



Funded by the  
European Union



Şanlıurfa (2024-2025)

# **Disadvantaged Groups In Access To Rights Monitoring Report**



**ETKİN**  
SAVUNUCULUK

# CAPACITY BUILDING OF LEGAL STRUGGLE AGAINST HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN ŞANLIURFA REGION

January, 2026

## Project Team:

Project Coordinator: **Ahmet Dođan**

Assistant Project Coordinator: **Atty. Hilal Yücel**

Rights Violations Monitoring and Archiving Specialist: **Atty. Gökhan Dayık**

Coordinator of Rights Violations Monitoring Committees: **Atty. Nahide Polat Aslan**

Grant Project Reporting Specialist: **Emel Sevgi**

Key Expert – Monitoring and Evaluation Expert: **Banu Ülkü**

## Design and Redaction:

Getu Creative

## Şanlıurfa Bar Association

Paşabađı Neighborhood, 775th Street, 21-D – Postal Code: 63040,

Haliliye / ŞANLIURFA, Phone: 0(414) 313 28 28,

e-mail : info@sanliurfabarusu.org.tr - urfabarusu@gmail.com

“Etkin Savunuculuk” Project Social Media Accounts





@etkinsavunuculuk

“Etkin Savunuculuk” Project Social Media Accounts

 @UrfaBarosu

 @urfabarusu\_

  /Şanlıurfa Barosu

[www.sanliurfabarusu.org.tr](http://www.sanliurfabarusu.org.tr)

This publication has been prepared by the Şanlıurfa Bar Association, in partnership with the Association for Access to Justice (AYHED), within the scope of the project “Enhancing the Capacity of Legal Struggle Against Human Rights Violations in the Şanlıurfa Region”, which is supported by the European Union under the Human Rights and Democracy Grant Programme. The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of the Şanlıurfa Bar Association and the Association for Access to Justice (AYHED) and does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

# CONTENTS



<b>4</b>	<b>Abbreviations</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Conceptual and Linguistic Framework</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>About the Project</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>What is the Purpose of this Report?</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Scope and Methodology</b>
10	Data Sources
10	Analytical Approach
10	Methodological Limitations
<b>11</b>	<b>Intersectional Discrimination and Forms of Exclusion</b>
11	Multiple Barriers to Accessing Rights
11	Exclusion at Institutional Contact Points
12	Application Experiences Not Reflected in Official Mechanisms
12	Applications Related to Refugee Children
13	Applications Concerning Refugee Women
13	Applications Concerning Persons with Disabilities
13	Cases Where Multiple Areas of Disadvantage Intersect
<b>14</b>	<b>Structural Problems in Fundamental Rights Areas</b>
14	Access to Justice
14	Access to Health and Social Services
15	Housing and Living Conditions
15	Access to Public Services
<b>16</b>	<b>Assessment Based on Case Studies</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>Conclusions and Policy Notes</b>
20	Notes on Institutional Practices
21	Institutionalization of the Intersectional Approach
20	Multi-Stakeholder and Continuous Monitoring
<b>22</b>	<b>Monitoring Findings and Policy-Level Improvement Areas Table</b>
<b>23</b>	<b>Methodological Note</b>
<b>24</b>	<b>References</b>

# ABBREVIATIONS

<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>ECHR</b>	European Court of Human Rights
<b>ECHR</b>	European Convention on Human Rights
<b>AYHED</b>	Association for Access to Fair Trial
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNCRC</b>	United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child
<b>CEDAW</b>	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
<b>CMK</b>	Criminal Procedure Code
<b>CRPD</b>	United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
<b>CRM</b>	Center of Return Management
<b>GREVIO</b>	Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence
<b>KVKK</b>	Law on the Protection of Personal Data
<b>ENPI</b>	European Neighborhood, Development and Partnership Instrument – Global Europe
<b>OCAS</b>	Automatic CMK Assignment System
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>SPMC</b>	Violence Prevention and Monitoring Center
<b>TCK</b>	Turkish Criminal Code
<b>UNHCR</b>	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees



# CONCEPTUAL AND LINGUISTIC FRAMEWORK

The concepts used in this report have been defined within the framework of human rights law and a rights-based approach. The terminology preferred throughout the study aims to highlight the structural barriers encountered in the process of accessing rights, rather than the administrative status of individuals.

The term **“refugee”** is used in the report for Syrian asylum seekers under temporary protection in Şanlıurfa. This choice is based on the understanding that individuals should be assessed not only on the basis of their temporary administrative status, but also in the context of their need for protection and access to fundamental rights.

Furthermore, instead of the term “disadvantaged groups,” the report uses the concept of “groups disadvantaged in accessing rights” to provide a more explanatory framework. This usage emphasizes that disadvantage stems not from individuals’ identities but from inequalities and structural barriers that arise in the processes of accessing rights.

Similarly, the term “persons with disabilities” has been used instead of “disabled individuals.” This choice reflects an approach that treats disability not as a personal characteristic but as a matter of rights shaped by social and institutional arrangements.

The use of concepts has been consistent throughout the report; terminological choices have been determined in line with an intersectional and rights-based perspective.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Şanlıurfa is one of Turkey's provinces with the highest child population and has been a border province hosting a large refugee population for many years. This demographic and socio-economic structure directly affects the scope and depth of the problems that arise in the area of access to rights.

This report was prepared based on applications and case follow-ups monitored in Şanlıurfa between January 1, 2024, and December 31, 2025, in light of data obtained by the commissions and committees of the Şanlıurfa Bar Association. The aim is to reveal the barriers faced by disadvantaged groups in accessing rights not only through individual cases but also from an intersectional and structural perspective. The study focuses on cases involving refugees, women, children, persons with disabilities, and cases where multiple disadvantages intersect.

The applications encountered during the monitoring process show that rights violations are often not based on a single cause. **In Şanlıurfa, it is not just being a child, a woman, or a refugee; it is the combined effect of these circumstances that can create more severe and layered barriers to accessing rights. Repeated and persistent problems have been identified in the areas of access to justice, health and social services, housing, and access to public services, particularly for refugee women, refugee children, and persons with disabilities.**

**Uncertainties at institutional contact points, unpredictable practices, delays in administrative procedures, and insufficient information** effectively hinder the pursuit of rights. **Language barriers, lack of legal support, and insecurity due to status** prevent many applications from ever reaching official mechanisms or limit their scope. This situation reduces the visibility of violations and paves the way for the perpetuation of rights violations.

Cases and applications monitored by the commissions and committees of the Şanlıurfa Bar Association show that intersectional discrimination is often not limited to a single area of rights. Problems in the areas of education, health, housing, and access to justice are interrelated and mutually reinforcing. In some cases, the delayed or ineffective functioning of administrative and judicial processes reveals that existing protection mechanisms do not sufficiently take into account multiple disadvantages.

This report shows that violations against disadvantaged groups in accessing rights in Şanlıurfa cannot be considered isolated incidents; they are directly linked to structural problems in institutional practices and application mechanisms. The report aims to contribute to the institutional adoption of an intersectional approach and the development of preventive policies and practices to strengthen equal and effective access to rights.



## ABOUT THE PROJECT

The “Project to Develop Legal Action Capacity Against Human Rights Violations in the Şanlıurfa Region” is a three-year program that aims to strengthen the legal action capacity of lawyers, bar mechanisms, and local civil society in the field of human rights in Şanlıurfa. The main objective of the project is to strengthen access to justice, particularly for children, women, victims of torture and ill-treatment, and groups exposed to hate crimes, to increase the visibility of rights violations, and to improve the effectiveness of judicial processes.

The project envisages the establishment of a Human Rights Violations Memory Center and Digital Archive Software within the Şanlıurfa Bar Association, the formation of thematic human rights violations committees consisting of 40 lawyers, and the provision of legal support for at least 40 cases. Eight of these cases will be pursued using a strategic litigation approach, contributing to the creation of precedent-setting decisions that can be brought before national and international human rights mechanisms.

Project activities are carried out within a multidimensional capacity-building framework through training programs, field monitoring and reporting activities, symposiums, experience-sharing meetings, and trainee lawyer programs. In addition, regular data collection, preparation of analysis reports, and public awareness-raising in the areas of children’s rights, women’s rights, torture and ill-treatment, and hate crimes are among the key outputs of the project.

The project is implemented by the Şanlıurfa Bar Association in partnership with the Association for Access to Fair Trial (AYHED). The work is supported under the European Union Democracy and Human Rights Thematic Program (NDICI–Global Europe). The project aims to create a lasting impact at the institutional and societal levels in Şanlıurfa to strengthen access to justice and effectively combat human rights violations.

## What is the purpose of this report?

Based on the application and case data monitored in Şanlıurfa, this report aims to highlight the obstacles faced by disadvantaged groups in accessing their rights. The study addresses the violations not only as isolated incidents but as structural problems linked to institutional practices, administrative processes, and application mechanisms.

The report aims to reveal how rights losses are exacerbated when multiple areas of inequality converge and to assess where existing application and monitoring mechanisms fall short. The goal is to contribute to strengthening equal and effective access to rights in Şanlıurfa.



# SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

## Data Sources

The report was prepared using an application-based and open-source monitoring method. In this context, the following data sources were utilized:

- Application data related to refugees for 2024 and 2025
- Application records related to women
- Cases and files monitored by the commissions and committees of the Şanlıurfa Bar Association
- National and local media records
- Field studies and institutional visit reports

All data has been anonymized and analyzed in accordance with personal data protection regulations.

## Analysis Approach

An intersectional approach was adopted in the evaluation process. Applications were examined not based on a single identity or status, but by considering situations where multiple areas of inequality intersect.

Applications were classified both on a group basis (e.g., refugee children, refugee women, persons with disabilities, LGBTQI+) and on a rights basis (access to justice, health, housing, public services).

## Methodological Limitations

Difficulties in obtaining regular and disaggregated data from official institutions, as well as the reluctance of some individuals to apply due to security concerns or fears of negative administrative consequences, are among the factors limiting the data set.

Therefore, the report provides an assessment based on verifiable data reflected in the monitoring process.

# INTERSECTIONAL DISCRIMINATION AND FORMS OF EXCLUSION

The data obtained during the monitoring process shows that rights violations often do not arise from a single cause. For disadvantaged groups in terms of access to rights, the convergence of multiple areas of inequality increases both the scope and impact of the problems experienced.

Particularly in the case of refugees, children, women, and persons with disabilities, it is impossible to understand the nature of rights violations without considering legal status, age, gender, health status, and socio-economic conditions together. This situation shows that violations arise not only at the individual level but also in connection with institutional processes and practices.

## Multiple Barriers to Accessing Rights

Applications show that refugees face multiple barriers to accessing fundamental rights due to legal status uncertainty, language barriers, economic inadequacies, and unpredictability in administrative practices. These barriers can have more severe consequences for children, women, and persons with disabilities.

Problems encountered in accessing healthcare, education, and justice are often interrelated. A delay or rejection in one area can directly affect other rights.

## Exclusion at Institutional Contact Points

Data shows that serious problems are encountered in the processes of contacting public institutions, accessing information, submitting applications, and following up on the process. **The complexity and inaccessibility of procedures**, combined with a lack of **interpreters and legal information**, effectively hinders the pursuit of rights.

This situation makes it difficult to exercise the right to apply, especially for disadvantaged groups in terms of access to rights.

## Application Experiences Not Reflected in Official Mechanisms

Monitoring findings show that many rights violations are not reflected in official complaint mechanisms. **Fear of deportation, concern about negative administrative consequences, economic hardship, and institutional distrust** may cause individuals to refrain from filing complaints.

**Language barriers, lack of legal information, and the complexity of the complaint process** are also factors that make access to remedies difficult in practice. Therefore, recorded complaints do not reflect all violations, but only those that have become visible.

This situation leads to a significant portion of rights violations, particularly against refugees, women, children, and persons with disabilities, remaining outside official mechanisms and failing to gain visibility.

## Applications Related to Refugee Children

Complaints concerning refugee children mainly focus on **identification processes, age assessment practices, access to education, and administrative supervision. Incorrect or incomplete age records can lead to children being treated as adults and being denied access to child-specific protection mechanisms.**

This situation poses serious risks to children's rights to liberty, security, and education. The failure to consider refugee status and childhood together increases the impact of violations and demonstrates that practices do not always uphold the principle of the best interests of the child.



## Applications Concerning Refugee Women

Data on refugee women show that rights violations often occur in areas where gender-based inequalities intersect with refugee status.

**Difficulties in accessing health services, lack of adequate support mechanisms during pregnancy and care processes, and lack of access to information in institutional contacts make it difficult for women to access their rights.** This situation leads to the actual limitation of avenues for seeking rights and reduces the visibility of violations.

## Applications Concerning to Persons with Disabilities

Applications concerning persons with disabilities are concentrated in the areas of access to public services, institutional care and rehabilitation processes, and access to effective application mechanisms.

**Physical access barriers, failure to implement adequate oversight and monitoring mechanisms, and limited support services weaken protection against rights violations.** When combined with other areas of inequality such as disability, refugee status, childhood, or poverty, the risk of rights loss increases.

## Cases Where Multiple Areas of Disadvantage Intersect

Monitoring findings show that in some cases, reasons based on refugee status, childhood, gender, health status, or identity coexist. In such situations, rights violations stem not from a deficiency in a single area but from interconnected structural problems.

These applications reveal that existing institutional mechanisms often operate in a one-dimensional manner and do not assess multiple areas of inequality together.

# STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS IN FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AREAS

This section examines the monitoring findings in terms of fundamental rights areas. The aim is to highlight the areas where rights violations are concentrated and the structural problems that are prominent for disadvantaged groups in terms of access to rights.

## Access to Justice

Monitoring data shows that disadvantaged groups face significant barriers in judicial and administrative processes in accessing rights. **Lack of legal information, problems accessing interpreter support, economic inadequacies, and the complexity of application processes**, as well as the situation of being dismissed from public service but not reinstated despite being acquitted, make it difficult to effectively use avenues for seeking rights.

Particularly for refugees, children, and in situations where multiple areas of inequality converge, delays or limitations in application processes weaken the effective right to apply.

## Access to Health and Social Services

Access to health and social services has been one of the most problematic areas during the monitoring period. Administrative barriers to refugees' access to health services, access to health care for LGBT+ refugees, registration problems, and lack of information are decisive factors. These barriers can have serious consequences for children, pregnant women, and people with chronic health problems. Disruptions in access to preventive and protective health services deepen the loss of rights.

Delays in the referral process to hospitals for persons deprived of their liberty are also a separate problem area. Administrative procedures and security practices can limit the right to health, especially in situations requiring urgent intervention.

## Housing and Living Conditions

Applications regarding housing conditions show that individuals living in temporary shelters and similar closed or semi-closed spaces face difficulties in accessing living conditions that are compatible with human dignity.

**Overcrowding, lack of hygiene, limited social spaces, and uncertainty in administrative practices** have particularly severe consequences for children, women, and persons with disabilities.

## Access to Public Services

Access to public services is a significant area of rights due to problems encountered in identification, registration, and document procurement processes.

The absence of identity documents or status uncertainty can effectively prevent access to education, social support, and other public services. This situation leads to persistent problems that directly affect the daily lives of disadvantaged groups in terms of access to rights.

Area of Rights	Key Identified Issues	Affected Groups
Access to Justice	Lack of interpreters, insufficient legal information, complexity of application processes	Refugees, children
Health and social services	Registration and status issues, administrative barriers to accessing health services	Refugees, LGBT+ individuals
Housing	Overcrowded living conditions, lack of hygiene, uncertain administrative practices	Women, children
Public services	Identification and registration issues	Refugee children

**Note:** This table summarizes the main structural problems identified during the monitoring process according to rights areas.

# ASSESSMENT BASED ON CASE STUDIES

This section examines selected cases from the data collected during the monitoring process to illustrate structural problems identified in relation to disadvantaged groups in terms of access to rights. The cases are not considered as isolated incidents but as examples of recurring problem areas identified throughout the report.

## Common Issues in the Cases

The cases examined show that rights violations have more severe consequences when factors such as refugee status, childhood, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and health status coincide. In particular, identification processes, age assessment practices, access to health services, and administrative supervision mechanisms emerge as recurring problem areas where multiple inequalities intersect.

These cases demonstrate that existing referral and protection mechanisms often operate on a single dimension and fail to adequately assess multiple areas of inequality together.

### Case Study 1

#### **Incorrect Age Assessment and Children Being Treated as Adults**

Two refugee children, aged 15 and 16, who were taken to a Temporary Shelter Center, faced deportation due to their ages being incorrectly recorded in the system (as over 18). The children were held as adults for a period of time. However, after the children declared their ages, they were referred to health institutions, and medical evaluations confirmed that they were children. After their ages were corrected, administrative supervision was terminated.

This case demonstrates that when refugee status and childhood are not assessed together, child-specific protection mechanisms can be bypassed.

### **Case Study 2**

#### **Child Denied Access to Education Due to Lack of Identity**

The child of a refugee woman without identity documents was unable to benefit from the right to education for a long time because he could not be registered. Applications to the immigration administration were unsuccessful, and following the applications, the juvenile court issued a decision on education and health measures; a letter was sent to the relevant administration requesting that identity procedures be carried out.

This case demonstrates that delays in identification processes directly affect children's rights to education and health.

### **Case Study 3**

#### **Discriminatory Recording of Health Status**

A refugee LGBT+ person was issued a deportation order and had their Temporary Protection Status revoked after being diagnosed with a "contagious disease." Following an appeal, the deportation decision was suspended. The trial is ongoing, but the person has not been granted temporary protection status. In this situation, the person is unable to obtain the medication they need to use routinely, and their access to healthcare is restricted.

This case demonstrates how administrative practices can lead to loss of rights in situations where health status intersects with refugee status.

### **Case Study 4**

#### **Detention of a Pregnant Refugee Woman in a Shelter**

It was reported that a pregnant refugee woman with children was held in a temporary shelter; age determination and status procedures could not be carried out due to her pregnancy. As a result of administrative efforts, the person was transferred to another province and later released.

This case shows that administrative uncertainties can increase victimization in situations where gender, pregnancy, and refugee status coincide.

## Case Study 5

### Death of a Child with Disabilities in Institutional Care

The case of the death of a child with autism receiving education at a rehabilitation center shows that human rights violations can have serious consequences when the oversight and accountability mechanisms of rehabilitation centers and similar places are not adequately implemented.

## Case Study 6

### Structural Discrimination Following Dismissal by Decree-Law (Failure to Reinstate Despite Acquittal)

One of the cases monitored during the monitoring process concerns a person dismissed from public office by a Decree-Law who was not reinstated to public office despite being acquitted in the criminal proceedings against them. This case demonstrates that a redress mechanism consistent with the right to a fair trial and the presumption of innocence was not implemented because the legal consequences of the acquittal were rendered ineffective in the administrative process. In other words, preventing the person from returning to public service despite the judicial decision removing the “allegation of guilt” creates a permanent exclusionary effect in access to rights, embodying a structurally discriminatory practice.

**When these cases are evaluated together, it is seen that rights violations are not limited to individual incidents; they recur around certain practices and mechanisms. Problems often stem not from individual mistakes but from deficiencies in institutional functioning.**

## Recurring Problems in Institutional Practices

Monitoring findings show that disadvantaged groups encounter similar and systematic problems when interacting with public institutions in accessing their rights. **Delays in identification and registration procedures, access to healthcare for LGBTQI+ individuals, erroneous or inadequate practices regarding the age and status determination of refugee children, failure to reinstate individuals to their positions despite court rulings, translation and information gaps, and administrative decisions made without sufficient justification** are the main recurring problems across different rights areas.

This situation demonstrates that institutional practices are inadequate in assessing multiple areas of inequality together and do not always take into account the specific circumstances of individuals.

### **Inadequacies in Application and Protection Mechanisms**

Data obtained during the monitoring process shows that, in some cases, although rights violations are reflected in official application mechanisms, these applications are not resolved effectively and in a timely manner. **The lengthiness of application processes, insufficient information, and delays in administrative procedures** weaken the effectiveness of avenues for seeking rights.

In some cases, the uncertainty of the application evaluation process or the lack of sufficient justification in decisions makes it difficult for applicants to actually benefit from legal safeguards. This situation reveals that protection mechanisms are not functioning effectively, especially for vulnerable groups.

**Therefore, the problem is not only the failure to file applications but also the inadequacy of the mechanisms to effectively remedy rights violations when applications are filed.**

### **Failure to Consider Multiple Disparities**

Current practices are often shaped by a single area of victimization; the unique risks that arise when multiple areas of inequality converge are not sufficiently taken into account.

Refugee children, refugees with disabilities, pregnant women, and persons with special needs due to health conditions experience the consequences of this approach more severely. This situation leads to the deepening and perpetuation of rights violations.



# CONCLUSION AND POLICY NOTES

The data examined in the report shows that violations against disadvantaged groups in accessing rights in Şanlıurfa are not limited to isolated incidents; certain social groups can be systematically excluded from equal access to rights due to their identities, statuses, and living conditions.

The applications and court cases followed point to recurring problems, particularly in the areas of access to justice, health and social services, housing, and access to public services. Delays at institutional contact points, lack of information, and unpredictable practices effectively limit avenues for seeking rights.

The cases examined reveal that existing mechanisms often operate in a one-dimensional manner and fail to adequately assess multiple areas of inequality together. This situation can have serious consequences, particularly for children, women, and persons with disabilities.

Ensuring equal and effective access to rights is not limited to addressing individual complaints. A preventive, inclusive, and intersectional approach must be adopted at the institutional level. In this context, it is important to review the compliance of current practices with human rights standards and to develop comprehensive policies and practices addressing structural problem areas.

The policy and practice notes in this section aim to provide recommendations for improvement at the level of institutional processes and mechanisms rather than individual cases.

## Notes on Institutional Practices

When disadvantaged groups interact with public institutions, **information and guidance mechanisms** should be made **accessible, transparent, and understandable**. Procedures related to identification, age, and status determination should be based on **transparent, standardized, and verifiable criteria** that take into account the specific circumstances of children and vulnerable groups. Translation and legal information services should be provided in a regular and sustainable manner as **an integral part** of the application process.

## Institutionalization of an Intersectional Approach

In policies and practices, individuals should be assessed not only on the basis of a single identity or status, but also taking into account situations where multiple areas of inequality converge.

Protection, monitoring, and referral mechanisms should be strengthened, particularly for refugee children, pregnant women, persons with disabilities, and persons with special needs due to health conditions.

The institutional adoption of an intersectional approach is important for the early detection of rights violations and the prevention of their recurrence.

## Multi-Stakeholder and Continuous Monitoring

The findings obtained in this report show that violations against disadvantaged groups in terms of access to rights cannot be addressed solely within the framework of the responsibility of individual institutions.

Effective protection systems require inter-agency coordination, regular data sharing, and the establishment of continuous monitoring mechanisms.

Regular cooperation mechanisms should be established between public institutions, local governments, bar associations, human rights boards, and civil society organizations. The monitoring capacity of provincial and district human rights boards should be strengthened and made functional; their competence in evaluating applications, monitoring, and reporting results transparently should be increased.

The monitoring activities carried out by bar associations and civil society organizations play an important role in making violations visible. The sustainability of these efforts is directly linked to the accessibility, accountability, and openness to cooperation of public institutions.

The continuity of monitoring activities is essential not only for identifying violations but also for developing preventive policies and strengthening accountability. Equal access to rights should be addressed as a shared responsibility.

## Monitoring Findings and Policy-Level Improvement Areas Table (2024–2025)

Monitoring Finding	Emerging Issue	Policy-Level Need
Delays in identification and registration processes	Children’s access to education and health services is being impeded	Acceleration and standardization of identification processes
Lack of interpreters and legal information in application processes	Difficulties in refugees’ access to justice	Provision of regular interpreters and legal support in application mechanisms
Uncertainty and delays in institutional procedures	Inability to effectively finalize applications	Establishing transparent and predictable administrative procedures
Inadequate living conditions in accommodation centers	Increased risks, especially for children and women	Strengthening oversight and monitoring mechanisms regarding shelter conditions
Failure to take multiple inequalities into account	Increased risk of loss of rights for disadvantaged groups in accessing rights	Integration of an intersectional approach into policies and practices



## **Methodological Note**

This report was prepared using an application-based and open-source method to monitor and highlight violations against disadvantaged groups in accessing rights.

Data was obtained through records kept by bar association commissions and units, applications made to civil society organizations, monitored case files, field and institutional visit reports, and regular media scans.

During the monitoring process, each application was evaluated taking into account the nature of the incident, the context in which it occurred, the affected groups, and the current status of the legal process. The analysis was based on an intersectional approach, acknowledging that violations often arise not from a single cause but from the convergence of multiple areas of inequality.

The study has methodological limitations. It should be noted that some violations may not have been reflected in the complaint mechanisms and that the available data is largely limited to the statements of the complainants and accessible official information.

This report does not claim to cover all violations in Şanlıurfa; it aims to provide a general overview based on the data reflected in the monitoring process.

## REFERENCES

- European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)
- United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC)
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)
- United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)
- Constitution of the Republic of Turkey
- Turkish Penal Code (TCK)
- Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP)
- Application records kept by the commissions and committees of the Şanlıurfa Bar Association (2024–2025)
- Case files reviewed during the monitoring process and field visit reports
- National and local media scans



