



## **DECISION TO STRIKE OUT**

**Case no. CH/00/4018**

**Miladin MILIČEVIĆ**

**against**

**THE FEDERATION OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

The Human Rights Chamber for Bosnia and Herzegovina, sitting as the Second Panel on 5 September 2002 with the following members present:

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

Mr. Ulrich GARMS, Registrar  
Ms. Olga KAPIĆ, 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) of the Agreement and Rules 49(2) and 52 of the Chamber’s Rules of Procedure:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The applicant complained of his inability to repossess his pre-war apartment, located at Marka Marulića street no. 17, previously Marka Marulića 3d, in Sarajevo.
2. On 4 June 1999 the applicant submitted a complaint to the Ombudsman for Human Rights in relation to the repossession of the apartment.
3. On 8 June 1999 the Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees ("CRPC") issued a decision confirming the applicant's occupancy right.
4. On 23 May 2000 the Administration for Housing Affairs of Sarajevo Canton ("the Administration"), issued a decision confirming the applicant's occupancy right and obliging the temporary user to vacate the apartment within 90 days from the date of receipt of the decision.
5. On 5 February 2001 the Administration issued a decision in renewed proceedings obliging the temporary user to vacate the apartment within 15 days from the date of receipt of the decision.
6. On 26 February 2001 the applicant submitted a request for execution of the decision of 5 February 2001 to the Administration.
7. On 7 March 2001 the Ombudsman for Human Rights decided upon the applicant's complaint, establishing that the Administration violated Article 11 in conjunction with Article 7 of the Law of Cessation of Application of the Law on Abandoned Apartments of the Federation. The Ombudsman recommended to the respondent Party to execute the decision of the Administration of 5 February 2001
8. On 21 April 2001 the applicant submitted to the Administration a request for issuance of a conclusion permitting execution of the CRPC decision of 8 June 1999.
9. On 26 June 2001 the applicant entered into possession of his pre-war apartment.

## **II. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CHAMBER**

10. The application was introduced on 4 February 2000.
11. On 7 May 2001 the application was transmitted to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina ("the Federation") for its observations on the admissibility and merits under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (the "Convention") and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention. On 21 June 2001 the Federation submitted its observations.
12. On 2 August 2001 the applicant informed the Chamber that he entered into possession of his apartment. The applicant noted that while he withdraws his complaints in this respect, he would like to maintain his claim for compensation.

## **III. OPINION OF THE CHAMBER**

13. 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 ... (b) the matter has been resolved; or (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."
14. The Chamber notes that the applicant lodged his application with a view to regaining possession of his property, and while the case was still pending before the Chamber, he regained such possession.

15. It would be open to the Chamber to consider the admissibility and merits of a case, when, as in the present case, the question arises whether the time-limits and other procedural requirements prescribed by domestic law have been complied with by the authorities. If it found a violation, then the Chamber would address the question of whether any remedies should be ordered, including compensation.

16. However, as the Chamber explained in the case of *S.P.* (case no. CH/99/2336, decision to strike out of 2 July 2001, Decisions July—December 2001), the Chamber is not unmindful of the difficulties faced by the domestic authorities in implementing the property legislation in force in a timely manner. Consequently, where it is established that the domestic authorities, albeit belatedly, have taken effective action and where the applicant has in fact been reinstated, although not within the time-limit established by law, the Chamber may be persuaded to strike out an application, unless there are particular reasons, apart from the delays in the reinstatement, that require continued consideration.

17. Turning to the facts of the present case, the Chamber notes that the applicant was reinstated into possession of his apartment on 26 June 2001. That being so, the Chamber considers that the main issue raised in the application has been resolved. The Chamber further notes, however, that the applicant has expressed his intention to pursue the application before the Chamber in regard to his claim for compensation. The Chamber observes that it can only award compensation if it makes a finding of a violation of the Agreement. Apart from the delays that occurred in securing his reinstatement, the applicant has not drawn the Chamber's attention to any special circumstances regarding the respect for human rights which would require the examination of the application to be continued after the main issue raised in the application has been resolved, and the Chamber considers that no such special circumstances are present in this application. In the circumstances, the Chamber finds that it would not be inconsistent with the objective of respect for human rights to strike out the application. Consequently, the claim for compensation cannot be considered.

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

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

19. For these reasons, the Chamber, unanimously,

#### **STRIKES OUT THE APPLICATION.**

(signed)  
Ulrich GARMS  
Registrar

(signed)  
Giovanni GRASSO  
President of the Second Panel