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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 18440/18
Robert Bogdan SKOCZEŃ
against Poland
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 8 September 2022 as a Committee composed of:

Erik Wennerström*, President,*
Krzysztof Wojtyczek*,*
Lorraine Schembri Orland*, judges,*

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 11 April 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 details are set out in the appended table.

The applicant's complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention about the excessive length of proceedings in his case and under Article 13 of the Convention about the lack of any effective remedy in domestic law were communicated to the Polish Government ("the Government").

THE LAW

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 the proceedings and the lack of any effective remedy in domestic law. 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 Government further undertook to adopt a range of general measures in respect of other persons who were victims of similar violations or might be affected by similar violations in the future.

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. He did not accept 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 an application 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, *Tahsin Acar v. Turkey* (preliminary issue) [GC], no. 26307/95, §§ 75-77, ECHR 2003-VI).

The Court has established clear and extensive case-law concerning complaints relating to the excessive length of civil and criminal proceedings and the lack of an effective remedy (see, for example, *Rutkowski and Others v. Poland*, nos. 72287/10 and 2 others, §§ 160 and 186, 7 July 2015, with further references).

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 against Poland – the Court considers that it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application (Article 37 § 1 (c); see also the conclusions reached in the first group of cases submitted in the pilot-judgment procedure *Załuska and Rogalska v. Poland and 398 other applications* (dec.), nos. 53491/10 and 72286/10, §§ 48-55, 20 June 2017).

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 29 September 2022.

Viktoriya Maradudina Acting Deputy Registrar	Erik Wennerström President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 and Article 13 of the Convention (excessive length of criminal proceedings and lack of any effective remedy in domestic law)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Date of receipt of Government's declaration	Date of receipt of applicant's comments	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in Polish Zloty PLN)[1]
18440/18 11/04/2018	**Robert Bogdan SKOCZEŃ** 1979	25/06/2020	10/05/2021	20,980

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