EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

FIFTH SECTION

DECISION

Applications nos. 48314/15 and 59485/16
Nataliya Volodymyrivna BOLBAS against Ukraine
and Anatoliy Stepanovych CHEREDNICHENKO against Ukraine
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 23 January 2025 as a Committee composed of:

Diana Sârcu*, President*,
Kateřina Šimáčková,
Mykola Gnatovskyy*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above applications lodged on the various dates indicated in the appended table,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The list of the applicants is set out in the appendix.

At the time of lodging of the applications the applicants resided on the territory which is currently not controlled by the Ukrainian Government ("the Government") and where Ukrainian or international postal services do not operate.

The applicants complained under various Articles of the Convention (see appended table). The Court's attempts to reach the applicants through the Court's Electronic Communication Service (eComms) and by phone were unsuccessful (see appended table for details). As a result, the Court has no other means to reach the applicants.

The applicants themselves have not contacted the Court since 2016.

THE LAW

Having regard to the similar procedural conduct of the applicants, the Court finds it appropriate to examine the applications jointly in a single decision.

The Court notes that all the available means to contact the applicants have been tried without success. The applicants did not provide the Court with any new contact information which could have allowed the Court to conduct further proceedings.

In the light of the foregoing, the Court concludes that the applicants may be regarded as no longer wishing to pursue the applications (Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention). Furthermore, in accordance with Article 37 § 1 *in fine*, the Court finds no special circumstances regarding respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto which require the continued examination of the applications (see *Bryska and Others v. Ukraine* [Committee] (dec.), nos. 11706/13 and 5 others, 23 November 2023).

The Court, however, reiterates that under Article 37 § 2 of the Convention it may decide to restore an application to its list of cases if it considers that the circumstances justify such a course.

In view of the above, it is appropriate to strike the cases out of the list.

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Decides to join the applications;

Decides to strike the applications out of its list of cases.

Done in English and notified in writing on 13 February 2025.

Viktoriya Maradudina	Diana Sârcu
Acting Deputy Registrar	President

APPENDIX

List of applications

No.	Application no. Introduction date	Applicant Year of Birth	Main complaints raised	Reasons for a strike-out decision
1.	48314/15 19/01/2016	**Nataliya Volodymyrivna BOLBAS** 1971	The present case concerns the applicant's complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention regarding the excessive length of civil proceedings and the non-enforcement of a final court decision.	On 13/11/2023 the applicant was requested to confirm whether she maintained her application before the Court; her attention was drawn to Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention, which provides that the Court may strike a case out of its list of cases where the circumstances lead to the conclusion that the applicant does not intend to pursue the application. However, the relevant letter of the Court, sent through the Court's Electronic Communication Service (eComms), was not downloaded by the applicant. The Registry's numerous attempts to reach her by phone in 2023-2024 were unsuccessful. It is also impossible to reach the applicant by post since she lives on the occupied territories of Ukraine where no postal services are functioning. It follows that there is no effective contact with the applicant.
2.	59485/16 30/09/2016	**Anatoliy Stepanovych CHEREDNICHENKO** 1955	The present case concerns the applicant's complaints under Articles 1, 2 and 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 that the Supreme Court of Ukraine by its resolution quashed the judgment in his favour in breach of the principle of legal certainty, which also resulted in that he was unlawfully and disproportionately deprived of his possessions.	On 02/08/2023 the applicant was requested to confirm whether he maintained his application before the Court; his attention was drawn to Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention, which provides that the Court may strike a case out of its list of cases where the circumstances lead to the conclusion that the applicant does not intend to pursue the application. However, the relevant letter of the Court, sent through the Court's Electronic Communication Service (eComms), was not downloaded by the applicant. The Registry's numerous attempts to reach him by phone in 2024 were unsuccessful. It is also impossible to reach the applicant by post since he lives on the occupied territories of Ukraine where no postal services are functioning. It follows that there is no effective contact with the applicant.