



Turkey

Ratified the European Convention on Human Rights in 1954

National Judge: Işıl Karakaş

[Judges' CVs](#) are available on the ECHR Internet site

Previous Judges: Kemel Fikret Arık (1959-1965), Suat Bilge (1966-1972), Ali Bozer (1973-1977), Feyyaz Gölcüklü (1977-1998), Rıza Türmen (1998-2008)

The Court dealt with 3,218 applications concerning Turkey in 2015, of which 3,060 were declared inadmissible or struck out. It delivered 87 judgments (concerning 158 applications), 79 of which found at least one violation of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Applications processed in	2013	2014	2015
Applications allocated to a judicial formation	3503	1584	2209
Communicated to the Government	509	200	214
Applications decided:	9198	2899	3218
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Single Judge)	5404	2328	2580
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Committee)	1639	229	402
- Declared inadmissible or struck out (Chamber)	1965	227	78
- Decided by judgment	190	115	158
Interim measures:	15	10	50
- Granted	1	1	4
- Refused (including out of scope)	14	9	46

For information about the Court's judicial formations and procedure, see the [ECHR internet site](#).

Applications pending before the court on 01/01/2016	
Total pending Applications	8648
Applications pending before a judicial formation:	8402
Single Judge	200
Committee (3 Judges)	4498
Chamber (7 Judges)	3703
Grand Chamber (17 Judges)	1

*including applications for which completed application forms have not yet been received

Turkey and ...

Its contribution to the Court's budget

For 2016 the Court's budget amounts to approximately 71 million Euros. That budget is financed by contributions from the 47 member States of the Council of Europe in accordance with scales based on population and GDP; the 2016 contribution of Turkey to the Council of Europe's (EUR 326 million) budget is **EUR 33,557,248**.

The Registry

The task of the Registry is to provide legal and administrative support to the Court in the exercise of its judicial functions. It is composed of lawyers, administrative and technical staff and translators. There are currently **679** Registry staff members of whom **40** are Turkish.

Noteworthy cases, judgments delivered

Grand Chamber

Cyprus v. Turkey

10.05.2001 (principal judgment)¹

Inter-State application lodged by Cyprus in 1994, concerning the situation in northern Cyprus since the division of the territory.

Continuing violation of Articles 2 (right to life), 5 (right to liberty and security), and 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) concerning Greek-Cypriot missing persons and their relatives

Continuing violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence) and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property) in conjunction with Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), concerning the homes and property of displaced persons

Violation of Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion), Article 10 (freedom of expression), Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education), Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment), 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and 13 (right to an effective remedy) and continuing violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property), concerning the living conditions of Greek Cypriots in the Karpas region of northern Cyprus

Violation of Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) on account of the practice, at the time, of authorising military courts to try Turkish civilians in northern Cyprus

¹ See also, with regard to the same case, the Grand Chamber [judgment](#) of 12 May 2014 on the question of just satisfaction. In this judgment, the Court held that the passage of time since the delivery of the principal judgment on 10 May 2001 did not preclude it from examining the Cypriot Government's just satisfaction claims. It concluded that Turkey was to pay Cyprus 30,000,000 euros (EUR) in respect of the non-pecuniary damage suffered by the relatives of the missing persons, and EUR 60,000,000 in respect of the non-pecuniary damage suffered by the enclaved Greek-Cypriot residents of the Karpas peninsula. These amounts, said the Court, are to be distributed by the Cypriot Government to the individual victims under the supervision of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

Öneryıldız v. Turkey

30.11.2004

Homes located near a rubbish tip in a shanty town outside Istanbul buried following a methane explosion.

Violation of Article 2 (right to life) in respect of the deaths of nine of the applicant's family members

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Mamatkulov and Askarov v. Turkey

04.02.2005

Extradition to Uzbekistan in 1999 of two members of the ERK opposition party

Violation of Article 34 (right of individual petition)

By failing to comply with the interim measures indicated by the Court under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court (interim measures), asking it not to extradite the applicants until further notice, Turkey was in breach of its obligations under Article 34 of the Convention

Öcalan v. Turkey

12.05.2005

Conditions of transfer to Turkey and detention of a man sentenced to death for activities designed to bring about the secession of part of Turkey's territory.

Several violations, including a violation of Article 3, the death penalty having been pronounced following an unfair trial

Leyla Sahin v. Turkey

10.11.2005

Disciplinary penalties for wearing the Islamic headscarf at university.

No violation of Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion)

No violation of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

No violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression)

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination)

Yumak and Sadak v. Turkey

08.07.2008

Electoral threshold of 10% imposed for parliamentary elections.

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 (right to free elections), in view of the State's margin of appreciation and the absence of a European standard

Demir et Baykara v. Turkey

12.11.2008

Annulment with retrospective effect of a collective agreement entered into by a trade union / prohibition on forming trade unions.

Violation of Article 11 (freedom of assembly and association) on account of interference with the exercise by the applicants, municipal civil servants, of their right to form trade unions

Violation of Article 11 of the Convention on account of the annulment, with retrospective effect, of a collective agreement between the trade union Tüm Bel Sen and the employing authority that had been the result of collective bargaining.

Salduz v. Turkey

27.11.2008

Restriction on applicant's right of access to a lawyer while in police custody for an offence falling under the jurisdiction of the state security courts, in spite of his age.

Violation of Article 6 § 3 (c) (right to defend oneself through legal assistance of one's own choosing) in conjunction with Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Varnava and Others v. Turkey

18.09.2009

Disappearance of nine Cypriot nationals after they were arrested and detained by the Turkish army during military operations in northern Cyprus in 1974.

Continuing violation of Articles 2 (right to life) and 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment)

Continuing violation of Article 5 (right to liberty and security) in respect of two missing men

No violation of Article 5 in respect of the other seven missing men

Kart v. Turkey

03.12.2009

Allegation by the applicant that he had been unable to defend his case in criminal proceedings against him because of his parliamentary immunity

No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial)

Serife Yiğit v. Turkey

02.11.2010

Refusal to award the applicant social-security benefits based on the entitlements of her deceased partner, with whom she had contracted a religious but not a civil marriage.

No violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property). No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for family life)

Sabri Güneş v. Turkey

24.05.2011

In this judgment, the Court defined compliance with the six-month time limit (Article 35 § 1 of the Convention), that was to say the starting date and the expiry date of the time-limit. It stated that the variable approach saw in its case-law was based on the principle that the six-month rule was autonomous and had to be construed and applied in each individual case in such a way as to ensure the effective exercise of the right to individual petition. On several occasions the Court confirmed the principle that compliance with the six-month time-limit was calculated in accordance with the Convention criteria and not on the basis of the conditions laid down by the domestic law of each respondent State.

The Court was unable to examine the merits of the case.

Nejdet Şahin and Perihan Şahin v. Turkey

20.10.2011

Divergence between the case-law of the ordinary administrative courts and that of the Supreme Military Administrative Court in cases about requests for supplementary pensions.

No violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial). Discrepancy in case-law between two supreme courts of the same State does not breach Convention.

Aksu v. Turkey

15.03.2012

Allegation that passages in a book about Roma and definitions in two dictionaries were offensive and discriminatory.

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

[Mustafa Tunç and Fecire Tunç v. Turkey](#)

14.04.2015

Death of a young man, Cihan Tunç, during his military service, while assigned to a site belonging to a private oil company for which the national gendarmerie was providing security services.

No violation of Article 2 (right to life)

Noteworthy cases, judgments and decisions delivered

Chamber

Cases concerning the right to life (Art. 2)

Violations of Article 2

[Öneryıldız v. Turkey](#)

30.11.2004

Grand Chamber Judgment (see page 3)

[İsaak v. Turkey](#) and [Solomou v. Turkey](#)

24.06.2008

Death of the applicants' kin during a Greek-Cypriot demonstration and protest in the United Nations buffer zone east of Nicosia.

[Opuz v. Turkey](#)

09.06.2009

Assaults and injuries inflicted by a man on his wife and mother-in-law over several years, culminating in the murder of the mother-in-law, despite a number of complaints by the victims and the institution of several sets of criminal proceedings by the prosecution authorities.

The Court found its first violation of Article 14 in a case concerning domestic violence and held that the violence suffered by the applicant and her mother had been gender-based, amounting to a form of discrimination against women.

[Beyazgül v. Turkey](#)

15.09.2009

Death of a 21-year-old man who fled in the face of warning shots fired by gendarmes on mission in the border area with Iran. (with reference, in particular, to the law on operations by security forces in border zones)

[Oyal v. Turkey](#)

23.03.2010

Refusal of the authorities to provide lifelong health care to a teenage boy infected with HIV as a result of blood transfusions at birth.

[Dink v. Turkey](#)

20.09.2010

See below, under freedom of expression.

[İsmail Altun v. Turkey](#)

21.09.2010

Applicant wounded by firearm during an operation to put a stop to a hunger strike by 83 detainees (on 19 December 2000, the date on which the security forces intervened simultaneously in 20 Turkish prisons where detainees had staged hunger strikes in protest against a plan for "F-type" prisons).

[Çoşelav v. Turkey](#)

09.10.2012

Juvenile's suicide in adult prison.

[Aydan v. Turkey](#)

12.03.2013

Accidental death of a passer-by who was shot by a gendarme on the fringes of a violent demonstration.

[Mehmet Şentürk and Bekir Şentürk v. Turkey](#)

09.04.2013

Death of a pregnant woman following a series of misjudgments by medical staff at different hospitals and the subsequent failure to provide her with emergency medical treatment when her condition was known to be critical.

[Ataykaya v. Turkey](#)

22.07.2014

Death of Mr Ataykaya's son, caused by a tear-gas grenade fired by the police during an illegal demonstration.

[Asiye Genç v. Turkey](#)

27.01.2015

Prematurely born baby's death in an ambulance, a few hours after birth, following the baby's transfer between hospitals without being admitted for treatment.

[Altuğ and Others v. Turkey](#)

30.06.2015

Death of Ms Keşoğlu at the age of 74 as the result of a violent allergic reaction to a penicillin derivative administered by intravenous injection in a private hospital.

[Özel and Others v. Turkey](#)

17.11.2015

Deaths of the applicants' family members, who were buried alive under buildings that collapsed in the town of Çınarcık in an earthquake on 17 August 1999, one of the deadliest earthquakes ever recorded in Turkey.

[Civek v. Turkey](#)

23.02.2016

The case concerned the murder of the applicants' mother, Selma Civek, by their father.

No violations of Article 2

[Horoz v. Turkey](#)

31.03.2010

Death of a prisoner taking part in a hunger strike in protest against "F-type" prisons.

[Berü v. Turkey](#)

11.01.2011

Death of a child in an attack by stray dogs, which were already known to be dangerous.

[Cavit Tınarlıoğlu v. Turkey](#)

02.02.2016

The case concerned an accident at sea in which Mr Tınarlıoğlu was injured while on holiday at an activity centre, and the ensuing proceedings.

Cases concerning suicides of conscripts during their military service

[Kılınç and Others v. Turkey](#)

07.06.2005

[Abdullah Yılmaz v. Turkey](#)

17.06.2008

[Lütfi Demirci and Others v. Turkey](#)

02.03.2010

[Servet Gündüz and Others v. Turkey,](#)

11.01.2011

[Hüseyin Kaplan v. Turkey](#)

15.10.2013

The Court declared inadmissible the applications [Zeki Kösebaşı and Others v. Turkey](#) and [Yeşilyurt v. Turkey](#).

Death in pre-trial detention

[Yurtsever and Others v. Turkey](#)

08.07.2014

Cases concerning inhuman and degrading treatment (Art. 3)

Violations of Article 3

[Öcalan v. Turkey](#)

12.05.2005

Grand Chamber judgment (see page 3)

[Öcalan v. Turkey](#)

18.03.2014

Complaint of Mr Öcalan - the founder of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), an illegal organisation) - about the irreducible nature of his sentence to life imprisonment and about the conditions of his detention (in particular his social isolation and the restrictions on his communication with members of his family and his lawyers).

[Camdereli v. Turkey](#)

17.07.2008

Ill-treatment inflicted by gendarmes and inadequacy of the criminal proceedings.

[Opuz v. Turkey](#)

09.06.2009

(see above under the right to life)

Abdolkhani and Karimnia v. Turkey

22.09.2009

Risk of ill-treatment of former members of the People's Mujahidin Organisation in the event of their deportation to Iran or Iraq.

Abdolkhani and Karimnia v. Turkey (no. 2)

27.07.2010

Detention of refugees in the basement of a police building for three months.

Gülizar Tuncer v. Turkey

21.09.2010

Use of force against the applicant by security forces dispersing a demonstration outside a post office in Istanbul in which she was taking part to send postcards to women detained in "F-type" prisons.

Üzer v. Turkey

21.09.2010

Ill-treatment of three young men, two of whom were minors, while in police custody, and subsequent police cover-up.

Ebcin v. Turkey

01.02.2011

Attack on the applicant in the street in the course of which acid was thrown in her face, and question of the authorities' obligation to protect people and diligence in the proceedings following the attack.

Yazgül Yılmaz v. Turkey

01.02.2011

Gynaecological examination to which the applicant, a minor, was subjected while she was in police custody – in order to ensure, according to the authorities, that she had not been assaulted – and failure to prosecute the doctors who had carried it out.

Saçılık and Others v. Turkey

05.07.2011

Complaint brought by Veli Saçılık and 24 other Turkish nationals, formerly detainees in Burdur Prison (Turkey), about a large-scale security operation carried out in the prison on 5 July 2000.

Ali Güneş v. Turkey

10.04.2012

Complaint by a high-school teacher who took part in a demonstration against the 2004 NATO summit in Istanbul that the police had ill-treated him, including by spraying tear gas on him.

The Court found in particular that:

- 1) the authorities had been unable to justify the use of tear gas against Mr Güneş after he had already been apprehended by the police; and,
- 2) no effective investigation had been carried out into his related complaints.

X v. Turkey (no. 24626/09)

09.10.2012

A homosexual prisoner who, after complaining about acts of intimidation and bullying by his fellow inmates, was placed in solitary confinement for over 8 months in total.

Necati Yılmaz v. Turkey

12.02.2013

Injuries sustained by the applicant at the hands of the bodyguards for having allegedly publicly insulted the Turkish Prime Minister at a road-opening ceremony.

Gülây Çetin v. Turkey

05.03.2013

The applicant complained that she had been kept in prison, initially pending trial and later following her conviction for murder, despite suffering from advanced cancer.

İzci v. Turkey

23.07.2013

Ms Izci complained that she had been attacked by the police following her participation in a peaceful demonstration to celebrate Women's Day in Istanbul and that such police brutality in Turkey was tolerated and often went unpunished.

The Court reiterated that a great number of applications against Turkey concerning the right to freedom of assembly and/or excessive use of force by law enforcement officials during demonstrations were currently pending. Considering the systemic aspect of the problem, it therefore requested the Turkish authorities to adopt general measures, in accordance with their obligations under Article 46 of the Convention, in order to prevent further similar violations in the future.

Gülizar Tuncer Güneş v. Turkey

11.02.2014

Allegations by the applicant that she had been assaulted by police officers during her arrest in 2000.

[Tüfekçi v. Turkey](#)

22.07.2014

Applicant's complaint that the police used force against him during a demonstration.

[Alpar v. Turkey](#)

26.01.2016

The applicants allege having been ill-treated during an identity check and during subsequent questioning at a police station.

Cases concerning the expulsion of former members of illegal organisations

[Charahili v. Turkey, Keshmiri v. Turkey, Ranjbar and Others v. Turkey and Tehrani and Others v. Turkey](#)

13.04.2010

In its judgments of 13.04.2010 the Court held that Turkey should release or refrain from placing in detention certain applicants.

[Alipour and Hosseinzadgan v. Turkey](#)

13.07.2010

Cases concerning the right to liberty and security (Art.5)

Violations of Article 5

[Pulatli v. Turkey](#)

26.04.2011

Disciplinary sanction depriving the applicant, a Turkish serviceman, of his liberty, without any examination of his case by a judicial body.

The Court found that the most appropriate form of redress would be for Turkey to introduce a mechanism to ensure that disciplinary sanctions involving deprivation of liberty were imposed or reviewed in proceedings before a judicial body.

[Altınok v. Turkey](#)

29.11.2011

Failure to provide detainees or their lawyer with a copy of the public prosecutor's opinion during the examination of an objection to their continued detention and the total lack of any compensatory remedy. Turkey must resolve **systemic legal problem** so that continued detention can be challenged.

[Nedim Şener v. Turkey and Sik v. Turkey](#)

08.07.2014

Continued pre-trial detention of investigative journalists accused of aiding and abetting the criminal organisation Ergenekon, whose members were convicted in 2013 of fomenting a *coup d'état*.

Cases concerning Article 6

Right to a fair trial/hearing

Violations of Article 6

[Göçmen v. Turkey](#)

17.10.2006

Use at the applicant's trial of statements obtained through torture.

[Mehmet and Suna Yigit v. Turkey](#)

17.07.2007

Refusal to grant legal aid in civil proceedings because the applicants were represented by a lawyer.

[Fazli Aslaner v. Turkey](#)

04.03.2014

Administrative proceedings in which certain judges at the Turkish Supreme Administrative Court were involved on more than one occasion, in the context of successive appeals on points of law.

[Balta and Demir v. Turkey](#)

23.06.2015

Applicants' conviction for membership of an illegal organisation, on the basis of statements by an anonymous witness whom the applicants were unable to question at any stage of the proceedings.

Inadmissible application

[Öcalan v. Turkey](#)

06.07.2010

Conviction of the applicant for activities aimed at bringing about the secession of part of Turkey's territory, and for training and leading a gang of armed terrorists.

In a [judgment](#) of 12 May 2005 the Court held that the proceedings before the State Security Court failed to meet the requirements of Article 6.

In its decision of 06.07.2010 it declared Mr Ocalan's new application inadmissible,

considering that the Turkish authorities' refusal to reopen criminal proceedings did not affect the execution of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights, supervision of which was the task of the Committee of Ministers.

Right to legal assistance of own choosing

Violations of Article 6

Cases concerning access to a lawyer while in police custody

Salduz v. Turkey

27.11.2008

Grand Chamber judgment (see page 1)

Dayanan v. Turkey

13.10.2009

Also concerning the right to remain silent

Right to the assistance of an interpreter

Violation of Article 6

Baytar v. Turkey

14.10.2014

Questioning in police custody, without the assistance of an interpreter, of an individual who did not have a sufficient command of the national language.

Right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time

Violations of Article 6

Göçmen v. Turkey

17.10.2006

(see case under 'the right to a fair trial/hearing')

Alkin v. Turkey

13.10.2009

Length of compensation proceedings in the case of an applicant whose leg was amputated when she was 11 years old after she stepped on a landmine while playing with other children near the village of Ortabağ.

Ümmühan Kaplan v. Turkey

20.03.2012 (pilot judgment) ²

Proceedings instituted in 1970 by the applicant's father, since deceased, in relation to some plots of land. The Court held that with regard to all cases raising the same general problem of length of judicial proceedings:

- Turkey had to put in place, within one year, an effective remedy affording adequate and sufficient redress, as concerned pending applications and those lodged between now and 22 September 2012;

- The following would be adjourned for one year: pending applications not yet communicated to the Turkish Government (2,373 applications as of 31 December 2011) and all those lodged between now and 22 September 2012

- The Court reserved the right to continue to examine under the normal procedure the 330 pending applications already communicated.

Behçet Taş v. Turkey

10.03.2015

Damage sustained by the applicant as a result of the explosion of an antipersonnel mine, and the fairness and length of the compensation proceedings instituted by him.

The Court declared the complaints alleging a violation of the right to life (Article 2) and the right to a fair hearing (Article 6 § 1) inadmissible as being manifestly ill-founded.

² Since 2004 and in response to the large number of cases deriving from systemic or structural problems in certain countries the Court has developed a pilot-judgment procedure. This consists in identifying in a single judgment systemic problems underlying a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights and indicating in that judgment the remedial measures required to resolve such situations. The pilot-judgment procedure is not only intended to facilitate effective implementation by respondent states of individual and general measures necessary to comply with the Court's judgments, but also induces the respondent State to resolve large numbers of individual cases arising from the same structural problem at domestic level, thus reinforcing the principle of subsidiarity which underpins the Convention system.

Inadmissible application

Müdür Turgut and Others v. Turkey

26.03.2013 (decision on the admissibility)

The applicants were arrested in Istanbul on grounds of their suspected links with a terrorist organisation.

The Court held in this case that Law no. 6384 was a direct and practical consequence of the pilot-judgment procedure applied in Ümmühan Kaplan v. Turkey (no. 24240/07) of 20 March 2012, designed to remedy complaints relating to the excessive length of proceedings.

Although that Law was not in force when the applicants lodged their application, the Court declared that it was not in a position to state at the present stage of the proceedings that the remedy currently available was not effective and accessible. It followed that the complaint had to be rejected for failure to exhaust domestic remedies.

Right to a fair hearing and equality of arms

No violation of Article 6

Diriöz v. Turkey

31.05.2012

Complaint by an accused that there had been an infringement of the principle of equality of arms in so far as the prosecutor stood on a raised platform whereas he and his lawyer had been placed, as was the rule, at a lower level in the courtroom.

Cases concerning the right to respect for family and private life (Art. 8)

Violations of Article 8

Mentes and Others v. Turkey

28.11.1997³

Houses burned during an operation by the security forces in June 1993 in the context of the conflict in south-east Turkey between the security forces and members of the PKK

(Workers' Party of Kurdistan), an illegal party.

Y.F. v. Turkey (no. 24209/94)

22.07.2003

Forced gynaecological examination of a detainee in police custody on suspicion of aiding and abetting the illegal PKK party.

Fazil Ahmet Tamer v. Turkey

05.12.2006

Censorship of prisoners' correspondence.

Güzel Erdağöz v. Turkey

21.10.2008

Refusal of the courts to allow an application to correct the spelling of a forename as it was a "regional word" not found in the dictionary published by the Turkish Language Institute.

Mustafa and Armagan Akin v. Turkey

06.04.2010

Brother and sister separated following their parents' divorce (father awarded custody of son and mother custody of daughter).

Perisan and Others v. Turkey

20.05.2010

Detainees injured or killed during an operation of the security forces on 24 September 1996 at Diyarbakir prison.

Özpinar v. Turkey

19.10.2010

Dismissal of a judge by the Judicial Service Commission for reasons relating to her private life (allegations, for example, of a personal relationship with a lawyer and of her wearing unsuitable attire and makeup).

Mehmet Nuri Özen and Others v. Turkey

11.01.2011

Refusal to dispatch prisoners' letters written in a language other than Turkish because their content was incomprehensible and therefore impossible to check.

Aydemir v. Turkey

24.05.2011

Search conducted in 2001 at the applicants' home, and at 48 neighbouring addresses, all situated in the vicinity of Aydın Prison. The searches were intended to prevent any assistance being provided to escaping prisoners via a tunnel. During the search of their home a relative of the applicants died.

³ In the same case, in its [judgment](#) of 24 July 1998, the Court decided on the question of just satisfaction.

Cengiz Kılıç c.Turquie

06.12.2011

Excessive length of divorce proceedings involving the issues of parental responsibility and contact for the parent not living with the child.

Alkaya v. Turkey

09.10.2012

Disclosure by the press of the home address of a Turkish actress whose apartment had been burgled.

Nusret Kaya and Others v. Turkey

22.04.2014

Concerned the fact that Turkish prisoners were not allowed to use the Kurdish language in their telephone conversations with their relatives.

Gözüm v. Turkey

20.01.2015

Refusal of Ms Gözüm's request, as a single adoptive mother, to have her own forename entered on the personal documents for her adopted son E. in place of the name of the child's biological mother.

Y. Y. v. Turkey (no. 14793/08)

10.03.2015

Refusal by the Turkish authorities to grant authorisation for gender reassignment surgery on the grounds that the person requesting it, a transsexual, was not permanently unable to procreate.

Bremner v. Turkey

13.10.2015

The case concerned the broadcasting of a television documentary in which the applicant, Mr Bremner, who was shown promoting his evangelical Christian beliefs, was described as a "foreign pedlar of religion" engaged in covert activities in Turkey.

Sodan v. Turkey

02.02.2016

The case concerned the applicant's transfer from his senior post within the governor's office in the capital to a similar post in the provinces following a report on his conduct pointing out that his wife wore an Islamic veil and that he himself had an introverted personality.

No violations of Article 8

Kemal Taşkın and Others v. Turkey

02.02.2010

Ban in official documents on names spelt with letters not found in the official Turkish alphabet.

Küçük v. Turkey and Switzerland

17.05.2011

International abduction of a child by his mother. The father complained in his own name and on behalf of his son that Turkey (their country) and Switzerland (where the child had been sighted) had not taken the necessary steps to secure the child's prompt return. Once the father had eventually recovered the child, the two were detained for several hours at Esenboğa Airport while travelling back to Turkey.

Cases concerning freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Art. 9)

Violations of Article 9

Leyla Sahin v. Turkey

10.11.2005 (Grand Chamber)

Grand Chamber judgment (see page 3)

Sinan Isik v. Turkey

02.02.2010

Rejection of the applicant's request to have the word "Islam", indicating his faith on his identity card, changed to "Alevi".

Arslan and Others v. Turkey

23.02.2010

Criminal conviction of members of a religious group for displaying their religious beliefs by wearing clothing peculiar to their faith.

Güler and Uğur v. Turkey

02.12.2014

Applicants' conviction for propaganda promoting a terrorist organisation on account of their participation in a religious service organised on the premises of a political party in memory of three members of an illegal organisation (the PKK) who had been killed by security forces.

Cases concerning conscientious objection

Ülke v. Turkey

24.01.2006

Mr Ülke refused to do his military service, on the ground that he had firm pacifist beliefs, and publicly burned his call-up papers at a press conference. He was initially convicted of inciting conscripts to evade military service and, having been transferred to a military regiment, repeatedly convicted for his refusals to wear a military uniform. He served almost two years in prison and later hid from the authorities.

Violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment)

Ercep v. Turkey

22.11.2011

Refusal by the applicant, a Jehovah's Witness and conscientious objector, to perform military service for reasons of conscience.

Violation of Article 9

Violation of Article 6 (right to a fair trial)

Turkey invited to enact legislation concerning conscientious objectors and to introduce an alternative form of service.

Savda v. Turkey

12.06.2012

Failure to recognise the right to conscientious objection, which would enable refusals to carry out military service to be legitimised in Turkey.

Violations of Article 3 (prohibition of degrading treatment) and 9

Violation of Article 6 § 1 on account of the lack of independence and impartiality of the military court

Cases concerning freedom of expression (Art. 10)

Violations of Article 10

Falakaoglu and Saygili v. Turkey

19.12.2006

Criminal conviction of the applicants under the Prevention of Terrorism Act for publishing articles in the press designating State agents as targets for terrorist organisations.

Ulusoy and Others v. Turkey

03.05.2007

Prohibition on performing a play in Kurdish in municipal theatres.

Asan v. Turkey

27.11.2007

Seizure of a book by the applicant, for disseminating separatist propaganda.

Nur Radyo Ve Televizyon Yayıncılığı

A.Ş. v. Turkey

27.11.2007

Nur Radyo Ve Televizyon Yayıncılığı

A.Ş. v. Turkey (n° 2)

12.10.2010

Ban imposed on broadcaster for airing religious programmes.

Sorguç v. Turkey

23.06.2009

University professor ordered to pay damages for distributing a paper at a scientific conference criticising the recruitment and promotion procedure for assistant professors and at the same time denigrating a colleague.

Cox v. Turkey

20.05.2010

American academic barred from Turkey for voicing her opinions on Kurdish and Armenian issues.

Bingöl v. Turkey

22.06.2010

Conviction of a member of DEHAP (the Democratic People's Party) for comments criticising the Turkish State's handling of the Kurdish question.

Gözel and Özer v. Turkey

06.07.2010

In its judgment, the Court pointed out that it had found violations of Article 10 in numerous cases against Turkey where media professionals had been convicted for publishing statements made by terrorist organisations, without proper analysis by the courts. It considered this virtually automatic repression incompatible with the freedom to receive and impart information or ideas.

Dink v. Turkey

20.09.2010

Murder of a journalist convicted of "denigrating the Turkish identity".

Fatih Tas v. Turkey

05.04.2011

Publication of a book describing the anti-terrorist activities of the Turkish security forces, attributing murders to them and disclosing the names of officials directly involved.

Altuğ Taner Akçam v. Turkey

25.10.2011

The applicant alleged that the fear of prosecution for his views on the Armenian issue had caused him considerable stress and anxiety and had even made him stop writing on the subject.

Ahmet Yıldırım v. Turkey

18.12.2012

Court decision to block access to Google Sites, which hosted an Internet site whose owner was facing criminal proceedings for insulting the memory of Atatürk. As a result of the decision, access to all other sites hosted by the service was blocked.

Cumhuriyet Vakfı and Others v. Turkey

08.10.2013

Injunction issued in May 2007 against the daily national newspaper, *Cumhuriyet* ("the Republic"), preventing further publication of a political advertisement allegedly quoting an interview given by the current Turkish President, Mr Abdullah Gül, to *The Guardian* newspaper in 1995. The paper's publisher, its owner and two of its journalists complained that the injunction was a violation of their right to freedom of expression.

Dilipak and Karakaya v. Turkey

04.03.2014

Judgment against two journalists, after hearings in their absence, for having written articles that were considered offensive towards a high-ranking dignitary of the army.

Mustafa Erdoğan and Others v. Turkey

27.05.2014

Complaint by a law professor, editor and publisher that they were ordered by the Turkish courts to pay damages to three judges of the Constitutional Court for insulting them in a journal article which

reported on a decision dissolving a political party. The article was published in a quarterly law journal in 2001.

Murat Vural v. Turkey

21.10.2014

Mr Vural's complained about the lengthy prison sentence he had to serve for pouring paint over statues of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Turkey, as a political protest.

Müdür Duman v. Turkey

06.10.2015

The case dealt with the complaint by a local leader of a political party that his conviction on account of illegal pictures and publications found in the office of his party had amounted to an unjustified interference with his right to freedom of expression.

Belek and Velioğlu v. Turkey

06.10.2015

Applicants' conviction by a State Security Court for publishing an article in a daily newspaper containing a statement by an illegal armed organisation.

Cengiz and Others v. Turkey

01.12.2015

The case concerned the blocking of access to YouTube, a website enabling users to send, view and share videos, from 5 May 2008 to 30 October 2010.

Görmüş and Others v. Turkey

19.01.2016

The case concerned three different aspects of freedom of expression, namely the protection of journalistic sources, the disclosure of confidential information and the protection of whistle-blowers.

Erdener v. Turkey

02.02.2016

The case concerned the upholding of a civil defamation claim against Ms Erdener, who at the time was a Member of the Turkish Parliament, on account of her remarks, reported in the press, criticising the medical care given to the Prime Minister, Bülent Ecevit, in a private university hospital.

No violation of Article 10

[Poyraz v. Turkey](#)

07.12.2010

Civil judgment against the applicant for defamation on the basis of a report which he had compiled as chief inspector of the Ministry of Justice and which had been leaked to the press, concerning allegations of professional misconduct on the part of a senior judge.

Inadmissible applications

[Demirbaş and Others v. Turkey](#)

09.11.2010

Question of the standing before the European Court of Human Rights of a municipal authority represented by individuals, namely, members constituting the municipal council, who complained, relying on Article 10, of the municipal council's dissolution following publications in Kurdish.

Application inadmissible: local authorities did not have standing to lodge an application under Article 34.

[Akdeniz v. Turkey](#)

11.03.2014

Blocking of access to two websites on the grounds that they streamed music without respecting copyright legislation.

Application inadmissible: the Court noted that the two music streaming websites had been blocked because they operated in breach of copyright law.

[Seizure of publications and conviction of the publishers](#)

Violations of Article 10

[Akdas v. Turkey](#)

16.02.2010

Turkish edition of an erotic novel by Guillaume Apollinaire

[Sapan v. Turkey](#)

08.06.2010

Book about the singer Tarkan

[Examples of cases concerning the suspension of newspapers](#)

Violations of Article 10

[Ürper and Others v. Turkey](#)

20.10.2009

[Saygılı and Bilgiç v. Turkey](#)

20.05.2010

[Turgay and Others v. Turkey](#)

15.06.2010

Cases concerning the right to form trade unions (Art. 11)

Violations of Article 11

[Demir et Baykara v. Turkey](#)

12.11.2008

Grand Chamber judgment (see page 3)

[Enerji Yapi-Yol Sen v. Turkey](#)

21.04.2009

Disciplinary sanctions against civil servants for taking part in a national one-day strike to secure the right to a collective-bargaining agreement.

[Saime Özcan v. Turkey](#)

[Kaya et Seyhan v. Turkey](#)

15.09.2009

Penalties against teachers for taking part in national strikes organised by their trade union.

[HADEP and Demir v. Turkey](#)

14.12.2010

Dissolution of the People's Democracy Party, "HADEP", by a decision of the Turkish Constitutional Court in 2003 (the concluded that it had become a centre of illegal activities which included aiding and abetting the PKK – the illegal Workers Party of Kurdistan).

[Gazioğlu and Others v. Turkey and Akgöl and Göl v. Turkey](#)

17.05.2011

Intervention by the police in demonstrations in which the applicants participated

Eğitim Ve Bilim Emekçileri Sendikası v. Turkey

25.09.2012

Proceedings to dissolve a teachers' union one section of whose statutes expressed the aim to defend the right to be taught "in one's mother tongue".

İsmail Sezer v. Turkey

24.03.2015

A disciplinary measure taken against a teacher, who held office in a union, for taking part in a panel discussion organised by a political party.

Party for a Democratic Society (DTP) and Others v. Turkey

12.01.2016

The case concerned the dissolution of the Party for a Democratic Society ("the DTP", *Demokratik Toplum Partisi*), part of the pro-Kurdish left-wing political movement, and the forfeiture of the parliamentary mandates of certain of its members of parliament, including those of its co-presidents.

Gülcü v. Turkey

19.01.2016

The case concerned in particular the conviction and detention of a minor for two years for membership of the PKK (Kurdish Workers' Party), an illegal armed organisation, after he participated in a demonstration held in Diyarbakır in July 2008 and threw stones at police officers. He was also convicted of disseminating propaganda in support of a terrorist organisation and resistance to the police.

Cases on prohibition of discrimination (Art. 14)

Violations of Article 14 taken together with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Ünal Tekeli v. Turkey

16.11.2004

Impossibility for the applicant to use only her maiden name after getting married.

Emel Boyraz v. Turkey

02.12.2014

Dismissal of Ms Boyraz from public sector employment on grounds of gender.

Violations of Article 14 taken together with Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion)

Cumhuriyetçi Eğitim Ve Kültür Merkezi Vakfi v. Turkey

02.12.2014

Possibility under Turkish law for places of worship to be granted an exemption from paying electricity bills and the refusal to grant this privilege to the applicant foundation.

Violations of Article 14 taken together with Article 2 of Protocol No. 1 (right to education)

Çam v. Turkey

23.02.2016

The case concerned a refusal to enrol Ms Çam as a student at the Turkish National Music Academy because she was blind.

Exhaustion of domestic remedies (Art. 35 § 1)

Inadmissible application

Hasan Uzun v. Turkey

30.04.2013

In its decision the Court reiterated that the rule of the exhaustion of domestic remedies was an indispensable part of the functioning of the Convention mechanism. Having examined the main aspects of the new remedy before the Turkish Constitutional Court, the Court found that the Turkish Parliament had entrusted that court with powers that enabled it to provide, in principle, direct and speedy redress for violations of the rights and freedoms protected by the Convention.

Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

Cases concerning the protection of property (Art. 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Violations of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1

[N.A. and Others v. Turkey](#)

(no. 37451/97)

11.10.2005

[FenerRum Erkek Lisesi Vakfi v. Turkey](#)

09.01.2007

Annulment with final effect of title to property belonging to a foundation set up in accordance with Turkish law by a religious minority with legal personality.

[Turgut and Others v. Turkey](#)

08.07.2008

Annulment without compensation of title to land forming part of the coastline or the State forest.

Inadmissible applications

[Uzan and Others v. Turkey](#)

29.03.2011

The applicants, the founder of the Rumeli Elektrik company and three Turkish companies (Rumeli Elektrik A.Ş., ÇEAŞ and KEPEZ A.Ş) complained about the transfer to the State of electricity distribution sites without any compensation.

Application declared inadmissible as manifestly ill-founded.

[Arioğlu and Others v. Turkey](#)

06.11.2012

The applicants complained about the loss of their property rights without payment of compensation.

Application declared inadmissible for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies.

Expropriations: a structural problem

Violations of article 1 of Protocol No. 1

[Sarica and Dilaver v. Turkey](#)

27.05.2010

Occupation of plots of land for years on end without any formal expropriation decision being taken.

The Court considered that the practice of *de facto* expropriation represented a structural problem in Turkey

[Yetis and Others v. Turkey](#)

06.07.2010

The Court found that there was a structural problem in the expropriation procedure in Turkey

Cases concerning the right to education (Art. 2 of Protocol No. 1)

Violations of Article 2 of Protocol No. 1

[Zengin v. Turkey](#)

09.10.2007

Refusal to exempt a State school pupil from compulsory lessons in "religious culture and ethics" with emphasis on knowledge of the Sunni branch of Islam.

[Temel and Others v. Turkey](#)

03.03.2009

Suspension of eighteen students from university for two terms for requesting the introduction of optional Kurdish language classes.

[Mansur Yalçın and Others v. Turkey](#)

16.09.2014

The applicants, who are adherents of the Alevi faith, an unorthodox minority branch of Islam, complained that the content of the compulsory classes in religion and ethics in schools was based on the Sunni understanding of Islam.

Cases concerning the right to free elections (Art. 3 of Protocol No. 1)

Violations of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

[Söyler v. Turkey](#)

17.09.2013

Complaint brought by a businessman convicted for unpaid cheques that he was not allowed to vote in the 2007 Turkish general elections while he was being detained in prison or in the 2011 general elections after his conditional release.

The Court found in particular that the ban on convicted prisoners' voting rights in

Turkey was automatic and indiscriminate and did not take into account the nature or gravity of the offence, the length of the prison sentence or the prisoner's individual conduct or circumstances. The application of such a harsh measure on a vitally important Convention right had to be seen as falling outside of any acceptable room for manoeuvre of a State to decide on such matters as the electoral rights of convicted prisoners.

Murat Vural v. Turkey

21.10.2014

(see cases concerning Article 10 among others)

No violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1

Özgürlük ve Dayanisma Partisi v. Turkey

10.05.2012

Refusal to grant direct public financing, provided for by the Turkish Constitution, to a political party, the ÖDP, which did not meet the minimum representativeness criterion.

The Court found in particular that the difference in treatment between the ÖDP and the parties which received funding was reasonably proportionate to the legitimate aim of strengthening democratic pluralism while avoiding fragmentation of the candidate lists.

Cases concerning the situation in northern Cyprus

Loizidou v. Turkey

18.12.1996

(First ECHR judgment concerning Turkey): no access to property in northern Cyprus for the owner, a Cypriot national.

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

No violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life)

Similar applications have been lodged and the same violations found by the Court⁴:

⁴ 27.01.09: Evagorou Christou (18403/91), Ioannou (18364/91), Kyriacou (18407/91), Michael

Xenides-Arestis v. Turkey

22.12.2005⁵

No possibility since 1974 for the applicant, a Cypriot national, to gain access to her home in northern Cyprus.

Unlike the applicant in *Loizidou*, Mrs Xenides-Arestis had her home in northern Cyprus and lived there.

Violation of Article 8 (right to respect for the applicant's home)

Violation of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 (protection of property)

Isaak v. Turkey and Solomou v. Turkey

24.06.2008

(see above under the right to life)

Inadmissible applications

Demopoulos and seven other applications

05.03.2010

In these applications, the Court found that the law as amended afforded an accessible, effective remedy for Greek Cypriots deprived of their property in northern Cyprus.

Other noteworthy cases, judgments and decisions delivered

Tendik and Others v. Turkey

22.12.2005

Lack of a remedy in respect of the length of judicial proceedings.

Violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy)

Inadmissible applications

Applications concerning the compensation procedure for victims of terrorism in Turkey

İçyer v. Turkey

12.01.2006

The Court examined a newly established remedy - Law on compensation for losses sustained as a result of terrorism or the

(18361/91), Nicola (18404/91), Sophia Andreou (18360/91); 20.01.09: Gavriel (41355/98), Orphanides (36705/97)

⁵ In the same case, in its Chamber [judgment](#) of 7 December 2006, the Court decided on the question of just satisfaction.

fight against terrorism which came into force on 27 July 2004 - and held that it was "accessible" and afforded "reasonable prospects of success". On that basis, 800 applications pending before the Court were declared inadmissible.

[Akbayır and Others v. Turkey, Fidanten and Others v. Turkey, Bingölbali and 54 Others v. Turkey and Boğuş and 91 other applications v. Turkey](#)

08.07.2011

Noteworthy pending cases

Grand Chamber

Doğan and Others v. Turkey (no. 62649/10)

Rejection of the request made by a number of Turkish nationals belonging to the Alevi faith for provision of a religious public service which, they maintain, has been granted to date exclusively to the majority of citizens, who subscribe to the Sunni understanding of Islam.

[Relinquishment of jurisdiction in favour of the Grand Chamber on 25 November 2014](#)
[Grand Chamber hearing on 3 June 2015](#)

Chamber

Cases communicated cases in 2010 (non-exhaustive list)

Case concerning death in the army
Şerife Yakıcı v. Turkey (no. 60245/08 - [Communicated](#) on 15.09.2010): death of the applicant's son after a fall during his military service with the Beşiri district Gendarmerie Command (Batman).

Suicide of a conscript
Ahmet and Gülbeyaz Sürer v. Turkey, no. 20184/06 - [Communicated](#) on 15.09.2010

Abulbari Tamuç and Others v. Turkey (no. 37930/09 - [Communicated](#) on 26.08.2010): Heybet Tamuç and her 8-year-old son Atilla Tamuç were gathering hay for their animals in the fields around their village when the boy found an object which exploded in his hands, killing him and his mother. Their family allege that

the State failed in its positive obligation to protect the two victims' right to life, that first aid was not administered promptly enough and that there was no effective investigation.

Cases communicated cases in 2011 (non-exhaustive list)

Telephone tapping
Karabeyoğlu v. Turkey (no. 30083/10 - [Communicated](#) on 02.05.2011)

Cases concerning persons arrested in the context of the operation against the criminal organisation Ergenekon
Ahmet Tuncay Özkan v. Turkey (no. 15869/09 - [Decision on the admissibility](#) on 13.12.2011)
Levent Gökteş v. Turkey (no. 59374/10 - [Decision on the admissibility](#) on 13.12.2011)

Cases communicated cases in 2012 (non-exhaustive list)

Cetin Dogan v. Turkey (no. 28484/10 - [Decision on the admissibility](#) on 10.04.2012)
The case concerns the criminal investigation into 196 suspected members of a criminal organization called "Balyoz", all generals or military officers, accused of having planned a military coup designed to overthrow by force the elected government in 2002 and 2003.

Death in pre-trial detention
Sozen and Others v. Turkey (no. 65578/10 - [Communicated](#) on 26.06.2012)

Allegations of medical negligence
Applicants' son's amputation and mental disability: **Aksoy v. Turkey** (no. 12370/10 - [Communicated](#) on 29.05.2012)

Death of a waste-treatment facility's employee (explosion of a grenade in a bin)
Atsız and Others v. Turkey (no. 6084/06 - [Communicated](#) on 11.06.2012)

**Cases communicated cases in 2013
(non-exhaustive list)**

Case concerning persons arrested in the context of the operation against the criminal organisation Ergenekon
Varlık v. Turkey (no. 55832/09 - [Communicated](#) on 28.03.2013)

D.Ç. v. Turkey (no. 10684/13 - [Communicated](#) on 15.11.2013): The applicant, a transsexual whose gender reassignment has not yet been carried out, is currently serving a prison sentence. He complains of the refusal of the authorities of the Ministry of Justice to bear the cost of his gender reassignment despite medical evidence which clearly shows that he urgently needs treatment. The applicant alleges violations of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention.

**Cases communicated cases in 2014
(non-exhaustive list)**

Allegations of medical negligence
Biçaklı and Others v. Turkey (no. 36680/11 - [Communicated](#) on 23.06.2014)

**Cases communicated cases in 2015
(non-exhaustive list)**

Cases concerning persons arrested in the context of the operation against the criminal organisation Ergenekon
Erarslan v. Turkey (no. 55833/09 - [Communicated](#) on 09.03.2015), **Murat v. Turkey** (no. 55837/09 - [Communicated](#) on 09.03.2015), **Uğurel v. Turkey** (no. 55838/09 - [Communicated](#) on 09.03.2015) and **Demirci Tansel v. Turkey** (no. 55843/09 - [Communicated](#) on 09.03.2015)
The applicants in these cases allege violations of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security) of the Convention.

**ECHR Press Contact:
+33 3 90 21 42 08**