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

SECOND SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 50430/20
Sadi YAŞAR
against Türkiye
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (Second Section), sitting on 5 February 2026 as a Committee composed of:

Stéphane Pisani*, President*,
Juha Lavapuro,
Hugh Mercer*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application 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") on 9 November 2020,

Having regard to the declaration submitted by the respondent Government requesting the Court to strike the application out of the list of cases,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant's details are set out in the appended table.

The applicant was represented by Ms Ö. Teke, a lawyer practising in Ankara.

The applicant's complaints under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention concerning the alleged conflicting case-law of the administrative courts relating to the date from which the difference in salary and other pecuniary elements were to be calculated in respect of the applicant's delayed appointment to the post of labour auditor, as well as the delayed enforcement of the administrative court decision in his favour, were communicated to the Turkish Government ("the Government").

THE LAW

The Government informed the Court that they proposed to make a unilateral declaration with a view to resolving the issues raised by these complaints. They further requested the Court to strike out the application in accordance with Article 37 of the Convention.

The Government acknowledged that the proceedings to which the applicant had been a party had not met the standards enshrined in Article 6 § 1 of the Convention and Article l of Protocol No. 1. They further emphasised that Article 53 § 1 (ı) of the Code of Administrative Procedure, as amended by Law no. 7145 of 31 July 2018, required reopening of administrative court proceedings in cases where the European Court of Human Rights decided to strike an application out of its list of cases following a friendly settlement or a unilateral declaration. The Government further offered to pay the applicant the amount detailed in the appended table and invited the Court to strike the application out of the list of cases in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention. The amount would be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable on the date of payment, and would be payable within three months from the date of notification of the Court's decision. In the event of failure to pay this amount within the above-mentioned three-month period, the Government undertook to pay simple interest on it, from the expiry of that period until settlement, at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points.

The payment will constitute the final resolution of the case before the European Court of Human Rights.

The applicant was sent the terms of the Government's unilateral declaration several weeks before the date of this decision. The applicant has refused the terms of the Government's declaration.

The Court observes that Article 37 § 1 (c) enables it to strike a case out of its list if:

> "... for any other reason established by the Court, it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application".

Thus, it may strike out applications under Article 37 § 1 (c) on the basis of a unilateral declaration by a respondent Government even if the applicant wishes the examination of the case to be continued (see, in particular, the *Tahsin Acar v. Turkey* judgment (preliminary objections) [GC], no. 26307/95, §§ 75-77, ECHR 2003-VI).

The Court has established clear and extensive case-law concerning complaints relating to the principle of legal certainty with respect to consistency of case-law (see, among others, *Lupeni Greek Catholic Parish and Others v. Romania* [GC], no. 76943/11, §§ 116-23, 29 November 2016, and *Brezovec v. Croatia*, no. 13488/07, §§ 66-68, 29 March 2011).

Noting the admissions contained in the Government's declaration as well as the amount of compensation proposed – which is consistent with the amounts awarded in similar cases – the Court considers that it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application (Article 37 § 1 (c)).

In the light of the above considerations, the Court is satisfied that respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto does not require it to continue the examination of the application (Article 37 § 1 *in fine*).

Finally, the Court emphasises that, should the Government fail to comply with the terms of their unilateral declaration, the application may be restored to the list in accordance with Article 37 § 2 of the Convention (see *Josipović v. Serbia* (dec.), no. 18369/07, 4 March 2008).

In view of the above, it is appropriate to strike the case out of the list.

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Takes note of the terms of the respondent Government's declaration and of the arrangements for ensuring compliance with the undertakings referred to therein;

Decides to strike the application out of its list of cases in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention.

Done in English and notified in writing on 26 February 2026.

Viktoriya Maradudina Acting Deputy Registrar	Stéphane Pisani President

APPENDIX

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name Year of birth	Representative's name and location	Date of receipt of Government's declaration	Date of receipt of applicant's comments, if any	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage and costs and expenses per applicant (in euros)[1]
50430/20 09/11/2020	**Sadi YAŞAR** 1986	Özge Teke Ankara	12/07/2024	20/09/2024	2,000

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