



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

SECOND SECTION

CASE OF BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE

*(Applications nos. 3038/18 and 85 others –
see appended list)*

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

18 November 2025

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

In the case of Balıkçı 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 individuals 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 appropriate redress 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 dismiss the Government’s objection to the examination of the applications by a Committee;

Having deliberated in private on 21 October 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, 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). 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. 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: (a) witness statements indicating ties with FETÖ/PDY; (b) social media posts; (c) possession of pro-FETÖ/PDY publications; (d) 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; (e) provision of financial support to FETÖ/PDY or to institutions with ties to FETÖ/PDY; (f) attending or holding meetings (*sohbet*); (g) communication with senior executives of the organisation; (h) ensuring communication between FETÖ/PDY members; (i) using the ByLock encrypted messaging application; (j) staying in FETÖ/PDY houses; and (k) 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, 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 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 their 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 these complaints 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. The Government further submitted 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. In addition, they 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. They also asked the Court to declare some of the 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 failure to use the remedy of an individual application to the Constitutional Court, an examination of the case files reveals that, contrary to the Government's assertions, the applicants concerned 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, nor are they 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 is “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 connection that the competent courts in the present case referred to 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 have justified 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 *Taş and Others v. Türkiye* [Committee], nos. 41527/17 and 212 others, § 20, 17 December 2024, and the references in both judgments).

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, and *Taş and Others*, cited above, § 22).

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 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.

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 (EUR) covering 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 extending the applicants' 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 amounts 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' claim for just satisfaction.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 18 November 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.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
1.	3038/18	Balıkçı v. Türkiye	04/01/2018	Cevdet BALIKÇI 1969 Ankara Turkish	Filiz ALKAN (ASLANCAN)	Awarded
2.	22156/18	Öz v. Türkiye	24/04/2018	Müjdat ÖZ 1971 Afyonkarahisar Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK	Awarded
3.	26287/18	Oral v. Türkiye	17/05/2018	Gökhan ORAL 1971 Denizli Turkish		Awarded
4.	29960/18	Güven v. Türkiye	06/06/2018	Selim GÜVEN 1983 Balıkesir Turkish	Fatih ŞAHİNLER	Awarded
5.	33850/18	Gezer v. Türkiye	05/07/2018	Kutret GEZER 1960 Denizli Turkish	Ahmet KOCABAŞ	Awarded
6.	33979/18	Uslu v. Türkiye	11/05/2018	Nurettin USLU 1959 Çanakkale Turkish		Awarded
7.	36184/18	Çinemre v. Türkiye	23/07/2018	Remzi ÇİNEMRE 1964 Sakarya Turkish	Ahmet EROL	Awarded
8.	48613/18	Bozkurt v. Türkiye	08/10/2018	Durmuş BOZKURT 1962 Antalya Turkish	Mehmet Turgay BİLGE	Awarded
9.	49861/18	Alkan v. Türkiye	12/10/2018	Ramazan ALKAN 1979 Ankara Turkish	Gözde ŞENYAYLA	Awarded

BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
10.	54403/18	Caferoğlu v. Türkiye	01/11/2018	Ahmet CAFEROĞLU 1981 Kırıkkale Turkish	Özgür KOÇUM	Awarded
11.	54929/18	Yalçinkaya v. Türkiye	01/11/2018	Merve YALÇINKAYA 1991 Muğla Turkish		Awarded
12.	57196/18	Yaşa v. Türkiye	12/11/2018	Özlem YAŞA 1983 Bilecik Turkish	Fetullah Furkan Hakkı BAYRAKTAR	Awarded
13.	57288/18	Üçkuyu v. Türkiye	14/11/2018	Mustafa ÜÇKUYU 1969 Ankara Turkish	Mehmet Kemal ÜÇKUYU	Awarded
14.	57907/18	Kara v. Türkiye	05/12/2018	Sami KARA 1964 Manisa Turkish	Arife YÜKSEKDAĞ ALTUNAY	Awarded
15.	58411/18	Eriktaş v. Türkiye	03/12/2018	Muhsin ERİKTAŞ 1972 Manisa Turkish	Mustafa ASLAN	Not awarded
16.	3054/19	Taşkın v. Türkiye	05/12/2018	Mustafa TAŞKIN 1971 İzmir Turkish	Rıdvan DURGUN	Awarded
17.	6249/19	Yılmazsoylu v. Türkiye	11/01/2019	Yusuf YILMAZSOYLU 1979 Antalya Turkish	Yusuf Sait PEKGÖZ	Awarded
18.	6940/19	Saygılı v. Türkiye	24/01/2019	Beytullah SAYGILI 1978 Aydın Turkish	Esra Elif BOZKURT	Awarded
19.	7279/19	Koyuncuoğlu v. Türkiye	24/01/2019	Hasan KOYUNCUOĞLU 1972 Manisa Turkish	Müjdat Fatih İÇEL	Awarded

BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
20.	7352/19	Büyükkalaycı v. Türkiye	21/01/2019	Ahmet BÜYÜKKALAYCI 1990 Ankara Turkish	İbrahim Halil UZUN	Awarded
21.	7531/19	Arduç v. Türkiye	30/01/2019	Osman ARDUÇ 1988 Antalya Turkish	Yusuf Sait PEKGÖZ	Awarded
22.	12465/19	Akpınar v. Türkiye	15/02/2019	Mehmet Salih AKPINAR 1988 Hatay Turkish	Mücahit AYDIN	Awarded
23.	12789/19	Curabay v. Türkiye	27/02/2019	Ferhat CURABAY 1982 Kırklareli Turkish	Hakan KAPLANKAYA	Awarded
24.	15608/19	Dursun v. Türkiye	30/11/2018	Serkan DURSUN 1985 İzmir Turkish	Kadir ÖZTÜRK	Awarded
25.	15702/19	Keser v. Türkiye	06/03/2019	Eyüp KESER 1978 Ankara Turkish	Hamide Nur ALKAÇ	Awarded
26.	15732/19	Avandağ v. Türkiye	01/03/2019	Hüseyin AVANDAĞ 1983 Kahramanmaraş Turkish	Özcan KARA	Awarded
27.	18189/19	Batak v. Türkiye	29/03/2019	Mustafa BATAK 1976 Tekirdağ Turkish		Awarded
28.	18779/19	Arık v. Türkiye	28/03/2019	Burhan ARIK 1987 Kahramanmaraş Turkish	İbrahim Halil UZUN	Awarded
29.	38918/19	Akdoğan v. Türkiye	10/07/2019	Mustafa AKDOĞAN 1980 Ankara Turkish	Kamile KILDAN	Awarded

BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
30.	46997/19	Mengirkaan v. Türkiye	19/08/2019	Şeyhmus MENGİRKAAN 1986 Bingöl Turkish	Dudu ERTUNÇ	Awarded
31.	49418/19	Yılmaz v. Türkiye	20/08/2019	Kutluhan YILMAZ 1976 Erzincan Turkish		Not awarded
32.	56917/19	Koçak v. Türkiye	16/10/2019	Hüsmen KOÇAK 1976 Tekirdağ Turkish	Nihat KILIÇ	Awarded
33.	57578/19	Gökçen v. Türkiye	24/10/2019	Abdullah GÖKCEN 1987 Hatay Turkish	Dudu ERTUNÇ	Awarded
34.	58724/19	Karaduman v. Türkiye	24/09/2019	Zekeriye KARADUMAN 1972 Osmaniye Turkish	Hayrettin AÇIKGÖZ	Awarded
35.	60476/19	Kahya v. Türkiye	19/11/2019	Ali Osman KAHYA 1958 Bursa Turkish	Rukiye KAHYA	Awarded
36.	4418/20	Deniz v. Türkiye	06/01/2020	Mehmet DENİZ 1990 Şanlıurfa Turkish	Enes Malik KILIÇ	Awarded
37.	7142/20	Ünal v. Türkiye	16/01/2020	Ali ÜNAL 1975 Çorum Turkish	F. Halide ÜNAL	Awarded
38.	8068/20	Aydın v. Türkiye	23/01/2020	Telat AYDIN 1973 Samsun Turkish	Ahmet ÖZDİN	Awarded
39.	12780/20	Udül v. Türkiye	24/02/2020	Eren UDÜL 1983 Manisa Turkish	Sertan AKŞAR	Awarded

BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
40.	14436/20	Aktaş v. Türkiye	04/03/2020	İsa AKTAŞ 1968 Samsun Turkish	Ayşenur ÖZDEMİR	Awarded
41.	14902/20	Bilgin v. Türkiye	11/03/2020	Ayhan BİLGİN 1986 Amasya Turkish	Nursel AKGÜN	Awarded
42.	25786/20	Keleş v. Türkiye	25/06/2020	Halit KELEŞ 1977 Istanbul Turkish	Ali TOKUL	Awarded
43.	27345/20	Hasyiğit v. Türkiye	29/06/2020	Özcan HASYİĞİT 1950 Istanbul Turkish	Adem UZAK	Awarded
44.	44393/20	Durak v. Türkiye	25/09/2020	Muzaffer DURAK 1990 Düzce Turkish	Cengiz YILMAZ	Awarded
45.	45804/20	Yiğit v. Türkiye	08/10/2020	Emrah YİĞİT 1982 Aksaray Turkish	Uğur ALTUN	Awarded
46.	45814/20	Şen v. Türkiye	01/10/2020	Sedat ŞEN 1977 Burdur Turkish	İrem TATLİDEDE	Awarded
47.	47697/20	Güney v. Türkiye	13/10/2020	İsmail GÜNEY 1990 Bursa Turkish	Mehmet ÖZER	Awarded
48.	48662/20	Ercan v. Türkiye	22/10/2020	Mustafa Kemal ERCAN 1972 Diyarbakır Turkish	Lezgin Ahmet BAYBAŞIN	Awarded
49.	49159/20	Sivri v. Türkiye	27/10/2020	Süleyman SİVRİ 1970 Eskişehir Turkish	Selma Zülal SİVRİ	Awarded
50.	50182/20	Uçar v. Türkiye	21/10/2020	Muhterem UÇAR 1977 İzmir Turkish	Lale KARADAŞ	Awarded

BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
51.	50656/20	Boz v. Türkiye	05/11/2020	Erol BOZ 1981 Konya Turkish	Yalçın REŞİTOĞLU	Not awarded
52.	50688/20	Şen v. Türkiye	06/11/2020	İhsan ŞEN 1991 Denizli Turkish	Adnan ERDOĞAN	Awarded
53.	51374/20	Ercan v. Türkiye	04/11/2020	Halil İbrahim ERCAN 1977 Samsun Turkish		Awarded
54.	52055/20	Şen v. Türkiye	13/11/2020	Mücahit ŞEN 1990 Ankara Turkish	Ahmet Serdar GÜNEŞ	Awarded
55.	52088/20	Han v. Türkiye	17/11/2020	Abdurrahman HAN 1983 Malatya Turkish	Firdevs ERYAMAN UTKU	Awarded
56.	52143/20	Turan v. Türkiye	11/11/2020	Bülent TURAN 1973 Tremelo (Belgium) Turkish		Awarded
57.	54296/20	Ünveren v. Türkiye	20/11/2020	Salih Buğra ÜNVEREN 1991 Istanbul Turkish		Awarded
58.	54391/20	Özdemir v. Türkiye	20/11/2020	Muhammet ÖZDEMİR 1977 Istanbul Turkish	Nermin KARAL ÖZDEMİR	Awarded
59.	55508/20	Dağlı v. Türkiye	01/12/2020	Harun DAĞLI 1980 Kırıkkale Turkish	Meral KAYA	Awarded
60.	103/21	Kaya v. Türkiye	04/12/2020	Özkan KAYA 1990 Eskişehir Turkish	Tuğba Nur KIYMAZ	Awarded

BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
61.	493/21	Ayçiçek v. Türkiye	03/12/2020	Mehmet Emin AYÇİÇEK 1976 Bolu Turkish		Awarded
62.	3939/21	Kaya v. Türkiye	10/12/2020	Mustafa KAYA 1978 Istanbul Turkish		Awarded
63.	10265/21	Deniz v. Türkiye	27/01/2021	Selçuk DENİZ 1990 Elazığ Turkish	Sercihan ÇELİK	Awarded
64.	10357/21	Çiyik v. Türkiye	08/02/2021	Abdullah ÇİYİK 1975 İzmir Turkish	Sümeyye ÖZCAN	Awarded
65.	10496/21	Yılmaz v. Türkiye	02/02/2021	İsa YILMAZ 1987 Istanbul Turkish	Emre AKARYILDIZ	Awarded
66.	13004/21	Çınar v. Türkiye	23/02/2021	Muhammet Emin ÇINAR 1995 Mersin Turkish		Awarded
67.	13553/21	Yılmaz v. Türkiye	01/03/2021	Abdulkadir YILMAZ 1984 Tekirdağ Turkish		Awarded
68.	14091/21	Bilgin v. Türkiye	26/02/2021	İsmail BİLGİN 1968 Denizli Turkish	Sümeyra DOBUR	Awarded
69.	14507/21	Er v. Türkiye	05/03/2021	Ali Sefa ER 1991 Istanbul Turkish	Rümeysa Senanur ER	Awarded
70.	15044/21	Örük v. Türkiye	10/03/2021	Metin ÖRÜK 1974 Kırıkkale Turkish	Meryem GÜNER	Awarded

BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
71.	16190/21	Mumcu v. Türkiye	16/03/2021	Kazım MUMCU 1970 Ankara Turkish	Semih ECER	Not awarded
72.	18061/21	Süvari v. Türkiye	24/03/2021	Recep SÜVARI 1977 Amasya Turkish		Awarded
73.	20844/21	Akelma v. Türkiye	26/02/2021	Enes AKELMA 1974 Diyarbakır Turkish	Harun AKELMA	Awarded
74.	22164/21	Kesik v. Türkiye	31/03/2021	Mahmut KESİK 1975 Ankara Turkish	Halil ŞAHİN	Not awarded
75.	28697/21	Acar v. Türkiye	31/05/2021	Serhat ACAR 1985 Bursa Turkish	Kübra ACAR	Awarded
76.	31574/21	Yücel v. Türkiye	11/06/2021	Fikri YÜCEL 1991 Istanbul Turkish	Naim UZUN	Awarded
77.	35316/21	Karagöz v. Türkiye	14/06/2021	İdris KARAGÖZ 1971 Eskişehir Turkish	Adem KAPLAN	Awarded
78.	36518/21	Dikmen v. Türkiye	08/07/2021	Babir DİKMEN 1973 Istanbul Turkish	Cemalettin ÖZER	Awarded
79.	36743/21	Yıldırım v. Türkiye	18/06/2021	İsmail YILDIRIM 1974 Kocaeli Turkish	Abdulkadir AKBAŞ	Awarded
80.	40386/21	Güç v. Türkiye	02/08/2021	Oktay GÜÇ 1989 Amasya Turkish	Muhammet Emin ÇITIR	Awarded
81.	51294/21	Özkan v. Türkiye	06/10/2021	Cebrail ÖZKAN 1989 Malatya Turkish		Awarded

BALIKÇI AND OTHERS v. TÜRKİYE JUDGMENT

No.	Applicati on no.	Case name	Lodged on	Applicant Year of birth Place of residence Nationality	Represented by	Just satisfaction
82.	3065/22	İnan v. Türkiye	15/12/2021	Ahmet İNAN 1974 Samsun Turkish		Awarded
83.	3729/22	Gençer v. Türkiye	14/01/2022	Ali GENÇER 1985 Trabzon Turkish	Latife GENÇER	Awarded
84.	6279/22	Bulut v. Türkiye	28/01/2022	Enes BULUT 1993 İzmir Turkish	Orçun MUŞLU	Awarded
85.	7577/22	Boztürk v. Türkiye	02/02/2022	Tarık BOZTÜRK 1980 Ankara Turkish	Emine Pınar TEKİNŞEN	Awarded
86.	9653/22	Armutcu v. Türkiye	26/01/2022	Murat ARMUTCU 1986 Çorum Turkish	Metin BOZKURT	Awarded