TS -15/15

IN THE NAME OF THE PEOPLE OF REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

COUNTY COURT IN BITOLA with the judge Goce Malinovski president of the counsel and judges jurors Anica Shapkovska and Nikola Petrovski members of the counsel in the legal matter of the petitioner AB Electroluh "St Goransgatan" 143, SE 105 45 Stockholm, Sweden represented by the authorized lawyer Zivka Kostovska Stojkovska from Skopje against the defendant Company for production of home appliances and professional equipment, stainless steel industrial brushes, palnezo, rubber products, electrical heaters, vacuum cleaners and robot design, lab, trading on retail and sale services, sport academy and cooperation export –import ELEKTROLUKS DOOEL Bitola Car Samoil 3b Bitola Macedonia represented by the authorized lawyer Nikolcho Lazaraov from Skopje, on basis of violation of the right of industrial property value 40.000, 00 denars after held oral main and public processing in presence of the authorized representatives of the parties on 2.01.2016 reached the following

VERDICT

Petition of the petitioner by which it was requested to be confirmed whether the defendant violated the right of the trademark of the petitioner for the trade mark Electrolux (with words) and registration number 03982 registered for products from the class 03, 07, 09, 11 and 21 by the International classification of products and services and Electrolux (with words) with registration number 03983 registered for the products from the classes 01, 03, 04, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 24 by the International classification of products and services and to be forbidden the defendant to use this trademark of the petitioner for the trademark zanussi (with words) with number of appeal TM 2013/556 for products and services and to be forbidden to the petitioner to use this trademark as well as to impose to the Macedonian academic research network MARNET to annulated the registrations of the domains

1. www.electroluks.com.mk
2. www.electrolux.com.mk
3. www.electroluxpalenzo.com.mk
4. www.electroluxappliances.com.mk
5. www.electroluxprofessional .com.mk
6. www.electroluxmakedonija.com.mk
7. www.electrolux.mk.www
8. www.electroluks.mk
9. www.electroluxservice.com.mk
10. www.electroluxheatingelements.com.mk
11. www.akademijaelectrolux.com.mk
12. www.electroluxdesign.com.mk

Судски преведувач од македонски на англиски и обратно во Основниот суд во Битола
ВЕСНА МИЛЕВСКА

13. www.electroluks.net.mk and to deactivate the same and to erase from the Registry as well as to pay to the petitioner the monetary expenses in amount of 123.700 denars IS OVERRULED AS NOT GROUNDED.
The petitioner IS OBLIGED to pay the caused monetary expenses to the defendant in amount of 73.699 denars in period of 8 days after the reception of this verdict and the remaining to the requested expenses of 74.835 denars of the appeal of the defendant is OVERRULED.

Explanation

The petitioner in his closing speech suggested to be confirmed whether defendant violated the right of trademark of the petitioner for the trademarks Electrolux (with words) and for the trademark zanussi (with words) which were registered at the State Institution for industrial ownership with special registration numbers from corresponding classes of products and services on the behalf of the petitioner, he had exclusive right the same to use in the turnover for marking of its products and services due to which considers that the defendant using his registered domains –names through Internet unauthorized used sign similar or identical to trademarks and products and services of the petitioner and that is with such similarity made confusion at the average consumers which products and services are involved. Such actions represented violation regarding the article 206 paragraph 1, 2, and 3 from Law for industrial ownership according to the legal regulation the petitioner as holder of the trademarks had exclusive right the same to use in the turnover for marking of his products and services ad according to which the legal regulation the petitioner as holder of the trademark had right to prohibit using in the turnover a sign which is identical or similar to the trademark for identical or similar products or services if such similarity can make confusion at the average consumer . That is why in the second part of the petition is suggested and to be forbidden the defendant to use these two trademarks referring to application of the article 25 of the regulation of MARNET because violation was made by Internet which was obvious from the presented evidences – expertise and reports for confirmed facts by notary public. He also stated that defendant acted opposite to the article 50 of ZTD because the company under which it was registered on Internet and registered domains did not use Cyrillic letters but Latin by which he violated the trademark of the petitioner. In the third part of the petition he requested to impose to MARNET to annulate the registrations of the domains – domain names (12) registered on the name of the defendant, to reactive the same and to erase them from the registry. He considers that there is not judged matter because the factual state now is different regarding this one confirmed by the verdict of the Supreme court which facts referred to 2007 and now they refer to the confirmed facts in 2013 and later. He asked for expenses.
The defendant suggested the petition to be overruled due to judged matter because by verdict of the Supreme court rev 1 number 220/2012 from 13.06.2013 which are in the court registers of this court TS umber 110/11 the petition was overruled of the same petitioner against this defendant on the same base for confirmation of the violation of the right of the industrial ownership for the same trademark. Anyway, if the court did not overrule the petition, to deny the

petition demand as not grounded regarding that it was confusingly set, it was neither clear what the petitioner asked from the subject petition, what protection he asks, if he asks protection of the trademark, if he asks protection of the domains, the content of the sites for which he presented records by notary public, if he asks protection of the name of the trademark symbols or signs , with statements that defendant did not make any violation of the right for using of the trademarks of the petitioner. Regarding the application of the Regulation of MARNET he considers that for using of domain the names registered on the behalf of the defendant the court is not authorized to act, but that is exclusively management processing in the authority of the organ of management, because that registry of domains exclusively is led by Macedonian academic research network (MARNET) which is public institution that is organ of management and in this part suggested the court to announce itself for absolutely unauthorized to act as really unauthorized. Regarding the violation of the trademarks of the petitioner considers that petitioner did not prove the petition demand and by nothing it was proved that allegedly petitioner violated the right of the trademarks Electrolux and trademark Zanussi, because using of the domains of the defendant actually just using of his name- company of the defendant Electroluks under which it was written in the registry and that is from 1999. The Supreme Court clearly stated in the verdict that registration of domains does not mean using of the trademark of the petitioner, because the defendant just registered domain which is corresponding to the name of his company and that did not put in confusion any potential consumers of products and services of the petitioner and pursuant to the article 168 of the Law for industrial ownership the regulation did not give right to the holder of the trademark to forbid third people in goods turnover to use their names, signs or trade brands regardless the fact that they are similar or identical to the trademark. It is even more that the defendant is craft shop – workshop, micro subject with activity repairing of electrical household appliances , nor he performs activity or any other trading activity and he hardly makes any turnover from the services for repairing and it is not clear in what way he took into confusion the average consumes – users of products which the petitioner produces as well known world company. Regarding the alleged violation of the trademark zanussi it was not clear at all, how defendant violated when this trademark was not mentioned at all , nor it is connected to defendant. He asked for expenses.

The court allowed and presented the suggested evidences : current balance for the defendant by CR of RM copy of ID for Silvana Palenzovska Elektroluks and for Teodor Palenzo Elektroluks announcement for unauthorized company from 22.10.2011 current balance for RTV NABBA Macedonia Elektroluks Bitola decisions by MARNET from 18.05.2015 for overruling of demand decision for change in craft registry from 21.05.2015 with enclosure decision of CR of RM for the craft man Elektroluks Palenzo Teodor Bitola , confirmation for recognized right for proof reading by Trajko Ognenovski from 20.07.2006 with enclosures illustrative and linguistic differences and conclusion with suggestion professional opinion extract for Elektroluks in electronic form professional opinion sealed by notary public Goran Dimanovski under UZP 2106/15 from 08.05.2015 invoice from 27.03.2014 issued by JS for management towards the defendant and Palenzovski Dimche invoice number 198 from 27.04.2015 reservation for title of

legal subject for Craft man Teodor Dimche Palenzo Club of athletic gymnastic foundation Palenzo Regulation from July 1996, Statute of the Club for athletic gymnastics from 1995 demand for recognition of the right of trademark from 10.08.2012 extract from Tourist info Bitola with enclosures photos correspondence by Magdalena Mladenovska for Elektroluks Palenzo from 4 May 2015 current balance by CR of RM for Elktroluks ltd Bitola decision by State Inspection for labor from 18.10.2002 with enclosure decision for fulfillment of technical conditions for performance of activity, document for registered activity by CR of RM for Elektroluks from 20.07.2011, decision for registration of activity in the registry of crafts men from 01.07.2005, decision for main activity by State Institution for statistics from 25.12.2001, decision by Ministry for justice from 03.02.2015 for using the word Macedonia on the behalf of the company, demand by ltd Elektroluks to MARNET from 07.05.2014 with enclosures domain names for transfer of sub domains by Palenzovski Dimche of ltd Elektroluks from 10.07.2014, contract for giving into governance of domains from 29.04.2013, festival for creation devices for household, decision of the presidentship of NABBA with enclosures, announcement to the public by the petitioner from 22.10.2011 in photocopy, extract from daily press application, contract for participation on fair from October 2002 with enclosure photos , demands for starting of arbitrage processing from 08.01.2015, response on demand for arbitrage to management Court against State Institution for industrial ownership of SZD ELEKTROLUKS AND NABBA Macedonia against decision of the State Institution from 30.04.2014 professional opinion by proofreader Zdravko Bozinovski in the subject PS-348/07, extract from Internet for Elektroluks – heating bodies ceramic heaters enclosed photos, extracts by MARNET for registration of domains correspondence from 21.01.2014 by Electrolux to Svetlana Bozinovska regarding the offer for annual service of machine for drying of clothes , finding and opinion from 2014 of MA Marin gavrilovski from December 2014, decision of the State Intuition for industrial ownership from 30.04.2014 from the Registry of trademarks from 18.02.2015 20.04.2015 correspondence of the Institution from 20.04.2015, Report for confirmation of facts, ODU number 1665/2014 notary public Aneta Petrovska Aleksovska from Skopje with enclosures ODU 576/2014, Internet application report from 10 2011 of the State Labor Inspectorate number 25354, decision for change in registry of craft men from 19.07.2010 demand by ltd Elektroluks to MARNET for conduction of decision for change of ownership of holder of right to domain from 07.05.2014, CD application for Elektroluks lists for the subject of this court TS 110/11, report ODU number 611/2015 with enclosure photos that its extracts from Internet demands for making arbitrage processing from 09.01.2015, verdict of the Supreme court by rev number 341/00 copy from TS number 348/07, decision of the manager of MARNET for overruled demands for Silvana Palenzovska Elektroluks, extract from Internet for the domain elektroluks.net.mk from ODU number 1710/2015, extracts from Internet for the domain Elektroluks MARNET from 2014 expertise by the Agency for expertise MAGO Skopje from 12.07.2012 and in accordance to the authorization of the parties to present an evidence the enclosed CD and without absence of the authorized representatives of the parties this counsel evaluated these evidences out of the

processing and evaluating the same regarding the article 8 of ZPP confirmed the following factual state:

It is inevitable that the petitioner is legal entity with head office in Stockholm Sweden and that was global leader in the production of household appliances and appliances for professional use for many years and he is holder of many national and international trademarks among which Electrolux and Zanussi. These two trademarks were registered on the name of the petitioner at the State institution for industrial ownership with special registry number 03982 and priority from 18.09.1957 registered for products from the class 03, 07, 09, 11 and 21 from the international classification of products and services and the same trademark is registered and with register number 03983 and priority from 20.09.1928 registered for products from classes 01, 03, 04, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 24 from the International classification of products and services while from the other side trademark zanussi was also registered at the State Institution for industrial ownership with words and in reality and it is obvious from the presented expertise of the expert Marjan Gavrilovski from Skopje

The defendant is registered in the Trade register of RM as ELEKTROLUKS ltd Bitola founded since 1999 with work permit as craft shop- workshop micro subject with activity code 95.22 – repairing of electrical devices for household as well as equipment for houses and kindergartens, obvious from the extracts for the current balance of CR of RM. It is enviable that the defendant was registered of domain names:

electroluks.com.mk electrolux.com.mk electroluxpalenzo.com.mk electroluxappliances.com.mk electroluxprofessional .com.mk electroluxmakedonija.com.mk electrolux.mk.www electroluks.mk electroluxservice.com.mk electroluxheatingelements.com.mk akademijaelectrolux.com.mk electroluxdesign.com.mk electroluks.net.mk as derivations from the name of his company Elektroluks which is inevitable from the Internet page of Macedonian academic research network MARNET and records for confirmation of facts sealed by notary public which the petitioner presented such as : record for confirmation of facts ODU 116/2015 from 23.04.2015 by the notary public Aneta Petrovska Aleksova from Skopje record ODU 1710/2015 from 10.09.2015.

The petitioner considers that in the concrete case the defendant by using of domain names (total 13) on Internet violated the right that the petitioner had as holder and owner of the both trademarks Electrolux and Zanussi and that such actions represented violation in reference of the article 206 paragraph 1, 2 and 3 from the Law for industrial ownership according to its legal regulation the petitioner as holder of the trademarks had exclusive right to use the same in the turnover for marking of his own products and services and according to its legal regulations the petitioner as holder of the trademark had right to prohibit using in the turnover of sign which is identical or similar to the trademark for identical or similar products or services, if such similarity can cause confusion at the average consumers including the possibility of association between the sign and the trademark and that is why he lodged the subject petition by why he requests to confirm the violation of the right of trademarks of the petitioner and to prohibit defendant to use the trademarks of the petitioner in a way that would impose to the Macedonian

academic research network MARNET to annulate the registrations of the domains – domain names (13) registered on the name of the defendant, to deactivate the same and to erase them from the registry. From the presented evidences and primarily the expertise of the expert Marjan Gavrilovski from Skopje and records for confirmation of facts sealed by notary public and by these evidences the petitioner tries to prove that the defendant violated the right of trademarks of the petitioner and it is obvious with the expertise and with the records sealed by notary public and the inevitable facts are confirmed that the petitioner is legal entity with head office in Stockholm- Sweden and that was global leader in production of household appliances and appliances for professional use for many years and he is holder of numerous national and international trademarks among which Electrolux and Zanussi, which trademarks were registered on the name of the petitioner at the State Institution for industrial ownership from one side and from the other side it is confirmed the inevitable fact that the defendant was registered of the abovementioned domain names which he registered at Macedonian academic research network (MARNET) which as legal entity was authorized for registration , deactivation or erasing of domains. During the evidence processing the defendant tried to prove that such action actually represented violation of the trademark of the petitioner and that is the petitioner suffered damage without proving what the damage is, what is the amount of the damage that the petitioner suffered. Actually the petitioner thinks that by the fact itself that defendant registered such mentioned domain names with such action on Internet, allegedly violated the right of trademark of the petitioner Electrolux and Zanussi in that way that allegedly led to confusion the potential consumers of the products which the petitioner produced and the services that he provided. More precisely defendant using his registered domain names on Internet unauthorized used signs similar or identical to trademark of products and services of the petitioner and that by such similarity created confusion at the average consumer for whose products and services it is word about. At the same time it is inevitably the fact that between parties in the processing, that the short title name of the petitioner and the defendant is "elekroluks".

At such confirmed factual state the court decided as in decision of this verdict from the following reasons:

By the subject petition the petitioner in the concrete case recalls to article 206 paragraph 1, 2, and 3 from the Law for industrial ownership according to its legal regulation the petitioner as holder of trademark had exclusive right to use the same in the turnover for marking of its products and services and according to its legal regulation, the petitioner as holder of trademark had right to prohibit using in the turnover a sign identical or similar to the trademark for identical or similar products or services, if such similarity can make confusion at average consumer, inclusively the possibility of association between sign and trademark. In paragraph 4 from the same article it was confirmed that the prohibition covers putting of the sign of the products or their package giving services or letting into turnover products marked by that sign or storing of products with such intention import or export of products under that sign and using of the sign in correspondence, announcement or marketing.

ВЕСНА МИЛЕВСКА

By article 207 from the same law the limitations were regulated of such right of the holder of the trademark according to which the right of the trademark does not give right to the holder of the trademark to forbid to third person to use in goods turnover their names, surnames, signs or trademarks ...regardless of the fact that such data are identical or similar to the trademark under the condition to be used according to the good business customs and not to lead to disloyal competition.

Pursuant to the article 294 of the same law it is planned person whose right has been violated to ask by petition: to be confirmed whether there is violation of the right, prohibition of the action by which the right is violated, payment of damage taking or destroying of products, civil penalty announcement of the verdict on expense of the defendant and other demands.

In the concrete case the petitioner with the subject petition asked to be confirmed whether there is violation of his right of trademarks in order to prohibit using it and in the third part of the petition it was asked to be imposed to the Macedonian academic research network MARNET which as legal entity was authorized for registration, deactivation or erasing of the domains which according to the court is in accordance to the abovementioned regulations from article 294 as content of the subject petition demand. By the subject petition the petitioner tried to prove that the defendant as registrant in total of 13 domain names registered in MARNET violated the right of the trademarks of the petitioner Electrolux and Zanussi which is inevitable that the petitioner registered at the State Institution for industrial ownership. But by the evaluation of the court and on basis of the presented evidences the court considers that the petitioner regarding to the article 205 of ZPP did not manage to prove the grounds of such made petition. The petitioner did not manage to prove what actually represents the violation of the trademarks of the petitioner, which signs or symbols the defendant uses and by which actions he allegedly violated the right of the trademarks of the petitioner. From the presented evidences it is inevitable that in the concrete case the defendant registered domains in MARNET which correspond to the name of his company elektroluks which is registered under such name in the registry of legal entities trade companies since 1999, he did not do anything else which could violate the trademarks of the petitioner.

Such legal conclusion resulted from the current court practice which is especially obvious form the presented evidences: the records of the subject at this court RS 110-11 (former number PS - 348/07 and the verdict of the Supreme court of RM which in its own verdict Rev I number 220/12 gives completely clear legal interpretation that is has completely legal attitude that by the actions of the defendant that is by using of the domain name Electrolux (which is the name of his company) means that the defendant completely acted according to good business customs because at the registration of the domain names the intention of the defendant was not at the registration of the domain names to use the trademark of the petitioner Electrolux or the logo of the petitioner on his behalf, but pursuant to legal regulations the defendant registered domain which corresponds to the name of his company. At the same time the Supreme court emphasized in its verdict that the limitations of the right of the trademark are completely clearly managed by article 207 of the same law and according to which the right of the trademark does not give right

to the petitioner as holder of the trademark to forbid to third person to use names , surnames signs or trademarks in the goods turnover ... regardless to the fact that those data are identical or similar to the trademarks under the condition if they do not to lead to disloyal completion .
The court evaluated that in the concrete case it is about using of Internet of total 13 domain names where there is the name of the company of the defendant and that defendant by that as registrant of those domain names did not make any violation of the right of trademark of the petitioner Electrolux which represents legal conclusion contained in the above-mentioned verdict of the Supreme court. Still, the court considers that in this case there is still no judged matter in reference to article 322 from the following reasons:
Namely, the abovementioned verdict by the Supreme court refers to the subject of the petition of the same petitioner and the same defendant is sentenced on basis of protection of the right of industrial ownership. Concretely in this subject the defendant had registered only one domain at MARNET Electrolux.com.tk. The court considers that in this case it is not about identical petition demand because for confirmation of the fact that is the case of judged matter, it is crucial to determine the identity of the living event, the identity of the subject of the lawsuit, but if there were any new facts after reaching of the verdict, then it is not a case of judged matter. In the concrete case there are new facts because the petitioner gives new violations of the right of trademarks, presenting records by a notary public from 2015 for using not only one domain which was above-mentioned, but 13 domain names whose registrant is the defendant. Beside that in the subject where a verdict by the Supreme Court was reached, it is about and it was decided in that subject for violations in 2007, when the defendant as registrant on Internet used only one domain name Electrolux.com.tk. Now, in the concrete case it is about using of internet of total 13 domain names where there is the name of the company of the defendant and the using of the domain names was made in 2015, so court considers that the demand of the petitioner to confirm whether the defendant made new violations of the trademarks of the petitioner and that is why there is not a judged matter. But, anyway the court considers that the petition was not grounded that is it was proved and certainly it took into consideration the already taken legal attitude of the Supreme court which was expressed in the abovementioned verdict Rev 1-220/12 from 13.06.2013 according to which the Supreme court clearly pointed out that using of domain names cannot represent violation of the right of trademark of the petitioner, that is for the trademark for which a protection is requested in the subject petition. Beside that, the court pointed out that the petitioner in the petition brought expertise and other evidences as well as records for confirmed facts by notary public which refer exclusively to using of the domain names of the defendant without presentation of not even one evidence that the defendant committed violation of the right of trademark and to petitioner, named as zanussi and that is why it is inevitable that this petition is not grounded which refers to this trademark. In the decision the court still took into consideration the inevitably confirmed facts that the defendant has been registered in the Trade registry of RM as ELEKTROLUKS LTD Bitola since 1999 with work permit as craft shop- workshop that is performance of activity exclusively as service activity that it is about micro subject with activity code 95.22 – repairing of electrical household appliances

ВЕСНА МИЛЕВСКА

as well as equipment for homes and kindergartens obvious from the extracts for current balance of CR of RM and evaluated that the objection of the defendant was grounded that a craft shop which repairs electrical household appliances cannot be disloyal competition of the petitioner as giant and well known producer of the trademark Electrolux and in reference of the above quoted article 206 paragraph 3 point 3 of the Law for industrial ownership is the fact that the defendant nor is the producer of electrical appliances by using the trademark of the petitioner nor he makes any turnover of such size by which his customers could identify themselves and to make confusion to the costumers for the products and services that the petitioner obtains. Taking into consideration all that was previously mentioned it is not clear in what way the defendant led to confuse the average consumers – customers of products which the petitioner produces as well known world company if the petitioner suffered any damage, what kind of damage he suffered in what size and etc. because evidence in that reference the petitioner did not deliver no such thing can be concluded from the presented expertise. Regarding the allegedly violation of the trademark zanussi it is not clear at all how the defendant violated that right when this trademark is not mentioned nor it is connected to the defendant.

Referring to the application of the law for MARNET and the Regulation for registration of domains to which the petitioner supported on in his closing speech as sublegal act that Macedonian academic research network MARNET uses from the content of his regulations, it is inevitable regulated the registration procedure itself, deactivation and erasing of domains at this legal entity. It is clear that pursuant to the article 25 of this Regulation among the other it was planned that registrant takes liability of eventual violation of the right of industrial ownership as well as damage for which court procedure was started in the subject petition, so nonexistence of regulation in the Regulation is similar to the legal regulations of the Law for industrial ownership and it has no larger importance for decision of the concrete lawsuit.

At the same time it is inevitable the fact that the petitioner has already started arbitrage processing at MARNET which stopped the procedure for erasing as there is a lawsuit between the parties waiting for the result of the lawsuit. At the same time the court considered that in this part of the petition by which the petitioner requested to be imposed to MARNET to make erasing and deactivation of the domains, the petitioner still has right to set it as a part of the petition and that the court has authority to decide in this part as such right requested from the consent of the petition. Regulated by article 294 of the Law for industrial ownership and especially of the paragraph I point 9 of this article, where the right was given to the person who believes that the right was violated so that he can point out in front of the court other demands as it is in the concrete case the demand of the petitioner to be impose MARNET to make deactivation and erasing of the domain names as one of the ways for ending of the eventual violations of the trademark. Surely, that this part of the petition is directly connected to the previous two petitions for confirmation if there is violation and for prohibition of the defendant to make such violation in the future, so regarding the fact that these two petitions were overruled as not grounded, it is logically concluded that the third part of the petition is overruled as well by which it was demanded from the court to impose to MARNET as authorized organ and legal entity that makes

registration and erasing of domains to make deregistration and erasing of the domain names whose registrant is the defendant himself.
In the process of decision other petition statements were evaluated, as it is the statement that the defendant allegedly acted opposite to the article 50 of ZTD in the way that company where he was registered on Internet and registered domains did not use Cyrillic letters but Latin but the court considers that such statements are not base for different decision, because the subject lawsuit was not for protection of the right and use of company, the lawsuit was not whether was allowed or not to use Latin letters of the name of the defendant which is completely another type of petition that is, it a base for leading of another type of lawsuit.

For the expenses the court decided regarding the result of the lawsuit pursuant to the article 148 of ZPP and obliged the petitioner to pay to the defendant monetary expenses in amount of 73.699 denars out of which: for composition of power of attorney and cost estimate of 1300, 00 denars composition of reply to a petition in amount of 300 denars, for composition of appeal by decision for 4 temporal measure in amount of 7200 denars, for representation on the hearings for processing for each of 4680 denars, for traveling costs for the lawyer from Skopje to Bitola for 4 hearings total of 26.600 denars for composition of submission from11.11.2015 2600 denars and for VAT 11.059, 00 denars pursuant AT as well as fee for appeal 1200, 00 denars

From all these reasons it was decided as in decision

President of counsel
Judge
Goce Malinovski

Advice: The right to appeal is allowed against the verdict in period of 8 days after the reception through this curt to the Court of Appeal Bitola.
DT Representative of the parties

Warrant for fee: the petitioner IS OBLIGED in period of 5 days from the delivery of the transcript of this verdict to pay fee for decision in amount of 1200 denars on budget account of RM 100000000063095 at NB of RM income code 722211 and on contrary the same will be charged enforced by decision of the Department for Public Incomes increased for 50% on base of penalty fee.

Преводот е верен на оргиналот
м-р Милевска Весна постојан судски преведувач
од англиски на македонски и обратно
16.10.2016

ВЕСНА МИЛЕВСКА

The translation is authentic to the original
M.A Milevska Vesna permanent legal translator
from English to Macedonian and vice versa
16.10.2016

VESNA MILEVSKA