



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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 43380/06  
Stanislav Vladimirovich MARTYNOV  
against Russia

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 22 May 2012 as a Committee composed of:

Peer Lorenzen, *President*,

Elisabeth Steiner,

Julia Laffranque, *judges*,

and André Wampach, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 9 September 2006,

Having deliberated, decides as follows

PROCEDURE

1. The applicant, Mr Stanislav Vladimirovich Martynov, is a Russian national who was born in 1983 and lives in the town of Shakhty, Rostov Region. He was represented before the Court by Mr A. Prudchenko, a lawyer practising in Shakhty.

2. The Russian Government (“the Government”) were represented by Mr G. Matyushkin, Representative of the Russian Federation at the European Court of Human Rights.

3. The applicant complained that the criminal proceedings against him had been unfair, in particular, given his impossibility to confront a leading prosecution witness, and that his detention after conviction had been unlawful.

4. By a letter dated 18 January 2012, sent by registered post, the applicant’s representative was notified that the period allowed for

submission of the observations had expired on 5 December 2011 and that no extension of time had been requested. The applicant's representative's attention was drawn to Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention, which provides that the Court may strike a case out of its list of cases where the circumstances lead to the conclusion that the applicant does not intend to pursue the application. No response followed.

## THE LAW

The Court considers that, in these circumstances, the applicant may be regarded as no longer wishing to pursue his application, within the meaning of Article 37 § 1 (a) of the Convention. Furthermore, in accordance with Article 37 § 1 *in fine*, the Court finds no special circumstances regarding respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and its Protocols which require the continued examination of the case.

In view of the above, it is appropriate to strike the case out of the list.

For these reasons, the Court unanimously

*Decides* to strike the application out of its list of cases.

André Wampach  
Deputy Registrar

Peer Lorenzen  
President