



Courts and Tribunals Judiciary

IN WESTMINSTER MAGISTRATES' COURT

BEFORE

Senior District Judge Goldspring (Chief Magistrate) for England and Wales

B E T W E E N

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

v

TOPER HASSAN

PRESS SUMMARY

Background

1. On 14 August 2025, the Chief Magistrate ordered the extradition of Toper Hassan, 58, a dual UK and Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus citizen, to the Republic of Moldova. Mr Hassan is wanted to stand trial for conspiracy to murder in relation to the killing of prominent gang figure Izzet Eren in Chişinău on 10 July 2024. (§1–2)

2. The Moldovan request alleges Mr Hassan played a central role in the planning and logistics of the murder, including:

- Travelling to Moldova multiple times in the year before the killing;
- Arranging accommodation for co-conspirators;
- Instructing his partner to destroy CCTV equipment after the murder;
- Facilitating the movement and concealment of key participants. (§3–7)

3. Prosecutors say the killing formed part of a violent feud between rival Turkish-Kurdish organised crime groups – the Tottenham Eren clan and the Hackney Turks – linked to a series of reprisal shootings and murders in the UK, Turkey, and mainland Europe since 2009. (§8–13)

The Offence and Proceedings

4. The alleged conduct would amount in UK law to conspiracy to murder, contrary to section 1 of the Criminal Law Act 1977, punishable by a maximum of life imprisonment. The offence carries 15–20 years' imprisonment in Moldova. (§21–22)

5. Moldova is a Part 2 territory under the Extradition Act 2003, meaning no prima facie evidence is required. Mr Hassan was provisionally arrested at Stansted Airport on 30 August 2024, having flown from Istanbul. (§2)

Grounds of Challenge

6. Mr Hassan contested extradition on three principal grounds (§23):

- i. Political Motivation (s.81(b) EA 2003) – alleging that he might be prejudiced at trial for political reasons. (§24–35)
- ii. Article 3 ECHR – Prison Conditions – claiming that inter-prisoner violence, the specific risk of reprisals and poor healthcare in Moldova's prisons would expose him to inhuman or degrading treatment. (§36–61)
- iii. Article 8 ECHR – Private and Family Life – arguing that extradition would cause disproportionate harm to him and or his family life. (§62–65)

Evidence

7. The Court heard from independent experts, including:

- Mr Giorgi Tugushi (Council of Europe CPT member), who described Moldovan prisons as plagued by systemic inter-prisoner violence driven by entrenched criminal hierarchies ('watchers'), understaffing, and chronic healthcare shortages.
- Mr Alexandru Vieru, a Moldovan lawyer and human rights specialist, who highlighted overcrowding, inadequate protection for vulnerable prisoners, and corruption among prison staff. (§67)

8. Both witnesses accepted that Block 4 of Leova Prison – the facility named in the assurances – was better than other parts of the system but stressed it was not risk-free. (§67–69)

Held

9. Political motivation: Applying the Fernandez, Hilali, and Nikolics tests, the Judge found no credible evidence that the request was politically driven or that Mr Hassan's trial or detention would be prejudiced for political reasons. (§24–35)

10. Article 3 ECHR: The Judge acknowledged systemic problems in Moldova's prisons but applied the approach from Tabuncic, Ciorici and Othman. He found that recent, specific, and monitorable assurances from the Moldovan Ministry of Justice – including segregation in Block 4 of Leova and initial detention in Chişinău – had been upheld by the Divisional Court in Ciorici (2025) and were sufficient to remove a 'real risk' of Article 3 breaches. (§36–61)

11. Article 8 ECHR: Applying the proportionality test from Norris, HH, and Celinski, the Judge concluded that while extradition would interfere with Mr Hassan's private and family life, there were no 'exceptionally severe' consequences capable of outweighing the very high public interest in extradition for serious, violent, transnational crime. (§62–65)

Decision

12. The Court held that all statutory requirements were satisfied:

- The conduct disclosed an extradition offence under UK law;
- No bar to extradition was established;
- Assurances from Moldova were reliable and adequate;
- Extradition was proportionate.

13. The case was sent by the Judge to the Secretary of State (SoS). (§20–22, 83)

14. Mr Hassan will remain in custody pending the decision of the SoS. (§83)

References in brackets are to paragraphs in the judgment.

NOTE: This summary is provided to assist in understanding the Court's decision. It does not form part of the reasons for the decision. The full judgment of the Court is the only authoritative document.