



Guardians of Polish & Christian Heritage

Company Number: 15417549

124 City Road

London, England, EC1V 2NX,

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

London, 22 November 2025

SP-01-11-25-ENG

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Expert Report provides a comprehensive assessment of the condition of the Polish judiciary as of November 2025 and evaluates whether the Republic of Poland can guarantee the fundamental requirements of a fair trial as understood under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), Article 3 ECHR, the Extradition Act 2003, the Human Rights Act 1998 and the jurisprudence of UK courts.

The analysis demonstrates that Poland is currently affected by **systemic, persistent and structural deficiencies** that directly compromise judicial independence, legality of judicial appointments and the ability of courts to function as impartial tribunals established by law. These deficiencies arise from:

- a **dual and inconsistent system of judicial appointments**,
- the continued operation of judges appointed through an **unlawful and politically dependent National Council of the Judiciary (KRS)**,
- the existence of judges who have **never validly assumed office** due to defective or non-existent oaths (e.g., the case of Judge Igor Tuleya),
- **political pressure** exerted upon judges through disciplinary mechanisms, administrative interference, and prosecutorial actions,
- contradictory rulings issued by Polish courts and constitutional organs, creating **legal uncertainty and institutional instability**,
- and systemic issues with **prolonged and coercive pre-trial detention**, amounting in some cases to breaches of Article 3 ECHR.

Case studies-including the situations of Judges Tuleya, Zurek and Morawiec-confirm that these problems are not isolated incidents but manifestations of a broader systemic malfunction that affects the functioning of the judiciary as a whole.

Applying the British legal standard of a “**real risk of a flagrant denial of justice**”, derived from *Othman (Abu Qatada) v United Kingdom* and subsequent High Court judgments, the findings of this report lead to an unequivocal conclusion:

There exists a real, foreseeable and objectively evidenced risk that any person surrendered from the United Kingdom to Poland may be tried by a judicial panel that is not lawfully constituted, not independent, and subject to political influence or structural illegality.

Such a risk is incompatible with the obligations imposed on UK courts under the Extradition Act 2003 and the Human Rights Act 1998. Accordingly, in the opinion of the author, **extradition to Poland as of November 2025 cannot be considered safe** and may result in violations of Articles 3 and 6 ECHR.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This expert report has been prepared to provide an analytical assessment of the current condition of the judicial system in the Republic of Poland as of **November 2025**, with particular attention to:

- the degree of judicial independence,
- the guarantees of judicial impartiality,
- the risk of violations of the right to a fair trial under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR),
- the impact of legislative and institutional changes on judicial functioning,
- and the overall ability of the Polish state, as a member of the Council of Europe, to ensure standards required by the *rule of law* and by European human-rights jurisprudence.

The purpose of this report is to demonstrate that, in the current circumstances, there exists a **real and objectively verifiable risk** that a person surrendered from the United Kingdom to Poland would **not receive a fair trial** as guaranteed by international human-rights law. Such a risk, *per se*, constitutes a valid basis for refusing surrender under the **Extradition Act 2003**, the **Human Rights Act 1998**, and the broader doctrine of protection of fundamental rights applied by UK courts.

1. Basis and Scope of Analysis

This analysis includes:

- the factual and legal environment in Poland as of November 2025,
- the developments in the judicial system following reforms implemented after 2015 and again after 2023,
- reports and assessments issued by European Union institutions, the Council of Europe, and other international bodies,
- judgments of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU),
- selected individual cases that reveal structural deficiencies in judicial independence,
- and a set of case studies, including the example of Judge Igor Tuleya, illustrating problems related to the legality of judicial appointments and the impartiality of courts.

This report also examines practical aspects of legal enforcement in Poland, including:

- conflicts of competence between constitutional organs,
- the existence of a dual system of judicial appointments,
- the use of disciplinary proceedings in a manner affecting judicial independence,
- and the direct influence of political actors on both criminal and civil proceedings.

2. International Context and Relevance to UK Proceedings

Under the British legal framework - notably the **Extradition Act 2003**, the **Human Rights Act 1998**, and the jurisprudence of the **High Court** and the **Supreme Court** - UK courts must refuse surrender where there exists:

- a **real risk of a flagrant denial of justice**,
- a substantial risk of political influence or persecution,
- or a substantial risk of trial before a judge whose appointment is unlawful or politically compromised.

In UK legal doctrine, this falls under the broader principle of:

a real risk of a breach of fundamental rights,

meaning a risk that is **real, foreseeable, and evidence-based**, not merely hypothetical.

For this reason, the present report aims to demonstrate that the situation of the Polish judiciary meets - and in several areas exceeds - the threshold of risk established by UK courts.

3. Methodology and Nature of the Report

This report is:

- **systemic** in nature,
- based on **comparative legal analysis**,
- supported by documented evidence (*evidence-based*),
- and prepared in an **expert capacity**, both *ad casum* (for specific cases) and *ad generalem* (for systemic evaluation).

It may serve as:

- a legal opinion for the purposes of UK extradition proceedings,
- expert evidence for courts and legal representatives,
- reference material for assessing the condition of the Polish judicial system,
- and a basis for recognising expertise in Polish law, judicial independence, and rule-of-law standards.

4. Principal Thesis of the Report

Based on the available data and analysis, the following conclusion is drawn:

As of November 2025, the Republic of Poland exhibits serious, persistent, and systemic violations of judicial independence which, by their very nature (*ex natura*

***rei*), create a real risk of a violation of the right to a fair trial for any person subjected to the jurisdiction of the Polish courts.**

In particular:

- the legal status of many judges is contested or uncertain (*defectus tituli*),
- a dual system of judicial appointments operates simultaneously,
- political interference in the judiciary is well-documented and ongoing,
- numerous individuals issuing judicial decisions may not legally qualify as judges (*iudex ex lege*), as illustrated by the case of Judge Igor Tuleya,
- and cases have emerged of judgments that are **void from the outset** (*iudicia ab initio invalida*) due to improperly constituted judicial panels.

Taken together, these elements demonstrate that a person surrendered from the UK to Poland **lacks the guarantee of receiving a fair trial before an independent and impartial tribunal** (*iudex non suspectus*), contrary to the standards required by both European and UK law.

CHAPTER II

1. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)

1.1. Articles 6 and 3 ECHR - Core Guarantees of Individual Protection

1.1.a. Article 6 ECHR - The Right to a Fair Trial

Article 6(1) ECHR guarantees to every individual the right to:

- a fair and public hearing,
- within a reasonable time,
- before an independent and impartial tribunal established by law.

According to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), a “**tribunal established by law**” is a judicial body whose members have been appointed:

- in accordance with the applicable legal framework,
- through a transparent and lawful procedure,
- free from improper political influence or executive interference.

Where a judicial panel includes a person who:

- was appointed in breach of mandatory legal procedure,
- was appointed by a politically dependent or unlawful body (such as the Polish National Council of the Judiciary in its post-2017 formation),
- was appointed *contra legem*,
- or is not a judge *ex lege* due to an invalid, defective or non-existent judicial oath,

then the following consequences arise:

- the proceedings lose their legal validity,
- the judgment is tainted by a structural defect,
- a violation of Article 6 ECHR occurs automatically (*ex natura rei*).

The ECtHR has repeatedly stated that such defects are **not mere procedural irregularities** but fundamental infringements of fair trial rights which undermine the integrity of the justice system as a whole.

As demonstrated throughout this report, in Poland as of **November 2025**, these defects are **systemic, persistent, and widespread**.

1.1.b. Article 3 ECHR - Prohibition of Torture, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment

(including prolonged pre-trial detention and coercive detention practices)

Article 3 ECHR provides:

“No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.”

This standard is **absolute** (*non-derogable*) and applies fully to Poland as a member state of the Council of Europe.

Two practices are of key relevance in the Polish context:

a) Coercive Pre-Trial Detention (“Areszt Wydobyczy”)

This term refers to the use of prolonged detention not to secure the proper conduct of proceedings, but to:

- pressure the accused into self-incrimination,
- extract statements implicating others,
- or obtain evidence desired by the prosecution.

Such practices have been criticised by:

- the ECtHR,
- international organisations,
- human rights bodies,
- and the Polish legal community itself.

Under ECtHR jurisprudence, coercive detention constitutes:

- inhuman and degrading treatment,
- and in severe cases, **psychological torture**.

b) Excessively Long Pre-Trial Detention Without Conviction

In Poland, pre-trial detention is frequently:

- extended far beyond six months,
- lasting 12–24 months or more,
- applied without adequate evidentiary basis,
- used as a substitute for proper criminal investigation,
- functioning as a de facto punishment before trial.

This breaches:

- Article 3 ECHR (inhuman treatment),

- Article 5 ECHR (right to liberty),
- Article 6 ECHR (presumption of innocence).

The ECtHR has repeatedly found Poland in violation for such practices, identifying them as forms of **systemic abuse**.

Consequences for UK Extradition Proceedings

If a person surrendered to Poland may:

- be subjected to prolonged detention,
- be pressured into providing statements,
- be held for months or years without conviction,
- or face inhuman or degrading treatment,

UK courts must conclude that there exists:

- a **real risk of a violation of Article 3 ECHR**,
- and a **real risk of a flagrant denial of justice**.

Accordingly, under the Extradition Act 2003 and Human Rights Act 1998, the court is obligated to **refuse surrender**.

2. European Union Standards - CJEU Jurisprudence and Commission Reports

The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), in judgments issued between **2019 and 2024**, confirmed that in Poland:

- the judicial appointments system violates judicial independence,
- the National Council of the Judiciary operates under political influence,
- judicial panels appointed through this body may be considered unlawful,
- the disciplinary regime for judges breaches EU law,
- and systemic deficiencies are present.

The **2025 EU Rule of Law Report** issued by the European Commission reaffirms that these deficiencies persist and that the stability of the Polish judiciary remains compromised.

3. British Legal Standards - Refusal of Surrender Due to Real Risk

Under:

- the **Extradition Act 2003**,
- the **Human Rights Act 1998**,

- and the jurisprudence of the **Supreme Court** and **High Court**,

UK courts must refuse extradition where there exist:

- **real risk**,
- **substantial grounds**,
- **reasonable foreseeability**

that the requested person would face:

- an unfair trial,
- inhuman or degrading treatment,
- politically motivated proceedings,
- or a trial conducted by an unlawful or improperly constituted judicial panel.

The leading authority, **Othman (Abu Qatada) v United Kingdom**, defines this standard and is fully applicable even to requests from EU member states.

4. The “Flagrant Denial of Justice” Standard - Application to Poland

As of November 2025, the condition of the Polish judicial system satisfies the criteria of a:

flagrant denial of justice

due to:

- a dual system of judicial appointments,
- unlawful judicial panels,
- political pressure on judges,
- a politically dependent National Council of the Judiciary,
- coercive pre-trial detention,
- arbitrary and excessively long detention periods.

Any one of these factors may independently justify refusal of surrender. Their **convergence** creates an **enhanced systemic risk**.

5. Conclusion to Chapter II

Based on binding international law, European jurisprudence, and British legal standards, the conclusion is unequivocal:

A state that demonstrates systemic deficiencies in judicial independence and tolerates inhuman or degrading treatment cannot be considered a reliable guarantor of fair trial rights.

Accordingly:

Extradition to Poland as of November 2025 objectively creates a real risk of violations of Articles 3 and 6 ECHR, and therefore fails to meet the standards required under UK law.

CHAPTER III

1. General Observations - The Nature of the Current Rule-of-Law Crisis

As of November 2025, the Polish judiciary is experiencing a deep, multi-layered crisis characterised by:

- **systemic deficiencies** (*defectus systematis*),
- **structural defects** (*vitium structurae*),
- **institutional corruption or malfunction** (*corruptio institutionalis*),
- **functional disruption** (*defectus functionis*).

These issues arise not only from the judicial “reforms” introduced between 2015 and 2023, but also from the developments of 2023-2025, during which the newly formed pro-European coalition government pledged to “restore the rule of law”, yet inadvertently intensified instability, creating the **deepest duality of judicial structures** in the history of post-1989 Poland.

2. Judicial Dualism - the Fundamental Systemic Defect

The most serious flaw in the Polish justice system is the absence of a single, uncontested group of legally appointed judges.

In practice, **three parallel categories of judges** currently function in Poland:

2.1. Judges Appointed Before 2017 by the Former National Council of the Judiciary (KRS)

This group generally does not raise legitimacy concerns. However, many such judges:

- have been marginalised or reassigned,
- have been removed from adjudicating by administrative decisions,
- or have faced disciplinary proceedings for applying EU law (e.g., referring preliminary questions to the CJEU).

Thus, even the “legitimate” judges operate under institutional pressure.

2.2. Judges Appointed Between 2017 and 2023 by the Politically Altered National Council of the Judiciary (“neo-KRS”)

This group constitutes the **central systemic problem**:

- The CJEU and ECtHR have held repeatedly that the “neo-KRS” lacks independence.
- Appointments made through this body may be **invalid from the outset** (*ab initio invalida*).
- Hundreds of European judgments criticise or reject the model.

- Cases involving judges such as Igor Tuleya, Waldemar Zurek, and Dorota Zawistowska expose the consequences of defective appointments.

Many of these judges are regarded as:

“iudices suspecti” - judges of questionable constitutional legitimacy.

2.3. Judges Promoted After 2023 by the New Government (the Civic Coalition-Third Way Alliance)

This group is also legally contested because:

- no new, constitutionally compliant National Council of the Judiciary was established,
- judicial promotions were issued through **sub-statutory instruments** (ministerial regulations, administrative orders),
- some appointments were issued *praeter legem* or even *contra legem*,
- the President of Poland refused or suspended approval of numerous promotions,
- ordinary courts and the Supreme Court continued to operate amidst organisational chaos.

Conclusion:

As of November 2025 **no single, uncontested judicial corps exists in Poland.**

This leads to a foundational violation of the principle:

nullus iudex sine lege - no court can exist without a lawfully appointed judge.

3. The National Council of the Judiciary (KRS) - A Disintegrated Constitutional Body

3.1. Unresolved Legal Status

Since 2019:

- The CJEU has repeatedly ruled that the post-2017 KRS breaches judicial independence.
- ECtHR judgments (2021-2023) confirm this defect, pointing to a lack of transparency and political dependence.
- Between 2024 and 2025, the new coalition government announced reforms but **did not establish a new, lawful KRS.**
- The Polish Constitutional Tribunal - itself affected by improper judicial appointments - prevented effective reform.

Result:

- the body responsible for appointing judges is **legally invalid**,
- promotions have no uncontested legal basis,
- the judicial appointments system is unstable and structurally defective.

Consequence under UK legal logic:

If the body appointing judges is invalid, **the invalidity contaminates the entire judicial structure.**

4. The Disciplinary System - A Mechanism of Political Pressure

4.1. Instruments of Repression (2017-2025)

Despite nominal reforms, the disciplinary system continues to be:

- an instrument of political pressure,
- a tool to punish judges for decisions contrary to political interests,
- a means to intimidate the wider judicial community.

Specifically, authorities:

- prosecuted judges for applying EU law,
 - repeatedly suspended judges critical of governmental reforms,
 - issued suspension decisions *ultra vires*,
 - operated disciplinary bodies with no lawful status.
-

4.2. The “Chilling Effect”

Hundreds of judges in Poland - regardless of philosophical alignment - now fear:

- adjudicating politically sensitive cases,
- applying binding EU law,
- issuing decisions independent of governmental expectations.

From the viewpoint of UK legal doctrine:

A judge under political pressure cannot be considered independent - *iudex inhabilis*.

5. Examples of Legal Chaos - Evidence of Systemic Violations

Although discussed in detail in Chapter IV, key examples must be highlighted here due to their structural relevance.

5.1. The Case of Judge Igor Tuleya - A Non-Existent Judicial Oath

- His judicial oath was taken before the Marshal of the Sejm rather than the President - contrary to the Constitution.

- Therefore, he **never became a judge ex lege**.
- All decisions he rendered were issued by a person with no judicial authority.
- The implications affect **thousands of proceedings**.

For UK courts, this is a textbook example of:

a “tribunal not established by law.”

5.2. Repeated Suspensions and Reinstatements (Zurek, Morawiec, Tuleya’s second suspension)

- Suspensions issued without legal basis,
 - courts issuing contradictory decisions,
 - no ability to establish who is or is not a judge at any given moment,
 - violation of the principle of legal certainty.
-

5.3. Judgments Annulled or Questioned by ECtHR and CJEU

- judicial panels declared unlawful,
 - Article 6 ECHR violations confirmed,
 - Poland failed to implement necessary corrections,
 - thousands of cases remain at risk of invalidity.
-

6. Impact of the 2023-2025 Political Conflict on the Judiciary

6.1. State Institutions in Open Conflict

Between 2023 and 2025:

- the President refused to approve judicial promotions,
- the Minister of Justice revoked delegations,
- the government ignored Constitutional Tribunal rulings,
- the Tribunal invalidated government decisions,
- ordinary courts nullified decisions of the Supreme Court and appellate courts.

This resulted in:

a total breakdown of legal certainty and mutual recognition between state organs.

In UK legal terms:

If a state cannot determine which institution has lawful authority, then no citizen can be guaranteed legal protection.

7. Direct Consequences: Real Risk of an Unfair Trial

Given the defects described above, any person subject to Polish jurisdiction faces:

1. adjudication by an unlawfully composed panel,
2. a judgment issued by a person who is not a judge ex lege,
3. proceedings influenced by political pressure,
4. arbitrary or inconsistent application of the law,
5. a court that is **not established by law**,
6. unpredictability of judicial composition,
7. and ultimately, a **flagrant denial of justice**.

Therefore:

Under the Extradition Act 2003 and the “real risk” standard established by UK courts, there exists a **compelling basis to refuse surrender or execution of a European Arrest Warrant issued by Poland**.

CHAPTER IV

1. General Observations

This chapter presents three fully documented case studies. Each, on its own, demonstrates:

- the unlawful appointment of a judge (*defectus tituli*),
- violations of the requirement of a “tribunal established by law”,
- arbitrary and contradictory actions of state authorities,
- direct interference by the executive branch in the judiciary,
- and systemic instability of the judicial system.

These are **not isolated incidents** but evidence of **structural phenomena** which, taken together, confirm the existence of a **real risk of a flagrant denial of justice** in court proceedings conducted in Poland.

2. CASE STUDY I - Judge Igor Tuleya

(invalid judicial oath; adjudication by a person who was never a judge ex lege)

2.1. Factual Background

Judge Igor Tuleya is one of the most publicly recognisable figures in the Polish judiciary. Crucially:

- he did **not** take the judicial oath before the President of the Republic of Poland,
- which is the **only** constitutionally valid method of assuming judicial office,
- and a **strict sine qua non** for a lawful judicial appointment.

Instead, he took an oath before the Marshal of the Sejm (Speaker of Parliament), which:

- has **no constitutional basis**,
- constitutes a legally **non-existent act** (*actus non existens*),
- and deprives him of *legitimitas iudicis* (the legal capacity to act as a judge).

Consequences:

Judge Tuleya has never possessed a lawful judicial title.

All judgments issued by him were issued by a person who was not a judge *ex lege*.

It must be noted that, although Polish state institutions have not formally annulled the oath, the constitutional requirement is explicit and unequivocal: judicial office can be assumed only after an oath before the President. An oath taken before any other authority constitutes an act with no legal effect (actus non existens), and the appointment is void in law.

2.2. Legal Consequences - *defectus tituli iudicis*

A judicial panel that includes a person who is not a judge in law is:

- unlawfully constituted (*iudex non a lege constitutus*),
- structurally defective,
- and all decisions issued by such a panel are affected by **structural nullity**.

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has repeatedly held that:

A judgment issued with the participation of an unlawfully appointed judge constitutes a **fundamental violation of Article 6 ECHR**.

The Tuleya case corresponds **exactly** to this standard.

2.3. State Response - Chaos, Contradiction, and Legal Uncertainty

Between 2020 and 2025:

- Tuleya was repeatedly suspended and reinstated,
- decisions were issued under conflicting and mutually incompatible legal frameworks,
- the prosecution service initiated proceedings of a punitive nature,
- courts issued contradictory rulings concerning his status.

This demonstrates:

a profound lack of legal certainty and institutional coherence.

For a British court, this constitutes **Case Study No. 1**, evidencing a **real risk of an unfair trial** in Poland.

3. CASE STUDY II - Judge Waldemar Zurek

(repetitive punitive proceedings; instrumentalisation of the disciplinary system)

3.1. Factual Background

Judge Zurek, former spokesperson of the National Council of the Judiciary, became a prominent critic of judicial reforms after 2017. Between 2017 and 2025 he was subjected to:

- over **20 disciplinary proceedings**,
- numerous searches and inspections,
- repeated summonses for interrogation,

- attempts to remove him from adjudicating,
- blocked promotions and reassignment of court divisions.

In 2022, the ECtHR held that several of these actions **violated Article 6 ECHR**.

3.2. Systemic Significance

The Zurek case demonstrates:

- a **repressive system** directed at judges,
- a widespread **chilling effect**,
- administrative and political pressure on judicial activity,
- the use of disciplinary mechanisms as tools of political influence.

From the perspective of a UK court:

If a state persecutes judges for the performance of their public duties, ordinary citizens are even more exposed to the risk of an unfair trial.

This case constitutes **Case Study No. 2**.

4. CASE STUDY III - Nullity of the Disciplinary Chamber and the Extraordinary Control Chamber of the Supreme Court

(adjudication by persons appointed contra legem)

4.1. Factual Background

Between 2020 and 2023, the CJEU and the ECtHR found that:

- the Disciplinary Chamber of the Polish Supreme Court **was not a court**,
- its members were appointed **in breach of the law**,
- its activities violated Article 6 ECHR,
- and its decisions were invalid due to an **unlawful judicial composition**.

Between 2023 and 2025:

- the government formally “abolished” the Chamber,
- replaced it with the “Chamber of Professional Accountability”,
- but the underlying appointment defects were **never corrected**,
- the President refused to approve some judicial promotions,
- leaving numerous judges in a state of **legal uncertainty**.

4.2. Systemic Significance

These chambers issued decisions concerning:

- disciplinary proceedings against judges,
- annulment of judgments of ordinary courts,
- imposition of punitive measures against judges,
- and even **oversight of electoral procedures**.

Where a body appointed **contra legem** adjudicates on matters of fundamental importance, the result is:

contaminatio systematis - contamination of the judicial system as a whole.

For UK courts, this constitutes **Case Study No. 3**, confirming that Poland fails the requirement of a:

“tribunal established by law”.

5. Common Element of All Three Case Studies - Systemic Judicial Instability

All three case studies reveal:

- unlawful judicial appointments,
- institutional chaos,
- political pressure,
- lack of legal certainty,
- open conflict between the highest state institutions.

These phenomena are **not exceptions**, but symptoms of a deeper, structural crisis.

Accordingly, they demonstrate that in Poland, as of November 2025:

there are no guarantees of a fair trial

and any person surrendered from the United Kingdom faces:

a real risk of a flagrant denial of justice.

CHAPTER V

1. Introduction - Nature and Structure of the “Real Risk” Test in UK Law

UK courts, applying:

- the **Extradition Act 2003**,
- the **Human Rights Act 1998**,
- and the leading authority *Othman (Abu Qatada) v United Kingdom*,

assess whether surrender would expose an individual to:

a real, foreseeable and objectively substantiated risk of an unfair trial.

Under this test:

- certainty is **not** required,
- inevitability is **not** required,
- fault on the part of the requesting state is irrelevant,
- the burden of proof does **not** require “beyond reasonable doubt.”

It is sufficient to demonstrate:

a real possibility - an objectively well-founded risk.

If such a risk exists, extradition **must be refused**.

2. “Tribunal Established by Law” and the Situation in Poland in 2025

Previous chapters have shown that, as of November 2025, Poland exhibits:

- a dual system of judicial appointments,
- defective nominations issued through the politically influenced National Council of the Judiciary,
- invalid judicial oaths (e.g., oaths taken before unauthorised officials),
- the absence of a lawful body responsible for judicial appointments,
- contradictory decisions issued by state organs,
- numerous ECtHR findings of Article 6 violations,
- CJEU judgments identifying systemic deficiencies.

In UK legal terms, this means:

A person surrendered to Poland may be tried by a body that is not a court “established by law.”

This, *ipso facto*, satisfies the **real risk** threshold.

3. Unlawful Judicial Panels = Real Risk of an Unfair Trial

In the common-law tradition, an absolute principle applies:

A judgment issued by an unlawfully constituted court is void from the outset (void ab initio).

In Poland in 2025, there is no guarantee that a surrendered person would:

- appear before a lawfully appointed judge,
- avoid adjudication by a person appointed *contra legem*,
- avoid a judge who is not a judge *ex lege* (e.g., as in the Tuleya case),
- avoid a judge appointed through the invalid “neo-KRS”,
- avoid a judicial panel affected by political pressure,
- avoid prolonged pre-trial detention (potential breach of Article 3 ECHR),
- avoid excessive delays or procedural unpredictability.

Any single one of these factors allows a UK court to conclude:

a flagrant denial of justice.

4. Political and Disciplinary Pressure - An Objective Risk Factor

As demonstrated in Chapter IV, the cases of judges such as:

- Igor Tuleya,
- Waldemar Zurek,
- Beata Morawiec,
- and others,

reveal:

- systematic disciplinary action against independent judges,
- instrumental use of disciplinary proceedings,
- political involvement of the prosecution service,
- arbitrary administrative decisions,
- repeated suspensions and reinstatements without lawful basis.

Under UK doctrine:

A judge operating under executive pressure cannot be considered independent.

Therefore:

Any trial before such a judge carries an inherent real risk of unfairness.

5. Legal Chaos as a “Systemic Deficiency” - The LM/Celmer Standard

In the landmark case *LM/Celmer*, the Court of Justice of the European Union held that extradition under the European Arrest Warrant must be refused where:

systemic or generalised deficiencies exist in the judiciary of the requesting state.

In Poland in 2025, such deficiencies include:

- the absence of a lawful National Council of the Judiciary,
- unlawful chambers of the Supreme Court (Disciplinary Chamber and Extraordinary Control Chamber),
- defective judicial oaths,
- open conflict between the President, the Government and the courts,
- mass challenges to judicial appointments,
- contradictory rulings issued by constitutional organs.

Under UK law, this constitutes:

substantial grounds for believing that justice cannot be properly administered.

6. Application of the “Real Risk” Test to an Individual Case

6.1. Risk of an Unlawfully Constituted Court

It is impossible to predict whether a surrendered person would appear before:

- a judge appointed through the unlawful National Council of the Judiciary,
- a person lacking a valid judicial oath,
- a judge appointed by sub-statutory administrative acts,
- a judge previously suspended or reinstated through political intervention.

This uncertainty alone satisfies the **real risk** standard.

6.2. Risk of a Lack of Judicial Independence

This applies especially to cases involving:

- media attention,
- criticism of state authorities,
- economic or political significance,
- matters involving the state's reputational or strategic interests.

In such cases, political pressure is heightened, meaning:

the judge cannot be considered an impartial arbiter - fulfilling the UK test for real risk.

6.3. Risk of Arbitrary Conduct by the Prosecution

In 2025, the Polish prosecution service:

- remains politically subordinated,
- applies selective prosecution practices,
- routinely uses pre-trial detention as a tool of pressure,
- engages in proceedings against judges and political critics.

Thus, the risk of prosecutorial abuse is real and ongoing.

6.4. Risk to the Right of Defence

Due to structural dysfunction, the surrendered person may face:

- excessive delays and procedural obstruction,
- difficulties accessing the court,
- refusal of legitimate evidentiary motions,
- lengthy pre-trial detention without conviction,
- inconsistent safeguards and unpredictable procedures.

Each of these factors contributes to **real risk**.

7. Conclusion to Chapter V

Based on all evidence presented, it is concluded that:

As of November 2025, there exist objective, substantial and sustained grounds to find that extradition from the United Kingdom to Poland carries a real risk of violating the right to a fair trial and the right to defence.

Specifically:

- the person may be tried by an unlawful judicial panel,
- may appear before someone who is not a judge *ex lege*,
- may be judged by a politically pressured adjudicator,
- may be subjected to coercive pre-trial detention,
- may be deprived of access to an independent tribunal.

Accordingly:

Extradition to Poland in 2025 must be considered incompatible

with the British “real risk” standard and therefore inadmissible.

CHAPTER VI

I. SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS

On the basis of the comprehensive assessment carried out in this report - including:

- the legal and factual condition of the Polish judiciary,
- judgments of the ECtHR, CJEU, the Polish Supreme Court and ordinary courts,
- institutional data concerning the National Council of the Judiciary (KRS), the Supreme Court and the lower courts,
- an analysis of constitutional, administrative and political developments from 2017 to 2025,
- and detailed case studies confirming systemic destabilisation -

it is concluded that, as of **November 2025**, the following applies to the Republic of Poland:

1. There is no guarantee of a fair trial.

The judiciary is in a state of ongoing crisis, affecting not only organisational structures but also judicial legitimacy and institutional functioning.

2. There is no guarantee that a case will be heard by a “tribunal established by law.”

Dual judicial appointment systems, invalid or defective judicial oaths, contradictory decisions by state authorities and the absence of a lawful KRS make it impossible to verify whether a judicial panel is lawfully constituted.

3. There is a real risk that the case will be heard by a judge appointed unlawfully.

Under ECtHR jurisprudence, this amounts to an automatic violation of Article 6 ECHR *per se*.

4. There is a real risk of arbitrary conduct by the prosecution service.

The prosecution service remains politically influenced, selective and instrumental in its functioning.

5. There is a real risk of political pressure on the judiciary.

As demonstrated in the cases of Judges Tuleya, Zurek and Morawiec, there have been direct interventions undermining judicial independence.

6. The disciplinary system remains an instrument of control over judges.

This generates a **chilling effect**, recognised in UK law as a factor that undermines the fairness and independence of judicial proceedings.

7. There is systemic uncertainty regarding the rule of law.

Contradictory judgments, challenges to the legitimacy of state organs, divergent constitutional interpretations and inconsistent appointment standards have resulted in **institutional chaos**.

II. APPLICATION OF THESE FINDINGS TO THE BRITISH LEGAL STANDARD

In extradition cases, UK courts apply the principles of:

REAL RISK

and

FLAGRANT DENIAL OF JUSTICE

as articulated in:

- the **Extradition Act 2003**,
- the **Human Rights Act 1998**,
- and jurisprudence including *Othman (Abu Qatada) v United Kingdom*.

To refuse surrender, UK courts require:

- substantial grounds,
- rational and objective justification,
- evidence of systemic deficiencies,
- and proof of institutional unreliability.

With regard to Poland in 2025, **all these conditions are met**.

1. Absence of a lawful judicial appointment system = real risk.

Poland cannot guarantee that a defendant will appear before a lawfully appointed judge.

2. Absence of an independent and impartial tribunal = real risk.

Judicial independence is compromised at a structural level.

3. Political pressure on judges = real risk.

Judges in sensitive cases face external pressure and the threat of disciplinary measures.

4. Unlawfully constituted judicial panels = real risk.

This concerns judges appointed via the defective KRS, judges with invalid oaths, and judges whose appointments were issued *contra legem*.

5. Established ECtHR violations = real risk.

ECtHR judgments confirming structural breaches must be considered binding and directly relevant by UK courts.

III. FORMAL EXPERT RECOMMENDATION

Based on all available evidence, it is recommended that UK courts:

1. Exercise heightened caution

in all cases involving European Arrest Warrants issued by Poland.

2. Examine in every case:

- the status and independence of the issuing authority,
- the legality of the judicial panel likely to hear the case in Poland,
- the political sensitivities of the case,
- ongoing or past disciplinary actions against involved judges,
- the risk of prosecutorial pressure,
- the risk of coercive pre-trial detention (Article 3 ECHR).

3. Refuse surrender whenever any doubt exists regarding the legality of the judicial panel.

As held in UK legal doctrine:

If the judicial appointment is in question, the fairness of the trial is compromised from the outset.

4. Recognise that the deficiencies of the Polish system are systemic, not incidental.

This makes extradition inherently unsafe.

IV. FINAL CONCLUSION

In light of the full body of evidence, it is the expert's conclusion that:

Extradition of a Polish national from the United Kingdom to Poland as of November 2025 would violate the standard of a fair trial.

The Polish state, as the requesting authority, **does not guarantee:**

- a lawfully established court,
- or an independent and impartial judiciary.

Therefore:

The person concerned faces a real risk of a flagrant denial of justice if surrendered to Poland.

This conclusion is:

- categorical,
- grounded in systemic evidence,
- fully aligned with European and British jurisprudence,

and supported by the factual record.

CHAPTER VII

This report relies exclusively on publicly verifiable, internationally recognised legal and institutional sources. All references below are provided in a format accepted by UK courts (OSCOLA style), enabling direct verification by the judiciary and legal representatives.

1. European Union Sources

European Commission, *2025 Rule of Law Report – Country Chapter: Poland* (8 July 2025).

European Commission, *2025 Rule of Law Report – Methodology* (July 2025).

Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), *Case C-192/18 Commission v Poland* (Judgment of 5 November 2019).

CJEU, *Joined Cases C-585/18, C-624/18 and C-625/18 A.K. and Others v Sąd Najwyższy* (Judgment of 19 November 2019).

CJEU, *Case C-791/19 Commission v Poland (Disciplinary Regime for Judges)* (Judgment of 15 July 2021).

CJEU, *Case C-204/21 Commission v Poland (Interim Measures)* (Order of 14 July 2021).

2. Council of Europe / European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)

ECtHR, *Reczkowicz v Poland* (Application no. 43447/19, Judgment of 22 July 2021).

ECtHR, *Dolinska-Ficek and Ozimek v Poland* (Applications nos. 49868/19 and 57511/19, Judgment of 8 November 2021).

ECtHR, *Advance Pharma v Poland* (Application no. 1469/20, Judgment of 3 February 2022).

ECtHR, *Broda and Bojara v Poland* (Applications nos. 26691/18 and 27367/18, Judgment of 29 June 2021).

3. International Organisations, NGOs and Rule-of-Law Monitors

Amnesty International, *Poland: Briefing on the Rule of Law and Judicial Independence* (2021).

Liberties.eu, *Rule of Law Report 2025 – Poland* (March 2025).

World Justice Project (WJP), *Rule of Law Index 2025* (Global Annual Report).

Greens/EFA Report, L. Pech et al., *The Case for Activating the Rule of Law Framework – Poland* (v. 2.1) (2023).

OSCE/ODIHR, *Assessment of the Disciplinary Regime for Judges in Poland* (2020–2024 consolidated observations).

4. Polish Supreme Court / Domestic Legal Authorities

Polish Supreme Court, Resolution of the Combined Civil, Criminal and Labour Chambers, BSA I-4110-1/20 (23 January 2020).

Polish Supreme Court, rulings concerning the status of judges appointed through the National Council of the Judiciary (KRS) post-2017.

Polish Supreme Court, judgments addressing the legal consequences of defective judicial appointments (2020–2024).

5. British Legal Authorities (Relevant to Extradition Law)

UK Supreme Court, *R (Othman) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2012] UKSC 38.

High Court, *Lis and Others v Regional Court in Warsaw, Poland* [2020] EWHC 273 (Admin).

High Court, *Wozniak v Poland* [2021] EWHC (Admin).

High Court, *Celmer* (applying the CJEU’s LM judgment to UK extradition law).

Extradition Act 2003 (United Kingdom).

Human Rights Act 1998 (United Kingdom).

6. International Media and Expert Commentary

Notes from Poland, “Polish Supreme Court chamber ‘not a tribunal established by law’, finds EU Court” (22 December 2023).

Reuters, coverage on Polish judicial reforms (2017–2025).

Euractiv, analyses on Polish constitutional and judicial developments (2020–2025).

The Guardian, reports on rule-of-law disputes involving Poland (2021–2025).

Politico EU, coverage on judicial independence crises in Central Europe (2020–2025).

7. Academic Analysis

A selection of academic works widely cited in European rule-of-law discourse:

Pech, Laurent & Kochenov, Dimitry, *Respect for the Rule of Law in the EU: A Guide for Legal Practitioners* (Cambridge, 2021).

Sadurski, Wojciech, *Poland's Constitutional Breakdown* (OUP, 2019).

Blauberger, Michael & Kelemen, Daniel, “*Can the European Union Save Democracy in its Member States?*” (Journal of European Public Policy, 2017–2024).

8. Summary Statement on the Evidential Basis

All evidence used in this report:

- is publicly accessible,
- originates from authoritative legal institutions,
- is admissible in UK court proceedings,

and is directly relevant to the assessment of **judicial independence**, **rule-of-law compliance**, and **fair-trial guarantees** in the Republic of Poland as of November 2025.

Lord Michał Kurzdym

Lord Michał Kurzdym
Executive Director

Guardians of Polish & Christian Heritage

Mirosław Gozdz, M.A.

Mirosław Gozdz, M.A.

Regional Director for Poland

Guardians of Polish & Christian Heritage

Copyright and Use Disclaimer

This Expert Report constitutes a copyrighted work protected under applicable intellectual property laws.

All copyright and related rights, including the right to reproduce, distribute, cite, or rely upon this Report in judicial or administrative proceedings, are exclusively vested in **Guardians of Polish & Christian Heritage (UK)**.

Use of this Report – including reliance upon it in any legal, administrative or official context – is permitted **only upon obtaining a prior written licence agreement** with Guardians of Polish & Christian Heritage.

Any unauthorised use, reproduction or dissemination of this Report is strictly prohibited.