PEER REVIEW

By Assoc. Prof. Tanya Panayotova Gradinarova, Associate Professor in Civil Procedure at the Department of Law of the University of National and World Economy, member of the Dissertation Committee for the defence of the dissertation of Rumen Nikolaev Georgiev – a doctoral candidate, in full-time mode of education, at the Civil Sciences Department, Department of Law of Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, on the topic of "**Termination and Conclusion of Enforcement Proceedings**" for acquiring the educational and academic degree of "Doctor" in the professional field of 3.6. Law (Civil Procedure)

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE,

With order No. РД-21-118/18.01.2024 issued by the Rector of Plovdiv University, I have been appointed as a member of the Dissertation Committee for the defence of the dissertation of Rumen Nikolaev Georgiev on the topic of **"Termination and Conclusion of Enforcement Proceedings"** for the acquisition of the educational and academic degree of "Doctor" in the professional field **3.6. Law (Civil Procedure), scientific field 3. Social, economic, and legal sciences.**

1. Background of the Doctoral Student.

The doctoral candidate is Rumen Nikolaev Georgiev, who graduated with a Master's degree in Law from the Department of Law at Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv in 2017. From August 2020 to the present, he has been registered as an attorney at the Bar Association in Plovdiv. Additionally, since June 2022, he has been appointed as a teaching assistant in Civil Procedure at the Department of Law of Paisii Hilendarski.

2. Information about the PhD Programme.

The submitted dissertation is the result of the work of Rumen Nikolaev Georgiev as a full-time doctoral student in the professional field 3.6 Law, doctoral program "Civil Procedure" at the Department of Civil Law Sciences, Department of Law at Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, under the supervision of Prof. Silvi Vasilev Chernev, PhD. However, we do not have information about the date of his enrolment. The dissertation was discussed and approved for public defence at a meeting of the Department of Civil Law Sciences, Department of Law of Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, held on 12 January, 2024. During the dissertation procedure, the requirements of the Act on the Development of the Academic Staff, the Rules on its Application, and the Rules on the Development of the Academic Staff of the Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv were observed.

3. Information About the Dissertation and the Abstract.

The dissertation titled "**Termination and Conclusion of Enforcement Proceedings**", submitted for defence by Rumen Nikolaev Georgiev, represents the first attempt in Bulgarian procedural literature to conduct a comprehensive scientific study dedicated to the complex issues concerning the concept of premature conclusion of enforcement proceedings, which, in procedural doctrine, is defined as termination. The chosen topic is highly relevant due to the increasing significance of the studied institute in the present day, contributing to its scholarly elucidation. The issues addressed in the dissertation are of interest not only from a theoretical standpoint but also hold practical significance, being useful for legal practice as well.

The dissertation comprises **206** pages, including the table of contents, bibliography, and case law references. At the end of the dissertation, a total of 51 titles are listed as cited literature, including 5 foreign sources. I find the scholarly apparatus used by the doctoral candidate to be insufficient, especially considering that the references are primarily to textbooks. This deficiency becomes particularly obvious in the attempt at examining the nature of prescription, which is fundamental to civil law, and the differences between this institute and that of peremption (Chapter Three, *pp. 113-114*), where the doctoral candidate has not used or analysed scientific sources from renowned authors. In a certain part of the dissertation (e.g., pp. 67-68), the citations and references to reproduced statements from other authors are not accurately presented. The citation of literary sources is also insufficiently precise.

In terms of structure, the composition includes an **introduction, four chapters and a conclusion**, where the author attempts to systematize but essentially repeats the main conclusions of the study, which are contained in its principal parts. The dissertation is not well-structured. There is a lack of balance between its separate parts. The author has failed to establish a criterion for organizing the structural components of the dissertation, resulting in the merging of significantly distinct grounds into a single chapter. For instance, the grounds of initiation by the creditor (Article 433, paragraph 1, item 2 of CPC) and those based on the discretion of the enforcement agent, inaccurately referred to by the author as "initiative" under Article 433, paragraph 1, items 5 and 6 of CPC, are both consolidated into Chapter Two. Its volume spans merely **27 pages**. Most striking is the imbalance in Chapter Four, which is dedicated, in accordance with the dissertation title, to the second concept – conclusion**. It comprises merely three pages and does not, in fact, meet the requirements for a separate chapter.** The suggestions for improving the legal framework are systematically presented in the individual chapters, and they are reiterated in the concluding part of the dissertation. In the introduction, the author has outlined the research objectives of the dissertation, defining its goal as "*to highlight some of the most significant issues related to the termination and conclusion of enforcement proceedings under CPC with practical focus, and "to provide an in-depth critical review of the established case law*" (p. 8)). The author has also indicated the scientific research

methods employed (*ibid*.). With the goal of the dissertation thus formulated, the writing effectively takes on a more commentary-based rather than research-oriented character, as much of the exposition tends to be informative rather than scientific in many parts. There is an obvious contradiction between the stated goal, on the one hand, and the outlined scientific novelty of the work, on the other. According to the author, the latter consists of "*the first in-depth study in Bulgarian legal literature of the issues related to the termination of enforcement proceedings under CPC*" (*ibid*.). However, the second concept mentioned in the title of the dissertation, termination, is missing.

The exposition essentially consists of **an examination of specific issues**, selected by the author, in applying the grounds for termination of enforcement proceedings, without covering the institute as a whole. As formulated, the dissertation topic necessitates not only an analysis of the second institute as well, namely the conclusion, which is missing from the writing, but also an exploration of the legal consequences of termination. This entails addressing the challenges in the application of Art. 433, paragraphs 3–5 of CPC; however, the author has confined his investigation to reflections on "*retroactive negation of enforcement actions*" (e.g. on p. *80*) and the nature of the termination order (*pp.75-78; pp.106-107*). The first chapter, titled "*Termination of Enforcement Proceedings Due to Extinguishment of the Enforceable Right or the Occurrence of Procedural Inadmissibility*" contains reproductions of commonly accepted and well-known provisions (e.g., on pages *26-27, 30-32, 40-41, 46-49*), without clarifying the fundamental concept of termination of the enforcement proceedings, without comparing and distinguishing its differences from other institutions (pages *10-11*). It examines selective hypotheses and challenges to the application of the grounds under Art. 433, para. 1, subparas. 1, 3, 4, and 7 of the CPC, without specifying the author's criteria for selection, except for extrajudicial set-off falling within the scope of the ground under Art. 433, para. 1, subpara. 1 of the CPC. The text also deviates from the researched subject matter and the chapter's topic in the unrelated part regarding prescription in enforcement proceedings (pp 45-62), without providing arguments for why this material legal institute is discussed within the scope of the ground under Art. 433, para. 1, subpara. 4 of CPC. Actually, the issue of applying prescription here is presented by the author through the prism of the retroactive effect of the claim submission request (Art. 422, para. 1 of CPC), rather than in relation to the dissertation's topic, and is therefore unrelated to it. The doctoral candidate has also put forward proposals de lege ferenda which are not related to the outlined subject of his research (*pp. 56; p. 58, p. 62*), thus allowing a mixture between the institutes of prescription and the legal consequences of filing a claim against it, on one hand, and the interruption of prescription during enforcement actions within the scope of pending enforcement proceedings, on the other. The section dedicated to the ground under Art. 433, para. 1, subpara. 7 of CPC (pp. *62-69*), actually lacks examination of the prerequisites for termination according to the rule. Instead, provided is a merely schematic presentation regarding claims under Art. 439 and Art. 440 of CPC, which is entirely off-topic. Furthermore, there is no analysis regarding the extent to which the

enumeration of claims in the provision is exhaustive. Incorrect is the author's interpretation of the motives and dispositif regarding item 4 of ***Interpretative Decision No. 3/2015 of July 10, 2017, Interpretative Case No. 3/2015, General Meeting of the Civil and Commercial Chamber of the SCC*** concerning the scope of the provision under Art. 440 of CPC, and the conclusion that it supposedly also applies to non-monetary right of action for the transfer of movable property (*p. 67*). On the contrary, in the motives, it is explicitly emphasized that the scope is limited to the execution of monetary claims. In the section dedicated to the ground for termination defined as "nullification of the writ of execution" (Art. 433, para. 1, subpara. 3 of CPC), the author has stated that only the "*most common hypotheses of nullification*" will be examined (*p. 70*), without providing arguments thereof. Thus, the exposition is not comprehensive, and the issues regarding the application of this ground remain underdeveloped. Chapter Two, titled *"Termination of the Enforcement Proceedings at the Request of the Creditor or at the Initiative of the Enforcement Agent"* comprises **merely 27 pages** (*pp. 81-108*), which is sufficient for an academic paper, but not for an individual chapter in a dissertation. The mention in the title that the termination is carried out "at the initiative" of the enforcement agent is imprecise, as it may give the impression that it occurs through administrative action. It is beyond dispute that in such cases the enforcement agent is entitled to exercise discretion in application. The exposition regarding the ground for termination at the request of the creditor (Art. 433, para. 1, subpara. 2 of the CPC, pp. *82-95*) has a commentary rather than a scholarly and research-based character and is drawn from some issues in practice. It also features reproductions of commonly accepted provisions in theory and restatements of legal texts, including the Tax and Social Insurance Procedure Code, where the matter of types of joined creditors and their method of joining in enforcement proceedings is entirely irrelevant to the dissertation's focus (*pp. 86-88*). Some of the issues outlined by the author in this chapter are not open to discussion at all, as they have already been addressed through arguments in interpretative acts. For instance, the matter mentioned by the author on page 93, under item 1.2, regarding the enforcement agent's right to decline termination of proceedings due to unpaid fees. Others are explicitly defined in the law and are not up for debate, such as the creditor's right to appeal the termination order as provided for in Article 435, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph 3 of the CPC. Thirdly, there are also current issues that remain superficially presented and inadequately explored in terms of perspectives and arguments, such as the question of the admissibility of termination at the request of the creditor against a single debtor - *93- 94).* The exposition dedicated to the ground under Article 433, paragraph 1, item 5 of CPC (*pp. 95-100*) is schematic and contains more colloquial rather than legal reasoning. The prerequisites for applying this ground in case law have not been examined, nor have there been presented the author's own arguments to support his view that it is entirely applied at the discretion of the enforcement authority. In the discussions regarding the ground under Article 433, paragraph 1, item 6 of CPC, there are several parts that are entirely unrelated to the topic. For example, the discussion about "deficiencies in regulations" concerning exemption from fees, which is a matter addressed in Article 83, paragraph 2 of CPC and Article 81 of the Private Enforcement Agents Act, rather than within the scope and conditions for applying the ground specified in

the title of this section (*pp. 101-102*). I find the issue raised by the author about advance fees for state and private enforcement agents (*pp. 103-106*) entirely unrelated to the dissertation's topic and discussions. Moreover, this issue has already been addressed by the provisions of ***Interpretative Decision No. 2/2013 dated June 26, 2015, Interpretative Case No. 2/2013, General Meeting of the Civil and Commercial Chamber of the SCC***, the provisions of which are literally reproduced by the doctoral candidate from page 103 to page 105 of the writing. On p. 105, the author suggests that "several key specifics of this ground" can be derived from the interpretation performed. However, in the subsequent discussion, these specifics are neither mentioned nor included. On the contrary, included are discussions on issues that are not in dispute, such as whether the termination order under this ground has a declaratory or constitutive nature, referred to imprecisely by the author as "effect" (*pp. 106-107*), the inclusion of which I find unnecessary. Chapter Three, titled "*Termination of the Enforcement Proceedings on the Grounds of Art. 433, Para. 1, Item 8 of CPC – on the Basis of Peremption,"* contains a decent exposition regarding the nature of peremption, which I find insufficiently analytical (*pp. 111–112*). However, it also presents a comprehensive and systematic discussion regarding the starting point, cessation, and interruption of the two time limits – prescription and peremption, examined through the prism of some of the various types of enforcement grounds, although not fully covering them (*pp. 124 - 136).* In the discussion of the historical development in the application of the institute of prescription in pending enforcement proceedings, unnecessary reproductions of opinions from case law and legal texts are made despite the existence of an already issued interpretative decision, namely ***Interpretative Decision No. 3/2020 dated March 28, 2023, Interpretative Case No. 3/2020, General Meeting of the Civil and Commercial Chamber of the SCC*** (*pp.118- 122*). In certain sections of it, there is unnecessary verbatim reproduction of the motives under item 10 of the interpretative act, as well as an attempt to back up the author's own perspective, which again reproduces those motives (*pp. 135-136*). I find the exposition on pp. 138–145 to be repetitive of well-established principles in theory and case law regarding the differences between the action and enforcement proceedings. In this sense, it seems unnecessary, and furthermore, it is not sufficiently systematic and clear in terms of the author's thesis. The same remark could be made towards the section from pp. 148–150, which redundantly reproduces well-known provisions concerning the initiation of enforcement proceedings without any analysis provided by the author. Completely unrelated to the topic of the dissertation is the method of determining local jurisdiction in the initiation of enforcement proceedings (*pp. 151–155*). Similar is the exposition, reproducing established views in legal theory regarding void judicial acts and defects in legal transactions, which represents a deviation from the topic (pp. *159-161).* The discussion centres on purely technical rather than legal issues, which are not appropriate for a scholarly composition (e.g. the issue of "withdrawing the writ of execution" on p. 166), as well as technical intricacies in commencing enforcement proceedings, which do not belong in a work that is supposed to have an investigative and not a commentary-based nature (*168-169*). Chapter four is titled "*Conclusion of Enforcement Proceedings* and comprises merely three pages (pp. *173-175*). The exposition presented therein is superficial and not actually dedicated to

conclusion. In this regard, both the title of the dissertation and Chapter Four significantly deviate from their intended content. It is informative in nature, repeating well-known and accepted standpoints in procedural doctrine, as well as the author's viewpoint on the termination of enforcement proceedings, which is imprecise *(p.174*). The examination of the differences between orders and decisions as acts of the enforcement agent does not take into account the provision of Article 434, paragraph 1 of the CPC. **This chapter does not meet the requirements for an independent structural part of the thesis, neither in terms of volume nor content**. At the same time, termination as an institute poses challenges in legal application in case law and requires theoretical elucidation, which has been underestimated by the doctoral candidate. The conclusion reiterates the content of the body of the work, repeating both the conclusions made by the doctoral candidate in earlier sections of the exposition, and the *de lege ferenda* proposals (*pp. 176-194*).

The abstract of the dissertation is 32 pages long and meets the formal requirements, accurately reflecting the content of the research. It also includes a reference to a scientific novelty (*pp. 6-7*), as well as the doctoral candidate's outline of his views on contributions (*pp. 30-31*). At the beginning of the abstract, the relevance of the research, its subject, objectives, and the methodological framework are outlined (*pages 3-7*).

The dissertation has general merits as well as achievements relevant to practical application.

3.1. The topic is chosen well, providing the author with the opportunity for an in-depth analysis and elucidation of the theoretical and practical issues arising in legal application concerning the termination of enforcement proceedings. It is characterized by unquestionable relevance, theoretical and practical significance, as evidenced by the interpretative decisions of the General Meeting of the Civil and Commercial Chamber of the SCC in the field, as well as the pending interpretative case No. 2/2023 before the GMCCC, rightly emphasized by the doctoral candidate.

3.2. The dissertation demonstrates theoretical knowledge on the topic, understanding and analysis of our national legal framework, both synchronically and historically. The work fuels and engages in both debate and analysis on some of the challenges, as well as the diverse opinions on them found in both theoretical discussions and case law.

3.3. The exposition presents a sequentially conducted study solely on the grounds for termination within the set topic, focusing on issues selected by the doctoral candidate, without achieving a good balance in the highlights of the discussed problems. Throughout the dissertation, the author demonstrates the ability for independent thought and provides justification for the practical and applied theses upheld.

3.4. The dissertation exhibits the attributes of a practical piece of work with commendable qualities. In some parts of the work, the discussed individual problems and proposals are systematically presented.

4. Scientific Contributions. The dissertation encompasses specific contributions, which are both practical and scientific in nature:

4.1. The thesis constitutes the first attempt in Bulgarian procedural literature to conduct a scientific and applied study dedicated to the issues concerning the grounds for termination of enforcement proceedings and the related problems. Certain parts of the composition offer a substantial historical analysis of the legal framework and the various opinions on some of the issues addressed in the work (*pp. 84-86, pp. 108-109*).

4.2. Thought-provoking and consistent is also the examination dedicated to distinguishing between the institutes of peremption and prescription, as well as the grounds for terminating and suspending the two terms, viewed through the prism of various types of enforcement grounds (*pp. 124-136*).

4.3. Similarly fruitful and yielding practical results is the exposition on the application of peremption and its starting point in cases involving joint debtors (pp. 162-166). The author has analysed several decisions from the case law of SCC the matter, attempting to justify their own stance on this current issue, raised within Interpretative case No. 2/2023 of the General Meeting of the Civil and Commercial Chamber of the SCC.

4.4. The section of the dissertation dedicated to the question of whether it is admissible for actions taken after the occurrence of peremption to interrupt prescription (*pp. 146-148, pp. 156-158)* is well-structured and includes scientific and practical contributions. It engages in debate with a decision of the Supreme Court of Cassation, which prompted the initiation of Interpretative case No. 2/2023 of the General Meeting of the Civil and Commercial Chamber of the SCC. Furthermore, it presents the author's well-founded thesis on the non-occurrence of the legal consequence of "interruption" when the action is taken after peremption has occurred by operation of law. While the author's analysis is limited to only one of the Supreme Court of Cassation's decisions, rather than both groups of opinions expressed in the acts of the highest instance, which prompted the initiation of interpretative case No. 2/2023 of the Supreme Court of Cassation, it is supported by sufficient arguments.

4.5. Support is also warranted for the attempt to isolate specific conclusions derived from the analysed issues into distinct sections of the study following the exposition (*pp. 169-172*), enhancing the clarity of the presentation.

5. Critical Remarks and Recommendations. Recommendations can be made regarding the submitted dissertation, which may assist the author in his future academic endeavours. Apart from those mentioned previously, these also encompass:

5.1. The content of the dissertation does not align with the formulated topic. As formulated, the topic of the dissertation necessitates an analysis of the concept of conclusion of enforcement proceedings, which has been omitted. The discussion of the institute of termination does not cover the issues of its legal consequences, and the content of the dissertation is limited to specific problems in the application of the grounds for termination.

5.2. The selected structure is unsuitable due to its significant imbalance. Isolating chapter four as a standalone section does not meet the structural requirements for a dissertation. Parts of the exposition redundantly restates and reproduces established theoretical views, as well as interpretative rulings from the Supreme Court of Cassation's case law, without independent analysis (*pp. 28; pp. 40-41, 46-49, pp. 68-69, pp. 71-73, pp. 77- 78, pp.118 - -122, pp. 135-136, pp. 148-150, pp. 159-161*). Such an approach is best to be avoided in scholarly research of this nature. There are other parts of the dissertation which I find irrelevant to the set topic of investigation (*pp. 46-49, pp. 45- 62, pp. 63-66, pp. 67-69, pp. 86 - 88, pp. 103-106, pp. 151 -155, pp. 159-161*). The composition would benefit if the analysis and delineation of specificities in the studied institute of termination were not limited solely to the grounds but also encompassed its legal consequences, instead of repeating well-known and accepted views in procedural doctrine and the interpretative practice of the Supreme Court of Cassation.

5.3. Unclear and underdeveloped are the doctoral candidate’s theses regarding retroactive nullification of actions taken prior to termination (*pp.79-81, pp. 107, pp. 146*). The only legal arguments in support of this viewpoint refer to the interpretative rulings under item 1 of ***Interpretative Decision No. 4/2017 dated March 11, 2019, Interpretative Case No. 4/2017, issued by the Supreme Court of Cassation*** *(pp. 79-81)*. These rulings are not applicable to all grounds for termination, and the viewpoint is not novel in procedural doctrine, as it is supported by authors whose opinions are not reflected in the doctoral thesis. The author's viewpoint regarding the legal consequences of termination under the grounds specified in Article 433, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 3 of CPC remains unclear, particularly in cases where the various instances of nullification of the enforcement order are not delineated. In the case of termination under Article 433, Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 6 of CPC, the author unequivocally asserts that *"the effect of actions performed prior to termination is not nullified"* (p. 107), but this viewpoint lacks sufficient justification. The argument cited, that since the enforcement agent exercises discretion upon termination, the enforcement actions are not negated, is unacceptable and unconvincing. In my opinion, the differences in the author's expressed views regarding the legal consequences of enforcement actions performed prior to termination stem from a misunderstanding of the concept of enforcement actions, which undoubtedly include the

precautionary measures imposed at the initiation of enforcement proceedings. If we assume that they retain their effect from imposition until termination, we would significantly infringe upon the rights of private parties in civil transactions. The author's opinion regarding the preservation of the validity of actions performed prior to termination due to peremption is also unacceptable, as it unduly conflates the concepts of "lifting bans and restrictions" and "cancellation of bans and restrictions," without distinguishing which actions the author is discussing in the section dedicated to the termination grounds (*p. 146*). The legal provisions containing regulations on the consequences of termination- Articles 433, paragraphs 3 to 5 of CPC, demand thorough examination and substantiated conclusions in this regard, which have not been adequately addressed in the presented work.

5.4. Also unacceptable is the criterion introduced by the author to differentiate between the declaratory or constitutive legal nature of the termination order *(pp. 75-78).* According to him, the distinction lies in the right of the enforcement agent to decide whether to terminate the proceedings or not. It is precisely this incorrect criterion that results in the thesis regarding the nature of this act under the grounds of Article 433, paragraph 1, item 1 of CPC being also erroneously justified. If accepted, it would mean empowering the enforcement authority to assess whether the enforceable right has been extinguished before the commencement of enforcement proceedings.

5.5. I find it unacceptable and unjustified to claim that the actions and acts performed by the enforcement body after the occurrence of peremption (*pp. 158-161*) are to be considered null. I believe that the author has not given careful enough consideration and assessment of the differences in the terms used and the nature of defective acts in the trial and enforcement proceedings, which are fundamentally distinct.

5.6. A significant portion of the recommendations *de lege ferenda* also cannot be endorsed (p.*28, p.35, p. 56, p. 58, p. 62, p.131, p. 177, p.178; etc.*), or they go beyond the scope of the dissertation, such as the proposed amendment to Article 115, paragraph 1 of the Contracts and Obligations Act with an additional letter "h" ("з"), *which would state that prescription does not run in all cases where the creditor is objectively prevented from taking action to satisfy their claim*" (*p. 126*). Other recommendations that I find reasonable are not sufficiently supported by scientific arguments, such as the proposal to abolish the ground under Article 433, paragraph 1, item 5 of CPC (*p. 100*). Categorically unacceptable is the thesis suggesting the issuance of a second original writ of execution with a note (*p.167).* I also do not support the author's recommendation *de lege ferenda* to explicitly regulate the possibility of issuing a second writ of execution in legislation, applying the decision of the enforcement agent for termination. Similarly, the multiple proposals for the issuance of yet another interpretative ruling by the Supreme Court of Cassation in the field of enforcement proceedings, whose issues have been further complicated due to the contradiction in the interpretative rulings issued so

far, cannot be supported.

5.7. Some parts of the dissertation feature language infelicities that should be avoided in academic writing, such as: the running of terms is "*rebooted (рестартира)*"(p. 131), "*to x out (тури кръст)*" p. 147.

6. *Publications.* In his compliance statement for meeting the minimum national requirements under Article 2b of the ADASRB, the author has listed four publications on the topic of the dissertation as published in non-peer-reviewed journals or published in reviewed collective volumes. The doctoral student's papers were sent to us; however, we were not provided with evidence of their publication or the nature of the journals in which they were published.

The publications on the topic of the dissertation have scientific and applied value, and the author's adopted views are reproduced in the final text of the dissertation, even verbatim. For example, on page 34, it is referenced as "*the arguments set out in this report"*. The doctoral candidate demonstrates academic growth over the years. The number of published works on the topic of the dissertation meets the requirements of the Rules on the Development of the Academic Staff of the Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv.

7. *Conclusion.*

Submitted for defence is a practically applicable study within Bulgarian procedural literature on some of the issues encountered in the application of the grounds for termination of enforcement proceedings. The dissertation meets the requirements set out in Art. 6 of Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria, the Rules on its Application, and those of Art. 32, para. 1 of the Rules on the Development of the Academic Staff of the he Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, as it reflects the doctoral candidate's sufficient theoretical knowledge in the field, while in some sections it demonstrates his ability for independent scholarly thinking and approach to the issues included in the researched subject.

Based on these considerations, I give my positive evaluation **and recommend to the members of the dissertation committee to vote affirmatively, so that the doctoral candidate Rumen Nikolaev Georgiev can obtain the educational and academic degree of "Doctor" in the professional field 3.6 Law, scientific specialty Civil Procedure, scientific field 3. Social, economic, and legal sciences.**

Sofia, 25.03.2024 **Peer Review by:**

/Assoc. Prof. Tanya Gradinarova/