



# *The Human Rights Advisory Panel*

Building D, UNMIK HQ Prishtinë/Priština, Kosovo | E-mail: [hrap-unmik@un.org](mailto:hrap-unmik@un.org) | Tel: +381 (0)38 504-604, ext. 5182

## **DECISION**

**Date of adoption: 11 May 2012**

**Case No. 226/09**

**Draginja VUJAČIĆ**

**against**

**UNMIK**

The Human Rights Advisory Panel, sitting on 11 May 2012,  
with the following members present:

Mr Marek NOWICKI, Presiding Member  
Mr Paul LEMMENS  
Ms Christine CHINKIN

Assisted by  
Mr Andrey ANTONOV, Executive Officer

Having considered the aforementioned complaint, introduced pursuant to Section 1.2 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 of 23 March 2006 on the Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

### **I. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE PANEL**

1. The complaint was introduced on 7 April 2009 and registered on 30 April 2009.
2. On 23 December 2009 and 20 July 2011, the Panel requested further information from the complainant. No response was received.
3. On 2 February 2012, the complaint was communicated to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG), for UNMIK's comments on admissibility. On 5 March 2012, the Panel received UNMIK's response.

## **II. THE FACTS**

4. The complainant is the wife of Mr Slobodan Vujačić, the sister of Mr Luka Petrušić and the sister-in-law of Mrs Radmila Petrušić.
5. The complainant states that on 17 June 1999, after KFOR soldiers finished their patrol in Banja e Pejës/Pećka Banja village, Istoq/Istog municipality, members of the Kosovo Liberation Army entered the complainant's family home and abducted Messrs Slobodan Vujačić and Luka Petrušić and Mrs Radmila Petrušić. Since that time, the whereabouts of all three persons have remained unknown.
6. The complainant states that the abductions were reported to KFOR, the Montenegrin Red Cross, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and the Italian Embassy.
7. On 16 November 1999, the ICRC opened a tracing request for Mr Slobodan Vujačić. The ICRC also opened tracing requests for Mr Luka Petrušić and Mrs Radmila Petrušić. Likewise, their names appear in the database compiled by the UNMIK Office on Missing Persons and Forensics.
8. On 9 December 2008, UNMIK's responsibility with regard to police and justice in Kosovo ended with the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX) assuming full operational control in the area of the rule of law, following the Statement made by the President of the United Nations Security Council on 26 November 2008 (S/PRST/2008/44), welcoming the continued engagement of the European Union in Kosovo. Between 9 December 2008 and 30 March 2009, all criminal case files held by the UNMIK Department of Justice and UNMIK Police were handed over to their EULEX counterparts.

## **III. THE COMPLAINT**

9. The complainant complains about UNMIK's alleged failure to properly investigate the abduction and probable killing of her husband, brother and sister-in-law. The complainant in essence also complains about the fear, pain and anguish that she suffered because of this situation.
10. The Panel considers that the complainant may be deemed to invoke, respectively, a violation of the right to life of Messrs Slobodan Vujačić and Luka Petrušić and Mrs Radmila Petrušić, guaranteed by Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), and a violation of her own right to be free from inhuman or degrading treatment, guaranteed by Article 3 of the ECHR.

## **IV. THE LAW**

11. Before considering the case on its merits, the Panel must first decide whether to accept the case, considering the admissibility criteria set out in Sections 1, 2 and 3 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12.

**Alleged violation of Article 2 of the ECHR**

12. The complainant alleges the lack of an adequate criminal investigation into the abduction of her husband, brother and sister-in-law.
13. In his comments, the SRSG raises no objection to the admissibility of this part of the complaint.
14. The Panel considers that the complaint under Article 2 of the ECHR raises serious issues of fact and law, the determination of which should depend on an examination of the merits. The Panel concludes therefore that this part of the complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Section 3.3 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12.
15. No other ground for declaring this part of the complaint inadmissible has been established.

**Alleged violation of Article 3 of the ECHR**

16. The complainant alleges mental pain and suffering caused to her by the situation surrounding the abduction of her husband, brother and sister-in-law.
17. The SRSG argues that the complainant does not expressly allege that the mental pain and anguish suffered is a result of UNMIK's response to the disappearance of her family members. The SRSG argues that the complaint does not contain any facts from which an inference can be drawn that the complainant herself has been the victim of inhuman treatment attributable to UNMIK. Therefore this part of the complaint is manifestly ill-founded.
18. The Panel considers that, despite the lack of express allegations put forward by the complainant in this respect, the complaint sets forth relevant facts relating to the disappearance of the complainant's husband, brother and sister-in-law upon which the alleged violation of the complainant's rights under Article 3 of the ECHR may be based.
19. The Panel refers to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights with respect to the question whether a member of the family of a disappeared person can be considered the victim of a treatment contrary to Article 3 of the ECHR, which prohibits inhuman treatment. The European Court of Human Rights accepts that this may be the case, depending on the existence of "special factors which give the suffering of the [family member] a dimension and character distinct from the emotional distress which may be regarded as inevitably caused to relatives of a victim of a serious human rights violation". The Court further holds that "relevant elements will include the proximity of the family tie, the particular circumstances of the relationship, the extent to which the family member witnessed the events in question, the involvement of the family member in the attempts to obtain information about the disappeared person and the way in which the authorities responded to those enquiries". It also emphasises "that the essence of such a violation does not so much lie in the fact of the disappearance of the family member but rather concerns the authorities' reactions and attitudes to the situation when it is brought to their attention" (see, e.g., European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) (Grand Chamber), *Çakici v. Turkey*, no. 23657/94, judgment of 8 July 1999, § 98, *ECHR*, 1999-IV; ECtHR (Grand Chamber), *Cyprus v. Turkey*, no. 25781/94, judgment of 10 May 2001, § 156, *ECHR*, 2001-IV; ECtHR, *Orhan v. Turkey*, no. 25656/94, judgment of 18 June 2002, § 358; ECtHR, *Bazorkina v. Russia*, no. 69481/01, judgment of 27 July 2006, § 139; see also Human Rights Advisory Panel (HRAP), *Zdravković*, no. 46/08, decision of 17 April 2009, § 41, and HRAP, *Radisavljević*, no. 156/09, decision of 17 February 2012, § 18).

20. The Panel considers that a complainant may invoke a violation of Article 3 of the ECHR even if there is no explicit reference to specific acts of the authorities involved in the investigation, since also the passivity of the authorities and the absence of information given to the complainant may be indicative of inhuman treatment of the complainant by the authorities (see HRAP, *Mladenović*, no. 99/09, decision of 11 August 2011, § 22; HRAP, *Petković*, no. 133/09, decision of 16 December 2011, § 20).
21. The Panel considers that this part of the complaint raises serious issues of fact and law, the determination of which should depend on an examination of the merits. The Panel concludes therefore that this part of the complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Section 3.3 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12, and rejects the objection raised by the SRSG.
22. No other ground for declaring this part of the complaint inadmissible has been established.

**FOR THESE REASONS,**

The Panel, unanimously,

**DECLARES THE COMPLAINT ADMISSIBLE.**

Andrey ANTONOV  
Executive Officer

Marek NOWICKI  
Presiding Member