FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 4945/05  
PREDIL ANSTALT  
against Italy

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 15 November 2016 as a Committee composed of:

Kristina Pardalos, *President,* Pauliine Koskelo, Tim Eicke, *judges,*and Renata Degener, *Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 20 January 2005,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant company, Predil Anstalt, is a limited liability company with its registered seat in Vaduz (Liechtenstein).

The applicant company was represented before the Court by Mr A. Penazzi, a lawyer practising in Milan.

The Italian Government (“the Government”) were represented by their Agent, Ms E. Spatafora, and their co-Agent, Ms P. Accardo.

The applicant company complained under Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention that there had been an unjustified interference with its right to the peaceful enjoyment of its possessions.

On 5 February 2009 the application was communicated to the Government, who submitted their observations on the admissibility and merits. The observations were forwarded to the applicant company, who was invited to submit its own observations. No reply was received to the Registry’s letter and no observations were submitted. No further correspondence was received from the applicant company or its representative.

By a letter dated 9 June 2016 the Government informed the Court that the applicant company had ceased to exist and had been struck off the Vaduz Companies Register on 5 October 2006. They submitted documentation in support of their statement.

By a letter dated 1 July 2016, sent by registered post to the applicant company’s representative, the applicant company was requested to comment on the Government’s letter and enclosed documentation no later than 22 July 2016. 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 company does not intend to pursue the application. The applicant company’s representative received this letter on 11 July 2016. However, 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.

Done in English and notified in writing on 8 December 2016.

Renata Degener Kristina Pardalos  
 Deputy Registrar President