



DECISION TO STRIKE OUT

Case no. CH/99/3392

Radinka NINKOVIĆ

against

THE FEDERATION OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The Human Rights Chamber for Bosnia and Herzegovina, sitting as the Second Panel on 10 January 2003 with the following members present:

Mr. Mato TADIĆ, President
Mr. Jakob MÖLLER
Mr. Mehmed DEKOVIĆ
Mr. Manfred NOWAK
Mr. Vitomir POPOVIĆ
Mr. Viktor MASENKO-MAVI

Mr. Ulrich GARMS, Registrar
Ms. Olga KAPIĆ, Deputy Registrar
Ms. Antonia DE MEO, Deputy Registrar

Having considered the aforementioned application introduced pursuant to Article VIII(1) of the Human Rights Agreement ("the Agreement") set out in Annex 6 to the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Adopts the following decision pursuant to Article VIII(3)(c) of the Agreement as well as Rules 49 and 52 of the Chamber's Rules of Procedure:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This case concerns the applicant's attempts to regain possession of her pre-war apartment, located in Vogošća, ulica Tome Mandeša 2.
2. On 12 August 1998 the applicant initiated a request for repossession of her pre-war apartment before the Administration of Housing Affairs (the "Administration"). The applicant finally regained possession of her apartment on 12 June 2001.

II. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CHAMBER

3. The application was introduced to the Chamber on 22 December 1999 and registered on the same day. The applicant is represented by Senija Poropat, a lawyer. The applicant complains that her rights protected under Articles 6 and 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights ("the Convention") and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention have been violated. The applicant asked the Chamber to order the respondent Party, as provisional measure, to reinstate her immediately into possession of her apartment.
4. On 13 September 2001 the Chamber transmitted the case to the respondent Party under Articles 6 and 8 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention.
5. On 9 July 2001 the applicant informed the Chamber that she had repossessed her pre-war apartment on 12 June 2001. In the same letter, the applicant asked to be compensated for pecuniary damage in the amount of 250 KM (Convertible Marks) per month starting from 2 November 1998, and for the costs of the proceedings in the amount of 521 KM.
6. On 14 November 2001 the respondent Party submitted observations in which it suggested that the Chamber strike out the application as the applicant had been reinstated into possession of her pre-war apartment.

III. OPINION OF THE CHAMBER

7. In accordance with Article VIII(3) of the Agreement, "the Chamber may decide at any point in its proceedings to suspend consideration of, reject or strike out, an application on the ground that ... (c) for any other reason established by the Chamber, it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application; provided that such a result is consistent with the objective of respect for human rights."
8. The Chamber notes that the applicant lodged her application with a view to regaining possession of her apartment, and while the case was still pending before the Chamber, she regained such possession. The Chamber further notes that although the applicant has been reinstated, she understandably asks the Chamber to find a violation of her rights protected by the Agreement due to the time that elapsed between her request for reinstatement into possession of her pre-war apartment and the actual repossession. She also asks the Chamber to order the respondent Party to pay compensation to her in recognition of the pecuniary damage suffered by her during the course of that time, including compensation for the costs of the proceedings.
9. The Chamber recalls that under Article VIII(2)(e) of the Agreement, "the Chamber shall endeavour to give particular priority to allegations of especially severe or systematic violations and those founded on alleged discrimination on prohibited grounds". As the Chamber has explained in the case of *Vujičić v. the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina* (case no. CH/99/2198, decision to strike out of 10 October 2002, Decisions July–December 2002), there are presently thousands of undecided applications pending before the Chamber, and this number is growing month by month. Moreover, significant progress in the return and property law implementation process in Bosnia and Herzegovina has occurred (*id.* at paragraphs 15-16).

10. Taking into account that the applicant has been reinstated into possession of her apartment, the Chamber considers that the ongoing alleged human rights violation has been brought to an end and the main issue of the application has been resolved. The Chamber recognises that valid reasons may underlie the applicant's request to nonetheless maintain her claim for compensation. However, in the light of the considerations discussed above, the Chamber finds that "it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application" within the meaning of Article VIII(3)(c) of the Agreement. The Chamber moreover finds that this result is "consistent with the objective of respect for human rights", as this "objective" must be understood to embrace not only the individual applicant's human rights, but also the Chamber's more general mandate to assist the Parties in securing to all persons within their jurisdiction the highest level of internationally recognised human rights (Articles I and II of the Agreement).

11. The Chamber, therefore, decides to strike out the application, pursuant to Article VIII(3)(c) of the Agreement.

IV. CONCLUSION

12. For these reasons, the Chamber, unanimously,

STRIKES OUT THE APPLICATION.

(signed)
Ulrich GARMS
Registrar of the Chamber

(signed)
Mato TADIĆ
President of the Second Panel