



The Human Rights Advisory Panel

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

DECISION

Date of adoption: 23 August 2012

Case No. 283/09

Predrag JOKSIMOVIĆ

against

UNMIK

The Human Rights Advisory Panel, sitting on 23 August 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 3 April 2009 and registered on 30 April 2009.
2. On 23 December 2009, the Panel requested further information from the complainant. No response was received.
3. On 4 April 2012, the Panel communicated the case to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) for UNMIK's comments on the admissibility of the case. On 3 May 2012, the SRSG submitted UNMIK's response.

II. THE FACTS

4. The complainant is the son of Mr Momčilo Joksimović.
5. The complainant states that on 7 November 1999, Mr Momčilo Joksimović was abducted from somewhere between the villages of Vragoli/Vragolija and Batushë/Batuse in the municipality of Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje.
6. The complainant states that the abduction was reported to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the Serbian Red Cross, KFOR and UNMIK. His father's mortal remains were subsequently found on 16 November 1999 on the road between Mitrovicë/Mitrovica and Drenicë/Drenica. The complainant states that the cause of death was gun shots to the head. A copy of the death certificate prepared by UNMIK on 19 April 2000 states that the cause of death was involuntary homicide.
7. 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

8. The complainant complains about UNMIK's alleged failure to properly investigate the abduction and killing of his father.
9. The Panel considers that the complainant may be deemed to invoke a violation of the right to life of his father, guaranteed by Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

IV. THE LAW

10. 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.
11. The complainant alleges in substance the lack of an adequate criminal investigation into the abduction and killing of his father.
12. In his comments, the SRSG argues that since the mortal remains of Mr Momčilo Joksimović were handed over to his family nine days after his disappearance, UNMIK complied with one of the procedural requirements envisaged by Article 2 of the ECHR, namely the obligation to conduct an investigation capable of determining the fate and whereabouts of the missing person. The SRSG is of the view that the complaint concerning the above-mentioned aspect of Article 2 is inadmissible.

13. On the other hand, the SRSG accepts that the complaint is *prima facie* admissible with respect to another procedural requirement of Article 2 of the ECHR, namely the obligation to conduct an investigation capable of determining “whether the death was caused unlawfully and subsequently leading to the identification and punishment of those responsible for the disappearance and/or death” of Mr Momčilo Joksimović.
14. The Panel notes that the SRSG distinguishes between two procedural requirements of Article 2 of the ECHR. He thus considers that the activities of locating and identification of the mortal remains of a missing person can be seen as an independent component of the procedural obligation envisaged by Article 2 of the ECHR.
15. On this point, the Panel refers to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights setting the standards of an effective investigation into killings and disappearances in life-threatening circumstances. The European Court states that “the essential purpose of such investigation is to secure the effective implementation of the domestic laws which protect the right to life” (see, e.g., European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) (Grand Chamber), *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, nos. 16064/09 and others, judgment of 18 September 2009, § 191). Specifically with regard to persons disappeared and later found dead, the Court has stated that the procedures of exhumating and identifying mortal remains do not exhaust the obligation under Article 2 of the ECHR. It is true that the Court holds that “the procedural obligation arising from a disappearance will generally remain as long as the whereabouts and fate of the person are unaccounted for, and it is thus of a continuing nature” (ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, no. 4704/04, judgment of 15 February 2011, § 46; in the same sense ECtHR (Grand Chamber), *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, cited above, at § 148). However, the Court also stresses that this procedural obligation “does not come to an end even on discovery of the body ... This only casts light on one aspect of the fate of the missing person and the obligation to account for the disappearance and death, as well as to identify and prosecute any perpetrator of unlawful acts in that connection, will generally remain” (ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, cited above, at § 46; in the same sense ECtHR (Grand Chamber), *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, cited above, at § 145). The procedural obligation under Article 2 of the ECHR should therefore be seen as a single obligation. While the location and the subsequent identification of the mortal remains of the victim may in themselves be significant achievements, the procedural obligation under Article 2 continues to exist (see ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, cited above, at § 64).
16. For these reasons, the Panel will not separate the obligation to conduct an investigation capable of determining the fate and whereabouts of the missing person from the obligation to conduct an investigation capable of determining whether there was an unlawful disappearance and leading to the identification and punishment of those responsible for the disappearance and death of the victim. The Panel will proceed on the basis of a single continuing obligation (see Human Rights Advisory Panel (HRAP), *Simović*, no. 246/09, decision of 6 April 2012, § 18). Obviously, however, the fact that the mortal remains of Mr Momčilo Joksimović have been located and subsequently identified is a significant element to be taken into account in the overall assessment of the fulfilment of the procedural obligation under Article 2 of the ECHR.
17. The Panel therefore considers that 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 the complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Section 3.3 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12.

18. No other ground for declaring the complaint inadmissible has been established.

FOR THESE REASONS,

The Panel, unanimously,

DECLARES THE COMPLAINT ADMISSIBLE

Andrey ANTONOV
Executive Officer

Marek NOWICKI
Presiding Member