



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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 18085/06  
Vladimir PANKRATENKOV  
against Russia

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 18 December 2012 as a Committee composed of:

Nina Vajić, *President*,

Julia Laffranque,

Erik Møse, *judges*,

and André Wampach, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 5 April 2006,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

PROCEDURE

The applicant, Mr Vladimir Nikolayevich Pankratenkov, is a Russian national who was born in 1968 and lives in Moscow.

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

The applicant complained under Article 6 of the Convention that the criminal proceedings against him had been unfair. He complained, in particular, that the trial court had relied on statements by witnesses whom he had had no opportunity to question.

On 14 November 2011 the application was communicated to the respondent Government.

On 12 March 2012 the Government's observations on the admissibility and merits of the application were received and the applicant was invited to submit his written observations in reply by 15 May 2012.

As the applicant's observations on the admissibility and merits had not been received by the indicated time-limit, on 2 July 2012 the applicant was advised by registered mail that the failure to submit his observations might result in the strike-out of the application. The applicant did not collect the Court's letter from the post office and it was returned to the Court as unclaimed.

## 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

Nina Vajić  
President