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

FIFTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 26867/21
Luděk ŠPERLICH
against the Czech Republic
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 19 June 2025 as a Committee composed of:

Andreas Zünd*, President*,
Diana Sârcu,
Mykola Gnatovskyy*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 19 May 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 K. Bocek, a lawyer practising in Frýdek-Místek.

The applicant's complaint under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the right of access to the Constitutional Court were communicated to the Czech 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 that there had been a violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the lack of access to the Constitutional Court resulting from a partial rejection of the applicant's constitutional appeal on

formal grounds. They offered to pay the applicant the amounts 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 amounts 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 these amounts within the above-mentioned three-month period, the Government undertook to pay simple interest on them, 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 and extensive case-law concerning complaints relating to the access to the Czech Constitutional Court (see, for example, *Adamíček v. the Czech Republic*, no. 35836/05, 12 October 2010).

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 absence of any arguments from the applicant to the contrary, the Court has no reasons to consider that the compensation offered by the Government constitutes inadequate or otherwise unreasonable redress for the violation of his Convention rights (see *Ryabkin and Volokitin v. Russia* (dec.), nos. 52166/08 and 8526/09, §§ 49-50, 28 June 2016, and *Igranov and Others v. Russia*, nos. 42399/13 and 8 others, § 24, 20 March 2018, and, for a similar approach, *Antovski and Others v. North Macedonia* (dec.) [Committee], no. 68160/17, 8 December 2022).

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 10 July 2025.

Viktoriya Maradudina Acting Deputy Registrar	Andreas Zünd President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (access to the Constitutional Court)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Date of receipt of Government's declaration	Date of receipt of applicant's comments, if any	Amount awarded for non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros)[1]	Amount awarded for costs and expenses per application (in euros)[2]
26867/21 19/05/2021	**Luděk ŠPERLICH** 1966	Bocek Karel Frýdek-Místek	28/02/2025	-	1,000	500

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