



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

Published on 28 September 2026

THIRD SECTION

Application no. 20234/26
Vladimir AJDER
against Serbia
lodged on 11 May 2026
communicated on 11 September 2026

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

The application concerns proceedings related to the applicant's custody over, maintenance of and contact with his two minor children, following his separation from their mother. Those proceedings were brought in 2020 and were partly finished by 2024. The proceedings concerning the applicant's contact with his children, however, are still pending. On 10 February 2026 the Constitutional Court dismissed the applicant's constitutional appeal.

Relying on Articles 6, 8 and 13 of the Convention, the applicant complains about: (a) the fairness and the adequacy of adjudication of the custody and maintenance proceedings; (b) the excessive length of those proceedings, as well as the proceedings concerning his contact rights; and (c) the lack of an effective remedy before the national judiciary.

QUESTIONS TO THE PARTIES

1. Was the length of the civil proceedings in the present case in breach of the "reasonable time" requirement of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (see *Frydlender v. France* [GC], no. 30979/96, § 43, ECHR 2000-VII; see also,

mutatis mutandis, *V.A.M. v. Serbia*, no. 39177/05, §§ 98-101, 13 March 2007, and *Veljkov v. Serbia*, no. 23087/07, § 85, 19 April 2011)?

2. Has there been a violation of Article 6 § 1 and/or Article 8 of the Convention? In particular, has there been a breach of these provisions as regards: (a) the fairness of and the decision-making in the custody and maintenance proceedings; and (b) the allegedly excessive length of those proceedings, as well as of the still ongoing proceedings concerning the applicant's contact with his children (see, for example, *Popadić v. Serbia*, no. 7833/12, §§ 82-85, 20 September 2022, and *Vujica v. Croatia*, no. 56163/12, §§ 93-96, 8 October 2015, with further references)?

3. Did the applicant have at his disposal an effective domestic remedy for his Convention complaints, as required by Article 13 of the Convention (see, for example, *Kudła v. Poland* [GC], no. 30210/96, § 157, ECHR 2000-XI)?