

To the Scientific Jury conducting the competition for Associate Professor at the Faculty of Law of Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv in Professional Line: 3.6 Law (Civil and Family Law) announced in *State Gazette*, issue 98 of 19 November 2024

OPINION

From

Assoc. Prof. Angel Yordanov Shopov of Faculty of Law at Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv

Dear Scientific Jury Members,

1. By Order No. ПД-22-67/16 January 2025 of the Rector of Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv I have been appointed a member of the scientific jury conducting a competition for Associate Professor at the Faculty of Law of Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv in Professional Line: 3.6 Law (Civil and Family Law). The competition is for the needs of the Chair of Civil Law Sciences of the Faculty of Law at Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv and is substantiated by the number of classes for lectures in the mandatory subject of “Family and Succession Law”.

2. Two candidates have been admitted to participation in the competition:

- Dimitar Simeonov Topuzov, PhD, who is Chief Assistant Professor at the Chair of Civil Law Sciences of the Faculty of Law at the University of Plovdiv (CCLS) and lawyer;
- Ivan Petkov Mangachev, PhD, lawyer.

The documents submitted show that both candidates have a Master’s Degree in Law: Dimitar Topuzov from Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv (2009), Ivan Mangachev from Sv. Kliment Ohridski Sofia University CY (1998). Both of them are Doctors of Law with dissertations in the field of civil law: Dimitar Topuzov defended a dissertation work on the topic: “Nullity of Marital Contracts” (2015), and Ivan Mangachev defended a dissertation work on the topic: “Contracts for Financial Security” (2008). Both are authors of monographs published on the basis of their dissertations.

Both candidates have length of service as lecturers in law at higher educational institutions. Mr. Topuzov was appointed assistant professor at the Faculty of Law in 2014, and

has been holding the academic position of chief assistant professor since 2016 after a competition. He teaches seminars and lectures to students in Family and Succession Law (FSL) and Civil Law, General Part, he also participates in the exams in these subjects. He has published an aid in FSL (co-authored), which has undergone 3 editions. He has been Secretary of CCLS (2016-2022), and, since 2020, scientific secretary of the Faculty of Law in academic development.

Mr. Mangachev was Chief Assistant Professor at the Department of Law of New Bulgarian University for more than 13 years (1 October 2005 – 30 August 2019), then he continued (maybe as part-time lecturer of non-law students) until the end of academic year 2021-22. He teaches seminars and lectures to students in Commercial Law and lectures to non-law students in Banking Law, Stock Exchange Law, and Legal Regime of International Financing. He has lectured at other institutions in Bulgaria and abroad, and currently is lecturing. Most of them are not taught at New Bulgarian University or in scientific organizations.

From the documentation submitted under the competition it can be concluded that the two candidates 1) have held the academic position of assistant professor or chief assistant professor for more than two years and 2) have not been proven to engage in plagiarism. **The minimum national requirements** under article 2b, paragraphs 2 and 3 and article 26 of the Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria Act (DASRBA), article 1a and article 53 of the Rules on the Implementation of the Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria Act (RIDASRBA), article 65 of the Rules on Development of the Academic Staff of the University of Plovdiv (RDASUP). Since no additional requirements for holding the academic position of “Associate Professor” have been adopted the compliance with them is not seen to in this procedure (an argument under article 1b, paragraph 5 of DASRBA, article 65, paragraph 3 of RDASUP).

3. The two candidates have submitted the following publications for participation in the competition

3.2.1. Chief Assist. Prof. D. Topuzov, PhD: a total of 15 publications

- habilitation work, monograph - Принципите на европейското семейно право и възможностите за развитие на българското имуществено-брачно законодателство [Principles of European Family Law and the Possibilities for Development of Bulgarian Property-Marital Legislation]. Sofia: Ciela, 2024, 302 pages;

- chapters of a co-authored monograph - Todorova, V., St. Stavru, D. Topuzov. Republic of Bulgaria – In International Encyclopedia of Laws: Family and Succession Law, edited by Walter Pintens. Alphen aan den Rijn, Kluwer Law International, 2022, 324 p.;
- 13 articles/papers – “Principles of European Family Law - Main Characteristics, Legal Nature and Demarcations”. In: *Правото в XXI век – предизвикателства and перспективи. Том 1* [Law in the 21st Century: Challenges and Perspectives. Volume 1]. Plovdiv: Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv Press, 2023, 373-387; “Will the effect of the chosen property-matrimonial regime be suspended in case that any of the spouses is subsequently placed under interdiction? In favor of the affirmative answer” In: *Брак and отношения между съпрузите. Дискусионник по семейно право* [Marriage and Relations between the Spouses. Debates in Family Law]. Plovdiv: Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv Press, 2022, 76-93; “Principles of European family law, support and succession rights of couples in de facto unions” (co-authored) In: *Правна мисъл* [Legal Thought], 2021, № 3-4, 62-77; “Overview of selected judgments of the Supreme Court of Cassation for 2019-2020 on matters of parental alienation and child’s personal relations with grandparents” In: *Предизвикай правото!* [Challenging the Law] electronic edition; “Principles of European family law regarding the property relations between the spouses” In: *Правна мисъл* [Legal Thought], 2020, No. 4, 3-22; “Problems of testamentary capacity” In: *Ius Romanum*, I/2020,335-358; “Is post-divorce spousal maintenance in Bulgarian law obsolete?” In: *Family Law and Family Realities. Conference book – 16th World Conference of the International Society of Family Law*. Eleven International Publishing, 2019; “Overview of selected judgments of the most recent practice of the Supreme Court of Cassation on matters of family law” In: *Предизвикай правото!* [Challenging the Law] electronic edition, 2019; “*De lege ferenda* on the protection of a rented family home” In: *Правна мисъл* [Legal Thought], 2018, No. 4, 48-60; “On the form of validity of the marriage contract” In: *Собственост and право* [Property and Law], 2018, No. 2, 43-51; “Representation between spouses in the light of the Principles of European Family Law” In: *Studia iuris*, 2017, No. 1; “The significance of the Principles of European Family Law for the improvement of the protection of the family home” In: *Soft law и развитието на съвременното право* [Soft law and Development of Contemporary Law]. Sofia: Sibi, 2017, 169-187; “May one claim partial transformation in case of co-ownership agreement approved by the divorce court? Practical questions if there is no agreement on the proportion of shares”. In: *Собственост и право* [Property and Law], 2016, No. 6, 41-47;

3.2.2. I. Mangachev, PhD, submits a total of 15 publications:

- habilitation work, monograph - Окончателност на сетълмента. Правна уредба. [Finality of the Settlement. Legal Regulation]. Sofia: Ciela, 2013, 283 pages;

- a total of 14 articles/papers: Protection of immovables in European legal systems. Santisteban, S. and P. Sparkes (eds.), The Common Core of European Private Law. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015; TARGET 2 and Settlement Finality. - Acta Universitatis Danubius. Juridica, Vol 7, No 1 (2011); “Active Solidarity and Its Application in the Bank Crediting” In: *Търговско и облигационно право* [Law of Commerce and Contracts], 2024, № 11; “The Act to declare the estates of the families of the former tsars Ferdinand and Boris and their heirs public property: nationalization, expropriation, seizure or étatisation?” In: *Творчеството на проф. Константин Кацаров през призмата на съвременното право* [The Work of Prof. Konstantin Katsarov through the Lens of Contemporary Law]. Sofia: NBU, 2024, 186-202; “On codex rationes, codex (ratio) accepti et expensi and receptum argentarii” In: *Грамада* [Gramada], 2017; On the Banking Terms “Vlog [deposit]”, “Deposit” and “Account” In: *Грамада* [Gramada] , 2018; “Legal Forms of Nationalization in the Banking Sector: Comparison and Brief Comments on Directive 2014/59/EU” In: *Търговско и облигационно право* [Law of Commerce and Contracts], 2014, No. 8; “The Nationalization of the Franco-Bulgarian Bank” In: *Грамада* [Gramada], 2018; “Uniform Rules for Demand Guarantees (URDG) and Bulgarian Court Practice” In: *Грамада* [Gramada]; “The claim under article 71 of the Commerce Act” In: *Грамада* [Gramada], 2017; “The stabilization proceedings: past, present and near future” In: *Грамада* [Gramada], 2017; “Payment Transaction in European and Roman Law” In: *Ius Romanum*, 2017, No. 2, 491-500; “Participants in a System with Finality of Settlement” In: *Грамада* [Gramada], 2015; “Forced Alienation and Nationalization as Forms of Making-Things-State-Property.” In: *Собственост и право* [Property and Law], 2009, № 6.

The works submitted by the candidates have their own respective ISBN/ISSN, which I skip for the sake of brevity. They **do not double the publications which served for the award of the educational and scientific degree of “Doctor”**.

4. Assessment of the publications submitted by the two candidates for participation in the competition

4.1. The publications of Dimitar Topuzov, PhD

4.1.1. The submitted monograph (*Principles of European Family Law...*) fully meets the requirements for such scientific work as stipulated in § 1, item 10 of the Additional Provisions of the RIDASRBA. It contains 277 pages of text, exclusive of the bibliography and the appendices. The work is structured into three chapters. The conclusions of the research are

useful for a possible improvement of the regulation of spouses' property rights and obligations. The object of research are the common matrimonial rights and obligations because they are the core of the marital legal relation. The personal rights and obligations of the spouses, which are immediately related to the property ones, are not left without consideration.

Chapter One deals with the peculiarities of the Principles: their structure and content; characteristics; the organization that created them; comparison with other legal terms. Here, the overview of the PEFL with the references made to the Bulgarian legal solutions is very successful and useful. The tracing of the practice in Bulgaria which has relied on other sources of flexible law but not on PEFL (note 205) can be pointed out as a sign of serious thoroughness.

Chapter Two makes an assessment of the compliance of the Bulgarian regulation of property-marital relations with the Principles. The recommendations for stipulating a more extended national regulation of the primary regime of the general personal and property matrimonial rights and obligations are convincing. Coupled with the trends typical of Bulgaria's contemporary national regulation, after a versatile and convincing arguments the author substantiates the need of comparison and borrowing of the PEFL solutions. The local doctrine and practice have not paid proper attention so far (95-98). The analysis continues with a comparison of the solutions of the Family Code and PEFL regarding the participation of the spouses in covering the needs of the family, protection of family home, representation and the obligation regarding the information between the spouses, etc.

One of the values of the study is that PEFL are not *a priori* accepted as the best model for regulation. Thus, for instance, after the author has examined the consequences of the violation of the regulation of the protection of the family home under PEFL and has distinguished them from the ones of voidability (p. 136), he puts the PEFL solution to well-argued criticism. The regulation of article 26 of the Family Code and the mandatory court practice on the matter (144-152) have been critically analyzed. Naturally, this necessitates the conclusion of deviation from the model adopted by the PEFL.

Chapter Three is dedicated to the prospects for improvement of the national regulation. Here the work gains its complete form thanks to the arguments and the text *de lege ferenda* proposed after it. On the basis of the conclusions from the preceding chapter the author motivates the introduction of common matrimonial rights and obligations that are unknown to the Bulgarian law: ones on protection of rented family home, right to court empowerment, obligation regarding information. The author also proposes a reconsideration of part of the regulation of the matrimonial rights and obligations.

More important points of contributions. What is proposed is regulation of

- more detailed primary matrimonial regime;
- a claim for award of the monetary value of the spouse's contribution due;
- protection of the family home among the common rights and obligations of the spouses;
- protection of a rented family home;
- rule regarding the representation of spouses;
- obligation to provide information which should ensure the possibility for determining other subjective matrimonial rights.

The book's approach can be assessed as innovative, and its structure as successful. It is precisely the structure that enables the manifestation of the scientific research qualities of the candidate by convincingly unfolding the outcomes thereof. This has been aptly achieved: the text is easy to read and understandable, the reader easily finds his/her way and adopts the author's arguments.

Critical notes. I am not convinced that in Bulgaria the general obligation are not commonly distinguished from the joint ones as asserted by the author on page 66, note 138. I also noticed a technical error: the Marriage Ordinance-Act dates from 1945 and not from 1944, as the latter is in the body text on page 104 whereas the correct information is given in footnote 238.

4.1.2. Chapters from a co-authored monograph - Todorova, V., St. Stavru, D. Topuzov. Republic of Bulgaria – In International Encyclopedia of Laws: Family and Succession Law, edited by Walter Pintens. Alphen aan den Rijn, Kluwer Law International, 2022. A world-renowned authoritative series in which the author's publication clarifies the conditions and the procedure for conclusion of marriage under Bulgarian law, its legal nature, the consequences of marriage and its invalidity; intestate succession (the circle, the orders and the quotas of possible heirs), and testamentary succession. Such publications may only be admired. It should be noted that this is a second supplemented edition of the book.

4.1.3. I group the Articles / Papers in the following manner:

- *On matters regarding PEFL:* Principles of European Family Law - Main Characteristics, Legal Nature and Demarcations; Principles of European family law, support and succession rights of couples in de facto unions (co-authored); *De lege ferenda* on the protection of a rented family home; Principles of European Family Law regarding the property relations between the spouses (co-authored); Representation between spouses in the light of the Principles of European Family Law; Is post-divorce spousal maintenance in Bulgarian law obsolete?; The significance of the Principles of European Family Law for the improvement of the protection of

the family home. – Due to the serious continuity with the text of the monograph in terms of the content my conclusions on the latter are also valid here.

- *On other matters of family and succession law*

- Will the effect of the chosen property-matrimonial regime be suspended in case that any of the spouses is subsequently placed under interdiction? In favor of the affirmative answer. – The text elaborates (and does not double) some views of the author that he has maintained in his PhD dissertation, the text does not double a publication submitted for the award of the educational and scientific degree of “Doctor” as well.

- Overview of selected judgments of the Supreme Court of Cassation for 2019-2020 on matters of parental alienation and child’s personal relations with grandparents. The matters being discussed are not sufficiently regulated, nor have they been studied by the law doctrine so far. For this reason the text has scientific novelty and is useful for the legal knowledge and practice.

- Problems of testamentary capacity (Ius romanum, I/2020, 335-358) – considering the volume of the work I qualify it as a study since it exceeds 20 pages. It clarifies the scope of requirements for testamentary capacity (article 13 of Succession Act), makes a parallel with the general civil capacity to act and an analysis in the context of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The author substantiates the theses on non-recognition of minors’ testamentary capacity as well as the right of persons placed under full interdiction due to mental illness to bequeath if they acted reasonably at the time when they made the testament. The point of reference is the notion that testamentary capacity is special which does not allow the principles of the general civil capacity to act to be transposed onto it. The conclusions in the study are very convincing and are supported by a thorough comparative law overview.

- Overview of selected judgments of the most recent practice of the Supreme Court of Cassation on matters of family law – some questions regarding the institution of transformation of matrimonial property as well as the origin are put to critical analysis.

- On the form of validity of the marriage contract – the article elaborates (and does not double) some views of the author that he has maintained in his PhD dissertation, the text does not double a publication submitted for the award of the educational and scientific degree of “Doctor” as well.

- May one claim partial transformation in case of c-ownership agreement approved by the divorce court? Practical questions if there is no agreement on the proportion of shares. The article looks for an answer to the question posed by interpretative case No. 3/2015 on the docket of the Supreme Court of Cassation, Civil College as resolved by Interpretative Judgment No.

3/2015 of the General Meeting of the Civil Colleges of the Supreme Court of Cassation in October 2018 – to a certain extent the conclusions were adopted by the General Meeting of the Civil Colleges, cf. the Interpretative Judgment itself.

So, in terms of D Group of Indicators I assign the candidate **Dimitar Topuzov, PhD**, **250** points instead of the 245 points stated because I qualify one of his works as a study and not as an article as such it was initially scored.

4.2. The publications of Ivan Mangachev, PhD

4.2.1. The submitted monograph (Finality of the Settlement...) meets the requirements for such scientific work as stipulated in § 1, item 10 of the Additional Provisions of the RIDASRBA. It contains 199 pages of text, exclusive of the bibliography and the appendices. However, there is no information about a scientific editor and/or scientific reviewers which causes some hesitation as regards the compliance with the requirements. And yet, I think that they have been complied with as I mean the list of acknowledgments to a number of colleagues who had supported the work of the author and their role for the book's publication as attached to the book. I also mean the fact that it was published in 2013, i.e. five years before the introduction of the definition of monograph.

So far this is the only monograph on the topic published in Bulgarian. The main regulation is transposed into Bulgarian law by Directive 98/26/EC in the Payment Service and Payment Systems Act (PSPSA) and in the Public Offering of Securities Act (POSA). The work is structured into four chapters. The conclusions from the research would serve for the improvement of the regulation and for the enrichment of the doctrine and the practice. The first chapter traces out the historical development and the ideas of the finality of settlement from Antiquity to date. It is interesting to find out that by the ancient emergence of the non-cash payments the premises for them started to get substantiated as well. The second chapter examines the subjects, and the third chapter examines the elements of the system for the finality of settlement. There are some interesting comparisons, e.g. the one between classical institutions of private law, on the one hand, and, on the other, terms such as settlement, contract for finality of settlement, netting, clearing, etc. Most of them are convincing and may be supported. The fourth chapter is focused on the peculiarities of the insolvency proceedings in the finality of settlement.

I note the research's significance in two important economic sectors where non-cash payments are being made via systems with finality of settlement: the banking system and the trade in securities. For these sectors it is very important what the consequences of the opening of

insolvency proceedings against the participant in non-cash payments will be. And the more the relative share of non-cash payments made increases, the more serious importance the requirements for the finality of settlement gain.

More important points of contributions given as recommendations *de lege ferenda*:

- the regulation of the finality of settlement should be in a separate act;
- the definition of netting should be supplemented by also covering the cases of multilateral netting;
- Bulgarian legislation should regulate the clearing houses;
- the finality of settlement should be synchronized with other statutory acts regulating similar matters.

Critical Notes. However, it should be noted that the scope of the research far exceeds the subject matter stated in the title: I agree with the note made by Prof. Kamelia Kasabova in the introduction to the book. In addition, the settlement and the requirements regarding it are subject to public-law regulation which pre-dates the time when Directive 98/26/EC came into being. Payment supervision (in the framework of which the settlement is being carried out) is distinguished, for instance, from bank supervision as different types of administrative control. It is also acknowledged that the regulation of the two types of supervision also stipulates almost identical measures applied by different empowered authorities functioning within the framework of the same institution (Bulgarian National Bank). *Hence arises the question whether this is not a matter concerning an institution of the public law.*

Second, the research would have only gained if it were aimed at a *certain aspect of* the application of the requirement for the finality of settlement (e.g. to any of the two sectors: the banking system or the trade in securities). At present, the multi-aspect nature of the research troubles the reader. For example, one cannot understand which of the many meanings of the term “settlement” is the leading one. Unconvincingly, the book begins not by clarifying the term which is a central element thereof but by reference to the middle of the book.

Third, the references to legal regulation of different nature and ranking (often partially amended or repealed one) which disorient the reader are unnecessary. To put it otherwise, the work suffers from excessive super-normativity which has affected its capacity to give or systematize knowledge.

Recommendations. The following steps would contribute to the text of the monograph getting more accessible. 1) The “comparative law” references which contain only the number of a provision and the title of a legal act in the respective official language should be eliminated. I qualify such references as an end in itself – it does add certain volume to the scientific work but

give no new knowledge (e.g. item 1.19 occupying a total of 2 pages of the body text: pp. 40-41). On its basis neither any comparisons, nor any conclusions have been additionally made. 2) It would be appropriate, if Dr. Mangachev wishes so, to consider the extent to which the legislator has taken his recommendations *de lege ferenda* into consideration as well as the law in force and the trends for modernization of the regulation. Currently, the following acts that have entered into force from 2013 to date remain outside the range of the monograph (the list is not exhaustive) Regulation (EU) No 909/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 on improving securities settlement in the European Union and on central securities depositories; Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/391 of 11 November 2016 supplementing Regulation (EU) No 909/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to regulatory technical standards further specifying the content of the reporting on internalised settlements; Markets in Financial Instruments Act (in force since 2018); Payment Service and Payment Systems Act (PSPSA) which is also in force since 2018 and which replaced the act of the same name in force as at the time when the monograph was written.

4.2.2. I group the Articles / Papers in the following manner:

- *On the topic of the monograph - TARGET 2 and Settlement Finality.* - Acta Universitatis Danubius. Juridica, Vol 7, No 1 (2011), 92-99; On codex rationes, codex (ratio) accepti et expensi and receptum argentarii, 2017; Participants in a System with Finality of Settlement, 2015; - Due to the continuity with the text of the monograph my observations on the latter are also valid here with the addition as regards the article in a foreign language that it is very good to promote the solutions of Bulgarian law abroad;
 - *On matters of property law*
 - (co-authored) A paper in relation to Bulgarian property law. - In: Protection of immovables in European legal systems. – A material from a world-renowned series and publisher, with established general methodology. The participation of national speakers and the promotion of Bulgarian law may only be admired.
 - On nationalization: Forced Alienation and Nationalization as Forms of Making-Things-State-Property; Legal Forms of Nationalization in the Banking Sector: Comparison and Brief Comments on Directive 2014/59/EU; The Nationalization of the Franco-Bulgarian Bank; The Act to declare the estates of the families of the former tsars Ferdinand and Boris and their heirs public property: nationalization, expropriation, seizure or étatisation? – They are written in accessible language, contain thorough analysis, and convincing conclusions.
 - *On matters of commercial law*

- The claim under article 71 of the Commerce Act. – The article contains some well-argued proposals *de lege ferenda*.
- The stabilization proceedings: past, present and near future. – The article traces out the historical development of the institution and attempts to predict some trends in the regulation.
- Of banking law: Active Solidarity and Its Application in the Bank Crediting; Payment Transaction in European and Roman Law; On the Banking Terms “Vlog [deposit]”, “Deposit” and “Account”; Uniform Rules for Demand Guarantees (URDG) and Bulgarian Court Practice. – The articles contain analyses that are significant for the civil and commercial law and practice, with sufficient scientific apparatus and well-argued applications *de lege ferenda*. I recommend, only as regards the last two articles, that the conclusions and proposals made be supported with references to the doctrine and comparative law practices.

Ivan Mangachev, PhD has 240 points for D Group of Indicators

5. Citations

According to the table with required points by groups of indicators the citations are in E Group of Indicators. The minimum number of points is 50 as both candidates cover the said minimum. In terms of E Group of Indicators the candidate Dimitar Topuzov, PhD has 355 points with a total of 9 publications cited, and the candidate Ivan Mangachev, PhD has 190 points with a total of 4 publications cited.

Therefore, on the grounds of article 26, paragraph 3 of Development of the Academic Staff Act both candidates obtain a positive conclusion for participation in the competition for the academic position of “Associate Professor”. However, since the position is for one candidate one should make a

6. Comparison between the candidates’ scores

Reference Table of compliance with the minimum national requirements of the candidate Dimitar Simeonov Topuzov, PhD by: field of higher education		
3. Social, Economic and Legal Sciences; Professional Line		
3.6 Law (Civil and Family Law)		
Group of Indicators	Minimum Points Required under the Rules on the Implementation of the Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of	Candidate’s Points

	Bulgaria Act	
A Group of Indicators	50	50
C Group of Indicators	100	100
D Group of Indicators	200	250
E Group of Indicators	50	355
Total Points		755

Reference Table of compliance with the minimum national requirements of the candidate Ivan Petkov Mangachev, PhD by: field of higher education 3. Social, Economic and Legal Sciences; Professional Line 3.6 Law (Civil and Family Law)		
Group of Indicators	Minimum Points Required under the Rules on the Implementation of the Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria Act	Candidate's Points
A Group of Indicators	50	50
C Group of Indicators	100	100
D Group of Indicators	200	240
E Group of Indicators	50	190
Total Points		580

By E Group of Indicators which are not mandatory for this competition only the candidate Mr. Topuzov has declared and demonstrated results equal to 95 points. For the conditions for taking these points into consideration are not present (an argument under article 27, paragraphs 3 and 4 of Development of the Academic Staff Act, article 57a, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Rules on the Implementation of the Development of the Academic Staff Act), they are not added to the results in the tables. But even if these conditions were present, this would increase the points of only one of the candidates which does not substantially change the following

7. Conclusion

On the basis of the aforesaid arguments for academic activity, the results of the two candidates and the two tables as attached it has turned out that the candidate Dimitar Simeonov

Topuzov, PhD, has greater indicators (755 points) than the candidate Ivan Petkov Mangachev, PhD (580 points).

Therefore, the candidate Dimitar Simeonov Topuzov, PhD, meets the conditions for winning the announced competition, **and for this reason I vote “AYE” to him being selected by the scientific jury to be proposed for the academic position of “Associate Professor in Civil and Family Law” to the Faculty Meeting of the Faculty of Law at the University of Plovdiv.**

Plovdiv, 10 March 2025

Respectfully yours,

(A. Sghopov)