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

# FIFTH SECTION

# DECISION

Application no. 77969/14
Aleksey Aleksandrovich DENDEVICH against Ukraine
and 4 other applications
(see appended table)[1]

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 11 July 2024 as a Committee composed of:

Carlo Ranzoni*, President*,
Mārtiņš Mits,
María Elósegui*, 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 and main Convention complaints raised by them is set out in the appendix.

The applicants' complaints under the Convention were communicated to the Ukrainian Government ("the Government"), who submitted observations on the admissibility and merits. The observations were forwarded to the applicants, who were invited to submit their own observations (see the appended table for dates and details). No reply was received by the Court.

By letters sent through the Court's electronic communication service (eComms) and by registered post, the applicants were notified that the period allowed for submission of their observations had expired and that no extension of time had been requested (see appended table for dates and details).

The applicants' attention was drawn to Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention, which provides that the Court may strike an application out of

[1] The case has been restored to the list of cases in respect of application no. 60048/16 on 2 July 2026.

its list of cases where the circumstances lead to the conclusion that the applicant does not intend to pursue the application. No reply followed.

## 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.

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.

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 5 September 2024.

| | |
|---|---|
| Viktoriya Maradudina | Carlo Ranzoni |
| Acting Deputy Registrar | President |

# APPENDIX

## List of applications

| No. | Application no.<br>Case name<br>Introduction date | Applicant's name<br>Year of birth<br>Place of residence | Representative's name<br>Location | Last letter from the applicant received | Main complaints raised | Reasons for a strike-out decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 77969/14<br>Dendevich v. Ukraine<br>27/11/2014 | **Aleksey Aleksandrovich DENDEVICH**<br>1965<br>Mykolayiv | | 27/01/2022 | Articles 3 and 6: the applicant alleged that he had been ill-treated by law-enforcement agents; that the investigation of his relevant complaints was ineffective; and that the criminal proceedings against him were unfair. | The applicant did not activate eComms and did not respond to numerous telephone calls. On 16 February 2024 the Registry's registered letter sent to the applicant's correspondence address in Mykolayiv (a town controlled by the Government) indicated in his last letter to the Court in 2022 returned as "unclaimed". |
| 2. | 47282/15<br>Tsarenko v. Ukraine<br>31/08/2015 | **Roman Ivanovych TSARENKO**<br>1986<br>Osytnyashka | Igor Yuriyovych IVASHCHENKO<br>Kirovograd (Kropyvnytskyy) | 27/01/2021 | Article 3: the applicant alleged that he had been ill-treated by law-enforcement agents and that the investigation of his relevant complaints was ineffective. | The applicant's representative failed to respond to the Registry's letters of 5 October 2022 and 23 October 2023, sent to him through eComms and eventually downloaded, inviting him to submit observations on the admissibility and merits and drawing his attention to the fact that failure to respond may lead to a decision to strike the application out of the Court's list. On 30/01/2024 the applicant himself received the Registry's letter sent by registered post, including a strike-out warning, to which he failed to respond. |
| 3. | 60048/16<br>Krasnov v. Ukraine<br>06/10/2016 | **Stanislav Oleksandrovych KRASNOV**<br>1986<br>Chubynske | Andriy Olegovych DOMANSKYY<br>Kyiv | 25/08/2021 | Articles 3 and 6: the applicant alleged that he had been ill-treated by law-enforcement agents; that the investigation of his relevant complaints was ineffective; and that the length of the criminal proceedings against him was inordinate. | The applicant's representative failed to respond to the Registry's letters of 13 July and 19 October 2023, sent to him through eComms and eventually downloaded, inviting him to submit observations on the admissibility and merits and drawing his attention to the fact that failure to respond may lead to a decision to strike the application out of the Court's list. On 9 February 2024 the applicant himself received the Registry's letter sent by registered post, including a strike-out warning, to which he failed to respond. |

| No. | Application no.<br>Case name<br>Introduction date | Applicant's name<br>Year of birth<br>Place of residence | Representative's name<br>Location | Last letter from the applicant received | Main complaints raised | Reasons for a strike-out decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | 42783/19<br>Tsygankov v. Ukraine<br>01/08/2019 | **Andriy Igorovych TSYGANKOV**<br>1967<br>Kyiv | | 01/08/2019 | Articles 6 and 8: the applicant complained that a court order obliging a telecommunications operator to disclose to prosecutorial authorities a wide range of his telecommunications data was neither lawful nor necessary. | The applicant did not activate an eComms account and did not respond to the Registry's letter of 12 January 2024 received by his authorised agent on 6 February 2024 warning him that the time-limit for submitting observations on the admissibility and merits of the application had expired and drawing his attention to the fact that failure to respond may lead to a decision to strike the application out of the Court's list. |
| 5. | 42784/19<br>Plisa v. Ukraine<br>01/08/2019 | **Nataliya Mykhaylivna PLISA**<br>1969<br>Kyiv | | 01/08/2019 | Articles 6 and 8: the applicant complained that a court order obliging a telecommunications operator to disclose to prosecutorial authorities a wide range of her telecommunications data was neither lawful nor necessary. | The applicant failed to respond to the Registry's letter of 2 June 2023, sent to her through eComms and eventually downloaded, inviting her to submit observations on the admissibility and merits of the application. She also failed to respond to the Registry's letters of 23 October 2023 (sent by eComms) and of 12 January 2024 (sent by registered post and received by her authorised agent on 6 February 2024) drawing her attention to the fact that failure to respond may lead to a decision to strike the application out of the Court's list. |