



## **DECISION ON ADMISSIBILITY**

**Case no. CH/02/11121**

**Nada GOJANOVIĆ**

**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. Miodrag PAJIĆ, Acting President  
Mr. Hasan BALIĆ  
Mr. Rona AYBAY  
Mr. Želimir JUKA  
Mr. Andrew GROTRIAN

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(2)(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 5 June 2002. The applicant requested that the Chamber order the respondent Party, as a provisional measure, to take all necessary action to prevent her eviction from an apartment which she occupies . On 7 June 2002 the Chamber decided not to order the provisional measure requested.

2. The applicant complains of a decision of the Administration for Housing Affairs of Canton Sarajevo ordering her eviction from the apartment with no right to alternative accommodation. The applicant occupied the apartment on the basis of a procedural decision issued by the Serb Municipality Novo Sarajevo on 9 March 1994. Her pre-war apartment located at Kemala Kapetanovića 32, Sarajevo is completely destroyed. The eviction was ordered because the pre-war occupant has obtained a decision entitling her to regain possession of the apartment.

## II. OPINION OF THE CHAMBER

3. 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.”

4. The Chamber notes that the decision on the applicant’s eviction was taken to allow the pre-war occupancy right holder to repossess the apartment. In these circumstances, the Chamber finds that 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.

5. As to the applicant’s claim that he has been denied the right to alternative accommodation, the Chamber notes that the European Convention on Human Rights does not contain a right to that effect. As the Chamber has explained in previous cases on this issue, it only has jurisdiction to consider the right to housing, which is protected by Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in connection with alleged or apparent discrimination in the enjoyment of such right (see case no. CH/01/6662, *Huremović*, decision on admissibility of 6 April 2001, paragraph 4, Decisions January-June 2001). The facts of this case do not indicate that the applicant has been the victim of discrimination on any of the grounds set forth in Article II(2)(b) of the Agreement. It follows that this part of the application is incompatible *ratione materiae* with the provisions of the Agreement, within the meaning of Article VIII(2)(c). The Chamber therefore decides to declare this part of the application inadmissible as well.

## III. CONCLUSION

6. For these reasons, the Chamber, unanimously,

**DECLARES THE APPLICATION INADMISSIBLE.**

(signed)  
Ulrich GARMS  
Registrar of the Chamber

(signed)  
Miodrag PAJIĆ  
Acting President of the First Panel