

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

THIRD SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 43967/10
Costin URSU against Romania
and 3 other applications
(see list appended)

The European Court of Human Rights (Third Section), sitting on 2 July 2015 as a Committee composed of:

Luis López Guerra, *President,*
Johannes Silvis,
Valeriu Griţco, *judges,*
and Karen Reid, *Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above applications lodged on the various dates indicated in the appended table,

Having regard to the declarations submitted by the respondent Government requesting the Court to strike the applications out of the list of cases,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The list of applicants is set out in the appended table.

The applicants' complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the excessive length of criminal proceedings were communicated to the Romanian Government ("the Government").

THE LAW

Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single decision.

After unsuccessful friendly-settlement negotiations, the Government informed the Court that they proposed to make unilateral declarations with a

view to resolving the issues raised by these complaints. They further requested the Court to strike out the applications in accordance with Article 37 of the Convention.

The Government acknowledged the excessive length of criminal proceedings. They offered to pay the applicants the amounts detailed in the appended table and invited the Court to strike the applications 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 would constitute the final resolution of the cases.

The Court has not received a response from the applicants 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* judgment ([GC], no. 26307/95, §§ 75-77, ECHR 2003-VI)).

The Court has established in a number of cases, including those brought against Romania, its practice concerning complaints about the violation of one's right to a hearing within a reasonable time (see, for example, *Frydlender v. France* [GC], no. 30979/96, § 43, ECHR 2000-VII and *Vlad and Others v. Romania*, nos. 40756/06, 41508/07 and 50806/07, §§ 131-133 and 161, 26 November 2013).

Noting the admissions contained in the Government's declarations 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 applications (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 applications (Article 37 § 1 *in fine*).

Finally, the Court emphasises that, should the Government fail to comply with the terms of their unilateral declarations, the applications 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 cases out of the list.

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Decides to join the applications;

Takes note of the terms of the respondent Government's declarations and of the arrangements for ensuring compliance with the undertakings referred to therein;

Decides to strike the applications out of its list of cases in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention.

Done in English and notified in writing on 23 July 2015.

Karen Reid
Registrar

Luis López Guerra
President

APPENDIX

No.	Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant name Date of birth	Date of receipt of Government's declaration	Date of receipt of applicant's comments, if any	Amount awarded for pecuniary, non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros)[1]
1.	43967/10 29/06/2010	**Costin URSU** 03/02/1971	02/04/2015	26/05/2015	810
2.	47996/13 18/07/2013	**Ioan VARTOLOMEI** 08/07/1977	02/04/2015	27/05/2015	1,620
3.	55699/13 16/08/2013	**Gabriel Narcis CHIRA** 28/09/1978	10/04/2015	18/05/2015	1,620
4.	69088/13 25/10/2013	**Mihai DARIE** 15/05/1962	10/04/2015	29/05/2015	810

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