



BEZBEDNI NOVINARI

 SIGURNA
L!NIJA
0800 100 115



Representatives of ANEM and the OSCE Mission to Serbia visiting Radar weekly (photo: ANEM / Veran Matić)

MONITORING OF THE MEDIA SCENE IN SERBIA FOR DECEMBER 2025

INTRODUCTION

The monitoring of the media scene is conducted to continuously track events and processes affecting media freedom in the Republic of Serbia. This monitoring focuses on freedom of expression; monitoring the implementation of existing regulations; the adoption of new regulations, as well as amendments to current ones, both in the media field and other areas that directly or indirectly impact media freedom; and the analysis of lawsuits considered by experts to be SLAPP suits (strategic lawsuits against public participation) targeting journalists and media outlets.

Publicly available data, information obtained from journalists, editors, and other media professionals, journalistic associations, and media organizations, as well as from governmental and non-governmental bodies, are used for monitoring.

The text of this Monitoring Report was prepared by expert monitoring team from the “Savović” Law Office in cooperation with ANEM.

Supported by:

This project is funded by
the European Union



#ЕУ
ЗА ТЕБЕ

B | T | D
The Balkan Trust
for Democracy

A PROJECT OF THE GERMAN MARSHALL FUND

Norway

I FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Freedom of expression, as in previous months, was both under attack and defended.

According to the latest report of the Civicus Monitor platform, Serbia has moved from the category of countries with an “obstructed” civic space (a category it had been placed in since 2019)¹ to the category of states whose civic space is “repressed.” With regard to freedom of expression, the report draws attention to the intimidation and detention of citizens, activists, and protest participants; to continuous campaigns aimed at discrediting journalists and media outlets; to the abuse of legal and institutional mechanisms to suppress public criticism; and to the fact that state security structures used spyware to monitor the phones of journalists, activists, and participants in student and anti-government protests. All of the above has significantly narrowed the space for free and pluralistic public debate.²

In a statement, United Nations experts warned of an escalation of attacks against journalists and independent media outlets in Serbia over the past year. The Government of the Republic of Serbia was called upon to put an end to the practice of impunity for perpetrators. The statement specifies that the attacks are often part of a broader narrative that appears to be supported by the state; that threatening and disparaging remarks against independent journalists are made by high-ranking officials, thereby creating a dangerous environment for journalists and encouraging impunity for attacks against them; and that the police often fail to intervene when journalists reporting from protests and public gatherings are exposed to verbal and physical attacks.³

The international organization Reporters Without Borders published the report “2025, a deadly year for journalists: where hatred and impunity prevail”, which states that at least ninety-eight physical attacks were carried out against media workers reporting on protests triggered by the death of sixteen people caused by the collapse of a canopy at the Railway Station in Novi Sad. According to the report, half of these attacks were committed by the police and remained unsanctioned. The climate enabling such conduct was shaped by verbal attacks by the President of the Republic of Serbia, who, as recalled by Reporters Without Borders, is included on their 2025 list of “predators of press freedom.”⁴

The investigative outlet BIRN published findings obtained in cooperation with the SHARE Foundation, according to which the Security Information Agency (BIA), during the detention of four farmers and environmental activists, installed the NoviSpy spyware on their phones.⁵ Earlier, Radio Free Europe published an article stating that the Serbian police, in April, despite media reports that Cellebrite had suspended cooperation with domestic institutions in February, purchased more than 30 different licenses for that tool. In addition, the police also possess the UFED (Universal Forensic Extraction Device) Touch2 Ultimate tool, which can be installed on tablet devices, enabling the police to extract data from targeted devices virtually anywhere.⁶

In the programme “360 Degrees,” broadcast on TV N1, Stevan Dojčinović, editor of the KRIK investigative portal, spoke about the manner in which the prosecutor’s offices—the Belgrade Higher Public Prosecutor’s Office (HPPO) and the Prosecutor’s Office for Organized Crime (POOC)—have handled the recording of a conversation between Vladimir Lučić, CEO of Telekom, and Sten Miller, CEO of United Group, concerning the shutdown of independent media in Serbia. This recording forms the backbone of the investigative story pursued by KRIK. Dojčinović pointed out the paradoxical situation in which the Belgrade Higher Public Prosecutor’s Office requested that KRIK submit a recording that was already publicly available. Although the recording is authentic—which, Dojčinović emphasized, was confirmed by the authors of the recording (Lučić did not deny it, and the company BC Partners confirmed its authenticity)—the HPPO claimed that KRIK had manipulated the recording. Manipulation of the recording, Dojčinović explained, would imply cutting the recording and inserting voices that do not exist. However, this did not occur. The only “manipulation” carried out by KRIK was enhancing the audio so that the conversation could be heard more clearly. Dojčinović expressed cautious hope regarding the proceedings initiated by the Prosecutor’s Office for Organized Crime. A meticulous investigation, the journalist stressed, would reveal the “heart of the way media control functions in Serbia.”⁷

At the annual meeting of the Permanent Working Group on the Safety of Journalists, representatives of journalists’ and media associations—most of whose status within the Working Group is currently frozen—raised objections before representatives of the Supreme Public Prosecutor’s Office regarding the conduct of both the prosecution and the police over the past year. Representatives of the OSCE Mission also presented the proposed Action Plan of the Permanent Working Group for 2026, which focuses on visits to local communities and improving cooperation between local journalists, prosecutors, and the police in resolving cases involving threats to journalists’ safety. The proposed Action Plan was supported by all participants.⁸

The Association of Independent Electronic Media (ANEM), the Independent Journalists' Association of Serbia (NUNS), and the OSCE Mission to Serbia held discussions on the safety of journalists in Zaječar, Negotin, and Bor. The discussions addressed key problems faced by journalists in this part of Serbia, ranging from severe financial difficulties to numerous physical attacks.⁹

ANEM and the Center for the Development of Local Media (CRLM) from Požarevac, within the project "Violence Prevention System and Protection of Journalists," prepared the "Report on Media in Eastern Serbia." The report showed that journalists and media outlets from Zaječar and Bor face threats to their safety through physical attacks, online targeting, various institutional obstructions, political pressure, and economic insecurity.¹⁰



Meeting of the Permanent Working Group for the Safety of Journalists in Zaječar (photo: OEBS / Miroslav Janković)

II ATTACKS, THREATS, AND PRESSURES

Findings from the “Scanner”

Aleksandar Dikić, the author of several programmes on KTV television (“Without Restraint,” “Without Censorship,” “Scanner by Dr. Aleksandar Dikić”) and a columnist for several media outlets (the daily Danas, the magazine Nova srpska politička misao, and the Bez cenzure portal), was deprived of liberty in the second half of December and placed in police custody for up to 48 hours.¹¹ Dikić was charged with the criminal offense of Calling for the Violent Overthrow of the Constitutional Order (Article 309 of the Criminal Code).¹² His defense attorney, Ivan Ninić, stated that Aleksandar Dikić was arrested at his family home, in the presence of his wife and minor son. Police officers searched his home, unsuccessfully looking for weapons.¹³ After being questioned at the premises of the Belgrade Higher Public Prosecutor’s Office, the journalist was released to defend himself while at liberty.¹⁴

The statement for which he was detained and deprived of liberty was given by Dikić to the YouTube channel of the [SRBIN.info portal](http://SRBIN.info). On that occasion, he used the image of a blindfold placed over the eyes before execution as a metaphor for “mitigating circumstances” that should be ensured for “members of the ruling party who decide to leave the system, side with citizens and students, and testify about corruption and crime within the party.”¹⁵ Assessing his client’s statement as clumsy, Dikić’s defense attorney emphasized the fact that the President of the Republic of Serbia was not mentioned in it at all. Ninić believes that the prosecution opted for a “popular qualification” of the criminal offense because it is the most appealing for communication with the electorate of the ruling party and the most susceptible to abuse.¹⁶

In a joint statement, the associations ANEM and NUNS assessed the deprivation of liberty of Aleksandar Dikić as a manifestation of blatant repression aimed at intimidating critical voices in Serbia. The organizations expressed suspicion that this was a politically motivated pressure and recalled that the journalist’s detention had been preceded by a campaign against him conducted by pro-government tabloids. They described the order for forcible entry and search of his home as an “additional disturbing indicator of the inappropriate use of repressive powers.” The statement reads:

Of particular concern is the application of disproportionate measures such as the inspection and search of journalists’ computer hard drives, other data storage devices, and mobile phones, as well as the recording of their contents, which directly compromises personal confidential data and journalistic sources. Such practices constitute a serious encroachment on the right to privacy and media freedom, as well as a dangerous precedent that directly intimidates journalists and their sources.¹⁷

Vuk Cvijić

In the second half of December, in the afternoon hours, an unknown person contacted investigative journalist Vuk Cvijić of the media outlet Radar and, in a brief telephone call placed from abroad, warned him to be careful about what he would publish the following day. When Cvijić asked which article the caller was referring to, the unknown person replied that he should be careful because, if he published it, they would “meet.” After Cvijić explained that the next day’s issue of Radar had already been printed and would be published according to the regular schedule, the caller responded: “Then you will meet me,” and the call was disconnected.¹⁸

The threatening call was reported to the competent authorities. On the day he received the call, the journalist gave a statement to the police, and the following day to the Third Basic Public Prosecutor’s Office.

Speaking about his suspicions regarding the origin of the call, Cvijić indicated that it came from criminal circles supported by the current authorities and pointed out the paradoxical nature of the situation, noting that he reported the attack to the police whose members had themselves attacked him on two occasions in the previous year.¹⁹ Due to the range of topics he covers, Cvijić interprets the reference to “tomorrow” in the call as a synonym for the future, in which the first article published after the warning is not the only “problematic” one.²⁰



Investigative journalist Vuk Cvijić (photo: Radar / Vesna Lalić)

The threat against Cvijić was condemned by journalists' and media associations,²¹ the informal community of judges and prosecutors "Defense of the Profession,"²² the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media Jan Braathu²³, and the President of the European Federation of Journalists, Maja Sever.²⁴ As a sign of support, representatives of the Permanent Working Group on the Safety of Journalists and the OSCE Mission to Serbia organized a visit to the editorial office of the weekly Radar.²⁵

For years, Vuk Cvijić has been exposed to both threats and physical attacks (on the attack that took place in front of the Faculty of Law building, see [Monitoring of the Media Scene for July 2025](#); on the attack during reporting from protests in front of the General Staff building, see [Monitoring of the Media Scene for August 2025](#); on the attack by Milan Lađević, see Monitoring of the Media Scene for [May](#) and [June](#) 2024 and [March](#) and [April](#) 2025).

On Guard

Throughout December, all "fortifications" from which, or about which, journalists were not allowed to report continued to be guarded. One such area was the fenced-off space in front of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia.

The editorial staff of the Mašina portal reported that unknown men prevented their journalist, who had come to inform the public about developments following the announcement that tents would be removed, from leaving the fenced area until she deleted the recordings she had made.²⁶ The journalist asked police officers to provide protection; however, they also demanded that she delete the recordings after showing them. A published [video recording](#) shows a police officer instructing the journalist that she has no right to record individuals without authorization. Emphasizing the capacity in which she was present on the public surface where she was recording, and that she had not recorded the individuals blocking her exit, the journalist refused to delete the recordings or hand over her phone to the police.²⁷

On the same day, a reporter from Nova S television also entered the same fenced area in order to verify the claim made by Police Director Dragan Vasiljević that the area was not a "restricted zone" accessed under controlled conditions and that journalists (adding that he was "not sure" about this) could not enter it. After entering the fenced area, the journalist was stopped by an unknown person who, disregarding his press credentials, told him that he could not record there without prior announcement. The journalist left the area without receiving an answer to the question of whom he should contact in order to be allowed to report from that location. According to information available in the media, three police officers were positioned not far from the reporter and observed the critical situation without reacting.²⁸

The following day, after a session of the National Assembly, reporting was also prohibited to TV N1 reporter Žaklina Tatalović,²⁹ just as it had earlier been prohibited to two reporters from the daily newspaper Danas. The journalists invoked their legally guaranteed right to report from a public place, but received the response from the unknown men who imposed the ban: “Forget the law, that’s not important now.”³⁰

Another area closed to reporting was guarded by a police cordon in Bački Petrovac, where citizens gathered to express dissatisfaction with a visit by the President of the Republic of Serbia. Vladimira Dorčov Valtnerov, a journalist from the Storyteller portal, who was wearing clearly visible press identification, found herself surrounded by a Gendarmerie cordon set up around the protesting citizens. Despite informing police officers of her professional capacity, she was not allowed to pass. Her freedom of movement was enabled only after NUNS contacted the Ministry of Interior’s liaison point.³¹



Threats Keep Their Own Pace

During December, the digital sphere continued to serve as a channel through which threats reached journalists.

The editorial office of Radar was threatened via email and through comments left on their website. The threats targeted the entire newsroom, with the only individual singled out being cartoonist Dušan Petričić. From an email address previously known to the editorial staff, the following message was received:

“YOU ARE USTASHA TRAITOROUS SCUM... WHEN 300,000 SERBIAN NATIONALIST HORDES SET OFF... WE WILL COME FOR YOU FIRST, YOU SCUM, AND ESPECIALLY FOR THIS FILTHY PIECE OF GARBAGE DUŠAN PETRIČIĆ WHO WILL GO AROUND SERBIA KILLING SERB PATRIOTS... WE WILL WIPE YOU OUT FOREVER...” Dušan Petričić was also threatened in a comment left on the outlet’s website: “And won’t this scoundrel be executed? Some are tried and banned from working because they call a Ustasha scoundrel a blocker, which he calls himself, and this criminal gets nothing. He is a free journalist. He should be shot, and those who support him burned. That would be democracy. Fuck your Ustasha mother.” This was followed by another message:

“We’ll meet in Zemun. I’ll show you how I turn a man into a caricature.”³²

Journalists’ and media associations appealed to the prosecution to identify those behind the threats.³³

Under a post on the X social network account Dobar, loš, zao (“The Good, the Bad, the Ugly”), Nenad Kulačin was told: “Hey, you fat jerk? When is someone going to knock those teeth out of your mouth and fix your hair and face a bit?”³⁴ The authors of the show Dobar, loš, zao were also threatened via Facebook and through comments on their YouTube channel, with messages such as: “Antifa terrorists like you two should just be fried”; “Fuck you, you won’t last long”; “Just cut your heads off, get lost”; “For these idiots—a bullet and some bombs.”³⁵

The professional community reacted,³⁶ and the threats were reported to the Special Prosecutor’s Office for High-Tech Crime.³⁷

KTV television informed the public that the websites bezcenzure.rs and ktv.rs were for a period inaccessible to visitors due to a hacker attack. As stated, the attack was preceded by an influx of followers on their social media accounts. The outlet managed to retain control over its accounts. The cyberattack was attributed to their professional work and critical positions toward the current regime.³⁸

Journalists’ and media associations reacted to false bomb threats reported at the building housing the editorial offices of Kurir and the portals Mondo and Espresso.³⁹

The editorial offices of the OzonPress portal and Čačanske novine reported to the competent authorities that unknown individuals had pelted the entrances to their premises with eggs in the early morning hours. The professional community reacted to the incident.⁴⁰

Muddy Roads

Following her reporting on the proceedings conducted against Minister of Culture Nikola Selaković, N1 television journalist Ana Novaković became the target of a smear campaign carried out against her on the social network X. The comments she received and published on her account in video form abounded in insults, sexist and misogynistic statements.⁴¹ The professional community stood in defense of the journalist. The case was recorded in the database of the Media Freedom Rapid Response network.⁴²

Journalists' and media associations strongly condemned the campaign conducted against N1 television journalist Danica Vučenić in tabloid and pro-government media.⁴³ Večernje novosti published the first article claiming that the journalist saw nothing controversial in the statement for which Aleksandar Dikić had been deprived of liberty: [“EXECUTE VUČIĆ” – Danica Vučenić: ‘What’s controversial?’](#) The statement was very tendentiously interpreted as Dikić’s position that the President of the Republic of Serbia should be executed, and as such it continued to be disseminated in subsequent articles (an article published in the daily Kurir was titled: [“THEY SEE NOTHING CONTROVERSIAL IN EXECUTING VUČIĆ! Scandalous statement by Danica Vučenić, justifies the horrific threats by Aleksandar Dikić”](#)). The articles followed after the journalist, on the day of Dikić’s arrest, asked his defense attorney the following question: “It is not clear why he is being charged with undermining the constitutional order, given that we do not see that in the statement—we have analyzed the statement. What is this about?”⁴⁴

Responding to questions from (pro-government) media, the President of the Republic of Serbia did not refer to Dikić’s statement, but rather to their interpretation of it:

I accept that, and it would go down in history. I am not afraid of those cowards. Imagine executing a man during whose time the country made the greatest progress, during whose time salaries and pensions were the highest, during whose time the most roads and railways were built, a man who built everything for you... Come, execute me, do it—that is the only way you can win.

While tabloid media were filled with articles about Danica Vučenić, the President of the Republic of Serbia also commented on the issue of banning N1 and Nova S, stating that it “does not even cross his mind,” because if it did, those media outlets would long ago have been banned in accordance with the law, given that they had “countless times called for the overthrow of the constitutional order and actively participated in it.” The reason those media outlets, according to the President, should be “cherished like the apple of one’s eye” lies in the fact that without them, among “people who support us,” there would be “neither emotion nor passion, nor would they know what they must defend.”⁴⁵

During a press conference held in mid-December 2025, N1 television journalist Mladen Savatović asked the President of the Republic of Serbia whether he expected that, until responsibility is established in the criminal proceedings conducted against him in the “General Staff” building case, the Minister of Culture in the Government of the Republic of Serbia, Nikola Selaković, would resign of his own accord or be dismissed by

the Prime Minister, and whether the President himself had requested that the General Staff building be stripped of its status as a cultural monument. Instead of an answer, Savatović received a “verdict” that everything he had said was a lie, that he was a “proven liar,” that he was shouting, that he was ill-mannered, that he called the President Hitler, that his parents had not taught him basic manners, and that the President would therefore “personally get involved.”⁴⁶ Due to the statements addressed to him, the journalist announced that he would file a lawsuit.⁴⁷

Following the President’s remarks, threats began arriving to Savatović via social networks and on the N1 portal. The first wave followed the press conference, and the second came after the journalist announced a lawsuit against the President. Threats were directed both at the journalist personally and at his newsroom. A person using the username “Srećko” left a comment on the N1 portal announcing an “ambush” in front of the television building, accompanied by insults and profanity. The journalist was called a “traitorous scumbag” who should be “taught a lesson,” because he was “a young man but without a shred of decency.” Alongside footage of an intrusion into a media agency in Russia, the N1 newsroom received the message: “I want to break into N1 like this.” They were also told: “Everything should be burned.” This message was followed by another stating: “Don’t do it alone, there are those of us who would gladly keep you company.”⁴⁸

N1 Executive Editor Jelena Petrović gave a statement to UNS, noting that following the President’s demeaning and insulting address to their journalist, threats and comments intensified on the portal and social networks,⁴⁹ particularly those directed at their female journalists.⁵⁰ The threats were reported to the Special Prosecutor’s Office for High-Tech Crime.

Journalists’ and media associations reacted strongly, condemned the threats, and assessed the conduct of the President of the Republic of Serbia as unacceptable and potentially dangerous.⁵¹



During “discussion” with N1 journalist Mladen Savatović (photo: printscreens N1)

A Recognizable Style

When, at a press conference, N1 television journalist Žaklina Tatalović attempted to ask an additional question to the President of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia regarding the procedure for electing members of the REM Council, technical staff muted her microphone. In the footage broadcast on TV N1, a man can be seen and heard introducing himself as the head of the Department for Electronics, Telecommunications and Informatics, telling the journalist that they had been instructed to mute her microphone. He ended the conversation with the words: "We're just sound technicians."⁵²

The professional community reacted to the incident, and UNS assessed the muting of the journalist's microphone as impermissible conduct that deprives citizens of information of public importance.⁵³

The Association of Independent Electronic Media (ANEM) condemned the threatening, insulting, and misogynistic chanting directed at Brankica Stanković from the stands of the Belgrade Arena during the EuroLeague basketball match Partizan–Virtus. ANEM recalled that the Editor-in-Chief of Insajder had been under 24-hour police protection for years following the broadcast of the series "(In)Power of the State" on then-TV B92 in 2009, due to threats to her safety. ANEM emphasized that chanting has intensified over the past year and a half and that none of the reports filed in this regard have yielded results. Inefficiency in the actions of state authorities, they stated, is the reason why Brankica Stanković and the Insajder newsroom no longer report threats.⁵⁴ (For more on threats directed at Brankica Stanković, see [Monitoring of the Media Scene for June](#).)



Repeated threatening chants against Brankica Stanković (photo: Insajder TV printscreen)

The Media Freedom Coalition expressed deep concern over the growing number of cases in which journalists in small communities are exposed to pressure from local officials, thereby seriously endangering their professional integrity and personal safety. As examples, the Coalition cited the attitude of the President of the Municipality of Bečej, Vuk Radojević, toward Bečejski mozaik journalist Kristina Demeter Filipčev—whom Radojević accused of being biased for allegedly ignoring positive topics and achievements of the current authorities—as well as the claim made in a holiday greeting by the President of the Municipality of Novi Bečej, Saša Maksimović, that “many forces have conspired against the policies of the Republic of Serbia, from the level of the European Union down to village portals in Novi Bečej,” clearly targeting the only registered portal in the territory of Bečej: the Webinfo portal.⁵⁵

An Institutional Full Stop and an Institutional Comma

The First Basic Court in Belgrade rendered a first-instance decision finding Novosti editor Andrijana Nešić—based on a criminal complaint filed against her by attorney Zdenko Tomanović over articles in which she allegedly labeled him a “Serb-hater,” “high traitor,” “coordinator of terrorist blockers,” and a person who “directs terrorism,”⁵⁶ among other descriptions—guilty of the criminal offense of Insult (Article 170 of the Criminal Code). She was sentenced to a fine of 450,000 dinars and a security measure banning her from performing editorial duties for a period of one year.⁵⁷

Opinions within the professional community regarding such a court decision range from support to condemnation. Some believe that the abuse of journalism through violations of the ethical code and the law, as well as the dissemination of insults and falsehoods, should be sanctioned.⁵⁸ Others, however, consider that such a verdict carries potential risks to freedom of expression and media freedom. The Independent Journalists’ Association of Serbia (NUNS) and ANEM recalled that measures introduced by this ruling are increasingly being sought against investigative journalists and newsrooms, expressing concern that such a judgment could evolve into a practice serving as a reliable mechanism for suppressing critical voices in Serbia.⁵⁹

Following a complaint filed by N1 television correspondent from Niš, Milan Stojanović, against workers who in February 2022 accosted him, got in his face, and forced him away to prevent him from filming excavation works in Njegoševa Street—where there were neither barriers nor signs warning that works were underway—two employees of the public utility company Naisus were found guilty at first instance of the criminal offense of Preventing the Printing and Distribution of Printed Matter and Broadcasting of Programmes (Article 149 of the Criminal Code) and fined 30,000 dinars each. The convicted individuals have the right to appeal the first-instance judgment.⁶⁰

At the end of December, Jelenko Pijevac was deprived of liberty on suspicion of having threatened Insajder journalist Nataša Mijušković on 2 November. Pijevac was questioned by the prosecution, after which the court was requested to order detention.⁶¹ For more on the threats directed at the Insajder journalist, see [Monitoring of the Media Scene for November 2025](#).

The Novi Sad police summoned Danas daily journalist Uglješa Bokić, acting on a prosecutor's order, to give a statement in connection with a criminal complaint filed by attorney Nemanja Aleksić against unknown persons for the criminal offense of Breach of the Confidentiality of Proceedings.⁶² The editorial office stated that, according to their information, the questioning was scheduled due to the publication of parts of an official police report on the Danas website. The newsroom assessed the prosecutor's action as unacceptable pressure on the journalist and the editorial office, to whom the Law on Public Information and the Code of Ethics of Journalists of Serbia guarantee the right to protect sources. The Independent Journalists' Association of Vojvodina characterized the prosecutor's summons as a direct threat to journalistic sources, an attack on media freedom, and an infringement of the public's right to be informed.⁶³

III MONITORING THE PROCESS OF ADOPTING NEW LAWS

At the end of December, the public was informed that the Ombudsman had prepared a Draft Law on Amendments to the Law on Public Order and Peace. The proposed amendments will be discussed in more detail in the Monitoring of the Media Scene for January 2026.⁶⁴

IV IMPLEMENTATION OF EXISTING REGULATIONS

Regulatory Authority for Electronic Media (REM)

At the session of the Culture and Information Committee of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia held on 5 December 2025, it was announced that Sreten Jovanović and István Bodžoni had been selected as candidates of national minority councils for membership in the REM Council.⁶⁵ Their candidacies were not formally adopted at that time, as Jovanović was requested to supplement the documentation within an additional deadline. The candidacies were officially adopted at the session held on 23 December 2025.⁶⁶

Four elected members of the REM Council—Rodoljub Šabić, Mileva Malešić, Ira Prodanov Krajišnik, and Dubravka Valić Nedeljković—resigned, citing their personal conviction that an independent REM is not desired in Serbia.⁶⁷

The Culture and Information Committee adopted a proposal to initiate a new procedure for nominating candidates for membership in the REM Council.⁶⁸ Key journalists' associations, media associations, and civil society organizations will not participate in the process of nominating new members.⁶⁹



Untried members of the REM Council (photo: Cenzolovka / Perica Gunjić)

Project Co-Financing

ANEM called on the Ministry of Information and Telecommunications to examine why calls for project co-financing of media content for 2025 have still not been concluded in five local self-government units—Preševo, Vrbas, Gadžin Han, Bujanovac, and Čačak—and to explain how it is possible that the Municipality of Surdulica did not announce a call at all during 2025.⁷⁰ Regarding the Municipality of Bujanovac, ANEM stated that a decision adopted on 26 December established that the municipality annulled the call because no applications for co-financing of media content were submitted, nor were there applications for membership in the project evaluation commission. Earlier, on 12 September, ANEM notes, Bujanovac annulled the 2025 call for project co-financing of media content and adopted a decision to announce a new call with a deadline for submitting projects of 3 October.⁷¹

V SLAPP LAWSUITS TARGETING JOURNALISTS AND MEDIA

The company Starting, one of the main subcontractors on the Novi Sad Railway Station building from which a canopy collapsed and killed 16 people, withdrew its private criminal lawsuit against KRIK journalist Sofija Bogosavljev. The First Basic Court in Belgrade was informed of the withdrawal by a written submission and, on that basis, rendered a judgment dismissing the charges against the journalist.⁷² For more on the lawsuit filed by Starting against Sofija Bogosavljev, see [Monitoring of the Media Scene for July 2025](#).

KRIK journalist Sofija Bogosavljev outside of courtroom (photo: ANEM / Veran Matić)



The Second Basic Court in Belgrade issued an acquittal in the criminal proceedings initiated against Pištaljka portal journalist Snežana Đurić by Vladimir Antić, legal representative of the Serbian Rowing Federation. The lawsuit charged the journalist with the criminal offense of Unauthorized Publication and Display of Another Person's Writing, Portrait, or Recording, proposing a prison sentence of two years. It also sought a conviction for the criminal offense of Insult and the imposition of a fine of 450,000 dinars. Vladimir Antić announced that he would appeal the judgment.⁷³ For more on the lawsuit filed against the journalist, see [Monitoring of the Media Scene for May 2024](#).

The Commercial Court of Appeal in Belgrade upheld the first-instance judgment of the Commercial Court rejecting the claim of the publisher of the daily Kurir that the publishers of the KRIK portal and the daily Danas be ordered to compensate alleged damages caused by the publication of the analysis "Front Pages 2023: Six Newspapers, More than 1,150 Manipulations" by the Raskrikavanje portal.⁷⁴ For more on the first-instance decision, see [Monitoring of the Media Scene for August 2025](#).

Supported by:

This project is funded by
the European Union



**#ЕУ
ЗА ТЕБЕ**

B | T | D The Balkan Trust
for Democracy
A PROJECT OF THE GERMAN MARSHALL FUND

Norway

Carrier:



Partners:



INSAJDER

This publication was released with the financial support of the European Union, Norway, and the Balkan Trust for Democracy, a project of the German Marshall Fund of the United States. The content is the sole responsibility of the Association of Independent Electronic Media and does not necessarily reflect the official views of the European Union, the Government of Norway, the German Marshall Fund, or the Balkan Trust for Democracy.

- 1 [Serbia - Civicus Monitor](#)
- 2 [People Power Under Attack 2025, CIVICUS Monitor, December 2025](#)
- 3 „[Serbia must end attacks against journalists](#)”, statement of the UN experts published on December 5, 20025.
- 4 „[U protekloj godini ponovo povećan broj ubijenih novinara, navode Reporteri bez granica](#)”, text published December 9, 2025 on Radio Slobodna Evropa website.
- 5 „[BIA ubacivala špijunski softver u telefone poljoprivrednika](#)”, author Aleksa Tošić, text published December 4, 2025 on BIRN website.
- 6 „[Alat za otključavanje i preuzimanje sadržaja sa telefona i dalje u rukama srpske policije](#)”, authors: Natalija Jovanović and Mirjana Jevtović text published October 30, 2025 on Radio Free Europe website.
- 7 „[Urednik KRIK-a: Uloga Nenada Stefanovića da spasi Lučića i Vučića, jasno je i njima da je snimak autentičan](#)”, text published December 25, 2025 on TV N1 website.
- 8 „[Stalna radna grupa za bezbednost novinara: Broj fizičkih napada na medijske radnike povećan za 440 odsto u 2025. godini](#)”, text published December 22, 2025 on ANEM website.
- 9 „[Život novinara i novinarki u Zaječaru, Negotinu i Boru: Udarci, pretnje i vredanje](#)”, text published December 10, 2025 on ANEM website.
- 10 „[Izveštaj o medijima u Istočnoj Srbiji](#)”, authors: Jana Jacić and Marko Tadić, date of publication: December of 2025.
- 11 „[Uhapšen Aleksandar Dikić u Novom Sadu - Vesti iz Srbije, regionala i sveta](#)”, author Valentina Todorović, text published December 24, 2025 on TV N1 website, source: FoNet and Beta.
- 12 „[Ninić: Aleksandru Dikiću sa KTV određeno policijsko zadržavanje](#)”, text published Decemer 24, 2025 on TV Insajder website.
- 13 Same.
- 14 „[Oglasio se Dikić nakon puštanja iz pritvora](#)”, text published December 25, 2025 on daily Danas website, source: Beta.
- 15 „[Ninić: Dikić dao nespretnu izjavu, nije spomenuo Vučića, vlast spinuje priču](#)”, text published December 24, 2025 on daily Danas website.
- 16 Same.
- 17 „[NUNS i ANEM: Hapšenje Aleksandra Dikića je čin represije i opasan udar na slobodu izražavanja](#)”, NUNS and ANEM statement published December 25, 2025 on their websites.
- 18 „[ANEM ALARM: Nova pretnja novinaru nedeljnika Radar Vuku Cvijiću](#)”, ANEM statement published December 17, 2025 on their website.
- 19 TV Show „[Prožimanje kriminala i vlasti je jedno tkivo](#)”, published January 13, 2026 on YouTube chanell „Naš portal”.
- 20 Emisija „[\(Ne\)poznat source pretnji Vuku Cvijiću?](#)”, published January 13, 2026 on YouTube chanell Nova S.
- 21 „[ANEM ALARM: Nova pretnja novinaru nedeljnika Radar Vuku Cvijiću](#)”, ANEM statement published December 17, 2025 on their website.; „[NUNS: Hitno identifikovati i sankcionisati osobe koje prete Vuku Cvijiću i Mladenu Savatoviću](#)”, NUNS statement published December 18, 2025 on their website.; „[UNS: Hitno pronaći i kazniti odgovornog za pretnje Vuku Cvijiću](#)”, UNS statement published December 18, 2025 on their website.
- 22 „[Solidarnost sa Vukom Cvijićem: 'Obrana struke' traži da se otkrije ko preti](#)”, text published December 18, 2025 on daily Danas website, source: Beta.
- 23 „[Jan Bratu: Svi slučajevi pretnji i napada na novinare moraju biti procesuirani](#)”, text published December 18, 2025 on Bezbedni novinari website.
- 24 „[Maja Sever: Vuk Cvijić treba ozbiljno da bude zabrinut za svoju bezbednost, utišavanje mikrofona reporterki N1 - šokantno](#)”, text published December 18, 2025 on TV N1 website.

25 „[Predstavnici Stalne radne grupe za bezbednost novinara i Misije OEBS u Srbiji u poseti redakciji nedeljnika Radar](#)”, text published December 18, 2025 on ANEM website.

26 „[Novinarka Mašine: Policija tražila da obrišem snimke zabeležene ispred Skupštine, predsedan i zastrašivanje](#)”, author Dijana Babić, text published December 17, 2025 on TV Insajder website.

27 Same.

28 „[ANEM ALARM: Nepoznate osobe nastavljaju ometanje rada novinara pretnjama ispred Skupštine Srbije, a policija ih štiti](#)”, ANEM statement published December 17, 2025 on their website.

29 „[\(VIDEO\) Odbrana i 'poslednji dani' tvrđave Ćacilend: Reporterka N1 pokušala da obide štorsko naselje ispred Skupštine - Vesti iz Srbije, regionala i sveta](#)”, video published December 17, 2025 on TV N1 website.

30 Same.

31 „[NUNS: Policija ne sme da ograničava kretanje novinara, a tužilaštvo da vrši pritisak na redakcije, novinarski sourcei moraju biti zaštićeni - hitno reagovati u Bačkom Petrovcu, Novom Pazaru i Novom Sadu](#)”, NUNS statement published December 22, 2025 on their website.

32 „[ANEM ALARM: Zastrahujuće nasilne pretnje redakciji nedeljnika Radar i karikaturisti Dušanu Petričiću](#)”, ANEM statement published December 12, 2025 on their website.

33 Same, „[Hitno identifikovati i procesuirati osobe koje prete redakciji Radar, Dušanu Petričiću, Nenadu Kulačinu i Marku Vidojkoviću](#)”, SafeJournalists network statement published December 12, 2025 on NUNS website; „[UNS: Kazniti odgovorne za pretnje redakciji nedeljnika Radar i Dušanu Petričiću](#)”, UNS statement published December 12, 2025 on their website.

34 [Pretnje smrću i fizičkoj sigurnosti novinarima, Nenad Kulačin, Šabac, 6. 12. 2025. god.](#) Excerpt from the database of Media Freedom Rapid Response network.

35 [ANEM ALARM: Nastavljaju se pretnje Marku Vidojkoviću i Nenadu Kulačinu, bez reakcija nadležnih](#), ANEM statement published 15. 12. 2025. god. on their website.; [ANEM ALARM: Prijavljena nova pretnja Marku Vidojkoviću, Nenadu Kulačinu ali i gostima emisije „Dobar, loš, zao”](#)[ANEM ALARM: Prijavljena nova pretnja Marku Vidojkoviću, Nenadu Kulačinu ali i gostima emisije „Dobar, loš, zao”](#), ANEM statement published December 17, 2025 on their website.

36 „[NUNS: Hitno identifikovati i procesuirati osobe koje prete Nenadu Kulačinu i Marku Vidojkoviću](#)”, NUNS statement published December 15, 2025 on their website.

37 „[ANEM ALARM: Nastavljaju se pretnje Marku Vidojkoviću i Nenadu Kulačinu, bez reakcija nadležnih](#), ANEM statement published December 15, 2025 on their website.; [ANEM ALARM: Prijavljena nova pretnja Marku Vidojkoviću, Nenadu Kulačinu ali i gostima emisije „Dobar, loš, zao”](#), ANEM statement published December 17, 2025 on their website.

38 „[Hakovani sajtovi Bez cenzure i KTV](#)”, UNS statement published December 11, 2025 on their website, source: KTV.

39 „[ANEM ALARM: Nadležni da hitno identifikuju osobe koje prete bombama u redakcijama](#)”, ANEM statement published December 18, 2025 on their website.

40 „[NUNS osuđuje napad na redakcije OzonPressa i Čačanskih novina, poziva na hitnu istragu](#)”, NUNS statement published December 26, 2025 on their website.

41 „[MFRR osudio kampanju uvreda novinarki N1 Ani Novaković](#)”, text published December 22, 2025 on TV N1 website.

42 [N1 journalist Ana Novaković targeted with smear campaign over reporting on Minister of Culture \(2025-12-16\)](#), excerpt from Media Freedom Rapid Response network database.

43 „[ANEM ALARM: Nedopustivo targetiranje Danice Vučenić u Novostima u koje se uključio i predsednik](#)”, ANEM statement published December 25, 2025 on their website.; „[NUNS: Tabloidna kampanja protiv Danice Vučenić i targetiranje N1 i Nove S od strane predsednika države ugrožavaju bezbednost novinara](#)”, NUNS statement published December 25, 2025 on their website.

44 [Ostale pretnje novinarima, Danica Vučenić, Beograd, 25. 12. 2025. god.](#), an extract from the SafeJournalists network's database of attacks on journalists.

45 „[Vučić: Mogli smo davno da zabranimo N1 i Novu](#)”, text published December 25, 2025 on TV N1 website.

46 „[\(VIDEO\) Vučić na pitanja novinara N1 odgovarao uvredama, neistinama, pa zapretio: Naučiću vas redu kad već roditelji nisu](#)”, video published December 16, 2025 on TV N1 website.

47 „[Mladen Savatović: Podneću tužbu protiv Vučića](#)”, text published December 17, 2025 on TV N1 website.

48 „[ANEM ALARM: Nove zabrinjavajuće pretnje Mladenu Savatoviću i televiziji N1](#)”, statement published December 18, 2025 on their website.; „[ANEM ALARM: Nastavlja se talas pretnji Savatoviću, Vidojkoviću i Kulačin nadležni hitno da reaguju](#)”, ANEM statement published December 19, 2025 on their website.

49 „[UNS: Nadležni da hitno pronađu i kazne odgovorne za seksističke pretnje novinarkama N1](#)”, UNS statement published December 25, 2025 on their website.

50 [Pretnje smrću i fizičkoj sigurnosti novinara, novinarka N1 - 1, Beograd, 23. 12. 2025. god.](#); [Pretnje smrću i fizičkoj sigurnosti novinara, novinarka N1 - 2, Beograd, 23. 12. 2025. god](#), an extract from the SafeJournalists network's database of attacks on journalists.

51 „[ANEM ALARM: Neprihvatljivo i potencijalno opasno ponašanje predsednika države prema novinarima](#)”, ANEM statement published December 16, 2025 on their website.; „[NUNS: Nedopustivo vređanje novinara i ometanje izveštavanja u javnom interesu, predsednik Vučić da se izvini, policija da prestane da pritiska novinare](#)”, NUNS statement published December 17, 2025 on their website.; „[UNS: Neprimereno obraćanje predsednika, Vučić da prestane sa vređanjem novinara](#)”, UNS statement published December 17, 2025 on their website.

52 „[U Skupštini dobili nalog da utišaju mikrofon Žaklini Tatalović](#)”, prilog published December 19, 2025 on TV N1 website.

53 „[UNS: Nedopustivo utišavanje mikrofona Žaklini Tatalović](#)”, UNS statement published December 19, 2025 on their website.

54 „[ANEM ALARM: Pretnje i uvrede Brankici Stanković postale redovan repertoar na utakmicama Partizana](#)”, ANEM statement published December 18, 2025 on their website.

55 „[Koalicija za slobodu medija: Sloboda javnog informisanja ne sme se povređivati zloupotrebom službenog položaja i javnih ovlašćenja](#)”, Coalition for Free Media statement published on December 26, 2025.

56 „[Nijedan režimski novinar nije kažnjen kao urednica Novosti: Ko je sledeći?](#)”, author Uglješa Bokić, text published December 4, 2025. on daily Danas website.

57 Same.

58 „[Zanatlje iz Žute kuće](#)”, author Nemanja Rujević, text published December 10, 2025 on daily Danas website.

59 „[NUNS: Zabranu obavljanja novinarskog posla urednici 'Novosti' opasna praksa – hitno reagovati na pretnje redakciji 'Kurira'](#)”, NUNS statement published December 4, 2025 on their website.

60 „[Dvojica radnika JKP 'Naisus' proglašena krivim za napad na dopisnika N1 Milana Stojanovića](#)”, text published December 2, 2025 on TV N1 website.

61 „[Saslušan osumnjičeni za napad na novinarku Insajdera Natašu Mijušković, tužilaštvo tražilo pritvor](#)”, text published December 26, 2025 on TV Insajder website.

62 „[Novinar Danasa pozvan na saslušanje u policiju kako bi otkrio svoj source](#)”, text published December 22, 2025 on daily Danas website.

63 „[NDNV: Poziv na saslušanja novinara Danasa je direktno ugrožavanje zaštite sourcea](#)”, NDNV Statement published on December 22, 2025 on their website.

64 „[Zaštitnik građana izradio Nacrt izmena i dopuna Zakona o javnom redu i miru: Uvršteni i prekršaji na društvenim mrežama](#)”, text published December 26, 2025 on TV N1 website, source: FoNet.

65 „[Marić \(SNS\): Priča o nezavisnim kandidatima za Savet REM-a je za malu decu](#)”, author Perica Gunjić, text published December 5, 2025 on Cenzolovka website.

66 „[Usvojena kandidatura dva člana iz redova nacionalnih manjina za Savet REM, opozicija tvrdi da su bliski SNS](#)”, text published December 23, 2025 on TV N1 website.

67 „[Šabić o ostavci na mesto člana Saveta REM: Nismo nijednog trenutka insistirali na većini, nego na primeni zakona](#)”, text published December 20, 2025 on TV N1 website.

68 „[Odbor za kulturu i informisanje usvojio pokretanje postupka za predlaganje kandidata za REM](#)”, text published December 29, 2025 on TV N1 website.

69 „[Šta mori SNS u nezavisnom radu Saveta REM-a i da li je zato i došlo do potiskivanja članova?](#)”, author Ana Opačić, text published December 29, 2025 on TV N1 website; „[ANEM neće učestvovati u predlaganju kandidata za izbor članova Saveta REM](#)”, ANEM statement published December 30, 2025 on their website.

70 „[ANEM poziva nadležno ministarstvo da proveri šta se dešava sa konkursima u šest lokalnih samouprava](#)”, text published December 29, 2025 on ANEM website.

71 „[Bujanovac poništio medijski konkurs jer nije bilo prijava](#)”, text published December 31, 2025 on ANEM website.

72 „[’Starting’ povukao tužbu protiv novinarke KRIK-a](#)”, author Isidora Martać, text published December 3, 2025 on KRIK website

73 „[Pobeda novinara: Novinarka Pištaljke Snežana Đurić oslobođena krivične optužbe](#)”, author Emili Samčević, text published December 11, 2025 on Pištaljka website.

74 „[KRIK dobio još jedan postupak po tužbi Kurira](#)”, author Isidora Martać, text published December 12, 2025 on KRIK website.