

	name	source	comments
1.	Bijelić v. Montenegro and Serbia	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=1&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=montenegro&sessionid=88498321&skin=hudoc-en	In the verdict Bijelić of 28 April 2009, the European Court of Human Rights found a violation of the right to peaceful enjoyment of property due to delay of the enforcement of final and enforceable sentence. Court decided that State has to pay: 4 500 euros jointly to second and third applicants and 4 405 jointly in respect of costs and expenses.
2.	Garzić v. Montenegro	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=1&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=garzi%u010Di%u0107&sessionid=88498478&skin=hudoc-en	In the verdict Garzić of 21 September 2010, the Court established an infringement of the right to access to court because the Supreme Court had unreasonably refused to consider the request for review. Court decided that State has to pay the applicant, 1 500 euros in respect of non-pecuniary damage.
3.	Mijušković v. Montenegro	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=1&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=miju%u0161kovi%u0107&sessionid=88498583&skin=hudoc-en	In the verdict Mijušković of 21 September 2010 the Court established a violation of the right to respect for private and family life due to delay of the execution of final custody judgment and failure of the state to enforce an interim custody order. Court decided that State has to pay the applicant, 10 000 euros in respect of non-pecuniary damage.
4.	Živaljević v. Montenegro	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=3&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=miju%u0161kovi%u0107&sessionid=88498583&skin=hudoc-en	In the verdict Živaljević of 8 March 2011, the Court established a violation of the right to trial within a reasonable time in proceedings which began in 1995. Court decided that State has to pay 1 200 euros damage to each of two applicants in respect of non-pecuniary.

5.	Šabanović v. Montenegro and Serbia	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=4&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=montenegro&sessionid=88498907&skin=hudoc-en	In the verdict Šabanović of 31 May 2011, the Court established a violation of the right to freedom of expression in a proceeding in which the applicant has been convicted for defamation.
6.	Koprivica v. Montenegro	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=5&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=montenegro&sessionid=88498907&skin=hudoc-en	In the verdict Koprivica v. Montenegro of 22 November 2011 the Court established violation of freedom of expression in defamation civil proceedings for compensation of damages due to defamation.
7.	Barać and Others v Montenegro	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=9&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=montenegro&sessionid=88498907&skin=hudoc-en	In the verdict Barać and Others v Montenegro of 13 December 2011, the Court established a violation of the right to a fair trial (13 applicants complained about unfairness of proceedings in which their claims for compensation against their employer were rejected in April 2006. Final judgment in their case was based on an Act which was found unconstitutional in February and had no longer been in force at the relevant time). Court decided that State has to pay: 202, 34 euros to each of thirteen applicants and 4 405 jointly in respect of costs and expenses.
8.	Lakićević and Others v. Montenegro and Serbia	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=6&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=montenegro&sessionid=88498907&skin=hudoc-en	In In the verdict Lakićević and Others v. Montenegro and Serbia of 13 December 2011, the Court established a violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property). Applicants (retired owners of private law firms) complained about the suspension of their pensions between 2004 and 2005 because they had re-opened their legal practices on a part-time basis. Court decided that State has to pay: the first and third applicants 8 000 euros each, the second applicant 6 000 euros, fourth applicant 4 000 euros in respect of pecuniary damage, 4 000 euros each for non-

			pecuniary damage, and 679, 8 euros the first applicant for costs and expenses.
9.	Boucke v. Montenegro	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=7&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=montenegro&sessionid=88493683&skin=hudoc-en	In verdict Boucke v. Montenegro of 21. February 2012, the Court established a violation Article 6 § 1 (enforcement of a final judgment). Mother Snežana Boucke and daughter Kristina Boucke complained that two judgments, which became final in 1998 and 2005 respectively, and which had ordered the father of Kristina Boucke to pay child maintenance, had never been enforced.
10.	Tomić and Others v. Montenegro	http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=10&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=montenegro&sessionid=94591456&skin=hudoc-en	In verdict Tomic and Others v. Montenegro of 17. April 2012 the Court established that has been no violation of right of fair trail.
11.	Stakić v. Montenegro	http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-113297 .	In verdict Stakic v. Montenegro of 2. October 2012 the Court established violation of Article 6 - Right to a fair trial (Article 6-1 - Reasonable time) and violation of Article 13 (Effective remedy). Court decided that State has to pay 4 000 euros damage to applicants in respect of non-pecuniary.
12.	Velimirović v. Montenegro	http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-113297 .	In verdict Stakic v. Montenegro of 2. October 2012 the Court established violation of Article 6 - Right to a fair trial (Article 6-1 - Reasonable time) Court decided that State has to pay 4 325 euros damage to applicants in respect of non-pecuniary.