KEY FINDINGS

Match-Fixing Case: Fair Trial, Judicial Independence and Individual Liability

SRL-LPB-2026-002 | EN | 25 October 2026 | APPROVAL DRAFT

Scope

This brief is based on the SRL Swiss September 2026 submission to OSCE/ODIHR. It does not re-decide whether match-fixing occurred. It examines procedural safeguards in subsequent criminal proceedings against officers involved in investigation no. 2010/2287.

Documented findings

1. Investigative measures in 2010–2011 involved prosecutorial applications and judicial orders. The report inventory identified 307 unique judicial-order identifiers; 38 were separately checked against signature pages.
2. In Istanbul 23rd Assize Court case no. 2016/62, the final three-member panel first sat together on 17 May 2021 and delivered judgment on 4 June 2021. This chronology does not itself prove bias but warrants explanation of how evidence was examined.
3. Police examination records asserting that earlier interceptions were unlawful informed the later proceedings. Factual police inquiry must be distinguished from legally authoritative review of judicial orders.
4. Individual liability requires proof of each officer's specific act, knowledge, intent and causal contribution. A signature or job title alone is not a substitute.
5. Raw audio, telecommunications data, surveillance footage and digital exhibits require verifiable integrity and effective independent defence scrutiny.

Legal framework

Relevant safeguards include ECHR Article 6; ICCPR Article 14; paragraph 5.8 of the 1990 OSCE Copenhagen Document; and CM/Rec(2010)12. CAS and Swiss Federal Supreme Court decisions are used comparatively, not as appellate rulings binding Turkish criminal courts.

Source: SRL Swiss, OSCE Match-Fixing Report, September 2026; Executive Summary, Part I–II and Annexes 1–4, 12–19, 25.