



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

## FIRST SECTION

### DECISION

Application n°. 21187/06  
Vladimir Mikhaylovich CHEREMISINOV  
against Russia

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 17 September 2013 as a Committee composed of:

Khanlar Hajiyev, *President*,

Julia Laffranque,

Erik Møse, *judges*,

and André Wampach, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 28 April 2006,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

## FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant, Mr Vladimir Mikhaylovich Cheremisinov, was Russian national, who was born in 1932 and lived in Novocherkassk, the Rostov Region. He was represented before the Court by Mr P.V. Sedlyar, a lawyer practising in Novocherkassk.

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 applicant complained under Article 6 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 about the non-enforcement and the subsequent quashing of the judgment of 15 September 2004 in his favour.

By letter of 12 April 2013 the applicant’s representative informed the Registry that on an unspecified date in November 2012 the applicant had died, that none of his relatives expressed a wish to maintain the case in his stead and that his application to the Court would not be pursued.

## THE LAW

In the light of the foregoing, the Court concludes that the applicant's heirs, if any, do not wish to pursue the application within the meaning of Article 37 § 1 of the Convention.

It has been the Court's practice to strike applications out of the list of cases in the absence of any heir or close relative who has expressed the wish to pursue an application (see *Léger v. France* (striking out) [GC], no. 19324/02, § 44, 30 March 2009, with further references). Furthermore, the Court does not consider that the present case involves an important question of general interest transcending the person and the interests of individual applicants. Accordingly, the Court concludes that it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the applications within the meaning of Article 37 § 1 of the Convention.

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