SECRETARIAT / SECRÉTARIAT

SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS
SECRÉTARIAT DU COMITÉ DES MINISTRES

COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS
COMITÉ DES MINISTRES

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Contact: Ireneusz Kondak
Tel: 03.90.21.59.86

Date: 04/11/2026

DH-DD(2026)1454

Document distributed under the sole responsibility of its author, without prejudice to the legal or political position of the Committee of Ministers.

Meeting: 1577th meeting (December 2026) (DH)

Communication from the applicant (02/11/2026) in the case of Karslı and Others v. Türkiye (Application No. 18693/20) (in respect of the applicant Murat Demirtaş (Application No. 23992/21)) (Yüksel Yalçınkaya group) - *appendices in Turkish are available at the Secretariat upon request*

Information made available under Rule 9.1 of the Rules of the Committee of Ministers for the supervision of the execution of judgments and of the terms of friendly settlements.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Document distribué sous la seule responsabilité de son auteur, sans préjuger de la position juridique ou politique du Comité des Ministres.

Réunion : 1577e réunion (décembre 2026) (DH)

Communication du requérant (02/11/2026) relative à l'affaire Karslı et autres c. Türkiye (Requête n° 18693/20) (concernant le requérant Murat Demirtaş (Requête n° 23992/21)) (Groupe Yüksel Yalçınkaya) ***[anglais uniquement]*** *- des annexes en turc sont disponibles auprès du Secrétariat sur demande*

Informations mises à disposition en vertu de la Règle 9.1 des Règles du Comité des Ministres pour la surveillance de l'exécution des arrêts et des termes des règlements amiables.

DH-DD(2026)1454: Rule 9.1 Communication from the applicant in Karslı and Others v. Türkiye
Document distributed under the sole responsibility of its author, without prejudice
to the legal or political position of the Committee of Ministers.

DGI
02 NOV. 2026
SERVICE DE L'EXECUTION
DES ARRETS DE LA CEDH

RULE 9.1 COMMUNICATION TO THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS

Council of Europe | Department for the Execution of Judgments of the ECHR

Applicant	**Murat DEMİRTAŞ**
ECtHR judgment	Karslı and Others v. Türkiye — 16 December 2025
Individual application	23992/21 (entry no. 329 in appended list)
Legal basis	Article 46 of the Convention and Rule 9.1 of the Committee of Ministers' Rules
Contact / submitted personally	[My email address – to be completed]; submitted personally without a representative

I. Purpose of the communication

I, Murat DEMİRTAŞ, personally submit this communication pursuant to Rule 9.1 to bring to the Committee of Ministers' attention the alleged failure to execute effectively, in my individual situation, the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights of 16 December 2025 in Karslı and Others v. Türkiye. I do not seek a new judicial determination by the Committee, but effective supervision of the individual measures required for execution.

II. The ECtHR judgment and the applicant

I, Murat DEMİRTAŞ, am identified at entry no. 329 of the appended list to Karslı and Others v. Türkiye, individual application no. 23992/21. The Court found violations of Article 7 and Article 6 § 1 of the Convention. The judgment addresses the decisive evidential weight attributed to alleged ByLock use and shortcomings in the procedural safeguards of criminal proceedings. Effective redress is required, although the judgment does not predetermine the outcome of any reopened proceedings.

III. Relevant domestic proceedings

1. On 12 April 2018, Istanbul 36th Assize Court convicted me in case no. 2017/7 (E.), judgment no. 2018/64 (K.).

2. Following the ECtHR judgment, I sought reopening of the criminal proceedings under Article 311(1)(f) of the Turkish Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP); I have completed my sentence, so the earlier request for suspension of its execution is no longer applicable.

3. In an additional decision of 20 August 2026, Istanbul 20th Assize Court, acting in the file of the former Istanbul 36th Assize Court, found the reopening request inadmissible under CCP Article 319, on the ground that none of the statutory grounds and supporting evidence had been indicated.

DH-DD(2026)1454: Rule 9.1 Communication from the applicant in Karslı and Others v. Türkiye
Document distributed under the sole responsibility of its author, without prejudice
to the legal or political position of the Committee of Ministers.

4. My counsel challenged that decision on 14 September 2026. Istanbul 21st Assize Court dismissed the objection in its final decision of 16 October 2026, no. 2026/726 (Misc.), stating briefly that the previous decision disclosed no procedural or legal irregularity.

IV. Concerns regarding execution

The reopening request expressly identified the ECtHR judgment of 16 December 2025, my inclusion in that judgment, and CCP Article 311(1)(f). Nevertheless, the decision of 20 August 2026 stated that no reopening ground or evidence had been identified, without a case-specific explanation of why the ECtHR's findings would not satisfy the requirements of CCP Article 311(1)(f). The decision of 16 October 2026 did not substantively address this concern. I submit that this has prevented meaningful access to an effective individual remedy for the violations found by the ECtHR.

V. Requests

I respectfully request that the Committee of Ministers: (a) examine the execution of the judgment in my individual case; (b) seek an explanation from the Turkish authorities as to how the decisions of 20 August and 16 October 2026 reconcile with the findings of the ECtHR; (c) supervise the adoption of individual measures providing me with a genuine and effective examination of reopening and redress for the consequences of the violations; (d) register this communication in the relevant execution file and, where appropriate, publish it; and (e) acknowledge receipt.

VI. Annexes

Annex 1 — Karslı and Others v. Türkiye judgment and my entry no. 329.

Annex 2 — Istanbul 36th Assize Court, judgment of 12 April 2018, 2017/7 (E.), 2018/64 (K.).

Annex 3 — Application for reopening based on the ECtHR judgment.

Annex 4 — Additional decision of 20 August 2026 rejecting reopening.

Annex 5 — Istanbul 21st Assize Court decision of 16 October 2026, 2026/726 (Misc.).

Annex 6 — Clarification of completed sentence and material errors in the historical reopening petition. Official proof of completion may be submitted separately.

Submitted personally by: Murat DEMİRTAŞ
Date: [to be completed] Signature: _____
Contact email: [to be completed]

DH-DD(2026)1454: Rule 9.1 Communication from the applicant in Karslı and Others v. Türkiye
Document distributed under the sole responsibility of its author, without prejudice
to the legal or political position of the Committee of Ministers.

DGI

02 NOV. 2026

SERVICE DE L'EXECUTION
DES ARRETS DE LA CEDH

CLARIFICATION TO RULE 9.1 COMMUNICATION

Identity and file

Murat DEMİRTAŞ, ECtHR application no. 23992/21 (entry 329), Karslı and Others v. Türkiye, judgment of 16 December 2025. Criminal conviction: Istanbul 36th Assize Court, file no. 2017/7, judgment no. 2018/64, dated 12 April 2018.

Correction of the court name

The historical application for reopening incorrectly addressed “Bakırköy 36th Assize Court”. The correct convicting court was Istanbul 36th Assize Court. Istanbul 20th Assize Court subsequently issued the refusal decision of 20 August 2026.

Correction regarding execution of sentence

The historical reopening application asked for suspension of execution of the prison sentence. The applicant confirms that he has completed the execution of his sentence. The current Rule 9.1 communication does not request suspension of an ongoing sentence; it seeks effective individual measures to address the continuing legal and practical consequences of the conviction. Official evidence of the completion date can be supplied if required.

Preservation of historical evidence

The earlier application is provided without alteration as evidence of what was actually filed domestically. This note identifies factual inaccuracies in that historical document and is not intended to amend the domestic court record.