

DISCIPLINARY RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BAILIFF DURING ENFORCEMENT ACTION UNDER THE CURENT LEGISLATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA

Bukurije Etemi-Ademi¹

¹*Department of Law, Faculty of Law*
**Corresponding author-mail: bukurije.etemi@unite.edu.mk*

Abstract

During the enforcement process, the bailiff has a legal obligation to protect the rights of the parties and participants in the proceedings. They accomplish this protection by submitting legal remedies against unlawful actions during enforcement, as well as by failing to undertake the action required by the Law on Enforcement, Code of Ethics and the obligations provided by the Statute of the Bailiffs Chamber, In addition to remedies such as opposing for unlawfulness or appealing against a ruling rendered by enforcement.

Law on Enforcement broadens the legal framework for the protection of parties and participants by allocating a large space dedicated to disciplinary responsibility, measures and conditions for their imposition. Oversight of bailiffs' work by the new Law on Enforcement of 2016 (*Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia No. 72/16*) stipulating the obligation of the Ministry of Justice and the Bailiff's Chamber for supervision, while the bailiff responds for the violations that he has committed during the execution of his unprofessional and irresponsible work, which have caused harm and violated rights of third parties and participants. In this regard we will analyze the legal obligations of the bailiff, the disciplinary responsibility, the disciplinary commission and the imposition of disciplinary measures, which are taken to ensure the legal security of the rights of the citizens in the Republic of North Macedonia.

Keywords: Law on Enforcement, Bailiff Chamber, Disciplinary Committee, disciplinary measures, bailiff

1. Introduction

The enforcement procedure is a procedure of forcible realization of claims that the subjects of the law claim to fulfill, in order to force the other party that has avoided undertaking the obligation within the voluntary deadline. The competent authority for deciding on enforcement of decision and citizen's request in the Republic of North Macedonia is the bailiff. He is a person who performs public authorizations defined by the Law on Enforcement. Since 2005 the enforcement practice in the Republic of Macedonia has changed significantly, because Macedonia adopted a new enforcement practice, in the name of facilitating the work of the court and making it easier, efficient and professional to enforce a separate procedure that would no longer be considered as a court procedure.

With the new Law on Enforcement in 2016 (*Official Gazette No. 72/16*) the enforcement practice was improved in many aspects, including the concretization of the legal regulation regarding the work of the bailiffs which normally provides citizens with legal certainty for easier and fairer execution during the enforcement process. This concretization of enforcement practice was manifested both in terms of the precise division of the conditions for nomination of the bailiff; substitute bailiff or assistant bailiff; technical conditions needed for implementation of this function, reward for enforcement performance, setting the action in case

of non-compliance legal norms and other legal acts within the Bailiff's Chamber as well as imposing disciplinary measures and termination of the bailiff's duties.

The function of the bailiff is a function that performs legal authorizations that undergo through supervision and control procedures. Exactly on this area we will address the normative aspects regarding the supervision and control of the bailiffs. We will present this analysis by analyzing the data of the annual reports of the Bailiff's Chamber where are presented citizens complains that assumed disciplinary proceedings and measures.

2. Supervision of the bailiffs' work

Ministry of Justice is competent for selecting the bailiff after fulfilling the legal requirements for bailiffs by selecting the persons based on the competition and the list of persons who have passed the professional examination for bailiffs, as well as supervising the work of the bailiffs. This ministry inter alia supervises the bailiffs' records, official documents related to the enforcement, order of cases by time, priority, insurance of the responsibilities, granting bailiff's assistant authorization to have access on his regular and special account, remuneration of the bailiff, administrative fees, supervision of conclusions to postpone enforcement at the request of the creditor and supervision of the submissions of parties and participants, etc (*article 54 Law on Enforcement, Official Gazette no. 72/16*). The supervision of the Ministry of Justice does not extend only on enforcement but also work on the bailiff Chamber. The Bailiff's Chamber can be supervised by conducting the records of the Chamber in relation to the management of claims and submissions of parties and participants in enforcement, keeping records of the Disciplinary Committee, deadlines for making disciplinary decisions (*article 54 paragraphs 2*). During the supervision, the Ministry of justice has the opportunity to access all records and documents to prove the factual situation and to submit a proposal for disciplinary proceedings or other measures, which will be in accordance with the law.

Law on Enforcement of 2016 added the legal framework while in the previous law of 2005, supervision was foreseen once a year, with notification three days in advance while reporting within 15 days and it was submitted only to the bailiff and the Bailiff's Office (*Consolidated text, Law on enforcement, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia No. 59/11*). Currently supervision is carried out by a Commission consisting of two representatives from the Ministry of Justice. In the case of supervision of the bailiff's performance, the notification must be given at least three days in advance. During this supervision the presence of the bailiff's is required, respectively the presence of a representative from the Bailiff's Chamber, the President of the Bailiff's Chamber or the person authorized when the supervision is being made.

In 2018 the Law on Enforcement was amended, in particular with the adoption of Law on Amending and Supplementing the Law on Enforcement (*Official Gazette No. 233/18*), paragraph 54-a was added which contains norms concerning extraordinary supervision, which in The Law on Enforcement of 2016, unlike the law of 2005, did not provide for provisions regulating this type of supervision. According to the Law on enforcement of 2005, the Ministry of Justice could supervise bailiffs' work and the Chamber of bailiffs at any time ex officio or by a request made by the President of basic court, a procedure which will be conducted in accordance with the rules, which were intended for regular supervision of the work of the bailiffs. The Commission consisting of representatives from the Ministry of Justice, authorized by the Minister of Justice himself is now competent for carrying out this supervision. A new guarantee of protection against procedural violations is the right to lodge a complaint which may be filed not only by the parties, but by participants and third parties too. This procedure for extraordinary supervision over the work of the bailiff may also be made by the request of the Court President, state body or by another legal entity. All the provisions applied on regular supervision shall be applied to the conduct of this procedure and normally a record shall be

prepared, which shall necessarily contain all the elements contained in the record which is made in cases of regular supervision.

3. Disciplinary responsibility of bailiffs

It is the duty of the bailiff or his deputies as individuals with public authority to perform his enforcement functions under the law, fairly, impartially and professionally. During the enforcement bailiff may not in any way violate the rights of the parties, participants and third parties in the procedure or cause damage, otherwise such actions that are performed as a result of unprofessional actions and unconscious breach of the disciplinary rules. Disciplinary violations not always consist of actions that are unlawful, but they are often committed by omission by the same bailiff who has caused harm to the parties, participants or third parties. Normally, during the imposition of disciplinary measures, certain circumstances which affect the determination of the responsibility of enforcement are taken into account, such as: the severity of the breach, the consequences of that breach, the degree of bailiff responsibility, the circumstances in which the offense was committed, his previous behavior, as well as other mitigating and aggravating circumstances, in particular the motives for the infringement, the power and endangerment or infringement of the protected good, its personal cases and its conduct after the infringement that has been committed, and other circumstances that have to do with the personality of the bailiff (*article 63, no. 72/16*). Any such circumstances shall be assessed by the Disciplinary Committee whether aggravating or mitigating, and especially taking into account previous offenses of the bailiff, whether they are the same or similar, the time elapsed since the commission of that offense and other circumstances more specifically are regulated by the bailiff Disciplinary Regulation.

Besides the legal provisions of the Law on Enforcement these responsibilities of bailiffs are regulated by a number of other acts such as the Code of Professional Ethics, the Statute of the Chamber of Bailiffs, the Regulation on Disciplinary Responsibility of Bailiffs, the Regulation on supervision of Bailiffs Work and the Bailiff Chamber, and other acts. According to the Statute of the Chamber of bailiffs, Disciplinary Commission consists of five members, of whom two members from the ranks of judges, proposed by the Judicial Council of the Republic of Macedonia, a member proposed by the Council of Public Prosecutors and two members from the Bailiffs Chamber (*article 31, Statute of the Chamber of Bailiffs of the Republic of Macedonia*). The members of Disciplinary Commission have their alternates. They are elected by the Assembly of Bailiffs Chamber and by members of the Chamber by the proposal of the bailiffs, while the members proposed by the Judicial Council are elected by the same judges through written proposal with the majority of votes which are secret. The members of the Disciplinary Committee and the President of the Disciplinary Committee are elected for three-year, with the right to be re-elected, while the President of the Disciplinary Committee is elected by the members of the Disciplinary Committee themselves.

It doesn't mean that the disciplinary committee members will always be the same; they can be replaced by their substitutes in cases where there are reasons of which the disciplinary commission member can be excluded. The Disciplinary Committee member will be excluded if he is related by blood in infinite line or in collateral line to the fourth degree or extramarital spouse, custody relations, adoptive relation with the bailiff, the injured party or the initiator of disciplinary proceedings or in any other form there are circumstances that question his or her impartiality, especially if the member of the Disciplinary Committee is affected by the unlawful act itself (*Article 23, Regulation on the Responsibility and Disciplinary Procedure of Bailiffs*). This matter is not included in the Law on Enforcement, but in the Disciplinary Regulation on Liability and Disciplinary Procedure which stipulates the obligation of a member from the moment he understands that there are legal obstacles to terminate any action and immediately

notify the Chairman of the Disciplinary Committee, who is responsible for deciding on the case and eventually determining the disciplinary liability of the member of the Disciplinary Committee himself if he has hidden the obstacles for which he cannot be legally a member of the Commission regarding the determination of the bailiff's liability. Disciplinary Committee in full composition implements disciplinary procedure and makes a decision based on the proposal of an authorized applicant, while the detailed conditions related to the disciplinary committee shall be determined by laws and other norms that specify the procedures relating to the proceedings of the Commission.

The main question is who are the subjects or persons who can initiate the disciplinary procedure of the bailiff. According to article 59 of the 2016 Law on Enforcement, the following authorized Applicant to submit a proposal are: -The President of the Chamber of Bailiffs, with the initiative of the Administrative Council who has the authority to supervise the work of the bailiffs, when after the supervision it is found that there is a violation of the Code of Ethics or on the initiative of the parties, participants and third parties who must have facts and evidence on their own initiative thorough which, those claims are proven; - The Ministry of Justice is also one of the proposers, given that it is a supervisory body for the bailiff's work and in case of bringing in a report according to which disciplinary violations are found, it will serve as a fact for initiating disciplinary proceedings; -The President of the Basic Court in whose court the bailiff is established, is another proponent in cases where the parties or participants have lodged legal remedies against the actions or omissions of the bailiff which the court has found to be unlawful, as a competent authority for developing the procedure and receiving objections to parties, participants and third parties in enforcement proceedings and in actions relating to the filing of counter-enforcement as another remedy in enforcement proceedings (*articles 86 and 88, no. 72/16*).

According to the current Law on Enforcement it is provided that the procedure is quick and urgent and it should take place within 60 days (*article 60*) from the date of submission of the proposal. The law stipulates that the Commission shall, within a "three-day period" forward the Proposal to the bailiff against whom enforcement proceedings are initiated, with the possibility that latter within eight days (*article 59, paragraphs 7 and 8*) may be entitled to respond to the Proposal. Disciplinary Committee compiles decision determining disciplinary responsibility at the latest within 15 days of adoption of the decision and immediately submit the same to the bailiff and the Ministry of Justice. The previous Law Enforcement of 2005 foresaw the possibility that within five days the Bailiff should send the proposal for response, this seems to be one of the moments where the idea of rationalizing the timing for procedural action was given a priority.

This decision of the Disciplinary Committee is final (*article 61 paragraph 3*), and the same bailiff has the right to file an administrative dispute before the court competent for adjudication of such disputes. Otherwise, competent to decide on the suspension of the bailiff's function is Disciplinary Committee, an action taken to protect the dignity and duty of the bailiff, and this suspension is valid until the disciplinary proceedings are completed.

For 2016, the Chamber of Bailiffs had received 297 submissions from parties who opposed the bailiffs' work. However, it is interesting how it is possible that out of all these submissions 232 were debtors, 61 creditors and 4 third parties. Hence, the President of the Chamber had made a decision not to submit disciplinary motion on 230 cases, 35 Decisions for giving an Opinion on application of enforcement tariff, 35 Decisions on tariff opinion, 1 Conclusion for termination of procedure, 56 Decisions on rejection the request, 9 Decisions to ascertain the withdrawal of a complaint (*Annual Report, Bailiffs Chamber, 2016, p. 23*). In 2017, unlike the previous year, the total was 249 submissions, of which 61 are creditors, 167 debtors, 2 participants and 19 third parties. The President of the Chamber of bailiffs had brought decisions for only three cases which were partially accepted that there had been a violation of the Tariff

(*Annual Report, Bailiffs Chamber, 2017, p. 29-30*). In 2017 from all submissions that had been addressed to the Bailiffs Chamber only one was directed against the Bailiffs Chamber and only one complains for a substitute bailiff. In 2018, unlike previous years, there are no data on the outcome of complaints but it is stated that there were submitted 254 complains (*see Annual Report, Bailiffs Chamber, 2018, p. 20*). The President of the Bailiffs Chamber had received two requests for foreclosure of the bailiff and two decisions were brought which found that the request for exclusion of the bailiff was not accepted and only one request for enforcement against a bailiff for non-payment of a fine for the disciplinary measure imposed for that bailiff by the Disciplinary Committee.

5. Types of disciplinary measures and their imposition

For violations of discipline by bailiffs under the Law on Enforcement 2005, Article 54 a and b included imposition of disciplinary measures, such as: public warning; a fine in the amount of 1500 to 5000, Euros converted in MKD according to the average exchange rate of the National Bank of the Republic of Macedonia at the day of the imposition of a disciplinary measure; v) the suspension of the right to perform the enforcement duties for a period of three months to one year, which period is shortened by the new Law on Enforcement in 2016 the period of temporary taking over of the bailiff's office is done within three to six months and g) permanent removal from the right to perform enforcement duties in cases when the bailiff has performed his duty knowing that there are legal obstacles between them when exercising the enforcement activity, although he has been temporarily prohibited from undertaking such actions. According to the 2016 Law on Enforcement, the amounts of fines range from 500-5000 Euros, which was reduced by half by the Law on Amending and Supplementing Law on Enforcement 2018 (Official Gazette 233/2018) and this value consists of 250-2500 Euros in MKD according to the average exchange rate of the National Bank of the Republic of Macedonia.

Under the 2016 regulation a new measure is added, "Written warning" (Article 62, paragraph 1, subparagraph a). A disciplinary measure written warning is a measure that can be imposed in addition to a public warning or fine punishment when the bailiff maintains official records and electronic data in violation of the Law on Archive Materials; breaking the rules of bailiffs Ethics Code or does not meet the obligations stipulated by acts of the Chamber or its behavior towards employees or other persons during the implementation of actions ruins the prestige and honor of bailiffs, as well as the prestige and honor of officials or other persons or bodies representing it, participants in the proceedings; improperly and incorrectly keeps the records which the bailiff is required to keep; submits reports on its work stipulated by this law with delay or inaccuracy; fails to submit a proposal for assigning a vice bailiff within the time limit set by enforcement law; enter inaccurate data about the debtor; take actions without a paid administration fee and prior enforcement orders; and takes actions for performance at no advanced price (*see article 64*). Another innovation is the possibility to impose a written reprimand, public reprimand or punishment with money when during deliveries and other documents with his behavior offends the court, the state authorities and the Chamber of enforcement bodies.

According to the line c of the article 62, fine or temporary deprivation of the right to perform a bailiff's duty (a term of three to six months) may be imposed on the bailiff if: the bailiff does not keep evidence of the paid remuneration and other expenses in accordance with the law; if unreasonably prolongs the enforcement; doesn't record the enforcement requests according to the time of their receipt in which the bailiff is obliged to keep; works under the influence of alcohol or drugs; it does not keep official records and documents by subject in his office; during the implementation of enforcement action does not take account of the dignity and personality

of the parties, participants and their families in the procedure of enforcement; avoids the obligation of continuing professional development and education which is provided through seminars and lectures; requires access to data about a person who is not a debtor; receives a greater or lesser remuneration for enforcement actions or other expenses contrary to the Tariff (*article 65, paragraph 1*). While the abovementioned causes are the same as those contained in the Law on Enforcement of 2005, for which a fine was imposed or temporary suspension of the right to be a bailiff, the following are the innovations of 2016: providing inaccurate data for the purpose of conducting supervision; makes submissions contrary to legal provisions; neglect to take action or take action in violation of legal provisions determined by the court in the procedure for objection against irregularities in enforcement, documents, records, documents and acts, as well as deliveries arising from his performance, which cannot be found in case files; fails to give authorization to his substitute bailiff for disposal with his regular and special account; has not been excluded, while the conditions for his exclusion have been met, uses facsimile in his work; does not act according to the order of requests received for enforcement or has not taken action on a enforcement request; changes the residency of the bailiff's office and fails to notify the Chamber within 15 days; has not filed an insurance policy to the Chamber within the time limit set by law, in case of damage. According to the Law on Amending and Supplementing Law on enforcement, in 2018 (*Official Gazette No. 233/2018*) were added two more possibilities for the submission of this disciplinary measure: "When the bailiff inaccurate and untimely prepares reports on its work and when at a request of a party wasn't prepared or were prepared incorrect calculation of the claims or administration price, the price for carrying out enforcement actions, the remuneration of bailiffs, real costs and charges that were made during realization of the enforcement procedure". According to the Annual Reports of Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia during 2016, 2017 and 2018, multiples complains of citizens where noticed the lack of rules regarding the bailiff's reporting of his work and how he applied the Tariff, one of the remarks was revising the Reward Tariff for bailiffs (*Annual Report of Ombudsman, 2018, p. 63*). Thus, the fees for bailiff may not exceed 20% of the principal debt and the interest specified in the enforcement document.

The last and most severe measure that can be imposed on the bailiff is permanent deprivation from the right to be a bailiff (line e): if he fails to take the prescribed measures to prevent money laundering; does not act upon the final decisions adopted by Court of Appeals, or for prolonging the enforcement; is also appointed by consciously hiding the existence of legal barriers; undertakes actions during the enforcement that are not foreseen by law or in contradiction with law determined by the court in the procedure for objection against the irregularities during enforcement; for himself or his family members (in straight line or fourth degree in side line); buys property in public sale or acquires other rights during enforcement proceedings; has used or misused the personal data of the parties, participants or third parties contrary to the purposes of the Law or the Law on the Protection of Personal Data; adds classified information with a degree of secrecy established in accordance with the law, performs commercial activities and mediates; concludes agreements on his own behalf for other persons, or on behalf of someone else for himself, or participates in legal work where he takes official actions as a bailiff, in violation of the law; accept gifts or other benefits related to enforcement, or place his personal financial interest in conflict with the status of bailiff; notwithstanding the material means which it supplied during the enforcement; possesses the material means that he supplied during the enforcement; does not identify the enforcement requests according to the time of their receipt in the records, which the bailiff is obliged to keep; money entrusted for safekeeping invests in its own name in violation of the provisions of this law; performs public or leadership functions, supervisory and administrative functions

in business organizations, political parties, government entities, payment services, notary and lawyer duties, and services to the religious community or religious group, and - misuses personal data determined by court decision, in accordance with the law. According to the Law on Enforcement of 2005, the basis upon which the law of 2016 foresees as a basis to temporarily or permanently loses the right to exercise enforcement functions, the old law apparently maintains a very rigorous approach and that is the option to be permanently deprived of the opportunity for that person to perform the function as a bailiff in the Republic of Macedonia.

According to the bailiff's Annual report, the overview disciplinary measures and procedures would look as it follows.

Table 1(a). Data collected from the Annual Report of the Bailiffs Chamber in 2018, for the Disciplinary Committee cases for disciplinary violations before imposing the sentence, public and written warning and temporary suspension

Year	Number of the bailiffs	General number of the proposed disciplinary measures	Ruling that is not caused violations of discipline	Ruling for fine imposition as a disciplinary measure	Ruling on the disciplinary measure remarks in written warning / public warning	Ruling on temporary suspension
2016	98	5	/	/	/	/
2017	101	3	/	2	1	/
2018	97	10	/	5	2	2

Table 1(b). Data collected from the Annual Report of the Bailiffs Chamber in 2018, on the cases of the Disciplinary Committee on permanent deprivation of the right to perform the enforcement task, temporary suspension for six months, rejecting the proposal due to limitation and rejecting the proposal

Year	Number of the bailiffs	General number of proposed disciplinary measures	Ruling on the permanent deprivation of the right to perform the enforcement task	Ruling on temporary suspension for six months	Ruling on rejecting the proposal due to limitation	Ruling on rejecting the proposal
2016	98	5	/	/	1	4
2017	101	3	/	/	/	/
2018	97	10	1	1	/	1

According to data for 2016, the Disciplinary Committee had reached 5 proposals, all of which came from extraordinary supervision, while neither the President of the Chamber nor the President of the Basic Court had filed any request. Proposals were raised for 3 types of violations: bailiff's actions which were not foreseen by the law or which are contrary to the law and 2 cases for unreasonably delaying the enforcement actions. For one of the cases with a ruling was rejected the case because of limitation (table no. 2), while four of the other cases pending before the Bailiff's Chamber remained pending, because the cases were filed following the new Enforcement Law of 2016, while the Disciplinary Committee did not act or make a decision on these cases because its mandate had expired. This was justified by the fact that according to the new Law of 2016 the Disciplinary Committee should have a member from the Council of Public Prosecutors of the Republic of Macedonia. On 21.03.2017 the Disciplinary Committee held a constitutive meeting in which the bodies of the Disciplinary Committee were elected, respectively the President of the Chamber and his substitute were elected. As in the previous year had remained unsolved four cases, on 04.04.2017, the new composition of the

Disciplinary Committee held control of the four cases and the same ones were rejected (Table 2). For 2017, three proposals were filed for initiation of disciplinary procedure, all by the Minister of Justice and we have no proposals from the President of the Basic Court and the President of the Bailiffs Chamber.

In 2018, unlike previous years, the number of proposals had increased to 10, and unlike previous years this year, there were five Rulings were made for imposing a disciplinary measure, one Ruling for imposing a disciplinary measure written warning and a Ruling for disciplinary measure public warning, two Rulings for temporary suspension, one Ruling on the permanent deprivation of the right to perform enforcement actions, one Resolution on the temporary deprivation of the right to perform enforcement tasks for a period of six months, and one Ruling on the rejection of the proposal. As for 2018, there are two proposals for this year and both had been made by the President of the Bailiffs Chamber, while the President of the Basic Court jet has no proposal for initiating disciplinary proceedings.

5. Conclusion

With the adoption of the Law on Enforcement in 2016, obviously trends were directed on improving enforcement system, correction of some situations, timeliness, as well as remedies for protection of all parties, participants and third parties. These changes undoubtedly reflected in the supervisory process to bailiff's work. Increased measures for which the Disciplinary Committee may impose disciplinary measures, as well as strengthening regulations concerning how Disciplinary Commission is form and specifically adding a new member of the Council of public prosecutors in the composition. On the other hand, the possibility of extraordinary control by two person's representatives from the Ministry of Justice is also a system of control for the bailiffs in general, but also for the Bailiffs Chamber in particular. As this control is subject to the same supervision, because evidences of requests, deadlines, decisions and other matters related to the Disciplinary Committee are held by the Bailiff Chamber. Looking at the way supervision is performed, we can say that the Ministry of Justice has a key role to play, according to annual reports, as it appears to be the most frequent proposer of disciplinary proceedings, while the Presidents of Basic Courts are in unsatisfied level, because if the court is competent to decide on remedies during the enforcement process, it means that on neither of the cases solved by the courts, violation haven't been found. According to the data's collected from the ombudsman's reports for 2016, 2017 and 2018, the largest number of citizen submissions were related to enforcement, as well as the statistics of Basic Courts on remedies received by the courts and the appeals, appears that in all cases any omission or violation of the procedure during the three years for which they were authorized to initiate proceedings are not found.

References

- [1]. Annual Reports on the work of the Bailiffs Chamber of the Republic of Macedonia for the period from January 1 to December 31, 2016, 2017 and 2018.
- [2]. Annual Reports of Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia, 2016, 2017 and 2018.
- [3]. Consolidated text April 20, 2011 (Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia no. 59/11).
- [4]. Law on enforcement (Official Gazette Nr. 72/16).
- [5]. Law on Amendments and supplement to the Law on Enforcement (Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia no. 142/16).
- [6]. Law on Amendments and supplement to the Law on Enforcement (Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia no. 233/18);
- [7]. Law on enforcement (Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia no. 35/05; 50/06; 129/06; 8/08; 83/09; 50/10, 83; 10; 88/10; 171/10).
- [8]. Regulation on the Responsibility and Disciplinary Procedure of Bailiffs, adopted by the Extraordinary Meeting of the Chamber Assembly on 25.05.2010, Skopje.
- [9]. Statute of the Chamber of Bailiffs of the Republic of Macedonia, Consolidated text, no. 03-369 / 12, dated 17.09.2019.