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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 4629/08
Pavel Nikolayevich MIKHALEV
against Russia

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 26 August 2014 as a Committee composed of:
Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, *President,*
Paulo Pinto de Albuquerque,
Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos, *judges,*
and Søren C. Prebensen, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*
Having regard to the above application lodged on 29 December 2007,
Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant, Mr Pavel Nikolayevich Mikhalev, is a Russian national, who was born in 1967 and lived before his arrest in Moscow.

The Russian Government ("the Government") were represented by Mr G. Matyushkin, the Representative of the Russian Federation at the European Court of Human Rights.

The applicant complained in particular under Article 6 of the Convention.

The applicant's complaint under Article 6 of the Convention was communicated to the Government.

On 16 January 2013 the Court requested the applicant's representative to submit a duly filled authority form. No response had been received to this letter.

On 17 April and 2 May 2014 two letters were sent by the Court to the Correctional Colony No. 3 in Fornosovo, Leningrad Region, which had been indicated as the applicant's address in the application form.

By the letters of 14 and 26 May 2014 the administration of the Correctional Colony No. 3 in Fornosovo returned the Court's letter

unopened. The cover letters attached to the returns indicated that the applicant had never served his sentence in the Correctional Colony No. 3.

THE LAW

The Court considers that, in these circumstances, the applicant may be regarded as failing to communicate his current postal address to the Court and thus 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.

Søren C. Prebensen
Acting Deputy Registrar

Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska
President