

TAIWAN CONSTITUTIONAL COURT

Schedule for the Oral Arguments from November 2023 to March 2024

Date	Case Name	Petitioner(s)	Case No.	Issue (Summarized)	Deadline for Amicus Curiae Applications and Expert Opinions
<p style="text-align: center;">November 27, 2023 (Morning)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Case on the Extended Confiscation of Criminal Proceeds</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">I-Hui CHI</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">111-Hsien-Min-4096</p>	<p>In a narcotics case, whether the applied Article 2, Paragraph 2 of the Criminal Code and Article 19, Paragraph 3 of the Narcotics Hazard Prevention Act are unconstitutional.</p>	<p>Amicus Curiae applications should be turned in by October 19, 2023. Once permitted, Amici Curiae shall turn in their expert opinions by November 19, 2023.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">December 19, 2023 (Morning)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Case on Life Sentence Prisoners Serving Remaining Sentence after Revocation of Parole</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Chao-Ho Hsieh</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">109-Hsien-Erh-333</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.</p>	<p>Amicus Curiae applications should be turned in by October 31, 2023. Once permitted, Amici Curiae shall turn in their expert opinions by November 30, 2023.</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">【1】 I-Ching CHEN (consolidated)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">109-Hsien-Erh-397</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version), Article 7-1, Paragraph 2 and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.</p>	

		<p>【2】 Supreme Court Criminal Panel No.3 (consolidated)</p>	<p>109-Hsien- San-26</p>	<p>The petition was filed by the Supreme Court Criminal Panel No.3, who was convinced that Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional when hearing the Supreme Court Case 109-Tai-Kang-778.</p>	
		<p>【3】 Ching-Ho LAI (consolidated)</p>	<p>109-Hsien- Erh-414</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【4】 Hsin-Sheng FU (consolidated)</p>	<p>109-Hsien- Erh-326</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version), Article 7-1, Paragraph 2 and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【5】 Ming-Hui LI (consolidated)</p>	<p>109-Hsien- Erh-336</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) and Article 7-2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【6】 Yu-Hua LI (consolidated)</p>	<p>109-Hsien- Erh-426</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version), Article 7-1, Paragraph 2 and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.</p>	

		<p>【7】 Kuo-Ching YANG (consolidated)</p>	<p>110-Hsien- Erh-18</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (1997 version) is unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【8】 Cheng-Yung YANG (consolidated)</p>	<p>110-Hsien- Erh-38</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【9】 Teng-Sheng WANG (consolidated)</p>	<p>108-Hsien- Erh-179</p>	<p>When motioning for an objection against serving the remaining sentence after revocation of parole, the petitioner argues whether the applied Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【10】 Chen-Hui HSIEH (consolidated)</p>	<p>110-Hsien- Erh-82</p>	<p>Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【11】 Ching-Pao CHEN</p>	<p>110-Hsien- Erh-173</p>	<p>(1) Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of</p>	

		(consolidated)		the Criminal Code are unconstitutional. (2) The petitioner of this case also motioned for a preliminary injunction.
		【12】 Yung-Chuan LIEN (consolidated)	110-Hsien-Erh-81	Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.
		【13】 Tsai-Pao HO (consolidated)	110-Hsien-Erh-185	(1) In a kidnapping and extortion case, the petitioner argues that Supreme Court Judgment 77-Tai-Shang-4688 (1988) is unconstitutional. (2) Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional. (The petitioner misquoted the article as “Article 79”.)
		【14】 Chun-Yu KUO (consolidated)	110-Hsien-Erh-234	Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.
		【15】 Chien-Yang TSAI (consolidated)	110-Hsien-Erh-282	Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.

		<p>【16】 Tse-Yuan CHEN (consolidated)</p>	110-Hsien- Erh-297	Whether Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.	
		<p>【17】 Chi-Fang YANG (consolidated)</p>	110-Hsien- Erh-179	Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.	
		<p>【18】 Wen-Cheng PENG (consolidated)</p>	110-Hsien- Erh-307	Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.	
		<p>【19】 Kuo-Chen WU (consolidated)</p>	109-Hsien- Erh-503	(1) Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version), Articles 7-1 and 7-2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional. (2) Petition to supplement the decision of J.Y. Interpretation No.796.	
		<p>【20】 Ming-Hsiung YU (consolidated)</p>	111-Hsien- Min-50	When motioning for an objection against serving the remaining sentence after revocation of parole, the petitioner argues whether the pertaining provisions of Article 79-1, Paragraph	

			5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.
		【21】 Ming-Tung KU (consolidated)	111-Hsien-Min-903466 Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.
		【22】 Chang-Feng TAN (consolidated)	111-Hsien-Min-1496 (1) In a narcotics case, the petitioner argues that the ruling of Supreme Court Criminal Order 111-Tai-Kang-120 is unconstitutional. (2) Whether the applied Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.
		【23】 Sung-Ming LI (consolidated)	111-Hsien-Min-903844 In a case concerning serving the remaining sentence after revocation of parole, whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (1997 version) is unconstitutional.
		【24】 Chin-Sheng LIN (consolidated)	112-Hsien-Min-900162 Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.

		【25】 San-Neng LI (consolidated)	112-Hsien- Min-159	Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.	
		【26】 Yao-Ching YANG (consolidated)	112-Hsien- Min-325	In a case concerning serving the remaining sentence after revocation of parole, whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.	
		【27】 Ming-Hui LI (consolidated)	112-Hsien- Min-900462	Whether the Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.	
		【28】 Tung-Peng CHEN (consolidated)	112-Hsien- Min-900496	Whether the applied Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (1997 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.	
		【29】 Ming-Hui LI (consolidated)	112-Hsien- Min-526	Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.	
		【30】 Kuo-Kuang LI (consolidated)	112-Hsien- Min-885	The petitioner, when motioning for objection against serving the remaining sentence of a robbery case after revocation of parole: (1) Argues that the ruling of Supreme Court	

				<p>Criminal Order 112-Tai-Kang-219 is unconstitutional.</p> <p>(2) Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (2005 version) is unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【31】 Ming-Chih CHANG (consolidated)</p>	112-Hsien-Min-900937	<p>(1) In a murder case, the petitioner argues that the ruling of Supreme Court Criminal Order 112-Tai-Kang-65 is unconstitutional.</p> <p>(2) Whether the applied Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (1997 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.</p>	
		<p>【32】 Pao-Ping LIU (consolidated)</p>	112-Hsien-Min-900946	Whether Article 79-1, Paragraph 5 of the Criminal Code (1997 version) and Article 7-2, Paragraph 2 of the Enforcement Law of the Criminal Code are unconstitutional.	
<p>December 25, 2023 (Morning)</p>	<p>Case on the Criminalization of Public Insult</p>	<p>Yu-Te CHU (The civil part of this case has been rendered into Taiwan</p>	<p>111-Hsien-Min-900243 (The original case number for</p>	<p>In a public insult case, whether the applied Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code is unconstitutional.</p>	<p>Amicus Curiae applications should be turned in by October 20, 2023. Once permitted, Amici Curiae shall turn in their expert opinions by December 11, 2023.</p>

		<p>Constitutional Court Judgment 111-Hsien-Pan-2.)</p>	<p>the civil part of this case is Hui-Tai-12668.)</p>		
		<p>【1】 Judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)</p>	<p>111-Hsien-Shen-900007</p>	<p>The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the defendants' freedom of speech, the principle of proportionality, the equality principle, and void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions) when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court Cases 105-Yi-1167, 105-Chien-1793, and 106-Chien-1139.</p>	
		<p>【2】 Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1 (consolidated)</p>	<p>110-Hsien-San-20</p>	<p>The petition was filed by Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1, who was convinced that Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code (public insult), unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), the principle of</p>	

				proportionality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 110-Chien-Shang-3.	
		【3】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)	107-Hsien- San-17	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.5, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), the principle of proportionality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 107-Chien-120.	
		【4】 Kuang-Yuan FENG (consolidated)	Hui-Tai- 13516	In a public insult case, whether the applied Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code violates the freedom of speech protected by Article 11 of the Constitution, and deviates from Articles 18.1, 19.1, and 19.2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.	
		【5】 Judge from	109-Hsien- San-10	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division	

		Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)		No.5, who was convinced that Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the defendant's freedom of speech, the principle of proportionality, the equality principle, and the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions) when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court case 107-Yi-1081.	
		【6】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1 (consolidated)	110-Hsien- San-19	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1, who was convinced that Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), and right to equality when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 110-Hua-Chien-79.	
		【7】 Taiwan High Court Criminal Division No.2	110-Hsien- San-24	(1) The petition was filed by the Taiwan High Court Criminal Division No.2, who was convinced that Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code unconstitutionally	

		(consolidated)		<p>violates the principle of proportionality and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan High Court Cases 108-Shang-Yi-770 and 109-Shang-Yi-552.</p> <p>(2) Whether J.Y. Interpretation No.509 should be supplemented or altered.</p>	
		<p>【8】 Chia-Hung HSIAO (consolidated)</p>	110-Hsien-Erh-186	In a public insult case, whether the applied Article 309, Paragraph 2 of the Criminal Code violates the freedom of speech and the principle of proportionality.	
		<p>【9】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1 (consolidated)</p>	110-Hsien-San-17	<p>The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 110-Hua-Chien-99.</p>	
		<p>【10】 Ai-Yu WANG</p>	110-Hsien-Erh-34	In a public insult case, whether the applied Article 309 of the Criminal Code violates	

		(consolidated)		Articles 11 and 23 of the Constitution, and contradicts the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions) under J.Y. Interpretations Nos. 545 and 636.	
		【11】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)	107-Hsien- San-16	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.5, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), freedom of speech, and the principle of proportionality when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 107-Hua-Chien-87.	
		【12】 Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3 (consolidated)	110-Hsien- San-15	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3, who was convinced that Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), the principle of	

				proportionality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 109-Yuan-Su-103.	
		<p>【13】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3 (consolidated)</p>	111-Hsien-Shen-1	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult), violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 110-Hua-Chien-271.	
		<p>【14】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1 (consolidated)</p>	109-Hsien-San-36	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 109-Yi-223.	

		<p>【15】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1 (consolidated)</p>	<p>110-Hsien- San-9</p>	<p>The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult), violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 110-Yuan-Yi-23.</p>	
		<p>【16】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1 (consolidated)</p>	<p>110-Hsien- San-16</p>	<p>The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 110-Yuan-Yi-76.</p>	
		<p>【17】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien</p>	<p>110-Hsien- San-18</p>	<p>The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.1, who was convinced that Article 309 of the</p>	

		District Court Criminal Division No.1 (consolidated)		Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for- vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 110-Hua- Chien-152.	
		【18】 Ta-Chun CHANG (consolidated)	Hui-Tai- 12970	In a public insult case, whether the applied Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code is unconstitutional.	
		【19】 Judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.1 (consolidated)	110-Hsien- San-11	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.1, who was convinced that Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the defendants' freedom of speech, the principle of proportionality, the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), and the equality principle when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court Cases 109-Chien-2018 and 110-Yi-140.	

		<p>【20】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3 (consolidated)</p>	<p>111-Hsien- Shen-6</p>	<p>The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3, who was convinced that Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code (public insult), violates void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, right to liberty and security of person (personal freedom), freedom of speech, right to property, and principle of proportionality when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 110-Hua-Chien-248.</p>	
		<p>【21】 Kun-Ting HUANG (consolidated)</p>	<p>111-Hsien- Min-900423</p>	<p>In a public insult case, whether the applied Article 309 of the Criminal Code violates the freedom of right, the principle of proportionality, and the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions).</p>	
		<p>【22】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal</p>	<p>111-Hsien- Shen-13</p>	<p>The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-</p>	

		Division No.3 (consolidated)		vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, and freedom of speech when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 109-Yi-297.	
		【23】 Judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3 (consolidated)	111-Hsien- Shen-17	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Hualien District Court Criminal Division No.3, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), right to equality, right to liberty and security of person (personal freedom), freedom of speech, right to property, and principle of proportionality when hearing the Taiwan Hualien District Court Case 111-Hua-Chien-194.	
		【24】 Hsiu-Hui HSIEH (consolidated)	111-Hsien- Min-903805	Whether Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code violates Articles 7, 8, 11, 15, and 22 of the Constitution.	
		【25】	111-Hsien-	Whether Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the	

		Hsiao-Ping LI (consolidated)	Min-3733	Criminal Code violates Articles 7, 8, 11, and 22 of the Constitution.	
		【26】 Chu-Hsing CHIANG (consolidated)	111-Hsien- Min-903908	In a public insult case, whether the applied Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code violates freedom of speech, the principle of proportionality, and the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions).	
		【27】 Judge from Taiwan Pingtung District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)	111-Hsien- Shen-21	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Pingtung District Court Criminal Division No.5, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) unconstitutionally violates the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), principle of equality, right to liberty and security of person (personal freedom), freedom of speech, right to property, and the principle of proportionality when hearing the Taiwan Pingtung District Court Case 111-Yi-575.	
		【28】 Shui-Tou TSAI	111-Hsien- Min-4145	(1) In a public insult case, the petitioner argues that Taoyuan District Court Criminal	

		(consolidated)		Judgment 110-Chien-Shang-505 is unconstitutional. (2) Whether the applied Article 309, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code is unconstitutional.	
		【29】 Judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.3 (consolidated)	112-Hsien-Shen-1	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.3, who was convinced that Article 309 of the Criminal Code (public insult) is unconstitutional when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court Case 111-Yi-477.	
		【30】 Ke-Chin WU (consolidated)	112-Hsien-Min-535	(1) In a public insult case, whether the Taiwan High Court Criminal Judgment 111-Shang-Yi-1671 is unconstitutional. (2) Whether the applied Article 309 of the Criminal Code is unconstitutional.	
December 26, 2023 (Morning)	Case on the Criminalization of Insulting a Public Official	Judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal	Hui-Tai-13556	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5, who was convinced that Article 140, Paragraph 1, First Sentence of the Criminal Code (insulting a public official)	Amicus Curiae applications should be turned in by October 20, 2023. Once permitted, Amici Curiae shall turn in their expert opinions by December 11, 2023.

		Division No.5 (consolidated)		unconstitutionally violates the defendants' freedom of speech, the principle of proportionality, void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), and the principle of equality when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court Cases 105-Yi-1167, 105-Chien-1793, and 106-Chien-1139.	
		【1】 Judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)	108-Hsien- San-49	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5, who was convinced that Article 140, Paragraph 1, First Sentence of the Criminal Code (insulting a public official) unconstitutionally violates the defendants' freedom of speech, the principle of proportionality, void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), and the principle of equality when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court Case 108-Chien-1695.	
		【2】 Judge from	108-Hsien- San-8	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division	

		Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)		No.5, who was convinced that Article 140, Paragraph 1, First Sentence of the Criminal Code (insulting a public official) unconstitutionally violates the principle of proportionality, void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), and the principle of equality when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court Cases 107-Chien-802 and 107-Chien-1001.	
		【3】 Judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)	109-Hsien- San-14	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5, who was convinced that Article 140, Paragraph 1, First Sentence of the Criminal Code (insulting a public official) unconstitutionally violates the defendants' freedom of speech, the principle of proportionality, void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), and the principle of equality when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court Case 108-Chien-2134.	
		【4】	111-Hsien-	The petition was filed by a judge from Taiwan	

		Judge from Taiwan Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5 (consolidated)	Shen- 900010	Changhua District Court Criminal Division No.5, who was convinced that Article 140, Paragraph 1, First Sentence of the Criminal Code (insulting a public official) unconstitutionally violates the principle of proportionality, void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), and the principle of equality when hearing the Taiwan Changhua District Court Cases 109-Chien-2018, 109-Chien-2124, and 110-Chien-420.	
		【5】 Fu-Ming TSAI (consolidated)	111-Hsien- Min-1291	Whether Article 140 of the Criminal Code (insulting a public official) violates the freedom of speech, principle of proportionality, void-for- vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), the principle of punishment fitting to the crime, and the principle of equality.	
		【6】 Yi-Tse CHEN (consolidated)	111-Hsien- Min-1505	Whether Article 140, Paragraph 1, First Sentence of the Criminal Code (insulting a public official) violates the freedom of speech, principle of proportionality, the void-for-	

				vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), the principle of punishment fitting to the crime, and the principle of equality.	
		【7】 Hui-Ju YANG (consolidated)	111-Hsien-Min-3542	Whether Article 140 of the Criminal Code violates the principle of equality, freedom of speech, the principle of proportionality, the void-for-vagueness doctrine (principle of clarity and precision of legal provisions), and the principle of punishment fitting to the crime.	
		【8】 Hsiu-Hui HSIEH (consolidated)	111-Hsien-Min-3646	Whether Article 140, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code violates Articles 7, 8, 11, 15, and 22 of the Constitution.	
January 16, 2024 (Morning)	Case on the Constitutionality of Height Requirements for General Police Officers Entrance Exam	Yun-Hsuan CHEN (consolidated)	111-Hsien-Min-3005	In a case concerning the height requirements for the police entrance exam, whether the applied Article 7, Paragraph 2 and Article 8, Paragraph 1 of the Civil Service Special Examination Regulation for General Police Officers violate the right of holding public offices guaranteed by Article 18 of the Constitution.	Amicus Curiae applications should be turned in by October 31, 2023. Once permitted, Amici Curiae shall turn in their expert opinions by January 2, 2024.

<p>March 12, 2024 (Morning)</p>	<p>Case on Including Previous Job Tenure in Salary Assessment for Elementary/Junior High School Substitute Teachers</p>	<p>Kai-Hsiang CHANG (consolidated)</p>	<p>108-Hsien- Erh-214</p>	<p>In a case concerning salary assessment of substitute teacher, whether the applied Article 35, Paragraph 2 of the Teachers' Act (2000 version) and Ministry of Education Letter Tai(87)-Jen(Yi)-87129048 of November 30, 1998 are in violation of Articles 15 and 23 of the Constitution and the J.Y. Interpretation No. 707.</p>	<p>Amicus Curiae applications should be turned in by October 31, 2023. Once permitted, Amici Curiae shall turn in their expert opinions by January 12, 2024.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------	---	--

Notes:

1. Cases scheduled for Oral Argument from November 2023 to March 2024 in the Taiwan Constitutional Court are as shown on this chart. For the reason that cases that require oral argument may increase, this chart is subject to change.
2. Documents of each cases are open to the public. Please refer to the TCC's website at [here](#) (this feature is only available in Traditional Chinese). Outline of Issues and the Notice on Court Audience of each cases shall be announced separately.
3. This translated schedule is prepared by the Department of Clerks for the Constitutional Court (Judicial Yuan) for information only and does not bind the Court. In case of any conflict of meaning between the Traditional Chinese version and the English version, the Traditional Chinese version shall prevail.