



REGULATORY
AUTHORITY FOR
ELECTRONIC MEDIA

Nikole Pašića 5
11103 Belgrade, Serbia
www.rem.rs

Number: 2235/2024 / I

Date: 07. 03. 2025

Belgrade

Report of the Monitoring and Analysis Service

Ex officio **procedure**, based on the complaint of the Slavko Ćuruvija Foundation.

MSP: PRVA TELEVIZIJA D.O.O. — Prva, Autoput 22, Belgrade.

Complaint: 04. 11. 2024

Subject of oversight: News and current affairs programme of TV Prva, 08 Oct, 17 and 18 Oct. 2024

Short description: Reporting on the trial of minor K.K, charged with multiple murders.

Report:

The complaint refers to the broadcasting of details from a hearing in which K.K, minor and perpetrator of a crime, participated in the capacity as a witness. The complainant is of the opinion that an infraction was committed regarding the protection of the minor by broadcasting his full name and surname, as well as by broadcasting the content of the trial that is partially closed to the public for the purpose of the protection of the minor.

The disputed parts of TV Prva news and current affairs programme are presented in detail in the transcripts contained in the complaint filed.

By examining the indicated disputed parts of the news and current affairs programme of TV Prva, it was determined that these were reports from the scene where the reporters presented indirect information obtained about the course of the court proceedings and developments in the courtroom, while repeatedly stating that this was unofficial information, describing additional details, such as the appearance of the courtroom.

The Technical Service took into account that this is an extreme event, for which there is no established practice when it comes to actions by judicial bodies, and in which the media are also placed in a situation where a strict compliance with the rules (protection of privacy of minors, presumption of innocence, etc.) does not have the significance of protecting public or personal interest, as in other cases.

tel: 011/2028 700
fax: 011/2028 745
email: offhce@rem.rs
TIN: 102945724
Registry number: 17488554

The fact that this is a special case was also noted during the discussion itself (150 Minutes broadcast, 18. 11. 2025): "This is something that the Serbian judiciary has never encountered before, this is an event that even the modern state of Serbia has not encountered in the 20th and 21st century, nor could anyone have imagined it. The question is also how the judiciary will manage to get out of this conundrum in which it has found itself" (Nemanja Lukić, lawyer). — "I do not even know how to formulate a question to you that would sound normal because it is an abnormal circumstance, as you said, this is the first time we have come across such a situation." (programme host).

Regarding the broadcasting of the full name and surname of the minor, although the **Rulebook on the Protection of the Rights of Minors in the Area of Media Services** states that the MSP has an obligation to protect the identity of minors even when a public authority or other person failed to do so, the allegation of identity confidentiality breach is without merit since the identity has been fully public since the actual crime was committed in May 2023. In addition, the identity of the minor is also clear based on the publicly known identity of his parents, who are also the subject of the specific court proceedings in which the minor appears as a witness. Even if it were taken into account that the minor has been harmed by releasing his identity, as well as the details of his testimony in court, the Technical Service is of the opinion that the harm is minor compared to that which stems from the liability for the atrocious murder with which he is charged.

The Technical Service indicates that the programme in question refers to the trial of Miljana and Vladimir Kecmanović, which was not closed to the public, except for the part where their son K. K. testified.

The Technical Service is of the opinion that the reporting of TV Prva on the trial of Miljana and Vladimir Kecmanović has not caused a significant damage to the public interest protected by the regulations under the jurisdiction of REM, or to the individual interests of interested parties.

Conclusion: There are no grounds for the initiation of an examination procedure.

Monitoring and Analysis Service