



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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 58364/08
Akmal Chuyanbayevich ZUNNUNOV
against Russia

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting 3 July 2012
as a Committee composed of:

Peer Lorenzen, *President*,

Elisabeth Steiner,

Khanlar Hajiyeu, *judges*,

and André Wampach, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 28 April 2008,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

The applicant, Mr Akmal Chuyanbayevich Zunnunov, is a Russian national who was born on an unspecified date and lives in Moscow.

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

In this case the applicant complained under Articles 6 § 1 and 13 of the Convention about non-enforcement of a domestic judgement ordering to provide him with social housing.

On 10 March 2010 the Court communicated the applicant’s complaint to the respondent Government under Rule 54 § 2 (b) of the Rules of Court. The Government submitted their observations on the admissibility and merits of the case on 15 September 2010.

By letter of 28 September 2010, the applicant was invited to submit, by 30 November 2010, his comments on the Government's observations, together with any claims for just satisfaction. By letter of 21 November 2010, the applicant requested the Court for extension of the time-limit for submission of his comments on the Government's observations which he had received on 15 October 2010. By letter of 3 February 2011 the applicant was informed that no extension of time had been granted.

By letter dated of 6 February 2012 sent by registered mail, the applicant was reminded that the time-limit for submission of his observations or claims for just satisfaction had expired on 30 November 2010 and that no extension of time had been granted. The applicant'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 an 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