

The Department of Communication and Information plays a fundamental role in strengthening transparency within the Constitutional Court. As the institution responsible for safeguarding the constitution, the Court must not only deliver fair and independent decisions, but also ensure that its work is understood, accessible, and trusted by the public. First, the department serves as the bridge between the Court and society. Second, effective communication enhances institutional legitimacy. Third, the department supports educational and civic awareness efforts. Finally, transparency through communication contributes to accountability. While the Court must maintain confidentiality in deliberations, it also has a duty to justify its final decisions. The communication department ensures that justification of Judgments is presented clearly, consistently, and in a manner that respects legal standards and the public's right to information. In sum, the Department of Communication and Information is not a administrative unit, but a cornerstone of transparency, trust, and democratic integrity in the Constitutional Court.

Since its establishment, the Department of Communication of the Court has steadily evolved into a strategic, professional, and proactive structure, driven by a deliberate process of development, guided by strategy, training, and international cooperation. A key driver of this progress has been the adoption of communication strategy plans. These plans have helped the department move to a clear, long-term vision: defining key messages, setting standards for clarity and accessibility of information, and integrating traditional and digital communication tools. Strategy plans have also clarified internal procedures, how sensitive cases are communicated, and how to respond to misinformation making the department more coherent and reliable in the eyes of the citizens. Continuous training has been another central pillar of advancement. The department has also benefited significantly from exchanges with peer courts and judicial institutions. Study visits, joint workshops, and participation in regional and international networks have enabled staff to observe how other constitutional courts organize their communication, manage social media, structure their press offices, and engage with civil society and media. Particularly important has been the placement of Court officials at the European Court of Human Rights. Through these placements, staff members have gained first-hand experience of communication at a highly visible international court that handles sensitive human rights issues. Overall, the Department of Communication has gradually transformed itself into a strategic partner of the Court's leadership.

Our Constitutional Court communicates with the public through a carefully balanced mix of traditional and modern channels, ensuring that its work remains accessible to all. Communication through the Court's website and email distribution to the media continues to play an essential role in maintaining accuracy and formality. At the same time, recognizing the rapid evolution of digital communication, the Court has expanded its presence on social media by developing active communication channels on Facebook, X, and YouTube to offer timely updates and increase its visibility among younger and more digitally engaged audiences. These platforms allow the Court to present its work in a more accessible and engaging way—using visuals, short summaries, and interactive content—while also fostering direct and open communication with the public. By embracing digital tools alongside its traditional methods, the Court has broadened its reach and effectively adapted to a world where transparency and public engagement rely increasingly on fast, user-friendly, and widely accessible communication.

The Communication and Information Unit publishes summaries of decisions on the Court's website and social media platforms—following the practice of the ECtHR—and, in cases of significant public interest, provides more detailed summaries. It also publishes full judgments, announcements, photos, and information regarding the activities of the Court and its judges, including visits, trainings, workshops, and representation carried out by judges and Court officials inside and outside the country. In addition, the department provides statistical overviews related to the Court's decision-making and work, key thematic summaries, informative bulletins,

information brochures, quarterly and annual bulletins of case law, various Court guides, as well as informative videos on the Court's competencies, composition, referral procedures, decision-making processes, and its most important judgments.

Across its social media channels, the Court shares live broadcasts of activities, as well as videos, photographs, and information, using creative designs and modern communication techniques to capture public attention. All inquiries for information submitted to the Court by citizens and the media receive a response within 24 hours. In accordance with the law, the Court grants access to public documents when legal criteria are met, and to date, it has not been the subject of any citizen complaints before the Agency for Information and Privacy. Communication with the public is carried out at all times with full respect for the protection of personal data.

In a Public Perception survey conducted by a company contracted by the COE Office in Pristina, it turned out that a majority of respondents, 61%, believe that the decisions are understandable and clear, demonstrating a significant level of transparency perceived by the public. However, 16% of respondents find the decisions unclear, pointing to an area where the Court might improve the communication or the way it articulates its rulings. Regarding respondents' primary sources of information on the Constitutional Court's decisions, 66% cited television as their main source. The internet and social media followed, with 47% and 43%, respectively. Additionally, 40% of respondents reported relying on the Court's website for updates.

But of course that over the years, the Court has inevitably become a target of disinformation—whether intentional, arising from a lack of legal knowledge, or driven by politically motivated efforts to undermine the Court's credibility in the public eye, particularly regarding its decision-making and institutional independence. This challenge has intensified with the rapid expansion of social media, which has made it easier to create, spread, and amplify misleading narratives.

Such disinformation poses serious risks: it can distort public understanding of constitutional processes, erode trust in judicial institutions, and create pressure on the Court's independence. In extreme cases, coordinated attacks can fuel polarization, misrepresent the Court's role, and weaken the rule of law by manipulating public perception. The speed and reach of digital platforms mean that false information can circulate widely before accurate clarifications are issued, making the work of correcting misinformation increasingly complex.

For these reasons, the Communication and Information Department plays a crucial role in responding swiftly, providing accurate explanations, and reinforcing transparency. Through clear communication and proactive engagement, the Court works to counteract inaccuracies, prevent the spread of misleading narratives, and safeguard public confidence in its constitutional mission. The Court has consistently maintained its integrity and has not yielded to such attacks, choosing not to be drawn into public disputes or political controversies. It has intervened publicly only on rare occasions, and solely when necessary to clarify essential facts for the public. In these exceptional cases, the Court has reaffirmed that its role is to faithfully carry out its constitutional duties, uphold the Constitution, and protect the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens. By exercising restraint and adhering strictly to its mandate, the Court has demonstrated its commitment to independence, professionalism, and the principles of the rule of law.

In what follows, I will present several of the most significant cases in which, in public opinion, the Court's decision-making has not been properly understood, and where it has been necessary for the Court to clarify its reasoning, even though such reasoning had already been clearly and thoroughly explained in the initial notice of decision and in the respective judgments.

One such case concerns a factory, relating to the recognition of the rights of former workers of this enterprise who had been unlawfully dismissed, and their entitlement to compensation for unpaid wages. The issue under the Court's review was the non-execution of decisions of the regular courts regarding this compensation. The Court ordered the Government and the Kosovo Privatization Agency to execute the final judgment of the Municipal Court of Ferizaj and to report back to the Court within six months on the measures taken. However, in public opinion, the case was misunderstood and misinterpreted as if the Constitutional Court had granted 20 million euros in compensation.

Another case, relating to the constitutional interpretation concerning the formation of the government, is the well-known "VLAN" case. In public discourse, often intentionally by the political parties involved, the Court's decision was misrepresented regarding which coalition or which party held the right to form the government. This misinterpretation turned the Court into a frequent target of various attacks.

There is also the case of the Association of Serb-Majority Municipalities, in which the Court examined only the statute of the Association and concluded that certain provisions were not in compliance with the Constitution. Nonetheless, in public opinion, this was interpreted as if the Court had approved the establishment of the Association.

Another case of great public interest was the Court's constitutional review of Law on Salaries in the Public Sector. This law aimed to create a uniform salary system across the public sector. As a result of the law, salaries in some sectors were reduced while in others they were increased. The Court found constitutional violations in relation to the salary reductions, whereas the sections of the law that increased salaries remained untouched. Despite this, public interpretation and media reports suggested that the entire law had been annulled and that the salary increases had also been reversed. This misunderstanding occurred even though the Court's notice explained the matter in great detail and, at the end, summarized in simplified non-legal language that the increased salaries would not be reduced.

Likewise, over the past two years the Constitutional Court has reviewed the constitutionality of several laws that the government presented as part of its justice reform. In most of these cases, the Court found the laws to be incompatible with the Constitution and consequently annulled them. Among these was the law on the Bureau for the Confiscation of Unjustified Assets, where the Court, among other things, concluded that it violated citizens' legal certainty. However, in public discourse, particularly from certain political parties and the one in Government, this was interpreted as an attempt by the Court to obstruct the justice reform and to protect specific political figures who may have unlawfully benefited from the state budget. In reality, the Court has acted with great diligence to safeguard the rights and freedoms of citizens, including their legal certainty, through its decisions.

