 persons were under age at the time of perpetration. The public prosecutor decided to dismiss 94 complaints, 56 out of which based on the principle of opportunity. In the same period, taking into account the criminal reports from the earlier period, 338 persons were charged and 252 convicted. The overall number of 250 men and 2 women were convicted. There were 37 or 15% of imprisonment sentences (out of which 30 sentences to imprisonment of up to 6 months), house arrest for 21 persons or 8%, 165 or 65% suspended sentences, 28 or 11% fines, and one person was sentenced to community work.²³ Regardless of the fact that the trial for this criminal offence is actually within the jurisdiction of the higher court, we see that the punitive policy is overtly lenient. Almost 2/3 of convictions are to probation, and 3/4 of prison sentences are to up to 6 months. Can such sanctioning policy have effect on the prevention of violence at sports events? If we add that one in five criminal reports is dismissed based on the principle of opportunity, and that one in seven is dismissed for other reasons, we believe it cannot.

The criminal offence of *violating prohibition imposed by protective measure* will hardly give positive effects. Firstly, the prescribed punishment is lenient, so that the effect of general prevention will not occur. Secondly, the criminal offence pertains to the violation of ban deriving from the protective measure. In this case, it is the prohibition of attending certain sports events. What happens when the convict does not violate the prohibition but fails to fulfill the duty imposed on him by the protective measure i.e. when he fails to report immediately before the beginning of a sporting event to a police officer and stay on the police premises for the duration of the sporting event? We find that in such cases there is no criminal offence because the criminal offence relates only to the violation of the ban imposed by the protective measure. Thirdly, what is the probability that the police will find out about every person who

22 The ruling of the High Court of Valjevo (Пресуда Вишег суда у Ваљеву), К.бр.44/16 dtd 22 December 2016 and the ruling of the Appellate Court in Belgrade Кж1 65/2017 dtd 13 February 2017.

23 Data provided by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia.

fails to fulfill the duty envisaged in this protective measure and gather sufficient evidence to prove that they have violated the prohibition. Fourthly, practice shows that even criminal procedures for criminal offences punishable by strict punishments last long. What will the effect of punishment (either a fine or a suspended sentence, as it is clear that the punishment of deprivation of liberty will be pronounced only rarely) on the perpetrator be if it is pronounced several years after the breach of protective measure? Does not the existing practice show that in such cases the procedure for misdemeanor is significantly more efficient? Within the first 6 months of the implementation of the APV, there were 772 requests for initiating misdemeanor proceedings for violation of urgent measures or for committing the violation from section 36 para 1 APV, out of which 624 persons were convicted, 586 sentenced to imprisonment,²⁴ 34 to fines and 4 persons were warned, although the law does not envisage a warning for this type of violation, whereas 32 persons were acquitted of misdemeanor charges.²⁵ An analysis of sentencing policy in respect of other criminal offences indicates that such efficiency cannot be expected in criminal proceedings, especially when the prescribed punishments are primarily fines and imprisonment sentences of up to six months.

It should also be pointed out that for the violation under Article 23 of the APV the sanction includes a mandatory protective security measure of banning attendance to certain sporting events. This protective measure is prescribed in Article 52 paragraph 1 item 9 of the Misdemeanour Law (Д. Коларић, С. Марковић, 2018:57) and Article 63 of the same act envisages that the prohibition of attending certain sporting events encompasses the obligation of the offender to immediately before the beginning of certain sports events personally report to an official in the local police department or a police station in the area in which the offender finds himself and to stay on the premises for the duration of the sporting event. The protective measure may be pronounced for one to eight years and the convicted person who fails to fulfill this obligation shall be punished by thirty to sixty days' imprisonment.

CLOSING CONSIDERATIONS

Several conclusions can be drawn from the considered subject matter.

First, it is necessary to harmonize the terms used in the Criminal Code, which refer to "violent behaviour at sporting events or public gatherings" with the terms used in the Law on Public Assembly which does not define the notion of 'public assembly' and represents *lex specialis* for this subject matter. It defines the notion of a public gathering which is in keeping with the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, and which guarantees freedom of gathering as one of the basic human rights. Mutual discrepancy of the two acts may result in the already mentioned problems in proving the existence of the criminal offence.

Second, it should be clearly pointed out that this criminal offence does not apply to friendly matches played without audience. This view was taken by appellate courts, yet some first-instance courts insist on criminal prosecution of the persons who commit violence even

²⁴ Within the first six months of the implementation of the Law on Prevention of Violence (LPV) the total number of 586 persons were sentenced to 13863 days of imprisonment for committing misdemeanour from section 36 para. 1, averaging at 23.6 days of prison per defendant. The sentence of 20 days' imprisonment was pronounced in 332 cases, from 21 to 40 in 176 cases and from 41 to 60 days in 78 cases. It is interesting that the Court for Misdemeanors in Belgrade in two cases sentenced the defendants to the highest legally envisaged punishments of 90 days (60+30) due to joinder with misdemeanour from section 9 para. 1 of the Act on Public Order (APO) (the decisions ПpH. 39/17 of 25/11/2017 and ПpH 738/17 of 28/7/2017).

²⁵ Data obtained from the RS MI at the request for free access to information of public interest, document no. 037-50/17 of 14/12/2017.

in such events. Also, if grave bodily injury is inflicted with premeditation but not during riots caused by perpetration of the basic form of the criminal offence under Article 344a, there are two criminal offences in a joinder, grave bodily injury as per Article 121 CC and the basic form of violent behaviour at sporting event or public gathering. It can be concluded from numerous examples that lower-instance courts pass different rulings, that is, that they recognize only the criminal offence from Article 344a. This means that it is necessary to ensure continued professional development of public prosecutors and judges.

Third, the procedure for revocation of suspended sentences in cases of violation of the protective measure of “a ban on attending certain sporting events” is complicated. It calls for a high level of coordination between the police, public prosecutor and courts, and then conducting new court proceedings, whereupon the court does not have to revoke the suspended sentence even if it establishes that there has been a breach of protective measure.

Four, we find that the new criminal offence that has recently been introduced in our criminal law and pertains to violation of the ban imposed as part of the protective measure will not bring significant improvement in complying with protective measures because lenient sanctions are frequently imposed (fines or imprisonment sentences of up to six months), and the conducted research indicated that even for the criminal offence under Article 344a where the basic form is punishable by a significantly stricter punishment, the punishment of imprisonment of six months to five years and a fine, the courts have passed suspended sentences in more than 65% of the cases and that the public prosecutors beforehand dismiss 20% of criminal complaints by applying the principle of opportunity. We can assume what the penal statistics will be like as regards this new criminal offence.

We are of an opinion that the state must find a much more efficient, effective and economical way to prevent and suppress violence at sporting events and public gatherings. We have seen that the Act on the Prevention of Domestic Violence efficiently resolved the problem of violating urgent measures through misdemeanor proceedings. Perhaps it is a good way to sanction the perpetrators who violate protective measures. An argument for a possible objection that in this way in our legal system misdemeanor norms would be used to sanction violations of measures arising from criminal law would be that criminal sanctions are used against the persons who violate measures pronounced in civil lawsuits.

REFERENCES

1. Ђорђевић, Ђ., Прекршајно право, Криминалистичко-полицијска академија, Београд, 2010,
2. Ђорђевић, Ђ., Забрана присуствовања одређеним спортским приредбама, у: Ђ. Игњатовић (ур.), Казнена реакција судова у Србији, Правни факултет, Београд., 2011, pp. 158-166.
3. Коларић Д., Реформа кривичног материјалног законодавства и поглавље 23 (на раскршћу између националног идентитета и европских интеграција), у: *Реформски процеси и поглавље 23 (годину дана после)*, Српско удружење за кривичноправну теорију и праксу, Златибор, 2017, pp.23-52.
4. Коларић Д., Концепцијске новине у Кривичном законнику Србије и адекватност државне реакције на криминалитет, у: *Суђење у разумном року и други кривичноправни инструменти адекватности државне реакције на криминалитет*, Српско удружење за кривичноправну теорију и праксу, Златибор, 2015, pp. 9-38

5. Коларић Д., Кривичноправни инструменти државне реакције на криминалитет и предстојеће измене у области кривичних санкција, у: Зборник радова, LIV Саветовање Српског удружења за кривичноправну теорију и праксу, Златибор, 2014, pp.485-503.
6. Коларић Д., Кривично дело убиства, Службени гласник, Београд, 2008.
7. Коларић Д. Марковић С., Поједине недоумице у примени Закона о спречавању насиља у породици, *Анали Правног факултета у Београду – Часопис за правне и друштвене науке*, Vol. 66, бр. 1, 2018.
8. Марковић С., Улога полиције у спровођењу мере безбедности „Забрана присуствовања одређеним спортским приредбама“, *Право и аутономија личности*, Том 1, Правни живот: часопис за правну теорију и праксу, Удружење правника Србије, бр. 9, Књига 578, Београд, 2015, pp. 603-620.
9. Марковић С., Мера безбедности Забрана присуствовања одређеним спортским приредбама у пракси полиције и правосуђа, *НБП - Журнал за криминалистику и право*, Криминалистичко-полицијска академија, година XXI, Београд, бр. 1, 2016, pp.133-161,
10. Стојановић, З., Кривично право-општи део, Правна књига Правни факултет Универзитета у Београду, Београд, 2013,
11. Стојановић З, Делић Н., Кривично право - посебни део, Правни факултет Универзитета у Београду и Правна књига, Београд, 2013,

CIP – Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

343.85:343.9.02(082)(0.034.2)

INTERNATIONAL scientific conference “Archibald Reiss days” (2018 ; Belgrade)

Thematic conference proceedings of international significance [Elektronski izvor].
Vol. 1 / International scientific conference “Archibald Reiss Days”, Belgrade, 2-3 October 2018 ; [editor-in-chief Darko Simović]. - Belgrade : Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies, 2018 (Belgrade : Službeni glasnik). - 1 elektronski optički disk (CD-ROM) : ilustr. ; 12 cm

Sistemska zahteva: Nisu navedeni. - Nasl. sa naslovne strane dokumenta. - Tiraž 200. - Bibliografija uz svaki rad. - Abstracts.

ISBN 978-86-7020-404-1

ISBN 978-86-7020-190-3 (niz)

а) Криминалитет - Зборници - Сузбијање

COBISS.SR-ID 268232204