

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

FIFTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 36733/06
Ida JELER against Slovenia
and 7 other applications
(see list appended)

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 22 January 2013 as a Chamber composed of:

Mark Villiger, *President,*
Angelika Nußberger,
Boštjan M. Zupančič,
Ann Power-Forde,
André Potocki,
Paul Lemmens,
Helena Jäderblom, *judges,*

and Claudia Westerdiek, *Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above applications lodged on 4 September 2006, 5 September 2006, 8 September 2006, 11 September 2006, 12 September 2006, 23 October 2006 and 6 November 2006,

Having regard to the submissions of the parties,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

The applicants, Mrs Ida Jeler ("the first applicant"), Mrs Jožica Celcer ("the second applicant"), Mrs Marija Dobočnik ("the third applicant"), Mr Leopold Kos ("the fourth applicant"), Mrs Marija Vodovnik ("the fifth applicant"), Mrs Helena Oblonšek ("the sixth applicant"), Mr Andrej Oblonšek ("the seventh applicant"), Mrs Olga Flis ("the eighth applicant"),

Mr Ervin Flis ("the ninth applicant") and Mrs Emilija Smogavec ("the tenth applicant") are citizens of Slovenia who were born in 1959, 1947, 1942, 1953, 1947, 1963, 1987, 1952, 1974 and 1972, respectively, and live in Oplotnica. They were represented before the Court by Mr V. Cugmas, a lawyer practising in Slovenske Konjice.

The Slovenian Government ("the Government") were represented by their Agents, Mrs T. Mihelič Žitko, State Attorney, Mr L. Bembič, State Attorney and Mrs N. Pintar Gosenca, State Attorney.

A. The circumstances of the case

The facts of the case, as submitted by the parties, may be summarised as follows.

1. Labour proceedings

The first, second, third, fourth and fifth applicants, M.O., the legal predecessor of the sixth and seventh applicants, and S.F., the legal predecessor of the eighth, ninth and tenth applicants, were employees of company LIP.

On 13 April 1993 they were made redundant. After having appealed against the decision unsuccessfully, on 17 May 1993, together with a number of other co-workers, they brought a claim against their employer with the Maribor Labour Court.

On 28 June 1994 the Convention came into force in respect of Slovenia.

In the course of the proceedings M.O. and S.F. died and the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth applicants took over the proceedings.

On 13 April 1999 the Maribor Labour Court held the first hearing; another six hearings ensued.

On 27 November 2001 the Maribor Labour Court rendered a first-instance judgment in which it found that the first, second, third, fourth and fifth applicants' as well as M.O.'s employment had been wrongfully terminated. The court ordered company K., the legal successor of company LIP, to pay the first, second, third, fourth and fifth applicants the outstanding monthly salaries and applicable benefits due to them, together with statutory interest, and reinstate them to appropriate positions. As regards the sixth and seventh applicants, company K. was ordered to pay each of them one-half of the amounts due to M.O. for the period from 15 November 1993 until 10 August 1998. By contrast, the claims of the last three applicants were rejected on the ground that their representative did not hold a valid power of attorney signed by the late S.F. Both parties appealed against this judgment.

On 12 March 2004 the Higher Labour and Social Court rendered a judgment in which it partially upheld the appeal of the respondent company K. and accordingly amended the operative part of the first-instance

judgment. In substance, the lower court's decision on wrongful termination and the consequent liability of company K. for the payment of outstanding monthly salaries and reinstatement was upheld. Thus, with regard to the first seven applicants the judgment became final. Moreover, the court upheld the appeal of the eighth, ninth and tenth applicants in relation to the validity of the power of attorney given by the applicants' predecessor S.F. and, in this part, remitted the case to the Maribor Labour Court for re-examination. In so far as this second-instance judgment acquired the authority of a final decision, the respondent company K. lodged an appeal on points of law against it.

On 30 November 2004 the Maribor Labour Court rendered a judgment in the renewed proceedings regarding the eighth, ninth and tenth applicants in which it found, firstly, that the applicants' representative was granted a valid power of attorney by the late S.F., and secondly, that the latter's employment had been wrongfully terminated. Accordingly, company K. was to pay each of the applicants a third of the outstanding monthly salaries and applicable benefits, together with statutory interest, due to S.F. for the period from 15 November 1993 until 31 August 1997. Company K. appealed against this judgment.

On 6 May 2005 the Higher Labour and Social Court confirmed the first-instance judgment in so far as it pertained to the validity of the power of attorney, but upheld the appeal in the part concerning the calculation of the salaries and applicable benefits with statutory interest due to the applicants. The court established that the operative part of the contested judgment was incomprehensible with regard to the amounts due, as they were not correctly specified. The case was again remitted to the Maribor Labour Court for re-examination.

On 17 January 2006 the Supreme Court dismissed the respondent company K.'s appeal on points of law regarding the final judgment of 12 March 2004.

On 31 January 2006 the Maribor Labour Court stayed the renewed proceedings regarding the eighth, ninth and tenth applicants on the ground that bankruptcy proceedings had been commenced against company K. on 20 April 2005. The applicants were referred to pursue their claims in these proceedings.

On 25 April 2006 the Maribor Labour Court invited the eighth, ninth and tenth applicants to continue the proceedings.

On 18 May 2006 the Maribor Labour Court rejected these applicants' claims on the ground that they had not pursued their claims in the bankruptcy proceedings and had thereby lost legal interest for the resumption of the labour proceedings.

2. Enforcement and bankruptcy proceedings

(a) As regards the first applicant

On 10 January 2005 the first applicant lodged a request for enforcement in the amount of 4,963,451 Slovenian Tolars (SIT) (20,712.11 euros (EUR)) with statutory interest, plus the costs of proceedings.

On 17 February 2005 the Slovenska Bistrica Local Court, enforcement division, granted the first applicant an enforcement order. The applicant managed to recover most of the principal, namely SIT 4,680,966.36 (EUR 19,533.33), but the remaining amount and the outstanding statutory interest remained unpaid.

On 20 April 2005 bankruptcy proceedings were initiated against company K. Consequently, on 5 May 2005 the Slovenska Bistrica Local Court stayed the enforcement proceedings with effect from 20 April 2005. The first applicant then pursued the remainder of her claim in the bankruptcy proceedings.

On 5 May 2006 the bankruptcy panel of the Maribor District Court terminated the bankruptcy proceedings against company K, as it had been sold. The first applicant's claim in the amount of SIT 5,015,266 (20,928.33 EUR) with interest, although allowed, was not paid. The bankruptcy proceedings continued against the bankruptcy estate, which, however, included only very limited assets.

On 9 September 2010 the Maribor District Court terminated the bankruptcy proceedings against the bankruptcy estate of former company K. The first applicant was unable to recover the amount due to her by the company.

(b) As regards the second applicant

The second applicant lodged a request for enforcement in the amount of SIT 4,963,451 (EUR 20,712.11) with statutory interest, plus the costs of proceedings. Additionally, she requested exemption from the payment of the court fees.

On 17 February 2005 the Slovenska Bistrica Local Court granted the applicant payment in three instalments, whereupon she appealed to the Maribor Higher Court. On 20 September 2005 the latter dismissed the appeal.

On 24 July 2006 the second applicant's request for enforcement was dismissed on the ground that bankruptcy proceedings had been initiated against company K. Meanwhile, on 14 June 2005, the third applicant had already submitted her outstanding claim for SIT 5,015,266 (EUR 20,928.33) in the bankruptcy proceedings; however, as the first applicant, she did not manage to recover it due to the lack of funds in the bankruptcy estate.

(c) As regards the third applicant

The third applicant lodged a request for enforcement in the amount of SIT 2,722,222 (EUR 11,359.63) with statutory interest, plus the costs of proceedings. Additionally, she requested exemption from the payment of the court fees; however her request was dismissed by the Slovenska Bistrica Local Court. The applicant appealed against this decision.

On 31 May 2005 the third applicant's request for enforcement was dismissed on the ground that bankruptcy proceedings had been initiated against company K. Meanwhile, on 14 June 2005, the third applicant had already submitted her outstanding claim in the bankruptcy proceedings, but was unable to recover it.

(d) As regards the fourth applicant

The fourth applicant lodged a request for enforcement in the amount of SIT 4,963,451 (EUR 20,712.11) with statutory interest, plus the costs of proceedings. Additionally, he requested exemption from the payment of the court fees.

On 17 February 2005 the Slovenska Bistrica Local Court granted the fourth applicant payment in three instalments. According to the applicant's submissions, company K. had declared bankruptcy before his request for exemption from the payment of the court fees was finally resolved.

The applicant submitted his outstanding claim for SIT 5,015,266 (EUR 20,928.33) in the bankruptcy proceedings, but was unable to recover it.

(e) As regards the fifth applicant

The fifth applicant lodged a request for enforcement in the amount of SIT 4,963,451 (EUR 20,712.11) with statutory interest, plus the costs of proceedings. Additionally, she requested exemption from the payment of the court fees.

On 17 February 2005 the Slovenska Bistrica Local Court granted her payment in three instalments, whereupon she appealed to the Maribor Higher Court. The latter, on 27 September 2005, dismissed the appeal.

On 24 July 2006 the fifth applicant's request for enforcement was dismissed on the ground that bankruptcy proceedings had been initiated against company K. Meanwhile, on 14 June 2005, the third applicant had already submitted her outstanding claim for SIT 5,015,266 (EUR 20,928.33) in the bankruptcy proceedings; however, as the other applicants, she did not manage to recover it.

(f) As regards the sixth applicant

The sixth applicant lodged a request for enforcement in the amount of SIT 1,324,141.5 (EUR 5,525.54) with statutory interest, plus the costs of proceedings.

On 14 April 2005 the Slovenska Bistrica Local Court, enforcement division, granted the sixth applicant an enforcement order. Subsequently, on 5 May 2005, before her claim was paid, the Slovenska Bistrica Local Court stayed the enforcement proceedings with effect from 20 April 2005.

The sixth applicant then pursued her outstanding claim in the bankruptcy proceedings, but was unable to recover it.

(g) As regards the seventh applicant

The seventh applicant's request for enforcement was, according to his submissions, granted on 18 February 2005. He subsequently succeeded in partially recovering his claim before company K. went into bankruptcy. He then pursued the remainder of his claim in the amount of SIT 1,375,956.15 (EUR 5,741.7) with interest in the bankruptcy proceedings, but, as the other applicants, was unable to recover it.

B. Relevant domestic law and practice

1. The 1991 Constitution

The relevant provision of the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia reads as follows:

Article 26

"Everyone shall have the right to compensation for damage caused by the unlawful acts of a person or body when performing a function or engaged in an activity on behalf of a State or local authority or as a holder of public office.

..."

2. The Code of Obligations 2001

The relevant provisions of the Code of Obligations read as follows:

Section 131

"(1) Any person who inflicts damage on another shall be obliged to reimburse it, unless it is proved that the damage was incurred without the culpability of the former.

..."

Section 148

"(1) A legal person shall be liable for damage inflicted on a third person by a body of the legal person during the performance of its functions or in connection therewith.

..."

3. Act on the Protection of the Right to a Trial without Undue Delay (hereinafter referred to as "the 2006 Act")

The relevant provision of the 2006 Act reads as follows:

Section 21

"(1) Action in respect of pecuniary damage caused by a violation of the right to a trial without undue delay may be brought by the party within eighteen months of the final ruling of the court on the party's case in accordance with the provisions of the Obligations Code concerning pecuniary damage.

(2) When deciding on pecuniary damage, the court shall take account of the provisions of the Code of Obligations and the criteria referred to in Article 4 and Article 16, paragraph 3 of the present Act. The strict liability for damage caused shall lie with the Republic of Slovenia."

A civil action for compensation for pecuniary damage resulting from an excessive length of proceedings can be brought against the State pursuant to the general rules on the liability for damages laid down in the Code of Obligations. Prior to the implementation of the 2006 Act, all four elements of damage liability, namely the unlawful State action, existence of damage, causal link and negligence or fault had to be established for damages to be awarded. Individuals who brought compensation claims for damage incurred as a result of a violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time were required to prove the first three elements, whereas the State could free itself from liability by proving that the damage had been incurred without its negligence or fault.

The 2006 Act provides for two types of State liability; liability for non-pecuniary damage, which is primarily subject to a settlement procedure before the State Attorney's Office, and liability for pecuniary damage, which is subject to an action for compensation before the civil courts, but under somewhat mitigated conditions compared to the general rules laid down in the Code of Obligations.

In particular, section 21 of the 2006 Act introduced strict liability for damage caused by a violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time and determined new criteria which the domestic courts are required to take account of when deciding on pecuniary damage. These criteria are based on the ones established by the Court's case-law, that is the complexity of the case, the conduct of the applicant and the relevant authorities, and the importance of what is at stake for the applicant in the dispute.

Section 25 of the 2006 Act lays down transitional rules as regards just satisfaction for damage sustained prior to 31 March 2007; where the claims for just satisfaction had already been lodged with the Court prior to this date and the violation has already ceased, the cases are referred by the Court for the settlement procedure before the State Attorney's Office. Section 25 deals only with just satisfaction for non-pecuniary damage.

4. The case-law of the domestic courts regarding the proceedings for compensation for pecuniary damage resulting from a violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time

On 8 November 2010 the Nova Gorica District Court rendered judgment no. Pg 246/2006 in which it awarded the plaintiff company EUR 27,562.59 with interest for pecuniary damage sustained as a result of a violation of its right to a trial within a reasonable time. As the claim for damages was introduced before the 2006 Act became operational, the proceedings were conducted pursuant to the general rules on the liability for damages. On 6 May 2011 the judgment was confirmed by the Koper Higher Court and thus became final.

In two other cases where the claims were introduced after the date of application of the 2006 Act, the Ljubljana District Court awarded the plaintiffs EUR 24,851.69 with interest and EUR 26,390.95 with interest respectively for pecuniary damage sustained as a result of a violation of their right to a trial within a reasonable time. One of the judgments was also confirmed by the Ljubljana Higher Court.

In another five cases the domestic courts dismissed the plaintiffs' claims for pecuniary damage, as they failed to prove either that the State violated their right to a trial within a reasonable time, or that they had sustained damage as a result of a violation of the "reasonable time" requirement or that there was a causal link between the alleged damage and the violation of the "reasonable time" requirement.

COMPLAINTS

The applicants complained under Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention of an excessive length of the labour proceedings and about the lack of an effective domestic remedy in that regard. Moreover, the applicants requested, in addition to non-pecuniary damage, also compensation for pecuniary damage.

THE LAW

The Court considers that, in accordance with Rule 42 § 1 of the Rules of Court, the applications should be joined, given their common factual and legal background.

A. Alleged violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention

The applicants complained about the excessive length of the labour proceedings. They relied on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, which reads as follows:

> "In the determination of his civil rights and obligations ..., everyone is entitled to a ... hearing within a reasonable time by [a] ... tribunal..."

On 5 March 2009 the respondent Government were given notice under Rule 54 § 2 (a) of the Rules of Court of the sixth and seventh applicants' case, on 11 March 2009 of the fifth applicant's case and on 14 March 2011 of the eighth, ninth and tenth applicants' cases. In addition they were requested to confirm whether section 25 of the 2006 Act would be applied in the above cases. In the event of an affirmative answer they were requested to submit a copy of the settlement proposal made to the respective applicant under the provision mentioned.

On 22 October 2010 the Court communicated the first, second, third and fourth applicants' cases to the respondent Government under Rule 54 § 2 (b) of the Rules of Court.

In reply, the Government informed the Court with respect to each of the applications that section 25 of the 2006 Act had been applied and that they had reached a settlement with the applicants. In their respective settlements the first five applicants received EUR 5,000 each for non-pecuniary damage and EUR 550.80 each for costs and expenses, the sixth and seventh applicants received EUR 5,000 each for non-pecuniary damage and EUR 626 for costs and expenses, the eighth and ninth applicants received EUR 3,600 each for non-pecuniary damage and EUR 454.41 for costs and expenses, and the tenth applicant received EUR 3,600 for non-pecuniary damage and EUR 413.10 for costs and expenses.

Moreover, as regards the first four applicants, the Government expressed their view that the observations on the admissibility and merits of the cases were no longer necessary. Additionally, with regard to the applicants' claims for just satisfaction for pecuniary damage, which had not been covered by the settlements, the Government raised the objection of non-exhaustion of domestic remedies, referring to the Court's case-law on the subject and maintaining that the applicants had at their disposal a civil action for compensation pursuant to section 21 of the 2006 Act in connection with the Code of Obligations.

With respect to the fifth, sixth and seventh applicants the Government argued that the settlements provided them an adequate and sufficient compensation for the violation of their right to a trial within a reasonable time, so they could no longer be considered victims of a violation of the Convention. Therefore, they requested the Court to strike the applications out of the list in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (a) and (b) of the Convention. As regards the eighth, ninth and tenth applicants, the Government made no specific requests regarding the future examination of the applications.

All the applicants informed the Court that they wished to withdraw the application only in so far as it concerned non-pecuniary damage, but maintained the complaints in so far as they pertained to pecuniary damage.

Article 37 § 1 of the Convention provides as follows:

> "1. The Court may at any stage of the proceedings decide to strike an application out of its list of cases where the circumstances lead to the conclusion that
>
> (a) the applicant does not intend to pursue his application; or
>
> (b) the matter has been resolved; or
>
> (c) for any other reason established by the Court, it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application."

The parties agree that the substantive issues regarding the length of proceedings and the question of non-pecuniary damages and costs and expenses have been resolved. The question is whether the fact that pecuniary damage has not been covered calls for a different approach.

The Court notes that in previous cases, where a settlement has been reached with the Government which did not cover all the applicants' claims, the Court has considered whether to continue its examination under Article 34 by reference to the notion of "victim" (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Çiçek and Öztemel and Others v. Turkey*, nos. 74069/01, 74703/01, 76380/01, 16809/02, 25710/02, 25714/02 and 30383/02, §§ 20-26, 3 May 2007).

In the present case, the part of the claims which was not covered by the settlement was not an independent complaint under a separate Article of the Convention (as in *Çiçek and Öztemel and Others v. Turkey*; see also *Guerrera and Fusco* v. Italy, no. 40601/98, §§ 54-55, 3 April 2003), but the pecuniary damage head of the applicants' Article 41 claim.

Under Article 41 the purpose of awarding sums by way of just satisfaction is to provide reparation solely for damage suffered by those concerned to the extent that such damage constitutes the consequence of a violation that cannot otherwise be remedied (see *Scozzari and Giunta v. Italy* [GC], nos. 39221/98 and 41963/98, § 250, ECHR 2000-VIII, and *Pisano v. Italy* (striking out) [GC], no. 36732/97, § 46, 24 October 2002). It must be noted that according to the domestic law on damage liability, it appears that it is open to the applicants to seek compensation for

pecuniary damage from the respondent State at the domestic level. As explained below, a civil claim for the compensation for pecuniary damage constitutes an effective remedy which was available to the applicants.

In view of these circumstances, the Court considers that it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the applicants' complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention. Moreover, there is no particular reason relating to respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols which would require the Court to continue the examination of this complaints under Article 37 § 1 *in fine*.

Accordingly, the applications should be struck out of the list in so far as they relate to Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

B. Alleged violation of Article 13 of the Convention

The applicants complained that they did not have an effective domestic remedy in respect of the length of proceedings, in breach of Article 13 of the Convention. Article 13 reads as follows:

> "Everyone whose rights and freedoms as set forth in [the] Convention are violated shall have an effective remedy before a national authority notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity."

The Court recalls that two distinct remedies are provided in the domestic law for seeking redress for a violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time, a civil claim for the compensation for pecuniary damage and the procedure under the 2006 Act in which, in addition to the preventive remedies it provides, an award can be made in relation to the non-pecuniary damage. In this respect, the Court reiterates that even if a single remedy does not satisfy the requirements of Article 13, the aggregate of remedies provided for under domestic law may do so. It is therefore necessary to determine in each case whether the means available to litigants in domestic law are "effective" in the sense either of preventing the alleged violation or its continuation, or of providing adequate redress for any violation that has already occurred (see, for example *Ištván and Ištvánová v. Slovakia*, no. 30189/07, § 108, 12 June 2012).

As regards the procedure under the 2006 Act, the Court refers to its established case-law (see, for example, *Pohlen v. Slovenia*, (dec.), no. 28457/03, §§ 36-44, 3 June 2008) according to which this Act affords the applicants an effective remedy in respect of their complaints about the length of proceedings.

On the other hand, as regards the applicants' claims for pecuniary damages, they had at their disposal, as argued by the Government, a civil action for compensation for pecuniary damage, a compensatory remedy which they could have made use of. Acknowledging that the primary responsibility for implementing and enforcing the rights and freedoms

guaranteed by the Convention lies with the domestic authorities, the Court has already concluded to the effect that a civil action for compensation is, in principle, an effective remedy with regard to the length of proceedings (see *Lukenda v. Slovenia*, no. 23032/02, § 59, ECHR 2005-X; *Jazbec v. Slovenia*, no. 31489/02, § 75, 14 December 2006; *Varacha v. Slovenia*, no. 9303/02, § 32, 9 November 2006, and *Lakota v. Slovenia*, no. 33488/02, § 35, 7 December 2006; *a contrario*, *Ommer v. Germany (no. 1)*, no. 10597/03, § 75, 13 November 2008). The applicants, who had not pursued their pecuniary claims at the domestic level on the ground that such an action did not constitute an effective remedy, called this conclusion into question. However, the Court, having examined the decisions of the domestic courts submitted by the parties, does not find sufficient reasons to depart from its findings in the above judgments.

The sixth and seventh applicants maintained that a civil claim for compensation, which was available to them pursuant to the general rules on damage liability, could not effectively redress a violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time which, as in their case, had already ceased before the implementation of the 2006 Act. They alleged that such claims were not resolved within a reasonable time and had little or no prospect of success, as all four elements of damage liability had to be established, which meant that the success of their claim was conditional on the State's fault.

However, the Government submitted copies of ten judgments rendered in six sets of proceedings in which civil claims for compensation for pecuniary damage had been brought against the State with regard to a violation of the plaintiffs' right to a trial within a reasonable time (see above in the "Relevant domestic law and practice" part). All of these cases were examined on the merits and sufficiently reasoned and in three out of the six, including the one which dates back to 2006 and was accordingly conducted entirely under the general rules of damage liability, the plaintiffs succeeded or partially succeeded with their claims. In this respect, the Court also recalls that the "effectiveness" of a "remedy" within the meaning of Article 13 does not depend on the certainty of a favourable outcome for the applicant.

Further, as regards the alleged excessive delays in decision making, which may render the remedy inadequate (see *Scordino v. Italy (no. 1)* [GC], no. 36813/97, § 195 in fine, ECHR 2006-V, with further references), the Court notes that in most cases submitted the proceedings lasted approximately three years at two levels of jurisdiction, and in no case did the proceedings last more than four years at first instance. Having regard to the overall length of proceedings in the cases submitted by the Government, and in the absence of more detailed information as to the conduct of the parties and domestic courts, the Court considers that it cannot be assumed, *a priori*, that civil proceedings for compensation for pecuniary damage

sustained as a result of a violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time would have been excessively long and thus ineffective.

It follows that these complaints are manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

For these reasons, the Court unanimously

Decides to join the applications;

Decides to strike the applications out of its list of cases in so far as they relate to Article 6 § 1 of the Convention;

Declares the remainder of the applications inadmissible.

Claudia Westerdiek
Registrar

Mark Villiger
President

APPENDIX

No	Application No	Lodged on	Applicant	Represented by
1.	36733/06	04/09/2006	**Ida JELER**	Velimir CUGMAS
2.	36738/06	04/09/2006	**Jožica CELCER**	Velimir CUGMAS
3.	36880/06	05/09/2006	**Marija DOBOČNIK**	Velimir CUGMAS
4.	42117/06	11/09/2006	**Leopold KOS**	Velimir CUGMAS
5.	48231/06	23/10/2006	**Marija VODOVNIK**	Velimir CUGMAS
6.	48836/06	06/11/2006	**Helena OBLONŠEK** **Andrej OBLONŠEK**	Velimir CUGMAS
7.	39748/06	12/09/2006	**Olga FLIS** **Ervin FLIS**	Velimir CUGMAS
8.	37137/06	08/09/2006	**Emilija SMOGAVEC**	Velimir CUGMAS