In the commentary, a critical opinion was expressed about the conclusion presented in the judgement of the Supreme Court that Article 337a(1) of the Criminal Procedure Code is a special regulation in relation to Article 350(4) of the Code, thus informing the injured party about the date of the court hearing should take place only after the injured party has brought a motion to be informed about the hearing. In the Commentator’s opinion, Article 337a(1) *in principio* of the Code is affected by an obvious legislative error following from a mechanical implementation of the directive of the European Parliament and the Council 2012/29/EU of 25 October 2012. Article 337a(1) *in principio* of the Code is contrary to existing and unrevoke regulations concerning the information of the injured party about the court hearing and the legal effects of the lack of such information, and it reduces the procedural safeguards of the injured party. Its application leads to undermining the principle of legal certainty. Critical remarks concern also the lack of an attempt on the part of the Supreme Court to give interpretation allowing to eliminate discrepancies between Articles 350(4) and 337a(1) of the Criminal Procedure Code that conditions the application of the rule of conflict *lex posterior derogat legi priori*. In the conclusion, the Commentator argues that Article 350(4) of the Code is *lex specialis.*