



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

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 44900/06
Sergey Anatolyevich PUTINTSEV against Russia
and 2 other applications
(see list appended)

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 28 January 2014 as a Committee composed of:

Elisabeth Steiner, *President*,
Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos,
Ksenija Turković, *judges*,
and André Wampach, *Deputy Section Registrar*,
Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

A. Application no. 44900/06 (lodged on 14 October 2006)

The applicant, Mr Sergey Anatolyevich Putintsev, is a Russian national, who was born in 1954 and lives in Novorossiysk.

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 that he had been found liable in administrative offence proceedings for a publication discussing allegedly unlawful actions of local public officials.

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

By letter dated 9 November 2012, sent by registered post, the applicant was notified that the period allowed for submission of his observations had expired on 17 August 2012 and that no extension of time had been requested. 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 the applicant does not intend to pursue the application.

It appears from the available material that the local post office notified the applicant that they were keeping the Court's letter for him. The applicant did not gather it from the post office. The Court's letter was then returned to it as undelivered.

B. Application no. 6687/06 (lodged on 27 January 2006)

The applicant, Mr Vadim Aleksandrovich Gubin, is a Russian national, who was born in 1968 and lives in Yekaterinburg. He was represented before the Court by Mr S. Kolosovskiy, a lawyer practising in Yekaterinburg.

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 Articles 3, 5 and 6 of the Convention about the conditions of his detention, length of detention and the alleged violation of his right to legal assistance in the criminal proceedings against him.

The applicant's above complaints were communicated to the Government, who submitted their observations on the admissibility and merits. The observations were forwarded to the applicant's representative, who was invited to submit his own observations. No reply was received to the Registry's letter.

By letter dated 18 January 2012, sent by registered post, the applicant's representative was notified that the period allowed for submission of his observations had expired on 23 September 2011 and that no extension of time had been requested. The applicant's representative'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. The applicant's representative received this letter on 8 February 2012. However, no response has been received.

C. Application no. 16242/08 (lodged on 15 February 2008)

The applicant, Mr Aleksey Aleksandrovich Alekseyev, is a Russian national, who was born in 1973 and lives in Mozhaysk. He was represented before the Court by Mr V. Antonov, a lawyer practising in Cheboksary.

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 raised several complaints under Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention.

These complaints were communicated to the Government, who submitted their observations on the admissibility and merits. The observations were forwarded to the applicant’s representative, who was invited to submit his own observations. No reply was received to the Registry’s letter.

By letter dated 9 November 2012, sent by registered post, the applicant’s representative was notified that the period allowed for submission of his observations had expired on 17 August 2012 and that no extension of time had been requested. The applicant’s representative’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.

It appears from the available material that the local post office notified the applicant’s representative that they were keeping the Court’s letter for him. The applicant did not gather it from the post office. The Court’s letter was then returned to it as undelivered.

THE LAW

The Court decides to join the applications and consider them in a single decision.

The Court considers that, in the circumstances, the applicants in the above cases 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 above 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

Elisabeth Steiner
President

APPENDIX

	File No	Case Name	Date of lodging
1.	6687/06	GUBIN v. Russia	27/01/2006
2.	44900/06	PUTINTSEV v. Russia	14/10/2006
3.	16242/08	ALEKSEYEV v. Russia	15/02/2008