OPINION
from
Assoc. Prof. Anna Staneva, PhD
Faculty of Law
Sv. Kliment Ohridksi Sofia University

RE: Competition for "Associate Professor" in Professional Line: 3.6 Law (Civil and Family Law) at Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, announced in *State Gazette*, issue 98 of 19 November 2024

By Order No. РД-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 the competition for Associate Professor in the field of higher education: 3. Social, Economic and Legal Sciences; Professional Line: 3.6 Law (Civil and Family Law) at Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, announced in *State Gazette*, issue 98 of 19 November 2024.

Two candidates have submitted documents for participation in the competition: Ivan Petkov Mangachev, PhD, and Chief Assistant Professor Dimitar Topuzov, PhD. Both were admitted to participation in the competition since they meet the formal statutory requirements.

I. Re: the application of Ivan Mangachev, PhD

1. Biographical Notes. Ivan Petkov Mangachev was born on 5 October 1973. In 1999, he graduated in Law from the Faculty of Law at Sv. Kliment Ohridksi Sofia University. After his doctorate at New Bulgarian University he was awarded the scientific degree of "Doctor of Law" by defending his dissertation thesis "Contracts for Financial Security". In the period 1999-2006 he worked as jurisconsult at the Ministry of Commerce and Tourism and at United Bulgarian Bank AD; in 2001-2002 he was legal adviser to the World Bank; in 2006-2016 he was Programme Coordinator at the National Institute of Justice; in he was jurisconsult of the Association of Bulgarian Banks, in 2017-2019 he was jurisconsult of Societe General Expressbank AD; in 2021-2022 he was jurisconsult at Eurobank Bulgaria AD. In the period 2021-2024, he was lawyer at Wolf Theiss Law Firm. Currently, he is a freelance lawyer registered with the Sofia Bar Association.

2. Works. In the Associate Professor Competition Iv. Mangachev participates with the monograph "Finality of the Settlement. Legal Regulation" and 14 articles in the field of banking law and some aspects of nationalization. One article is in the field of Roman Law and therefore is not an object of this opinion.

2.1. The monograph was published in 2013 by Ciela Publishing House and its volume is 215 pages (I exclude the comparative tables between the text of Directive 98/26/EC, the Bulgarian legislation and European national legislations as well as an alphabetical index). The work consists of an introduction, four chapters, and a conclusion.

Chapter One "Legal Regulation. Historical Notes" begins by some general concepts; goes through the "idea of finality" which, in the author's opinion, originated from the Herstatt case and the reports of the Bank of International Settlements in Basel that followed. The next section describes the contemporary[1] Bulgarian and European regulations of the finality of the settlement. The last section is entitled "Historical Development of the Premises for the Finality of the Settlement." It is stated that the main premises are the existence of non-cash payments and insolvency. Actually, the section traces out the emergence of non-cash payments and banking.

This chapter provides interesting historical information although it does not exactly refer to the "finality of settlement." One can notice a lack of correspondence between the chapter's title and the sections included therein and their actual content as well as certain lack of logic in the arrangement: the historical development (§4) comes after the contemporary regulation (§3).

Chapter Two outlines the subjects of the systems of finality of settlement. It states the legal definitions of system operator, settlement agent, depositary institution, clearing house, central contractual partner, etc.

Chapter Three "Elements of the Mechanism of Finality of Settlement" includes, first, the agreement on a system with finality of settlement. The author finds that the characterization of the agreement as a multilateral transaction is inaccurate; he also distinguishes it from the contract for company, contract for current account, etc. in order to arrive at the conclusion that the matter at hand concerns a contract *sui generis*. It would not be pointless to analyze the characteristics of the contract being examined from the point of view of the common known division of contracts: unilateral or bilateral (the author specifies that it is a bilateral one but he actually means the number of parties), formal or informal, one made for a consideration or one without return consideration, etc.

Section 2 also examines the settlement account which is also distinguished from other types of accounts. The concept of transfer order is discussed. It is not until this point, and among other things at that, that the first and principal element of the finality of settlement is introduced, i.e. the irreversibility of the order. Then follow sections related to the security interests, clearing, netting and settlement, warranty schemes.

The last Chapter Four examines the peculiarities of the insolvency proceedings under finality of settlement. The text contains some general questions regarding the insolvency of banks. The meaning of article 3 (1) of Directive 98/26/EC and the dispute on whether the

[1] When the author speaks of "contemporary" regulation he means the one in force as at the date of publication of the work. It should be taken into consideration that the said regulation has since undergone some substantial changes, mostly in 2018 when a new Markets for Financial Instruments Act was adopted and the Public Offering of Securities Act was substantially amended. Accordingly, the Contracts for Financial Security Interests Act and Ordinances No. 3 and No 16 of the Bulgarian National Bank, etc. were either amended or new ones were adopted.

provision refers to the transfer orders or to netting only, are discussed. The question regarding the word "moment" of revocation of bank's license used in the Bank Insolvency Act is interesting and important one; the author discusses the matter but does not arrive at a specific conclusion.

In conclusion I would say that the main contribution of the work is its novelty. The finality of settlement has not been the subject matter of a monograph research. The work also has some informative significance regarding this understudied matter and its history. In many places, e.g. as regards the agreement on a system with finality of settlement as well as in the last chapter regarding the insolvency the author points out some questions of law that deserve attention, states others' opinions and solutions in other countries, which is positive thing. He makes some appropriate proposals on changing *de lege ferenda*. What is insufficient in most cases is the legal analysis and the formulation of author's own well-argued viewpoints *de lege lata*.

2.2. Articles and Scientific Papers. Some of the articles provide general information about the phenomena under examination without having scientific value and therefore I will not focus on them. Such are: No. 2, No. 3 and No. 12.[2]

The article "Participants in a System with Finality of Settlement", *Грамада* [Gramada] legal website, ISSN (online): 2682-9703, examines the different participants in a system with finality of settlement studied in Chapter Two of the Habilitation Work.

The article "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 étatization?" In: *Творчеството на проф. Константин Кацаров през призмата на съвременното право: Сборник доклади от научна конференция, посветена на 125-годишнината от рождението на проф. Константин Кацаров* [The Work of Prof. Konstantin Katsarov through the Lens of Contemporary Law: A Collection of Papers from a Scientific Conference dedicated to the 125th anniversary of the birth of Prof. Konstantin Katsarov, 7 November 2023]. NBU: New Bulgarian University Press, 2024, pp. 186-202, ISSN 3033-1129. The article deals with matters related to the nationalization of the estates of the former tsars Ferdinand and Boris. The author has provided exhaustive information about the regulation in effect in the early 20th century and the methods of monarch's acquisition of property. The contemporary legislative and court acts delivered in relation to the claims of the tsar's family to restore their ownership are traced out in detail.

The forms of nationalization of property are examined in the article "Forced Alienation and Nationalization as Forms of Making-Things-State-Property." In: *Собственост и право* [Property and Law], 2009, No. 6.

[2] The numbering followis the list of scientific publications for participation in the associate professor competition submitted by the candidate.

There are two more articles dedicated to nationalization. These are: "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. 08 and "The Nationalization of the Franco-Bulgarian Bank" In: *Грамада* [Gramada] legal website, ISSN (online): 2682-9703. The first article examines the nationalization in the banking sector; a historical and comparative law analysis has been made of the methods of nationalization. The tools of financial stabilization envisaged in Directive 2014/59/EU are examined. The subject matter of the second article is the peculiarities of the nationalization of the Franco-Bulgarian Bank.

The article "Active Solidarity and Its Application in the Bank Crediting" In: *Търговско и облигационно право* [Law of Commerce and Contracts], 2024, No. 11, examines an understudied matter that is not regulated by statute. Some proposals *de lege ferenda* which deserve attention are made.

In the article "On the Banking Terms "Vlog [deposit]", "Deposit" and "Account" In: *Грамада* [Gramada] legal website, an attempt is made to distinguish between the terms "vlog", "deposit" and "payment account". The conclusion that the payment account emerges as the generic term is not convincingly argued.

The article "Uniform Rules for Demand Guarantees (URDG) and Bulgarian Court Practice" In: *Грамада* [Gramada] legal website, has practical importance regarding the application of the Rules by the courts.

The article "The claim under article 71 of the Commerce Act" In: *Грамада* [Gramada] legal website examines the important matters of how the term "member of the company" used in article 71 of the Commerce Act should be understood and whether the personal companies have bodies.

The article "Payment Transaction in European and Roman Law" In: *Ius Romanum*, Universum iuris romani, 2017, No. II, pp. 491-500, examines the cash and non-cash payments in Roman law and seeks for continuity with the contemporary law of the European Union.

The scientific works submitted by Ivan Mangachev, PhD for the competition meet the requirements of the law. Most of them are of great cognitive value; some them contain scientific contributions and matter for the court practice. Generally, it can be found that the author's interests lie mainly in the field of commercial law and, mostly, in the methods of payment: historical and present-day ones. It is as if the author's second field of interest are the matters of nationalization and privatization. The fact that the author focuses on understudied subjects, looks for the roots of the phenomena being analyzed and provides valuable historical information should be given a positive assessment.

II. Re the application of Dimitar Topuzov, PhD

1. Biographical Notes. Dimitar Simeonov Topuzov was born on 18 May 1985. In 2009, he graduated in Law from the Faculty of Law at Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv. In 2011-2014, he was a regular PhD student at the same faculty and in 2015 he successfully defended doctor's dissertation on the topic: "Nullity of Marital Contracts" (published in 2016). In 2011-2013, he worked as jurisconsult at the Municipality of Plovdiv. In 2014, he became assistant professor at the Chair of Civil Law Sciences of the Faculty of Law at Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, and since 2016 he has been chief assistant professor at the same chair where he teaches seminar classes in Family and Succession Law and in Civil Law, General Part. He has been registered with the Plovdiv Bar Association since 2016.

2. Works. D. Topuzov participates in the associated professor competition with the monograph "**Principles of European Family Law and the Possibilities for Development of Bulgarian Property-Marital Legislation**" published by Ciela Publishing House in 2024, a co-authored monograph, and 13 articles published after the defense of the doctor's dissertation. Almost all publications are on problems of family law.

2.1. The monograph *Principles of European Family Law and the Possibilities for Development of Bulgarian Property-Marital Legislation* contains 302 pages and consists of an introduction, three chapters, and a conclusion. A list of literature used and the text of the Principles regarding the property relations between the spouses being examined are attached thereto.

The matter examined in the work is poorly known to Bulgarian legal literature. There are only several articles on this topic and therefore the fact that this is the first monograph research dedicated to the Principles of European Family Law is a positive one per se.

The first part of Chapter One is dedicated to the Commission on European Family Law (the Commission). The author provides detailed information regarding the establishment, composition, nature, functions and purposes of the Commission. He underlies that it is independent from the European Union, the Council of Europe, other organizations as well as from the countries whose law is the subject matter of research. This is a scientific project aiming to set up a basis for synchronization of the family law in the individual European countries.

The second part of Chapter One outlines the Principles of European Family Law (the Principles) drafted by the Commission as the author points out that they are divided into five groups and outlines the main content of each of them.

Albeit it is informative in nature the first chapter is important and useful for the reader. To a great extent the development of the Principles and their role are unknown to the law community and the work provides focused and structured knowledge on this matter. Alongside, some conclusions have been made that constitute contributions regarding the legal nature of the Principles. The author emphasizes that as far as they are created by am organization without legislative competence the Principles are not binding in nature. Despite

that they have "certain regulatory function" as the author refers them to the so-called "*soft law*". The finding that the Principles are constructed not so much based on the method of dominant law but mostly by using the method of the better law is important.

The second chapter is entitled "General Assessment of the Compliance of Bulgarian regulation of Property-Marital Relations with the Principles of European Family Law". In this chapter the author focuses on the general principles related to the property-marital relations; examines in detail each of them and compares it to the Bulgarian family legislation in force, and draws a conclusion regarding the existence or lack of compliance. This analysis is important because it show where the Bulgarian legislation stands in comparison with the law of other European countries.

In *the third chapter* "Prospects for Improvement of the Regulation of Property-Marital Obligations", on the basis of the analysis made in the second chapter, the author makes some proposals on changes to the Family Code.

This chapter most clearly shows the author's in-depth knowledge of the family law and his skill of performing a serious legal analysis. The proposals *de lege ferenda* are well-thought and deserve lawmakers' attention. The first recommendation refers to the introduction of general provisions which are valid irrespective of the applicable regime of property relations between the spouses. The author finds that their appropriate systemic place is in Chapter Three "Personal Relations between the Spouses" whose title should be changed. This approach is hardly appropriate. The stand-alone regulation of the personal relations has importance of its own as they are determinant for the remaining relations between them. The regulation of property rules in the same chapter would violate the uniform characteristic and significance of the norms contained in Chapter Three of the Family Code.

As regards the principle "Contribution to the Needs of the Family" D. Topuzov finds a high degree of compliance with the Bulgarian regulation contained mostly in article 17 of the Family Code. A deviation is found as regards the responsibility of the spouses assumed for the needs of the family. According to the author it is sufficient if both of them are responsible without stipulating joint responsibility. The author's assertion that a covenant in the marriage contract stipulating spouses' participation in satisfying the family needs other than the one stipulated in article 17 of the Family Code would be null because it would contradict the law is correct in my opinion. Of course, it should be clarified that such an agreement is possible if the criterion stipulated in the law is specified in monetary terms: depending on the personal abilities.

According to the author there is another incompliance with the Principles and a gap in our legislation because of the fact that the Family Code does not stipulate funds for overcoming the failure of any of the spouses to fulfill his/her obligation to contribute according to his/her abilities to family's welfare (article 17). He proposes that a claim for the fulfillment of that obligation be formulated in article 17 of the Family Code. The obligation to contribute to the family's welfare is a manifestation of the equality between the spouses and aims, first

and foremost, at pointing out the fact that it does not consist in quantitative equalization of the financial contribution. It is not about an obligation of one of the spouses to the other but about a joint commitment of both spouses for the benefit of the family as a whole.

By comparing the principle regarding the protection of family home with the Bulgarian regulation the author finds that the latter is more narrow: article 26 of the Family Code applies only with respect to the residence (without the household goods) and if it is personal property of one of the spouses. According to the author the protection must apply for all property regimes, including the contractual one, and irrespective of the property to the things, as the consequence of breaching it should be the nullity thereof.

In relation to the principle of "Representation" it is proposed that court empowerment of one of the spouses to represent the other one when the latter is unable to express his/her opinion but has not been placed under interdiction, be introduced. Indeed, this is an important problem which, however, is a general one and does not manifest itself only in the property relations between spouses. Therefore, its regulation should hardly be made among the property relations between spouses.

In summary, the work proposes a number of ideas that are new for the Bulgarian family law, which, regardless of whether they are supported on their merits, are interesting, well-founded and deserve to be thought over *de lege ferenda*. I would recommend that the author look for and draw more arguments (especially as regard the protection of the family home) from the practice of the courts.

*2.2. The co-authored monograph „*Republic of Bulgaria" – In: International Encyclopedia of Laws: Family and Succession Law, edited by Walter Pintens, Alphe van den Rijn, NL: Kluwer Law International, 2019, ISBN 978-90-654-4888 (co-authors: V. Todorova and S. Stavru). The work is an overall presentation of the regulation of Bulgarian law of the person, family and succession law. It is intended mostly for foreigners and gives full and accurate information about the legal regulation in Bulgaria.

2.3. Articles submitted for participation in the competition
Some of the articles (No. No. 1, 5, 9, 11, 12) examine matters included in the said monograph and therefore they shall not be expressly mentioned. However, it should be taken into consideration that there is no complete overlapping. For instance the article regarding the protection of the family home (No. 9 and No. 12) examines the matter in much more detail and with much more arguments while it is merely outlines in the monograph. The situation with the article under No. 11 regarding the representation between spouses is similar.

The article "Will the effect of the chosen property-matrimonial regime be suspended in case that any of the spouses is subsequently placed under interdiction?" is an interesting one. It is published in *Брак и 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], pp.76-93, ISBN 978-619-202-730-8. The author maintains that if one of the spouses is placed under interdiction the effect of the marriage contract concluded before that is suspended and the legal regime of community applies. The author finds that it provides the weaker party with better protection.

The article "Principles of European family law, support and succession rights of couples in de facto unions" In: *Правна мисъл* [Legal Thought], 2021, No. 3-4, pp. 62-77, ISSN 1310-7348 (co-author: Assoc. Prof. Velina Todorova). Although it contains only a presentation of the Principles developed by the Commission on European Family Law this article constitutes a contribution because of the fact that it emphasizes the possibility of application of similar rules for couples who have not entered into marriage.

The article "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, 21 February 2021, has practical importance.

Some important theoretical questions are examined in the article "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, 21 February 2021. The criticism of the Judgment delivered on Commercial Case 3/2015 is convincing. It contains some important reasoning on the question of the scope of transformation of spouses' personal property, which was supported by the recently delivered judgment on Commercial Case No. 2/2022.

The article "Problems of testamentary capacity" In: *Ius Romanum*, No 1/2020; Hereditas, pp. 335-358, makes an in-depth comparison between the general civil capacity to act and the testamentary capacity. The conclusion that the testamentary capacity does not need an extension by means of interpretation is justified.

The article "Is post-divorce spousal maintenance in Bulgarian law obsolete?" In: Rogerson, C., J. Miles, P. Parkinson, M. Antonoskolskaia (eds.) Family Law and Family Realities. Conference book – 16th World Conference of the International Society of Family Law. Eleven International Publishing, 2019, examines the regulation of support between former spouses in the Family Code. The comparative law study on the matter and the author's conclusion that the regulation of the examined relations in Bulgaria is outdated and does not comply with the specifics of contemporary family constitute contributions.

In the article "On the form of validity of the marriage contract" In: *Собственост и право* [Property and Law], 2018, No. 2, pp. 43-51, the author gives a substantiated answer to two material questions: whether a marriage contract concluded in a form more onerous than the required one (notarized) and whether the parties may agree on the form of validity.

The article "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." In: *Собственост и право* [Property and Law], 2016, No. 6, pp. 41-47, deals with an important question. The author states his view on the matter posed in Interpretative Judgment No. 3/2015 of the General Meeting of Civil Colleges of the Supreme Court of Cassation. The problem is also discussed in the aforesaid article that contains a broader overview of the court practice.

The scientific works of Chief Assistant Professor Dimitar Topuzov submitted for the competition meet the requirements of the law. They contain a number of scientific contributions. D. Topuzov displays thorough knowledge of civil and family law, skill to analyze the legal norms in their interconnection and to formulate his legal views with convincing arguments. He operates with rich scientific apparatus by honestly contending other authors' opinions. The author makes numerous appropriate proposals taking into account the practical applicability of his theses.

The disagreement with some of the proposals made by D. Topuzov does not reduce the scientific value of his works. On the contrary, the fact that they give rise to scientific dispute shows that the analyzed problems are important and presented in such manner that they give rise to interest and discussion.

III. Comparison of the Two Applications

1. Main indicators under article 26, paragraph 1 in relation to article 26, paragraph 2 of Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria Act and Annex No. 1 to article 1a, paragraph 1 of the Rules on the Implementation of the Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria Act

The candidate **Ivan Petkov Mangachev, PhD, has a total of 580 points**, as follows: under letter A – dissertation thesis for the award of the educational and scientific degree of "Doctor": 50 points; under letter C – habilitation work – monograph – 100 points; under letter D – scientific publications: 240 points; under letter E – citations: 190 points.

The candidate **Chief Assistant Professor Dimitar Simeonov Topuzov, PhD, has a total of 750 points**, as follows: under letter A – dissertation thesis for the award of the educational and scientific degree of "Doctor": 50 points; under letter C – habilitation work – monograph – 100 points; under letter D – scientific publications: 245 points; under letter E – citations: 355 points.

Both candidates meet and exceed the minimum requirements.

The difference between them is 170 points in favor of candidate D. Topuzov.

As regards the formal difference of the points under the main indicators I would add the considerably higher quality of the scientific production of D. Topuzov. Iv. Mangachev's habilitation work has certain cognitive function regarding a phenomenon that is unknown to the broad legal community but it lacks well-structured presentation in legal & logical terms, author's own clear definitions of the terms used by him; the legal analysis is incomplete. The work of D. Topuzov provides full and very well arranged information regarding the Commission on European Family Law and the principles developed by it. The comparison between them and the Bulgarian family law in force provides a basis for the numerous logical and well-founded proposals made as regards amending the legislation. Some of them launch ideas that are innovative for Bulgarian law.

2. Additional Indicators within the meaning of article 27, paragraph 4 of Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria Act

According to the said provision the additional indicators matter only in the event of a draw of the main indicators which is not the case here. Notwithstanding this, in this case it is important to take into account the candidates' **academic work**.

In terms of the remaining additional indicators, although both candidates have provided information, it is not confirmed by documents and there is no objective basis for comparison.

As evident from the submitted certificate Ivan Mangachev, PhD, taught at New Bulgarian University from 2004 to 2022[3] where he led courses in commercial law and related subjects. There is no information about the specific number of hours. In some places it is specified that these are seminars but for most of them it is not specific whether they are lectures or seminars.

As evident from the submitted certificate Dimitar Topuzov, PhD, has been chief assistant professor in Civil and Family Law at the Faculty of Law of Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv from 2016 to the present[4]. He has led seminars in Family and Succession Law and in Civil Law, General Part, as well as lectures in the same subjects to full-time and correspondence students. The certificate specifies the number of hours for each academic year.

As regards the teaching activity I would give preference to D. Topuzov. It is true that his length of service in teaching is shorter but he is considerably younger and almost all of his teaching service (except for the period 2011-2013) has been teaching one at the same

[3] It should be noted that in his CV I. Mangachev points out that he was chief assistant professor at New Bulgarian University from 2005 to 2019 while the length of service recorded in his employment record book is one year (2005-2006) as assistant professor at New Bulgarian University. The latter can probably be explained by the fact that only the main employment contract is recorded in the employment record book.

[4] In this case too there is a discrepancy between the certificate and the CV as in the latter it is stated that D. Topuzov was assistant professor in the period 2014-2016.

educational institution. He is currently chief assistant professor at Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv. One can see persistence and attitude towards teaching as his main occupation. In addition, it is important that in the course of his entire length of service D. Topuzov has taught Family and Succession Law and in Civil Law, General Part full-time. His entire scientific production is in this field while Iv. Mangachev's works and teaching activity are in the field of Commercial and Banking Law.

The latter circumstance is one of essential importance since the competition for "associate professor" in Civil and Family Law is announced for ensured teaching load of 188 hours per academic year in the mandatory subjects of Family and Succession Law and Civil Status Acts.

D. Topuzov's participation in the preparation of a teaching aid (collection of cases) in Family and Succession Law which has undergone three editions should also be taken into account.

IV. Conclusion

On the grounds of article 26, paragraph 3 in relation to article 26, paragraph 1 of Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria Act I find that the application of Chief Assistant Professor Dimitar Simeonov Topuzov, PhD, satisfies to a greater extent the requirements for holding the academic position of "Associate Professor" in Civil and Family Law at the Faculty of Law of Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv and I propose the following ranking of the candidates in the competition:
- ranked first: Chief Assistant Professor Dimitar Simeonov Topuzov, PhD;
- ranked second: Ivan Petkov Mangachev, PhD.

In view of the aforesaid and on the grounds of article 26, paragraph 3 ЗРАСРБ, article 57, paragraph 3 of the Rules on the Implementation of the Development of the Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria Act and article 68, paragraph 3 and article 69, paragraph 1 of Rules on Development of the Academic Staff of the University of Plovdiv, I propose to the academic jury to adopt a decision by virtue of which Chief Assistant Professor Dimitar Simeonov Topuzov, PhD, be elected to hold the academic position of "Associate Professor" at Paisiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv in the field of higher education: 3. Social, Economic and Legal Sciences; professional line: 3.6 Law, scientific subject: Civil and Family Law.

Respectfully yours, [digital signature]
Assoc. Prof. Anna Staneva, PhD
10 March 2025