

Nullity of the first act and the chain of subsequent decisions

Maternal consent, six months, official secrecy and the second adoption

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

Milivoj Miletić → Milan Vasić → Milan Petrović

The legal question runs through the entire chain: the author contests the validity of the 1979 act that replaced his identity and parental entries, and therefore the status invoked to obtain consent for a second adoption in 1984. The first act was issued seven days before his fifth birthday. The archive allows the statutory requirements concerning his parents, whereabouts and consent to be tested against contemporary records and against the courts' reasons for rejecting nullity in 2026. The appellate judgment labels parental conditions as Article 31 although they belong to Article 30. The revision of 29 May 2026 challenges those reasons and the use of the first adoption for a second one, including the prohibition of dissolution in Article 40. No Supreme Court decision on that revision is in the archive.

Evidence to examine first

Introduction before three written assessments; Vera evaluates, announces and consents

Milivoj was introduced to the prospective adopters on 5 June 1979, before the three written assessments by social worker Vera Radovanović on 12 June, pedagogue Milosava Gudelj on 18 June and psychologist Cvetko Ratković on 19 June. Vera was one of those three professional assessors: her report of 12 June expressly recommends approving the adoption. On 15 June, the same Vera informs the foster mother that Milivoj will be adopted at the end of June, before the other two written opinions; she is then appointed guardian on 20 June and gives consent to the adoption on 21 June, only 16 days after the introduction. Articles 14, 15 and 17 require examination of the statutory conditions and the child's interests, professional opinions and a finding that the conditions are met before the adoption hearing is scheduled.

[5 June: introduction to the adopters](#) · [12 June: Vera recommends approval](#) · [15 June: Vera announces adoption](#) · [18 June: Gudelj's favourable written opinion](#) · [19 June: Ratković's favourable written opinion](#) · [20 June: Vera appointed guardian and gives consent in the 21 June record](#) · [Article 14: preparatory examination](#) · [Article 15: professional opinions](#) · [Article 17: conditions before scheduling](#)

The judgment quotes six months without establishing the period

Article 30(1) sets six months from abandonment, with the parents' whereabouts still unestablished. The first-instance judgment quotes that condition but concludes that the adoption was lawful without identifying a concrete abandonment date or six-month interval. The contemporaneous file records Cvita's address on the personal sheet dated 10 April 1979 and the child's health insurance through her employment-service registration. Those records require a concrete answer to the author's challenge to the constructed absence of his mother. Article 41 expressly links the absence of the specified Article 30 conditions to nullity of full adoption. The tracking dossier gives 5 April 1979 as the intake date; the adoption followed on 21 June, 77 days later. The intake date does not itself establish the date of abandonment from which the statutory period runs.

[Article 30\(1\): abandonment and whereabouts](#) · [Court quotes the condition](#) · [Court's conclusion](#) · [1979: recorded maternal address](#) · [Insurance through the mother's registration](#) · [Article 41: statutory grounds of nullity](#) · [5 April: dossier intake](#)

Parental data in the record that must exclude them

Article 34 prohibits entering information about the adoptee's parents in the record establishing full adoption. Yet that very record from 21 June 1979 describes the mother's alleged unknown whereabouts and failure to perform parental duties to justify guardian consent. The later registration decision records the adopters invoking Articles 34 and 35 to replace the birth-register entries; Article 35 specifically regulates the annulled and new entries. Article 33 says that the parents' prior-consent statement is not read aloud at the hearing; it does not remove the separate prior-consent requirement in Article 30(4).

[Article 34: parental data excluded from the record](#) · [1979 record: statements about the mother](#) · [Article 33: prior consent is not read aloud](#) · [Article 30\(4\): prior consent](#) · [Decision: applicants invoke Articles 34 and 35](#) · [Article 35: annulled and new birth entries](#)

The disputed first act supplies the “father” for the second adoption

Milorad Vasić’s consent of 12 September 1984 calls the child “my minor son”; Vera Radovanović takes the statement. The second adoption then relies on the consent of the person it calls the father. The author’s nullity argument follows the whole chain: the void 1979 act cannot create a lawful parental status capable of replacing the biological parent’s consent in 1984. His separate alternative argument remains: even if the first full adoption were valid, Article 40 prohibits its dissolution.

[Milorad: “my minor son”](#) · [1984: consent attributed to the father](#) · [Article 40: full adoption cannot be dissolved](#)

Pervaz uses adoption data protected as an official secret

Article 39 makes full-adoption files and data, and the annulled birth registration, an official secret. Pervaz’s 12 December 1979 appeal uses assertions about the adoption and the adopters’ statements to attack Milivoj’s inheritance. This is the concrete comparison behind the author’s objection that confidential adoption information was used against the child. The cited documents do not identify who supplied those details to Pervaz.

[Article 39: official secrecy](#) · [Pervaz: the alleged adopter statement](#)

The appellate judgment labels Article 30 conditions as Article 31

On source page 3 the appellate judgment calls the parental conditions “Article 31”. In the archived law, Article 30 contains the age, parental-status, whereabouts and prior-consent conditions; Article 31 instead concerns adoption by spouses. This comparison identifies the precise provision to test against the judgment’s reasoning.

[Judgment: reference to Article 31](#) · [Article 30: full-adoption conditions](#) · [Article 31: adoption by spouses](#)

Guardian consent is used in place of the mother’s consent

The 1979 record cites Article 5 when naming Vera Radovanović as the special guardian who gives consent. Article 30(4) requires the other parent’s prior consent when one parent is dead or unknown, while Article 42 lists the general provisions applied to full adoption without listing Article 5. These are the concrete texts behind the author’s objection to substituting guardian consent for the mother’s consent.

[1979: Article 5 and guardian consent](#) · [Article 30\(4\): the other parent’s consent](#) · [Article 42: applicable general provisions](#)

“Not adopted” becomes “not the son”

The 9 January 1980 remand directs the court to examine paternity and recognition. On 30 May Pervaz instead proposes asking whether the deceased had adopted Milivoj. The 20 October SIZ reply says only that Pavle had not adopted him; the 10 November ruling cites that reply for the broader finding that he was neither the deceased’s son nor his adopted child. The change of question and expansion of the answer are visible in the four passages.

[9 January: paternity and recognition](#) · [30 May: Pervaz’s adoption-only question](#) · [20 October: not adopted by Pavle](#) · [10 November: not the deceased’s son](#)

Questions for examination

1. Which Article 30 route was applied, and which source establishes each condition?
2. How was guardian consent distinguished from the independent adoption conditions?
3. How do the judgments address the Article 31/30 discrepancy and Article 40 argument?

Start with these sources

[SAPV Adoption Act 1976 - legal mechanism map](#)

1976 adoption law: the actual provisions for comparison.

[1979 full adoption record and decision - operative identity overwrite](#)

1979 act: recorded factual and consent basis.

[Second adoption record - Vasić Milan transferred into Petrović Milan](#)

1984 second adoption: the later use of the first status.

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

Appellate judgment: its reasoning and statutory wording.

[Revision of 29 May 2026: the appellate judgment confronted with the 1976 law and the identity evidence](#)

Revision: detailed objections and alternative requested outcomes.

[Milorad Vasić consent - false parental position from the 1979 void adoption record](#)

Milorad's consent as "father", taken by Vera Radovanović.

[First-instance judgment: Bojana Vujić dismisses the annulment claim; disputed reasoning and rejected witnesses](#)

The judgment's concrete reasoning and its stated source for the second adoption.

[Vera Radovanović dossier 3871/79 — father when useful, unknown when identity is at stake](#)

Contemporaneous records of the mother's address and the child's insurance through her.

[Exclusion of Milivoj Miletić from O.196/79 — Pervaz appeal, adoption secrecy and court legalization of contaminated material](#)

The 1979–1980 probate file contains Pervaz's appeal, the paternity inquiry ordered on remand, the adoption-only reply and the final exclusion reasoning.

[Vasić pre-adoption assessment \(June 1979\) — compressed validation of the first identity substitution](#)

The three written expert opinions and their dates in June 1979.

Test each step against its source, distinguishing findings, party arguments and editorial comparisons. The full revision preserves the author's nullity argument.

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

Contact: contact@origindossier.org