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

THIRD SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 57941/18
NDREKAJ SHPK
against Albania
(see appended table)

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

Peeter Roosma*, President*,
Andreas Zünd,
Oddný Mjöll Arnardóttir*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 5 December 2018,

Having regard to the declaration submitted by the respondent Government requesting the Court to strike the application out of the list of cases,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant's company details are set out in the appended table.

The applicant was represented by Mr Dobjani, a lawyer practising in Tirana.

The applicant's company complaint under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the non-enforcement of the Durres Court of Appeal, decision no. 115 of 9 February 2015, ordering the Municipality of Durres to pay the company certain sums of money arising from a contract for public works was communicated to the Albanian Government ("the Government"). Complaints based on the same facts were also communicated under other provisions of the Convention.

THE LAW

After unsuccessful friendly-settlement negotiations, the Government informed the Court that they proposed to make a unilateral declaration with a

view to resolving the issues raised by these complaints. They further requested the Court to strike out the application in accordance with Article 37 of the Convention.

The Government acknowledged the excessive length of enforcement proceedings. They further acknowledged that the domestic authorities had violated the applicant's rights guaranteed by other provisions of the Convention.

They offered to pay the applicant the amount detailed in the appended table and invited the Court to strike the application out of the list of cases in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention.

The Government further undertook to ensure the enforcement of domestic decisions under consideration in this case within the same three-month period, and to pay any costs of the domestic enforcement proceedings.

The amount would be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable on the date of payment and would be payable within three months from the date of notification of the Court's decision. In the event of failure to pay this amount within the above-mentioned three-month period, the Government undertook to pay simple interest on it, from the expiry of that period until settlement, at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points.

The payment would constitute the final resolution of the case.

The applicant company was sent the terms of the Government's unilateral declaration several weeks before the date of this decision. The Court has not received a response from the applicant accepting the terms of the declaration.

The Court observes that Article 37 § 1 (c) enables it to strike a case out of its list if:

> "... for any other reason established by the Court, it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application".

Thus, it may strike out applications under Article 37 § 1 (c) on the basis of a unilateral declaration by a respondent Government even if the applicant wishes the examination of the case to be continued (see, in particular, the *Tahsin Acar v. Turkey* judgment (preliminary objections) [GC], no. 26307/95, §§ 75-77, ECHR 2003-VI).

The Court has established clear and extensive case-law concerning complaints relating to the non-enforcement or delayed enforcement of domestic decisions (see, for example, *Qufaj Co. Sh.p.k. v. Albania,* no. 54268/00, 18 November 2004, and *Gjyli v. Albania,* no. 32907/07, 29 September 2009).

Noting the admissions contained in the Government's declaration as well as the amount of compensation proposed – which is consistent with the amounts awarded in similar cases – the Court considers that it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application (Article 37 § 1 (c)).

In the light of the above considerations, the Court is satisfied that respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto does not require it to continue the examination of the application (Article 37 § 1 *in fine*).

Finally, the Court emphasises that, should the Government fail to comply with the terms of their unilateral declaration, the application may be restored to the list in accordance with Article 37 § 2 of the Convention (see *Josipović v. Serbia* (dec.), no. 18369/07, 4 March 2008).

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

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Takes note of the terms of the respondent Government's declaration and of the arrangements for ensuring compliance with the undertakings referred to therein;

Decides to strike the application out of its list of cases in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention.

Done in English and notified in writing on 5 September 2024.

Viktoriya Maradudina	Peeter Roosma
Acting Deputy Registrar	President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (non-enforcement or delayed enforcement of domestic decisions)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Date of registration	Date of receipt of Government's declaration	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage and for costs and expenses (in euros)[1]
57941/18 05/12/2018	**NDREKAJ SHPK** 1996	03/11/2023	3,600

[1] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant