



## **DECISION TO STRIKE OUT**

**Case no. CH/00/5362**

**Strahinja ĐURIĆ**

**against**

**THE FEDERATION OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

The Human Rights Chamber for Bosnia and Herzegovina, sitting as the Second Panel on 12 October 2002 with the following members present:

Mr. Viktor MASENKO-MAVI, Acting President  
Mr. Jakob MÖLLER  
Mr. Mehmed DEKOVIĆ  
Mr. Vitimir 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 Ulica Milana Preloga no. 21/IV, in Novi Grad - Sarajevo.
2. On 5 November 1998, the applicant submitted to the Sarajevo Municipality a claim to repossess his apartment.
3. On 5 March 1999, the applicant lodged a request for reinstatement into his apartment with the Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees ("CRPC").
4. On 16 March 2000, the applicant filed a complaint against the "silence of the administration" to the Ministry for Physical Planning, Housing and Communal Affairs of the Sarajevo Canton.
5. On 12 September 2000, the CRPC issued a decision confirming the applicant's occupancy right over his pre-war apartment.
6. On 19 July 2002, the applicant was reinstated into possession of his pre-war apartment.

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

7. The application was introduced on 11 July 2000 and registered on the same day.
8. On 21 September 2000, the application was transmitted to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina ("the Federation") under Articles 6, 8 and 14 of European Convention on Human Rights (the "Convention") and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention. On 21 November 2000, the Chamber received the observations on the admissibility and merits of the application from the Federation.
9. On 30 July 2002, the Federation informed the Chamber that the applicant had been reinstated into possession of his apartment on 19 July 2002.
10. On 16 September 2002, the applicant confirmed that he had been reinstated into his apartment. He further requested the Chamber to strike out his application.

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

11. 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."
12. The Chamber notes that the applicant lodged his application with a view to regaining possession of his apartment, and while the case was still pending before the Chamber, he regained such possession.
13. 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.
14. 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 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.

15. Turning to the facts of the present case, the Chamber notes that the applicant was reinstated into possession of his apartment on 19 July 2002. That being so, the Chamber considers that the main issue raised in the application has been resolved. The Chamber further notes that the applicant considers the matter resolved. 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. The Chamber, therefore, decides to strike out the application, pursuant to Article VIII(3) of the Agreement.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

16. For these reasons, the Chamber, unanimously,

**STRIKES OUT THE APPLICATION.**

(signed)  
Ulrich GARMS  
Registrar

(signed)  
Viktor MASENKO-MAVI  
Acting President of the Second Panel