



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

SECOND SECTION

CASE OF ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE

*(Applications nos. 30185/17 and 136 others –
see appended list)*

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

14 October 2025

This judgment is final but it may be subject to editorial revision.

In the case of Çetin and Others v. Türkiye,

The European Court of Human Rights (Second Section), sitting as a Committee composed of:

Jovan Ilievski, *President*,

Péter Paczolay,

Juha Lavapuro, *judges*,

and Dorothee von Arnim, *Deputy Section Registrar*,

Having regard to:

the applications against the Republic of Türkiye lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”) by the applicants listed in the appended table (“the applicants”), on the various dates indicated therein;

the decision to give notice of the complaints under Article 5 of the Convention concerning the alleged lack of reasonable suspicion regarding the commission of an offence, the alleged lack of relevant and sufficient reasons when ordering and extending the applicants’ pre-trial detention, the length of the pre-trial detention, the alleged ineffectiveness of the judicial review of the lawfulness of detention, and the absence of a remedy to obtain compensation for the alleged breaches of their rights under Article 5 to the Turkish Government (“the Government”), represented by their Agent at the time, Mr Hacı Ali Açıkgül, former Head of the Department of Human Rights of the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Türkiye, and to declare the remainder of the applications inadmissible;

the parties’ observations;

the decision to reject the Government’s objection to the examination of the applications by a Committee;

Having deliberated in private on 23 September 2025,

Delivers the following judgment, which was adopted on that date:

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE

1. The present applications mainly concern the arrest and pre-trial detention of the applicants in the aftermath of the coup attempt of 15 July 2016, primarily on suspicion of their membership of an organisation described by the Turkish authorities as the “Fetullahist Terror Organisation/Parallel State Structure” (*Fetullahçı Terör Örgütü / Paralel Devlet Yapılanması* – hereinafter referred to as “FETÖ/PDY”), which was considered by the authorities to be behind the coup attempt (further information regarding the events that unfolded after the coup attempt, including the details of the state of emergency declared by the Government and the ensuing notice of derogation given to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, as well as the legislative developments that followed the declaration of the state of emergency, may be found in *Baş v. Turkey*, no. 66448/17, §§ 6-14 and 109-10, 3 March 2020).

2. On various dates the applicants were arrested and placed in pre-trial detention, mainly on suspicion of membership of FETÖ/PDY, an offence punishable under Article 314 of the Criminal Code (see *Baş*, cited above, § 58). Challenges brought by them against their detention were dismissed by the competent courts.

3. On various dates in the course of the ensuing criminal investigations and trials, the competent judicial authorities ordered the applicants' continued detention. The applicants were held in pre-trial detention for periods ranging from one year to four years and five days.

4. It appears from the information and documents in the case files that, when ordering and extending the applicants' pre-trial detention, the competent judicial authorities relied on various evidential grounds, including but not limited to: witness statements indicating ties with FETÖ/PDY; social media posts; possession of pro-FETÖ/PDY publications; working in, or being a member of, institutions with ties with the organisation in question or an organisation shut down by the legislative decrees under the state of emergency; provision of financial support to FETÖ/PDY or to institutions with ties to FETÖ/PDY; attending or holding meetings (*sohbet*); communication with senior executives of the organisation; ensuring communication between FETÖ/PDY members; use of the Bylock application; staying in FETÖ/PDY houses; and carrying out various other activities on the orders of the organisation.

5. It further appears from the case files that, in accordance with Articles 100 and 101 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for the text of these provisions, see *Kavala v. Turkey*, no. 28749/18, §§ 71-72, 10 December 2019), the competent judicial authorities justified their decisions to deprive the applicants of their liberty not only on the basis of the existence of reasonable suspicion, but also on the grounds of the nature and severity of the alleged offence of membership of an armed terrorist organisation, and the fact that that offence was among the "catalogue" offences listed in Article 100 § 3 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Without making an individualised assessment, they also relied on the state of the evidence and the risk of the applicants' absconding and tampering with evidence, and considered that detention would be a proportionate measure in the circumstances. Moreover, in the later stages of the proceedings, the competent judges took into account the time spent by the applicants in pre-trial detention when deciding to extend their detention, without explaining the relevance of that factor to their decision.

6. In the meantime, the applicants lodged one or more individual applications with the Constitutional Court in respect of the detention orders, complaining, *inter alia*, about the alleged lack of reasonable suspicion that they had committed an offence and the alleged lack of reasons to justify the decision to remand them in pre-trial detention, all of which were summarily declared inadmissible by the Constitutional Court.

7. According to the latest information provided by the parties, most of the applicants were convicted of membership of an armed terrorist organisation by the courts of first instance, on the basis of evidence that was available at the time of their detention or that appeared at a later stage in the proceedings. It further appears that some of the criminal proceedings are still pending before the appellate courts or the Constitutional Court.

THE COURT'S ASSESSMENT

I. JOINDER OF THE APPLICATIONS

8. Having regard to the similar subject matter of the applications, the Court finds it appropriate to examine them jointly in a single judgment.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 5 §§ 1 AND 3 OF THE CONVENTION

9. The applicants complained that there had been no specific evidence giving rise to a reasonable suspicion that they had committed a criminal offence necessitating pre-trial detention. They further argued that the domestic courts had not provided relevant and sufficient reasons in their decisions ordering their placement in detention and their continued detention. They also maintained that the domestic authorities had failed to consider alternative measures to detention. In that connection, they alleged that there had been a violation of Article 5 §§ 1 (c) and 3 of the Convention.

A. Admissibility

10. The Government urged the Court to declare inadmissible the complaints of applicants who had not made use of the compensatory remedy under Article 141 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, or whose compensation claims were still pending. The Government further claimed that some of the applicants had been granted compensation under Article 141 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and had therefore lost their victim status. They further requested that the Court declare the applications inadmissible as being an abuse of the right of application, in so far as the applicants had not informed the Court of the developments in their cases following the lodging of their applications. They also asked the Court to declare some applications inadmissible on account of the applicants' failure to duly raise their complaints under Article 5 § 3 of the Convention before the Turkish Constitutional Court. The Government lastly submitted that the applicants' initial and continued pre-trial detention had complied with the domestic legislation and Article 5 §§ 1 (c) and 3 of the Convention.

11. The Court notes that similar objections raised by the Government have already been dismissed in other cases against Türkiye (see, for instance, *Selahattin Demirtaş v. Turkey* (no. 2) [GC], no. 14305/17, §§ 212-14, 22 December 2020; *Alparslan Altan v. Turkey*, no. 12778/17, §§ 84-85, 16 April 2019; *Baş, v. Turkey*, no. 66448/17, §§ 118-21, 3 March 2020; and *Turan and Others v. Turkey*, nos. 75805/16 and 426 others, §§ 57-64, 23 November 2021), and sees no reason to depart from those findings in the present case. Moreover, as regards the objections concerning the exhaustion of the individual application remedy before the Constitutional Court, an examination of the case files reveals that, contrary to the Government's claims, the applicants concerned have expressly raised their complaints pertaining to Article 5 § 3 of the Convention in their application forms submitted to the Constitutional Court.

12. The Court therefore considers that the applicants' complaints under Article 5 §§ 1 (c) and 3 of the Convention are not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention or inadmissible on any other grounds. They must therefore be declared admissible.

B. Merits

1. Alleged lack of reasoning in the decisions ordering the applicants' pre-trial detention (Article 5 § 3 of the Convention)

13. As regards the merits, the Court reiterates that, according to its well-established case-law under Article 5 § 3 of the Convention, the persistence of a reasonable suspicion that a detainee has committed an offence is a condition *sine qua non* for the validity of his or her continued detention. The Court must further establish whether the national authorities gave relevant and sufficient reasons for the detention from the time of the first decision ordering detention on remand onwards. Those other grounds may be a risk of flight, a risk of pressure being brought to bear on witnesses or of evidence being tampered with, a risk of collusion, a risk of reoffending, or a risk of public disorder and the related need to protect the detainee (see *Buzadji v. the Republic of Moldova* [GC], no. 23755/07, §§ 87-88 and 101-02, 5 July 2016). Those risks must be duly substantiated, and the authorities' reasoning on those points cannot be abstract, general or stereotyped (see *Merabishvili v. Georgia* [GC], no. 72508/13, § 222, 28 November 2017).

14. The Court notes that when ordering the applicants' initial and continued pre-trial detention, the judicial authorities cited, in a formulaic manner, numerous pieces of evidence in support of their findings that there were concrete indications that the applicants had committed an offence (see paragraph 4 above). However, the Court has doubts as to whether the national courts convincingly demonstrated the link between the pieces of evidence they mentioned in the detention orders and the existence of a

“reasonable suspicion” that the applicants had committed the offence of membership of an armed organisation of which they were suspected.

15. Even assuming that there was “reasonable suspicion” that an offence has been committed, decisions ordering and prolonging pre-trial detention must contain relevant and sufficient reasons justifying the necessity of the detention. In that connection, the Court observes that in Türkiye, as required by the Convention, domestic law provides that the competent judicial authorities must put forward “relevant and sufficient” reasons when considering the need to place and keep a suspect in pre-trial detention. This is a procedural obligation laid down in Articles 100 and 101 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provide that decisions to place or keep a suspect in pre-trial detention must include legal and factual reasons (see *Tuncer Bakırhan v. Turkey*, no. 31417/19, §§ 23-24, 14 September 2021).

16. The Court notes in this regard that the competent courts relied on the following grounds for detention: the nature of the offence; the severity of the sentences prescribed by law for the offence concerned; the state of the evidence; the period spent in detention; the risk of the applicants’ absconding and tampering with evidence; and the finding that alternative measures to detention appeared insufficient (see paragraph 5 above).

17. In so far as the detention was justified on the basis of the “nature of the offence”, the Court notes that the domestic courts ruling on the applicants’ detention considered that they were accused of offences listed in Article 100 § 3 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (also referred to as “catalogue” offences). As regards these “catalogue” offences, the Court observes that under Article 100 § 3 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, Turkish law provides that for certain offences there is a statutory presumption of the existence of grounds for detention (risk of absconding, tampering with evidence, or putting pressure on witnesses, victims and other persons). In this connection, the Court reaffirms that any system of mandatory detention on remand is *per se* incompatible with Article 5 § 3 of the Convention. Where the law provides for a presumption concerning the grounds for pre-trial detention, it must nevertheless be convincingly demonstrated that there are concrete facts warranting a departure from the rule of respect for individual liberty. This is also the case where the judicial authorities justify the detention of a suspect by the nature of the offence in question or the severity of the potential sentence prescribed by law (compare also *Tuncer Bakırhan*, cited above, §§ 46-49). The Court therefore needs to examine whether the national courts carried out an individualised examination when ordering the applicants’ pre-trial detention.

18. As regards the other reasons given by the national courts for placing or keeping the applicants in pre-trial detention, the Court observes firstly that they entail a formulaic enumeration of the grounds for detention under domestic law in a general and abstract manner, such as the state of the evidence, the period spent in detention and the risk of the applicants’

absconding and tampering with evidence. While the Court is prepared to accept that, in view of the particular circumstances surrounding the attempted coup, the risk of the applicants' absconding and/or tampering with evidence might justify the measure of detention, at least during the initial phase of the criminal investigation, it nevertheless observes that the subsequent decisions ordering the applicants' continued pre-trial detention did not contain an individualised analysis in that regard. In the Court's view, decisions worded in formulaic and stereotyped terms, as in the present case, can on no account be regarded as sufficient to justify a person's continued pre-trial detention (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *Şık v. Turkey*, no. 53413/11, § 62, 8 July 2014). This is particularly so, given that the applicants in the present case were remanded in pre-trial detention for periods ranging from one year to more than four years.

19. The Court notes that it has already examined many cases in which it has found a violation of Article 5 § 3 of the Convention for similar reasons (see *Tuncer Bakırhan*, cited above, §§ 40-58, and the cases cited therein; see also *Kolay and Others v. Türkiye* [Committee], nos. 15231/17 and 283 others, §§ 11-19, 12 December 2023). In the present case, having regard to the grounds provided by the national judicial authorities, the Court considers that they ordered and extended the applicants' pre-trial detention on grounds that cannot be regarded as "sufficient" to justify the measure in issue.

20. The Court further considers that while the applicants were detained a short time after the coup attempt – which is undoubtedly a contextual factor that should be fully taken into account in interpreting and applying Article 5 of the Convention – it has not been established that the failure to comply with the requirements described above could be justified by the derogation notified by the Government of Türkiye under Article 15 of the Convention and did not go beyond the "extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation". This is particularly so, having regard to the duration of the applicants' pre-trial detention, which lasted at least one year in each case. The Court points out in this connection that the considerations giving rise to the application of Article 15 of the Convention have gradually become less forceful and relevant as the public emergency threatening the life of the nation, while still persisting, has declined in intensity, at which point the "exigency" criterion must be applied more stringently (see *Baş*, cited above, § 224; compare also *Kolay and Others*, cited above, § 18, and the references therein; and *Taş and Others v. Türkiye* [Committee], nos. 41527/17 and 212 others, § 20, 17 December 2024).

21. In the light of the foregoing, the Court concludes that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 3 of the Convention in respect of all the applicants.

2. *Alleged lack of reasonable suspicion that the applicants committed a criminal offence (Article 5 § 1 (c) of the Convention)*

22. Having regard to the particular circumstances of the present case (see paragraphs 14-15 above) and its findings under Article 5 § 3 of the Convention (see paragraph 21 above), the Court considers that it is not necessary to determine whether there was any objective information showing that the suspicion against the applicants was “reasonable” at the time of their detention (for a similar approach, see *Tuncer Bakırhan*, cited above, §§ 36-39; see also *Kolay and Others*, cited above, § 20).

III. OTHER COMPLAINTS

23. As regards any remaining complaints under Article 5 of the Convention, the Court decides not to examine the admissibility and merits of those complaints, in view of its findings under Article 5 § 3 above and its considerations in *Turan and Others* (cited above, § 98).

APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

24. Some of the applicants did not submit a claim for just satisfaction, or failed to do so within the prescribed time-limit. Accordingly, the Court considers that there is no call to award them any sum on that account (see the appended table indicating the applicants to whom no award is to be made).

25. The remaining applicants requested varying amounts in respect of non-pecuniary damage, submitting their claims within the prescribed time-limit. The majority of them also claimed compensation in respect of pecuniary damage, as well as the legal costs and expenses incurred before the domestic courts and the Court.

26. The Government contested the applicants’ claims as being unsubstantiated and excessive.

27. For the reasons set out in *Turan and Others* (cited above, §§ 102-07), the Court rejects any claims in respect of pecuniary damage and awards each of the applicants who submitted claims a lump sum of 3,000 euros in respect of non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses, plus any tax that may be chargeable on that amount (see the last column of the appended table).

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Declares* admissible the complaints under Article 5 §§ 1 (c) and 3 of the Convention concerning the alleged lack of reasonable suspicion regarding

the commission of an offence and the alleged lack of relevant and sufficient reasons when ordering and extending the pre-trial detention;

3. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 3 of the Convention on account of the absence of sufficient grounds for ordering and keeping the applicants in pre-trial detention;
4. *Holds* that there is no need to examine separately the merits of the complaints under Article 5 § 1 (c) of the Convention;
5. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the remaining complaints under Article 5 of the Convention;
6. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay each of the applicants who submitted a claim for just satisfaction (see the appended table), within three months, EUR 3,000 (three thousand euros), plus any tax that may be chargeable, in respect of non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses, to be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable at the date of settlement;
 - (b) that from the expiry of the above-mentioned three months until settlement simple interest shall be payable on the above amount at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points;
7. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claims for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 14 October 2025, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Dorothee von Arnim
Deputy Registrar

Jovan Ilievski
President

APPENDIX

List of cases:

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
1.	30185/17	Çetin v. Türkiye	01/03/2017	Metin ÇETİN 1983 Tekirdağ Turkish	Mustafa DEMİR	Awarded
2.	30685/17	Yerlikaya v. Türkiye	28/02/2017	Nail YERLİKAYA 1991 Tokat Turkish	Adnan ERDOĞAN	Awarded
3.	38448/17	Erdem v. Türkiye	22/05/2017	Alpay ERDEM 1976 Ankara Turkish	Ali YILDIZ	Awarded
4.	41874/17	Koçak v. Türkiye	23/03/2017	Cebirail KOÇAK 1977 Elazığ Turkish	Mesut Can TARIM	Awarded
5.	44794/17	Topal v. Türkiye	01/06/2017	Ahmet TOPAL 1973 Malatya Turkish	Deniz SEZGİN	Not awarded
6.	48983/17	İren v. Türkiye	25/04/2017	Erdem İREN 1980 Istanbul Turkish	Büşra KURT KÜÇÜK	Awarded
7.	49551/17	Yigit v. Türkiye	03/04/2017	Ramazan YİĞİT 1969 Ankara Turkish	Necip Fazıl YILDIZ	Awarded
8.	54589/17	Metin v. Türkiye	11/07/2017	Abdurrahim METİN 1991 Eskişehir Turkish	Ömer KARADENİZ	Not awarded
9.	54648/17	Önder v. Türkiye	01/05/2017	Akın ÖNDER 1973 Turkish	Gülşah OBUT	Not awarded
10.	58476/17	Aldı v. Türkiye	20/07/2017	İsmail ALDI 1985 Giresun Turkish	Tarık Said GÜLDİBİ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
11.	58919/17	Hankulu v. Türkiye	22/02/2017	Mahmut HANKULU 1986 Kayseri Turkish	Hayrullah TUFAN	Awarded
12.	60341/17	Kale v. Türkiye	21/06/2017	Arif KALE 1968 Mersin Turkish	Abdulselam DURAN	Awarded
13.	61646/17	Mete v. Türkiye	01/06/2017	Haydar METE 1969 Istanbul Turkish	Gizem ÇAKMAK BEKAR	Awarded
14.	61932/17	Çiftçi v. Türkiye	01/06/2017	İsmail ÇİFTÇİ 1985 Sivas Turkish	Yunus Emre YAŞAR	Awarded
15.	62884/17	Çini v. Türkiye	30/06/2017	Ahmet ÇİNİ 1985 Kocaeli Turkish	Mustafa UYSAL	Awarded
16.	63683/17	İmal v. Türkiye	08/05/2017	Ramazan İMAL 1975 Şanlıurfa Turkish	Büşra KURT KÜÇÜK	Awarded
17.	68912/17	Öksüz v. Türkiye	29/08/2017	Mehmet ÖKSÜZ 1983 Tekirdağ Turkish		Awarded
18.	69555/17	Kocabay v. Türkiye	23/08/2017	Serkan KOCABAY 1976 Ankara Turkish	Hicran GÜLMEZ GENCALOĞLU	Awarded
19.	69814/17	Serin v. Türkiye	09/08/2017	Nevzat SERİN 1960 Denizli Turkish	Dilara YILMAZ	Awarded
20.	71061/17	Soncan v. Türkiye	08/08/2017	Emre SONCAN 1982 Istanbul Turkish	İrem GÜNEŞ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
21.	71064/17	Kaya v. Türkiye	08/08/2017	Bayram KAYA 1982 Istanbul Turkish	İrem GÜNEŞ	Awarded
22.	73515/17	Yazgan v. Türkiye	15/09/2017	Vahit YAZGAN 1969 İzmir Turkish	Mehmet Nur TERZİ	Awarded
23.	76372/17	Taktak v. Türkiye	10/10/2017	Ahmet TAKTAK 16/03/1970 Eskişehir Turkish	Oğuzhan GÖKSU	Awarded
24.	78952/17	Aksu v. Türkiye	12/03/2018	İlhami AKSU 1966 İzmir Turkish	Furkan ÖZÇELİK	Awarded
25.	81096/17	Diri v. Türkiye	08/11/2017	Adem DİRİ 1981 Ankara Turkish		Not awarded
26.	81483/17	Tekin v. Türkiye	16/11/2017	Murat TEKİN 1975 Kastamonu Turkish	Esra ACAR	Awarded
27.	81670/17	Can v. Türkiye	10/11/2017	Ergüder CAN 1967 Manisa Turkish	Hüseyin ÖZÇELİK	Awarded
28.	82032/17	Bul v. Türkiye	23/10/2017	Cemal Azmi BUL 1955 Rize Turkish	Dilara YILMAZ	Awarded
29.	82871/17	Aktaş v. Türkiye	02/11/2017	Tayfun AKTAŞ 1965 Istanbul Turkish	Gül AKTAŞ	Awarded
30.	84019/17	Karaçıl v. Türkiye	01/11/2017	Kudret KARAÇİL 1980 İzmir Turkish	Mesut Can TARIM	Awarded
31.	5936/18	Hanay v. Türkiye	25/04/2017	Metin HANAY 1979 Istanbul Turkish	Dilara YILMAZ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
32.	6388/18	Kocaman v. Türkiye	18/01/2018	Halil KOCAMAN 1985 Ankara Turkish	Levent KOCAMAN	Awarded
33.	6519/18	Özdemir v. Türkiye	20/12/2017	Ferdi ÖZDEMİR 1983 Istanbul Turkish	Demet YÜREKLİ KAYAALP	Awarded
34.	6701/18	Odabaşı v. Türkiye	04/01/2018	Ali ODABAŞI 1979 Ankara Turkish	Mehmet ÖNCÜ	Awarded
35.	8608/18	Karagöz v. Türkiye	27/04/2017	Mehmet KARAGÖZ 1972 Karaman Turkish	Xavier LABBEE	Awarded
36.	9869/18	Yıldız v. Türkiye	26/01/2018	Mustafa YILDIZ 1969 Ankara Turkish	Necip Fazıl YILDIZ	Awarded
37.	9887/18	Tunç v. Türkiye	30/01/2018	Recep TUNÇ 1971 Antalya Turkish	Nurgül YAYMAN YILMAZ	Awarded
38.	9969/18	Güler v. Türkiye	29/01/2018	Mehmet GÜLER 1963 Kocaeli Turkish	Ahmet EROL	Awarded
39.	9982/18	Eren v. Türkiye	29/01/2018	Ömer EREN 1987 Turkish	Ahmet EROL	Awarded
40.	10609/18	Kara v. Türkiye	12/02/2018	Recep KARA 1972 İzmir Turkish	Ümmügülsüm OKUR	Awarded
41.	12565/18	Aydoğan v. Türkiye	16/02/2018	Hakan AYDOĞAN 1978 Ankara Turkish	Hayrettin AÇIKGÖZ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
42.	16308/18	Yıldırım v. Türkiye	29/03/2018	Abdurrahman YILDIRIM 1983 Giresun Turkish	Hilal YILMAZ PUSAT	Awarded
43.	16907/18	Alemdar v. Türkiye	20/03/2018	Gökay ALEMDAR 1977 Istanbul Turkish	Ahmet EROL	Awarded
44.	19254/18	Dere v. Türkiye	12/04/2018	Erol DERE 1969 İzmir Turkish		Awarded
45.	19465/18	Aykan v. Türkiye	11/04/2018	Abdurrahman AYKAN 1977 Wetzlar Turkish	Lale KARADAŞ	Awarded
46.	19695/18	Tekin v. Türkiye	16/04/2018	Adem TEKİN 1972 Ankara Turkish	Adem KAPLAN	Awarded
47.	19867/18	Gülecen v. Türkiye	18/04/2018	Mahmut GÜLECEN 1972 Ankara Turkish	Hüseyin AYGÜN	Awarded
48.	20491/18	Akkoyun v. Türkiye	16/04/2018	Erkan AKKOYUN 1987 Istanbul Turkish	Esra Nur AKYOL	Awarded
49.	21083/18	Karakaş v. Türkiye	20/04/2018	Doğan KARAKAŞ 1967 Ankara Turkish	Adem KAPLAN	Awarded
50.	21157/18	Aydın v. Türkiye	20/04/2018	Harun AYDIN 1987 Hatay Turkish	Adem KAPLAN	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
51.	22076/18	Karabürk v. Türkiye	02/05/2018	Mustafa KARABÜRK 1975 Giresun Turkish	Erol GÜNAYDIN	Awarded
52.	22182/18	Dolmaz v. Türkiye	02/04/2018	Fahri DOLMAZ 1974 İzmir Turkish	Akkız KARDEŞLER	Awarded
53.	22241/18	Yılmaz v. Türkiye	08/05/2018	Kudret YILMAZ 1976 Kütahya Turkish	Memnune Melike AKYILDIZ	Awarded
54.	22257/18	Göçmen v. Türkiye	10/05/2018	Abdullah Ömer GÖÇMEN 1971 Kütahya Turkish	Halil ÇETİN	Awarded
55.	23883/18	Doğan v. Türkiye	10/05/2018	Kılıç DOĞAN 1969 Ankara Turkish	Hakan KAPLANKAYA	Awarded
56.	24450/18	Aslan v. Türkiye	04/05/2018	Züfer ASLAN 1976 Samsun Turkish	Şeyma MISIRLIOĞLU	Awarded
57.	26411/18	Özyapı v. Türkiye	30/05/2018	Mustafa ÖZYAPI 1968 Ankara Turkish	Hüseyin AYGÜN	Awarded
58.	26880/18	Okuşluk v. Türkiye	30/05/2018	Ahmet Yasin OKUŞLUK 1984 Konya Turkish	Demet YÜREKLİ KAYAALP	Awarded
59.	27059/18	Tütüncü v. Türkiye	18/05/2018	Zakir TÜTÜNCÜ 1972 Kocaeli Turkish	Adem KAPLAN	Awarded
60.	27255/18	Çatur v. Türkiye	28/05/2018	İbrahim ÇATUR 1977 Burdur Turkish	Nurgül YAYMAN YILMAZ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
61.	39466/18	Çilkız v. Türkiye	10/08/2018	Erol ÇİLKIZ 1986 Istanbul Turkish	Cengiz YILMAZ	Awarded
62.	39536/18	Kaya v. Türkiye	02/08/2018	Hüseyin KAYA 1978 Tekirdağ Turkish	Mehmet Ertürk ERDEVİR	Awarded
63.	39835/18	Tekin v. Türkiye	06/08/2018	Ayhan TEKİN 1974 Ankara Turkish	Ebubekir ÇAKIR	Awarded
64.	42120/18	Tüysüz v. Türkiye	03/09/2018	Erol TÜYSÜZ 1973 Kocaeli Turkish	Yakup GÖNEN	Awarded
65.	42307/18	Şahin v. Türkiye	15/08/2018	Fatih ŞAHİN 1965 Istanbul Turkish	Handan YAVAŞCAN MARHAN	Awarded
66.	42858/18	Alıcı v. Türkiye	28/08/2018	Halil ALICI 1983 Hatay Turkish	Dudu ERTUNÇ	Awarded
67.	43165/18	Ebcim v. Türkiye	03/09/2018	İskender EBCİM 1978 Bingöl Turkish	Ahmet Serdar GÜNEŞ	Awarded
68.	45325/18	Sert v. Türkiye	17/09/2018	Fatih SERT 1983 Ankara Turkish	Ahmet Serdar GÜNEŞ	Awarded
69.	45330/18	Hazman v. Türkiye	14/09/2018	Ahmet HAZMAN 1984 Kırıkkale Turkish	Ahmet Serdar GÜNEŞ	Awarded
70.	45543/18	Nokta v. Türkiye	07/09/2018	Sinan NOKTA 1983 Karabük Turkish	Adem KAPLAN	Awarded
71.	46225/18	Aydın v. Türkiye	20/09/2018	Cengiz AYDIN 1973 Çorum Turkish	Kerem ALTUNTAŞ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
72.	48203/18	Çimen v. Türkiye	02/10/2018	Osman ÇİMEN 1985 Kayseri Turkish	Hüseyin DÖNMEZ	Awarded
73.	48911/18	Kobalay v. Türkiye	28/09/2018	Hasan KOBALAY 1980 Aydın Turkish	Adem KAPLAN	Awarded
74.	49836/18	Yaşa v. Türkiye	15/10/2018	Hasan YAŞA 1981 Bilecik Turkish	Tarık Said GÜLDİBİ	Awarded
75.	50062/18	Akkaya v. Türkiye	12/10/2018	Ali AKKAYA 1975 Düzce Turkish	Betül KAYA	Awarded
76.	51313/18	Olgaç v. Türkiye	19/10/2018	Şahin OLGAÇ 1990 Gaziantep Turkish	Mehmet Fatih İÇER	Not awarded
77.	52539/18	Arlı v. Türkiye	22/10/2018	Ali ARLI 1977 İstanbul Turkish	Tarık Said GÜLDİBİ	Awarded
78.	53071/18	Kara v. Türkiye	22/10/2018	Yunus KARA 1984 Nevşehir Turkish	Fatih GÖÇER	Awarded
79.	3652/19	Dinlemez v. Türkiye	18/12/2018	Zafer DİNLEMEZ 1987 Ankara Turkish	Ömer Tarık ORMANCI	Awarded
80.	3709/19	Kuş v. Türkiye	21/12/2018	Mesut KUŞ 1972 İzmir Turkish	Sultan TAKAK	Awarded
81.	4571/19	Kocaer v. Türkiye	28/12/2018	Mustafa KOCAER 1974 Manisa Turkish	Tuğba ÇIĞ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
82.	5916/19	Ekemen v. Türkiye	26/12/2018	Mustafa EKEMEN 1975 Manisa Turkish	Ömer KÖSTEKÇİ	Awarded
83.	16532/19	Çomak v. Türkiye	18/03/2019	Erol ÇOMAK 1969 Burdur Turkish	Yasemin ÇOMAK	Awarded
84.	19695/19	Gülbay v. Türkiye	29/03/2019	Kenan GÜLBAY 1975 Eskişehir Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK	Awarded
85.	19866/19	Çelik v. Türkiye	24/03/2019	Muhammed Said ÇELİK 1976 Elazığ Turkish	Ayşegül ÇELİK	Awarded
86.	20047/19	Dönmez v. Türkiye	25/03/2019	Mehmet DÖNMEZ 1974 Ankara Turkish	Mehmet ÖNCÜ	Awarded
87.	21344/19	Bakan v. Türkiye	12/04/2019	Vedat BAKAN 1970 İstanbul Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK	Awarded
88.	23822/19	Gür v. Türkiye	03/04/2019	Alim GÜR 1956 Konya Turkish	Ülkü GÜR	Not awarded
89.	23942/19	Talay v. Türkiye	01/04/2019	Mahmut TALAY 1975 Mersin Turkish		Not awarded
90.	27493/19	Şahin v. Türkiye	17/05/2019	Orhan ŞAHİN 1978 Kırıkkale Turkish	Tülay ÇETİN	Not awarded
91.	32501/19	Hoş v. Türkiye	10/05/2019	Mustafa HOŞ 1976 İzmir Turkish	Mine ÖZTÜRK	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
92.	33034/19	Hamurcu v. Türkiye	31/05/2019	Baki HAMURCU 1990 Karabük Turkish	Sümeyye UYAR	Awarded
93.	34664/19	Alptekin v. Türkiye	14/06/2019	Mustafa ALPTEKİN 1988 Balıkesir Turkish		Awarded
94.	35252/19	Abdi v. Türkiye	24/06/2019	Mehmet ABDİ 1982 Kırıkkale Turkish	Mustafa SOYLU	Awarded
95.	53290/19	Şan v. Türkiye	05/10/2019	Mehmet Akif ŞAN 1978 Ankara Turkish	Beyza Esma TUNA	Awarded
96.	61931/19	Uğur v. Türkiye	15/11/2019	Şaban UĞUR 1985 Kayseri Turkish	Regaip DEMİR	Awarded
97.	6382/20	Oflaz v. Türkiye	15/01/2020	Bilal OFLAZ 1984 Ankara Turkish	Merve KOÇ	Awarded
98.	14810/20	Yılmaz v. Türkiye	06/03/2020	Erhan YILMAZ 1989 Kocaeli Turkish	Metehan USLUEROL	Not awarded
99.	15694/20	Gençkaya v. Türkiye	17/03/2020	Fethi GENÇKAYA 1986 Kahramanmaraş Turkish	Nihal KARAGÖZ	Awarded
100.	16406/20	Çancılar v. Türkiye	07/04/2020	Mesut ÇANCILAR 1991 Samsun Turkish	Gökhan DİRİCAN	Awarded
101.	16553/20	Kaya v. Türkiye	17/03/2020	İlhami KAYA 1984 Ankara Turkish	Nihal KARAGÖZ	Not awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
102.	17100/20	Bebek v. Türkiye	27/03/2020	Bekir BEBEK 1981 Ankara Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK	Awarded
103.	17366/20	Hocaoğlu v. Türkiye	27/03/2020	Ahmet HOCAOĞLU 1978 Samsun Turkish	Mehmet ÖNCÜ	Awarded
104.	17668/20	Bostancı v. Türkiye	08/04/2020	Fatma BOSTANCI 1992 Ankara Turkish	Merve Vildan DUMAN	Awarded
105.	18713/20	Çelik v. Türkiye	21/04/2020	Celal ÇELİK 1978 Istanbul Turkish	Ebubekir RENK	Awarded
106.	18782/20	Akgül v. Türkiye	21/04/2020	Murat Kağan AKGÜL 1985 Tekirdağ Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK	Awarded
107.	19196/20	Dölen v. Türkiye	06/05/2020	Sadrettin DÖLEN 1981 Istanbul Turkish	Muhammed Selim TÜRKOĞLU	Not awarded
108.	21238/20	Sağlam v. Türkiye	05/05/2020	Ferdi SAĞLAM 1988 Ankara Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK	Awarded
109.	21248/20	Alada v. Türkiye	29/04/2020	Ensar ALADA 1987 Sivas Turkish	İhsan MAKAS	Awarded
110.	21557/20	Darama v. Türkiye	05/03/2020	Resul DARAMA 1976 Manisa Turkish	Tarık Said GÜLDİBİ	Awarded
111.	22575/20	Maraşlıoğlu v. Türkiye	08/05/2020	Mevlüt MARAŞLIOĞLU 1989 Aksaray Turkish	Enes Malik KILIÇ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
112.	23987/20	Duman v. Türkiye	29/05/2020	Cafer DUMAN 1977 Aksaray Turkish	Kaşif ALTINSOY	Awarded
113.	25638/20	Erol v. Türkiye	17/06/2020	Muhammet EROL 1989 Şanlıurfa Turkish	Burcu EROL	Awarded
114.	26913/20	Berk v. Türkiye	17/06/2020	Ömer BERK 1971 Kırşehir Turkish	Lale KARADAŞ	Awarded
115.	26961/20	Tunç v. Türkiye	05/06/2020	Raşit TUNÇ 1990 Manisa Turkish	Çağrı Seyfettin GÖKDEMİR	Awarded
116.	30048/20	Kılıçdoğan v. Türkiye	22/06/2020	Ali KILIÇDOĞAN 1980 İzmir Turkish	Bülent ULAŞ	Awarded
117.	33022/20	Genç v. Türkiye	21/07/2020	İsmet GENÇ 1990 Giresun Turkish	Eda YAMAN	Awarded
118.	33333/20	Urgan v. Türkiye	24/07/2020	İshak URGAN 1982 Turkish	Merve KOÇ	Awarded
119.	36371/20	Karakoç v. Türkiye	06/08/2020	Serdar KARAKOÇ 1992 Sakarya Turkish	Gamze AKSOY	Awarded
120.	36760/20	Taşkın v. Türkiye	06/08/2020	Orhan TAŞKIN 1981 Aydın Turkish	Esra Nur AKYOL	Awarded
121.	37181/20	Işıklı v. Türkiye	29/07/2020	İbrahim IŞIKLI 1972 Mersin Turkish	Selma IŞIKLI	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
122.	37921/20	Yayan v. Türkiye	11/08/2020	İlyas YAYAN 1990 Bingöl Turkish	Ömer YAYAN	Awarded
123.	38261/20	Balcı v. Türkiye	19/08/2020	Ersin BALCI 1979 Adana Turkish	Müjdat Fatih İÇEL	Awarded
124.	38262/20	Kaya v. Türkiye	11/08/2020	Cağatay KAYA 1994 İstanbul Turkish	Ahmet KAYA	Awarded
125.	38991/20	Barış v. Türkiye	31/08/2020	Mehmet Fatih BARIŞ 1976 Tekirdağ Turkish	Mustafa KÜÇÜK	Awarded
126.	39599/20	Kayabaşı v. Türkiye	05/09/2020	Erol KAYABAŞI 1984 Kastamonu Turkish	Yakup Yaşar MIRZAOĞLU	Awarded
127.	40610/20	Çelik v. Türkiye	21/08/2020	Serhat ÇELİK 1990 İstanbul Turkish	Hasan ÇELİK	Awarded
128.	42398/20	Şahan v. Türkiye	03/09/2020	İsmail ŞAHAN 1976 Konya Turkish	Leyla MESUTOĞLU	Awarded
129.	43092/20	Yıldırım v. Türkiye	08/09/2020	Doğan YILDIRIM 1981 Sivas Turkish	Hamdi Kenan SEVİNÇ	Awarded
130.	44081/20	Çavuş v. Türkiye	29/09/2020	Çetin ÇAVUŞ 1982 Ankara Turkish	Beyza Esmâ TUNA	Awarded
131.	53963/20	Ordu v. Türkiye	25/11/2020	Hüseyin ORDU 1977 Manisa Turkish	Kadriye TÜMEN	Awarded
132.	55519/20	Uslu v. Türkiye	27/11/2020	Vedat USLU 1978 Turkish	Zafer İRAZ	Awarded

ÇETİN AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of Birth Place of Residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
133.	1315/21	Kocakurt v. Türkiye	22/12/2020	Hubeyb KOCAKURT 1982 İzmir Turkish	Kadriye TÜMEN	Awarded
134.	9455/21	Kavak v. Türkiye	26/01/2021	Hasan KAVAK 1981 Yozgat Turkish	Lezgin Ahmet BAYBAŞIN	Awarded
135.	11883/21	Aslan v. Türkiye	28/01/2021	Ahmet ASLAN 1976 Zonguldak Turkish	Arzu BEYAZIT	Awarded
136.	22432/21	Köşe v. Türkiye	27/04/2021	Ümit KÖŞE /1989 Ankara Turkish	Uğur ALTUN	Awarded
137.	39544/21	Kaya v. Türkiye	26/07/2021	Mehmet Salih KAYA 1977 Ankara Turkish	Mahmut KAÇAN	Awarded