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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 3815/21
Dušanka PIPUŠ
against Slovenia
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 23 March 2023 as a Committee composed of:

Alena Poláčková*, President*,
Gilberto Felici,
Raffaele Sabato*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 4 January 2021,

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 details are set out in the appended table.

The applicant was represented by Mr P. Prus Pipuš, a lawyer practising in Maribor.

The applicant's complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention concerning the lack of effective proceedings to challenge the cancellation of the applicant's subordinated bonds were communicated to the Slovenian Government ("the Government").

THE LAW

The Court notes that the applicant in the present case raised complaints under Articles 6 and 13 of the Convention about the lack of an effective remedy or procedure to challenge the Bank of Slovenia's measures divesting her of her subordinated bonds. These complaints are similar to those in *Pintar and Others v. Slovenia* (nos. 49969/14 and 4 others, §§ 68 and 69,

14 September 2021) where the Court decided that this issue be considered under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1.

The Government informed the Court that they proposed to make a unilateral declaration with a view to resolving the issues raised by this complaint. They further requested the Court to strike out the application in accordance with Article 37 of the Convention.

The Government acknowledged the lack of effective proceedings to challenge the cancellation of the applicant's subordinated bonds. 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 amount 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 will constitute the final resolution of the case.

The applicant 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 case-law concerning complaints relating to the lack of effective proceedings to challenge the Bank of Slovenia's extraordinary measures leading to cancellation of the subordinated bonds and shares (see *Pintar and Others v. Slovenia*, nos. 49969/14 and 4 others, 14 September 2021).

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 13 April 2023.

Viktoriya Maradudina Acting Deputy Registrar	Alena Poláčková President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention (extraordinary measures by national bank cancelling shares and bonds)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Date of receipt of the Government's declaration	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses (in euros)[1]
3815/21 04/01/2021	**Dušanka PIPUŠ** 1940	Prus Pipuš Peter Maribor	17 October 2022	3,800

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