

What does judicial review check when official records validate one another?

Contemporary reasoning, institutional accountability and the practical examination of evidence.

Court record through 29 May 2026; institutional correspondence through 7 September 2026.

Milivoj Miletić → Milan Vasić → Milan Petrović

The 2026 first-instance judgment accepts written documents because authorised and qualified persons produced them, and credits the claimant's account where it agrees with that evidence. The appeal and revision ask whether this method answers the actual contradictions about parental origin, statutory conditions and a second adoption after full adoption.

Evidence to examine first

The first-instance judgment accepts the written documentation because its authors were authorised and qualified, accepts the claimant's testimony where it agrees with the credited evidence, and rejects hearing Vinka Ignjatić and Dragan Ignjatić because the facts were already sufficiently examined and further evidence would prolong the case. These are specific judicial reasons against which to examine access to an effective consideration of the evidence.

[Authority and qualifications of authors](#) · [Accepted parts of the testimony](#) · [Reasons for rejecting witnesses](#)

The appellate judgment answers the objection about the two different parental-condition routes by saying the conditions were met "in any event". Read that passage beside Article 30(1) and (4), which state different conditions, and the revision's maintained objection. This makes the quality of the court's answer directly examinable.

[Appellate judgment: conditions met "in any event"](#) · [Article 30\(1\): parental conditions](#) · [Article 30\(4\): the other parent's consent](#)

The cited birth extract names a different parental pair

The first-instance judgment says it established the 1984 adoption by Periša and Georgina Petrović from birth-register extract 2463/1979. That extract names the child Petrović Milan but retains Milorad and Gospava Vasić in the parent fields. The Petrović couple is identified in the separate 1984 adoption record. Read the three documents together to check the mismatch between the fact stated and the particular document cited as its proof.

[2026: the court's evidentiary explanation](#) · [Birth extract: number 2463/1979](#) · [Extract: Petrović child name](#) · [Extract: Vasić parent entries](#) · [1984 record: the Petrović adopters](#)

Questions for examination

1. Does the reasoning separately establish the facts and legal conditions, rather than rely on the authority of the issuing institution?
2. Can the reader trace an explicit answer to the mother's prior consent and the Article 40 transition?
3. How are an individual's documentary objections examined when he has represented himself during substantial parts of the proceedings?

Start with these sources

First-instance judgment: Bojana Vujić dismisses the annulment claim; disputed reasoning and rejected witnesses

The judgment exposes the evidentiary method and the actual rejection of the claim.

Appeal of 18 March 2026: nullity, unanswered evidence and the second adoption

The appeal identifies the arguments presented for review, including Articles 7 and 40.

Appellate Court dismisses the appeal: Branka Perc, Aleksandra Pekez Kalinić and Marko Prentović — Gž2 211/26, 22 April 2026

The Appellate Court's April judgment provides the contemporary reviewing court's response.

Revision of 29 May 2026: the appellate judgment confronted with the 1976 law and the identity evidence

The dated revision continues the challenge; it is not a decision granting relief.

SAPV Adoption Act 1976 - legal mechanism map

The archived 1976 statute permits verification of the rules cited by institutions and parties.

Civil register after second adoption - Petrović Milan as sealed second layer

The extract names Petrović Milan as the child but Vasić Milorad and Gospava as parents.

Second adoption record - Vasić Milan transferred into Petrović Milan

The second adoption record identifies the Petrović adopters.

Use the paired judgments alongside the arguments actually put to them to assess the quality of judicial reasoning, institutional accountability and practical access to an examination of the evidence.

[Full author's summary](#) · [Complete document index](#)

Contact: contact@origindossier.org

An institutional route that can be traced

Court record through 29 May 2026; institutional correspondence through 7 September 2026.

The 24 August notice and 7 September forwarding message add a registered institutional route to the court record. They identify how the author's correspondence reached the ministry designated for further handling. This permits comparison between the documentary challenge, its administrative routing and the author's hope for attention within the European Union.

Hungarian Prime Minister's Office: notice of referral to the competent ministry

The 24 August referral notice bears ID_ME-IF/332/2/2026 and names the ministry for further handling.

Hungarian Prime Minister's Office forwards the identity case to the ministry, with the full bilingual reminder

The 7 September forwarding message bears ME_ERK/16706/2026 and reproduces the author's 19 May correspondence.

Author's note — 9 October 2026

I regard Hungary with respect: my correspondence was registered and referred to the competent ministry for further handling. This gives me hope that my case will also receive attention within the European Union, of which both my countries of origin, Croatia and Hungary, are members.

Read an original scan, its full translation and the local annotation together. Court wording, the author's account and editorial comparisons are identified separately. The full author's summary remains available unchanged.

[Full author's summary](#) · [Complete document index](#) · [Chronology and parallel proceedings](#)

Contact: contact@origindossier.org