

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

FIFTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 7117/10
Stanislav UJČIČ
against Slovenia

The European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section), sitting on 26 June 2012 as a Committee composed of:

Ann Power-Forde, *President,*
Boštjan M. Zupančič,
Angelika Nußberger, *judges,*

and Stephen Phillips, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 4 February 2010,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

The applicant, Mr Stanislav Ujčič, is an Slovenian national, who was born in 1958 and lives in Slovenska Bistrica. He is represented before the Court by Odvetniška Družba Matoz O.P. D.O.O., a law firm practising in Koper.

The Slovenian Government ("the Government") are represented by their Agent, Mrs V Klemenc, State Attorney.

A. The circumstances of the case

The facts of the case, as submitted by the parties, may be summarised as follows.

The applicant was serving his sentence in the closed section of Dob Prison between 2 August 2008 and 7 July 2011.

As regards the facilities available to the applicant in the cells and common areas, as well as the health care regime in the prison, the conditions imposed on the applicant regarding activities outside the cells and contact with the outside world in general, see the Court's decision in the case of *Lalić and Others v. Slovenia* (dec.), nos. 5711/10, 5719/10, 5754/10, 5803/10, 5956/10, 5958/10, 5987/10, 6091/10, 6647/10 and 6893/10, 27 September 2011.

Between 7 August 2008 and 6 February 2009 the applicant was held in cell no 5, Block 2 which measured 59.25 square metres and held sixteen inmates (3.70 square metres of personal space available to each inmate). Afterwards he was moved into cell no 10/3, Block 2 which measures 20.67 square metres and held four inmates (5.17 square metres of personal space available to each inmate).

Between August 2008 and December 2010 the applicant was on seventy-eight occasions treated for different health problems in the prison clinic. Between August 2008 and December 2010 the applicant had eleven sessions with a psychiatrist. According to the Government's submissions dated 22 December 2010 the applicant on one occasion sought additional support from the prison psychologist. During the applicant's stay in the Dob Prison the applicant was diagnosed with a type 2 diabetes. According to the report by the prison clinic dated 13 September 2010 the reasons for the development of diabetes were not the alleged mental distress suffered by the applicant while serving his prison sentence but an inherited predisposition and the applicant's obesity. According to the report by the prison clinic dated 7 December 2010 the applicant was prescribed an appropriate treatment with a combination of two drugs and offered a suitable dietary food.

B. Relevant domestic law and practice

For the relevant domestic law and practice, see paragraphs 33-35 and 38-47 of the Court's judgment in the case of *Štrucl and Others v. Slovenia* (nos. 5903/10, 6003/10 and 6544/10, 27 September 2011), and paragraphs 34-36 of *Mandić and Jović v. Slovenia* (nos. 5774/10 and 5985/10, 27 September 2011), *Lalić and Others*, cited above, as well as *Mešić v. Slovenia* (no. 5767/10, 22 November 2011) and *Ferenc v. Slovenia* (no. 6682/10, 13 March 2012).

COMPLAINTS

The applicant complained that the conditions of his detention in Dob Prison amounted to a violation of Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention. In

particular, he complained of severe overcrowding, which had led to a lack of personal space, poor sanitary conditions and inadequate ventilation, as well as excessive restrictions on time spent outside the cell, high temperatures in the cells, inadequate health care and psychological assistance, inadequate measures as regards the rehabilitation of drug addicts, and exposure to violence from other inmates owing to insufficient prison security. He further submitted that the situation amounted to a structural problem, which had been acknowledged by the domestic authorities.

In addition, the applicant complained that he had not received adequate medical treatment, especially in connection with his mental distress and that his mental distress had caused the development of diabetes.

Citing Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention, the applicant also complained of restrictions on visits, telephone conversations and correspondence.

The applicant lastly complained, under Article 13, that he did not have any effective remedy at his disposal as regards his complaints under Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention.

THE LAW

The Court does not find it necessary to examine the Government's objections concerning the issue of exhaustion of domestic remedies and compliance with the six-month rule, as the application should in any event be declared inadmissible for the reasons set out below.

As regards the applicant's complaint that he had not received adequate medical treatment, especially in connection with his mental distress, and that his mental distress had caused the development of diabetes, the Court recalls that Article 3 imposes an obligation on the States to ensure that the health and well-being of detainees are adequately secured by, among other things, providing them with the requisite medical assistance (see *Kudła v. Poland* [GC], no. 30210/96, § 94, ECHR 2000-XI). The Court would further note that information relating to detention often falls within the knowledge of the domestic authorities. Accordingly, applicants might experience certain difficulties in procuring evidence to substantiate a complaint in that connection. Still, in such cases applicants may well be expected to submit at least a detailed account of the facts complained of and to provide – to the greatest possible extent – some evidence in support of their complaints (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Visloguzov v. Ukraine*, no. 32362/02, § 45, 20 May 2010; *Mešić v. Slovenia*, cited above; and *Ferenc v. Slovenia*, cited above).

Turning to the circumstances of the present case, the Court notes that the applicant provided no evidence or details as regards his allegations and also did not dispute the Government's submissions on adequacy of his treatment,

including the submissions that between August 2008 and December 2010 he was on seventy-eight occasions treated in the prison clinic and that he had eleven sessions with the psychiatrist, as well as that he had only on one occasion sought additional support from the prison psychologist. He further did not provide any evidence regarding the alleged interlink between his mental illness, and additional distress caused by his placement in the Dob Prison, and the development of diabetes; neither did he dispute the Government's submissions that he had an inherited predisposition for diabetes. It follows that this complaint is manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention.

As regards the remainder of the applicant's complaints on general conditions of detention in the closed section of Dob Prison, the Court notes that these complaints are identical to those of the applicants in the case of *Lalić and Others* (cited above). In that case the Court has found the general conditions of detention in the closed section of Dob Prison, including the medical and psychological care provided to the prisoners held therein, as well as the arrangements concerning security measures, and the restrictions on maintaining contact with people outside the prison to be adequate *vis-à-vis* the Convention standards. It has accordingly also rejected the applicant's complaint under Article 13 of the Convention, as no arguable claim for the purpose of the aforementioned provision could have been established.

The Court takes note of the similar factual background of the aforementioned case and the present application, including the fact that the present applicant always had sufficient personal space in the cell in which he was detained. It follows that these complaints are manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention.

For these reasons, the Court unanimously

Declares the application inadmissible.

Stephen Phillips Deputy Registrar	Ann Power-Forde President