

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

FIFTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 35456/14
Petro Ivanovych SOROKOPUD
against Ukraine

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 17 November 2016 as a Committee composed of:

Khanlar Hajiyev, *President,*
Faris Vehabović,
Carlo Ranzoni, *judges,*
and Hasan Bakırcı, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on the date indicated in the appended table,

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 Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention concerning the excessive length of criminal proceedings and the lack of any effective remedy in domestic law were communicated to the Ukrainian Government ("the Government"). Further 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 criminal proceedings and the lack of any effective remedy in domestic law. 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 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 will constitute the final resolution of the case.

The Court has not received a response from the applicant which accepts the terms of the unilateral 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 applications".

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 applicants wish the examination of the cases to be continued (see the principles emerging from the Court's case-law, and in particular the *Tahsin Acar v. Turkey* (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 excessive length of criminal proceedings (see, for example, *Merit v. Ukraine,* no. 66561/01, 30 March 2004).

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 (*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 8 December 2016.

Hasan Bakırcı
Deputy Registrar

Khanlar Hajiyev
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)

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant name Date of birth	Other complaints under well-established case-law	Date of receipt of Government's declaration	Date of receipt of applicant's comments, if any	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros)[i]
1.	35456/14 30/04/2014	**Petro Ivanovych SOROKOPUD** 28/08/1954	Prot. 4 Art. 2 (1) - excessive length of obligation not to abscond	10/03/2016		2,070

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