



GEORGIAN
YOUNG
LAWYERS'
ASSOCIATION

THE RESULTS OF MONITORING POLITICALLY MOTIVATED CASES RELATED TO DETAINEES DURING PROTESTS IN 2024–2025 AT FIRST INSTANCE COURTS

**THE RESULTS OF MONITORING
POLITICALLY MOTIVATED CASES
RELATED TO DETAINEES DURING PROTESTS IN 2024–2025
AT FIRST INSTANCE COURTS**

**Georgian Young Lawyers' Association
2025**

Heads of Publication: NONA KURDOVANIDZE
TAMAR ONIANI

Authors: TAMAR BOCHORISHVILI
PHATIMA CHAPHICHADZE
TAMAZ KIRTAVA

Observers: NANA MTCHEDLISHVILI
MARIAM JIKIDZE

Editor: KHATUNA KVIRALASHVILI

Technical Editor: IRAKLI SVANIDZE

It is prohibited to reprint, reproduce or distribute the materials of this publication for commercial purposes without prior written permission of Georgian Young Lawyers Association.

J. Kakhidze street #15, Tbilisi, Georgia
(+995 32) 295 23 53, 293 61 01
www.gyla.ge

© 2025, *Georgian Young Lawyers Association*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
CONTEXT	4
METHODOLOGY	4
KEY FINDINGS	5
CHAPTER 1 - „POLITICAL PRISONERS“ (MEANING AND CONTEXT)	10
1.1. The Definition by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE)	10
1.2. Article 18 of the European Convention on Human Rights and the Case-law of the European Court	11
1.3. The Definition of the The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly	13
1.4. The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (WGAD)	13
1.5. Amnesty International (the term “Prisoner of Conscience”)	14
CHAPTER 2 – ASSESSMENTS REGARDING GEORGIA RELATED TO THE DETAINED INDIVIDUALS IN CONTEXT OF THE PROTESTS	15
2.1. The Council of Europe	15
2.2. European Union	15
2.3. OSCE	15
2.4. Joint Statement by the Foreign Ministers of 20 European Countries and the High Representative of the European Union	16
2.5. Joint Statement by 24 Diplomatic Missions	16
2.6. Amnesty International	17
2.7. Clooney Foundation for Justice	18
2.8. Other Statements	19
CHAPTER 3 - RESULTS OF GYLA’S COURT MONITORING	20
3.1. Information on the Charges	20
3.2. Practice of Use Pretrial Detention Without Considering Individual Circumstances of the defendant	20
3.3. Cases of Ill-treatment	22
3.4. The Principle of Publicity	25
3.5. The Examination of the Cases of those Detained During Protests Against Russian Law was being Deliberately Delayed	28
3.6. Restriction of the Right to Defense	29
3.7. Issues Related to Interpreters	31
3.8. Judgments and Sentences	32
3.9. Cases of Drug Crimes	33
3.10. The Problem of Amending the Ordinance of the Government “On Approval of the List of Objects of Strategic and/or Special Importance”	34
3.11. Presumption of Innocence	36
CHAPTER 4 - INSTITUTIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROSECUTION AND PROSECUTORS AND CRITERIA FOR THE VALIDITY OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION	38
CONCLUSION	42
ANNEX 1	43
ANNEX 2	45
ANNEX 3	47

INTRODUCTION

The Georgian Young Lawyers' Association (GYLA), through the present report, summarizes the results of first instance court monitoring concerning criminal cases against 69 individuals detained/arrested in the context of demonstrations during 2024-2025. 10 individuals have been charged in relation to the protest rallies of spring 2024, while 59 individuals - November 2024 - February 2025 rallies/ continuous demonstrations.

For monitoring purposes, representatives of the organization attended nearly 300 hearings from May 2024 to September 2025. The aim of monitoring criminal trials is to observe and present the trends identified during court hearings from the perspective of an objective observer. The organization has carried out court monitoring since 2013, and GYLA was the first organization in Georgia to develop guiding principles and methodology for court monitoring.¹

CONTEXT

Since the spring of 2024 (and in particular, from 28 November 2024), against the backdrop of an escalating human rights crisis in the country,² one of the forms of repression has been the use of criminal law mechanisms against demonstrators.³ In this context, according to the cases observed by GYLA, the number of individuals charged or already convicted is 69, which is a considerably high number.

The use of criminal detentions in relation to protest activities has, in effect, criminalized peaceful protest and restricted freedom of assembly. The charges, instances of violations of the presumption of innocence by high-ranking officials, measures taken against defendants and the strict criminal policy, indicate political persecution of individuals with dissenting views by the ruling party "Georgian Dream", serving the purpose of suppressing public protest.

METHODOLOGY

GYLA has been conducting court monitoring since 2011. To date, the organization has prepared 18 monitoring reports on criminal proceedings and has also published 2 special reports.⁴ GYLA has observed criminal proceedings using a specially designed methodology. The monitoring was conducted by attending hearings in the first instance courts. During the observation process, monitors relied on specifically designed questionnaires. All information reflected in this report derives from attending and observing such hearings. The questionnaires included both "closed" questions, which could be answered with "yes" or "no," and "open" questions, allowing monitors to provide more detailed explanations and describe

¹ GYLA, The Criminal Trail Monitoring [Manual](#), 2021, last update: 12.09.2025.

² GYLA, [Georgia: Human rights Amidst the Russian law, Human Rights 60 Days Following the Revival of the Foreign Influence Transparency Bill](#), last update: 12.09.2025.

³ This refers to the demonstrations in the spring of 2024 against the "Russian law" and the demonstrations since November 28, 2024, which followed the Georgian Dream's announcement to suspend negotiations with the European Union. For more context, see GYLA's reports: [Georgia: Human rights Amidst the Russian law, Human Rights 60 Days Following the Revival of the Foreign Influence Transparency Bill](#), 2024; [Civil Rights Facing Police Terror](#), 2024; See, also, [Report](#) of 11 Civil Society Organisations: Human Rights Crisis in Georgia Following the 2024 Parliamentary Elections, 2025, last update: 12.09.2025.

⁴ GYLA's [Reports](#), last update: 12.09.2025.

their observations. Furthermore, throughout the proceedings, GYLA's monitors also prepared narrative documentation of the trials and of particularly significant motions, thereby adding clarity and context to their work. Through this procedure, monitors and analysts were able to collect objective, measurable data, while also identifying other important facts. Finally, the compliance of court activities with international standards, the Constitution of Georgia, and domestic legislation was analyzed and assessed. Also, publicly available information regarding the monitored cases was processed. The observations presented in this report contain important data of relevance both for the judiciary and for the legislative and executive authorities.

During the reporting period, GYLA observed nearly 300 criminal hearings concerning 69 individuals. For monitoring purposes, the cases were selected based on the following criteria:

- Criminal cases related to the alleged persecution of individuals on political grounds or for civic activism;
- Cases concerning individuals detained during the protests against the so-called "Russian Law" (Spring 2024);
- Cases of individuals detained following the protests after 28 November 2024.

In addition, the report presents rights violations identified during the criminal hearings concerning the founder of the media organizations "Netgazeti" and "Batumelebi", Mzia Amaghlobeli. In this case, GYLA represented the interests of Mzia Amaghlobeli as her legal representative.

KEY FINDINGS

Observation of criminal cases before the first instance courts reveals that the use of criminal prosecution mechanisms against activists is not directed solely at identifying and preventing specific alleged criminal acts, but also serves as a means of exerting pressure on the rights to freedom of assembly and expression. This practice does not represent an isolated violation of rights but contains elements of political motive / hidden intent. Below are presented the main findings about key issues:

1. Charges Brought

Activists are mostly charged with crimes such as: organizing or participating in group violence; preparation of an explosion; assaulting a police officer; damaging or destroying property by arson, explosion, or other dangerous means; unlawful production, manufacture, acquisition, storage, transportation, or transfer of narcotic substances, their analogues, or precursors in particularly large quantities; attempting to block a strategic facility and other (For details see annexed table).

2. Use of Detention as a Measure of Restraint

At the first stage, courts almost invariably imposed, and subsequently in most cases left without changes, the strictest form of measure of restraint - detention. Courts granted the motions of prosecution for usage of detention without taking into account circumstances relating to the accused, such as their individual characteristics, personality, occupation, age, health, family and financial situation, and other relevant factors.

According to GYLA's assessment, the imposition of unsubstantiated and prolonged detention on activists did not serve the legitimate purposes of measure of restraint. The requests for, and imposition of, detention functioned instead as a means of punishing activists and/or exerting pressure upon them.

GYLA's court monitoring findings over the years demonstrate that detention as a measure of restraint is not always applied strictly as a measure of last resort. In practice, two problematic issues arise: the high rate of detention and instances of unsubstantiated detention (For details see subchapter 3.2.).

3. Cases of Ill-treatment

19% (13 individuals) of detained demonstrators reported instances of ill-treatment during proceedings, which in essence amount to acts prohibited under the Constitution of Georgia and international human rights treaties and are criminally punishable (depending on the circumstances, each may amount to crimes defined in Articles 144¹, 144², 144³ of the Criminal Code – torture, threat of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment).

Allegations of ill-treatment were made by: Saba Skhvitaridze, Revaz Kiknadze, Nikoloz Katsia, Anatoly Gigauro, Davit Khomeriki, Davit Lomidze, Temur Zasokhashvili, Archil Museliants, Anastasia Zinovkina, Artem Gribul, Tevdore Abramov, Aleksandre Elisashvili, and Mzia Amaghlobeli.

In addition, several defendants pointed to problems within penitentiary establishments, in particular: heat and lack of ventilation; the presence of cockroaches in cells; water and canalization problems; and insufficient medical care.

Investigations about cases of ill-treatment are characterized as ineffective. Neither the Special Investigation Service (prior to its abolition on 1 July 2025) nor the Prosecutor's Office identified responsible individuals. Out of the 13 individuals, only one (Saba Skhvitaridze) was granted victim status, while 12 others were not recognized as victims by the Prosecutor's Office (For details see subchapter 3.3.).

4. The Principle of Publicity

At the initial stage, publicity was restricted by the arbitrariness⁵ of individual judges and/or through the use of small courtrooms, which limited the ability of interested individuals to attend hearings. Subsequently, restrictions were imposed on media coverage of proceedings, and legislative amendments further worsened transparency of the judiciary.

Amendments to the "Organic Law on General Courts" prohibited photo, film, video recording and broadcasting within the court (in the courthouse, courtroom, or court yard), except when this is carried out by the court itself or by a person authorized by the court. Dissemination of recorded materials was left to the discretion of the court, which could decide whether or not to release photos, films, or video recordings of hearings. These amendments practically eliminated the possibility for media to cover court hearings. The provision allowing video and audio recording or broadcasting of a particular hearing upon a specific decision of the High Council of Justice has not functioned in practice. Despite numerous requests

⁵ Number of judges unjustifiably close the court hearing partially or completely. For example, judge of the Criminal Cases Panel of the Tbilisi City Court, Irakli Shvangiradze's decision to close the hearing that caused forcible removal from the courtroom of all attendees, including media representatives, except for the Public Broadcaster, which did not provide live coverage of the hearing. See, [GYLA's statement](#), GYLA responds to the unjustified partial closure of a Court Hearing that hindered Human Rights organizations from monitoring the proceedings, 05.03.2025, last update: 12.09.2025.

by media outlets to get permission to cover criminal proceedings against activists, the High Council of Justice did not even provide responses.

Problems were also noted regarding the publishing information about hearings. Information about criminal cases against demonstrators was not always published on the official website of the court or displayed on monitors specifically designated for this purpose inside the court. (For details see subchapter 3.4.).

5. Delays of Cases

The criminal cases of individuals detained in the context of the 2024 spring protests were subject to artificial delays.⁶ This was tendentious in cases that had already reached the final stage. The hearings were scheduled with long intervals, mostly once every 2 months, only because of the mandatory requirement to review detention. Representatives of the defence consistently raised objections regarding this practice. The proceedings were not completed in a timely manner on the grounds that President Salome Zurbishvili (Zourabichvili) would not have been able to pardon the activists within the framework of her presidential powers (For details see subchapter 3.5.).

6. Restrictions on the Right to Defence

Another challenge identified in the criminal cases against activists was, in certain instances, restrictions imposed on the right to defence.

In a criminal case involving eleven defendants,⁷ the judge unjustifiably appointed public defence lawyers to all of the defendants, except for one defendant, despite the fact that all others were represented by their own lawyers at the hearing. The defendants stated that they did not want involvement of new lawyers. In this situation, there were no legal grounds for the appointment of public defence lawyers. Preventive appointment of a public lawyer is not prescribed by the criminal procedure legislation. Moreover, the factor of trust between a defendant and a lawyer must be taken into account, as the lawyer-client relationship is primarily based on trust. According to the defendants' position stated during the hearing, they had retained private lawyers precisely for this reason. The court's actions constituted a serious interference with the defendants' right to defence.

This raised suspicions that the judge tried to conclude the proceedings within the 9-month detention period in order to avoid change of detention as a measure of restraint due to the expiry of that period.

Issues relating to interpreters were also revealed in the ongoing cases. Lack of interpreter qualifications or significant deficiencies in translation directly restricted the defendants' rights, particularly in terms of effective defence and the protection of the principle of a fair trial. When defendants are unable to understand the substance of the proceedings against them, including the formulation of the charges, the

⁶ Criminal cases against Saba Meparishvili and Omar Okribelashvili, Giorgi Okmelashvili, Davit Koldar and Giorgi Kuchuashvili, Also, Fridon Bubuteishvili.

⁷ Defendants: Andro Chichinadze, Onise Tskhadadze, Guram Mirtskhulava, Jano Archaia, Luka Jabua, Ruslan Sivakov, Revaz Kiknadze, Giorgi Terishvili, Valeri Tetrashvili, Sergei Kukharchuk and Irakli Kerashvili. Charge: Article 225 of the Criminal Code - Organisation, management or participation in group violence. Judge: Nino Galustashvili.

assessment of evidence, and witness testimonies, they cannot state their position or adequately exercise defence mechanisms. There were identified incidents, where defence lawyers explained that the translation provided by interpreters did not serve the defendant's interests and was at times significantly insufficient or inappropriate. Challenges concerned both the quality of translation and breaches of neutrality and ethical standards, which constituted a significant barrier to the defendants' full participation in the proceedings and the effective exercise of their right to defence (For details see subchapter 3.6).

7. Judgements and Sentences

The approach of prosecuting and judicial authorities in the criminal cases against activists is mostly strict, which was reflected in the predominance of convictions and the imposition of custodial sentences.

All criminal proceedings against activists have been completed (as of September 2025, only the cases of Nino Datashvili and the 2 February events remain under consideration in the court of first instance⁸).

It should be underlined that, except for Giorgi Akhobadze, Tevdore Abramov, and Nikoloz Katsia, all defendants were found guilty by the court.

In several cases, the courts reclassified the charges: for example, in the cases of Anatoli Gigauri, and the so-called "eight"⁹ and "eleven"¹⁰ defendants, the charges were reclassified to lighter articles. In case of Saba Skhvitartidze **the prosecution itself changed the charges**: instead of Article 353¹. 2 of the Criminal Code (assault on a police officer), the case was requalified under Article 120 - Intentional infliction of minor harm to health.

Charges were also reclassified in the case of Mzia Amaghlobeli, founder of "Batumelebi" and "Netgazeti". Instead of Article 353¹ of the Criminal Code (assault on a police officer, other public official, or public institution), the court convicted her under Article 353 (resistance, threats, or violence against a public order officer or other public official).

8 individuals out of 10 detained during the protests against the "Russian law," received custodial sentences. As for those detained in the context of the November-December protests, without exception, all convicted individuals were sentenced to custodial penalties in the form of imprisonment (See attached table).

The criminal proceedings against activists in the Tbilisi City Court, particularly those relating to drug-related crimes, revealed that, in most cases, neutral evidence was lacking. In some cases, the neutrality of witnesses presented by the prosecution as independent raised doubts. Video evidence was often absent, even in situations where it would have been possible to obtain recordings from external cameras likely to capture the search and seizure process. Moreover, in certain cases, the video evidence that was presented raised questions as to its reliability (For details see subchapter 3.9).

⁸ Defendants: Irakli Tsignadze, Giorgi Ugulava, Dimitri Bidzinashvili, Irakli Tabatadze, Nikoloz Kutubidze, Vasili Eliava, Nikoloz Kumsiashvili, Aleksandre Gogoladze.

⁹ Defendants: Nikoloz Javakhishvili, Tornike Goshadze, Irakli Miminoshvili, Zviad Tsetskhladze, Vefkhia Kasradze, Vasil Kadzlashvili, Giorgi Gorgadze and Insaf Aliyev.

¹⁰ Defendants: Andro Chichinadze, Onise Tskhadadze, Guram Mirtskhulava, Jano Archaia, Luka Jabua, Ruslan Sivakov, Revaz Kiknadze, Giorgi Terishvili, Valeri Tetrashvili, Sergei Kukharchuk and Irakli Kerashvili.

8. Instrumentalisation of the Criminal Law

In response to the planned demonstration of 2 February 2025, the Government of Georgia amended Ordinance of the Government No. 361 of 23 October 2024 on 31 January 2025. The amendment added a single point to the list of “strategic and/or specially designated facilities,” namely, the international highways as defined by Government Ordinance of the Government No. 407 of 18 June 2014 on the approval of the list of international and domestic highways. As a result of this amendment, criminal liability was imposed for blocking Aghmashenebeli Avenue near Tbilisi Mall, which later formed the basis for the prosecution of 8 individuals.

The amendment to the Decree of the Government was introduced within a single day. Consequently, an act that would not have entailed criminal liability the day before became punishable under criminal law. Since the demonstration had been announced prior to the amendment, and the amendment was adopted just one day before the event, the public had no reasonable time to be informed.

The fact that a single provision was added to the Ordinance of the Government one day before the planned demonstration, covering the exact location of the announced protest, raises suspicions that the “Georgian Dream” abuses its powers in an attempt to deliberately hinder the exercise of the fundamental rights to freedom of assembly and expression (For details see subchapter 3.10).

9. The Impunity of Special Force Officers and Their Commanders

It is alarming that no criminal prosecution has initiated against any individual responsible for violence committed against activists and journalists during the protests.

Furthermore, by abolishing the Special Investigation Service, Georgian Dream once again demonstrated that it does not intend to conduct effective investigations into police violence and ill-treatment, to fulfil obligations undertaken within the EU Association process, to execute the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, or to take into consideration the recommendations of the Venice Commission.

CHAPTER 1 - „POLITICAL PRISONERS“ (MEANING AND CONTEXT)

The assessment of the reviewed cases is closely linked to the issue of political justice. A large part of society, international institutions, and reputable international human rights organizations consider the detained individuals to be political prisoners, and the criminal prosecution against them as a manifestation of political justice (see chapter 2). Accordingly, during discussion on these cases, it is important to analyze in which circumstances a person may be regarded as a political prisoner and what factors indicate the use of criminal law as a political tool. This report is based on the standards that are reviewed in the following chapter.

1.1. The Definition by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE)

There is no universally accepted definition of the term “political prisoner.” However, Resolution No. 1900 (2012) of the **Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe**¹¹ provides a widely used definition of this term.

According to this resolution:

“A person deprived of his or her personal liberty is to be regarded as a ‘political prisoner’:

- a. if the detention has been imposed in violation of one of the fundamental guarantees set out in the European Convention on Human Rights and its Protocols (ECHR), in particular freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of expression and information, freedom of assembly and association;*
- b. if the detention has been imposed for purely political reasons without connection to any offence;*
- c. if, for political motives, the length of the detention or its conditions are clearly out of proportion to the offence the person has been found guilty of or is suspected of;*
- d. if, for political motives, he or she is detained in a discriminatory manner as compared to other persons; or,*
- e. if the detention is the result of proceedings which were clearly unfair and this appears to be connected with political motives of the authorities.”*

In its 2025 report, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe’s General Rapporteur on Political Prisoners in Europe explained that the definition of a “political prisoner” **may cover any form or duration of deprivation of liberty**, be it imprisonment following conviction, pre-trial detention, detention with a view to extradition, administrative detention, or even house arrest.¹²

¹¹ PACE, [Resolution](#) 1900 (2012), last update: 12.09.2025.

¹² PACE Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights Situation of political prisoners in Russia and Belarus [Information Note](#) General Rapporteur on Political Prisoners in Europe: Ms Azadeh ROJHAN, Sweden, Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group, AS/Jur (2025) 12, last update: 12.09.2025.

1.2. Article 18 of the European Convention on Human Rights and the Case-law of the European Court

Although neither the **European Convention on Human Rights** nor the **case-law of the European Court of Human Rights** provides a definition of the term “*political prisoner*”, the Court’s practice under Article 18 of the Convention is relevant in this context.

According to Article 18, the restrictions permitted under the Convention on the rights and freedoms of individuals shall not be applied for any purpose other than those for which they have been prescribed.

During examination whether a **criminal prosecution pursued a political or any other ulterior purpose**, the Court considers the following factors:

- i. The factors deriving from the broader political context in which the criminal case was brought against the applicant are not sufficient proof in that respect.¹³
- ii. Whether the prosecution and the judiciary authorities had an ulterior motive.¹⁴ In particular.
- iii. The statements of the representatives of the authority, in certain circumstances, may indicate the deliberate persecution of a person.¹⁵
- iv. A certain political climate may create an environment that influences the decisions of the domestic courts in relation to the applicant, or to other persons belonging to the same group or category.¹⁶
- v. A proof of ulterior purpose behind a judicial decision if there is evidence that the courts were not sufficiently independent from the executive authorities.¹⁷
- vi. Whether the accusation against the applicant is genuine and meets the standard of “reasonable suspicion” within the meaning of Article 5 § 1 of the Convention.¹⁸ Where the accusation is based on facts which cannot reasonably be considered criminal under domestic law, this is particularly relevant under Article 18 of the Convention and may suggest the existence of an ulterior motive.¹⁹
- vii. Whether the decisions of the domestic courts were well justified.²⁰
- viii. Whether the measures of restraint applied to the accused were sufficiently related to the objectives of criminal justice and whether their duration was adequate.²¹

¹³ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of MERABISHVILI v. GEORGIA*, 72508/13, 28 November 2017, par. 322.

¹⁴ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of BATIASHVILI v. GEORGIA*, 8284/07, 10 October 2019, par. 102.

¹⁵ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of MERABISHVILI v. GEORGIA*, 72508/13, 28 November 2017, par. 324; Also, European Court of Human Rights, *Case of MAMMADOV v. AZERBAIJAN*, 15172/13, 22 May 2014, par. 142.

¹⁶ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of SELAHATTİN DEMİRTAŞ v. TURKEY* (No. 2), 14305/17, 22 December 2020, par. 434, 436.

¹⁷ Ibid. See also, The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of MERABISHVILI v. GEORGIA*, 72508/13, 28 November 2017, par. 324.

¹⁸ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of ISMAYILOVA v. AZERBAIJAN* (No. 2), 30778/15, 27 February 2020, par. 111.

¹⁹ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of KAVALA v. TURKEY*, 28749/18, 10 December 2019, par. 220, 224.

²⁰ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of AZIZOV AND NOVRUZLU v. AZERBAIJAN*, 65583/13, 70106/13, 18 February 2021, par. 78.

²¹ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of NAVALNYY v. RUSSIA* (No. 2), 43734/14, 9 April 2019, par. 95.

The Use of Article 18

Article 18 of the Convention does not have independent effect. It is applied in conjunction with any other article. However, a violation of Article 18 may be found in relation to a specific article even if no violation of that article taken separately has been found.²²

The Existence of an Ulterior Purpose

A restriction may be based not on a legitimate aim prescribed by the Convention, but rather on an ulterior purpose. Such a restriction may pursue only an ulterior purpose or both a legitimate and an ulterior one.²³ The existence of a legitimate aim under the Convention does not, in itself, exclude the presence of an ulterior purpose, just as the coexistence of a legitimate and an ulterior purpose does not *a priori* amount to a violation of Article 18.²⁴ When both legitimate and ulterior purposes are present, the Court examines which of them was predominant.²⁵

Establishing the Predominant Purpose

A violation of Article 18 arises only if the ulterior purpose was the predominant one.²⁶ Whether a purpose was predominant depends on all the circumstances of the case.²⁷ In assessing that point, the Court will have regard to the nature and degree of reprehensibility of the alleged ulterior purpose, and bear in mind that the Convention was designed to maintain and promote the ideals and values of a democratic society governed by the rule of law.²⁸

The European Court is not limited to direct evidence and it may also rely on circumstantial evidence.²⁹ In this case circumstantial evidence means information about primary facts, contextual elements, or a sequence of events capable of forming the basis for conclusions about the main facts.³⁰ In this respect, the Court often takes into account reports and statements by international observers, non-governmental organisations, and the media, as well as judgments of other international or national courts, to clarify or verify its findings.³¹

Targeted prosecution of a particular individual may indicate the presence of an ulterior purpose. Likewise, a pattern of persecution of a specific group. For example,³² the arbitrary arrest or the abusive

²² The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of MERABISHVILI v. GEORGIA*, 72508/13, 28 November 2017, par. 288.

It is noteworthy that the standards for the application and interpretation of Article 18 were summarised in the judgment of the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights in *Merabishvili v. Georgia* (MERABISHVILI v. GEORGIA [GC]). It is noteworthy that prior to this case, the case-law of the Court of Human Rights on the said article was in a number of cases contradictory, which is the reason why, in that judgment, the Court considered it necessary to define and summarise the standard more clearly.

²³ Ibid, par. 292.

²⁴ Ibid, par. 303-305.

²⁵ Ibid, par. 308.

²⁶ Ibid, par. 305.

²⁷ Ibid, par. 307.

²⁸ Ibid, par. 307.

²⁹ Ibid, par. 316.

³⁰ Ibid, par. 317.

³¹ Ibid.

³² For example, in the case of *Navalny v. RUSSIA* [GC], which covered seven episodes of Navalny's detention, the Court considered that the targeting of the applicant as an opposition politician affected not only him or his supporters but also the very essence of democracy, and constituted an underlying aim of "significant gravity". The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of NAVALNYY v. RUSSIA* [GC], 29580/12, 15 November 2018, par. 173-176.

use of criminal law against individuals critical to the government, activists, or human rights defenders, may also point to such a purpose.³³

However, the Court has also underlined that the criminal prosecution of a person with a particular political status, such as a politician, does not automatically indicate the existence of an ulterior purpose,³⁴ just as the absence of political status does not exclude the possibility that a hidden political motive lies behind the criminal proceedings.³⁵

1.3. The Definition of the The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

In 2014, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly endorsed the definition of a “political prisoner” adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in its Resolution 1900 (2012).³⁶ **This definition is also applied by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly’s Special Representative on Political Prisoners in the preparation of reports.**³⁷

1.4. The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (WGAD)

The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (WGAD) distinguishes five categories of arbitrary detention:

Category I – When there is no legal basis for the deprivation of liberty.³⁸ The only existence of a legal provision is not sufficient to establish a legal basis. This category also includes cases where a person is deprived of liberty on the basis of a law that is manifestly contrary to international law.³⁹

Category II – When the deprivation of liberty results from the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms, such as freedom of movement, freedom of opinion and belief, freedom of expression, freedom of peaceful assembly and association, the right to participate in public affairs (active or passive electoral rights), and the right to equality. This category covers cases where deprivation of liberty is a response to the legitimate exercise of these rights.⁴⁰

Category III – When there is a violation of the right to a fair trial. If the Working Group finds that guarantees related to the right to a fair trial have been violated, it further considers whether the violations are of such gravity as to render the deprivation of liberty arbitrary.⁴¹

³³ The European Court of Human Rights, Case of *AZIZOV AND NOVRUZLU v. AZERBAIJAN*, 65583/13, 18 February 2021, par. 76.

³⁴ The European Court of Human Rights, Case of *SELAHATTİN DEMİRTAŞ v. TURKEY (No. 2)*, 14305/17, 22 December 2020, par. 424.

³⁵ *მამადლი აზერბაიჯანის წინააღმდეგ (MAMMADLI v. AZERBAIJAN)*, 47145/14, 19 April 2018, par. 103.

³⁶ OSCE PA, BAKU [DECLARATION](#) 2014, par. 113, last update: 12.09.2025.

³⁷ ANNUAL [REPORT](#) OF THE OSCE PA SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE ON POLITICAL PRISONERS CONGRESSMAN STEVE COHEN (USA), THE 30TH ANNUAL SESSION OF THE OSCE PA JUNE 30 – JULY 4, 2023, last update: 12.09.2025; ANNUAL [REPORT](#) OF THE OSCE PA SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE ON POLITICAL PRISONERS CONGRESSMAN STEVE COHEN (US), THE 31ST ANNUAL SESSION OF THE OSCE PA JUNE 29 – JULY 3, 2024, last update: 12.09.2025.

³⁸ Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, [FACT SHEET](#) NO. 26/REV. 1, 12, last update: 12.09.2025.

³⁹ WGAD, Opinion No. 4/2019, par. 49.

⁴⁰ Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, [FACT SHEET](#) NO. 26/REV. 1, 14, last update: 12.09.2025.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, 15.

Category IV – When asylum seekers, refugees, or migrants are subjected to prolonged deprivation of liberty without judicial supervision or due administrative process.⁴²

Category V – When the deprivation of liberty constitutes discrimination based on birth, nationality, ethnicity, social origin, language, religion, economic status, political or other opinion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or any other status, and aims at or results in the denial of equality before the law.⁴³

The Working Group does not use the term “political prisoner.” However, in cases of arbitrary detention on the grounds of political opinions or activities, Categories II and V are particularly relevant. According to the Working Group, there is a close link between these two categories: when deprivation of liberty results from the exercise of civil and political rights, there is a strong presumption that it also falls under Category V.⁴⁴ To determine the existence of a discriminatory motive, the Working Group considers not only the specific circumstances of the individual case but also the broader context, such as prior patterns of persecution against the person concerned and assessments by other international human rights mechanisms, as well as the Working Group’s own previous opinions revealing patterns of persecution of individuals critical of the government.⁴⁵

1.5. Amnesty International (the term “Prisoner of Conscience”)

Human rights defenders often use the term “prisoner of conscience.” Sometimes, this term is used as a synonym of “political prisoner.”⁴⁶ According to the international human rights organization Amnesty International, a prisoner of conscience is defined as: **a person who has been deprived of their liberty solely because of their conscientiously held beliefs, or for discriminatory reasons relating to their ethnicity, sexuality, gender, or other identity, who has not used violence or advocated violence or hatred.**⁴⁷

Accordingly, the term “*prisoner of conscience*” as used by Amnesty International is not identical to “*political prisoner*.” It is a narrower concept, as it places particular emphasis on the non-violent element.⁴⁸

⁴² Ibid, 17.

⁴³ Ibid, 18.

⁴⁴ WGAD, Opinion No. 3/2024, par. 110.

⁴⁵ WGAD, Opinion No. 4/2025, par. 79.

⁴⁶ Although this term has long established a place in the vocabulary of human rights defenders, it is most closely associated with the international civil society organization, Amnesty International. The creation of this term is connected with Amnesty International. Amnesty International was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1977 for its work in protecting the rights of prisoners of conscience. Amnesty International, Amnesty International [handbook](#), 2002, 5, last update: 12.09.2025; See also the text of a 1961 article by Amnesty International founder Peter Benenson, where he first used the term: AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL SPEAK FREE [INFORMATION SHEET](#) 3, 2011, last update: 14.09.2025.

<https://peaceprizelaureates.nobelpeacecenter.org/en/laureate/1977-amnesty-international>, last update: 14.09.2025.

⁴⁷ „a person who has been deprived of their liberty solely because of their conscientiously held beliefs, or for discriminatory reasons relating to their ethnicity, sexuality, gender, or other identity, who has not used violence or advocated violence or hatred.” See.: Amnesty International [statement](#) on Aleksei Navalny, 25.02.2025, last update: 14.09.2025.

⁴⁸ Amnesty International [statement](#) on Aleksei Navalny, 25.02.2025, last update: 14.09.2025; Amnesty International [Statement](#) on Alexei Navalny’s status as Prisoner of Conscience, 21.05.2025, last update: 14.09.2025.

CHAPTER 2 – ASSESSMENTS REGARDING GEORGIA RELATED TO THE DETAINED INDIVIDUALS IN CONTEXT OF THE PROTESTS

2.1. The Council of Europe

- Resolution 2585 (2025) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe⁴⁹ outlines the measures that, in the Assembly's view, are necessary to overcome the political crisis in Georgia. Among these, one of the points is the **release of political prisoners** (para. 7.1).
- Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe - On August 6, the Commissioner for Human Rights of Council of Europe commented on the judgement against Mzia Amaghlobeli via the social network X.⁵⁰ The Commissioner stated that the sentence is disproportionate and raises serious concerns in relation to the European Convention on Human Rights. He called on the authorities to release Mzia Amaghlobeli.

2.2. European Union

- Resolution of the European Parliament, dated 13 February, 2025⁵¹ - calls for the unconditional and immediate release of **all political prisoners** and individuals detained during anti-government protests. It also demands the release of **Mzia Amaghlobeli** (para. 11).
- Resolution of the European Parliament, dated 9 July, 2025⁵² - expresses particular concern regarding the **growing number of political prisoners** and reiterates its call on the authorities for their unconditional and immediate release (para. 1). It also reiterates the call for the immediate and unconditional release of **Mzia Amaghlobeli** and for the quash of the charges against her, which are politically motivated (para. 15).⁵³
- Statement by the EU Spokesperson, 6 August, 2025⁵⁴ - The European Union strongly condemned the judgement against **Mzia Amaghlobeli**, expressed deep concern over the instrumentalisation of the judiciary and its use as a tool of repression against independent voices, and called on the Georgian authorities to release Mzia Amaghlobeli and all individuals who have been unjustly detained.

2.3. OSCE

- Porto Declaration⁵⁵ - Declaration adopted by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly on 3 July calls on the Georgian authorities to **release all political prisoners** (para. 62)

⁴⁹ PACE [Resolution](#) 2585 (2025), last update: 14.09.2025.

⁵⁰ See the [response](#) of the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights on social network X, updated: 14.09.2025.

⁵¹ European Parliament [resolution](#) of 13 February 2025 on the further deterioration of the political situation in Georgia (2025/2522(RSP)), last update: 14.09.2025.

⁵² European Parliament [resolution](#) of 9 July 2025 on the 2023 and 2024 Commission reports on Georgia (2025/2024(INI)), last update: 14.09.2025.

⁵³ The resolution also strongly condemns the arrest and conviction of Zurab Japaridze, Mamuka Khazaradze, Badri Japaridze, Giorgi Vashadze, Nika Melia and other opposition politicians on politically motivated charges, and considers them political prisoners (ibid., para. 10).

⁵⁴ Georgia: [Statement](#) by the EU Spokesperson regarding the judgement against journalist Mzia Amaghlobeli, last update: 14.09.2025.

⁵⁵ PORTO [DECLARATION](#) AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY AT THE THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL SESSION PORTO, 29 JUNE – 3 JULY 2025, last update: 14.09.2025.

- Response by the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media⁵⁶ - In a statement published on social network X on 6 August, the Representative referred to the judgement against Mzia Amaghlobeli as alarming and called on the state to release her.
- Statement by 37 OSCE Participating States⁵⁷ - On 11 September 2025, 37 OSCE participating states published a statement on the human rights situation in Georgia, in which they strongly condemned the disproportionate sentence imposed on **Mzia Amaghlobeli**, as well as the recent **custodial sentence of protest participants**. They called on Georgia to release all individuals who have been unjustly detained, to ensure the independence of the judiciary, and to uphold the right to a fair trial.
- According to dismissed information, ODIHR expressed its readiness to monitor the proceedings of political prisoners upon receiving the necessary consent. In relation to this, President Salome Zourabichvili invited them in December 2024. However, "Georgian Dream" has not granted OSCE/ODIHR the required consent to carry out the monitoring.⁵⁸

2.4. Joint Statement by the Foreign Ministers of 20 European Countries⁵⁹ and the High Representative of the European Union

- In the joint statement published by the British Embassy on 11 July 2024, it is stated: "We strongly **condemn the recent, politically motivated, imprisonment and detention of the leaders of Georgian opposition**, clearly designed to stifle political opposition in Georgia, a few months ahead of the local elections. Their detention, **as well as arbitrary arrests and increasing repression of other Georgian authorities' critics, representatives of civil society, peaceful protesters and independent journalists**, contribute to dismantling of democracy in Georgia and rapid transformation towards an authoritarian system, in contradiction to European norms and values."

2.5. Joint Statement by 24 Diplomatic Missions⁶⁰

- In a statement released on 6 August, the diplomatic missions condemned the judgement against **Mzia Amaghlobeli** and assessed it as disproportionate and politicised. According to their assessment, the case of Mzia Amaghlobeli, along with the pressure exerted on "Batumelebi" and "Netgazeti", exemplifies the growing intimidation of journalists in Georgia, impunity for acts of violence, and politically motivated legal persecution.

⁵⁶ See the [response](#) of the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media on social network X, last update: 14.09.2025.

⁵⁷ Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Malta, Moldova, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Lithuania. See. The human rights situation in Georgia: Joint [Statement](#) to the OSCE, September 2025, last update: 14.09.2025.

⁵⁸ IPN [News](#), Giorgi Burjanadze - "Dream" does not give OSCE/ODIHR the necessary consent to conduct monitoring on political prisoners' cases, 21.07.2025, last update: 25.09.2025.

⁵⁹ Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom. See. Joint [statement](#) on recent developments in Georgia, 11.07.2025, last update: 14.09.2025.

⁶⁰ Diplomatic missions of Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine and the United Kingdom. See the [Joint Statement](#) of 24 diplomatic missions on the sentencing of journalist Mzia Amaghlobeli 14.09.2025.

2.6. Amnesty International

- Statement of 14 April⁶¹ - The arrest of **Mzia Amaghlobeli**, her possible ill-treatment, and the subsequent court proceedings raise serious concerns regarding the potential motivation behind her criminal prosecution. This, in contrast to the apparent impunity from the police, points to the discriminatory treatment of her and other protest participants by the criminal justice system in Georgia. **Her case also highlights broader systemic issues, including politically motivated criminal prosecution**, suppression of dissent, and gender-based retaliation against those who exercise their right to peaceful protest in Georgia.
- Statement of 25 June “Justice for Tortured Georgian Protester: Saba Skhvitaridze”⁶²- **Saba Skhvitaridze’s** arrest and subsequent treatment appears to be retaliatory, aimed at punishing him for participating in protests and creating a wider chilling effect to deter others from joining the protests. From the outset, his case has been marked by unlawful and retaliatory actions by the state authorities, consistent with a broader pattern of using the criminal justice system to suppress dissent. On 23 July Amnesty International posted a video where is shown Saba Skhvitaridze’s father talking about his son’s arrest.⁶³ In the description of video is written “No one should be punished for raising their voice. No one should be tortured for demanding freedom.”
- Statement of 27 June⁶⁴ - According to the statement, authorities in Georgia must stop their relentless assault on dissent and targeting protesters and political activists for the peaceful exercise of their human rights [...].
- Statement of 11 July⁶⁵ - Amnesty International responded to the judgement against **Saba Jikia** with a statement. Although the statement does not specifically refer to him as a "political prisoner," it notes that “This selective approach to justice is of deep concern. Georgian authorities must immediately end this impunity and injustice.”
- Statement of 6 August⁶⁶ - Amnesty International responded to the judgement against Mzia Amaghlobeli. According to the organization, “The proceedings were riddled with procedural violations and bias, and the court refused to admit much of the defence’s submissions and investigate credible allegations of ill-treatment by police officials. Mzia Amaghlobeli must receive a fair trial, and the abuses she has suffered must also be independently investigated and addressed to ensure justice.”
- Statement of 22 August⁶⁷ - Based on Amnesty International, Andro Chichinadze’s and his co-defenders’ remand hearings and the subsequent trial have been marred by numerous fair trial violations, and **the charges against them appear politically motivated**. Amnesty International highlighted following circumstances:

⁶¹ Amnesty International [document](#), Georgia: Justice for Journalist Mzia Amaghlobeli, 14.04.2025, last update: 14.09.2025.

⁶² Amnesty International [document](#), Georgia: Justice for Tortured Georgian Protester: Saba Skhvitaridze, 25.06.2025, last update: 14.09.2025.

⁶³ See the [Facebook post](#) of Amnesty International, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁶⁴ Amnesty International [statement](#), Georgia: Crackdown on government critics deepens as another opposition politician is jailed, 27.06.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁶⁵ Amnesty International, [statement](#), Georgia: Jailing of teenage protester raises fair trial concerns, 11.07.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁶⁶ Amnesty International, [statement](#), Georgia: Impunity prevails as Mzia Amaghlobeli to be jailed after ill treatment and an unfair trial, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁶⁷ Amnesty International, [statement](#) Georgia: Actor protester jailed, denied justice: Andro Chichinadze, last update: 15.09.2025.

- Before refusing to apply bail as a measure of restraint to the defendants, the court failed to properly consider arguments against detention;
- Andro Chichinadze and others are charged with participation in group violence. However, there is no connection between them as a group, and no evidence exists to prove organized or coordinated acts of violence;
- The prosecution failed to establish the constituent elements of the alleged crime that are prescribed by law;
- The main piece of evidence is a video showing Andro Chichinadze throwing a stick. However, it is not visible where the stick lands, and the prosecution has not demonstrated that it caused any harm;
- The court accepted police officers' testimonies without question, including that of an officer who misidentified one of the defendants;
- High-ranking officials violated the defendants' presumption of innocence;
- The court failed to examine the credible allegations of ill-treatment.

According to Amnesty International, the detention of Andro Chichinadze and his co-defendants should be reviewed and they should be provided with a fair trial or they should be released immediately. A video about Andro Chichinadze was posted on Amnesty International's Instagram page on August 27.⁶⁸ In the video description is written "... He stood up against authoritarianism. Now he's behind bars..."

- Statement of 3 September - According to the statement of the Deputy Director for Eastern Europe and Central Asia at Amnesty International regarding the **judgments delivered against 20 individuals on 2 and 3 September**, „The trials of Andro Chichinadze, Saba Skhvitadze and the others show that the Georgian government is instrumentalizing criminal justice to punish protesters and silence dissent. Protestors in Georgia have suffered human rights violations through torture and other ill-treatment, arbitrary detention and unfair trials." The statement also drew attention to the failure to investigate allegations of ill-treatment. According to the statement, these **unjust convictions should be quashed**, and Saba Skhvitadze, Andro Chichinadze, and others should be released or granted the right to a fair trial.

2.7. Clooney Foundation for Justice

- In a statement published on 6 August,⁶⁹ it was noted that the judgement against **Mzia Amaghlobeli** raises alarming questions regarding the future of freedom of expression and the rule of law in Georgia. According to the statement, the judgement places Georgia among those countries that use criminal law to silence journalists and restrict freedom of expression.

⁶⁸ See the [Instagram post](#) of Amnesty International, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁶⁹ See the [Instagram post](#) of Clooney Foundation for Justice, last update: 15.09.2025.

2.8. Other Statements

- On 2 September, the Observatory for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders⁷⁰ issued a statement⁷¹ demanding the unconditional and immediate release of **Nino Datashvili** and all arbitrarily detained human rights defenders. **The Observatory qualifies Nino Datashvili's detention as "arbitrary,"** condemns the lack of access to healthcare in detention, and denounces the attempt to stigmatise her through the use of labels related to mental health.

A number of international human rights organisations also expressed concern regarding the judgement against Mzia Amaghlobeli, including the International Press Institute (IPI)⁷², the European Centre for Press and Media Freedom (ECPMF)⁷³, the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ)⁷⁴, ARTICLE 19⁷⁵, and PEN America⁷⁶. In their respective statements, these organisations characterised the judgement as **an attack on media freedom and freedom of expression**.

⁷⁰ The Observatory for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders represents a partnership between international civil society organizations - the World Organization Against Torture (OMCT) and the International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH). See: [OMCT](#), Georgia: Arbitrary detention and judicial harassment of pro-democracy activist Nino Datashvili, 02.09.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁷¹ [OMCT](#), Georgia: Arbitrary detention and judicial harassment of pro-democracy activist Nino Datashvili, 02.09.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁷² See [the Respond of IPI](#), last update: 15.09.2025.

⁷³ See [the Respond of ECPMF](#), last update: 15.09.2025.

⁷⁴ See [the Respond of IFJ](#), last update: 15.09.2025.

⁷⁵ See [the Respond of ARTICLE 19](#), last update: 15.09.2025.

⁷⁶ See [the Respond of Pen America](#), last update: 15.09.2025.

CHAPTER 3 - RESULTS OF GYLA'S COURT MONITORING

3.1. Information on the Charges

GYLA's monitoring on criminal proceedings covered 69 criminal cases. Activists were mostly charged with the following crimes:

- **Organizing or participating in group violence** (Articles 225(1) and (2) of the Criminal Code);
- **Preparation of an explosion** (Articles 18, 229 of the Criminal Code);
- **Attack on a police officer, a special penitentiary service officer, another state official, or a public institution** (Article 353¹(1) of the Criminal Code);
- **Damage or destruction of property by setting fire, explosion, or other dangerous means** (Article 187(2)(a) of the Criminal Code);
- **Damage or destruction of property** (Article 187(1) of the Criminal Code);
- **Illegal manufacture, production, acquisition, storage, transportation, or sending of narcotic drugs, their analogs or precursors, in especially large quantities** (Article 260(6)(a) of the Criminal Code);
- **Violence by a group of persons against two or more persons** (Article 126.1¹(b)(c) of the Criminal Code);
- **Persecution of a person related to political activity, committed with violence** (Article 156(2)(a) of the Criminal Code);
- **Attempt to block a facility of strategic or special importance, which has disrupted or could have disrupted the normal functioning of this organisation or facility jointly by more than one person;** (Articles 19, 222(a) of the Criminal Code);
- **Assault on a public official while performing official duties (assault on a person equated with a public official in connection with their official duties)** (Article 353²(3));
- **Beating or an other type of violence that caused the victim's physical pain but did not entail the consequence provided for by Article 120 of this Code, committed by a group of persons** (Article 126.1¹(b)).⁷⁷

3.2. Practice of Use Pretrial Detention Without Considering Individual Circumstances of the Defendant

It is notable that in cases of persons detained in the context of protests, the court every time has satisfied prosecution's motions for the most severe measure of restraint - pretrial detention. Courts approved the prosecution's motions for detention without taking into account the individual circumstances of the defendant, such as their personal characteristics, occupation, age, health, family or property status, or other circumstances.⁷⁸ Among the detainees were persons under 21 years old, students, and individuals from socially vulnerable families. Some were the sole breadwinners or caregivers of family members with health problems. Most of them had no prior convictions or administrative offenses. The prosecution's justification for detention relied on generalized risks, such as flight risk, destruction of evidence, or committing new crimes.

According to the Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia, pretrial detention is the most severe measure of restraint and involves strict isolation of the defendant from the outside world for a term defined by the court. Detention restricts other rights of the accused, such as freedom of movement, employment, and communication with the outside world.

Under Article 198(5) of the Criminal Procedure Code, when deciding to apply a measure of restraint and its specific type, the court shall take into consideration the accused's age, health, family, and other

⁷⁷ For full details, see the Annex 2.

⁷⁸ The Law of Georgia Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia, Article 198.5.

circumstances when imposing a preventive measure. The court is not restricted by the category of the crime when imposing detention. Detention should only be applied if it is the sole means to prevent:

- Hiding and interfering with the rendering of justice;
- Interfering with the collection of evidence;
- Committing a new crime.

In practice, two problematic issues are observed: a high rate of pretrial detention and unsubstantiated detention. Data from Common Courts show that in recent years the rate of detention remains high.⁷⁹ According to the latest Supreme Court statistics, detention was applied in 42% of cases in 2021, 39% in 2022, and 38% in 2023.⁸⁰

GYLA's court monitoring findings over the years demonstrate that detention as a measure of restraint is not always applied strictly as a measure of last resort. The organisation considers that use of detention by courts is unsubstantiated when the decisions are not based on specific factual circumstances, threats are assessed abstractly, and less severe measures of restraint could achieve the same goals. Detention cannot be applied solely because the accused allegedly committed a grave or especially grave crime. GYLA has repeatedly recommended courts to adopt a more humane approach and apply the measure of restraint, which interferes less with the defendant's right to freedom, while still achieving the goals of measure of restraint.⁸¹

It should also be noted that detention imposes a significant burden on the state. As of 2024, the annual cost of maintaining one detainee is 21,604 GEL, approximately 1,800 GEL per month.⁸² GYLA requested information from the Ministry of Justice and the Special Penitentiary Service⁸³ on the total number of detainees and their maintenance costs in 2025, but this information was not provided, indicating challenges in public information disclosure.

Measures of restraint should not aim to punish defendant. The court must first consider less restrictive measures and only exceptionally impose detention when no other measures can ensure proper behavior.

The right to liberty implies that detention - the maximum restriction of freedom - should always be regarded as a last resort. According to the European Court of Human Rights, "detention is such a severe measure that it can only be justified where less severe measures are insufficient to safeguard individual or public interests."⁸⁴ Therefore, detention should not be the starting point but applied only after all other measures are deemed inadequate.⁸⁵

In order to neutralize certain threats, the criminal procedural legislation also provides the use of additional obligations.⁸⁶

In particular, along with a measure of restraint, the following may also be applied to the defendant: an obligation to appear in court at the appointed time or immediately upon summons; a ban on engaging in certain activities or professions; an obligation to appear and report to the court, police or other state body daily or at other intervals; supervision by an agency appointed by the court; electronic monitoring; an obligation to be in a certain place at certain hours or not; a ban on leaving or entering a certain place; a

⁷⁹ The [data](#) of the Supreme Court of Georgia on the imposition of measures of restraint, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁸⁰ The [data](#) of the Supreme Court of Georgia on the imposition of measures of restraint, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁸¹ GYLA, Monitoring of Criminal Trails Report №16, 2022. GYLA, Monitoring of Criminal Trails [Report](#) №17, 2022. GYLA, Monitoring of Criminal Trail [Report](#) №18, 2022, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁸² The [Explanatory note](#) on the draft law on "on the Amendments to the Criminal Code of Georgia", 6, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁸³ # G-04/49-25 Letter of the Georgian Young Lawyers Association dated July 28, 2025.

⁸⁴ The European Court of Human Rights, *Case of AMBRUSZKIEWICZ v. POLAND*, 38797/03, 4 May 2006, par. 31.

⁸⁵ The Comment of the HRC, 35, par. 38; CCPR, SMANTSER v. BELARUS, 1178/2003, 23 October 2008, par. 10.3.

⁸⁶ The Law of Georgia Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia, Article 199.2.

ban on meeting with certain persons without special permission; an obligation to surrender a passport or other identity document; any other measure determined by the court that is necessary to achieve the goals of applying a measure of restraint.

Thus, the list of additional obligations is not exhaustive and the judge may apply any other additional measure that is not directly indicated in the list of additional measures. The judge has the right to use additional measures only in conjunction with the main measure of restraint, and not independently of it. That is why these measures have an additional function and their goal, together with the main measures of restraint, is to minimize threats.⁸⁷

The above-mentioned additional obligations further strengthen the effect of non-custodial measures of restraint and are a good alternative to imprisonment, although unfortunately we practically did not encounter them in criminal cases against activists.

It should be emphasized that in all cases against activists, the court satisfied the measures of restraint requested by the prosecutor's office. In addition, in all cases, the number of times the prosecutor requested a change in the restraining measure was satisfied, although some of the lawyers' motions were different. The measure of restraint was changed only once at the lawyer's motion and it was related to the case of the Batumi dean and students. In this case the prosecutor agreed with the lawyer's petition.

3.3. Cases of Ill-treatment

19% of detained protesters (13 persons) reported ill-treatment during court proceedings, amounting to acts punishable under the Constitution of Georgia, international human rights instruments, and criminal law (including acts comparable to torture, threats of torture, or degrading or inhuman treatment under Articles 144¹, 144², and 144³ of the Criminal Code).

Allegations of ill-treatment were made by: Saba Skhvitaridze, Revaz Kiknadze, Nikoloz Katsia, Anatoly Gigauro, Davit Khomeriki, Davit Lomidze, Temur Zasokhashvili, Archil Museliantz, Anastasia Zinovkina, Artem Gribul, Tevdore Abramov, Aleksandre Elisashvili, and Mzia Amaghlobeli.⁸⁸

- i. **Saba Skhvitaridze** has described his experience of torture and inhuman treatment in details. According to him, he was arrested by police on the Zestafoni road without being informed of the reason for his detention or being given the opportunity to contact a lawyer. He was handed over to an unidentified operational group near Gori and transferred to the police department in Dighomi. On the 5th floor of the Dighomi police building, four masked individuals physically assaulted and beat him. He was then taken to the 8th floor, where another masked individual in patrol uniform, along with others, continued the abuse.
- ii. **Revaz Kiknadze** stated that he was forced to confess to the crime and blame others under psychological pressure and verbal abuse, which would cause him to be loyal to the system. They kidnapped him near Lake Lisi and threatened to bury him alive. Kiknadze also noted that after being transferred to Ortachala, one of them threatened to take him downstairs and put him on an “enema” or a bottle of champagne. The other replied that he might escape, that it was a dirty job, so let’s wear gloves. The information provided to the court by the defendants, along with other experiences, confirms the fact that the ill-treatment is systemic and widespread.

⁸⁷ GYLA, [Preventive Measure Usage Standards](#), 2020, 39, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁸⁸ GYLA did not monitor Mzia Amaghlobeli's case. GYLA provided/is providing her with legal representation.

- iii. **Nikoloz Katsia** has mentioned that during his detention, he was treated with ridicule and insult, called "Rizhika" [*Ginger-head*], used offensive language towards him and told that he had to prove whatever they said. Public sources also reported⁸⁹ that Nikoloz Katsia was not provided with food in the penitentiary institution. Also, other convicts were using the funds on his personal bank account. In this regard, the Public Defender's Office of Georgia also disseminated an information that Nikoloz Katsia, during the meeting with the Public Defender's representatives, pointed out the facts of his rights being violated in the penitentiary facility. On February 21 at the court hearing, Nikoloz Katsia noted that the employees of the penitentiary facility forced him to perform squats before the hearing.
- iv. In **Anatoly Gigauri's** case, the defense has stated at the court proceeding that he was punched in the face by a police officer. This is evidenced by video footage.
- v. **Davit Khomeriki** has noted threats of sexual violence, physical and psychological abuse, and incidents of stripping.
- vi. **Davit Lomidze** was beaten during arrest. He had pre-existing spinal problems, which were exacerbated by the beating and required surgery.
- vii. **Temur Zasokhashvili** also has reported physical abuse during arrest.
- viii. **Archil Museliantsi**, according to him, was threatened and offered a deal to cooperate in exchange for incriminating political officials.
- ix. **Anastasia Zinovkina** noted that she had suffered threats to her life, physical violence, and threats of sexual violence. **One police officer allegedly placed his hand on his genitals and threatened to harm her if she moved.** She was detained without witnesses or video recording. She claimed she could identify the police officer who took her phone and planted drugs in her coat's pocket. The defendant recalled that the policeman threatened to "use" her if she continued to look at the coat. After planting the drugs, she was forced to wear the coat, and only then did the official search begin.
- x. **Artem Gribuli** also pointed to aggressive treatment and threats of sexual violence during the arrest.
- xi. **Aleko Elisashvili** explained at the first presentation hearing that he was put in a car and beaten during the arrest.
- xii. **Tevdore Abramov** stated that after being transferred to the police department, he was stripped naked and forced to do squats. He was mocked for his earring and tattoos and subjected to abusive language because of his connection to the protests.
- xiii. As is known, GYLA represents the interests of **Mzia Amaghlobeli**. Her arrest was violent and illegal, accompanied by physical violence and numerous violations by the police. Following her arrest, Batumi Police Chief Irakli Dgebuadze verbally and physically abused Mzia, ignored her needs, and prevented her from contacting her lawyers. Despite numerous appeals, she has not yet been granted victim status, which fundamentally limits the defense of her rights.

Overall, investigations were ineffective. The abolition of the Special Investigation Service (SIS) further signals the government's unwillingness to investigate police violence and ill-treatment effectively, comply with EU Association Agreement obligations, implement European Court of Human Rights judgments, and follow Venice Commission recommendations.⁹⁰

Effective investigation requires five criteria: (1) independence of investigation, (2) its adequacy, (3) promptness of investigation, (4) publicity, and (5) participation of victims. Currently, there are reasonable

⁸⁹ Publika, [Article](#), Nika Katsia pointed out the facts of violation of his rights in the penitentiary facility, 24.01.2025, last update:15.09.2025.

⁹⁰ GYLA, [statement](#), The abolition of the Special Investigation Service confirms that the Georgian Dream does not even formally intend to investigate torture and police violence, 23.05.2025. last update:15.09.2025.

doubts regarding compliance with these criteria. To date, there are reasonable doubts about the non-fulfillment of these criteria. Accordingly, the investigative body shall answer these questions and provide the public with accurate information on why most prisoners (according to GYLA, 12 out of 13⁹¹ do not have victim status) who indicate ill-treatment, the victim's status, and what the progress of the investigation is.

Also, it is noteworthy that no criminal prosecution was initiated against any person for the violence against activists and journalists during the protests. The data presented in the report of the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia⁹² also reveals the attitude of the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia to whether it exercises effective procedural supervision over such cases.

- In 2024 the Special Investigation Service initiated an investigation into 413 criminal cases, but criminal prosecution was carried out against only 105 persons. Out of the 105 persons there were prosecuted: 24 - employees of the Ministry of Internal Affairs; 2 - employees of the Ministry of Defense; 4 - employees of the Penitentiary Department.⁹³

In addition, several defendants spoke about the conditions and treatment in the penitentiary facility. As noted above, defendant Nikoloz Katsia indicated that he was not provided with food in the penitentiary, and other convicts used the funds on his personal bank account. This was also confirmed by the information released by the Public Defender's Office of Georgia,⁹⁴ according to which Nikoloz Katsia, during a meeting with the Public Defender's representatives, indicated the facts of violation of his rights in the penitentiary facility.

According to domestic and international law, a penitentiary facility is obliged to ensure both proper nutrition of defendants/convicts, as well as their proper living conditions. It is inadmissible not only to refuse to provide food to defendants/convicts, but even to reduce their calorie content for the purpose of punishment. This may contain signs of torture/inhumane treatment.

In addition, the penitentiary facility is obliged to detect and prevent crimes within the territory of the penitentiary facility, as well as to transport and accommodate the defendant/convicted in such a way that they are not subjected to verbal and physical abuse by other defendant/convicted. The penitentiary service is obliged to prevent circumstances provoking violence or other types of repression. GYLA called on the Special Penitentiary Service: to execute the imprisonment of Nikoloz Katsia in accordance with the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of Georgia, international treaties of Georgia and the Penitentiary Code. Also, GYLA called on the Special Investigation Service, which was existing at that time, to respond to the inhumane conditions of imprisonment of Nikoloz Katsia and to conduct an effective investigation.⁹⁵

Several defendants pointed to other problems in the penitentiary facility. In particular, on July 19, 2025, Giorgi Ahobadze's letter was made public [*.. We have been asking for a ventilator to be brought to the store for a long time, it is unimaginable heat, we are literally suffocating in these boxes, it is impossible to sleep at night. How can a ventilator not be delivered to the store for two weeks..*]]⁹⁶

⁹¹ Only Saba Skhvitaridze has victim status.

⁹² Prosecutor's Office of Georgia, 2024 Activity [Report](#), 61., last update: 15.09.2025.

⁹³ *ibid*.

⁹⁴ Publika, [Article](#), The statement of the Public Defender of Georgia, Nika Katsia, indicated the facts of violation of his rights in the penitentiary institution, 24.01.2025, last update: 15.08.2025.

⁹⁵ GYLA, [Statement](#), GYLA responds to inadequate detention conditions of Nikoloz Katsia, 24.01.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁹⁶ Radio Liberty, [Article](#), "We have been asking for a fan to be brought into the store for a long time. It is unbelievably hot, we are suffocating," - Giorgi Akhobadze, 19.07.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

*On August 11, 2025, Insaf Aliyev's lawyer stated that the defendant had begun a hunger strike. The lawyer noted that there were cockroaches in the cell, after which Aliyev and his cellmates were transferred to another cell where, according to the lawyer, [..there was no water in the cell and the sewage system was clogged. They were unable to wash their hands and face or wash dishes, which is why they could not receive food and effectively limited their access to food..]*⁹⁷ In addition, according to the lawyer, "[Insaf Aliyev has health problems, requires medication and a syringe every two days. Despite the promise that medication would be delivered, he still has limited access to the necessary medical supplies.]"

Problems with timely medical care in the penitentiary facility were also revealed in the case of Nino Datashvili⁹⁸. Anastasia Zinovkina also spoke about her own health challenges and demanded appropriate support and treatment from the penitentiary facility.⁹⁹

A number of defendants declared hunger strikes during the judicial review stage of criminal cases.¹⁰⁰

It is noteworthy that the initiation of a hunger strike by prisoners is an extreme form of protest, directed against both the substantive circumstances of the criminal cases pending against them, as well as the alleged ill-treatment/conditions in the penitentiary facility. This action expresses the high intensity of the prisoners' dissatisfaction and indicates possible systemic shortcomings of the state. In such a situation, a prompt, proportionate and legally justified response from the state is necessary, including taking into account international and national obligations to protect the health and dignity of prisoners. However, unfortunately, such a response from the state has largely failed to occur.

3.4. The Principle of Publicity

A public hearing is a fundamental guarantee of a fair trial, ensuring the openness of judicial proceedings and enabling public control.

Initially, publicity was restricted through the arbitrary decisions of individual judges¹⁰¹ and/or by holding hearings in small courtrooms¹⁰². Later, media coverage of proceedings was entirely prohibited, and the legislation concerning judicial transparency deteriorated.

For instance, on 5 March 2025, judge Irakli Shvangiradze closed the pre-trial hearing on the criminal cases against the individuals detained in context of the protests: Andro Chichinadze, Onise Tskhadadze, Guram Mirtskhulava, Jano Archaia, Luka Jabua, Ruslan Sivakov, Revaz Kiknadze, Giorgi Terashvili, Valeri Tetrashvili, Sergei Kukharchuk, and Irakli Kerashvili.

⁹⁷ Radio Liberty, [Article](#), Insaf Aliyev, accused of gang violence, has begun a hunger strike – lawyer, 11.08.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

⁹⁸ Radio Liberty, [Article](#), "It's hard to sit, stand, lie down" - the lawyers of the arrested teacher demand that he be taken to the clinic for examination, 16.07.2025, latest update: 15.09.2025.

⁹⁹ Publika, [Article](#), "During the protests, Anastasia Zinovkina, accused of drug crimes, speaks about her health challenges and demands appropriate support and treatment from the penitentiary facility, 13.08.2025, latest update: 15.09.2025.

¹⁰⁰ Netgazeti, [Article](#) - "He has lost 16 kilos" – two prisoners end hunger strike", 27.01.2025, Netgazeti, [Article](#), Gribul and Anton Chechin ended their hunger strike, 25.07.2025, Tabula, [Article](#), Mzia Amaglobeli: I am starving. Freedom is more valuable than life, 20.01.2025;: 15.09.2025.

¹⁰¹ GYLA, Statement, Judge Irakli Shvangiradze restricts activities of persons with observer status while considering the case of demonstrators, 25.03.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

¹⁰² GYLA, [Statement](#), GYLA's assessment of the case involving 11 individuals arrested in the context of protests: Detention remains unjustified, 11.01.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

Judge Shvangiradze's decision to close the hearing (that was justified by referring to the situation in the courtroom - specifically, the fact that some attendees expressed mild applause after the defendants spoke) caused forcible removal from the courtroom of all attendees, including media representatives, except for the Public Broadcaster, which did not provide live coverage of the hearing.

It is important to emphasize that the only presence of the Public Broadcaster in the courtroom cannot be regarded as ensuring the publicity of a court hearing, particularly when the broadcaster does not provide live coverage of the proceedings.

Although the court has an obligation to maintain order in the courtroom, any decision restricting publicity must be necessary and proportionate. In this case, the partial closure of the hearing and the complete exclusion of independent media and society, including GYLA's court monitoring mission, undermines the transparency of the proceedings.

GYLA called on the court to uphold procedural standards of a fair trial and to ensure that hearings remain genuinely accessible to the public, especially in cases involving the criminal prosecution of protesters, which are of high public interest.¹⁰³

Furthermore, at the hearing on 25 March 2025, Judge Irakli Shvangiradze did not examine the defense motion requesting that the hearing be held publicly. The judge also rejected the defense motion to allow attendance by monitors with observer status, including representatives of the Georgian Young Lawyers' Association and the Public Defender's Office.

As a result, by the judge's decision, the human rights organization was unjustifiably denied the right to observe the hearing. This constitutes an arbitrary and improper use of judicial discretion contrary to the principle of publicity. In addition to unjustifiably restricting the principle of publicity, Judge Shvangiradze's decision also revealed a competence issue: representatives of the Public Defender, who have attended closed hearings for many years, were not allowed to be present.

Such a decision reasonably raises doubts about the judge's ability to conduct a public hearing in a manner that ensures order in the courtroom. It also suggests that judicial decisions made during the proceedings may lack sufficient legal reasoning, leading the judge to avoid the level of transparency that would allow independent, legally qualified organizations to assess the lawfulness of those decisions in real time.

From GYLA's perspective as a human rights organization, court monitoring is critically important. This process allows for public oversight of whether judicial activities comply with the constitutional and international standards of a fair trial. The closure of proceedings, particularly when unjustified, undermines the principle of publicity and raises concerns regarding impartiality, access to justice, and the protection of defendants' rights. Consequently, it weakens civil society's ability to monitor systemic deficiencies in the judiciary, negatively affecting the realization of the right to a fair trial and, as result, the execution degree of justice.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ GYLA, [Statement](#), GYLA responds to the unjustified partial closure of a Court Hearing that hindered Human Rights organizations from monitoring the proceedings, 05.03.2025, last update:15.09.2025.

¹⁰⁴ GYLA, [Statement](#), Judge Irakli Shvangiradze restricts activities of persons with observer status while considering the case of demonstrators, 25.03.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

It is essential to ensure the public disclosure of information about court hearings. Information on criminal proceedings against protesters was not always published on the court's website or displayed on the dedicated monitors within the court building.¹⁰⁵

Later the judiciary became completely closed to media coverage.¹⁰⁶ It became prohibited to do photo, film, video recording and broadcasting within the court (in the courthouse, courtroom, or court yard), except when this is carried out by the court itself or by a person authorized by the court. Dissemination of recorded materials was left to the discretion of the court, which could decide whether or not to release photos, films, or video recordings of hearings. Video and audio recording or broadcasting of hearings was permitted only upon a specific decision by the High Council of Justice of Georgia for each individual case. On the very first day of the law's entry into force, problems in its implementation emerged, rendering the work of media outlets impossible. Several media organizations applied to the High Council of Justice for permission to record audio and video at the hearing involving eleven protesters (Andro Chichinadze, Onise Tskhadadze, Guram Mirtskhulava, Jano Archaia, Luka Jabua, Ruslan Sivakov, Revaz Kiknadze, Giorgi Terashvili, Valeri Tetrashvili, Sergei Kukharchuk, and Irakli Kerashvili). However, they received no response from the Council before the start of the hearing. During the hearing, defense lawyers requested that the presiding judge, Nino Galustashvili, declare a recess to communicate with the High Council of Justice regarding the issue of media access, but the judge denied this request.

This bureaucratic mechanism effectively prevents the media from covering court proceedings.¹⁰⁷ It is noteworthy that certain stages of the judicial process - such as initial appearances of defendants before the court, are often scheduled only a few hours in advance due to short procedural deadlines. Under such circumstances, media outlets do not have sufficient time to receive a timely response from the High Council of Justice. Media representatives also faced uncertainty regarding the proper procedure for submitting requests to the High Council of Justice, including who exactly was authorized to make such decisions and within what time frame. Media outlets did not receive any information on these issues even after communicating with the Chancellery of the High Council of Justice. It is evident that these legislative changes were deliberately aimed at restricting coverage of cases of high public interest.

All of the above constitutes a clear violation of one of the structural principles of a fair trial, publicity and transparency. Conducting judicial proceedings behind closed doors without sufficient justification fosters public perception that the judiciary seeks to avoid informing the public about the quality of justice, which directly and negatively impacts the reputation of the judicial system as a whole.

¹⁰⁵ For example, 19.06.2025 The trials of Archil Museliants and Giorgi Akhobadze were not published on the website. The trial of Archil Museliants was postponed by 1 hour, postponed, and no GYLA representative was able to attend, as information about the session was not available. On the same day, the trial of Museliants was held in the 11th session hall, where those present expressed dissatisfaction because no sound was heard. After which the judge closed the trial altogether, including expelling journalists from the hall.

25.06.2025 - The trial of Giorgi Akhobadze was not published on the court website.

01.07.2025 - The trial of Archil Museliants was not published on the court website.

11.07.2025 - No information was published on the monitor in the court or on the court website about the so-called On the eight-person case (the case of Nikoloz Javakhishvili, Tornike Goshadze, Irakli Miminoshvili, Zviad Tsetskhladze, Vefkhia Kasradze, Vasil Kadzlashvili, Giorgi Gorgadze and Insaf Aliyev).

¹⁰⁶ GYLA, [Statement](#), Amendments to Organic Law of Georgia "On Common Courts" Completely Exclude Judicial System's Accountability to Society, 27.06.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

¹⁰⁷ GYLA verified through direct communication with media outlets that a number of media outlets, including Publica and Radio Liberty, had applied to the High Council of Justice for permission to cover the proceedings at different times and in connection with different hearings, but there was no response.

3.5. The Examination of the Cases of those Detained During Protests Against Russian Law was being Deliberately Delayed

Suspensions regarding the political instrumentalization of the Prosecutor's Office and the judiciary were reinforced by the handling of criminal cases against 6 individuals detained during the April–May 2024 protests against the “Russian Law” (Saba Meparishvili, Omar Okribelashvili,¹⁰⁸ Giorgi Okmelashvili, Davit Koldari, Giorgi Kuchuashvili, and Fridon Bubuteishvili).¹⁰⁹ All of them remained in detention, and despite multiple reviews of the lawfulness of their pre-trial detention, the courts consistently upheld the strictest measure of restraint - detention. Case of another activist from the “Russian Law” protests - Giorgi Shanidze was concluded earlier than the others. The court found him guilty on both charges and sentenced him to 4 years of imprisonment. However, a few days after the judgment was delivered, he was pardoned by the President.¹¹⁰

A pattern was observed in these cases: the courts scheduled hearings with extensive intervals between them, most often every two months, only due to the statutory requirement to periodically review pre-trial detention. Defense representatives consistently expressed dissatisfaction with this practice. The courts failed to complete the proceedings in a timely manner, allegedly so that President Salome Zourabichvili (Zourabichvili) would not have sufficient time, within her term of office, to pardon the activists, as she had done in the case of Giorgi Shanidze.

In the case of Saba Meparishvili and Omar Okribelashvili, who were charged with damage or destruction of property in group of persons, specifically, damaging a metal barrier worth 400 GEL, the next hearing was scheduled for 11 November 2024, following the hearing on 23 September 2024. However, the hearing on 11 November could not take place due to reasons attributed to the court,¹¹¹ and it was postponed to 22 November 2024. After the 22 November hearing, the court again postponed the next session for more than a month, setting it for 25 December 2024.

In the case of Giorgi Okmelashvili¹¹², who was accused of attacking on a police officer and possession of a “small amount of narcotic substance,” the substantive hearing began on 16 July 2024. Following the hearing held on 3 October 2024, no further hearing took place until 12 December. The hearing scheduled for 15 October 2024 was postponed due to the prosecutor's failure to appear, without specifying a new date. The defense submitted several letters¹¹³ requesting that the hearing be scheduled promptly to avoid unnecessary delays. Later, the defense was informed that the next session was scheduled for 12 December 2024. This occurred despite the fact that only one witness had been examined, all other evidence was undisputed, the case was in its final phase, and only the closing statements remained. The defense even indicated that it would need only 5-10 minutes to present its position.

A similar situation occurred in the cases of Giorgi Kuchuashvili and Davit Koldari,¹¹⁴ where the hearing scheduled for 21 November 2024 was again postponed without setting a new date. In the case of Fridon

¹⁰⁸ საიას განცხადება, GYLA's assessment of the case of Saba Meparishvili and Omar Okribelashvili, detained during the protest against the Russian law, GYLA, 25.09.2024, last update: 15.09.2025.

¹⁰⁹ GYLA, Statement, Court Postpones Hearings on Criminal Cases of Participants in "Russian Law" Protests, 24.11.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

¹¹⁰ Radio Liberty, [Article](#), The President pardons Giorgi Shanidze, 20.10.2024, last update: 15.09.2025.

¹¹¹ According to the lawyers, the reason for the postponement of the hearing was the judge's illness.

¹¹² Crimes are provided for in Article 353¹(1) and Article 260(1) of the Criminal Code.

¹¹³ GYLA received information through communication with the lawyers that they sent letters of request to the judge on 18.10.2024 and 04.11.2024.

¹¹⁴ They were charged with Article 353 Prima of the Criminal Code - assault on a police officer, employee of the Special Penitentiary Service or other representative of the government or public institution, and Article 187 Part 1 - damage or destruction of property.

Bubuteishvili,¹¹⁵ the hearing held on 14 November 2024 was followed by another session scheduled for more than a month later, on 26 December 2024.

All the above was perceived as deliberate delay of the judicial proceedings and a gross violation of the defendants' right to a prompt examination of the case and a fair hearing.

It should also be taken into account that all defendants remained in pre-trial detention during this entire period. **Particularly in cases where the parties had agreed on the admissibility of evidence and no further examination was necessary¹¹⁶, it remains unclear why the courts continued to keep the defendants in custody, despite the absence of any risk of influencing witnesses, the very risk that the prosecution had relied upon to justify detention in almost every case. GYLA noted that the courts' use of pre-trial detention in these cases lacked proper reasoning as required by the relevant standard. The assessment of risks was abstract, and the intended purposes could have been achieved through less severe measure of restraint.**

None of the aforementioned cases were concluded during President Salome Zourabichvili's (Zourabichvili) term of office, further reinforcing suspicions of political interest in the handling of these proceedings.

While the state maintains an intolerant policy toward activists and punishes them in an exemplary manner, to this day, there has been no adequate investigation or identification of responsible officials in relation to alleged facts of excessive use of force by law enforcement officers during the protests against the "Russian Law."

3.6. Restriction of the Right to Defense

One of the major challenges identified in the cases against activists was the restriction of the right to defence. On 24 June 2025, Judge Nino Galustashvili of the Tbilisi City Court appointed public lawyers for all eleven defendants in criminal case: Andro Chichinadze, Onise Tskhadadze, Guram Mirtskhulava, Jano Archia, Luka Jabua, Ruslan Sivakov, Revaz Kiknadze, Giorgi Terashvili, Valeri Tetrashvili, Sergei Kukharchuk, and Irakli Kerashvili. According to the judge, the purpose of appointing public defenders was to avoid delaying the hearings. Among the eleven defendants, only one's Irakli Kherashvili's lawyer was not presented at the hearing. His lawyer had informed the court a month in advance that a hearing should not be scheduled on those specific dates. Initially, the judge took this circumstance into account. However, later she added the hearing dates to the already determined schedule. Because of this defendant Irakli Kerashvili left the courtroom in protest. The judge appointed public lawyers for all eleven defendants, even though, apart from one, all other defendants' lawyers were present and explicitly stated that they did not wish for any new lawyer to be assigned to their cases.

The law defines mandatory defence in circumstances where the defendant is unable to ensure adequate defence on his own, lacks the capacity to defend himself, or where the seriousness of the potential penalty necessitates effective legal assistance. Specifically, the participation of a defence lawyer is mandatory when: (a) the defendant is a minor; (b) does not speak the language of the criminal proceedings; (c) has a condition that prevents him from effectively conducting his own defence; (d) a court-psychiatric examination has been ordered; (e) the offence carries a possible life sentence; (f) plea negotiations are ongoing; (g) the case is being heard before a jury; (h) the defendant is evading law enforcement

¹¹⁵ The prosecution also charged him with Article 353 Prima of the Criminal Code - assault on a police officer, employee of the Special Penitentiary Service or other representative of the government or public institution, and Article 187 Part 1 - damage or destruction of property.

¹¹⁶ The cases of Giorgi Okemlashvili, Fridon Bubuteishvili and Omar Okribelashvili.

authorities; (i) the defendant has been expelled from the courtroom; (j) the identity of the defendant is unknown; (k¹) the issue of extradition under a simplified procedure is being considered; or (l) any other case directly stipulated by the Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia.

In the present case, there were no legal grounds for appointing public lawyers. Preventive appointment of a public lawyers is not recognized under Georgian criminal procedural law. It is also important to consider the factor of trust between the defendant and the defence lawyer. The relationship between a lawyer and a client is primarily based on trust. According to the statements made by the defendants during the hearing, they had private, contractually engaged lawyers for this purpose. At no stage of the proceedings was it recorded that any defendant was left without legal representation or that the absence of a defence lawyer had impeded the holding of a hearing. It is therefore unclear why, in cases where, for example, a single defendant already had 4 or 5 defence lawyers, it was necessary to appoint an additional public lawyer. According to the defence, when no specific legal ground exists, it is incomprehensible why the court would restrict the defendants' right to be represented by a lawyer of their own choosing.

Based on GYLA's assessment, under such circumstances, the mandatory appointment of public lawyers was unfounded and constituted gross interference by the court with the defendants' right to defence.¹¹⁷ It is also noteworthy that the public lawyers appointed in this mandatory manner requested a two-week period from the court to review the voluminous case materials in order to adequately prepare for witness examinations. The judge did not take this into account and scheduled the hearing within two days, instructing the lawyers to familiarize themselves with the case materials gradually and, in parallel, participate in the witness questioning.

On 11 January 2025, Judge Irakli Khuskivadze of the Tbilisi City Court reviewed the issue of extending pre-trial detention 8 eight defendants detained during the November–December 2024 protests, including Nikoloz Javakhishvili, Thornike Goshadze, Irakli Miminoshvili, Zviad Tsetskhladze, Vefkhia Kasradze, Vasil Kadzelashvili, Giorgi Gorgadze, and Insaf Aliev.

At this hearing, the disregard of the defendants' right to defence was particularly alarming, which, according to GYLA's assessment, constituted a violation of the right to a fair trial. The logistical guarantees necessary for an oral hearing were not ensured, resulting in a material breach of the right to a fair trial and effectively depriving the defendants of their right to defence. These issues manifested in the following ways:

- Limited space created practical challenges for effective communication between the defendants and their lawyers. Despite the large number of defendants (8 persons), the number of defence lawyers, the high public interest, and the presence of numerous attendees (including family members and relatives of the defendants, some of whom could not enter the courtroom), the court failed to hold the hearing in the largest available courtroom, which was free at the time and whose availability was foreseeable. Even after a motion by the defence, the judge refused to change the venue and continued the hearing in a small courtroom, thereby impeding communication between defendants and their lawyers.
- The cramped conditions posed risks to the defendants' health and, consequently, to their ability to participate effectively in the proceedings. Due to the limited space and the large number of people present, defendant Irakli Miminoshvili felt unwell (complaining of shortness of breath), which further hindered communication between the lawyers and the defendants.
- Other technical challenges: Initially, there was insufficient space for the lawyers, forcing 11 lawyers to share a single table. Only after a specific request did the court provide an additional table.

¹¹⁷ GYLA, Statement, Judge Nino Galustashvili forcibly appointed a public lawyer to the defendants in the eleven-person case, which is unfounded and a gross interference with the right to defense., 25.06.2025. last update: 15.09.2025.

- Instead of moving the hearing to a larger courtroom, after the defence lawyers and defendants left the room in protest following the denial of their motion, the judge appointed public defenders to the case. This effectively forced the defendants to choose between two options: either to proceed with their own lawyers under the inadequate conditions described above or to be represented by public lawyers they had never previously met or communicated with.

This approach effectively amounted to an ultimatum, as the court completely disregarded the objective circumstances raised by the defence regarding the inability to effectively exercise the right to defence. GYLA considers that such conduct by the court amounted to deliberate disregard for the defendants' right to be represented by a lawyer of their own choosing. It is also noteworthy that the public lawyers later appointed to the case pointed to the same challenges raised earlier by the private lawyers concerning the right to defence, and also stated that they were unaware of the defendants' positions, since by that time none of the defendants remained present in the courtroom.

The organization and procedural management of a trial have a significant impact on the right to a fair hearing. Ensuring effective communication between the defendant and the lawyer is essential, and such communication must be both practical and effective. According to GYLA's assessment, the court should have created appropriate conditions for the proceedings, conditions under which the defendants would feel that they were effectively represented by their chosen lawyers and that a safe environment ensuring their meaningful participation in the hearing was guaranteed. The violations observed during the 11 January 2025 hearing were of such magnitude that they amounted to a breach of fundamental guarantees of the right to a fair trial, including the right to defence. This, in turn, substantiates the claim that the proceedings were not fair, as required by Georgian legislation and by international human rights treaties.¹¹⁸

3.7. Issues Related to Interpreters

The ongoing cases also revealed problems concerning interpreters. The lack of qualification of interpreters or substantial deficiencies during the translation process directly restricts the rights of defendants, particularly in terms of ensuring effective defence and upholding the principle of a fair trial. When a defendant is unable to understand the content of the proceedings against them, including the formulation of the charges, the evaluation of evidence, and the testimony of witnesses, they cannot adequately express their position or effectively exercise defence mechanisms.

Such procedural shortcomings violate the principles of equality and adversarial proceedings and are considered systemic problems that directly affect the fairness of the judicial process. In these circumstances, a court hearing may be formally deemed conducted, yet in reality, it fails to meet the minimum standards necessary for the defendant's active and substantive participation.

Instances were revealed in which the defence noted that the translation provided by the interpreter did not serve the interests of the defendant and was, at times, significantly insufficient or inappropriate. The challenges concerned both the quality of translation and breaches of neutrality and ethical standards¹¹⁹, which posed serious obstacles to the defendant's full participation in the proceedings and the realization of the right to defence.

Particular attention was drawn to interpreter Shorena Tabatadze, who has been involved in several criminal cases.¹²⁰ The defence repeatedly questioned both her professional competence and her ability to maintain neutrality during the proceedings. Such circumstances are noteworthy, as the objectivity and

¹¹⁸ GYLA, [Statement](#), The hearing to review the measures of restraint for the eight individuals was conducted in blatant violation of their right to a fair trial, 11.01.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

¹¹⁹ For example, in the cases of the so-called 11 individuals, Anton Chechin, Anastasia Zinovkina, and Artem Gribuli.

¹²⁰ The interpreter has participated in the criminal cases of Anton Chechin, Anastasia Zinovkina and Artem Gribul.

high professional standards of an interpreter are essential to ensuring the defendant's legal guarantees and upholding the principle of a fair trial.

3.8. Judgments and Sentences

The court hearings of some of the ongoing cases against the activists have been completed.¹²¹ The court found all of them guilty. The court sentenced 8 out of 10 people arrested under criminal law during the protest against the 2024 Russian law to so-called custodial sentences.¹²²

It is noteworthy that in one case - **the case of Saba Skhvitardze** - the **Prosecutor's Office itself changed the legal qualification of the charge**. Initially, Skhvitardze was accused under **Article 353¹ (2)** of the Criminal Code of Georgia, which concerns attack on a police officer. However, later, at the motion of the prosecution, Judge **Jvebe Nachkebia** reclassified the charge to Article 120 - intentional infliction of minor harm to health and ultimately sentenced the defendant to 2 years of imprisonment within the sanction prescribed by that article.

In several other cases, the court also reclassified the charges. In **Anatoly Gigauri's case**, Judge Jvjebe Nachkebia reclassified the charge¹²³ under Article 353 (1) of the Criminal Code of Georgia, and sentenced Gigauri to two years of imprisonment.¹²⁴ Judges Tamar Mchedlishvili and Nino Galustashvili reclassified the charges in the so-called "eight-person"¹²⁵ and "eleven-person"¹²⁶ cases. Instead of Article 225,¹²⁷ they were convicted under Article 226, which concerns organizing or actively participating in group actions that disturb public order. All of them were each sentenced to 2 years of imprisonment, except for Zviad Tsetsikhladze, Vefkhia Kasradze, and Vasil Kadzeshashvili, who were sentenced by Judge Tamar Mchedlishvili to 2 years and 6 months of imprisonment.

The charge was reclassified in the case of Mzia Amaghlobeli, founder of "Batumelebi" and "Netgazeti." Instead of Article 353¹ of the Criminal Code (attack on a police officer, other public official, or public institution), the judge delivered judgement under Article 353 (resistance, threat, or violence against a law enforcement officer or other public official) of the Criminal Code and sentenced her to 2 years of imprisonment.

It is noteworthy that the court delivered judgment of acquittal in case of 3 persons. All of which concerned defendants accused of drug-related crimes. Specifically, Judge Romeo Tkeshelashvili

¹²¹ See Annex 2.

¹²²GYLA, [Statement](#), The Court issued judgments of conviction for all persons detained under criminal charges during the protests against the Russian Law, 04.02.2025, last update:17.09.2025.

¹²³ The Prosecutor's Office charged Gigauri under 353(1) of the Criminal Code of Georgia (assault on a police officer in connection with the official activities of a police officer).

¹²⁴ Publika, [Article](#), -Anatoly Gigauri sentenced to 2 years in prison, 12.08.2025, last update: 17.09.2025.

¹²⁵ Defendants: Nikoloz Javakhishvili, Tornike Goshadze, Irakli Miminoshvili, Zviad Tsetsikhladze, Vefkhia Kasradze, Vasil Kadzeshashvili, Giorgi Gorgadze and Insaf Aliyev.

¹²⁶ Defendants: Andro Chichinadze, Onise Tskhadadze, Guram Mirtskhulava, Jano Archaia, Luka Jabua, Ruslan Sivakov, Revaz Kiknadze, Giorgi Terishvili, Valeri Tetrashvili, Sergei Kukharchuk and Irakli Kerashvili.

¹²⁷ This refers to the organization, management or participation in group violence, and only three of the aforementioned defendants - Zviad Tsetsikhladze, Vefkhia Kasradze and Vasil Kadzeshashvili - were charged with organizing it.

acquitted Giorgi Akhobadze,¹²⁸ while Judge Tamar Mchedlishvili acquitted Tevdore Abramov¹²⁹ and Nikoloz Katsia,¹³⁰ finding all three not guilty.

3.9. Cases of Drug Crimes

When delivering a judgment of conviction, the court typically relies on the search and seizure record and the physical evidence obtained during that process. This investigative measure is often carried out on the basis of a report prepared from so-called operational information. During the trial, the prosecution always examines the police officers who participated in the search and seizure, and, like the prosecutor, they represent the prosecution side. As a result, in numerous cases — particularly those related to drug crimes — the court relies on evidence originating from the prosecution itself, which lacks neutrality, and on the basis of which the standard of proof “beyond a reasonable doubt” is established, forming the foundation of a guilty verdict.

The Constitutional Court of Georgia declared unconstitutional¹³¹ the normative content of Article 13(2) of the Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia, which allows the use of an illegally obtained item as evidence when the possession of that item by the defendant is confirmed only by the testimonies of persons representing the prosecution, who directly participated in the investigative action.

If a search or seizure is conducted on the basis of anonymous information or information provided by a confidential source/informant as defined by the Law of Georgia “On Operative-Investigative Activities,” in accordance with Article 112(1) or (5) of the Criminal Procedure Code, and an illegal object, item, or substance is seized, such evidence may serve as the basis for a conviction only if the possession of the illegal object, item, or substance by the person is confirmed by evidence other than the testimony of the investigator who conducted the investigative action, the investigator involved in it, the operative officer participating in it, and the corresponding search and seizure record. This rule does not apply when obtaining or presenting other evidence is objectively impossible.¹³²

We considered that this legislative amendment does not fully address the risks and intent outlined in the reasoning part of the Constitutional Court’s decision. It does not impose on the prosecution an obligation to video record searches and seizures and leaves broad discretion for failing or refusing to obtain neutral evidence, which would otherwise be easily achievable given that police officers today are equipped with modern technology.¹³³

The hearings of cases against activists in the Tbilisi City Court once again demonstrated the validity of these concerns. In most of these cases, video evidence was not presented, even when it was possible to obtain recordings from external surveillance cameras that might have captured the search and seizure process. Moreover, even the video evidence that was presented raised serious questions: in several reviewed recordings, the conduct of the search suggested that some police officers involved were not seeking to find an item but rather appeared to arrive with the intention of seizing a specific pre-identified

¹²⁸ Radio Liberty, [Article](#), The judge will announce Giorgi Akhobadze's judgement on August 6.05.08.2025, last update: 17.09.2025

¹²⁹ Radio Liberty, [Article](#), -The court found Tedo Abramov not guilty - he was released from the courtroom, 15.08.2025, last update: 17.09.2025.

¹³⁰ Formula, [Article](#), - The court found Nika Katsia not guilty, 03.09.2025, last update: 17.09.2025.

¹³¹ The judgement №2/2/1276 of the Constitutional Court of Georgia, dated 25 December 2020.

¹³² The Law of Georgia on amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia. 28.06.2021, last update:17.09.2025.

¹³³ GYLA, GYLA, Monitoring of Criminal Trails [Report](#) №15, 76, last update: 17.09.2025.

object.¹³⁴ In addition, in some instances, the neutrality of witnesses presented as “neutral observers” of the search was questionable, considering the doubts surrounding them.¹³⁵

In one criminal case,¹³⁶ where an acquittal was rendered, the court stated: *[[...“The court takes into account the time elapsed between the receipt of operational information and the commencement of the investigative action - the personal search of the defendant. It also considers that the search was conducted in a calm environment, without resistance, and that technical means of video recording (including a mobile phone) were available. Accordingly, the court notes that in this case, obtaining evidence other than the testimony of the police officers was objectively possible, since the receipt of operational information did not require such urgent action that would have precluded the authorized person from preparing in advance, equipping themselves with appropriate technical means, and ensuring video recording of the search. It should be noted that “even in cases of urgent necessity, recording a search is, as a rule, not associated with insurmountable difficulty, for instance, through the use of a mobile phone camera, which today constitutes an item of everyday use.” ...]]*

Alongside this reasoning, in the same judgment, the judge also noted that, based on the analysis of the evidence presented, the court did not share the defence’s version that the acquitted individual¹³⁷ had been targeted for their active civic stance, alleging that police officers had [“planted” the narcotic substance, forcibly obtained a biological sample, and applied it to the packaging of the narcotic substance. The defence also argued that, during the investigative actions, the prosecution neither ensured nor attempted to obtain neutral evidence, such as video recordings or the presence of independent witnesses, despite having the opportunity to do so.”]¹³⁸

Given that the court emphasized the absence of neutral evidence in the case and used this as a basis for the acquittal, it remains unclear on what grounds the court simultaneously dismissed the defence’s arguments or why it referred to this issue when the evidence presented did not establish the defendant’s guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The only logical inference is that the defendant did not possess the narcotic substance in question, and how that substance appeared in the criminal case materials should be a matter for further investigation.

The fact that, in cases litigated by the Prosecutor’s Office genuinely neutral evidence is absent, **suggests that the prosecution does not anticipate a high evidentiary standard from the courts when it comes to securing convictions beyond a reasonable doubt.**

3.10. The Problem of Amending the Ordinance of the Government "On Approval of the List of Objects of Strategic and/or Special Importance"

At the end of January 2025, information was disseminated through social media about a planned demonstration in the area adjacent to Tbilisi Mall.¹³⁹ The participants of the demonstration aimed to hold a large-scale protest and block the road in order to once again demonstrate to the government that “the protest is popular, powerful, and uncompromising.”¹⁴⁰ Following the dissemination of this information,

¹³⁴ For example, the search of Anastasia Zinovkina's apartment.

¹³⁵ For example, one of the witnesses presented in the case is an employee of the LEPL of the Ministry of Economy, and the other is a translator. See the subchapter “Cases of Drug Crimes”.

¹³⁶ Tbilisi City Court verdict against Giorgi Ahobadze, case N 1/88-25, August 6, 2025.

¹³⁷ The person's first and last name have been replaced.

¹³⁸ Tbilisi City Court, Judgement against Giorgi Akhobadze, case N 1/88-25, August 6, 2025.

¹³⁹ BUSINESS MEDIA, [Article](#) - On February 2, at 4:00 PM, a road blockade was announced as a sign of protest, 30.01.2025, last update:17.09.2025.

¹⁴⁰ Publika, [Article](#) - MIA at the rally near Tbilisi Mall: We call on you to refrain from illegal actions, 01.02.2025, last update:17.09.2025.

within a short period of time, the Government of Georgia amended Ordinance of Government №361 of 23 October 2024. The aforementioned amendment is dated 31 January, one day prior to the planned demonstration. According to the consolidated version of the Ordinance *“On the Approval of the List of Strategic and/or Special Importance Objects,”* one new provision was added to the list of objects: “The international motor roads determined by the list approved by the Ordinance of Government №407 of 18 June 2014 ‘On the Approval of the List of International and Domestic Motor Roads of Importance.’”¹⁴¹ This amendment introduced criminal liability for blocking Agmashenebeli Avenue near Tbilisi Mall,¹⁴² on the basis of which the Prosecutor’s Office of Georgia charged 8 individuals.¹⁴³

The fact that a new provision was added to the Ordinance of Government only 1 day before the planned demonstration, covering the exact area where the protest was to be held, raises doubts that the authorities abused their powers and sought to artificially interfere with the exercise of the fundamental human rights to freedom of assembly and expression.¹⁴⁴

It is noteworthy that the consolidated version of Ordinance of Government №361 of 23 October 2024 was not available in the free version of the Legislative Herald of Georgia, which hinders the public’s full awareness regarding acts that are criminally punishable.

The amendment to the Ordinance of the Government was adopted within a single day. As a result of this change, it became possible for an act to constitute a criminal offence, whereas only a day earlier it would not have entailed criminal liability. Since the aforementioned protest had been announced before the amendment was introduced and the Ordinance of the Government was amended one day prior to the demonstration, the short time interval effectively deprived the public of a reasonable period to become informed.

It is also noteworthy that following the amendment to the Ordinance of Government and the detention of 8 individuals, on 6 February 2025, an amendment was introduced to Article 222 of the Criminal Code of Georgia, adding the following note: “For the purposes of this article, the list of the facilities of strategic and/or special importance shall be approved by an ordinance of the Government of Georgia.”¹⁴⁵ Also, on 20 February 2025, the Government adopted a new ordinance, which repeated the previously introduced amendment, changing only the chronology.¹⁴⁶ It is noteworthy that within a 20-day period, the sequence of events — the amendment of the ordinance, the subsequent revision of a provision of the Criminal Code, and the reissuance of the ordinance, creates the impression that the initial amendment was impulsive, poorly reasoned, and aimed at a specific purpose.

The situation is problematic because, following the amendment to the Criminal Code, the Government was granted the authority to determine, at its own discretion, by ordinance, which object’s blockage would constitute a crime. Since the Government belongs to the executive branch rather than the legislative, this raises questions about whether such wording effectively grants the Government of Georgia an indirect law-making power.

¹⁴¹ The Ordinance of the Government of Georgia No. 28, “On Approval of the List of Objects of Strategic and/or Special Importance” on Amendments to Resolution No. 361 of the Government of Georgia of October 23, 2024, 31.01.2025, The Ordinance of the Government of Georgia No. 361 on Approval of the List of Objects of Strategic and/or Special Importance.

¹⁴² The Criminal Code of Georgia, Article 222, last update: 17.09.2025.

¹⁴³ Radio Liberty, Article, “Eight people were arrested under criminal law for attempting to block the road near Tbilisi Mall”, 04.02.2025, last update: 17.09.2025.

¹⁴⁴ The Constitution of Georgia, Articles 21-17; The European Convention on Human Rights, Articles 10-11, last update: 17.09.2025.

¹⁴⁵ [The Law of Georgia on Amendments to the Criminal Code](#), 06/02/2025, last update: 17.09.2025

¹⁴⁶ The Ordinance of Government of Georgia, №40, 20.02.2025.

3.11. Presumption of Innocence

The presumption of innocence constitutes one of the most important foundations of human rights protection, ensuring individuals' legal safeguards, freedom, and respect for dignity. Upholding this principle is not merely a formal legal requirement but a guarantee closely linked to the right to a fair trial, the rule of law, and democratic values.

A fair, independent, and impartial judiciary must, on the basis of law, ensure that no person is punished before their guilt has been established by a conviction delivered by a court. Therefore, the presumption of innocence represents one of the fundamental principles of a state governed by the rule of law, protecting both the interests of the individual and those of society as a whole.

The presumption of innocence is guaranteed by both international¹⁴⁷ and domestic¹⁴⁸ legal frameworks — through the provisions of the Constitution of Georgia and the Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia¹⁴⁹. This obliges state institutions to protect it.

Accordingly, the presumption of innocence is a legal safeguard that ensures the right to a fair and impartial trial, protects the dignity and freedom of the accused, reduces the risk of unfair or biased actions by the state, and prevents the politicization of legal responsibility.

Political officials, the Prime Minister, the President, Members of the Parliament, and Ministers are representatives of the state whose statements carry significant public importance and influence. Their words are often perceived as the official position of the state, which increases their responsibility. When making public statements, particularly regarding ongoing criminal investigations and/or court proceedings, they must respect the presumption of innocence and refrain from making premature or accusatory remarks.

„A person shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty, in accordance with the procedures established by law and the court's judgment of conviction that has entered into legal force.“¹⁵⁰

According to the observation of the Georgian Young Lawyers' Association, before the delivery of judgments in the cases against activists, numerous public statements were made by high-ranking government officials that violated the presumption of innocence. It is noteworthy that political officeholders were not parties to the ongoing cases and therefore should not have had access to information about the evidence contained in the criminal files. These statements not only infringed upon the defendants' presumption of innocence but also aimed to mislead the public by disseminating false information and creating negative perceptions about the accused. Furthermore, such statements could have been perceived by the court as indirect instructions to render decisions that would be favorable to the ruling party.

For instance, representatives of the “Georgian Dream” party repeatedly violated the presumption of innocence with disinformation statements concerning Mzia Amaglobeli. In particular, on 29 January 2025, Irakli Kobakhidze stated the following during the “Imedi LIVE” program on TV Imedi: “The fact was as follows. You may recall that there was an initial incident when this person was putting stickers on police officers. Her wrongdoing was in no way connected to journalistic activity; in that situation, she was acting as a party activist. Therefore, linking this fact to the media is absolute speculation... She does not even express remorse, neither she nor her fellow members of the collective United National Movement.”¹⁵¹ Additionally, on 16 April 2025, during an appearance on TV Rustavi 2, Irakli Kobakhidze stated:

¹⁴⁷ The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) — Article 11(1), The European Convention on Human Rights (1950) — Article 6(2), The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) — Article 14(2).

¹⁴⁸ The Constitution of Georgia, Article 31.

¹⁴⁹ The Law of Georgia Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia, Article 5. 1

¹⁵⁰ The Constitution of Georgia, Article 31.

¹⁵¹ Radio Liberty, [Article](#), "Mzia Amaglobeli files a lawsuit against Kobakhidze, Mdinaradze and Subari for defamation", 07.05.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

*"The vast majority of those currently in prison are victims. However, I could not say that, for instance, about Mzia Amaghlobeli, who is not a victim, who was carrying out a specific order when she insulted a police officer. Her task was to demean the police and insult the dignity of law enforcement."*¹⁵²

A similar statement was made by Mamuka Mdinardze. During a government briefing on 3 February 2025, he stated: "Let us not portray as a hero a woman who was acting under a specific order... First, she put a 'sticker' on a police officer. The purpose and result of that act was to damage the reputation of state institutions, of the police... She did it with the sole intent of undermining the reputation of the police and the police officer."¹⁵³

After, on 26 June 2025, during a conversation with journalists, Nino Tsilosani made the following statement: *"It is a double standard for men and women when you hit another person in the face. Especially when that other person may be a police officer whose duty is to protect the rights and safety of that very citizen, and when this act of hitting in the face occurs under an order, for payment, for hire, and within the framework of agent activity."*¹⁵⁴

All of the above-mentioned statements became grounds for Mzia Amaghlobeli's lawyers to file motions before the court requesting the questioning of Irakli Kobakhidze and Nino Tsilosani. According to the defense, the content and nature of these statements could not be regarded as political opinions and constituted a violation of the presumption of innocence. The defense was also interested in understanding the basis on which these statements were made.¹⁵⁵ However, the motions were not granted.

Signs of the violation of the presumption of innocence were also evident in other instances, to which the defense referred during the proceedings.¹⁵⁶ In their assessment, such conduct represented an attempt to demonstrate influence over the judiciary. Moreover, certain statements made by politicians did not correspond to the evidence contained in the criminal case. For example, it remains unclear why the Mayor of Tbilisi, Kakha Kaladze, comments on criminal cases when he has no competence to assess them and, in a legal state he should not have access to the evidence.

Such large-scale violations of the presumption of innocence by political officials clearly demonstrate that the criminal proceedings against activists, including Mzia Amaghlobeli, were marked by a high degree of political influence.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Radio Liberty, [Article](#), "Mzia Amaghlobeli files a lawsuit against Kobakhidze, Mdinardze and Subari for defamation", 07.05.2025, last update: 15.09.2025. Georgian News, [Article](#), "Kobakhidze Again Claims Mzia Amaghlobeli 'Carried Out Specific Order'", 10.07.2025, last updated: 15.09.2025; Mtis Ambebi, [Reportage](#), Ivanishvili's Prime Minister's False Statements About Mzia Amaghlobeli, 17.05.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

¹⁵⁴ Batumelebi, [Article](#), Mzia Amaghlobeli's lawyers request the interrogation of questioning Nino Tsilosani, 04.07.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

¹⁵⁵ Publika, [Article](#), The judge did not satisfy the motions of Amaghlobeli's lawyers to question Kobakhidze and Tsilosani., 14.07.2025, last update: 16.09.2025.

¹⁵⁶ Netgazeti, [Article](#), Kobakhidze calls anti-Russian protest participants a "violent group" - "Everyone will be held accountable in the strictest terms," 12.05.2025, last update: 15.09.2025; Radio Liberty, [Article](#), "When a high-ranking official, a politician, makes comments in parallel with the court and this violates the presumption of innocence, this is direct pressure on the court and primarily on you (addressing the judge). It directly instructs the court to deliver judgment of conviction," 24.07.2025, last updated: 15.09.2025. 1TV Channel, [Article](#), Irakli Kobakhidze - Prisoners who are called prisoners of conscience are, in fact, under specific charges for shameless actions, 15.08.2025, last update: 15.09.2025. 1TV Channel, [Article](#), "Kakha Kaladze - There was misconduct on the part of some police officers, but why do you call those who threw heavy objects and stones at law enforcement officers 'prisoners of conscience?', 22.07.2025, last updated: 15.09.2025. Tabula, [Article](#), Mdinardze about Chichinadze: I can even stand as a guarantor if he realizes what he has done. 20.01.2025, last update: 15.09.2025.

CHAPTER 4 - INSTITUTIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROSECUTION AND PROSECUTORS AND CRITERIA FOR THE VALIDITY OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION

According to the principle established by the Constitution,¹⁵⁷ the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia shall be independent in its activity and shall only comply with the Constitution and law. This provision reflects the institutional independence of the Prosecutor's Office, while its functions are defined both by national legal acts and by obligations set forth in international treaties and conventions. Moreover, the institutional independence of the Prosecutor's Office is reinforced by the Organic Law of Georgia "On Prosecutor's Office". Pursuant to this law, The Prosecutor's Office of Georgia is a unified, centralised system that is independent in its activities and shall comply with law only. It shall be inadmissible to interfere in the activities of the Prosecutor's Office, as well as any in other action that may encroach on its independence.¹⁵⁸

The Prosecutor's Office is the authority responsible for criminal prosecution. To ensure the exercise of this function, it provides procedural guidance over investigations. In cases provided for by the Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia and in accordance with the established procedure, the Prosecutor's Office conducts criminal investigations in full and represents the state prosecution before the court.¹⁵⁹

A prosecutor exercises his or her powers on behalf of the State. In court, the prosecutor acts as the representative of the public prosecution and bears the burden of proving the charge. When exercising his or her powers in court, the prosecutor is independent and is bound only by the law.¹⁶⁰ The initiation and conduct of criminal prosecution fall within the exclusive discretionary authority of the prosecutor.¹⁶¹

Criminal prosecution may also not be initiated or may be discontinued if it contradicts the guiding principles of criminal justice policy.¹⁶² In this regard, Order No. 181 of 8 October 2010 of the Minister of Justice of Georgia, On the Approval of the General Part of the Guiding Principles of Criminal Justice Policy,¹⁶³ establishes the principles and recommendations that must guide prosecutors when exercising their discretionary authority to decide on the initiation of criminal prosecution. In particular:

Within the scope of discretionary powers and in accordance with the established principles, the prosecutor must independently determine whether the initiation of prosecution in a given case is expedient.

*When deciding whether to initiate criminal prosecution, the prosecutor must apply two tests — **the evidentiary test and the public interest test, which together constitute the so-called "full test."** Only when the full test is satisfied the prosecutor shall initiate criminal prosecution. Also, Both tests, require assessment, necessitating particular caution by the prosecutor.*

A decision to initiate criminal prosecution must be made only when both elements of the full test are satisfied, specifically:

¹⁵⁷ The Constitution of Georgia, Article 65.

¹⁵⁸ The Organic Law of Georgia on the Prosecutor's Office, Article 6.

¹⁵⁹ The Law of Georgia Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia, Article 32.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, Article 33.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, Article 166.

¹⁶² Ibid, Article 105.

¹⁶³ The Order of the Minister of Justice of Georgia No. 181 "On the Approval of the General Part of the Guiding Principles of Criminal Justice Policy", dated 8 October, 2010, last update: 17.09.2025.

- a) the evidence in the case provides a sufficient basis to establish a real prospect of conviction before the court — the evidentiary test;
- b) the initiation of prosecution is dictated by the public interest — the public interest test.

Each stage of the full test must be examined independently through an analysis and assessment of the circumstances of the case, and only thereafter must be made a decision on whether to initiate, refrain from, or discontinue prosecution.

Evidentiary test - A prosecutor must not initiate or must discontinue criminal prosecution if there is no reasonable suspicion that a particular person has committed a criminal offense and/or if it is unlikely that the person's guilt will be established by the court.

Public interest test - From the standpoint of justice, even where the evidentiary test is satisfied, the prosecutor must refrain from initiating prosecution if doing so would contradict the public interest.

An essential aspect of the prosecutor's discretionary authority is determining whether the initiation of prosecution serves a substantial public interest. The prosecutor must assess whether prosecution is in the public interest and should refrain from initiating it when the countervailing public interest clearly outweighs the interest of punishment. The assessment of the public interest must take into account various factors. According to the above-mentioned Order, the following elements must be evaluated: the State's legal priorities, the nature and gravity of the crime, the preventive impact of criminal prosecution, the degree of culpability of the individual (even when the prosecutor has sufficient evidence to prove the person's guilt, it is necessary to assess the level of culpability in comparison with other participants in the crime. Considering the degree of participation and motive of an accomplice, the prosecutor may reasonably decide to refrain from prosecution - for example, if the person's role in the offense was secondary and no other aggravating factors exist), the individual's criminal history, willingness to cooperate, and personal characteristics. The Order also specifies that the principles and factors listed therein are not exhaustive and that the decision as to whether prosecution serves the public interest must be made in consideration of the specific circumstances of each individual case.

It is noteworthy that, by Order No. 008 of 17 March 2020 of the Prosecutor General of Georgia, the Regulation of the Strategic Development and Criminal Justice Policy Council¹⁶⁴ — a standing advisory body under the Prosecutor General — was approved. According to this regulation, one of the Council's powers is to review issues related to the guiding principles of criminal justice policy and to provide corresponding recommendations.¹⁶⁵

On 16 June 2025, GYLA addressed the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia in writing form, requesting information about the guiding principles of criminal justice policy applied by the Prosecutor's Office when initiating criminal prosecution. The above-mentioned Order of 2010 remains publicly available on the Legislative Herald of Georgia website as the currently valid version. However, this document dates back to 2010.

¹⁶⁴ The Order of the Prosecutor General of Georgia No. 008 "On the approval of the Regulations of the Permanent Advisory Body of the Prosecutor General of Georgia - the Council for Strategic Development and Criminal Policy, dated of March 17, 2020, last update: 17.09.2025.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, Article 5.d.

Given that criminal justice policy is not a static system, its content and form constantly evolve in line with societal needs and the State's strategic objectives, responding to social, political, economic, and cultural changes, it requires periodic review and adaptation.

Furthermore, considering that in 2020, for the purpose of supporting the activities of the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia, the Prosecutor General approved the Regulation of the Strategic Development and Criminal Justice Policy Council, which is authorized to review issues related to the guiding principles of criminal justice policy and to give relevant recommendations.¹⁶⁶

It was reasonable to expect that during this period, especially given that criminal prosecution is a daily process, the Prosecutor's Office would have provided an updated document or, at a minimum, referred to the existing one. However, in contrast, we received the response presented below in violation of the time limit established by law.



The 2022-2027 Strategy Document of the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia also states that *[[..in order to pursue a uniform criminal justice policy, recommendations will be developed and updated on the initiation of criminal prosecution, the use of measures of restraint, the conclusion of plea agreements, the use of discretionary powers, and other relevant issues of prosecutorial activity. In order to apply the recommendations in practice and determine their effectiveness, the implementation of the recommendations will be periodically monitored..]]*.¹⁶⁷

After the adoption of the strategy document, instead of signs of positive changes in criminal justice policy, the situation in some areas has significantly worsened. **It should also be noted that progress in terms of discretionary powers was minimal even before that - this component has been an "effective" formulation at the legislative level for years, which in practice, in the hands of an ordinary prosecutor, rarely turns into a truly "effective" legal instrument.**

¹⁶⁶ The Order of the Prosecutor General of Georgia No. 008 “On the approval of the Regulations of the Permanent Advisory Body of the Prosecutor General of Georgia – the Council for Strategic Development and Criminal Policy”, dated 17 March 2020, Article. 2,5

¹⁶⁷ The [Strategy](#) of the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia (2022-2027), p. 16. Updated: 17.09.2025

In accordance with the Code of Ethics of the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia, an employees of the Prosecutor's Office are obliged to take full responsibility for their actions and decisions. It is not permissible to absolve himself/herself of responsibility on the grounds that the decision was made on the instructions of a superior official.¹⁶⁸ Although the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia is a centralized body where decisions are made within a hierarchical structure, with subordinate prosecutors reporting to superior prosecutors, this arrangement does not diminish the individual responsibility of each prosecutor for the actions and decisions that are the subject of their professional activities.

This principle is particularly important in criminal prosecutions, where prosecutors must conduct their activities within the limits of real discretion defined by law — act in accordance with the law, the guiding principles of criminal justice policy, and make objective, lawful decisions based on professional assessment and legal analysis.

Given that prosecutors themselves are subjects of legal liability for the actions they take in the course of criminal prosecution, their independent action, consistent with the law and ethical standards, is a necessary prerequisite for ensuring professional integrity and justice.

¹⁶⁸ The Order of the Prosecutor General of Georgia No. 038 “On the approval of the Code of Ethics for Employees of the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia”, dated August 26, 2020, Article 7, last update: 17.09.2025.

CONCLUSION

The circumstances presented in the report clearly indicate that, in many cases, the initiation of criminal proceedings against specific individuals did not meet the standard of “reasonable suspicion,” which constitutes a necessary legal precondition for such a decision. Even in those cases where the standard of reasonable suspicion was formally considered satisfied, the prosecution failed to fully adhere to the guiding principles of criminal justice policy. In particular, questions arise as to whether the prosecution correctly assessed the existence of a public interest in prosecution, as well as whether it properly respected the boundary between constitutionally guaranteed freedom of expression and the use of criminal law mechanisms as a means of its suppression.

The trail examination of these criminal cases revealed signs of selective justice, where the government apparatus was fully involved, including through the use of legal and propaganda resources. The decisions taken in these cases, at various stages of the examination, highlighted both the lack of judicial independence and, in some cases, serious challenges to professional competence. The final judgements taken by the court did not contain such a set of evidence that would convince an objective person of the guilt of the person, which indicates that the decisions taken by the judges in a number of criminal cases did not meet the standard of beyond reasonable doubt necessary to deliver a judgment of conviction.

This trend significantly damages the already alarming level of trust in the judiciary, undermines the principle of the rule of law, and increases the risk of politically motivated justice in other criminal cases.

GYLA considers the cases under review to be politically motivated, with the predominant purpose of the proceedings being retaliation against dissent.

ANNEX 1

The judges hearing the cases

A total of 31 judges participated at various stages of the judicial proceedings concerning the activists' cases. Among them, six judges (Maridashvili Lela, Barbakadze Eka, Shvangiradze Irakli, Nachkhebria Jvebe, Galustashvili Nino, and Metreveli Viktor) were appointed in 2024 for a three-year probationary term.

The judges hearing initial appearance of defendants before the court:

1. Barbakadze Eka (The judge also heard preliminary hearings)
2. Eptashvili Teona
3. Tarashvili Nino (The judge also heard preliminary hearings)
4. Iashvili Aleksandre
5. Kalatozishvili Arseni
6. Kurtanidze Daviti
7. Maridashvili Lela
8. Mgeliashvili Davit (The judge also heard preliminary hearings)
9. Mchedlishvili Tamari (The judge also heard preliminary hearings)
10. Sakhelashvili Nino (The judge also heard preliminary hearings)
11. Ubilava Gizo
12. Kolbaia Levani (The judge also heard preliminary hearings)
13. Shamatava Nana
14. Khuskivadze Irakli

The judges of preliminary hearings:

1. Barbakadze Eka (The judge also heard initial appearance of defendants before the court)
2. Gelashvili Giorgi (The judge was also hearing on the merits)
3. Gelovani Levani
4. Tarashvili Nino (The judge also heard initial appearance of defendants before the court)
5. Kalichenko Lela
6. Mgeliashvili Davit (The judge also heard initial appearance of defendants before the court)
7. Kolbaia Levani (The judge also initial appearance of defendants before the court)
8. Shvangiradze Irakli
9. Khudzhadze Nato

The judges hearing on the merits:

1. Arevadze Giorgi
2. Galustashvili Nino
3. Gelashvili Giorgi (The judge also heard preliminary hearings)
4. Gudadze Natia
5. Metreveli Viktor
6. Mskhiladze Lili
7. Mchedlishvili Tamari (The judge also heard initial appearance of defendants before the court)

8. Narimanishvili Davit
9. Natchkebia Jvebe
10. Sakhelashvili Nino (The judge also heard initial appearance of defendants before the court)
11. Tkeshelashvili Romeo
10. Kokiashvili Maia
11. Sharadze Zviadi
12. Chkhikvadze Lasha
13. Jinjolia Mikheil

The prosecutors participating in the trials:

1. Gobejishvili Shmagi
2. Gogaladze Giorgi
3. Gogeshvili Tornike
4. Gubeladze Zviadi
5. Todua Vazha
6. Iakobidze Tamari
7. Kepuladze Nino
8. Lekiasvili Ana
9. Metreveli Ana
10. Mukbaniani Giorgi
11. Okropiridze Vano
12. Zhvania Nino
13. Kartvelishvili Natia
14. Kvavadze Irakli
15. Chkhaidze Shota
16. Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi
17. Tsetskhladze Paata
18. Tsiramua Medea
19. Chitadze Nugzari
20. Khintibidze Roini
21. Khubejashvili Ani

ANNEX 2

Responses of the Georgian Young Lawyers' Association Regarding the Monitoring of the Criminal Trials

1. GYLA, GYLA is Monitoring the Criminal Cases Against the Participants of the Russian Law Protests, 23.09.2024, [See the Link](#).
2. GYLA, The Assessment of GYLA on the Case of Saba Meparishvili and Omar Okribelashvili, Arrested During the Protest Against the Russian Law, 25.09.2024, [See the Link](#).
3. GYLA, Court Postpones Hearings on Criminal Cases of Participants in "Russian Law" Protests, 24.10.2024, [See the Link](#).
4. GYLA, GYLA Responds to the Case of Anatoli Gigauri, 29.10.2024, [See the Link](#).
5. GYLA, GYLA Will Monitor the Cases of Persons Detained under Criminal Law in Court, 05.12.2024, [See the Link](#).
6. GYLA, Updatable Information: On the Criminal Cases Related to the Demonstrations, 06.12.2024, [See the Link](#).
7. GYLA, Results of Monitoring Criminal Cases Against Demonstrators, 10.12.2024, [See the Link](#).
8. GYLA, The Prosecution and the Judicial Bodies are Stalling the Consideration of the Case of Giorgi Okmelashvili, Who Was Arrested During the Protests Against the "Russian Law", 12.12.2024, [See the link](#).
9. GYLA, Prosecutor's Office Shall Also Review the Use of Detention in Other Protest-related Cases, As It Did in Aleko Elisashvili's Case, 16.12.2024, [See the Link](#).
10. GYLA, GYLA Assesses the Use of Criminal Justice Mechanisms Against Protesters, 25.12.2024, [See the Link](#).
11. GYLA, Judge Zviad Sharadze Sentenced Imprisonment to 5-years Term to Irakli Megvinetukhutsesi, Accused in Context With Protests Against the "Russian Law", 30.12.2024, [See the Link](#).
12. GYLA, The Cases of Individuals Detained under Criminal Law in Relation to the Protests, 09.01.2025, [See the Link](#).
13. GYLA, GYLA's Assessment of the Case Involving 11 Individuals Arrested in the Context of Protests: Detention Remains Unjustified, 11.01.2025, [see the link](#).
14. GYLA, The Hearing to Review the Preventive Measures for the Eight Individuals Was Conducted in Blatant Violation of Their Right to a Fair Trial, 11.01.2025, [See the Link](#).
15. GYLA, GYLA Responds to the Inadequate Detention Conditions of Nikoloz Katsia, 24.01.2025, [See the Link](#).
16. GYLA, A Pre-trial Hearing Was Held on the Case of the Dean and the Students of the Batumi Art University, 29.01.2025, [See the Link](#).
17. GYLA, The Court Delivered a Judgment on Case of Giorgi Okmelashvili, 03.02.2025, [See the Link](#).
18. GYLA, The Court Issued Judgments of Conviction for All persons Detained under Criminal Charges During the Protests Against the Russian Law, 04.02.2025, [See the Link](#).
19. GYLA, GYLA Responds to the Unsubstantiated Partial Closure of a Court Hearing that Hindered Human Rights Organizations from Monitoring the Proceedings, 05.03.2025, [See the Link](#).
20. GYLA, Judge Irakli Shvangiradze Restricts Activities of Persons With Observer Status While Considering the Case of Demonstrators, 25.03.2025, [See the Link](#).
21. GYLA, GYLA Responds to the Unacceptable Practice of Stripping Detainees, 29.03.2025, [See the Link](#).
22. GYLA, GYLA Assesses the Stage of Pre-trial Hearings in Criminal Cases Related to Protests, 31.03.2025, [See the Link](#).
23. GYLA, Monitoring of the Criminal Cases Reveals of Ill-treatment of 10 Prisoners of Conscience, 25.04.2025, [See the Link](#).
24. GYLA, GYLA Considers the Use of the Strictest Restraint Measure, Detention, Against Nino Datashvili to be Unjustified, 21.06.2025, [See the Link](#).
25. GYLA, Judge Nino Galustashvili forcibly Appointed a Public Lawyer to the Defendants in the Eleven-person case, Which is Unfounded and a Gross Interference with the Right to Defense, 25.06.2025, [See the Link](#).

26. GYLA, Media Cannot Cover Cases of Persons Detained in the Context of Protests from the Courtroom, 30.06.2025, [See the Link](#).
27. GYLA, Judge Nino Galustashvili Violated the Principle of Proportionality by Expelling Giorgi Terishvili from the Courtroom, 22.07.2025, [See the Link](#).
28. GYLA, GYLA Responds to the Statement Made by the STD Employees Who Testified at the Trial on July 17 Regarding the Numbering of Helmets, 23.07.2025, [See the Link](#).
29. GYLA, GYLA Submitted a Written Opinion of the Friend of the Court ('Amicus Curiae') Regarding the Measure of Restraint Applied to Nino Datashvili, 07.08.2025, [See the Link](#).

ANNEX 3

N	Person	Age (-21/21+) / Sex	Date of Arrest	Charge	Applied/ Changed Measures of Restraint	Judge	Prosecutor	Judgment and the date of the First Instance Court
1	Durglishvili Vazha	Is being specified; Male.	Is being specified	Article 187.1. - Damage or destruction of property.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kalatozishvili Arseni Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Mskhiladze Lili	Khubejashvili Ani	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years (conditional sentence). 12 July 2024.
2	Rautberg Andrei	Person 21+ of age; Male.	Is being specified	Article 187.1. - Damage or destruction of property.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kalatozishvili Arseni Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Gudadze Natia	Khubejashvili Ani	Fine in the amount of 3000 GEL. 12 August 2024.
3	Shanidze Giorgi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	09.05.2024	Article 187.1. - Damage or destruction of property. Article 265.2. – Illegal sowing, growing or cultivation of plants containing narcotics.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Tarashvili Nino Preliminary Hearing: Gelashvili Giorgi Merits: Jinjolia Mikheili	Khintidze Roini	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years. 16 September 2024. (Was pardoned by President Salome Zourabichvili)
4	Meghvinetukhutsesi Irakli	Person 21+ of age; Male.	09.05.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Iashvili Aleksandre Preliminary Hearing: Gelovani Levani Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Gogaladze Giorgi	Imprisonment for a term of 5 years, with the restriction of the rights regarding weapons. 30 December 2024.

5	Okribelashvili Omari	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	16.05.2024	Article 187.2.c. - Damage or destruction of property by a group of persons.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Gudadze Natia	Chitadze Nugzari	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years and 6 months, from here a year is a conditional sentence (Plea Bargain). 20 January 2025.
6	Meparishvili Saba	Person 21+ of age; Male.	16.05.2024	Article 187.2.c. - Damage or destruction of property by a group of persons.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Davit Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Gudadze Natia	Chitadze Nugzari	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years and 6 months, from here a year is a conditional sentence. 20 January 2025. (Plea Bargain).
7	Bubuteishvili Fridon	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	09.05.2024	Article 187.1. - Damage or destruction of property; Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kalatozishvili Arseni Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Khubejashvili Ani	Imprisonment for a term of 5 years. 20 January 2025.

8	Okmelashvili Giorgi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	15.05.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer. Article 260.1. – Illegal purchase and/or storage of drugs, their analogues, precursors.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Ubilava Gizo Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Gelashvili Giorgi	Khubejashvili Ani (was only once replaced by Khintibidze Roini)	Imprisonment for a term of 5 years. 3 February 2025.
9	Kutchuashvili Giorgi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	08.05.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Jinjolia Mikheili	Khintibadze Roini (was only once replaced by Khubejashvili Ani)	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years. 4 February 2025.
10	Koldari Daviti	Person 21+ of age; Male.	08.05.2024	Article 187.1. - Damage or destruction of property.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Jinjolia Mikheili	Khintibadze Roini	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years and 3 months. 4 February 2025.
11	M.G.	Person younger than 18 years; Male.	29.11.2024	Article 187.2.a. - Damage or destruction of property by setting fire, explosion or using any other universally dangerous means.	Detention changed to the transfer into the supervision of a parent	Initial Appearance: Kalatozishvili Arseni Preliminary Hearing: Barbakadze Eka Merits: Chkhikvadze Lasha	Iakobidze Tamari	The judgment is confidential. March 2025.

12	Mumladze Danieli	Person 21+ of age; Male.	06.12.2024	Article 187.2.c. - Damage or destruction of property by a group of persons.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Epitashvili Teona Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Mskhiladze Lili	Iakobidze Tamari	Imprisonment for a term of 3 years. 2 June 2025.
13	Khutashvili Gurami	Person 21+ of age; Male.	05.12.2024	Article 187.2.c. - Damage or destruction of property by a group of persons.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Epitashvili Teona Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Mskhiladze Lili	Iakobidze Tamari	Imprisonment for a term of 3 years. 2 June 2025.
14	Kulanin Denis	Person 21+ of age; Male.	28.03.2025	Article 187.1. - Damage or destruction of property.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Shamatava Nana Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Kokiashvili Maia	Khintibadze Roini	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 4 June 2025. (Information received from the prosecutor. GYLA was unable to attend the announcement of the judgment due to the late provision of information).
15	Chkheidze Lasha	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 187.1. - Damage or destruction of property.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Barbakadze Eka Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Narimanishvili Daviti	Metreveli Ana (Replaced Samkharadze Nodari)	Fine in the amount of 1000 GEL and imprisonment for a term of a year (for the violation of the terms of the conditional sentence). 9 June 2025.

16	Devidze Mate	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	19.11.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Khubejashvili Ani	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years and 6 months. 12 June 2025.
17	Mindadze Giorgi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	01.12.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Epitashvili Teona Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Khintibidze Roini	Imprisonment for a term of 5 years. 3 July 2025.
18	Jikia Saba	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mgeliashvili Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Iakobidze Tamari	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years and 6 months. 10 July 2025.
19	Kvaratskhelia Anzori	Person 21+ of age; Male.	05.12.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mgeliashvili Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Nachkebia Jvebe	Khintibidze Roini	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years and 6 months. 18 July 2025.

20	Jorbenadze Mamuka	Person 21+ of age; Male.	09.12.2024	Article 126.1 Prima.b. and c. - Violence by a group of persons against two or more persons.	Detention was changed to Bail	Initial Appearance: Kolbaia Levani Preliminary Hearing: Kolbaia Levani Merits: Metreveli Viktori	Tsetsckhladze Paata	Fine in the amount of 20000 GEL, 2000 GEL was deducted beforehand for the Detention. 25 July 2025.
21	Mikeladze Gurami	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	09.12.2024	Article 126.1 Prima.b. and c. - Violence by a group of persons against two or more persons.	Detention was changed to Bail	Initial Appearance: Kolbaia Levani Preliminary Hearing: Kolbaia Levani Merits: Metreveli Viktori	Tsetsckhladze Paata	Fine in the amount of 17000 GEL, 2000 GEL was deducted beforehand for the Detention. 25 July 2025.
22	Gvianidze Daviti	Person 21+ of age; Male.	09.12.2024	Article 126.1 Prima.b. and c. - Violence by a group of persons against two or more persons.	Detention was changed to Bail	Initial Appearance: Kolbaia Levani Preliminary Hearing: Kolbaia Levani Merits: Metreveli Viktori	Tsetsckhladze Paata	Fine in the amount of 17000 GEL, 2000 GEL was deducted beforehand for the Detention. 25 July 2025.
23	Davitadze Giorgi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	09.12.2024	Article 126.1 Prima.b. and c. - Violence by a group of persons against two or more persons.	Detention was changed to Bail	Initial Appearance: Kolbaia Levani Preliminary Hearing: Kolbaia Levani Merits: Metreveli Viktori	Tsetsckhladze Paata	Fine in the amount of 17000 GEL, 2000 GEL was deducted beforehand for the Detention. 25 July 2025.

24	Kakabadze Anri	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	09.12.2024	Article 126.1 Prima.b. and c. - Violence by a group of persons against two or more persons.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kolbaia Levani Preliminary Hearing: Kolbaia Levani Merits: Metreveli Viktori	Tsetskhladze Paata	Imprisonment for a term of 9 months. 25 July 2025.
25	Amaglobeli Mzia	Person 21+ of age; Female.	12.01.2025	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Sakhelashvili Nino Preliminary Hearing: Metreveli Viktori Merits: Sakhelashvili Nino	Gogeshvili Tornike Chkhaidze Shota	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 6 August 2025. Reclassified to Article 353 part 1 of the CCG.
26	Akhobadze Giorgi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	08.12.2024	Article 260.6.a – Illegal Purchase, storage of drugs in particularly large quantities.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Maridashvili Lela Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Tkeshelashvili Romeo (Replaced Jinjolia Mikheili)	Gobejishvili Shmagi	Was found not guilty. 6 August 2025.
27	Lomidze Daviti	Person 21+ of age; Male.	01.12.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer or his/her vehicle in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Shamatava Nana Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Khubejashvili Ani	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years and 6 months. 8 August 2025.

28	Zasokhashvili Temuri	Person 21+ of age; Male.	30.11.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer or his/her vehicle in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Shamatava Nana Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Khubejashvili Ani	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years and 6 months. 8 August 2025.
29	Gigauri Anatoli	Person 21+ of age; Male.	25.11.2024	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Maridashvili Lela Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Nachkebia Jvebe	Iakobidze Tamari	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 12 August 2025. Reclassified to Article 353 part 1 of the CCG.
30	Abramov Tevdore	Person 21+ of age; Male.	07.12.2024	Article 260.6.a – Illegal Purchase, storage of drugs in particularly large quantities.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Chitadze Nugzari	Was found not guilty. 15 August 2024.
31	Khomeriki Daviti	Person 21+ of age; Male.	02.12.2024	Article 18 – 229.1. – Preparation of an Explosion.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kalatozishvili Arseni Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todua Vazha	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years and 6 months. 15 August 2024.

32	Musellants Archili	Person 21+ of age; Male.	30.11.2024	Article 187.2.a. – Damage of property, by setting fire.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Shamatava Nana Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Arevadze Giorgi	Khubejashvili Ani	Imprisonment for a term of 4 years. 22 August 2024.
33	Chechin Anton	Person 21+ of age; Male.	03.12.2024	Article 260.6.a – Illegal Purchase, storage of drugs in particularly large quantities.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Nachkebia Jvebe	Gobejshvili Shmagi (Replaced Chitadze Nugzari)	Imprisonment for a term of 8 years and 6 months. 2 September 2024.
34	Javakhishvili Nikoloz	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Todia Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 2 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
35	Goshadze Tornike	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Todia Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 2 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.

36	Miminoshvili Irakli	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 2 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
37	Tsetskhladze Zviadi	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 225.1. - Organisation of a group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years and 6 months. 2 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
38	Kasradze Vepkhia	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 225.1. - Organisation of a group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years and 6 months. 2 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
39	Kadzelashvili Vasili	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 225.1. - Organisation of a group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years and 6 months. 2 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.

40	Gorgadze Giorgi	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 2 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
41	Aliev Insaf	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Khuskivadze Irakli Preliminary Hearing: Mgeliashvili Daviti Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 2 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
42	Skhvitadze Saba	Person 21+ of age; Male.	05.12.2024	The Prosecutor's Office changed Article 353 Prima.2. to Article 120.1. - Intentional infliction of minor harm to health, which has entailed a short-term deterioration of health or an insignificant or unstable loss of general working ability.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Maridashvili Lela Preliminary Hearing: Khujadze Nato Merits: Nachkebia Jvebe	Khintidze Roini	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024.
43	Chichinadze Andro	Person 21+ of age; Male.	05.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.

44	Tskhadadze Onise	Person 21+ of age; Male.	05.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
45	Mirtskhulava Gurami	Person 21+ of age; Male.	05.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
46	Archaia Jano	Person 21+ of age; Male.	05.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
47	Jabua Luka	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	06.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.

48	Sivakov Ruslan	Person 21+ of age; Male.	05.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todia Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
49	Kiknadze Revazi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	06.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todia Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
50	Terishvili Giorgi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	06.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todia Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
51	Tetrashvili Valeri	Person 21+ of age; Male.	06.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todia Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.

52	Kukharchuk Sergei	Person 21+ of age; Male.	06.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
53	Kerashvili Irakli	Person 21+ of age; Male.	06.12.2024	Article 225.2. - Participation in group violence	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Shvangiradze Irakli Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Todua Vazha Tsalughelashvili Vakhtangi (Replaced Giorgi Mukbaniani)	Imprisonment for a term of 2 years. 3 September 2024. Reclassified to Article 226 of the CCG.
54	Katsia Nikolozi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	07.12.2024	Article 260.6.a – Illegal Purchase, storage of drugs in particularly large quantities.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamari Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Chitadze Nugzari	Was found not guilty. 3 September 2024.
55	Zinovkina Anastasia	Person 21+ of age; Female.	17.12.2024	Article 260.6.a.- b. – Illegal Purchase, storage of drugs in particularly large quantities, by a group of persons with prior agreement.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Shamatava Nana Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Chitadze Nugzari	Imprisonment for a term of 8 years and 6 months. 12 September 2025.

56	Gribul Artem	Person 21+ of age; Male.	17.12.2024	Article 260.6.a.- b. – Illegal Purchase, storage of drugs in particularly large quantities, by a group of persons with prior agreement.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Shamatava Nana Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Galustashvili Nino	Chitadze Nugzari	Imprisonment for a term of 8 years and 6 months. 12 September 2025.
57	Elisashvili Aleksandre	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.12.2024	Article 156.2.a. – Persecution of a person because of their political activities, committed with violence.	Detention was changed to Bail	Initial Appearance: Mchedlishvili Tamar Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Gelashvili Giorgi (Replaced Jinjolia Mikheil)	Metreveli Ana Gubeladze Zviadi	Ongoing
58	Tsignadze Irakli	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.02.2025	Article 19-222.2.a. - Attempted blockage of a facility of strategic or special importance, which could have disrupted the normal functioning of this facility, by a group of persons.	Bail in the amount of 5000 GEL.	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Lekiasvili Ana Kartvelishvili Natia (Replaced Okropiridze Vano) Kvavadze Irakli	Ongoing
59	Ugulava Giorgi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.02.2025	Article 19-222.2.a. - Attempted blockage of a facility of strategic or special importance, which could have disrupted the normal functioning of this facility, by a group of persons.	Bail in the amount of 5000 GEL.	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Lekiasvili Ana Kartvelishvili Natia (Replaced Okropiridze Vano) Kvavadze Irakli	Ongoing

60	Bidzinashvili Dimitri	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.02.2025	Article 19-222.2.a. - Attempted blockage of a facility of strategic or special importance, which could have disrupted the normal functioning of this facility, by a group of persons.	Bail in the amount of 5000 GEL.	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Lekiashevili Ana Kartvelishvili Natia (Replaced Okropiridze Vano) Kvavadze Irakli	Ongoing
61	Tabatadze Irakli	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.02.2025	Article 19-222.2.a. - Attempted blockage of a facility of strategic or special importance, which could have disrupted the normal functioning of this facility, by a group of persons.	Bail in the amount of 5000 GEL.	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Lekiashevili Ana Kartvelishvili Natia (Replaced Okropiridze Vano) Kvavadze Irakli	Ongoing
62	Kutubidze Nikolozi	Person younger than 21 years; Male.	04.02.2025	Article 19-222.2.a. - Attempted blockage of a facility of strategic or special importance, which could have disrupted the normal functioning of this facility, by a group of persons.	Bail in the amount of 3500 GEL.	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Lekiashevili Ana Kartvelishvili Natia (Replaced Okropiridze Vano) Kvavadze Irakli	Ongoing

63	Eliava Vasilii	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.02.2025	Article 19-222.2.a. - Attempted bloackage of a facility of strategic or special importance, which could have disrupted the normal functioning of this facility, by a group of persons.	Bail in the amount of 3500 GEL.	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Lekiashevili Ana Kartvelishvili Natia (Replaced Okropiridze Vano) Kvavadze Irakli	Ongoing
64	Kumsiashevili Nikolozi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.02.2025	Article 19-222.2.a. - Attempted bloackage of a facility of strategic or special importance, which could have disrupted the normal functioning of this facility, by a group of persons.	Bail in the amount of 4000 GEL.	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Lekiashevili Ana Kartvelishvili Natia (Replaced Okropiridze Vano) Kvavadze Irakli	Ongoing
65	Gogoladze Aleksandre	Person 21+ of age; Male.	04.02.2025	Article 19-222.2.a. - Attempted bloackage of a facility of strategic or special importance, which could have disrupted the normal functioning of this facility, by a group of persons.	Bail in the amount of 5000 GEL.	Initial Appearance: Kurtanidze Daviti Preliminary Hearing: Tarashvili Nino Merits: Sharadze Zviadi	Lekiashevili Ana Kartvelishvili Natia (Replaced Okropiridze Vano) Kvavadze Irakli	Ongoing

66	Datashvili Nino	Person 21+ of age; Female.	20.06.2025	Article 353 Secunda.3. - An assault against a Georgian state servant, when the public official is performing his/her official duties (An assault on a person with an equal status to a state servant in relation to his/her official activities)	Detention	Initial Appearance: Barbakadze Eka Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Mchedlishvili Tamari	Tsiramua Medea Kepuladze Nino	Ongoing
67	Ratiani Zviadi	Person 21+ of age; Male.	23.06.2025	Article 353 Prima.1. – Attacking a police officer in connection with the official activities of the police officer.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Kalatozishvili Arseni Preliminary Hearing: Kalichenko Lela Merits: Gelashvili Giorgi	Gogaladze Giorgi	Ongoing
68	Tokhshua Tornike	Person 21+ of age; Male.	16.08.2025	Article 126.1. Prima.b. - Beating or another type of violence that caused the victim's physical pain but did not entail the consequence provided for by Article 120 of this Code, by a group of persons.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Barbakadze Eka	Jvania Nino	Ongoing

69	Shervashidze Mindia	Person 21+ of age; Male.	16.08.2025	Article 126.1. Prima.b. - Beating or another type of violence that caused the victim's physical pain but did not entail the consequence provided for by Article 120 of this Code, by a group of persons.	Detention	Initial Appearance: Barbakadze Eka	Jvania Nino	Ongoing
----	---------------------	--------------------------------	------------	---	-----------	--	-------------	---------