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

FIFTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 20768/04
Sergey Alekseyevich PETRISHYN
against Ukraine

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 1 July 2014 as a Committee composed of:

Angelika Nußberger, *President,*
Ganna Yudkivska,
André Potocki, *judges,*

and Stephen Phillips, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 22 May 2004,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant, Mr Sergey Alekseyevich Petrishyn, is a Ukrainian national, who was born in 1965 and lives in the village of Kizilovoye, Ukraine.

The Ukrainian Government ("the Government") were represented by their Agent, most recently, Ms Nataly Sevostianova, of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine.

The applicant's complaint under Article 6 of the Convention about the excessive length of proceedings was 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 letters dated 18 September and 20 December 2013, sent by registered post, the applicant was notified that the period allowed for submission of his observations had expired on 26 July 2013 and that no extension of time had been requested. The applicant'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. No response has been received.

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

Angelika Nußberger
President