

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

SECOND SECTION

CASE OF YAVUZ v. TÜRKİYE

(Application no. 30082/20)

JUDGMENT

STRASBOURG

15 May 2025

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

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

In the case of Yavuz v. Türkiye,

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

Gediminas Sagatys*, President*,
Stéphane Pisani,
Juha Lavapuro*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having deliberated in private on 24 April 2025,

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

PROCEDURE

1. The case originated in an application against Türkiye lodged with the Court under Article 34 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ("the Convention") on 9 June 2020.

2. The applicant was represented by Mr V. Karaduman, a lawyer practising in Diyarbakır.

3. The Turkish Government ("the Government") were given notice of the application.

THE FACTS

4. The applicant's details and information relevant to the application are set out in the appended table.

5. The applicant complained of the excessive length of criminal proceedings.

THE LAW

I. ALLEGED VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION

6. The applicant complained that the length of the criminal proceedings in his case had been incompatible with the "reasonable time" requirement. He relied on Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

7. The Court reiterates that the reasonableness of the length of proceedings must be assessed in the light of the circumstances of the case and with reference to the following criteria: the complexity of the case, the conduct of the applicant and the relevant authorities and what was at stake for the applicant in the dispute (see, among many other authorities, *Pélissier and Sassi v. France* [GC], no. 25444/94, § 67, ECHR 1999-II, and *Frydlender v. France* [GC], no. 30979/96, § 43, ECHR 2000-VII).

8. In the leading case of *Ümmühan Kaplan v. Turkey* (no. 24240/07, 20 March 2012) the Court already found a violation in respect of issues similar to those in the present case (see also, among others, *İshak Sağlam v. Turkey*, no. 22963/08, §§ 34-38, 10 July 2018 and *Ruşen Bayar v. Turkey*, no. 25253/08, §§ 91-98, 19 February 2019).

9. Having examined all the material submitted to it, including the Government's arguments related to the declaration of the state of emergency for almost two years from 21 July 2016 to 19 July 2018, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic, the Court has not found any fact or argument capable of justifying the overall length of the proceedings at the national level (see, *mutatis mutandis, Şahin Alpay v. Turkey,* no. 16538/17, § 75, 20 March 2018; *Bieliński v. Poland*, no. 48762/19, § 44, 21 July 2022; *Q and R v. Slovenia*, no. 19938/20, § 80, 8 February 2022; and *Kavala v. Turkey*, no. 28749/18, § 195, 10 December 2019). Having regard to its case-law on the subject, the Court considers that in the instant case the length of the proceedings was excessive and failed to meet the "reasonable time" requirement.

10. This complaint is therefore admissible and discloses a breach of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention.

II. APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 41 OF THE CONVENTION

11. Regard being had to the documents in its possession and to its case-law (see, in particular, *Ümmühan Kaplan,* cited above), the Court finds it reasonable to award the sums indicated in the appended table.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT, UNANIMOUSLY,

1. *Declares* the application admissible;

2. *Holds* that this application discloses a breach of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention concerning the excessive length of criminal proceedings;

3. *Holds*
   (a) that the respondent State is to pay the applicant, within three months, the amounts indicated in the appended table, 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.

Done in English, and notified in writing on 15 May 2025, pursuant to Rule 77 §§ 2 and 3 of the Rules of Court.

Viktoriya Maradudina Acting Deputy Registrar	Gediminas Sagatys President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention (excessive length of criminal proceedings)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Start of proceedings	End of proceedings	Total length Levels of jurisdiction	Award by the Constitutional Court File number	Final decision by the Constitutional Court Date	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros)[1]	Amount awarded for costs and expenses per application (in euros)[2]
30082/20 09/06/2020	**Mehmet YAVUZ** 1950	Vedat Karaduman Diyarbakır	20/06/2009	26/02/2019	9 years, 8 months and 7 days 2 levels of jurisdiction	0 2019/11363	13/03/2020	5,000	250

[1] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant.
[2] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant.