CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

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

## FOURTH SECTION

## DECISION

## AS TO THE ADMISSIBILITY OF

Application no. 73191/01
by Genowefa WIKTOROWICZ
against Poland

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting on 18 October 2005 as a Chamber composed of:

Sir Nicolas BRATZA, *President*,
Mr J. CASADEVALL,
Mr G. BONELLO,
Mr R. MARUSTE,
Mr S. PAVLOVSCHI,
Mr L. GARLICKI,
Mr J. BORREGO BORREGO, *judges*,
and Mr M. O'BOYLE, *Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 18 November 1999,

Having regard to the decision to apply Article 29 § 3 of the Convention and examine the admissibility and merits of the case together.

Having regard to the observations submitted by the respondent Government and the observations in reply submitted by the applicant,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

# THE FACTS

The applicant, Mrs Genowefa Wiktorowicz, is a Polish national who was born in 1949 and lives in Łask-Kolumna.

## A. The circumstances of the case

On 24 November 1994 the applicant lodged a civil action with the Łask District Court (*Sąd Rejonowy*) asking for discontinuation of the construction works carried out on an adjacent plot of land.

On 12 August 1998 the Łask District Court gave judgment.

On 30 September 1998 the applicant lodged an appeal against this judgment with the Sieradz Regional Court (*Sąd Okręgowy*). On 11 August 1999 the Sieradz Regional Court gave judgment and upheld the first-instance judgment.

On 25 October 2000 the applicant's lawyer lodged a cassation appeal with the Supreme Court (*Sąd Najwyższy*).

On 6 July 2001 the Supreme Court refused to examine the cassation appeal, considering that it had been manifestly ill-founded. That decision was served on the applicant on 23 July 2001.

On 18 November 1999, the date on which the application was lodged with the Court, the proceedings were pending before the Supreme Court.

## B. Relevant domestic law and practice[1]

On 17 September 2004 the Law of 17 June 2004 on complaints about a breach of the right to a trial within a reasonable time (*Ustawa o skardze na naruszenie prawa strony do rozpoznania sprawy w postępowaniu sądowym bez nieuzasadnionej zwłoki*) ("the 2004 Act") entered into force. It lays down various legal means designed to counteract and/or redress the undue length of judicial proceedings.

Section 2 of the 2004 Act reads, in so far as relevant:

> "1. Parties to proceedings may lodge a complaint that their right to a trial within a reasonable time has been breached [in the proceedings] if the proceedings in the case last longer than is necessary to examine the factual and legal circumstances of the case ... or longer than is necessary to conclude enforcement proceedings or other proceedings concerning the execution of a court decision (unreasonable length of proceedings)."

Section 5 reads, in so far as relevant:

---

1. For a more detailed rendition of the relevant domestic legal provisions see *Michalak v. Poland* (dec.), no. 24549/03, §§ 12-23, to be published in ECHR 2005-... – also available on the Court's Internet site (http://www.echr.coe.int).

"1. A complaint about the unreasonable length of proceedings shall be lodged while the proceedings are pending. ..."

Section 12 provides for measures that may be applied by the court dealing with the complaint. It reads, in so far as relevant:

"1. The court shall dismiss a complaint which is unjustified.

2. If the court considers that the complaint is justified, it shall find that there was an unreasonable delay in the impugned proceedings.

3. At the request of the complainant, the court may instruct the court examining the merits of the case to take certain measures within a fixed time-limit. Such instructions shall not concern the factual and legal assessment of the case.

4. If the complaint is justified the court may, at the request of the complainant, grant ... just satisfaction in an amount not exceeding PLN 10,000 to be paid by the State Treasury. If such just satisfaction is granted it shall be paid out of the budget of the court which conducted the delayed proceedings."

Section 18 lays down transitional rules in relation to the applications already pending before the Court. It reads, in so far as relevant:

"1. Within six months after the date of entry into force of this law persons who, before that date, had lodged a complaint with the European Court of Human Rights ... complaining of a breach of the right to a trial within a reasonable time guaranteed by Article 6 (1) of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ..., may lodge a complaint about the unreasonable length of the proceedings on the basis of the provisions of this law if their complaint to the Court had been lodged in the course of the impugned proceedings and if the Court has not adopted a decision concerning the admissibility of their case.

..."

On 18 January 2005 Supreme Court (*Sąd Najwyższy*) adopted a resolution (no. III SPP 113/04) in which it ruled that while the 2004 Act produced legal effects as from the date of its date of entry into force (17 September 2004), its provisions applied retroactively to all proceedings in which delays had occurred before that date and had not yet been remedied.

## COMPLAINT

1. The applicant complained under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention that the length of the proceedings in her case had exceeded a "reasonable time" within the meaning of this provision.

2. She further complained that length of the proceedings complained of had infringed her rights guaranteed under Articles 3, 8, 13 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No 1 to the Convention.

# THE LAW

1. The applicant complained under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention that the length of the proceedings in her case had exceeded a "reasonable time" within the meaning of this provision.

The applicant did not address the issue of exhaustion of domestic remedies.

Pursuant to Article 35 § 1 of the Convention:

> "The Court may only deal with the matter after all domestic remedies have been exhausted, according to the generally recognised rules of international law..."

The Court observes that the present application was lodged with the Court when the relevant proceedings were pending before the domestic court.

It further observes that, pursuant to section 18 of the 2004 Act, it was open to persons such as the applicant in the present case whose case was pending before the Court to lodge, within six months from 17 September 2004, a complaint about the unreasonable length of the proceedings with the relevant domestic court, provided that their application to the Court had been lodged in the course of the impugned proceedings and that it had not yet been declared admissible.

The Court has already examined that remedy for the purposes of Article 35 § 1 of the Convention and found it effective in respect of complaints about the excessive length of judicial proceedings in Poland. In particular, it considered that it was capable both of preventing the alleged violation of the right to a hearing within a reasonable time or its continuation, and of providing adequate redress for any violation that has already occurred (see *Michalak v. Poland* (dec.), no. 24549/03, §§ 37-43).

However, the applicant, despite having been informed by the Registrar of the possibility of lodging a complaint about the length of the proceedings under the 2004 Act, has chosen not to avail herself of this remedy.

It follows that the application must be rejected under Article 35 §§ 1 and 4 of the Convention for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

2. The applicant further alleged a breach of Articles 3, 8, 13 and Article 1 of Protocol No 1.

However, those complaints have not been supported by any material evidence. Nor has the applicant stated any factual basis for her Convention claims.

It follows that the remainder of the application is manifestly ill-founded and must be rejected in accordance with Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention.

For these reasons, the Court unanimously

*Decides* to discontinue the application of Article 29 § 3 of the Convention;

*Declares* the application inadmissible.

Michael O'BOYLE
Registrar

Nicolas BRATZA
President