

BASIC COURT PODGORICA

PLAINTIFF: Tihomir Goranović, from Nikšić, residing at Put pored Bistrice no. 1/3, employed at the Ministry of Interior – Police Directorate as Chief Police Inspector, represented by attorney Veselin D. Radulović from Podgorica;

DEFENDANT: Ministry of Interior – Police Directorate

LAWSUIT

regarding: determination of workplace mobbing and compensation for damages

The Plaintiff has been employed with the Defendant for almost 25 years, currently holding the title of Chief Police Inspector. Before and during his employment with the Defendant, he acquired professional knowledge for performing duties within the Police Directorate, graduated from the Military Academy of the Army – Infantry Division, earning the title of Graduate Officer, successfully completed several security seminars, and has been repeatedly commended and rewarded for his professional results.

Until 2021, the Plaintiff was rated EXCELLENT by his immediate superiors for his work and contribution to security.

EVIDENCE: Undisputed,

Examination of the Plaintiff as a party to the proceedings,

If necessary, other evidence that the Plaintiff will timely propose.

On 27 February 2021, the then Acting Director of the Police Directorate, Zoran Brđanin, contacted the Plaintiff by telephone and informed him that he was dismissed from his previous function as Head of the Security Centre Nikšić and that he would be reassigned to a new position. One of the reasons for the Plaintiff's dismissal was political pressure exerted by certain structures on the then management of the Police Directorate.

EVIDENCE: Review of the submitted content of daily newspaper publications, as well as statements of politicians in public appearances and on social networks, all available at the following links:

- <https://www.pobjeda.me/clanak/grupa-gradana-proslavila-smjene-na-celuniksicke-policije>
- <https://www.pobjeda.me/clanak/brdanin-smijenio-nacelnika-i-komandira-cb-niksicmijenja-ih-dragoljub-pekovic>
- <https://www.pobjeda.me/clanak/dnp-pokrenula-peticiju-za-smjenu-nacelnika-cb-niksic-i-jednog-komandira>
- <https://www.facebook.com/pokretura/posts/-smijenjeni-na%C4%8Delnik-cb-nik%C5%A1i%C4%87-tihomir-goranovi%C4%87-i-komandir-stanice-policije-dar/1492126157657840/>
- <https://www.portalanalitika.me/clanak/peticijama-do-ostvarenja-politickih-ciljeva>
- <https://www.in4s.net/plac-internacionalnih-montenegrina-za-madjaricem-i-goranovicem-krive-brdjanina-za-smjenu-postenih-i-casnih-policijskih-sluzbenika/>
- <https://www.pobjeda.me/clanak/mandic-odmah-otkriti-napadace-na-trebjesanina>
- <https://www.pobjeda.me/clanak/knezevic-pronaci-napadace-na-trebjesanina-ili-mafija-ili-drzava>
- <https://www.vijesti.me/vijesti/politika/516149/mandic-napad-na-luku-je-napad-na-mene-dps-postao-ekstremisticka-organizacija>
- <https://www.novosti.rs/crna-gora/vesti/964521/nece-nas-zaustaviti-lazovic-slicni-kriminalci-ostra-reakcija-koalicije-buducnost-niksica-zbog-maltretiranja-mila-bozovica>
- <https://www.novosti.rs/crna-gora/vesti/963905/stoji-iza-skrnavljenja-dzamiye-vrh-dps-pokusava-lazno-optuzi-srbe>
- <https://www.novosti.rs/crna-gora/vesti/964781/milovi-policaici-poslanike-privode-niksicu-sve-vise-incidenata-udaru-predstavnici-demokratskog-fronta-srpski-drzavljeni>

For the next three years, the Plaintiff was not assigned to any position. From the time he was dismissed as Commander of the Police Station CB Nikšić until 10 January 2024, the Plaintiff was excluded from the work process without explanation. He was isolated, professionally neglected, denied training, and deprived of rights related to his work.

^[P]_[SEP]EVIDENCE: Examination of the Plaintiff,

If necessary, other evidence.

Thus, for three full years the Plaintiff was professionally and personally humiliated, with psychological consequences affecting his family life. He was placed in an unequal position within the system and deprived of his fundamental labor rights: the right to work and career development, professional training, fair financial compensation, and engagement in more complex tasks consistent with his title and work experience.

In January 2024, the Plaintiff received Decision No. 49, ref. 100/23-68247/1, dated November 22, 2023, by which he was assigned to the Department for Support to Police Organizational Units, Work Improvement, and Analytics, to the civil service position No. 4273 – Police Officer for Support to Organizational Units.

EVIDENCE: Decision of the Defendant No. 49, ref. 100/23-68247/1, dated November 22, 2023

However, the harassment of the plaintiff continued in the new department, because his assignment decision was not delivered by the immediate superior – the Head of the Department – but by Police Officer Željko Peković from Nikšić Police Station, acting on the instructions of the then Acting Deputy Director Lazar Šćepanović. He informed the plaintiff that it had been “decided at a higher level” to assign him to the Nikšić Police Station and to the superior Goran Đurđevac (then Senior Inspector), who would be giving him work assignments.

After the plaintiff presented to Željko Peković that he held the rank of Chief Police Inspector, and that a superior of a lower rank cannot issue work orders to a superior of higher rank, and after explaining the job description of the assignment decision (in accordance with the systematization act) and requesting a written order for delegated tasks, Peković stated that he would consult with the then Acting Deputy Director Lazar Šćepanović, and that the Director would decide what would be done, saying that this was the best solution.

EVIDENCE: Testimony of the Plaintiff,

Testimony of the Witness Željko Peković

On January 11, 2024, at the request of the then Acting Deputy Director of the Police Administration Lazar Šćepanović, a meeting was held in the official premises of the Nikšić Police Station, attended by the plaintiff, as well as Darko Mađarić, Željko Peković, and Goran Đurđevac.

On that occasion, Acting Deputy Director Lazar Šćepanović stated that the plaintiff had poorly managed the Security Center, that he had been “targeted by foreign services,” and that he should perform executive tasks for the applicant in the misdemeanor procedure and represent them before the competent authority, as well as other tasks in the police station since he was no longer in a managerial position. After the plaintiff pointed out his acquired rank, long-standing professional experience in managerial positions in the Police Administration, and the job description of the position to which he was assigned (as contained in the systematization act), and requested a written order, Šćepanović abandoned this unlawful plan.

The plaintiff informed the then Director of the Police Administration, Zoran Brđanin, in detail about the content and outcome of this conversation at a meeting held on January 12, 2024, in the Director's office, attended also by Police Officer Darko Mađarić.

Zoran Brđanin, at the time Director of the Police Administration, as a person involved in the drafting of the systematization act, explained to the plaintiff all the tasks and the required professional level derived from the assignment decision, which contradicted the initial intention of the then Acting Deputy Director Šćepanović.

EVIDENCE: Testimony of the Plaintiff,

Testimony of the Witnesses Zoran Brđanin and Darko Mađarić

The plaintiff informed his immediate superior of both meetings and discussions through the regular monthly work report.

From the receipt of the new assignment decision and during the following 16 months of work, the plaintiff did not have a single work meeting with the Head of Department, even though he submitted his work reports regularly, in which he, among other things, requested a work meeting to clarify the methodology for engaging department officers. For 2024, the plaintiff did not receive an official annual evaluation, nor was he contacted regarding the evaluation procedure. In 2025, the plaintiff was not called for a discussion to plan annual leave, nor did he receive a decision regarding the use of annual leave.

During 2025, the harassment continued through the continuous assignment of work tasks below the plaintiff's professional rank of Chief Police Inspector. Until July 10, 2025, in addition to tasks corresponding to his rank in terms of description and complexity, the plaintiff was assigned tasks that, by their nature, complexity, and responsibility, belonged to positions of significantly lower rank, including those requiring only a secondary professional qualification.

It is particularly humiliating for the plaintiff that such conduct was carried out precisely in the organizational unit he had previously led, further undermining his professional integrity, authority, and dignity.

EVIDENCE: Monthly work reports detailing tasks assigned to the Plaintiff by type and date, submitted to the superior via official email

On April 10, 2025, the plaintiff was summoned to an oral hearing scheduled for April 25, 2025, without prior information on its subject, which prevented him from preparing adequately and engaging legal assistance. The hearing was conducted regarding the enforcement of a new systematization act; however, such procedure was not applied uniformly to all officers but only to certain individuals, including the plaintiff. During the hearing, the plaintiff was presented with a draft assignment, and he stated in the

minutes that he had no objections to the draft's content but reserved the right to appeal.

On June 11, 2025, the plaintiff received Notice No. 02/7-102/25-30037/1, stating, among other things, that the public authority would issue a decision on the assignment in accordance with the draft proposal.

EVIDENCE: Notice of the Defendant No. 02/7-102/25-30037/1 of June 11, 2025

This procedure further confirms that the decision had been made in advance, and the entire process was a formality without genuine intent to consider the officer's remarks.

The continuation of harassment occurred on July 10, 2024, when the plaintiff was summoned for a meeting with the Head of the Western Regional Security Center, Darko Radusinović, who orally informed him that an act had been delivered from the Police Administration stating that the plaintiff failed the security check, that he was "unsuitable for further work in the Police Administration," and that a disciplinary procedure had been initiated against him. According to Radusinović, the security check had been initiated in June 2024 by the Head of the Department for Support to Police Organizational Units, Work Improvement, and Analytics, a certain superior Popović.

When the plaintiff asked the reasons for failing the security check and what he was being accused of, the Head replied that he could not disclose the reasons nor the specific matters and that a disciplinary procedure would have to be initiated against him. Thus, the plaintiff was denied the basic right to be informed of the accusations and any evidence supporting them, and, consequently, to defend himself.

The plaintiff informed the management of the Defendant in writing about this meeting and its content on July 22, 2025.

EVIDENCE: Official Note of the Plaintiff No. 50 239/25-5/840 of July 22, 2025

On July 24, 2025, the plaintiff submitted a written request to the Head of the Western Regional Security Center, Darko Radusinović, demanding information on the security check initiator act – exact date, reference number, name and position of the initiator, Minister's decision on forming the security check commission, names of members, any decisions changing its composition, the document (or extract) by which the commission determined that the plaintiff "failed" the check, the date of the decision, signatures of members, reasoning, case number, and the initiative under which the disciplinary procedure was initiated against the plaintiff, including the date of initiation if applicable.

EVIDENCE: Plaintiff's Request No. 50-070/25-6553 of July 24, 2025

On August 4, 2025, the Head of the Western Regional Security Center, Darko Radusinović, responded confirming that on July 4, 2025, he held a meeting with the plaintiff, informing him of security issues affecting his continued work in his police rank,

stating that this constituted a disciplinary offense, and that a proposal for a disciplinary procedure would be submitted. During the meeting, it was explained that there was no obligation to disclose the reasons for the security issues and that details would be provided by the Disciplinary Commission. The act also stated that the security check was conducted by a commission formed by the Minister, marked classified, and that requested data could not be provided. Finally, the act noted that the Nikšić Security Department initiated a disciplinary procedure against the plaintiff on July 18, 2025, Act "I" No. 7625.

EVIDENCE: Act of the Head of the Western Regional Security Center Darko Radusinović No. 50 070/25-6553/1 of August 4, 2025

On August 8, 2025, the plaintiff sent a follow-up request for information and documentation regarding the security check and disciplinary procedure.

EVIDENCE: Follow-up Request of the Plaintiff No. 50/070/25-6553/2 of August 8, 2025

On August 11, 2025, Radusinović responded, informing the plaintiff that his requests were forwarded to the Department for Coordination of Police and Related Affairs of the Police Administration, which would respond.

EVIDENCE: Act of the Head of the Western Regional Security Center Darko Radusinović No. 50 070/25-6553/3 of August 11, 2025

On August 20, 2025, the plaintiff submitted a request to the Defendant – Directorate for Normative-Legal and HR Affairs, requesting access to and copies of his personnel file.

EVIDENCE: Plaintiff's Request to the Defendant No. 02-105/25-39694/2 of August 20, 2025

The Defendant did not respond to this request.

In summary, February 27, 2021, marks the beginning of harassment against the plaintiff and conduct that violates his dignity, reputation, and personal and professional integrity, which has continued until the filing of this claim.

Article 2 of the Law on the Prohibition of Workplace Harassment defines: "Mobbing, within the meaning of this law, is any active or passive behavior at work or in connection with work toward an employee or group of employees, which is repeated, and which aims to or constitutes a violation of the employee's dignity, reputation, personal and professional integrity, causing fear or creating a hostile, humiliating, or offensive environment, worsening working conditions, or leading the employee to isolate themselves or resign from the employment or other contract on their own initiative."

All of the above clearly indicates that the plaintiff has been continuously harassed at work, that his dignity, reputation, and personal and professional integrity have been

violated, that a hostile environment has been created, that he has been accused of acts constituting serious criminal allegations without disclosure, and that he has not been allowed to defend himself. Working conditions have been deliberately worsened to isolate or force him to leave the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and when this failed, the plaintiff was removed from work without explanation and subjected to a disciplinary procedure without being provided any decision or evidence. As a result of the harassment, the plaintiff suffers severe mental distress.

The plaintiff attempted to avoid litigation with the Defendant, hoping that the harassment would stop. In accordance with the Law on the Prohibition of Workplace Harassment, on July 21, 2025, he submitted a request to the Minister highlighting the mobbing.

EVIDENCE: Complaint – Request to Initiate Protection Procedure Against Mobbing No. 01-215/25-37636/1 of July 21, 2025

However, the Defendant continued harassment and did not act on this complaint. On August 6, 2025, the plaintiff submitted a follow-up to the Minister, No. 01-215/25-37637/2, warning of violations of statutory deadlines.

EVIDENCE: Plaintiff's Follow-up No. 01-215/25-37636/2 of August 6, 2025

In this process, the plaintiff continued to experience harassment and obstruction of his legal rights. According to Articles 15(3), 20, and 22 of the Law on the Prohibition of Workplace Harassment, the Defendant was required to initiate and complete mediation procedures within prescribed deadlines and inform the plaintiff if mediation was unsuccessful. The Defendant ignored the plaintiff's requests, and the process was not initiated or completed in accordance with the law, continuing the pattern of harassment.

Since the plaintiff followed the legal procedure and first submitted a request for protection against mobbing, and since mediation failed due to the Defendant's persistent inaction, it is proposed that the Court, after conducting the evidentiary procedure and concluding the main hearing, issue the following:

JUDGMENT

I. It is ESTABLISHED that the Plaintiff, Tihomir Goranović, suffered workplace harassment (mobbing) by the Defendant. The Defendant is prohibited from repeating actions constituting mobbing and is obliged to recognize and ensure the enforcement of this prohibition in the future, within eight days from the finality of the judgment.

II. The Defendant is ORDERED to pay the Plaintiff, as compensation for violation of

personal rights (dignity, reputation, personal and professional integrity), the amount of _____ € (to be specified during the proceedings), within eight days from the finality of the judgment, under threat of enforcement.

III. The Defendant is ORDERED to reimburse the Plaintiff's legal costs, in accordance with the applicable Attorney Tariff, within eight days from the finality of the judgment, under threat of enforcement.

In Podgorica, 2 September 2025

For the Plaintiff, Representative:
Veselin D. Radulović, Attorney at Law, Podgorica
