

**Tabular summary of additional irregularities concerning Supreme Court judges
appointed with the participation of an improperly shaped National Council of the Judiciary**

Name of judge appointed to the Supreme Court with nomination from the improperly shaped National Council of the Judiciary	Never was a judge before being appointed (YES/NO) ⁱ	Announcement by the President regarding vacancies in the Supreme Court without the Prime Minister's countersignature (YES/NO) ⁱⁱ	Appointment despite the injunction issued by the Supreme Administrative Court (YES/NO) ⁱⁱⁱ	Primarily appointed to the Disciplinary Chamber / the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs of the Supreme Court (YES => which Chamber/NO) ^{iv}	Appointment after a resolution of the three joint chambers of the Supreme Court on 23 January 2020 ^v	Other issues
Bednarek Małgorzata	YES	YES	NO	YES (Disciplinary Chamber)	NO	She was a co-founder of "Ad Vocem" Association, which was supporting former Ministry of Justice Zbigniew Ziobro.
Bielecki Leszek	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Bojańczyk Antoni	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Bosek Leszek	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	He was the head of an office reporting directly to the prime minister, tasked with representing the interests of the State Treasury.
Czubik Paweł	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Demendecki Tomasz	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	He was a friend of at the time vice-minister of justice Łukasz Piebiak; they were on the same year during studies. In 2022 he was the supervisor of Piebiak's doctoral thesis.

Dobrowolski Marek	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	In 2017–2018, member of the team for the consultative referendum on constitutional amendments operating at the Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland. Since 2016, member of the Legislative Council to the Prime Minister (12th and 13th term). Appointed on the basis of a nomination by the improperlyly constituted National Council of the Judiciary in 2018.
Doliwa Adam	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Dziergawka Anna	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	It was her second appointment – in 2019 neo-KRS promoted her to the district court. In adopting the resolution, the Council ignored the recommendation of the candidate evaluation team, which had identified other judges to be presented to the President. In 2019 and 2021, she represented the Minister of Justice in the Commission for Legal Adviser Applications. The recommendation of the Bishop of Bydgoszcz was cited in the justification for the resolution.
Góra-Błaszczkowska Agnieszka	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Grela Jacek	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	
Grzesiowski Krzysztof	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	Since 2007 he was a judge of the lowest level (district) court. By the improperly constituted Council he was promoted directly from the basic level of ordinary courts directly to the Supreme Court.
Janiszewska Beata	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	
Jurkowska-Chocyk Agnieszka	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	She signed the lists of candidates for the improperly formed National Council of the Judiciary: Łukasz Konrad Piebiak (2021), Łukasz Konrad Piebiak (2022), Zbigniew Łupina (2022).
Kapiński Zbigniew	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	He gave a positive opinion on Przemysław Radzik's candidacy for the court of appeal, despite having serious reservations about his work. Radzik was Deputy Disciplinary Commissioner for Ordinary Court Judges, who prosecuted judges for applying European law. Shortly after that Kapiński was promoted to the Supreme Court.
Karska Elżbieta	YES	NO	NO	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	YES	She is married to the Eurodeputy of the leading party at a time, Law and Justice, Karol Karski. The Ministry of Justice intervened to ensure that Judge

						Elżbieta Karska, wife of Law and Justice MEP Karol Karski, had an exclusive assistant at the Supreme Court. Vice-Chair of the Legislative Council to the Prime Minister of the 13th term (since 1 September 2018).
Kołodziejski Paweł	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	Since 2019, he has been a member of the Team for the Reform of the Fiscal Penal Code, appointed by the Minister of Justice. In addition, among other things, he was a member of the examination team responsible for developing practical tasks for the written part and case studies for the oral part of the prosecutor's examination, as well as a member of the Examination Commission for legal advisors training at the Ministry of Justice based in Bydgoszcz.
Kowalski Maciej	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Krajewski Marcin	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	
Księżak Paweł	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Kunicki Ireneusz	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	For over 20 years he was a judge of the lowest level (district court). It was his second promotion in career – from the lowest instance court to the Supreme Court. The Council justified this promotion by scientific career of the candidate.
Lemańska Joanna	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES ((the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	From 14 February 2018, she was a member of the Programme Council of the National School of Judiciary and Public Prosecution, appointed by the President of the Republic of Poland (she served as Deputy Chair of the Council).
Łochowski Marcin	NO	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES ((the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	Currently in the Civil Chamber.

Łodko Mariusz	NO	NO	NO	YES (the Disciplinary Chamber)	YES	Currently in the Civil Chamber.
Manowska Małgorzata	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	From January 2016, so 2 years before appointment, she was the director of the National School of Judiciary and Public Prosecution, reporting to the Minister of Justice.
Misztal-Konecka Joanna	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	
Nawrot Oktawian	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES ((the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Niczyporuk Janusz	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES ((the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Pastuszko Grzegorz	YES	NO	NO	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	YES	Since 2020, he has served as an external expert for the Ministry of Justice (he was appointed in 2024). In August 2021, Dr Grzegorz Pastuszko issued a positive opinion to Sejm Marshal Elżbieta Witek on the resumption of voting. He expressed anti-EU views in the media.
Pawłyszcz Dariusz	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	He was appointed in 2022. Before that he was strongly associated with the Minister of Justice - from 1 February 2016, he was delegated to perform administrative duties at the Ministry of Justice. From 1 February 2016 to 28 March 2017, he was entrusted with duties in the Legislative Department. From 29 March 2017 to June 2020, he served as Director in the Department of Human Resources and Organisation of Ordinary and Military Courts. On 21 June 2020, he resigned from his secondment to the Ministry of Justice and on 22 June 2020, he was delegated to perform the duties of Director of the National School of Judiciary and Public Prosecution. Since 1 September 2020, he has also been delegated to perform judicial duties at the Court of Appeal in Warsaw. At a time of his appointment his lifetime partner Dagmara Pawełczyk-Woicka, was a member of Council (in the next term she was

						chosen to be a President of a Council). Her candidacy to the Council was submitted to the by Dariusz Pawłyszcz as her proxy. After appointment to the Supreme Court, Dariusz Pawłyszcz continued his role as a Director of the National School of Judiciary and Public Prosecution.
Przesławski Tomasz	YES	YES	NO	YES (the Disciplinary Chamber)	NO	Currently in the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs.
Redzik Adam	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Roch Adam	YES	YES	NO	YES (the Disciplinary Chamber)	NO	Currently in the Criminal Chamber. By order of the Minister of Justice of 6 July 2016, he was appointed to the examination board to conduct the prosecutor's examination in 2016 as a specialist in the field of criminal proceedings, criminal enforcement law and proceedings in cases involving minors. He was also appointed to the Programme Council of the National School of Judiciary and Public Prosecution for the previous and current terms of office. <i>'Prosecutor Roch gave his consent to interrogate her between contractions'</i> – this is an excerpt from the account of a case that was widely discussed throughout Poland 15 years ago. Adam Roch, now a judge of the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court, as a prosecutor in Katowice, allowed the interrogation of a woman in her ninth month of pregnancy. The case was brought before the European Court of Human Rights and ended with a settlement stating that the pregnant woman had been subjected to 'inhuman treatment and torture'. That was in 2006, when Zbigniew Ziobro was the Prosecutor General.
Sadowski Mirosław	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES ((the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	He was an expert member of the Team for the Prevention of Crimes Resulting from Religious and Racial Hatred appointed by the Minister of Justice (2017–2018). He was appointed to the Supreme Court in 2018.

Siwek Marek	NO	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	Currently in the Criminal Chamber.
Sobutka Jarosław	YES	NO	NO	YES (the Disciplinary Chamber)	YES	Currently in the Chamber of Labour and Social Insurance, without any significant achievements in the field of labour law and social security before transfer to this Chamber.
Stankiewicz Stanisław	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Stefanicki Robert	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Stefańska Ewa	NO	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	Her candidacy for Supreme Court judge was approved in February by the legal National Council of the Judiciary, but President Andrzej Duda did not make a decision on her appointment at that time. Judge Stefańska decided to enter a new competition before the illegal Council.
Stępkowski Aleksander	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	The Council promoted him in 2018, the President appointed him in 2019. From November 2015 to August 2016, he served as Undersecretary of State at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. When Law and Justice was making changes to the Constitutional Tribunal, he convinced the Venice Commission that everything was being done in accordance with European standards. He was dismissed from his position. He was one of the founders of the Ordo Iuris Institute for Legal Culture, which was established in 2013. He served as its president from 2013 to 2015 and from 2016 to 2017. Ordo Iuris is a conservative association of lawyers known for its fight against 'gender ideology' and advocating for extreme penalties for abortion, including imprisonment for women who terminate their pregnancies.
Stryczyńska Ewa	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Szanciło Tomasz	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	He was appointed in 2018, and in 2016 he was appointed by the Minister of Justice to the Examination Board for the bar examination.

Szczepaniec Maria	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Telusiewicz Piotr	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	In 2019, an improperly constituted Council nominated him to the District Court. He was appointed to Supreme Court in 2023, and from 12 April 2021 to 31 January 2022 he was seconded to the National School of Judiciary and Public Prosecution, a unit subordinate to the Minister of Justice. In 2019, attorney Krzysztof Sokołowski sought Judge Piotr Telusiewicz's recusal, arguing his appointment via the post-2017 NCJ could mean the court was improperly composed and warning of a "threat of nullity of proceedings." About six months later, Sokołowski says he was notified that disciplinary proceedings had been opened against him on the order of Justice Ministry State Secretary Sebastian Kaleta , and the notice included a letter Telusiewicz had sent directly to the minister describing the hearing and stating he would not recuse.
Trzebiatowski Marcin	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Wesołowski Krzysztof	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Wiak Krzysztof	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	He is connected with highly controversial association "Ordo Iuris".
Widło Jacek	NO	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Witkowski Ryszard	YES	YES	NO	YES (the Disciplinary Chamber)	NO	Currently in the Criminal Chamber. Before being appointed in 2018, he was a prosecutor. In 2016-2018, he was a member of the National Council of Prosecutors at the Prosecutor General's Office.

Wojciechowski Paweł	YES	NO	NO	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	YES	
Załucki Mariusz	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Zaradkiewicz Kamil	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	He was appointed in 2018. Since 2017 he was a Director in the Ministry of Justice of the newly created Department. The Minister of Justice appeared in person at the meeting of the National Council of the Judiciary when Kamil Zaradkiewicz's candidacy was being considered. In 2016, the media reported that Zaradkiewicz, a long-time employee of the Constitutional Tribunal and director of the jurisprudence team, had been demoted (transferred to a lower position) and subsequently dismissed from the Constitutional Tribunal. The Constitutional Tribunal issued a statement saying that this was not due to his academic views, but rather his attitude and behaviour as a civil servant. The dispute was later settled with the new president of the Constitutional Tribunal, and according to the media, he was to receive three months' salary as part of the agreement after his dismissal by President Andrzej Rzepliński.
Zgoliński Igor	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	By order of the Minister of Justice dated 22 June 2018, he was appointed to the examination board to conduct the judicial examination. The examination board was appointed by order of the Minister of Justice dated 22 June 2018.
Żmij Grzegorz	YES	YES	YES (Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court of 27 September 2018, II GW 28/18)	YES (the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs)	NO	
Żywicka Agnieszka	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	
Żywicka Renata	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	By order of the Minister of Justice of 24 March 2021, she was appointed as the representative of the Minister of Justice to the Examination Board for Legal Adviser Training at the Ministry of Justice in Toruń.

ⁱ Article 5, item 3 of the Act amending the Act on the Structure of the Ordinary Courts and certain other acts of 20 July 2018 (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1443), added Article 35, para. 3 to the Act on the NCJ, which abolished the requirement for candidates seeking nomination to submit the required documents (professional experience, academic

achievements, opinions of superiors, recommendations, publications, an opinion of the relevant court college and an assessment of the relevant assembly of judges) in the process of creating the list of recommended candidates. This requirement was only abolished for candidates for (any chamber of) the Supreme Court, but not for candidates for judges of the ordinary courts. This has led to a situation where the only mandatory criterion for admission to the Supreme Court (other than satisfying the formal requirements) is the candidate's interview with a three-person committee consisting of members of the NCJ, lasting from several to several dozen minutes. Furthermore, a rule was introduced in Article 5, item 5 of the above Act of 20 July 2018, whereby if a resolution in individual cases regarding an appointment to the office of Supreme Court judge is not contested by all participants of the proceedings, it becomes final in the part that applies to the decision to submit a motion for appointment to the office of Supreme Court judge. Paradoxically, it is easier to be admitted to the Supreme Court than to be promoted within the ordinary court system, where a candidate's judicial achievements are assessed by an inspecting judge, which involves reviewing case files from 100 cases across various categories. Such a solution eliminates the possibility of a candidate effectively appealing against a resolution of the NCJ to the competent court. In conclusion – unlike competitions for the ordinary courts – the NCJ is not obliged to thoroughly review the professional achievements of the candidates applying for positions in the Supreme Court, while the resolutions of the NCJ appointing candidates to the Supreme Court are not subject to any effective judicial review which means that the competitions for all chambers of the Supreme Court conducted by the improperly formed NCJ are illusory. The result is that individuals nominated to the Supreme Court with the participation of the neo-NCJ, who had not previously served as judges in ordinary courts, were never assessed by the independent NCJ in terms of their independence and impartiality, and since they did not pass the judicial examination (unlike graduates of the judicial school), they were also not subject to a substantive assessment of their judicial skills. These individuals have therefore never been truly rooted in the judicial profession.

ⁱⁱ After the President's Supreme Court vacancy notice M.P. 2018 item 633 was published without the Prime Minister's countersignature, a recurring procedural argument emerged in many later cases: that judges appointed through competitions launched by that notice were selected in a process that started from a legally defective act. The claim was framed as an "origin defect"—i.e., if the vacancy notice itself should have required countersignature, then every downstream step (applications, NCJ recommendation, and the eventual presidential appointment) is built on a flawed foundation. In practice, this was used to challenge the legitimacy of panels including those appointees (especially in sensitive cases), to support motions for recusal/independence review, and to argue that judgments issued by such panels risk being treated as rendered by an improperly composed court.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Supreme Administrative Court (NSA) stayed enforcement of the National Council of the Judiciary's resolution of 28 August 2018 (No. 331/2018) in the challenged part. The applicant sought interim relief because the NCJ had not served him the resolution (and reasons), preventing an appeal, and he warned that—absent a stay—the President could appoint judges before judicial review ends, creating irreversible effects in the Supreme Court's composition. He also alleged defects including the lack of the Prime Minister's countersignature on the President's vacancy notice and the improper composition of the NCJ, arguing that only interim protection could prevent circumvention of the right to an independent court under Article 45(1) of the Constitution.

^{iv} Despite the general defectiveness of appointments to the Disciplinary Chamber and The Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs In its judgment of 11 October 2021, II GOK 9/18, the Supreme Administrative Court repealed the contested resolution of the National Council of the Judiciary of 28 August 2018 No. 331/2018 on the submission (non-submission) of a motion for appointment to the office of judge of the Supreme Court in the Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs Chamber.

^v Participation in the competition following the resolution of the joint chambers of 23 January 2020, which implemented the preliminary ruling of the CJEU of 19 November 2019 in joined cases C-585/18, C-624/18, C-625/18, has the status of a legal principle and which ruled that the National Council of the Judiciary, as constituted by the Act of 8 December 2017, is not independent, and that the Supreme Court judges appointed with its participation do not meet the criteria of independence and impartiality as a result of which judgments issued with their participation are subject to revocation. The resolution of the joint chambers of the Supreme Court on national grounds unequivocally ruled that the appointment of persons to the Supreme Court, in the assessment of which the improperly constituted National Council of the Judiciary participated, was qualifiedly defective, as a result of which the composition of the Supreme Court, in which such persons sit, does not constitute an independent and impartial court within the meaning of both Article 45 of the Polish Constitution and international law.