



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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 44291/06  
OOO GAZETA 'MOLVA'  
against Russia

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 29 January 2013 as a Committee composed of:

Khanlar Hajiyeu, *President*,

Julia Laffranque,

Erik Møse, *judges*,

and André Wampach, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 21 July 2006,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant company, OOO Gazeta 'Molva', is a limited liability company under the Russian laws registered in Vladimir.

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 company's complaints under Article 10 of the Convention were communicated to the Government, who submitted their observations on the admissibility and merits. The observations were forwarded to the applicant company, which was invited to submit its own observations. No reply was received to the Registry's letter.

By letter dated 14 December 2011, sent by registered post, the applicant company was notified that the period allowed for submission of its observations had expired on 8 June 2011 and that no extension of time had

been requested. The applicant company'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 has been received.

## THE LAW

The Court considers that, in these circumstances, the applicant company may be regarded as no longer wishing to pursue its 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

Khanlar Hajiyev  
President