

Stanković Gordana*

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8363-0609>

Ćorac Sanda**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1902-7628>

UDC: 343.55:343.85

Review article

DOI: 10.5937/ptp2603074S

Received on: November 26, 2025

Approved for publication on:

April 27, 2026

Pages: 74–89

JOINDER OF ACTIONS FOR PROTECTION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

ABSTRACT: Active legitimation for the purpose of protection against domestic violence belongs to the family member who was a victim of domestic violence, the legal representative of the victim of violence, the guardianship authority, as the authority for family protection, and the public prosecutor, as a state authority. The procedure for protection from domestic violence can also be initiated ex-officio. Given that different plaintiffs can initiate a lawsuit for protection against violence against the same defendant who behaved violently, the question arises whether it is possible to join the initiated lawsuits for protection against domestic violence, especially those initiated by the victim of violence and the public prosecutor, in order to effectively determine one or more measures for protection against domestic violence through joint discussion, investigation and decision-making in the joint procedures and achieve not only effective protection of the victim of violence, but also cost-effectiveness and legal certainty.

Keywords: *domestic violence, system of protection against violence, special litigation procedure for protection against domestic violence, public prosecutor as a party in a functional sense, joinder of actions for protection against violence.*

*LLD, retired Full Professor, University of Niš, Faculty of Law, Niš, Serbia, e-mail: gordanastankovic10@gmail.com

**LLD, Associate Professor, University of Kragujevac, Faculty of Law, Kragujevac, Serbia, e-mail: scorac@jura.kg.ac.rs



© 2026 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Domestic violence is a harmful and dangerous social phenomenon and a “factor in the weakening of the family and society as a whole” (Ponjavić 2012, p. 146). It is a general social problem that occurs in all countries, regardless of the fact that domestic violence is not always obvious and visible, since it often occurs within the most intimate circles, among the closest people. This negative social phenomenon, which can appear in the physical, psychological, sexual or economic form of domestic violence, as well as the form of prohibited behavior, has long been defined as a personal and intra-family issue, and not as a prohibited action that requires state intervention in order to prevent it and protect the victim of domestic violence, due to the way family life is conducted (behind “closed doors”) (Kostić 2006, p. 236).

The system of protection against domestic violence includes protection within the framework of the Criminal Code (2005), which, in its Art. 194, provides for a special criminal offense of “Domestic Violence”, the Law on Prevention of Domestic Violence (2016), which in its Art. 17, para. 2, provides for the imposition of emergency measures, and the Family Law – FL (2005), which regulates domestic violence as a family law phenomenon and provides for substantive and procedural norms.

2. Procedure in litigation for protection against domestic violence

The provisions of the FL (2005) provide for family law protection against domestic violence in domestic law by regulating a special civil procedure for protection against domestic violence (Art. 283 – 289), in which the common rules prescribed for all special civil procedures for resolving family law disputes also apply (Art. 201 – 208)¹, as well as the general rules of the Civil Procedure Law – CPL (2011), given that special civil procedures are regulated in a fragmentary manner as a deviation from the general civil procedure.

¹ The provisions of the FL, which regulate special litigation procedures in family matters, lack careful professional editing of the legal text, which primarily refers to the failure to distinguish between civil law disputes and litigation, since they are not synonyms. The procedural literature states that in the titles of the tenth part of the legal text, which regulates special family litigation procedures, in parts of the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh section, although it concerns litigation procedures in which family law disputes are resolved, the words “procedure in the dispute” are incorrectly written instead of “procedure in litigation” (Stanković 2025, p. 5).

The procedure for protection against domestic violence is specific in its legal nature because the court provides protective assistance to the victim of domestic violence and imposes family law sanctions on the perpetrator of violence, and does not resolve a civil law dispute, which is regularly the cause of litigation, given that in the case of domestic violence, there is no classic civil law dispute in litigation, which is characterized by disagreement between the parties in a legal relationship regarding their rights and obligations and their conflict of interests (Stanković & Boranijašević 2023, p. 598).

The procedure in litigation for protection against domestic violence is initiated by a lawsuit filed by authorized persons or bodies or *ex officio*. These lawsuits can be conducted independently or joined with proceedings in other family law matters. Joined, adhesion proceedings for protection against domestic violence can be initiated by the parties or the court *ex officio*.

Active legitimation in litigations for protection against domestic violence in which the determination of a protective measure against violence (FL, 2005, Art. 198) or the extension of the duration of a time-limited protective measure ordered by the court is requested allows this procedure to be initiated by a family member against whom violence was committed, his or her legal representative, the public prosecutor and the guardianship authority (FL, 2005, Art. 284, para. 2). In order to protect the victim of domestic violence, the legislator has provided for a wide range of persons and authorities who are given active legitimation, because domestic violence is not treated as a personal problem of the victim of domestic violence, but as a social problem and phenomenon.² In this special civil procedure, the child has active procedural legitimation when he or she initiates a procedure for his or her own protection against violence. The child is represented as a party in the litigation by his or her legal representative. The legal representative of the person under guardianship against whom the violence was committed, the public prosecutor and the guardianship authority have the status of a party in the functional sense. In the litigations that they initiate against the perpetrator of domestic violence, the child or the victim of violence does not have the status of a party because the litigation is based on a two-party scheme.

The literature emphasizes that the need to provide protection to the victim of domestic violence even without their initiative, has led to the expansion of active legitimation to both the public prosecutor's office, as a state body, and the guardianship authority, as a body for the protection of

² The procedure for terminating the measure of protection against violence can be initiated exclusively by the family member against whom the measure was determined.

the family and persons enjoying special social protection, in order to prevent the situation in which the victim might not initiate legal proceedings at all or might reluctantly withdraw from them under pressure from the perpetrator of domestic violence, due to fear of the perpetrator (Draškić 2016, p. 629).

Litigation proceedings for protection against domestic violence can also be initiated *ex officio* as an adhesion procedure to a proceeding initiated by a lawsuit filed by a party with active legitimation (Stanković & Boranijašević 2020, p. 598). In proceedings for the protection of a child against domestic violence initiated *ex officio*, the child does not have the procedural status of a party, because he or she is then a “hidden” or “concealed” party” (Stanković 1997, p. 113) since the proceeding is initiated in the interest of the child and his or her protection.

The court may impose the proposed protective measures against violence not only in the interest of the parent as the plaintiff who filed a lawsuit for personal protection against domestic violence, but also of their minor child who was not designated as a party in the initial action and who witnessed the act of domestic violence as a passive victim, assessing the degree of vulnerability of the plaintiff – the parent and their child and showing “zero tolerance” for the manifested psychological violence in order to, not only eliminate the consequences of the violent event, but also to act preemptively to prevent the repetition of the defendant’s violent behavior and the possible occurrence of more serious consequences (see decision of the Supreme Court, Rev. 2015/25, February 27, 2025). The court is obligated to assess *ex officio* whether, in order to ensure effective and complete protection against domestic violence, it is necessary to initiate an official adhesion procedure and to include in the family law protective measures a minor child who, as a passive victim, witnessed the psychological or physical violence committed by the defendant against the parent as the plaintiff, thereby violating the child’s mental health and peace of mind. The court is obliged to obtain an expert opinion on this matter from the competent guardianship authority in order to protect the rights of the minor child, not only the parent as a victim of violence. Although the minor child is not named as a party in the lawsuit, nor did the parent, as the legal representative of the child or as the representative of a family member who endures violence, request the imposition of protective measures against the child, the court may conclude that the child was an indirect victim of violence. In adhesion initiated civil proceeding, the court *ex officio* determines the subject matter of the lawsuit, formulates a request for a judgment and, in accordance with its investigative powers, collects the necessary procedural material (Stanković & Boranijašević 2023, p. 595).

If the guardianship authority has not initiated a procedure for protection against domestic violence, in a procedure initiated by other authorized entities or the court *ex officio*, it may appear as a supporting body to the court, when, upon the court's order, it provides assistance in obtaining the necessary evidence, and as a specific expert, when it gives its opinion on the appropriateness of the requested protective measure against domestic violence (Stanković 1984, pp. 74–89).

A lawsuit requesting the determination of a protective measure against violence is usually of a condemnatory nature when a conviction for an act is requested because the plaintiff requests that a specific measure be imposed that will order the defendant to do something, to suffer something, or to refrain from doing something. A lawsuit requesting the extension of an already imposed measure is of the same nature. A lawsuit can also have a transformative-condemnatory nature if it is requested that the defendant be denied the exercise of a right, while at the same time requiring that he do something, suffer something or refrain from doing something. The transformative nature of the lawsuit is manifested in the plaintiff's request for the termination of a certain measure determined by a judgment.

The procedure in litigation for protection against domestic violence is based on a specific deviation from the fundamental procedural principles of general litigation procedure.

The principle of formality in litigation for protection against domestic violence allows the court to initiate an adhesion proceeding and to expand the scope of family law protection beyond the limits of the requests made by the parties. It allows it to apply imperative norms in the proceedings, thereby removing all procedural barriers arising from the court's attachment to the parties' dispositions (Stanković 2006, p. 490). Therefore, the decision to impose one or more protective measures against domestic violence also depends on the court's assessment.

Deviation from the principle of disposition, as in other special litigation proceedings for resolving family law disputes is manifested through limiting the parties' freedom of disposition of their rights and obligations and undertaking those litigation actions that represent the prohibited disposal of claims. In these litigations, the court is not bound by the claim formulated in the lawsuit by the party with active procedural legitimation. It may also determine a protective measure against domestic violence that was not requested if it assesses that such a measure best achieves protection.

There are also deviations from the general procedural principles in terms of methodological procedural principles. In these disputes, the adversarial

principle applies, according to which the parties are obliged to provide the court with the procedural material necessary for the decision. The investigative principle also applies in these disputes, given that family law norms are of a mandatory nature, that the court is obliged to provide special legal protection to certain categories of persons and that it is obliged to consider the interests of minor children. In disputes involving domestic violence, the court may establish facts even when they are not disputed between the parties and may also independently investigate facts that neither party has presented (FL, 2005, Art. 205). Likewise, the court may present evidence that neither party has proposed. In these litigations, the application of the investigative principle causes a number of specificities in the evidentiary procedure (Palačković 2024, p. 30).

In litigations involving domestic violence, the principle of urgency of court proceedings dominates to prevent further escalation of domestic violence and protect the victim. This principle is operationalized by prescribing particular urgency in proceedings (FL (2005), Art. 285), by not delivering the lawsuit to the defendant for a response, by the court's obligation to schedule and hold a hearing within eight days from the date the court received the lawsuit, by requiring the court to conduct the proceedings in a maximum of two hearings because of the need to effectively protect the victim of domestic violence (FL, 2005, Art. 204, para. 1 and 3) and by requiring the second-instance court to issue a decision within 15 days of the date the appeal, i.e. the legal case files by the first-instance court are delivered to it (FL, 2005, Art. 285, para. 2 and 3). The prescribed short deadlines for taking legal action should enable the court to act efficiently and provide immediate protection to the victim of violence.

Deviation from basic procedural principles in these litigations is manifested through the exclusion of the general public, as provided for by law, in order to protect the private life of the parties. The general public is excluded and the data from the court files represent classified information that all participants in the proceedings are obligated to keep secret.

In the litigation procedure for protection against domestic conducted for the protection of a child, independent representation of the child should be ensured when there is a conflict of interest between the child and his or her legal representative. The court is obliged to appoint a temporary representative for the child when it determines that his or her legal representative is not adequately representing him or her.

A judgment granting a claim or rendered by a court *ex officio* has a condemnatory or transformative character, regardless of whether the

proceeding in litigations for protection against violence was conducted as an independent or as an adhesion proceeding. Depending on what is requested in the lawsuit or what the court has decided *ex officio*, the operative part of the judgment may be complex.

The court decides on the costs of the proceedings, considering reasons for fairness.

The court delivers the judgment in litigations for protection against domestic violence to the parties. The court is obliged to immediately deliver the judgment to the guardianship authority in whose territory the family member against whom the violence was committed has primary or temporary residence, and to the guardianship authority in whose territory the family member against whom the protective measure has been ordered has primary or temporary residence. The guardianship authority is obliged to keep records and documentation on persons against whom violence has been committed and on persons against whom a protective measure has been determined in accordance with the regulations governing the procedure and manner of recording these cases.

An appeal against a judgment determining or extending a protective measure against violence does not have suspensive effect. It does not delay the execution of the judgment on the determination or extension of a protective measure against domestic violence unless the court decides otherwise.

3. Joinder of litigations for protection against domestic violence

Although the joinder of proceedings in litigations for protection against violence with other litigations, by the nature of the matter, is not expressly provided for by the provisions of special family litigation proceedings, considering that in this special litigation proceedings the rules of general civil proceedings are subsidiarily applied, it is possible to join lawsuits if there are conditions for their merger. Lawsuits in which protection from domestic violence is required are joined for the purpose of simultaneous investigation, discussion and decision-making, because in this way, effective treatment and effective protection of the victim of domestic violence is enabled by determining the measure or measures of family law protection, reducing the costs of the procedure and achieving legal certainty.

The fact that active procedural legitimation is recognized for a wide range of persons allows for the joinder of the initiated litigations to occur in the proceedings before the first instance court. First of all, there may be a joinder of litigations initiated by a lawsuit or a countersuit, filed by family members

who consider themselves victims of violence. It often happens in practice that spouses or unmarried partners, due to damaged mutual relations, after a conflict has occurred, consider themselves victims of violence and file lawsuits against each other and demand protection against domestic violence or that they file a countersuit during the initiated proceeding. Furthermore, a litigation conducted between a family member against whom violence was committed and the perpetrator may be joined with a litigation initiated against the perpetrator by the public prosecutor, as a party in a functional sense, regarding the same violent behavior of the perpetrator towards the victim of domestic violence, regardless of whether the public prosecutor exercises his authority under the provisions of the FL (2005) or the Law on Prevention of Domestic Violence (2016). It is also possible to join a litigation initiated by a center for social work as a guardianship authority for the purpose of protecting a victim of violence as their actively legitimized legal representative with a litigation possibly initiated by a public prosecutor to whom a report of violent behavior towards a victim of domestic violence was filed.³

Joinder of litigations may also occur if, during the initiated proceeding for protection against domestic violence, the court initiates an adhesion procedure *ex officio*. These proceeding are joined by the decision of the court, if the court, in addition to a proceeding initiated by a parent as a victim of domestic violence, initiated an adhesion proceeding in order to protect the child as a passive victim of violence and in the interests of the child upon learning that the child witnessed an event that constitutes physical or verbal domestic violence.

The joinder of litigations for the purpose of joint investigation, discussion and decision-making before the same court is possible under the provisions of general litigation procedure if the conditions required by law are met.

One of the conditions is subjective in nature – the parties are the same or the same person is in one of the party roles, although this procedural role is not the same in each litigation. In a litigation for protection against domestic violence, the subjective condition is met when two litigations are being conducted against the same person as the defendant regarding the same event, one of which was initiated by the plaintiff who is the victim of violence, and the other by the basic public prosecutor's office as a party in a functional sense

³ In judicial practice, it is increasingly common for the competent public prosecutor to initiate proceedings before a civil court for the imposition of family-law protective measures, in addition to pursuing criminal prosecution, and to request, for example, the issuance of a restraining order for the victim of domestic violence or the extension of such a measure.

that is authorized to file a lawsuit against the perpetrator of violence with the court for the purpose of determining family law protective measures.

Joinder of litigations according to the provisions of the CPL (2011) is possible only if the same type of procedure is provided for all joined litigations. In joint lawsuits conducted for the purpose of protecting victims of domestic violence, even though the lawsuits were filed by the victim of domestic violence and the public prosecutor or the guardianship body, the rules of procedure are the same. By joining lawsuits, it is possible to present evidence using the same means of evidence in the joined lawsuits for protection against domestic violence in which the same contested facts are involved.

In the domain of family law protection, there is a deviation from the rule of general civil procedure which prescribes the same type of procedure as a condition for joinder of litigations, as it is permitted, in special family law litigation procedure, not only to join different civil procedures initiated by a lawsuit, but also adhesion procedures in which different rules of special civil procedures are applied. Thus, for example, it is possible to join divorce proceedings or paternity proceedings with alimony proceedings or to join those with adhesion proceedings for protection against domestic violence (Stanković & Boranijašević 2023, p. 591).

In joined litigations for protection against domestic violence, the court acts in a collegial composition; a three-member panel consisting of one judge and two lay judges, and in the appeal procedure, a panel consisting of three judges decides (CPL, 2011, Art. 35 and 37). The court acts in joined litigations for protection against domestic violence according to the rules of the special civil procedure provided for these cases.

Given that the first-instance court in litigations for protection against domestic violence can decide on the determination or extension of a protective measure against domestic violence, the question arises whether the litigations can be joined if, for example, the public prosecutor requested the determination of a protective family law measure, and the plaintiff who is the victim of violence requested the extension of an already issued protective measure against domestic violence in the lawsuit? We think that, in terms of the conditions stipulated in the provisions of the CPL (2011), the conditions for the joinder of litigations are met even in the event that the court needs to decide on the determination or extension of a protective measure against domestic violence, given that the legal conditions regarding the admissibility of the joinder of litigations have been met, regardless of the fact that the stated claims are substantively different.

Joinder of litigations is a possibility and not a duty of the civil court, because the court decides on this *ex officio* and for reasons of expediency. The proposal to merge litigations can also originate from one of the parties. The court issues a separate decision on the joinder of litigations, regardless of whether this occurred *ex officio* or at the proposal of a party (Bodiroga 2022, p. 324). The court may issue a decision on the joinder of litigations during the preparatory procedure and at the stage of the main hearing. This decision is, by its legal nature, a decision on the management of the procedure. No appeal is allowed against the decision to join litigations.

The court may decide on the joining of the litigations at a hearing or outside the main hearing. When deciding on the joining of the proceedings, the court is obliged to take into account the stage of each of the cases being joined and, depending on considerations of expediency, it will decide accordingly, bearing in mind that the principle of urgency takes precedence over procedural economy.

Litigations joined for the purpose of joint discussion and decision-making do not lose their independence, so they are still independent and self-contained from each other, because each of the joined litigations has its own separate subject matter.⁴ The joinder of litigations does not change the subject-matter and territorial jurisdiction of the court, although the judge who, according to the annual trial schedule, was responsible for resolving a specific dispute in one of the initiated litigations may possibly change. As a rule, the court decides that the litigation that was initiated later or in which the proceedings began later is merged with the litigation that was initiated earlier. After that, all submissions and minutes are kept in the register under the same number, the number under which the “older” case was registered.

Joinder of lawsuits does not lead to adversariality, nor does it withdraw the application of the provision on a joint attorney for the receipt of documents and a joint legal representative for the receipt of documents, because this is not a case of adversarial proceedings. Furthermore, the joinder of lawsuits does not cause objective accumulation of claims, since each of the litigations was initiated by a separate lawsuit in which claims for judgment may be accumulated.

⁴ Even though the indirect subject matter of the litigations is the same (perpetrated domestic violence), the direct subject matter of a litigation i.e. the request for a judgement can be different because the imposing of different protective family law measures is requested in the initial procedural action (see, for example, Stanković & Boranijašević, 2023, p. 54).

The plaintiffs in the joined lawsuits for protection against domestic violence (the victim of domestic violence and the public prosecutor) independently undertake the litigation actions that produce an effect in the lawsuit they initiated. The factual allegations may be identical or different, even though the same event is involved, depending on the type of measure for preventing violence requested by the lawsuit. The evidence offered by the plaintiffs in the merged lawsuits may be the same or different. A plaintiff who is a victim of domestic violence may be heard as a witness in the lawsuit initiated by the public prosecutor, since he or she is not a party to it.

When the litigations are joined for the purpose of joint decision-making, the court decides depending on the results of the procedure conducted. The term “may” used in the provision of Art. 328 of the CPL (2011) means that the court is not obliged to issue a judgment to decide on the claims from the joined litigations. The court’s decision on the joining of litigations always depends on its assessment of expediency and economy.

The judgment rendered by the court in joined litigations, regardless of whether they were initiated by a lawsuit or in an adhesion procedure, may have one or more dispositions depending on the content of the claim of the family member against whom the violence was committed, the claim of the public prosecutor, or the court’s decision to protect the child as a passive victim of violence in an official adhesion procedure and in his or her interest.

When merging lawsuits for protection against domestic violence, the court may issue a single joint judgment, which will impose a single measure of family law protection, a combination of multiple measures, or all requested and necessary measures prescribed by law in order to provide efficient and effective protection to the victim or victims of domestic violence. By issuing a single decision in joined lawsuits conducted in connection with domestic violence, imposing family law protection measures against the same defendant in connection with the same event in which domestic violence occurred, in which the prosecutor appears as the victim of violence, or the basic public prosecutor’s office or guardianship authority as a party in a functional sense, the risk of judgments being issued with contradictory reasoning, which would jeopardize legal certainty, is eliminated.

The adoption of a joint decision granting protection from violence in joined lawsuits is an option that depends on the specific situation and the court’s decision. If the same measure of protection against violence is requested in both lawsuits, the judgment approving the claim may be formulated identically in both lawsuits. If one of the parties in the joined lawsuits requested the

imposition of multiple measures of family law protection against violence, the disposition of the joint judgment will, by the nature of the matter, be different.

The decisions regarding the reimbursement of litigation costs in these joined lawsuits will be different because they contain substantively different accessory condemnatory claims on which the court decides according to special rules. The public prosecutor as a party has the right to reimbursement of costs but not the right to a reward (Stanković 2024, p. 526), while the prosecutor who is a victim of domestic violence has the right to reimbursement of necessary litigation costs, which also includes the reward to the attorney for representation (Stanković 2024, p. 508). The same rules that determine the compensation for the prosecutor, as a victim of violence, also determine the compensation for litigation costs to the guardianship authority as a foreign party in a functional sense, given that the center for social work, as a family protection authority, is a legal entity.

In terms of declaring legal remedies, when the joined litigation is decided by a single, joint judgment, each litigation is still independent because the legal remedy challenges the decision made on the individual claim that was raised in the individual litigation. The deadlines for appeal run independently for each party from the moment of delivery of the judgment.

The decision made in joint litigation for protection from domestic violence may be challenged by regular and extraordinary legal remedies. FL (2005), in its provision of Art. 288, stipulates that an appeal does not stay the execution of the judgment on the determination or extension of a measure of protection from domestic violence. A general review is permitted against a decision made in joint litigation for protection from domestic violence, which follows from the provision of Art. 208 of the FL (2005).

4. Concluding review

The Family Law establishes a system of family law protection against domestic violence, which provides for measures of protection against domestic violence and regulates a special procedure in litigation for protection against domestic violence. The law assigns the role of procedural actors who can initiate the aforementioned special procedure to the family member against whom the violence was committed, the public prosecutor and the guardianship authority. This procedure, in the interest of child protection, can also be initiated as an official adhesion procedure.

Given that the legislator has broadly defined active procedural legitimation, as well as that the procedure can be initiated *ex officio* in order to

protect a child as a passive victim of violence, the paper specifically presents and comments on the provisions on the merger of lawsuits for protection from domestic violence at the request of a family member against whom violence was committed. In these lawsuits, the role of the prosecutor is played by subjects with active procedural legitimation, while in the officially initiated adhesion procedure, the hidden party is the child who was a passive victim of violence.

The rules of general civil procedure allow for the merger of the aforementioned lawsuits in which the defendant is the person who committed domestic violence for the purpose of joint discussion, investigation and decision-making, provided that the proceeding is not prolonged. Both cases are heard by the same court with local jurisdiction and the same collegial composition. The same rules of procedure are prescribed for joined litigations, although in cases involving family disputes, joinder of litigations is possible even when the procedures and rules of procedure are different. The court decides on joining cases, depending on the assessment of expediency, efficiency and procedural economy, and this act of managing the procedure concentrates the procedural material, ensures expedient proceedings, procedural economy, effective legal protection and legal certainty, as it avoids the same decisions on the same act of violence being explained differently.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, G.S.; methodology, G.S. and S.Ć.; formal analysis, G.S. and S.Ć.; writing – original draft preparation, G.S. and S.Ć.; writing – review and editing, S.Ć. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This paper is the result of Sanda Ćorac's scientific research conducted within the 2026 Research Programme of the Faculty of Law, University of Kragujevac, funded by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article. Further inquiries may be directed to the corresponding authors.

Informed Consent for Participation in the Study / Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Stanković Gordana

Univerzitet u Nišu, Pravni fakultet, Niš, Srbija

Ćorac Sanda

Univerzitet u Kragujevcu, Pravni fakultet, Kragujevac, Srbija

SPAJANJE PARNICA ZA ZAŠTITU OD NASILJA U PORODICI

APSTRAKT: Aktivna procesna legitimacija u cilju zaštite od nasilja u porodici pripada članu porodice koji je bio žrtva nasilja u porodici, zakonskom zastupniku žrtve nasilja, organu starateljstva, kao organu za zaštitu porodice, i javnom tužiocu, kao državnom organu. Postupak za zaštitu od nasilja u porodici može da bude i oficijelno pokrenut. S obzirom na to da različiti tužioci mogu da pokrenu parnicu za zaštitu od nasilja protiv istog tuženog koji se nasilnički ponašao, postavilo se pitanje da li je moguće spajanje pokrenutih parnica za zaštitu od nasilja u porodici, posebno onih koje su pokrenili žrtva nasilja i javni tužilac da bi se zajedničkim raspravljanjem, izviđanjem i odlučivanjem u spojenim postupcima efikasno odredila jedna ili više mera za zaštitu od nasilja u porodici i ostvarila ne samo efikasna zaštita žrtve nasilja već i ekonomičnost i pravna sigurnost.

Ključne reči: *nasilje u porodici, sistem zaštite od nasilja, poseban parnični postupak za zaštitu od nasilja u porodici, javni tužilac kao stranka u funkcionalnom smislu, spajanje parnica za zaštitu od nasilja.*

References

1. Bodiřoga, N. (2022). *Parnični postupak [Civil proceedings]*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu
2. Draškić, M. (2016). *Komentar Porodičnog zakona [Commentary on the Family Law]*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik
3. Kostić, M. (2006). Nasilje u porodici – dve metode sudske zaštite [Domestic violence – two methods of judicial protection]. In: Stanković, G. (ed.), *Novine u porodičnom zakonodavstvu [Innovations in Family Law]* (pp. 235–254). Niš: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu
4. Krivični zakonik [Criminal Code]. *Službeni glasnik RS*, br. 85/05, 88/05 - ispr., 107/05 - ispr., 72/09, 111/09, 121/12, 104/13, 108/14, 94/16, 35/19 i 94/24
5. Palačković, D. (2024). Slobodno sudijsko uverenje u parničnim postupcima u vezi sa porodičnim odnosima [*Free judicial conviction in civil proceedings related to family relations*]. In: Jašarbegović, A. (ed.), *Zbornik radova Dani porodičnog prava [Family Law Days : Conference Proceedings]*. (pp. 28–47). Mostar: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta „Džemal Bijedić“
6. Ponjavić, Z. (2012). Odgovornost države za nasilje u porodici prema Konvenciji o ljudskim pravima [State responsibility for domestic violence under the Human Rights Convention]. In: Panov, S., Janjić Komar M., & Škulić, M. (eds.), *Nasilje u porodici – zbornik radova sa Naučnog skupa [Domestic Violence – Conference Proceedings]*. (pp. 146–163). Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta, Centar za izdavaštvo i informisanje
7. Porodični zakon [Family Law]. *Službeni glasnik RS*. br. 18/05, 72/11 - dr. zakon i 6/15
8. Stanković, G., & Boranijašević, V. (2020). *Građansko procesno pravo [Civil Procedural Law]*. Niš: Sven
9. Stanković, G., & Boranijašević, V. (2023). *Građansko procesno pravo [Civil Procedural Law]*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik
10. Stanković, G. (1984). Procesni položaj organa starateljstva u građanskom sudskom postupku [The procedural position of the guardianship authority in civil court proceedings In: *Saradnja suda i organa starateljstva u primeni novih porodičnih zakona [Cooperation between the Court and Guardianship Authorities in the Implementation of new Family Laws]* (pp. 74–89). Beograd: Institut za pravne i društvene nauke Pravnog fakulteta

11. Stanković, G. (1997). Procesni položaj deteta u parničnom postupku [The procedural position of the child in civil proceedings]. In: Vučković Šahović, N. (ed.), *Prava deteta u svetu i Jugoslaviji [Rights of the Child in the World and Yugoslavia]* (pp. 111–116). Beograd: Beogradski centar za ljudska prava
12. Stanković, G. (2006). Osnovna načela posebnih parničnih postupaka u porodičnim stvarima [Fundamental principles of special civil proceedings in family matters]. U: Ponjavić, Z. (ed.), *Novo porodično zakonodavstvo – zbornik sa savetovanja [New Family Legislation – Conference Proceedings]*. (pp. 481–498). Kragujevac: Pravni fakultet, Centar za porodično pravo
13. Stanković, G. (2024). *Komentar Zakona o parničnom postupku (1. izdanje) [Commentary on the Law on Civil Procedure (1st edition)]*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik
14. Stanković, G. (2025). Terminološke greške u sudskim odlukama u parnicama za rešavanje porodičnih sporova [Terminological errors in court decisions in lawsuits for resolving family disputes]. *Izbor sudske prakse*, 33(3), pp. 5–11
15. Zakon o parničnom postupku [Law on Civil Procedure]. *Službeni glasnik RS*. br. 72/11, 49/13 - odluka US, 74/13 - odluka US, 55/14, 87/18, 18/20 i 10/23 - dr. zakon
16. Zakon o sprečavanju nasilja u porodici [Law on Prevention of Domestic Violence]. *Službeni glasnik RS*. br. 94/16 i 10/23 - dr. zakon