POLICY BRIEF

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.

Recommendations

1. Disclose and examine objective reasons and records for final-stage judicial panel changes.

2. Give person-specific reasons for conduct, mens rea, causation and the supporting evidence.

3. Separate factual police findings from judicial decisions on the legality of earlier orders.

4. Ensure effective defence access to underlying data, chain-of-custody material and independent expertise.

Evidence limitations and source

The reasons for panel assignments are not conclusively established from the hearing minutes alone. Annex 3 reproduces only pages 1–499 of a 682-page first-instance judgment; the Court of Cassation did not uphold every part of that judgment.

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

SRL
Security Studies & Rule Of Law Association