

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

FIFTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 20771/06
by Tomáš GRIMM
against the Czech Republic

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 11 January 2011 as a Committee composed of:

Mark Villiger, *President,*
Karel Jungwiert,
Isabelle Berro-Lefèvre, *judges,*

and Stephen Phillips, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 10 May 2006,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

The application was lodged by Mr Tomáš Grimm, a Czech national who was born in 1978 and lives in Varnsdorf. He is represented before the Court by Mr L. Ejem, a lawyer practising in Česká Lípa. The Czech Government ("the Government") were represented by their Agent, Mr V.A. Schorm, from the Ministry of Justice.

The applicants complained under Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention about the length of civil proceedings and functioning of the new domestic remedy in this respect.

The applicant's complaints under these provisions were 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 4 August 2010, sent by registered post, the applicant's representative was notified that the period allowed for submission of his observations had expired on 15 July 2010 and that no extension of time had been requested. The applicant's representative'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 Registry has not received the advice of receipt confirming the notification of the letter. The applicant's representative has not submitted the written observations to date.

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.

Stephen Phillips
Deputy Registrar

Mark Villiger
President