

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

THIRD SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 10549/08
Aleksandrs BOSOLĀJEVS
against Latvia

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting on 10 April 2012 as a Committee composed of:

Ján Šikuta, *President,*
Nona Tsotsoria,
Mihai Poalelungi, *judges,*

and Marialena Tsirli, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 28 January 2008,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

The applicant, Mr Aleksandrs Bosolājevs, is a Latvian national who was born in 1973 and is currently serving a life-sentence in Daugavgrīva Prison. The Latvian Government ("the Government") were represented by their Agent, Mrs I. Reine.

The applicant complained among other things under Article 3 of the Convention about the maximum-security regime for life-sentenced prisoners.

This complaint was communicated to the Government, who submitted their observations on the admissibility and merits. The observations were forwarded to the applicant, who was invited to submit his own observations. No reply was received to the Registry's letter.

By letter dated 7 February 2011, sent by registered post, the applicant was notified that the period allowed for submission of his observations had

expired on 7 January 2011 and that no extension of time had been requested. The applicant's 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. The applicant did not respond to this letter.

THE LAW

The Court considers that, in these circumstances, the applicant may be regarded as no longer wishing to pursue his application, within the meaning of 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 its Protocols which require the continued examination of the case.

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

For these reasons, the Court unanimously

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

Marialena Tsirli	Ján Šikuta
Deputy Registrar	President