FOURTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 36595/06  
Jānis ANIŅŠ  
against Latvia

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting on 2 April 2013 as a Committee composed of:

Päivi Hirvelä, *President,* Ledi Bianku, Paul Mahoney, *judges,*

and Fatoş Aracı, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

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

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant, Mr Jānis Aniņš, is a Latvian national, who was born in 1950 and lives in Paris.

The Latvian Government (“the Government”) were represented by their Agents, Mrs I. Reine and subsequently by Mrs K. Līce.

The applicant complained under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention about the length of criminal proceedings against him.

The applicant’s complaints were communicated to the Government. Notice of the communication was sent to the applicant who was also requested to appoint a representative pursuant to Rule 36 §§ 2 and 4 of the Rules of Court. He was advised to contact the national bar association should he encounter any difficulties in finding an advocate.

The Government submitted their observations on the admissibility and merits. The observations were forwarded to the applicant, who was invited to appoint a representative and to submit his own observations.

After repeated prompting from the Registry of the Court, the applicant successively designated two representatives (A.A. and H.S.), neither of whom has replied to any letters sent by the Court and neither of whom has submitted any information which would allow the Court to verify that he is “an advocate authorised to practice in any of the Contracting Parties” (Rule 36 § 3 of the Rules of the Court).

By letter dated 10 October 2012, sent by registered post, the applicant was notified that during more than ten months since the application had been communicated to the respondent Government 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 applicant received this letter on 24 October 2012 and once again sent to the Court an authority form in the name of H.S. without any further explanations.

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