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

SECOND SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 14901/15
Aleksandar MASTELICA and Others
against Serbia

The European Court of Human Rights (Second Section), sitting on 17 November 2020 as a Committee composed of:

Valeriu Griţco, *President,*
Branko Lubarda,
Pauliine Koskelo, *judges,*

and Hasan Bakirci, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 19 March 2015,

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

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

1. A list of the sixteen applicants is set out in the appendix hereto. The applicants were all represented by Mr D. Mladenović, one of the applicants and a lawyer by training.

2. The Serbian Government ("the Government") were represented by their former Agent, Ms N. Plavšić.

A. The circumstances of the case

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

*1. The construction of the power line (*dalekovod*) and the related proceedings*

4. All of the applicants lived in the settlements of Vinča and Kaluđerica, in the Belgrade municipality of Grocka (*Gradska opština Grocka*).

5. On 14 October 1988 the City of Belgrade (*Grad Beograd*) adopted a detailed urban-planning document concerning the construction of a high-voltage (400 kV) power line, which would operate at 50 Hz, in the municipality of Grocka. According to this document, there were only a small number of existing residential buildings or other properties in the area at that time.

6. In the years that followed, the area and its surroundings were developed extensively. Houses, schools and kindergartens, as well as commercial and industrial buildings, were built, albeit some, apparently, without valid construction permits.

7. In November 2003 the City of Belgrade published a decision affirming that the 1988 planning document (see paragraph 5 above) was still in accordance with the relevant legislation.

8. On 2 June 2008 the Ministry of Infrastructure (*Ministarstvo za infrastrukturu*) set out the specific requirements for the construction of the power line in question.

9. On 11 June 2009 and 14 October 2010 the government (*Vlada Republike Srbije*) adopted two separate decisions "establishing that expropriation [of the land and other real estate in the area where the power line was to be constructed] was in the public interest" (*utvrđen javni interes za eksproprijaciju*). Both decisions were also published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia nos. 46/09 and 75/10 of 19 June 2009 and 20 October 2010 respectively.

10. On 27 July 2009, between the publication of the two above-mentioned decisions, the Ministry of the Environment and Infrastructure (*Ministarstvo životne sredine i infrastrukture*) approved the construction of the power line.

11. In October 2010 a statutory company, JP Elektromreža Srbije ("the investor"), produced an environmental impact assessment study (*studija o proceni uticaja na životnu sredinu*). The study was prepared by an organisation, Elektroistok, on behalf of the investor and was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning (*Ministarstvo životne sredine i prostornog planiranja*) for approval.

12. On 22 October 2010, in an announcement published in *Politika*, one of the major daily newspapers in Serbia, the Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning informed the public of the request for approval submitted by the investor. The public was also invited to examine the study (*izvrši uvid u sadržinu studije*) in the premises of the local authorities, within a period of twenty days, and then submit any written comments in that connection. Lastly, the public was informed that an open debate on the issue was to be scheduled for 19 November 2010. This debate ultimately took place as planned and was attended by fifteen people. Seven of them were representatives of the investor and the organisation which had prepared the environmental impact assessment study on its behalf, seven were municipal or city officials and one was a professor from the Belgrade University Faculty

of Electrical Engineering (*Elekrotehnički fakultet*). Following a discussion, no objections in respect of the environmental impact assessment study were registered.

13. On 31 December 2010 the Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning approved the study submitted by the investor in October 2010 (see paragraph 11 above). In so doing, it also took into account the investor's detailed additional submissions of 15 December 2010.

14. On 13 January 2011, again by means of an announcement published in *Politika*, the Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning informed the public of its decision of 31 December 2010 (see paragraph 13 above). Furthermore, it noted, *inter alia*, that any interested parties who wished to challenge that decision were entitled to bring judicial review proceedings (*podnesu tužbu nadležnom Upravnom sudu*) within a period of thirty days from when this information was made public through the mass media.

15. On 21 June 2011 the Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy (*Ministarstvo za infrastrukturu i energetiku*) formally issued the investor with a construction permit (*energetska dozvola za izgradnju energetskog objekta*).

16. On 23 August 2011 the investor informed the authorities that construction would commence on 31 August 2011; however, it only started in May 2014.

17. Between April 2013 and March 2014 the Grocka municipality contacted various government bodies and institutions, on behalf of the applicants, enquiring as to whether construction of the power line could be dealt with "differently", such as being moved to another route or even suspended.

18. On 20 August 2014 the City of Belgrade informed the applicants, *inter alia*, of the procedure that would need to be followed if they wanted to have the power line moved to a different location.

19. On 15 October 2015 the Technical Operations Control Commission (*Komisija za tehnički pregled o puštanju u probni rad*) confirmed that the power line had been built in accordance with the relevant requirements and approved the commencement of a trial period.

2. The findings of the Ombudsman and other related facts

20. On 12 November 2014 the Ombudsman (*Zaštitnik građana*) found, *inter alia*, that the inhabitants of the Grocka municipality had not been properly informed about the possible environmental impact of the power line under construction. Notably, they did not know that the power line was to be built in the area until the commencement of the individual expropriation proceedings concerning their respective properties in 2011. It was also inappropriate, according to the Ombudsman, to rely on the 1988 planning document, given that the area had been extensively developed in the meantime, which meant, furthermore, that there was now a reasonable concern that the power line could adversely affect the environment in general

and the health of the inhabitants in particular (the closest route of the power line, for example, having been planned to be 15 metres away from a local schoolyard and 46 metres away from the main school building). The Ombudsman further issued a recommendation to the relevant authorities to reassess the possible environmental effects of the power line, taking into account the actual situation on the ground and as part of a process which would fully inform and involve all interested parties. Finally, the Ombudsman considered that, should any negative effects ultimately be identified, other mutually acceptable solutions ought to be explored. These could, for example, entail the relocation of the power line to another route or the moving of the settlement itself to a different location.

21. On 8 January 2015 the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection (*Ministarstvo poljoprivrede i zaštite životne sredine*) informed the Ombudsman that, *inter alia*, the procedure for the approval of the environmental impact assessment study had been entirely in accordance with the relevant legislation and that the 1988 planning document had also been reviewed and found still to be in accordance with the relevant legislation by the City of Belgrade in 2003 (see paragraph 7 above).

22. On 12 November 2013 the investor likewise sent a letter to the Ombudsman, stating that the relevant legal requirements and procedures had been fully complied with and that there was hence no need for a reassessment of the decisions already taken.

3. The proceedings before the Constitutional Court

23. On 14 April 2014 the applicants lodged an appeal (*ustavna žalba*) with the Constitutional Court (*Ustavni sud*), complaining, *inter alia*, that they had not been able to take part in the proceedings leading to the approval of the construction of the power line, since they had not been informed of that process in good time, that the entire proceedings had otherwise also been fundamentally flawed and, lastly, that the power line was likely to have an adverse effect on their own and their families' health.

24. On 15 September 2014 the Constitutional Court dismissed their appeal on the basis that they had failed to exhaust domestic remedies. In particular, the court found that the applicants should have brought judicial review proceedings (*upravni spor*) against the government's decisions of 11 June 2009 and 14 October 2010 (see paragraph 9 above), as well as the decision of 31 December 2010 of the Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning (see paragraph 13 above), while, as regards the decision of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy of 21 June 2011 (see paragraph 15 above), they should have lodged an appeal with the government.

4. Other relevant findings

25. On 10 July 2003 the Vinča Nuclear Sciences Institute (*Institut za nuklearne nauke "Vinča"*) issued an opinion to the effect that a transformer station (*trafo-stanica*) linked to the power line in question should not be built at the proposed location in the settlement of Mirijevo as this was "not justified ... from the point of view of non-ionising radiation protection". It would appear that, ultimately, the transformer station was moved to a different location.

26. On 28 May 2014 a statutory company, Nuclear Facilities of Serbia (*Nuklearni objekti Srbije*), conducted a radiation level assessment exercise in the wider area. Specifically, it carried out tests in the vicinity of Smederevski put, Boleč, some 100 metres north of the IDEA supermarket and kilometres away from the applicants' own places of residence. The recorded levels of the electric and magnetic fields' intensity were between approximately 0.861 kV/m and 3.002 kV/m and 0.71 microteslas and 2.10 microteslas, respectively.

27. On 29 December 2014 the Serbian Public Health Institute "Dr Milan Jovanović Batut" (*Institut za javno zdravlje Srbije, Dr Milan Jovanović Batut*), in response to a request by the applicants, outlined, *inter alia*, the relevant national and international standards as regards non-ionising radiation and the possible health risks involved (see, *inter alia*, paragraphs 33 and 36 below).

28. On 25 April 2015, acting upon the applicants' initiative, the Institute of Occupational Medicine and Radiological Protection "Dr Dragomir Karajović" (*Institut za medicinu rada i radiološku zaštitu, Dr Dragomir Karajović*) issued an opinion which essentially contained the same conclusions and recommendations as those in the Ombudsman's report of 12 November 2014 (see paragraph 20 above). It further noted, *inter alia*, that studies had shown that daily exposure to a magnetic field greater than 0.4 microteslas was associated with an increased risk of childhood leukaemia and that in the vicinity of a 400 kV power line the magnetic field intensity could be more than ten times higher. A safe distance for a residential settlement, according to the Institute, would therefore be some 400 metres away from such a power line.

29. Between 23 and 29 October 2015, once the power line had already become operational (see paragraph 19 above), the Nikola Tesla Institute (*Elektrotehnički institut "Nikola Tesla"*) carried out a comprehensive electric and magnetic radiation level assessment exercise in the wider area. In particular, it conducted numerous tests at six separate locations where the radiation was likely to be the highest, but ultimately recorded results which were all "well below the national limits" (see paragraph 33 below). The Institute noted, in particular, that this had been achieved because the power line in question had been installed at a considerable height from the ground. The Institute's report was made public on 3 December 2015.

30. On 4, 5 and 9 April 2016 the Nuclear Facilities of Serbia, again in response to a request by the applicants, carried out an extensive radiation level assessment exercise, at five separate locations, namely in the homes or in the vicinity of the first, seventh, thirteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth applicants' places of residence, as well as in the playground of a local kindergarten. The recorded levels of the electric and magnetic fields' intensity were between approximately 0.001 kV/m and 1.513 kV/m and 0.156 microteslas and 1.06 microteslas, respectively.

B. Relevant domestic law and practice

1. *Constitution of the Republic of Serbia (*Ustav Republike Srbije*, published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia – OG RS – no. 98/06)*

31. Article 74 of the Constitution provides as follows:

> "Everyone shall have the right to a healthy environment and the right to timely and comprehensive information about the state of the environment.
>
> Everyone, especially the Republic of Serbia and its autonomous provinces, shall be responsible for the protection of the environment.
>
> Everyone shall be obliged to preserve and improve the environment."

2. *Constitutional Court decision no. IUz-17/2011 of 23 May 2013*

32. In its decision, the Constitutional Court declared unconstitutional a number of procedural provisions of the Expropriation Act (*Zakon o eksproprijaciji*, published in OG RS nos. 53/95, 23/01 and 20/09). In so doing, it explained, *inter alia*, that it was crucial for the interested parties to be informed of the government's decision on the "establishment of the public interest in the expropriation" of a given property (see, for example, paragraph 9 above), which was why such a decision had to be notified properly rather than merely published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia. Indeed, in order for the interested parties to make use of a judicial review procedure, should they choose to do so, they would first have to be duly informed of any decision affecting their legitimate rights and interests. In any event, the Constitutional Court affirmed that the "establishment of the public interest" referred to above could not be challenged in any subsequent expropriation proceedings involving individual owners and their properties.

3. *Non-Ionising Radiation Protection Regulations (*Pravilnik o granicama izlaganja nejonizujućim zračenjima*, published in OG RS no. 104/09)*

33. These regulations provide that, as regards the general public and in terms of frequencies of 50 Hz, the relevant exposure limits are 2 kV/m and 40 microteslas for electric and magnetic fields respectively.

C. Relevant international standards

34. The relevant parts of a handbook entitled *Establishing a Dialogue on Risks from Electromagnetic Fields*, published by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2008, read as follows:

> "**WHO DECIDES ON GUIDELINES?**
>
> Countries set their own national standards for exposure to electromagnetic fields. However, the majority of national standards are based on the guidelines set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). This non-governmental organization, formally recognized by WHO, evaluates scientific results from all over the world. ICNIRP produces guidelines recommending limits of exposure, which are reviewed periodically and updated as necessary.
>
> **WHAT ARE GUIDELINES BASED ON?**
>
> ICNIRP guidelines developed for EMF exposure cover the non-ionizing radiation frequency range from 0 to 300 GHz. They are based on comprehensive reviews of all the published peer-reviewed literature.
>
> Exposure limits are based on effects related to *short-term* acute exposure rather than *long-term* exposure, because the available scientific information on the long-term low level effects of exposure to EMF fields is considered to be insufficient to establish quantitative limits.
>
> Using short-term acute effects, international guidelines use the approximate exposure level, or *threshold level*, that could potentially lead to adverse biological effects."

35. ICNIRP guidelines for limiting exposure to time-varying electric and magnetic fields, published in *Health Physics* 99(6):818-836 in 2010, state that, when it comes to the general public and as regards frequencies of 50 Hz, the relevant exposure limits are 5 kV/m and 200 microteslas for the electric and magnetic fields respectively.

36. In those guidelines, the ICNIRP also notes that epidemiological studies have consistently shown that daily exposure to a weak magnetic field (greater than 0.3 - 0.4 microteslas) was associated with an increased risk of childhood leukaemia and that the International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified these magnetic fields as probably carcinogenic to humans. However, the guidelines also point out that a causal link between magnetic fields and childhood leukaemia has not been established and that neither have any other long-term effects.

COMPLAINTS

37. Relying on various provisions of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, the applicants essentially complained that the power line in question was bound to have a particularly adverse effect on their own health, as well as the health of their families, and also that they had not been able to properly take part in the proceedings leading to the approval of its construction.

THE LAW

38. The applicants reaffirmed their complaints. The Court, being the master of the characterisation to be given in law to the facts of the cases before it (see, among many other authorities, *Radomilja and Others v. Croatia* [GC], nos. 37685/10 and 22768/12, §§ 114 and 126, 20 March 2018), finds that the above complaints fall to be examined under Article 8 of the Convention, the relevant parts of which read as follows:

> "1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life [and] his home ...
>
> 2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."

A. The parties' submissions

1. The Government

39. The Government maintained that the applicants had failed to exhaust the effective domestic remedies referred to in the Constitutional Court's decision of 15 September 2014 (see paragraph 24 above). They had also not made use of the various existing avenues of redress as part of their subsequent individual expropriation proceedings.

40. The Government further submitted that the entire power line construction project had been carried out lawfully and in full compliance with the relevant domestic and international standards. The applicants had also had an opportunity to participate in the public debate which had taken place before the construction project had been officially approved, but had shown no interest in doing so (see paragraph 12 above). The Government pointed out that the 1998 planning document had likewise been reviewed and reapproved in 2003, 2008 and 2009 (see paragraphs 7, 8 and 10 above) and that the authorities had thus taken into account all of the subsequent developments in the area, despite the fact that some of the applicants' buildings had in fact been built without a valid building permit.

41. Lastly, the Government averred that, in any event, the applicants had not substantiated their allegations to the effect that they or their families had

suffered any adverse health effects as a consequence of the construction of the power line in question.

2. The applicants

42. The applicants argued that they could not have made use of the remedies referred to by the Government and the Constitutional Court since they had not been promptly or properly informed of the relevant decisions (see paragraphs 32, 24 and 23 above, in that order). Once they had found out about them, through their own initiative, it had already been too late to institute any meaningful proceedings. Moreover, none of the key decisions regarding the construction of the power line could have been challenged in the course of the individual expropriation proceedings following the adoption of the government's decisions of 11 June 2009 and 14 October 2010 (see paragraphs 9 and 32 above). Lastly, in the context of the exhaustion of domestic remedies, the applicants maintained that even the Constitutional Court itself had lacked impartiality and had therefore ultimately provided them with no redress for the violations alleged.

43. In addition to the above, the applicants submitted that the entire procedure concerning the approval and construction of the power line had been unlawful and that they had not been involved in the decision-making process. The relevant planning document had also not been valid and had not taken into account the changes on the ground since 1988, which was why the power line had been constructed close to a school and a kindergarten, as well as close to and above the applicants' own homes (some 24 metres from the roof of the first applicant's house, for example). The applicants further stated that the radiation level testing which had been carried out by various "government-linked institutions" had been biased and hence unreliable. On the other hand, the applicants fully endorsed the findings of the Ombudsman's report, as well as those of the Institute of Occupational Medicine and Radiological Protection and the Nuclear Facilities of Serbia, which, according to them, indicated that their health and the health of their families had been seriously endangered (see paragraphs 20, 26, 28 and 30 above). Finally, the applicants maintained that no alternative routes for the construction of the power line had ever been seriously considered by the authorities, and that no distinction should be made between the lawfully constructed buildings and those without a formal building permit since the applicants were, for example, obliged to pay taxes and various other utilities in respect of them all.

B. The Court's assessment

1. Relevant principles

44. In today's society the protection of the environment is an increasingly important consideration (see *Fredin v. Sweden (no. 1)*, 18 February 1991, § 48, Series A no. 192, cited in *Hamer v. Belgium*, no. 21861/03, § 79, ECHR 2007-XIII (extracts); *Turgut and Others v. Turkey*, no. 1411/03, § 90, 8 July 2008; and *Rimer and Others v. Turkey*, no. 18257/04, § 38, 10 March 2009). However, Article 8 is not engaged every time environmental deterioration occurs: no right to nature preservation is included as such among the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Convention or its Protocols (see *Kyrtatos v. Greece*, no. 41666/98, § 52, ECHR 2003-VI (extracts); *Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 36022/97, § 96 *in limine*, ECHR 2003-VIII; and *Fadeyeva v. Russia*, no. 55723/00, § 68, ECHR 2005-IV). The State's obligations under Article 8 therefore come into play only if there is a direct and immediate link between the situation at issue and the applicant's home or private and/or family life (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Botta v. Italy*, 24 February 1998, § 34 *in limine*, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-I). Therefore, the first point for examination is whether the environmental interference of which the applicant complains can be regarded as affecting adversely, to a sufficient extent, the enjoyment of the amenities of his or her home or the quality of his or her private or family life (see *Ivan Atanasov v. Bulgaria*, no. 12853/03, § 66, 2 December 2010).

45. In assessing evidence, the Court has generally applied the standard of proof "beyond reasonable doubt". However, such proof may follow from the coexistence of sufficiently strong, clear and concordant inferences or of similar unrebutted presumptions of fact, and it has been the Court's practice to allow flexibility in that respect, taking into consideration the nature of the substantive right at stake and any evidentiary difficulties involved (see *Fadeyeva*, cited above, § 79, and *Ivan Atanasov*, cited above, § 75). The salient question, in the context of Article 8, is whether the applicant has been able to show to the Court's satisfaction, firstly, that there has been an actual interference with his or her private sphere and, secondly, that a minimum level of severity has been attained (see *Fadeyeva*, cited above, § 70). The mere allegation that certain domestic regulations were not respected is not sufficient to ground the assertion that the applicant's rights under Article 8 have been interfered with (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Furlepa v. Poland* (dec.), no. 62101/00, 18 March 2008; *Galev and Others v. Bulgaria* (dec.), no. 18324/04, 29 September 2009; and *Ivan Atanasov*, cited above, § 75).

46. The above principles have also, *mutatis mutandis*, been applied by the Court more recently in a case involving the effects of the applicants' exposure to a high-voltage power line. In that particular situation, the Court concluded that it had not been demonstrated that the strength of the electromagnetic field created by the power line had reached a level capable of having a harmful

effect on the applicants' private and family life (see *Calancea and Others v. the Republic of Moldova* (dec.), no. 23225/05, 6 February 2018).

2. Application of these principles to the present case

47. Turning to the present case, the Court considers that there is no need for it to examine the Government's objection as regards the exhaustion of domestic remedies since the applicants' complaints are in any event inadmissible for the following reasons. Specifically, the Court notes that the relevant domestic regulations provided that, as regards the general public and in terms of frequencies of 50 Hz, the relevant exposure limits were 2 kV/m and 40 microteslas for electric and magnetic fields respectively, while the relevant international limits were 5 kV/m and 200 microteslas (see paragraphs 33-35 above). According to the information in the case file, however, the highest recorded levels in the present case were approximately 3.002 kV/m and 2.10 microteslas, but even that was based on tests carried out at locations which were apparently kilometres away from where the applicants resided (see paragraph 26 above). In any event, those figures were still well below the above-mentioned international standards, recommended by the WHO, which standards have already been accepted by the Court as relevant in the assessment of the levels of electromagnetic radiation caused by high-voltage power lines (see *Calancea and Others*, cited above, §§ 28 and 29). On 4, 5 and 9 April 2016 the Nuclear Facilities of Serbia carried out yet another extensive radiation level assessment exercise on five separate locations, apparently in the homes or in the vicinity of the first, seventh, thirteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth applicants' places of residence, as well as in the playground of a local kindergarten, and recorded maximum levels of the electric and magnetic fields' intensity of approximately 1.513 kV/m and 1.06 microteslas respectively (see paragraph 30 above), which was well below both the relevant national and international standards mentioned above. Moreover, while epidemiological studies have suggested that daily exposure to a weak magnetic field (greater than 0.3 - 0.4 microteslas) could be associated with an increased risk of childhood leukaemia, ICNIRP guidelines point out that a causal link between magnetic fields and childhood leukaemia has not been established and that neither have any other long-term effects (see paragraph 36 above; see also *Calancea and Others*, cited above, § 19).

48. In these circumstances, the Court finds that it has not been proved that the values of the electromagnetic fields generated by the high-voltage line in question have had a harmful effect on the applicants or their families. Nor can the mere fear of negative consequences over the long term trigger the application of Article 8 (see *Ivan Atanasov*, cited above, § 76). The Court is therefore of the view that the minimum threshold of severity required for it to be able to find that there has been a violation of Article 8 of the Convention has not been attained. Consequently, it cannot conclude that the respondent State failed to take reasonable measures to protect any of the applicants'

rights guaranteed by that provision (see *Calancea and Others*, cited above, § 32).

49. Finally, while it is true that certain domestic institutions, notably the Ombudsman and the Institute of Occupational Medicine and Radiological Protection, expressed concern in respect of the situation complained of by the applicants, they did not do so on the basis of evidence that the applicants personally had already been adversely affected by the power line in question (see paragraphs 20 and 28 above). Rather, they had regard to the general aims of protecting the environment, which are quite different from the aims of Article 8 of the Convention, namely to provide a safeguard to those personally affected by violations of their fundamental human rights (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Ivan Atanasov*, cited above, § 77, and *Velikova v. Bulgaria* (dec.), no. 41488/98, ECHR 1999-V (extracts)). As already noted above, neither Article 8 nor any of the other provisions of the Convention or the Protocols thereto were specifically designed to provide protection of the environment; other international instruments and domestic legislation are better suited to address such issues (see *Kyrtatos*, cited above, § 52 *in fine*, and *Ivan Atanasov*, cited above, § 77).

50. In view of the foregoing, the applicants' complaints are manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 (a) and 4 of the Convention (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Calancea and Others*, cited above, §§ 23-33).

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Declares the application inadmissible.

Done in English and notified in writing on 10 December 2020.

Hasan Bakırcı	Valeriu Griţco
Deputy Registrar	President

Appendix

No.	Applicant's Name	Year of birth	Nationality	Place of residence
1	Aleksandar MASTELICA	1978	Serbian	Belgrade
2	Zoran ANĐELKOVIĆ	1964	Serbian	Belgrade
3	Saša BLAGOJEVIĆ	1973	Serbian	Belgrade
4	Milorad ČOLIĆ	1949	Serbian	Belgrade
5	Živorad ĐORĐEVIĆ	1957	Serbian	Belgrade
6	Ljubiša GORUNOVIĆ	1964	Serbian	Belgrade
7	Dušan ILJIĆ	1954	Serbian	Belgrade
8	Momčilo IVANOVIĆ	1958	Serbian	Belgrade
9	Milanka JOVANOVIĆ	1962	Serbian	Belgrade
10	Aleksandar KIRILOV	1954	Serbian	Belgrade
11	Dejan KRSTIĆ	1966	Serbian	Belgrade
12	Zorica KRSTIĆ	1966	Serbian	Belgrade
13	Dušan MLADENOVIĆ	1956	Serbian	Belgrade
14	Ivan STAMENKOVIĆ	1954	Serbian	Belgrade
15	Branko STOJANOVIĆ	1956	Serbian	Belgrade
16	Zehadin ZULFIKARI	1954	Serbian	Belgrade