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

FOURTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 43939/20
Predrag JOZIĆ
against Bosnia and Herzegovina
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting on 1 July 2021 as a Committee composed of:

Armen Harutyunyan, *President,*
Jolien Schukking,
Ana Maria Guerra Martins, *judges,*

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 22 September 2020,

Having regard to the observations submitted by the parties,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant's details are set out in the appended table.

The applicant was represented by Mr M. Raguž, a lawyer practising in Stolac.

The applicant's complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 concerning the non-enforcement of a domestic decision were communicated to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina ("the Government") on 19 November 2020.

THE LAW

In their observations of 16 March 2021, the Government submitted that the applicant had failed to inform the Court of the fact that the final judgment in his favour had been enforced on 16 February 2010. They therefore requested the Court to reject the application as an abuse of the right of individual application in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention.

The applicant did not dispute the facts as presented by the Government.

The Court reiterates that an application may be rejected as an abuse of the right of individual application within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention if, among other reasons, it was knowingly based on false information or if significant information and documents were deliberately omitted either where they were known from the outset or where new significant developments occurred during the proceedings. Incomplete and therefore misleading information may amount to an abuse of the right of application, especially if the information in question concerns the very core of the case and no sufficient explanation is given for the failure to disclose that information (see *Gross v. Switzerland* [GC], no. 67810/10, § 28, ECHR 2014; *S.A.S. v. France* [GC], no. 43835/11, § 67, ECHR 2014; and *Čaluk and Others v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* (dec.) [Committee], nos. 3927/15 and 63 others, §§ 18-19, 25 September 2018).

Turning to the present case, the Court observes that the domestic decision under consideration was indeed enforced on 16 February 2010 (see the appended table). The applicant did not inform the Court about that development. The Court learned about it only from the Government's observations of 16 March 2021. No convincing explanation for that omission was provided.

Having regard to the fact that the information withheld concerned the very core of the application, the Court finds that such conduct was contrary to the purpose of the right of individual application. Lawyers must understand that, having due regard to the Court's duty to examine allegations of human rights violations, they must show a high level of professional prudence and meaningful cooperation with the Court by sparing it the introduction of unmeritorious complaints and, both before proceedings have been instituted and thereafter, they must inquire diligently into all the details of the case, meticulously abide by all the relevant rules of procedure and must urge their clients to do the same. Otherwise, the wilful or negligent misuse of the Court's resources may undermine the credibility of lawyers' work in the eyes of the Court and even, if it occurs systematically, may result in particular individual lawyers being banned from representing applicants under Rule 36 § 4 (b) of the Rules of Court (see *Stevančević v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* (dec.), no. 67618/09, § 29, 10 January 2017).

In the light of the foregoing, the Court considers that the present application constitutes an abuse of the right of individual application within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) *in fine* of the Convention. It must therefore be rejected in accordance with Article 35 § 4 of the Convention.

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Declares the application inadmissible.

Done in English and notified in writing on 22 July 2021.

{signature_p_2}

Viktoriya Maradudina
Acting Deputy Registrar

Armen Harutyunyan
President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (non-enforcement or delayed enforcement of domestic decisions)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Relevant domestic decision	Start date of non-enforcement period	End date of non-enforcement period Length of enforcement proceedings
43939/20 22/09/2020	**Predrag JOZIĆ** 1975	Sarajevo Municipal Court, 05/11/2007	29/10/2009	16/02/2010 3 month(s) and 19 day(s)