Annex C – Court Consolidations

District of Banja Luka

Population in district: 650,538

Current number of courts: 9

Proposed number of courts: 7

Proposed number of branches: 0

Basic Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Banja Luka	48	31.6	290685	36km Kotor Varoš 49km Gradiška 55km Prijedor	+	+	+	Court remains but loses Ćelinac & Skender Vakuf / Kneževo
Bosanska Gradiška / Gradiška	9	5.9	60446	33km Srbac 44km Kozarska Dubica 49km Banja Luka	+	+	+	Court remains
Kotor Varoš	4	1.4	19741	19km Kneževo 21km Ćelinac 36km Banja Luka	–	–	o	Court remains gaining Ćelinac & Skender Vakuf / Kneževo

Bosanska/ Kozarska Dubica	5	2.3	34319	33km Prijedor 44km Gradiška 49km Novi Grad	–	–	o	Merged with Prijedor
Mrkonjić Grad	6	6.6	32054	63km Banja Luka	+	–	+	Court remains
Bosanski Novi / Novi Grad	7	4.7	40281	32km Prijedor 49km Kozarska Dubica	o	o	o	Court remains
Prijedor	15	6.3	100188	32km Novi Grad 33km Kozarska Dubica 55km Banja Luka	+	+	+	Court remains
Prnjavor	8	3.2	49040	30km Derventa 55km Banja Luka	o	o	o	Court remains
Srbac	5	2.3	24384	33km Gradiška 64km Prnjavor	–	–	o	Merged with Bosanska Gradiška / Gradiška

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

The problem courts from a restructuring standpoint in Banja Luka District are in Kotor Varoš (- – o), Bosanska/Kozarska Dubica (- – o), and Srbac (- – o). None of these courts meet the criteria for continuation. Adding the municipalities of Ćelinac and Skender Vakuf / Kneževo to Kotor Varoš's jurisdiction, however, should increase both population

and case-filings for that court sufficiently to bring it up to minimally acceptable levels (o o o). Banja Luka Basic Court should welcome the relief of that caseload. Bosanska/Kozarska Dubica is best merged with the Prijedor court, 33km to the south. Srbac gravitates most logically toward Bosanska Gradiška / Gradiška; residents of Srbac already travel to Bosanska Gradiška / Gradiška for hospital services.

District of Bijeljina

Population in district: 242,576

Current number of courts: 4

Proposed number of courts: 3

Proposed number of branches: 0

Basic Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Bijeljina	18	15.3	124288	50km Lopare 57km Zvornik	+	+	+	Court remains
Lopare	3	2.4	18632	50km Bijeljina	–	–	+	Merged with Bijeljina
Srebrenica	4	4.1	44175	54km Zvornik 68km Vlasenica	o	o	+	Court remains
Zvornik	8	4.0	55481	46km Vlasenica 54km Srebrenica 57km Bijeljina	o	+	+	Court remains

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.

**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

The only problem in the Bijeljina District is the Lopare court (- – +). Although remote from Bijeljina, Lopare has neither the caseload nor the population sufficient to justify a court. Travel to Bijeljina is not difficult, however, and there is regular bus service. If travel proves to be a problem for Lopare residents, the Bijeljina Basic Court may consider holding "court days" in Lopare.

District of Doboj

Population in district: 266,714

Current number of courts: 4

Proposed number of courts: 4

Proposed number of branches: 0

Basic Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Derventa	6	6.5	62183	30km Prnjavor 41km Doboj 54km Modriča	+	+	o	Court remains
Doboj	16	7.5	139037	28km Teslić 41km Derventa 50km Modriča	+	+	+	Court remains
Modriča	9	5.5	65494	50km Doboj 54km Derventa	+	+	+	Court remains
Teslić	4	3.4	48157	28km Doboj	o	o	o	Court remains

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.

**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

All of the courts in Doboj District meet minimum criteria. Thus no changes are needed here.

District of Srpsko Sarajevo

Population in district: 165,282

Current number of courts: 5

Proposed number of courts: 3

Proposed number of branches: 1

Basic Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Rogatica	3	1.7	17643	35km Sokolac 40km Višegrad	–	–	o	Merged with Višegrad
Sokolac	6	4.4	46991	35km Rogatica 51km Srpsko Sarajevo 51km Vlasenica	o	o	+	Court remains
Srpsko Sarajevo	5	2.8	28119	51km Sokolac	–	–	+	Made a branch of Sokolac
Višegrad	5	2.2	28691	40km Rogatica 75km Sokolac	–	–	+	Court remains
Vlasenica	8	4.2	34838	51km Sokolac	o	–	+	Court remains

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

The District of Srpsko Sarajevo does not contain large cities in which to concentrate courts, posing problems for a reasonable restructuring plan. None of these courts carries a

substantial caseload. The mountainous terrain and the distances between cities make consolidation difficult, however. On balance it makes the most sense to close the court in Rogatica, merging it with Višegrad. This brings Višegrad into minimally acceptable range on all three criteria (o o +). Although it is the seat of the district court, Srpsko Sarajevo is too small in terms of population and caseload to continue as a separate court. It should be merged with the Sokolac court; however, given its considerable distance from Sokolac, court facilities with minimal staff should remain open in Srpsko Sarajevo as a two-judge branch of the Sokolac court. Vlasenica (o – +) just barely misses the minimum criteria for population, but should be kept anyway, as it is too remote to have reasonable consolidation options.

District of Trebinje

Population in district: 114,477

Current number of courts: 3

Proposed number of courts: 2

Proposed number of branches: 1

Basic Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Nevesinje	5	1.8	29573	112km Foča/Srbinje 119km Trebinje	–	–	+	Made a branch of Trebinje
Foča/Srbinje	5	3.2	35045	98km Srpsko Sarajevo 112km Nevesinje 143km Trebinje	o	o	+	Court remains

Trebinje	8	4.2	49859	119km Nevesinje 143km Foča/Srbinje	o	o	+	Court remains

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

Geographic distance is a serious problem for the Trebinje District. Nonetheless, the caseload in Nevesinje (- – +) is too small to warrant a separate court there. Accordingly, Nevesinje should be merged with the Trebinje court, but remain open as a one-judge branch to meet the needs of the public in that area. Although Nevesinje is actually slightly closer to Foča/Srbinje, the roads to Trebinje are far superior, particularly in the winter.

Una Sana Canton (Bihać)

Population in canton: 305,049

Current number of courts: 7

Proposed number of courts: 5

Proposed number of branches: 0

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Bihać	15	16.6	68385	25km Cazin 35km Bosanska Krupa	+	+	+	Court remains
Bosanska Krupa	5	3.9	29211	25km Cazin 35km Bihać 34km Bužim	o	–	o	Court remains

Bužim	3	2.1	17781	34km Bosanska Krupa	–	–	o	Merged with Bosanska Krupa
Cazin	7	6.3	60122	25km Bihać 25km Bosanska Krupa 40km Velika Kladuša	+	+	o	Court remains
Ključ	4	1.7	15972	35km Sanski Most 95km Bihać	–	–	o	Merged with Sanski Most
Sanski Most	6	3.9	64416	35km Ključ 125km Bihać	o	+	+	Court remains
Velika Kladuša	5	4.4	49162	40km Cazin	o	o	o	Court remains

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

The Bužim (- – o) and Ključ (- – o) courts are the obvious candidates for closure in this Canton. Some suggestion was made that the municipality of Bosanski Petrovac could be carved off from the Bihać Municipal Court's jurisdiction and given to Ključ to help bolster its anemic case filings. But the addition of Bosanski Petrovac (pop. 8272) would still fail to bring the Ključ court into a case-filing and population range sufficient to meet the articulated criteria. Accordingly, Ključ should be merged with the court in Sanski Most, which may wish to initiate occasional "court days" in Ključ.

Bosanska Krupa (o – o) is also marginal under the criteria, but benefits from the closure of Bužim. Merging Bužim back with Bosanska Krupa – which historically had jurisdiction for Bužim – brings the merged court within the acceptable range (+ o o).

Posavina Canton (Orašje)

Population in canton: 43,666

Current number of courts: 2

Proposed number of courts: 1

Proposed number of branches: 0

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Odžak	5	2.2	16055	52km Odžak	–	–	+	Merged with the Orašje court
Orašje	6	2.8	27611	52km Orašje	–	–	+	Court remains

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

Neither court has the caseload or the population to justify itself. Accordingly, the two courts should be merged into one court based in Orašje, the cantonal capital and the site of the greater population and case-filing activity. The Orašje court may wish to schedule court days in Odžak, to meet local needs there. The cantonal court will remain in Odžak.

Tuzla Canton

Population in canton: 506,296

Current number of courts: 9

Proposed number of courts: 5

Proposed number of branches: 1

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Banovići	7	4.2	28636	13km Živinice	o	–	–	Merged with Živinice
Gračanica	10	4.4	63308	25km Srebrenik 35km Lukavac 48km Gradačac 50km Tuzla	o	+	+	Court remains
Gradačac	9	2.7	47029	26km Srebrenik 48km Gračanica	–	o	+	Court remains
Kalesija	6	3.9	55707	25km Tuzla 30km Živinice	o	+	o	Court remains
Kladanj	5	2.9	15672	34km Živinice 49km Tuzla	–	–	o	Made a branch of Živinice court
Lukavac	9	5.1	51521	15km Tuzla	o	o	–	Merged with Tuzla
Srebrenik	7	3.5	41661	25km Gračanica 26km Gradačac	o	o	o	Merged with Gradačac
Tuzla	33	19.5	150816	15km Lukavac 15km Živinice 25km Kalesija	+	+	+	Court remains
Živinice	8	5.5	51946	13km Banovići 15km Tuzla 30km Kalesija 34km Kladanj	+	o	–	Court remains

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.

**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria:

Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

Clearly the Banovići (o – -) and Živinice (+ o -) courts are too close together to warrant their continued existence as separate courts. Although Banovići has the better building at present, Živinice has the higher population and higher caseload, and is better located on the main highway. The municipality of Živinice has pledged its help in securing a suitable building for the court there. If there are delays in securing an adequate space in Živinice for the combined court, it can operate out of the Banovići building, but the combined court should be relocated to Živinice as soon as adequate space is available.

The Kladanj court (- – o) is too small, both in caseload and population, to continue and should be merged with another court. The ideal candidate would be the Olovo court, also too small. But because Olovo is in the Zenica-Doboj Canton, that merger must await constitutional reform in the Federation that would allow cross-cantonal jurisdiction. In the meantime, Kladanj should be merged with the Živinice court, 34 km away over a winding mountain pass. Three judges should be allowed to reside in the new court building in Kladanj, however, as a branch of the Živinice court. That will keep the building in court hands for an eventual merger with Olovo.

Although Lukavac (o o -) has adequate caseload and population, it is too close to Tuzla to warrant continued existence as a separate court. No one in Lukavac municipality will be seriously inconvenienced by having to travel to Tuzla to court.

Gradačac (- o +) and Srebrenik (o o o) are both marginal courts in terms of caseload and population, and they should clearly be merged. Where to merge them is a more difficult question. Gradačac has a slightly larger population and a long history. Srebrenik is a little more centrally located

and has the larger caseload. Although Gradačac had the better building, the Srebrenik municipality has promised to build space to accommodate the newly merged court. Although the combined court could go either place, the balance favors Gradačac.

The courts of Gračanica (o + +) and Kalesija (o + o) meet the criteria adequately and can continue as separate courts, provided that Kalesija gets a new building. Space has been identified there, but it is not clear if and when it will be made available to the court, which is severely cramped in its current quarters.

Zenica-Doboj Canton

Population in canton: 395,407

Current number of courts: 10

Proposed number of courts: 6

Proposed number of branches: 1

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Breza	5	2.7	13775	12km Visoko 24km Vareš	–	–	–	Merged with Visoko
Kakanj	8	4.6	43800	22km Visoko 29km Zenica	o	o	o	Court remains
Maglaj	5	2.6	23611	25km Zavidovići 34km Tešanj	–	–	o	Merged with Zavidovići
Olovo	4	1.2	12934	58km Visoko 72km Vareš	–	–	+	Made branch of Visoko court
Tešanj	8	3.8	58690	34km Maglaj 44km Zavidovići	o	+	+	Court remains

Vareš	4	3.3	10118	36km Visoko	o	–	o	Merged with Visoko
Visoko	8	4.7	40044	12km Breza 22km Kakanj 36km Vareš 51km Zenica 58km Olovo	o	o	o	Court remains
Zavidovići	8	4.1	37942	12km Žepče 25km Maglaj 53km Zenica	o	o	+	Court remains
Zenica	22	16.5	127972	29km Kakanj	+	+	+	Court remains
Žepče	4	2.2	26521	12km Zavidovići	–	–	–	Court remains for time being

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

The courts in Breza (- – -) and Žepče (- – -) are the two obvious candidates for closure as they fail all three criteria. Breza should be merged with the nearby court of Visoko.

Žepče municipality, however, is the subject of a carefully negotiated agreement acknowledged and implemented by the High Representative in a decision of October 6, 2000. Accordingly, notwithstanding its failure to meet the criteria, the court in Žepče will be retained pending a full review of the High Representative's October 6 decision and surrounding circumstances.

Although Maglaj (- – o) has a fine building, it fails most of the criteria, and should also merge with Zavidovići.

Olovo due to its poor caseload and population does not pass the test. However, due to its remote location, and as it cannot be merged with the Kladanj court until constitutional changes occur (see discussion of Kladanj above), it should, for the time being, be a made a one-judge branch of the Visoko

court. The court in Vareš (o – o) serves an extremely small population and is much closer to Visoko. As "court days" should be sufficient to meet the needs of that community, the court can be merged with Visoko.

Kakanj (o o o), Visoko (o o o), and Zavidovići (o o +) meet minimum standards. Kakanj is enjoying a vibrant economic development, and the other two courts will grow substantially with their absorption of neighboring courts.

Bosanski-Podrinje Canton (Goražde)

Population in canton: 35,235

Current number of courts: 1

Proposed number of courts: 1

Proposed number of branches: 0

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Goražde	5	4.5	35235	N/A	o	o	+	Court remains

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

The court in Goražde (o o +) meets the criteria, and even if it did not, it must remain as the sole municipal court in the canton.

Central Bosnia Canton (Travnik)

Population in canton: 239,122

Current number of courts: 7

Proposed number of courts: 3

Proposed number of branches: 1

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Bugojno	12	8.2	70162	48km Jajce 45km Travnik	+	+	+	Court remains
Fojnica	3	1.2	11074	21km Kiseljak 72km Travnik	–	–	o	Merged with Kiseljak
Jajce	5	2.2	22731	48km Bugojno	–	–	+	Made branch of Bugojno court
Kiseljak	4	2.1	27145	21km Fojnica 51km Travnik 60km Novi Travnik	–	–	+	Court remains
Novi Travnik	5	4.3	24944	14km Travnik	o	–	–	Merged with Travnik
Travnik	11	4.6	51028	14km Novi Travnik 19km Vitez 51km Kiseljak 72km Fojnica	o	o	+	Court remains
Vitez	7	5.6	32038	19km Travnik	+	–	–	Merged with Travnik

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

As both Novi Travnik (o – -) and Vitez (+ – -) do poorly respectively in terms of population and geography, they should be merged with the nearby court in Travnik (o o +). In order to accommodate the larger municipal court in Travnik, the cantonal court can be relocated to the space vacated by the

municipal court of Novi Travnik.

Fojnica (- – o) and Kiseljak (- – +) are both small and are obvious candidates for merger. Together they meet minimum requirements (o o +), so the combined court can remain in Kiseljak.

Jajce (- – +) does not have the sufficient caseload and population to justify its existence as a separate court. It is remotely located, however, and easily meets the criteria for continuation as a branch of the Bugojno (+ + +) court.

Herzegovina-Neretva Canton (Mostar)

Population in canton: 217,106

Current number of courts: 10

Proposed number of courts: 3

Proposed number of branches: 0

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Čapljina	5	4.8	19376	25km Čitluk 25km Stolac 45km Neum 34km Mostar	o	–	o	Court remains
Čitluk	4	1.5	16298	20km Mostar	–	–	o	Merged with MC Mostar
Jablanica	3	1.3	13021	23km Konjic	–	–	o	Merged with Konjic
Konjic	6	4.1	29817	23km Jablanica 60km Mostar 54km Prozor-Rama	o	–	+	Court remains

Central Zone	5	0	Total 104997	20km Čitluk 40km Stolac 48km Jablanica	n/a	+	–	Merged into MC Mostar
Mostar I	13	7.4			+		+	
Mostar II	14	5.5			+		–	
Neum	3	0.4	6680	45km Čapljina	–	–	+	Merged with Čapljina
Prozor-Rama	3	1.3	17056	31km Jablanica 54km Konjic	–	–	+	Merged with Konjic
Stolac	4	0.9	9861	25km Čapljina 40km Mostar	–	–	o	Merged with Čapljina

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

Neum (- – o) and Stolac (- – o), both seriously deficient under the criteria, should be merged into Čaplijna (o – o) which is currently marginal but which should gain a satisfactory level of population and caseload from the two mergers (+ o o).

Čitluk (- – o) too fails the criteria and is only 20 km from Mostar. Mostar (+ + +) itself has been divided into three different courts, although there are efforts already underway toward unification. Čitluk should be added to the mix to create a single large court in Mostar.

Jablanica (- – o) and Prozor-Rama (- – +) are both too small to justify their existence and should be merged with the Konjic court. As Prozor-Rama is more isolated, it is strongly recommended that “court days” be held there.

West Herzegovina Canton (Široki Brijeg)

Population in canton: 81,299

Current number of courts: 2

Proposed number of courts: 1

Proposed number of branches: 0

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Ljubuški	4	2.7	22209	34km Široki Brijeg	–	–	o	Court remains
Široki Brijeg	8	4.4	59090	34km Ljubuški	o	+	+	Merged with Ljubuški

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

Although Široki Brijeg (o + +) appears to meet the criteria far better than Ljubuški (- – o), these figures are misleading. In fact, the canton consists of four municipalities and Široki Brijeg's jurisdiction has been drawn to include three of the four, even though the Grude municipality gravitates more naturally toward Ljubuški. While mechanical application of the criteria would dictate that the court be kept in Široki Brijeg, there is more to the picture than the numbers. Of the four municipalities, Ljubuški is considered as the main urban center in the area and attracts most of the economic activity, including twelve attorney's offices. The caseload also seems to indicate that litigation cases *per capita* are significantly higher in Ljubuški than in Široki Brijeg. Accordingly, notwithstanding the stated criteria, it actually makes more sense to keep the municipal court in Ljubuški.

Given the new premises soon to be made available in Široki Brijeg, it is proposed that the cantonal court be located there.

Sarajevo Canton

Population in canton: 400,219

Current number of courts: 2

Proposed number of courts: 1

Proposed number of branches: 0

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Sarajevo I	34	34.2	141377	n/a	+	+	+	Merge into one MC Sarajevo
Sarajevo II	41	55.6	258842	n/a	+	+	–	

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

The two Sarajevo municipal courts are located in the same building, and the population for both courts comes almost entirely from urban and suburban Sarajevo itself. As stated in the Preliminary Report, retaining two courts provides no benefits in terms of efficiency, administration or cost savings, and there is evidence that jurisdictional questions between the two courts consume staff and even judge time. Accordingly, the two courts should be merged.

Canton 10 (Livno)

Population in canton: 83,949

Current number of courts: 3

Proposed number of courts: 1

Proposed number of branches: 1

Municipal Court	Current no. of judges	Case-load Index*	Population in area that court covers	Geographical Distances	Criteria**			Recommendation
					C	P	G	
Drvar	2	0.8	15665	110km Livno	–	–	+	Made a branch of Livno court
Livno	4	3.5	37559	40km Tomislavgrad 110km Drvar	o	o	+	Court remains
Tomislavgrad	3	2.3	30725	40km Livno	–	–	o	Merged with Livno

*Explained on pp. 4-6 of the report and calculated on the spreadsheets at Annex E.
**How the court satisfies the three objective criteria: Caseload (C), Population (P), and Geography (G), as explained on pp. 7-9.

Given the relatively low population and the small caseload in this canton there is clearly no need for three municipal courts. Tomislavgrad (- – o) and Drvar (- – +) fail most of our criteria and should be merged with Livno. However due to the truly remote location of Drvar, it is proposed to keep it open as a one-judge branch of the Livno court.