



## **DECISION ON ADMISSIBILITY AND TO STRIKE OUT**

**Case no. CH/00/4152**

**Jovan ILIĆ**

**against**

**THE FEDERATION OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

The Human Rights Chamber for Bosnia and Herzegovina, sitting as the Second Panel on 2 July 2003 with the following members present:

Mr. Mato TADIĆ, President  
Mr. Jakob MÖLLER, Vice-President  
Mr. Mehmed DEKOVIĆ  
Mr. Giovanni GRASSO  
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 Articles VIII(2)(c) and VIII(3)(c) of the Agreement and Rules 49(2) and 52 of the Chamber’s Rules of Procedure:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The application was introduced on 23 February 2000 and registered on 29 February 2000.
2. The case concerns the applicant's attempts to regain possession of and to register the ownership over his apartment, located at ulica Envera Šehovića 44 in Sarajevo, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which he purchased from the former JNA (Yugoslav National Army) Housing Fund on 13 April 1992.
3. On 30 April 2002, the respondent Party informed the Chamber that on 25 April 2002, the apartment in question was sealed.
4. On 4 June 2002, the Chamber sent a letter, via registered mail, to the applicant requesting him to confirm the information received from the respondent Party. On 10 June 2002, the applicant responded that he had entered into possession of his apartment on 13 May 2002, and he attached the minutes taken at the time of his repossession. The applicant complained that the previous occupant had taken all of his things from the apartment on 21 April 2002, at the time of vacating it.
5. On 27 January 2003, 9 April 2003 and 23 May 2003, the Chamber received letters from the applicant in which he stated that he has received the order from the Federation Ministry of Defence allowing him to be registered as the owner of his apartment. He further expressed his intention to pursue his application before the Chamber with regard to the compensation claim for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages.

## **II. OPINION OF THE CHAMBER**

### **A. Claim for loss of moveable property**

6. In accordance with Article VIII(2) of the Agreement, "the Chamber shall decide which applications to accept.... In so doing, the Chamber shall take into account the following criteria: ... (c) The Chamber shall also dismiss any application which it considers incompatible with this Agreement, manifestly ill-founded, or an abuse of the right of petition."
7. Regarding the applicant's claim for the loss of moveable property from his pre-war apartment, the Chamber notes that the applicant has not shown that this alleged damage was directly caused by the respondent Party or any person acting on its behalf. Therefore, the Chamber finds that this part of the application does not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms guaranteed under the Agreement. It follows that this part of the application is manifestly ill-founded, within the meaning of Article VIII(2)(c) of the Agreement. The Chamber therefore decides to declare this part of the application inadmissible.

### **B. Claim for other compensation**

8. 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 ... 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."
9. The Chamber notes that although the applicant has succeeded in repossessing the apartment in question and has obtained the order from the Federation Ministry of Defence to be registered as the owner over the apartment, he understandably asks the Chamber to order the respondent Party to pay compensation to him in recognition of the damage, both pecuniary and non-pecuniary, suffered by him during the course of the proceedings in question.
10. 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.

11. Taking into account that the applicant has repossessed the apartment in question and has received the order to be registered as the owner over it, 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 his 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).

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

### III. CONCLUSION

13. For these reasons, the Chamber, unanimously,

**DECLARES THE APPLICATION INADMISSIBLE IN PART and  
STRIKES OUT THE REMAINDER OF THE APPLICATION.**

(signed)  
Ulrich GARMS  
Registrar of the Chamber

(signed)  
Mato TADIĆ  
President of the Second Panel