



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

SECOND SECTION

CASE OF BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE

*(Applications nos. 26831/17 and 93 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 Budak 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 pre-trial detention, the length of pre-trial detention and the ineffectiveness of the judicial review of the lawfulness of the detention to the Turkish Government (“the Government”), represented by their then Agent, Mr Hacı Ali Açıkğül, 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 dismiss 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 attempted *coup d’état* of 15 July 2016, 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 attempted *coup d’état* (for further background information, see *Akgün v. Turkey*, no. 19699/18, §§ 3-9, and §§ 106-07, 20 July 2021).

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 v. Turkey*, no. 66448/17, § 58, 3 March 2020). The competent judicial authorities dismissed objections raised by the applicants against their detention.

3. On various dates in the course of the ensuing criminal investigations and trials, the competent judicial authorities ordered the applicants' continued detention.

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: (a) using the ByLock encrypted messaging application; (b) provision of financial support to FETÖ/PDY in view of their use of accounts with Bank Asya, a bank with alleged ties to FETÖ/PDY; (c) provision of financial support, the details and nature of which were not provided, to FETÖ/PDY or to institutions with ties to FETÖ/PDY; (d) sharing social media posts or participating in protests in support of FETÖ/PDY; (e) possession of pro-FETÖ/PDY publications; (f) having regular telephone contact with FETÖ/PDY suspects; (g) working in or being a member of institutions with ties with the organisation in question or an organisation shut down by the state-of-emergency legislative decrees; (h) suspension or dismissal from office; (i) possessing United States one-dollar banknotes with an "F" serial number; (j) travelling abroad with FETÖ/PDY suspects; (k) enrolling their children in an educational institution allegedly affiliated with FETÖ/PDY; (l) attending or holding meetings (*sohbet*), the dates, nature or characteristics of which were not specified; (m) staying in FETÖ/PDY residences; (n) witness statements indicating ties with FETÖ/PDY; and (o) 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 (see *Kavala v. Turkey*, no. 28749/18, §§ 71-72, 10 December 2019, for the text of those provisions), 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 the 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.

6. In the meantime, the applicants lodged one or more individual applications with the Constitutional Court in respect of the detention orders, alleging, *inter alia*, a lack of reasonable suspicion that they had committed an offence and a lack of reasons to justify the decision to remand them in pre-trial detention. All of their applications were 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 present 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 OF THE CONVENTION

9. The applicants complained that there had been no specific evidence giving rise to a reasonable suspicion, within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 (c) of the Convention, that they had committed a criminal offence necessitating, in particular, their initial pre-trial detention.

10. The Government urged the Court to declare this complaint inadmissible in respect of the 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. They further asked the Court to 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.

11. The Court notes that similar objections raised by the Government have already been dismissed in other cases against Türkiye (see, for instance, *Baş*, cited above, §§ 118-21, 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. The Court therefore considers that this complaint is not manifestly ill-founded within the meaning of Article 35 § 3 (a) of the Convention, nor is it inadmissible on any other grounds. It must therefore be declared admissible.

12. The Court notes that the applicants’ initial pre-trial detention was mainly based on evidence of their (a) use of the ByLock messaging application; (b) banking activities considered as financing FETÖ/PDY; (c) sharing of social media posts or participation in protests in favour of FETÖ/PDY; (d) possession of certain pro-FETÖ/PDY publications; (e) regular telephone or other contact with FETÖ/PDY suspects; (f) employment by and/or membership of FETÖ/PDY-affiliated institutions and organisations; (g) suspension or dismissal from office; and (h) possession of United States one-dollar banknotes with an “F” serial number.

13. To the extent that the detention orders took into account the applicants’ alleged use of the ByLock messaging application, the Court notes

that it has already found that the mere use of ByLock was not sufficient to constitute “reasonable suspicion” within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 (c) of the Convention in respect of the offence with which the applicants were charged (see *Akgün*, cited above, §§ 151-85, 20 July 2021, and *Taner Kılıç v. Turkey* (no. 2), no. 208/18, §§ 102-03 and 106-09, 31 May 2022). Accordingly, in applications where the use of ByLock constituted the principal basis for the applicants’ detention, the Court has found that there was no reasonable suspicion that they had committed an offence, for the purposes of Article 5 § 1 (c) of the Convention.

14. As regards the other evidential grounds referred to by the national courts where the use of ByLock was not the central or sole factor, the Court refers to its finding in *Taner Kılıç* (cited above, §§ 104-05) that acts such as subscribing to the organisation’s lawful publications, enrolling children in legally operating schools allegedly affiliated with the organisation, or holding an account with Bank Asya were merely circumstantial and, in the absence of further evidence, could not reasonably give rise to a suspicion of having committed the alleged offence. The Court emphasised in that case that such acts enjoyed a presumption of lawfulness unless there was further specific evidence capable of establishing the suspect’s intentional involvement in an organisation’s criminal activities (*ibid.*, § 105). In the light of those considerations, the Court finds that the additional grounds relied on in the present applications for ordering the applicants’ detention, such as the possession of specific one-dollar banknotes, social media activity, protests, contact with other suspects, employment by and/or membership of affiliated entities, or dismissal from public service, likewise fall within the scope of acts which do not, *per se*, give rise to a reasonable suspicion that the applicants were members of a terrorist organisation. Those factors do not carry any greater evidential weight than the circumstantial evidence previously examined by the Court. The Court thus considers, *a fortiori*, that the other acts imputed to the applicants allegedly demonstrating an “organisational connection” (see paragraph 4 above) cannot reasonably be construed as evidence of membership of a terrorist organisation in the absence of further information substantiating such suspicions (compare *Taner Kılıç*, cited above, §§ 104-05, and the cases cited therein). The Court also notes, with regard to some of the applicants, that the Government have referred to the existence of witness statements justifying the measures in question. It observes, however, that the detention orders do not refer to any statements setting out concrete and specific facts that may have given rise to a reasonable suspicion at the material time that the applicants concerned were members of a terrorist organisation (compare also *Tüzemen and Others v. Türkiye* [Committee], nos. 66683/16 and 116 others, § 13, 8 July 2025).

15. The Court further notes that, when ordering the applicants’ initial pre-trial detention, the judicial authorities sought to justify the detention orders by making a general reference to Article 100 of the Code of Criminal

Procedure, the severity of the potential sentence prescribed by law, and “the evidence in the case files”. However, in doing so, they merely cited the wording of the provision in question, without actually specifying the evidence giving rise to a reasonable suspicion that the applicants had committed the offence in question. The Court refers in this connection to its findings in *Baş* (cited above, §§ 190-95), according to which vague and general references to the wording of Article 100 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and to the evidence in the case file cannot be regarded as sufficient to justify the “reasonableness” of the suspicion on which the applicants’ detention was supposed to have been based, in the absence either of a specific assessment of the individual items of evidence in the file, or of any information available in the file at the material time that could have justified the suspicion against the applicants, or of any other kinds of verifiable material or facts.

16. Since the Government have not provided any other indications, facts or information capable of establishing, at the time of the applicants’ initial detention, a reasonable suspicion that they had committed the alleged offence, the Court finds that the requirements set out in Article 5 § 1 (c) of the Convention in that regard have not been satisfied (compare *Baş*, cited above, § 195, and *Taner Kılıç*, cited above, §§ 114-16). Lastly, the Court notes that the applicants were detained a short time after the attempted *coup d’état* – that is, the event that prompted the declaration of the state of emergency and the notice of derogation by Türkiye. While this is undoubtedly a contextual factor that should be fully taken into account in interpreting and applying Article 5 of the Convention in the present case, the measure at issue cannot be said to have been strictly required by the exigencies of the situation (compare *Baş*, cited above, §§ 115-16 and 196-201).

17. The Court therefore concludes that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention.

III. OTHER COMPLAINTS

18. As regards any remaining complaints under Article 5 §§ 1, 3 and 4 of the Convention, the Court decides not to examine them, in view of its findings under Article 5 § 1 above and its considerations in *Turan and Others* (cited above, § 98).

APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

19. The applicants, except for the applicants in applications nos. 8565/18, 43864/18, 19141/19, 22748/19 and 30860/19, requested varying amounts in respect of non-pecuniary damage, submitting their claims within the time-limit allotted. The majority of them also claimed amounts in respect of pecuniary damage, as well as the legal costs and expenses incurred before the domestic courts and the Court.

20. The Government contested the applicants' claims as being unsubstantiated and excessive.

21. 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, save for the applicants in applications nos. 8565/18, 43864/18, 19141/19, 22748/19 and 30860/19, a lump sum of 5,000 euros, covering non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses, plus any tax that may be chargeable on that amount.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Decides* to join the applications;
2. *Declares* the complaint under Article 5 § 1 of the Convention concerning the alleged lack of reasonable suspicion, at the time of the applicants' initial pre-trial detention, that they had committed an offence admissible;
3. *Holds* that there has been a violation of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention on account of the lack of reasonable suspicion, at the time of the applicants' initial pre-trial detention, that they had committed an offence;
4. *Holds* that there is no need to examine the admissibility and merits of the applicants' remaining complaints under Article 5 of the Convention;
5. *Holds*
 - (a) that the respondent State is to pay, within three months, each of the applicants, save for the applicants in applications nos. 8565/18, 43864/18, 19141/19, 22748/19 and 30860/19, EUR 5,000 (five thousand euros) in respect of non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses, plus any tax that may be chargeable on that amount, 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 amounts at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points;
6. *Dismisses* the remainder of the applicants' claims for just satisfaction.

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

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
1.	26831/17	Budak v. Türkiye	18/03/2017	İbrahim BUDAK 1974 Erzurum Turkish	Levent MAZILIGÜNEY
2.	49751/17	Yüzer v. Türkiye	17/06/2017	Yakup YÜZER 1964 Ankara Turkish	Hilal YILMAZ PUSAT
3.	55148/17	Maraş v. Türkiye	19/04/2017	Rıfat MARAŞ 1982 Büdingen (Germany) Turkish	Hasan SEVER
4.	58451/17	Karahan v. Türkiye	17/07/2017	Ercan KARAHAN 1987 Afyonkarahisar Turkish	Gülhis YÖRÜK
5.	60297/17	Çıngı v. Türkiye	28/06/2017	Devlet ÇINGİ 1974 Kırşehir Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK
6.	61103/17	Manisa v. Türkiye	14/08/2017	Cüneyt MANİSA 1979 Şırnak Turkish	Nurgül YAYMAN YILMAZ
7.	69860/17	Karagöz v. Türkiye	18/08/2017	Kasım KARAGÖZ 1973 İstanbul Turkish	Dilara YILMAZ
8.	70642/17	Yıldız v. Türkiye	22/08/2017	Özkan YILDIZ 1986 Balıkesir Turkish	Burcu HAS
9.	71047/17	Ağsakal v. Türkiye	16/08/2017	Ahmet AĞSAKAL 1987 Flörsheim (Germany) Turkish	İbrahim AĞSAKAL

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by
10.	2690/18	Paşaalioğlu v. Türkiye	19/12/2017	Erkan PAŞAALIOĞLU 1973 Çorum Turkish	Hakan KAPLANKAYA
11.	3279/18	Başar v. Türkiye	26/12/2017	Mehmet BAŞAR 1986 Çankırı Turkish	Harun IŞIK
12.	3454/18	Yurdaer v. Türkiye	08/12/2017	Ahmet YURDAER 1972 Denizli Turkish	Akerke ABDYKALYKOVA ONAT
13.	4634/18	Eker v. Türkiye	13/07/2017	Dilek EKER 1975 Bolu Turkish	Mustafa DEMİR
14.	6631/18	Çetinkaya v. Türkiye	12/01/2018	Gökhan ÇETİNKAYA 1989 Kahramanmaraş Turkish	Mehmet ÇETİNKAYA
15.	8313/18	Kahraman v. Türkiye	26/01/2018	Abdulahat KAHRAMAN 1987 Denizli Turkish	Hasan Önder SULLU
16.	8565/18	Kaya v. Türkiye	13/02/2018	Halil İbrahim KAYA 1990 Uşak Turkish	Karar Koray ATAK
17.	8607/18	Seçkiner v. Türkiye	28/04/2017	Mehmet SEÇKİNER 1978 Eskişehir Turkish	Xavier LABBEE
18.	8899/18	Taş v. Türkiye	02/06/2017	Murat TAŞ 1981 Ankara Turkish	Gülhis YÖRÜK
19.	8901/18	Girgin v. Türkiye	02/06/2017	Yalçın GİRGİN 1978 Ankara Turkish	Gülhis YÖRÜK

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by
20.	8910/18	Çolak v. Türkiye	23/05/2017	Yasin ÇOLAK 1968 Ankara Turkish	Gülhis YÖRÜK
21.	8912/18	Yıldız v. Türkiye	06/07/2017	Adem YILDIZ 1977 Ankara Turkish	Gülhis YÖRÜK
22.	9581/18	Kumaş v. Türkiye	13/02/2018	Hasan KUMAŞ 1960 Trabzon Turkish	Fatma ALBAYRAK
23.	9587/18	Demir v. Türkiye	13/02/2018	Burak DEMİR 1990 Ankara Turkish	Fatma ALBAYRAK
24.	9588/18	Yıldırım v. Türkiye	13/02/2018	Feyza YILDIRIM 1993 Rize Turkish	Fatma ALBAYRAK
25.	11977/18	Aydoğdu v. Türkiye	05/03/2018	Cumhur AYDOĞDU 1978 Tekirdag Turkish	Büteyra DEMİR
26.	12628/18	Göksu v. Türkiye	05/03/2018	Fazlı GÖKSU 1981 Samsun Turkish	Mehmet ŞEN
27.	14185/18	Kunçay v. Türkiye	13/03/2018	İsa KUNÇAY 1968 Manisa Turkish	Nevzat AKBİLEK
28.	15443/18	Sandal v. Türkiye	22/03/2018	Ramazan SANDAL 1981 Kahramanmaraş Turkish	Ahmet AKSOY
29.	16300/18	Evren v. Türkiye	14/03/2018	Erhan EVREN 1980 Elazığ Turkish	Mehmet Sıddık KARAGÖZ
30.	17110/18	Melemez v. Türkiye	16/03/2018	Kenan MELEMEZ 1977 Bartın Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by
31.	17579/18	Baran v. Türkiye	16/02/2018	Salim BARAN 1974 Çorum Turkish	Tarık Said GÜLDİBİ
32.	17720/18	Sarıtemur v. Türkiye	06/04/2018	Yılmaz SARITEMUR 1984 Aydın Turkish	Elif KANDİLLİ
33.	19870/18	Demirci v. Türkiye	18/04/2018	Recep DEMİRCİ 1990 Kocaeli Turkish	Burhan DEMİRCİ
34.	20982/18	Solmaz v. Türkiye	24/04/2018	Kamil SOLMAZ 1968 Isparta Turkish	Ömer Furkan DAĞ
35.	21074/18	Kaplan v. Türkiye	20/04/2018	Enver KAPLAN 1963 Eskişehir Turkish	Adem KAPLAN
36.	21101/18	Büyük v. Türkiye	20/04/2018	Ömer Ali BÜYÜK 1994 İstanbul Turkish	Adem KAPLAN
37.	23774/18	Arı v. Türkiye	05/04/2018	Zekeriya ARI 1975 Eskişehir Turkish	Mehmet YALÇIN
38.	24223/18	Murat v. Türkiye	07/05/2018	Ömer MURAT 1969 Sivas Turkish	Fatih SARIKUŞ
39.	25205/18	Özcan v. Türkiye	21/05/2018	Ahmet Şahin ÖZCAN 1963 Ankara Turkish	Vedat ÇAPRAZ
40.	30491/18	Ekim v. Türkiye	13/06/2018	Ömer Faruk EKİM 1981 Kırşehir Turkish	Iyaz ÇİMEN
41.	38587/18	Arslan v. Türkiye	01/08/2018	Orhan ARSLAN 1970 Ankara Turkish	Zülküf ARSLAN

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by
42.	39152/18	Güç v. Türkiye	31/07/2018	Ömer GÜÇ 1975 Kocaeli Turkish	İlyas TEKİN
43.	39833/18	Zengin v. Türkiye	15/08/2018	Ahmet Bilal ZENGİN 1973 Ankara Turkish	Zümrüt ŞAHİN
44.	41856/18	Pınarakar v. Türkiye	14/08/2018	Sami PINARAKAR 1972 Ankara Turkish	Necip Fazıl YILDIZ
45.	42238/18	Dolaşık v. Türkiye	27/08/2018	İlhan DOLAŞIK 1983 Malatya Turkish	Ahmet Serdar GÜNEŞ
46.	42430/18	Bedir v. Türkiye	03/09/2018	Habip BEDİR 1984 Kayseri Turkish	Yunus EMRE
47.	42866/18	Atılgan v. Türkiye	29/08/2018	Gökhan ATILGAN 1988 İstanbul Turkish	Şehriban TOĞRUL
48.	42882/18	Çalışkan v. Türkiye	29/08/2018	Elvan ÇALIŞKAN 1978 Balıkesir Turkish	Ahmet Serdar GÜNEŞ
49.	43864/18	Baş v. Türkiye	29/08/2018	Ergün BAŞ 1972 Kırşehir Turkish	Sinan İPEK
50.	44202/18	Aydın v. Türkiye	08/09/2018	Nurettin AYDIN 1984 Düzce Turkish	Ali KAYGISIZ
51.	45534/18	Karadavut v. Türkiye	07/09/2018	Özgür KARADAVUT 1977 Ankara Turkish	Adem KAPLAN
52.	45893/18	Kaya v. Türkiye	20/09/2018	Sunulah KAYA 1991 Antalya Turkish	Mehmet ARI

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by
53.	46097/18	Dalar v. Türkiye	14/09/2018	Muhammet DALAR 1989 Isparta Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK
54.	46241/18	Kıran v. Türkiye	24/09/2018	Hüsnü KIRAN 1973 Istanbul Turkish	
55.	50802/18	Ertekin v. Türkiye	11/10/2018	Sedat ERTEKİN 1966 Ankara Turkish	Adem KAPLAN
56.	52946/18	Tekkoyun v. Türkiye	30/10/2018	Muhammet Fatih TEKKOYUN 1980 Kırıkkale Turkish	Dilara YILMAZ
57.	3146/19	Önerbay v. Türkiye	14/12/2018	Kamil ÖNERBAY 1980 Ankara Turkish	Hüseyin YILMAZ
58.	3357/19	Topuz v. Türkiye	17/12/2018	Ramazan TOPUZ 1974 Konya Turkish	Vedat ÇAPRAZ
59.	4658/19	Bekdemir v. Türkiye	31/12/2018	Yunus BEKDEMİR 1961 Samsun Turkish	İnan UZUN
60.	5196/19	Gönülaçar v. Türkiye	27/12/2018	Evren GÖNÜLAÇAR 1984 Gümüşhane Turkish	Muhammed Nuh POLAT
61.	5613/19	Kızıltan v. Türkiye	08/01/2019	Meral KIZILTAN 1977 Antalya Turkish	Yusuf Sait PEKGÖZ
62.	6315/19	Civan v. Türkiye	07/01/2019	Yunus CİVAN 1988 Ankara Turkish	Adem KAPLAN
63.	6329/19	Ayaz v. Türkiye	21/12/2018	Fahrettin AYAZ 1985 Tokat Turkish	Salih BAŞ

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by
64.	16245/19	Dırman v. Türkiye	20/03/2019	Hüseyin DIRMAN 1985 Antalya Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK
65.	17495/19	Atakan v. Türkiye	25/03/2019	Atakan YÜCEL 1986 Istanbul Turkish	Hüseyin AKBAŞ
66.	19141/19	Yiğit v. Türkiye	28/03/2019	Hasan YİĞİT 1969 Ankara Turkish	Ömercan AYDIN
67.	19184/19	Polat v. Türkiye	26/03/2019	Adem POLAT 1976 Konya Turkish	Muhammet Emin ÇITIR
68.	21188/19	Demirtaş v. Türkiye	20/02/2019	Ali DEMİRTAŞ 1989 Adana Turkish	
69.	21961/19	Elibol v. Türkiye	12/04/2019	Ersin ELİBOL 1973 Istanbul Turkish	Lale KARADAŞ
70.	22748/19	Çebi v. Türkiye	16/04/2019	Emre ÇEBİ 1988 Bayburt Turkish	Veysel MALKOÇ
71.	30259/19	Uyanık v. Türkiye	22/05/2019	Kenan UYANIK 1981 Eskişehir Turkish	Ramazan AKDOĞAN
72.	30860/19	Pampal v. Türkiye	27/05/2019	Mehmet PAMPAL 1966 Yozgat Turkish	
73.	35801/19	Sarı v. Türkiye	25/06/2019	İsmail SARI 1969 İzmir Turkish	
74.	120/20	Kılıçak v. Türkiye	19/12/2019	Osman KILIÇAK 1987 Eskişehir Turkish	Mustafa ALGAM

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by
75.	7384/20	Özdemir v. Türkiye	22/01/2020	Kürşad ÖZDEMİR 1977 Tekirdağ Turkish	Erşan CANSEVEN
76.	7911/20	Güden v. Türkiye	28/01/2020	Kadir GÜDEN 1975 Antalya Turkish	Yusuf Sait PEKGÖZ
77.	16084/20	Sefer v. Türkiye	09/03/2020	Salim SEFER 1984 Karabük Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK
78.	17104/20	Durak v. Türkiye	03/04/2020	Emre DURAK 1988 İstanbul Turkish	Fatif ŞAHİNLER
79.	23970/20	Demir v. Türkiye	15/05/2020	Selami DEMİR 1982 Manisa Turkish	Hasan YILDIZ
80.	24326/20	İpekçi v. Türkiye	15/06/2020	İlyas İPEKÇİ 1988 Ankara Turkish	Özkan OĞURLU
81.	29933/20	Akyüz v. Türkiye	17/06/2020	Murat AKYÜZ 1974 Düzce Turkish	Bekir DÖNMEZ
82.	30439/20	Şahin v. Türkiye	17/06/2020	Levent ŞAHİN 1977 Bolu Turkish	Merve Vildan DUMAN
83.	33367/20	Aker v. Türkiye	22/07/2020	Rana AKER 1988 Samsun Turkish	İnan UZUN
84.	33596/20	Coşkun v. Türkiye	24/07/2020	Onur COŞKUN 1975 Ankara Turkish	Ayşe COŞKUN
85.	33963/20	Aydın v. Türkiye	24/07/2020	Yunus Emre AYDIN 1988 Ankara Turkish	Ahmet Serdar GÜNEŞ

BUDAK AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Application no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by
86.	37312/20	Öztaş v. Türkiye	12/08/2020	Hasan ÖZTAŞ 1975 Afyonkarahisar Turkish	Harun BOZKURT
87.	40092/20	Kantemir v. Türkiye	27/08/2020	Yasin KANTEMİR 1993 Çorum Turkish	Kübra KAZANCI TOSUN
88.	40176/20	Öksüz v. Türkiye	25/08/2020	Enes ÖKSÜZ 1991 İzmir Turkish	
89.	41682/20	Erçikdi v. Türkiye	15/09/2020	Veysel ERÇIKDI 1974 Denizli Turkish	Mehmet TUNÇER
90.	41928/20	Topuz v. Türkiye	01/09/2020	İlhan TOPUZ 1980 Afyonkarahisar Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK
91.	48710/20	Karanfil v. Türkiye	23/10/2020	Arif KARANFİL 1971 Balıkesir Turkish	Burcu HAS
92.	55276/20	Yavuz v. Türkiye	26/11/2020	Zeynep YAVUZ 1989 İstanbul Turkish	Dilara YILMAZ
93.	283/21	Ergin v. Türkiye	18/12/2020	Hüseyin ERGİN 1965 Denizli Turkish	Ayşegül ERGİN
94.	17904/21	Şekerci v. Türkiye	05/03/2021	Yaşar ŞEKERCİ 1963 Kocaeli Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK