

One child. Three official names.

A source-led introduction to OriginDossier | Court record through 29 May 2026; institutional correspondence through 7 September 2026.

Milivoj Miletić was born on 28 June 1974 in Novi Sad to the Croatian maternal line of Cvita Miletić and the Hungarian paternal line of Lakatos Pál. The archive follows the same person through the records Milivoj Miletić, Milan Vasić and Milan Petrović.

The author's charge is void adoption, forced assimilation and continuing state illegality. He argues that an invalid initial act could not create lawful authority for later acts. The original records, his pleadings and the court decisions can be compared directly.

Milivoj Miletić → Milan Vasić → Milan Petrović

Evidence to examine first

The original birth-registration form of 28 June 1974 names Cvita Miletić as the mother and expressly records her ethnicity as Croatian. This is the direct civil-register source for the maternal origin described in the overview.

[Cvita Miletić and the maternal ethnicity field](#)

In court file P.1642/76, Cvita testified on 18 January 1977 that she had a son, Milivoj, with the defendant. The hearing record of 26 October 1977 identifies Lakatos Pál as Hungarian and records his own statement that he had a son with Cvita.

[Cvita's testimony, 18 January 1977](#) · [Pál's recorded ethnicity](#) · [Pál's own statement](#)

Six points to examine first

Paternity was already in the court record

The divorce file contains the father's statements and Cvita's testimony about the child. Compare these with the later treatment of his origins. The archive distinguishes those recorded statements from the separate question of formal legal acknowledgment.

Sources: [Father's divorce P.1642/76](#)

One child, parallel official identities

The 1979 probate proceedings identify Milivoj in his father's estate while the adoption process produces the Vasić identity. Compare the initial inheritance record with the subsequent exclusion from heirship.

Sources: [Probate O.196/79](#) · [Exclusion 1979–1980](#) · [Adoption 21.06.1979](#)

Vera Radovanović's record and the June assessments

The tracking record, three pre-adoption assessments and adoption act should be read together: descriptions of the mother, the child's care, knowledge of the family, inconsistent assessments and the speed of the procedure.

Sources: [Tracking record 3871/79](#) · [Assessments 06/1979](#) · [Adoption 21.06.1979](#)

The second adoption uses the first adoption's status

The 1984 consent record and second adoption must be compared with the 1979 full adoption and the 1976 law. The author challenges the first act's validity and, independently, the claimed authority to use that status for another adoption.

Sources: [Consent 1984](#) · [Second adoption 1984](#) · [Adoption law 1976](#)

The Vasić placement and the child's experience

Compare the idealized assessments with the Vasić divorce file and the claimant's account of violence, abandonment and the destruction of identity. The child's account and statements by other parties remain attributed to their sources.

Sources: [Assessments 06/1979](#) · [Vasić divorce P.1106/82](#) · [Claim 2024](#)

The consequences extend beyond childhood

Military records document service and wartime participation under the later identity. The 2005 welfare report and 2023 prosecution correspondence extend the record of attempts to obtain information and institutional action.

Sources: [Military records 1993–1999](#) · [CSR report 09.03.2005](#) · [Prosecution KTRKO 533/23](#)

The proceedings reached 2026

The latest supplied procedural document is the revision dated 29 May 2026. The archive does not contain a Supreme Court decision on that revision.

22 Feb 2024

The claim was filed; the date is recorded in the subsequent jurisdiction ruling.

Sources: [Claim 2024](#) · [Jurisdiction P.98/24](#)

3 Mar 2025

The author sent a settlement proposal in good faith. CSR's receipt confirmation is preserved; acknowledgment of receipt is not acceptance.

Sources: [Settlement 03.03.2025](#)

15 Oct 2025

The hearing record and the author's written statement can be compared with his further written submission of 27 October.

Sources: [Hearing 15.10.2025](#) · [Statement 15.10.2025](#) · [Submission 27.10.2025](#)

12 Jan 2026

The final written submission sets out the author's detailed challenge to the adoption chain and the institutions' handling of it.

Sources: [Final submission 12.01.2026](#)

9 Feb 2026

Final hearing and first-instance judgment dismissing the claim. The author separately disputes the record's assertions that documents were read.

Sources: [Final hearing 09.02.2026](#) · [Judgment 09.02.2026](#)

18 Mar / 22 Apr 2026

The dated appeal and appellate judgment: the appeal was rejected. The two dates are 35 days apart; this is not proof of the appeal's receipt date or total processing time.

Sources: [Appeal 18.03.2026](#) · [Appellate judgment Gž2 211/26](#)

29 May 2026

Revision addressed to the Supreme Court through the Basic Court, represented by Nikolaj Petronijević. Its date is not a separate filing receipt.

Sources: [Revision 29.05.2026](#)

A comparison that can be checked

On page 3, the appellate judgment labels a provision "Article 31" while recounting the content of Article 30 of the 1976 law. Read the cited law beside the decision and the revision's challenge. The revision also preserves the argument about Article 40 and the second adoption.

Sources: [Appellate judgment Gž2 211/26](#) · [Adoption law 1976](#) · [Revision 29.05.2026](#)

First instance: Bojana Vujić. Appellate panel: Branka Perc (president), Aleksandra Pekez Kalinić and Marko Prentović. Aleksandra Pekez Kalinić also presided over the 2024 jurisdiction panel; the two roles are linked in the archive.

Sources: [Judgment 09.02.2026](#) · [Appellate judgment Gž2 211/26](#) · [Jurisdiction panel R.22/24](#)

Institutional correspondence — registered referral in 2026

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

The author addressed SVM/VMSZ on 16 April and Hungarian government mailboxes on 19 May. A notice of 24 August records ID_ME-IF/332/2/2026. The forwarding message of 7 September, ME_ERK/16706/2026, sends the correspondence to the Ministry Responsible for Social Relations and Culture for further handling. These records extend the institutional correspondence beyond the supplied court record.

Request for SVM's position on the documented forced assimilation of a child of Hungarian origin

The author's 16 April request for an official SVM/VMSZ position on his Hungarian paternal identity.

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