



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

THIRD SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 42144/16
Sunčica ANTIĆ
against Serbia
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting on 29 August 2019 as a Committee composed of:

Dmitry Dedov, *President*,

Alena Poláčková,

Gilberto Felici, *judges*,

and Liv Tigerstedt, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 6 July 2016,

Having regard to the observations submitted by the respondent Government and the observations in reply submitted by the applicant,

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 N. Antić, a lawyer practising in Vladičin Han.

The applicant's complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1, concerning the non-enforcement of three domestic decisions given against a socially/State-owned company, were communicated to the Serbian Government ("the Government").

THE LAW

The Government submitted that the applicant had failed to inform the Court that two sets of enforcement proceedings had been terminated at her request. They therefore suggested that the Court 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 that fact, but considered it irrelevant.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

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 *Matović v. Serbia* (dec.) [Committee], no. 33104/16, 25 September 2018).

Turning to the present case, the Court observes that the applicant withdrew her requests for enforcement in respect of the decisions of 2 June 2003 and 29 January 2004 which led to the final termination of the two sets of enforcement proceedings in April 2005. The applicant did not inform the Court about that fact before notice of the application was given to the Government and no convincing explanation for this 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 willful 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 view of the above, 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 19 September 2019.

Liv Tigerstedt
Acting Deputy Registrar

Dmitry Dedov
President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

(non-enforcement of domestic decisions given against a socially/State-owned companies)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant Date of birth	Final domestic decision Court and date	Enforcement order Court and date	Date of withdrawal of the request for enforcement	Date of termination of enforcement proceedings
42144/16 06/07/2016	Sunčica Antić 30/04/1966	Municipal Court in Vladičin Han, 02/06/2003	Municipal Court in Vladičin Han, 10/10/2003	08/04/2005	26/04/2005
		Municipal Court in Vladičin Han, 29/01/2004	Municipal Court in Vladičin Han 31/03/2004	08/04/2005	25/04/2005
		Court of First Instance in Vladičin Han, 05/02/2013	Commercial Court in Leskovac, 15/05/2014	-	-