



Number: 187/2025/1

Date: 28/03/2025

Belgrade

Report of the Monitoring and Analysis Service

Ex officio procedure, based on a complaint from XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX from the CRTA organisation, Francuska 6, Belgrade

MSP: TV Informer - Insajder tim d.o.o. Bulevar Peke Dapčevića 17, Belgrade.

Complaint: 21/02/2025

Subject of oversight: Specijal programme, 28/01/2025 from 14:10.

Summary: Discussion with Vojislav Šešelj regarding the incident at the SNS headquarters in Novi Sad

The complaint refers to a short sequence from the interview in the Specijal programme. The programme belongs to the news and current affairs programme genre. As part of the disputed content, the following sentence is highlighted:

V. Šešelj: *Last night, a group of hooligans attacked the headquarters of the Serbian Progressive Party in Novi Sad. That is how I understood it.*

The host: *He said that that was perhaps the straw that broke the camel's back, but don't you think that the pressures...*

Based on the transcript attached to the complaint containing the disputed part of the discussion, the Technical Service does not find grounds for establishing an infraction related to hate speech or to violation of personal dignity (inter alia, bearing in mind that specific persons were not named); namely, calling the students *hooligans* was downplayed by the statement "That is how I understood it", which made it clear that it was a subjective view of the guest in the studio. In the highlighted part of the interview, there is no grounds for finding that the host of the programme encouraged the guest to engage in hate speech and justify violence or describe people as hooligans. Furthermore, there is no room for the conclusion that the guest approved the use of baseball bats or even the use of firearms. In the highlighted part of the discussion, the relevant statement is the following: *The security had baseball bats, and they could also have had guns, if they had staff with permission to carry firearms* (V. Šešelj).

In terms of the interpretation of the event itself (who was attacked, whether the students attacked the party premises or they were the ones who were attacked outside the premises), the Regulator has no authority or means to engage in establishing the facts; however, it is an incident that directly preceded the resignation of the prime minister from his office and was perceived in various ways by the public.

Conclusion: There are no grounds for initiating an examination procedure.

Monitoring and Analysis Service