

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

FIFTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 14503/07
Nina Leonidovna NATAROVA
against Ukraine

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 10 May 2016 as a Committee composed of:

André Potocki, *President,*
Ganna Yudkivska,
Síofra O'Leary, *judges,*

and Milan Blaško, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 15 March 2007,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

The applicant, Ms Nina Leonidovna Natarova, is a Ukrainian national, who was born in 1951 and lives in Lugansk.

The facts of the case, as submitted by the applicant, may be summarised as follows.

On 14 November 2002 the applicant instituted proceedings in the Artemivskyy District Court of Lugansk against her former husband seeking recognition of her title to part of a flat. She further requested the court to invalidate a contract by which her former husband had transferred the disputed part of the flat to his daughter.

On 16 October 2003 the court rejected the applicant's claims as unsubstantiated.

On 14 April 2004 and 7 November 2006, respectively, the Lugansk Regional Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court upheld that judgment.

COMPLAINTS

The applicant complained under Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention about the outcome of the proceedings, alleging that the courts had misinterpreted the facts and had wrongly applied the law. The applicant complained under Article 6 § 1 that the proceedings in her case had not been completed within "a reasonable time". She also complained under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 on account of the outcome of the proceedings.

THE LAW

1. The applicant complained about the length of the proceedings. She invoked Article 6 § 1 of the Convention which reads, in so far as relevant, as follows:

> "In the determination of his civil rights and obligations ... everyone is entitled to a ... hearing within a reasonable time by [a] ... tribunal ..."

The Court notes that the proceedings in question started on 14 November 2002 and ended on 7 November 2006. They, therefore, lasted for 3 years, 11 months and 24 days before courts at three levels of jurisdiction.

The Court considers that the overall length of the proceedings at issue did not in the circumstances exceed what may be considered "reasonable".

It follows that this complaint is manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention.

2. The Court has examined the remainder of the applicant's complaints. However, having regard to all the material in its possession, it finds that these complaints do not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms set out in the Convention or its Protocols.

It follows that this part of the application must be rejected as being manifestly ill-founded, pursuant to Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention.

For these reasons, the Court unanimously

Declares the application inadmissible.

Done in English and notified in writing on 2 June 2016.

Milan Blaško
Deputy Registrar

André Potocki
President