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

FOURTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 4446/25
Đurađ VELENDEČIĆ
against Bosnia and Herzegovina

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting on 26 May 2026 as a Committee composed of:

Anja Seibert-Fohr*, President*,
Faris Vehabović,
Sebastian Răduleţu*, judges*,
and Simeon Petrovski, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to:

the application (no. 4446/25) against Bosnia and Herzegovina lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ("the Convention") on 27 January 2025 by a national of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mr Đurađ Velendečić, who was born in 1951 and lives in Srbac, Bosnia and Herzegovina ("the applicant");

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

The applicant complained under Article 6 about the outcome of a labour dispute. On 6 December 2016 the Constitutional Court rejected his constitutional appeal as out of time having found that the applicant's prior appeal on points of law was not an effective remedy and that, as a result, the statutory time-limit for the lodging of the constitutional appeal had not been complied with. There is no indication in the case file as to the exact date of the service of the decision of the Constitutional Court. However, the applicant provided a copy of a letter of 22 December 2016 that he had sent to the Constitutional Court complaining about its decision.

THE COURT'S ASSESSMENT

Before the entry into force of Protocol No. 15 to the Convention (1 August 2021), Article 35 § 1 of the Convention referred to a period of six months. Article 4 of Protocol No. 15 has amended Article 35 § 1 to reduce the period from six to four months. The new time-limit does not have a retroactive effect, since it does not apply to applications in respect of which the final decision within the meaning of Article 35 § 1 was taken prior to the date of entry into force of the new rule (see the Explanatory Report to Protocol No. 15, § 22).

The object of the six-month time-limit under Article 35 § 1 is to promote legal certainty, by ensuring that cases raising issues under the Convention are dealt with in a reasonable time and that past decisions are not continually open to challenge. As a rule, the six-month period runs from the date of the final decision in the process of exhaustion of domestic remedies (see, for example, *Lekić v. Slovenia* [GC], no. 36480/07, §§ 64-65, 11 December 2018).

In the present case, the decision of the Constitutional Court, which was the last decision in the process of exhaustion of domestic remedies, was rendered on 6 December 2016 and, based on the available evidence, the applicant first became aware of it no later than 22 December 2016. The present application was introduced on 27 January 2025. Accordingly, even assuming that the application is not inadmissible on non-exhaustion grounds (owing to the applicant's failure to seize the Constitutional Court in a timely manner), it has been submitted too late.

It follows that the application must 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 18 June 2026.

Simeon Petrovski Deputy Registrar	Anja Seibert-Fohr President