

## THE COURT,

### ***Having deliberated on the requests made, finds as follows:***

As at 05.12.2018, the referral of the Prosecutor's Office attached to Bucharest Court of Appeal was registered on the dockets of this court under no. 8494/2/2018, pursuant to the provisions of art. 42 and following of Law no. 302/2004 republished, and of art. 2 and 3 of the European Convention on Extradition of 13.12.1957, concerning the extradition request lodged by the judicial authorities of the Republic of Turkey regarding the named **DEMIRKAYA KAMIL**, an international fugitive for perpetration of the offence of membership of an armed criminal terrorist group provided at art. 314/2 of the Turkish Criminal Code and carrying a penalty of five to ten years' imprisonment, a persons against whom the competent magistrate of the Peace and Criminal Jurisdiction Court no. 2 of Antalya issued an arrest warrant on 21.12.2017.

Furthermore, it was explained that no apprehension measure was taken against the persons subject to the respective request.

As at 06.12.2018, the Court proceeded to hearing the extraditable person **DEMIRKAYA KAMIL**, in the presence of the chosen defendant, the statement thus given being documented and attached to the casefile (***sheets 7-8***).

In the public hearing of 06.12.2018, the Court, pursuant to art. 49 para. (2) of Law no. 302/2004 republished, approved the request for postponement made by the chosen defender of the extraditable person in order to allow them to adequately build their defence and draw up written submissions on the opposition to surrender.

Thus, on 13.12.2018, the chosen defender of the extraditable person submitted to the casefile the reasons for their opposition to the extradition request (sheets 13-16), arguing that the conditions for extradition were not met, and asking that the extradition request lodged by the Republic of Turkey, the General Prosecutor's Office of Antalya, was dismissed.

They further submitted that the extradition request alleged that the requested person was criminally prosecuted for perpetration of the offence of membership of the armed terrorist group Feto, basically showing that he had provided support to the terrorist organization Fethullah in the coupe d'état of July 2016, he had fled Turkey on 12.07.2016 (just days before the so-called coupe d'état), and that after the period 17-25 December, accounts had been found opened with Bank Asia, the bank

supporting the terrorist organization Feto, in his name and that of his wife, that his phone had been used on 2015 to contact certain persons considered that high-level leaders of the terrorist organization Fethullah, and that he had been recorded with the Bylock programme.

Under such circumstances, the requested person is deemed a fugitive and subject to an arrest warrant issued on the grounds of art. 314 para. 2 of the Turkish Criminal Code, for an offence carrying a penalty of five to ten years' imprisonment.

It was further submitted that the person requested by the Turkish authorities had managed a number of schools considered to be financed by Fethullah Gulen, and that he had also worked as a journalist and/or manager of Zaman Newspaper, a newspaper which was banned in Turkey for its alleged support to the so-called terrorist organization Feto. As a result, his capacity of teacher and journalist in a number of entities (schools/editorial teams) considered by the current political power in Turkey as terrorist has brought him a criminal casefile and the issuing of an arrest warrant against him, even if he has no connection whatsoever with any terrorist activity.

It was submitted that the reasons claimed by the Turkish State for his extradition did not suffice to lead to the conclusion that he had allegedly committed any criminal offence, being well known that fact that human rights were violated in Turkey, and all sympathizers or persons who had worked for organizations financed by Fethullah Gulen were unjustly detained and tortured.

It was argued that the requested person had fled Turkey just days before the so-called coupe d'état of 16.07.2016 because he had feared for his physical integrity and his freedom and that of his family, because many employees of ZAMAN Newspaper of Istanbul had been apprehended and tortured.

It was shown that, against such circumstances, the conditions for extradition provided under Law no. 302/2004 were not met.

Thus, pursuant to the provisions of art. 19 para. 1 letter b of Law no. 302/2004 on international cooperation of the judiciary on criminal issues, persons seeking asylum are exempt from extradition, being submitted that the application filed by the requested person to acquire the status of refugee or be granted subsidiary protection in Romania was provided to the Prosecutor's Office attached to Bucharest Court of Appeal.

Furthermore, pursuant to the provisions of art. 21 para. 1 letters a and b of Law no. 302/2004, extradition shall be refused if the right to a fair trial has not been

observed, and/or there are serious reasons to believe that extradition is being requested in order to prosecute or punish a person for reasons of race, religion, (...) political or ideological opinion or belonging to a certain social group.

Thus, as it follows from the extradition request and the arrest warrant, the reason for which extradition is requested is his alleged membership of a certain social group, the social group considered an armed terrorist organization, despite the fact that it is a matter of common knowledge at international level the so-called terrorist organization has never committed any act of terror.

It was further submitted that from the documents submitted to the casefile it follows that the requested person had worked for ZAMAN Newspaper and, according to recent publications in Turkey, he was considered an important name in Feto, the organizer of the media structure of Feto in Bulgaria and Romania, and to have allegedly financed European politicians.

Similarly, it was also submitted that the documents enclosed to the opposition to extradition evidenced that fact that, currently in Turkey, any connection or alleged connection with the Fethullah movement led to an unjust conviction and torture. The official website of the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Turkey publishes every week reports on Feto members apprehended, and each such report concerns hundreds of them (as many as 667 persons only in the period 15.10.2018-22.10.2018). The private schools and newspapers which do not support the current political power are closed, and the employees/management staff thereof are convicted without a fair trial and tortured.

It was further explained that the person requested was charged in Turkey for having allegedly used the ByLock app. As it was acknowledged at international level, as many as 75,000 persons were arbitrarily and unlawfully taken into custody in Turkey for having downloaded this app.

It was also submitted that the international organizations and media outlets unanimously reported the human right infringements in Turkey, and the convictions and torture inflicted against members/supporters of, or persons who had even the slightest connection with the Fethullah Gullen movement. In a report dated 25.10.2018, Amnesty International accused Turkey of having denied the people charged for the coup of 2016 the right to appeal.

Considering the above, pursuant to the provisions of art. 21 para. 1 letters a and b, and of art. 3 of the European Convention on Extradition, applicability of the mandatory grounds for refusal of extradition was requested to be ascertained.

Furthermore, reference was made also to the provisions of art. 22 para. 2 of Law no. 302/2004 reading that extradition of a person may be refused or postponed where the surrender of such person is likely to entail particularly serious consequences for him or her. In this respect, a request was to be taken into account the age of the requested person, the fact that his family was no longer in Turkey, and that a potential extradition to this country was liable to entail particularly serious consequences for him.

Written documents were submitted in support of the opposition to extradition (*sheets 17-86*).

In the public hearing of 14.12.2018, the chosen defender of the **extraditable person Demirkaya Kamil**, during the debates, asked the Court to hold that the conditions for extradition were not met and to reject the extradition request filed by the Republic of Turkey, the General Prosecutor's Office of Antalya, which wrongly alleged that the extraditable person was guilty of perpetration of the offence of membership of the armed terrorist organization Fethullah, and provided as the constituent elements of this offence the fact that he allegedly had accounts opened with Asia Bank, he was a registered user of the ByLock app and, back in 2015, he had allegedly contacted high-profile members of the terrorist organization Fethullah. The aspects indicated may not represent a constituent element of any offence, so much the more of a terrorism charge.

It was further submitted that the only guilt the requested person could be charged with was his work as journalist and teacher for organizations which did not lend unconditional support to the current president of the Republic of Turkey, namely President Erdogan, this being the only reason for which the extraditable person was indicted in Turkey and risked imprisonment and the mistreatments all the journalists apprehended in Turkey were applied.

Thus, the defence assessed that the general situation in Turkey, namely the seizure of the building of Zaman Newspaper, as it followed from the statement of the witness, and the previous apprehension of more journalists before the date of 16 July 2016, determined the extraditable person to flee Turkey and not come back to this country, fearing that his physical integrity and freedom would be at risk. In fact, they

showed that his entire family had fled Turkey because they had all worked before as either members of teaching staff or journalists.

As a result, they concluded that, in this case, the conditions provided under Law no. 302/2004, against the provisions of art. 19 para. 1 letter b of Law no. 302/2004, as well as the provisions of art. 21 para. 1 letters a and b of Law no. 302/2004, were not met. Similarly, they also submitted that the issuing of an arrest warrant in default, for these unreliable grounds, could only lead to the conclusion that the right to a fair trial was not observed in Turkey. They argued that the main reason for which the extraditable person is prosecuted was his membership of a certain social group, considered a terrorist group, despite the fact that they had never committed any acts of terror.

To continue, the defence also submitted that they filed to the casefile written documents showing that the extraditable person was considered in Turkey a supporter of Fethullah Gulen, the media organizer in Romania and Bulgaria, and very high profile person in the structure of this alleged terrorist group. Similarly, the documents in the casefile show that the extraditable person worked for the respective newspaper, but also the general situation in Turkey (as depicted in the reports of international organizations), namely the fact that the human rights are not respected, that all political opponents of Erdogan are unjustly detained without access to a fair trial or effective appeals and, more than this, as it follows from the statements of the witnesses heard by the court, these are tortured and denied minimum rights in the prisons they are unjustly thrown in.

He also added that the website of the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Turkey published every week reports on the Fethullah members apprehended, and that hundreds of so-called supporters of the Fethullah movements are arrested every week.

As a result, the defence considered that the provisions of art. 21 para. 1 letters a and b of Law no. 302/2004 were met, and asked the court to give due consideration to the statements of the witnesses heard on this date, who knew Demirkaya Kamil and were familiar with the situation of the journalists and the political opponents of the Erdogan regime in Turkey, and gave detailed accounts of what happened to any persons who were unjustly considered Fethullah sympathizers.

Last, but not least, the court was requested to consider that the extraditable person had a certain age, all his family members were in Romania, and his potential

extradition to Turkey would manifest adverse effects, by reference to the provisions of art. 22 para. 2 of Law no. 302/2004.

**Having reviewed the complaint lodged, the submissions of the requested person and the evidence produced in the case**, the Court finds that the request for extradition of the named **Demirkaya Kamil** relies on the Miscellaneous Case Resolution no. 2017/7158 for perpetration of the offence of membership of an armed criminal terrorist group provided at art. 314/2 of the Turkish Criminal Code and carrying a penalty of five to ten years' imprisonment, a resolution on the basis of which the magistrate of the Peace and Criminal Jurisdiction Court no. 2 of Antalya issued an arrest warrant on 21.12.2017.

With the letter no. 13802/2018 of 09.05.2018, the Ministry of Justice - the Services for International Judicial Cooperation of Criminal Matters submitted to the Prosecutor's Office attached to Constanta Court of Appeal, on the grounds of the provisions of art. 37 para. 4, by reference to art. 40 of Law no. 302/2004 republished, the extradition request drawn up and lodged by the judicial authorities of the Republic of Turkey.

As at 21.11.2018, the Prosecutor's Office attached to Constanta Court of Appeal submitted the extradition request to the Prosecutor's Office attached to Bucharest Court of Appeal considering that the investigations conducted in the case concluded that the Turkish citizen had his domicile in city of Bucharest.

The extradition request had enclosed the documents provided at art. 36 of Law no. 302/2004, namely the arrest warrant issued in default, the applicable legal texts of the Turkish legislation, and an excerpt concerning the marital status of the requested person.

According to this request, the extraditable person is searched for enforcement of the arrest warrant issued on 21.12.2017 by the magistrate of the Peace and Criminal Jurisdiction Court no. 2 of Antalya for perpetration of the **offence of membership of an armed criminal terrorist group** provided at art. 314/2 of the Turkish Criminal Code.

Having reviewed the documents submitted by the requesting state, it was determined that the General Prosecutor's Office of Antalya was investigating the extraditable person for perpetration of the aforementioned offence.

The content of the extradition request describes the offence he is charged with, and alleges that **he supported the armed criminal group of the clergyman**

***Fethullah Gulen which organized the attempted military coup d'état of 15.07.2016 as a member of this group, having, together with his family, accounts opened with Asia Bank, the bank supporting this organization, his phone number was used as means of communication within the organization, and he was found to have been in relations with the high-profile leaders of Fethullah terrorist organization.***

The content of the extradition request further stipulates that the requested person left the territory of Turkey on 12.07.2016.

The referral made by the Prosecutor's Office attached to Bucharest Court of Appeal found that, having reviewed the documents submitted by the requesting state, the criminal charge brought up against the extraditable person has a correspondent in the Romanian criminal legislation, meeting the constituent content substance of the offence provided at art. 35 para. 2 of Law no. 535/2004 on prevention and fighting against terrorism.

It was further submitted that the investigations conducted found that the requested person entered Romania on 14.01.2018 through Oancea Border Crossing Point using the Turkish passport no. U00148638, was issued the residence permit no. RO0465469 by the Romanian authorities on 08.11.2017, valid until 08.11.2018, had established his residence in Bucharest, Drumul Gura Calitei, nr. 4-32, bl. 3, sc. B, ap. 162 according to the lease agreement no. 1/25.06.2018 concluded with Vancea Andreea Diana, and was an employee of SC Romzaman Impex SRL, according to the employment agreement no. 22/11.10.2016 and the addendum no. 2/01.01.2018 thereto. Similarly, he lives in Romania together with his wife and minor son; the proof of registration of an application for renewal of his residence permit with the General Immigration Inspectorate was submitted to the casefile.

From the letter issued by the General Inspectorate of the Romanian Police - the Center for International Police Cooperation - the National Interpol Office, it followed that the Turkish citizen was not declared wanted person at international level through the formal INTERPOL channels because the General Secretariat of the International Criminal Police Organization - INTERPOL prohibited the use of Interpol's communication channels to interact on any issue that concerned the 2016 coup d'état in Turkey because this came against the provisions of art. 3 of the Constitution of this institution reading that "It is strictly forbidden for the Organization to undertake any intervention or activities of a political, military, religious or racial character."

It was further submitted that the named DEMIRKAYA KAMIL was a Turkish citizen, was married in the Republic of Turkey, was not granted any form of protection in Romania, nor did he appear in the records of the General Inspectorate as seeking international protection.

During the hearing in the Prosecutor's Office attached to Bucharest Court of Appeal, the requested person formally filed a political asylum application and submitted, through his chosen defender, the proof of filing by email a political asylum application with the General Immigration Inspectorate on 05.12.2018.

With the referral of the Public Ministry, the Court was asked to rule on the applicability of the provisions of art. 19 para. 1 letter b of Law no. 302/2004, and art. 2 para. 1 last sentence of Law no. 80/97 ratifying the European Convention on Extradition.

Similarly, it was further submitted that, having reviewed the content of the extradition request and the documents enclosed thereto, being the arrest warrant in default and the legal texts applicable from the Turkish legislation, it followed that there were solid reasons to consider that the extradition was requested for the purpose of prosecuting the person for reasons in connection with his political or ideological opinions, which came against the scope of extradition provided at art. 3 of the European Convention on Extradition of 13.12.1957, with applicability of the mandatory ground for refusal of extradition provided at art. 21 para. 1 letter b of Law no. 302/2004.

The Court finds that the conditions to order extradition of the requested person **DEMIRKAYA KAMIL** are not met in the case, and holds as follows:

Regarding the extradition request lodged by the authorities of the Republic of Turkey concerning the named Demirkaya Kamil, the Court holds that, given the applicability of the European Convention on Extradition executed in Paris on 13.12.1957, together with the two additional protocols thereto executed in Strasbourg on 15.10.1975 and, respectively on 17.03.1978, *ratified by both Romania, and Turkey*, as well as of the provisions of art. 18-77 of Law no. 302/2004 republished transposing into the domestic legislation the provisions of the framework-decisions of the European Union on judicial cooperation in criminal matters.

Under the aforementioned European Convention, the contracting States committed to surrender each other, pursuant to the rules and subject to conditions laid down thereunder, persons prosecuted for an offence or wanted to serve a sentence or be applied a safety measure by the judicial authorities of the requesting party.



Under Law no. 80/1997, Romania ratified the European Convention on Extradition of 1957, together with the two additional protocols thereto, subject to the following reserves laid down in art. 2 para. 1 letter d of the same item of legislation, reading that *"The person who has been granted asylum in Romania may not be extradited"*, respectively under art. 6 para. 1 letter a) and art. 6 para. 1 letter b of the same item of legislation (introduced under art. 2 para. 2 of the Law), which texts read that *"Any contracting State is entitled to refuse extradition of its nationals"*, and *"For the purposes of this Convention, national means the Romanian citizen or the person who has been granted asylum in Romania"*.

At the same time, pursuant to art. 19 para. 1 letter b of Law no. 302/2004 republished, ***"the persons seeking asylum, beneficiaries of the status as refugee or of subsidiary protection in Romania, where extradition would be to the origin country or to any other State where their life or freedom would be jeopardized or where they would be placed under torture, inhuman or degrading treatment"***, are exempt from extradition.

Furthermore, pursuant to the provisions of art. 21 para. 1 letter b) of Law no. 302/2004 republished, extradition shall be refused ***if there are serious reasons to believe that extradition is being requested in order to prosecute or punish a person for reasons of race, religion, sex, nationality, language, political or ideological opinion or belonging to a certain social group;***

The Court finds that, in this case, extradition is requested by the authorities of Turkey to enforce the arrest warrant issued on 21.12.2017 by the magistrate of the Peace and Criminal Jurisdiction Court no. 2 of Antalya, considering that the Turkish citizen is investigated for perpetration of the ***offence of membership of an armed criminal terrorist group*** provided at art. 314/2 of the Turkish Criminal Code.

The content of the extradition request describes the offence he is charged with, and alleges that ***he supported the armed criminal group of the clergyman Fethullah Gulen which organized the attempted military coup d'état of 15.07.2016 as a member of this group, having, together with his family, accounts opened with Asia Bank, the bank supporting this organization, his phone number was used as means of communication within the organization, and he was found to have been in relations with the high-profile leaders of Fethullah terrorist organization.***

As regards the submissions of the extraditable person that allegedly he is unjustly charged with offence he has never committed, or that Turkish casefile lacks any evidence in support of his guilt, the Court finds that these may not be reviewed in the extradition proceedings as long as the Romanian court is not called upon to rule on the submissions of the defence, but to determine whether the conditions required to be met to order extradition of the requested person are indeed met.

Within the scope of such a review, the Court finds that the nature of the charges brought up against the requested person may not be overlooked, taking note of the fact that he is accused of being member of an alleged terrorist organization, a conclusion drawn from the existence of bank accounts and the use of a mobile app, despite the lack of details about the contribution of the person concerned to supporting the alleged terrorist group, the charges limiting only to making generic allegations.

The manner in which these charges were brought up and the context in which the arrest warrant was issued and extradition of the person was requested support, however, the conclusion that there are ***serious reasons to believe that extradition is being requested in order to prosecute or punish a person for reasons of political or ideological opinion or belonging to a certain social group***, being implied an alleged membership of the organization led by the clergyman Fethullah Gulen.

The serious reasons the text of art. 21 para. 1 letter b) of Law no. 302/2004, republished, refers to are held by the court on the basis of the statements of the witnesses heard in the case and the written documents submitted to the casefile by the requested person, through defender.

The court finds that in the statement given by the requested person in the proceedings carried out for the settlement of the extradition request, he submitted that since his arrival to Romania in 2016, all his activities have been lawful, he has been holding a residence permit, an employment agreement and a lease, and his child has been enrolled in an accredited school.

He added that all the charges brought up against him concerned his work as teaching staff in education units in Turkey and Moldova, and as journalist for Zaman Newspaper of Turkey which, in fact, has been closed by the authorities in the meanwhile.

The requested person also explained that he had fled Turkey in 2016 considering the pressures exerted in the country at that time and, the fact that a

number of journalists working for Zaman Newspaper of Istanbul, people he had known, as well as several relatives, had been sent to prison.

No objections were raised as to identity, and the requested persons submitted that he opposed extradition claiming a failure of the justice system in Turkey, and no waiver of the specialty rule.

The accounts of the requested persons were confirmed by both the statements of the witnesses heard in the case, as well as by the data contained in the documents of the casefile.

Thus, the evidence produced in the case (the documents submitted at sheets 29-49 read in connection with the statements of the requested person and the accounts of the witnesses heard in the case) confirmed the work of the requested person as journalist and teach staff, both before and after the time when the Turkish authorities issued the pre-trial arrest warrant, which work had been rendered both in Turkey and abroad. It also clearly follows the position taken by the requested person in his journalist work against the current regime in power in Turkey.

From the documents submitted to the casefile it also follows how the apprehension of the requested person and, later, the settlement of this extradition request were presented in Turkey, considering that he was eventually released, being portrayed as "the organizer of the media structure of FETO in Bulgaria and Romania" (*sheets 18-23 of the casefile*).

The same documents available in the casefile point also to the situation in the requested person's country of origin in connection with the measures taken by the authorities against institutions and persons considered to support the movement of Fethullah Gulen, considered by the authorities a terrorist organization, because of the political opposition against the Government's measures. In fact, the court also finds that the Turkish authorities have constantly made public the measures taken against this organizations, the dismissals and arrests operated against militaries, intellectuals and public servants under the charge of membership of, or support provided to the movement of Fethullah Gullen, as it follows also from the documents submitted to this casefile by the requested person, which cannot be ignored either. The fact that the Turkish authorities suspended application of the European Convention on Human Rights during the state of emergency declared and that these repressive measures continue to date, and the authorities constantly publish weekly reports with the supporters of this movement placed in pre-trial arrests may not be disregarded either.

The Court holds as relevant the accounts of the two witnesses heard in the case about the current situation in Turkey as regards apprehension and prosecution of an impressive number of journalists, closure of publications and the treatment applied to the journalists placed in pre-trial arrest or convicted.

All this evidence entitles the court to find that, in this case, it may be reasonably determined that the extradition of the Turkish citizen is being requested in order to prosecute or punish him for reasons of political or ideological opinion or membership to a certain social group, which is a mandatory ground to refuse extradition.

As regards the other claims of the Public Ministry in the referral made and of the requested person in his opposition to extradition lodged, the Court finds that the requested person has not been granted asylum in Romania, nor does he benefit of any form of protection for the time being, but he submitted an asylum application in our country when he appeared before the Prosecutor's Office, as evidenced by the documents enclosed to the casefile of the Public Ministry.

The provided circumstance, linked to the conclusion that, should he be extradited, there is a high risk that the extraditable person would be subject to inhuman or degrading treatments, supports also application of the provisions of art. 19 para. 1 letter b of Law no. 302/2004, republished.

As regards the alleged violation of the right to a fair trial, the Court finds that it is too early to speak about a violation of the right to trial enshrined under art. 6 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms because the court proceedings have not been yet concluded, but are in early stages, and the data available in the casefile in connection with the issuing of the arrest warrant do not support, for the time being, any considerations regarding the violation of this right.

Considering the above, the Court, relying on art. 52 para. 1 letter c, and para. 7 of Law no. 302/2004, republished, shall find that the conditions for extradition of the Turkish citizen **DEMIRKAYA KAMIL** are not met.

It shall dismiss the referral of the Prosecutor's Office attached to Bucharest Court of Appeal.

It shall dismiss the extradition request lodged by the judicial authorities of the Republic of Turkey regarding the Turkish citizen **DEMIRKAYA KAMIL**.

The legal costs incurred by the State will be borne by the State.

The costs with the fee of the Turkish interpreters for 2 hours of work per interpreter (during the hearings of 06.12.2018 and 14.12.2018) will be paid by with the state and will be covered from the specifically allocated fund for legal costs.

**FOR THESE REASONS,  
IN THE NAME OF THE LAW,  
DECIDES:**

On the grounds of art. 52 para. 1 letter c, and para. 7 of Law no. 302/2004, republished, it finds that the conditions for extradition of the Turkish citizen **DEMIRKAYA KAMIL** are not met.

It dismisses the referral of the Prosecutor's Office attached to Bucharest Court of Appeal.

It dismisses the extradition request lodged by the judicial authorities of the Republic of Turkey regarding the Turkish citizen **DEMIRKAYA KAMIL**.

The legal costs incurred by the State are borne by the State.

The costs with the fee of the Turkish interpreters for 2 hours of work per interpreter (during the hearings of 06.12.2018 and 14.12.2018) will be paid by the state and are covered from the specifically allocated fund for legal costs.

Subject to appeal within 5 days of rendering, subject to art. 52 para. 8 of Law no. 302/2004, republished.

Rendered in public session, this day of 14.12.2018.

**PRESIDENT,**  
**Doinița Luminița Nițu**  
**Lungu**  
*[signature illegible]*

**CLERK,**  
**Cristinela Nicoleta**  
*[signature illegible]*

Drafted by N.D.L

Typed by V.D/14.12.2018

**REPORT**

**14.12.2018**

After rendering of the solution in public session, the extraditable person Demirkaya Kamil submitted he would not lodge an appeal.

**Clerk,**

**Cristinela Nicoleta Lungu**

*[signature illegible]*

*[19.02.2019*

*2 copies]*

*[signature illegible]*

*I, the undersigned, **GRECU SIMONA-OANA**, a Sworn Translator, authorized by the Ministry of Justice by License no. 12906, certify this is a true and accurate translation of the document copy in Romanian that was translated by me.*

**SWORN TRANSLATOR**

