FOURTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 57754/12
Alvis MĀRTIŅKRISTS
against Latvia

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting on 14 January 2014 as a Committee composed of:

 Päivi Hirvelä, *President,* Vincent A. De Gaetano, Robert Spano, *judges,*
and Fatoş Aracı, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 30 August 2012,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant, Mr Alvis Mārtiņkrists, is a Latvian national, who was born in 1985.

The Latvian Government (“the Government”) were represented by their Agent, Mrs K. Līce.

The applicant complained under Article 3 of the Convention about his ill‑treatment by prison guards and about the conditions of detention in Brasa Prison.

The applicant’s complaints were communicated to the Government. Notice of the communication was also sent to the applicant who was requested to appoint a representative pursuant to Rule 36 §§ 2 and 4 of the Rules of Court.

The Government submitted their observations on the admissibility and merits.

The applicant was repeatedly reminded that he needed to appoint a legal representative. No reply was received to the Registry’s letters.

By letter dated 30 October 2013, sent by registered post, the applicant was reminded that he had failed to appoint a representative as required by Rule 36 § 2 of the Rules of the Court. 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.

The letter, which had been sent to Brasa Prison, was returned to the Court on 27 November 2013. The envelope contains a handwritten indication that the applicant had been released from the prison on 3 January 2013. He has not informed the Court of his new postal address.

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.

 Fatoş Aracı Päivi Hirvelä
 Deputy Registrar President