

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

# FIRST SECTION

## DECISION

#### Application no. 33539/05 Sergey Nikolayevich SOBAKAR against Russia and 3 other applications (see list appended)

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 3 July 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 applications lodged on various dates listed in the appendix,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

## THE FACTS

The applicants are four Russian nationals. Their names, dates of birth and places of residence are tabulated in the appendix. The Russian Government ("the Government") were represented by Mr G. Matyushkin, the Representative of the Russian Federation at the European Court of Human Rights.

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

The applicants complained under Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 about non-enforcement of the final domestic court judgments granting their claims against municipal unitary enterprises, commercial companies enjoying the right of economic control over its



property. A list of the respective domestic judgments is set out in the appendix.

On 20 May 2011 the Court communicated the applicants' complaints to the respondent Government under Rule 54 § 2 (b) of the Rules of Court.

By letters of 21 September 2011 the applicants were invited to submit, by 23 November 2011, their comments on the Government's observations, together with any claims for just satisfaction. The applicants did not reply.

By letters dated 20 January 2012 sent by registered post, the applicants were notified that the period allowed for submission of the observations had expired on 23 November 2011 and that no extension of time had been requested. The applicants' 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 applicants do not intend to pursue the application. No responses followed.

#### THE LAW

1. Given that the applications at hand concern similar complaints and raise identical issues under the Convention, the Court decides to consider them in a single decision.

2. Having regard to the correspondence with the applicants, the Court finds that they may be regarded as no longer wishing to pursue their applications, 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 cases.

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;

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

André Wampach Deputy Registrar Peer Lorenzen President

No	Application	Lodged on	Applicant	Final domestic
	No		Date of birth	judgments
			Place of residence	(dates, courts)
1.	33539/05	23/08/2005	Sergey Nikolayevich	17/02/2004 and
			SOBAKAR	04/03/2005,
			19/06/1956	Justice of the
			Miass	Peace of the 30th
				Court Circuit of
				the Tavricheskiy
				District of the
				Omsk Region;
				05/08/2004;
				Justice of the
				Peace of the 29th
				Court Circuit of
				the Tavricheskiy
				District
2.	42460/05	30/09/2005	Olga Nikolayevna	14/04/2004;
			VLADYKA	Petrozavodsk
			28/05/1955	Town Court of
			Petrozavodsk	the Karelia
				Republic
3.	13691/09	04/01/2009	Natalya Borisovna	17/08/2004;
			LOBOVA	Oktyabrskiy
			09/05/1966	District Court of
			Belgorod	Belgorod, the
				Belgorod Region
4.	65268/09	22/11/2009	Valentina	12/02/2009;
			Leontyevna	Elizovskiy
			BELIKOVA	District Court of
			10/11/1946	the Kamchatka
			Paratunka	Region

# **APPENDIX**