

Legal Regulation Experience of Individual Countries of The European Region Regarding Implementation of International Standards for Ensuring Criminological and Criminal-Legal Protection of Justice*

Yuliia Khrystova,¹ Serhiy Miroshnychenko,² Iryna Kurbatova,³
Oleksiy Titarenko,⁴ Maksym Maksimentsev⁵

¹ Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

² National University "Odesa Law Academy", Ukraine

³ Kyiv City Prosecutor's Office, Ukraine ⁴ University of Customs and Finance, Ukraine ⁵ Legal Bureau "ALMEGA", Ukraine



[10.15408/jch.v12i2.41093](https://doi.org/10.15408/jch.v12i2.41093)

Abstract.

The article describes the experience of Germany and Austria in implementing international standards for ensuring criminological and criminal-legal protection of justice. A set of general scientific and specific scientific research methods were used in the preparation of this article to define special subjects authorised to carry out such criminological activities, peculiarities of their interaction with the police and other law enforcement agencies, to reveal the content of legislative mandates regarding organisation and functioning of the Court Security Services and their counterparts, as well as that of the legislation on criminal liability for criminal offences against justice. The purpose of this work is to determine promising directions for increasing the efficiency of implementing criminological and criminal-legal protection of justice by authorised subjects in Ukraine, which has become especially important in the sphere of ensuring national security under martial law, taking into account positive experience of such European region countries as Germany and Austria regarding implementation of international standards recognised by the international community in this area. Based on the results of the research, prospective directions for improving the activity of the Court Security Service of Ukraine, its interaction with the National Police and other subjects of the state sector and non-state sector in the provision of criminological protection of justice, as well as the legislation of Ukraine on criminal liability for criminal offences against justice, taking into account experience of Germany and Austria regarding implementation of standards recognised by the international community in this area.

Key words: Criminological Protection of Justice; Court Security; Court Security Service; National Police of Ukraine; Criminal Offences Against Justice.

* Received: April 15, 2024; revised: April 28, 2024; accepted: August 12, 2024; published August 30, 2024.

1 **Yuliia Khrystova**, a doctoral student at the Department of Criminal Law and Criminology of Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine; PhD in Law, Associate Professor, Police Lieutenant Colonel. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5175-9242> Email: khrystova.3108@gmail.com

2. **Serhiy Miroshnychenko**, Professor, Doctor of Law, Professor of the Department of Criminal Law, Process and Forensics, Kyiv Institute of Intellectual Property and Law of the National University "Odesa Law Academy". Ukraine. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4215-1603> Email: sermir1708@gmail.com

3 **Iryna Kurbatova**, Doctor of Law. Prosecutor of the Department of Kyiv City Prosecutor's Office, Ukraine, ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6636-2408> Email: kurbatova.iryana@gmail.com

4 **Oleksiy Titarenko**, Associate professor, Doctor of Science in Law, Professor at the Department of Law enforcement activity and Criminal Law Disciplines, University of Customs and Finance, Ukraine ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3271-9402> Email: titarenkoaleksey1978@gmail.com

5 **Maksym Maksimentsev**, Doctor of Law, Deputy Director, Legal Bureau "ALMEGA". Ukraine. ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1173-9113> Email: maksiments@yahoo.com

**Corresponding author: khrystova.3108@gmail.com

A. INTRODUCTION

Security management in justice remains an unchanged priority for many countries worldwide. It is also an important topic of international forums (Report of the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice 2021) to ensure the independence of judicial bodies. ([The main principles of independence of judicial bodies, 1985](#))

It is important that two significant groups of priority tasks have coincided for Ukraine at the moment: the first one is related to the state's course towards European and Euro-Atlantic integration, which brought the urgent need for judicial reform to the agenda (Strategy for development of the justice system and constitutional judiciary for 2021–2023; On speeding up judicial reform and overcoming manifestations of corruption in the justice system in 2023); the second one relates to ensuring the protection of justice in the special conditions of martial law and the de-occupation of the territories of Ukraine, which places an additional burden on the newly created Judicial Security Service and other entities authorised to perform this criminological function and requires effective and coordinated measures to be applied. The above points determine the relevance of the scientific and theoretical understanding of the experience acquired by the European region countries in ensuring the protection of justice for further determination of promising directions in increasing the efficiency of implementing the criminological function of protection of justice by authorised subjects in Ukraine which has become especially important in the sphere of ensuring national security in conditions of martial law, respectively to the standards recognised by the progressive international community in this area.

First, there is no unified international document on the security of justice. However, specific standards for ensuring the security of justice were reflected in international documents (which differ in their legal force and scope) dedicated to the standards of independence of the judiciary and judges. In particular, they were reflected in paragraphs 2.11 of the Basic principles of independence of judicial bodies, approved by resolutions 40/32 and 40/146 of the UN General Assembly (1985) as “the prohibition of undue influence, inducements, pressure, threats or interference in the activities of judicial bodies during decision of cases transferred to them from any side and for any reason”, “guarantees of the security of judicial bodies” (The main principles of independence of judicial bodies 1985), in point 5 of the Recommendations on the practical implementation of the Basic Principles on the independence of judicial bodies, adopted by the UN Economic and Social Council resolution

1989/60 and approved by the UN General Assembly resolution (1989) as “provision by the state of the resources necessary to provide judges with a decent level of personal security” (Recommendations on the practical implementation of the Basic Principles regarding independence of judicial bodies 1989); in Article 8 of the Universal Charter of the Judge, adopted by the Central Council of the International Association of Judges (1999) as “Security of office.” ([The Universal Charter of Judges, 1999](#))

Taking into account the fact that the specified international documents were the subject of our consideration in the previous publication, without resorting to a re-analysis of their content, as well as of the different points of view of scientists on this issue and the justification of their own position, we note that the main unique international principles of ensuring security of justice should include the following: a) ensuring personal safety of judges; b) ensuring various levels of security in the buildings (premises/territories) of courts (depending on the type of cases considered), as well as ensuring zonal security measures; c) provision by the state of adequate resource support for measures related to ensuring a decent level of personal security for judges; d) prohibition of undue influence on judges, inducements, pressure, threats or interference in the activities of judicial bodies during the resolution of cases assigned to them; e) ensuring safety of judges’ private life and confidentiality; f) ensuring security and protection of data systems and organizational systems, including electronic justice. ([Khrystova, 2023: 239](#))

In Ukraine, in 2019, a new state body was created in the justice system, accountable to the Supreme Council of Justice and controlled by the State Judicial Administration of Ukraine – the Court Security Service (On the judiciary and the status of judges in 2016); this body was created for the provision of personal security of judges, members of their families and court employees, for protection and maintenance of public order in courts, as well as for ensuring safety of participants in court processes. However, if necessary, during the performance of tasks and functions entrusted to the specified unique entity, other such entities (law enforcement subjects) may be additionally involved; in particular, these are such entities as the National Police of Ukraine, the National Guard of Ukraine, the State Emergency Service of Ukraine, the Security Service of Ukraine; and the procedure of interaction with these entities is regulated by a joint order (On the approval of the Procedure for interaction of the Court Security Service with the National Police of Ukraine, the National Guard of Ukraine, the State Emergency Service of Ukraine, the Security Service of Ukraine during performance of tasks and functions by the Court Security Service 2020).

The presented analysis of the experience of individual countries of the European region in this area was carried out based on the author's understanding of the provision of criminological protection of justice as an activity for the formation of an effective system of countering criminogenic influences and criminal offences against justice in order for ensuring its independence and for practical affirmation of the rule of law principle during judicial proceedings, in particular, regarding granting of the following powers to the subject (entity) determined for ensuring the security of justice: to stop and prevent offences and crimes, to perform an interaction with other subjects and entities in the system of combating criminal offences against justice; perform early detection and countermeasures against possible threats ([Khrystova, 2022 p. 192](#)), based on studying relevant international documents, foreign and Ukrainian legislation.

B. METHODS

The research is based on the groundwork of foreign and Ukrainian researchers on methodological approaches to ensuring criminological security and criminal-legal protection of justice, as well as an analysis of the competence of the Court Security Services and their counterparts regarding the effectiveness of the assigned tasks. In this article, we will consider the experience of implementing international standards for the provision of criminological and criminal-legal protection of justice in countries in the European region, such as Germany and Austria.

The methodological basis of this work is presented as a set of general scientific and unique scientific methods of cognition. In particular, with the help of the dialectical method, the subjects authorised to ensure security of justice in various countries of the European region, as well as peculiarities of their interaction with the police and other law enforcement agencies, were determined; the use of the unique legal method of cognition made it possible to reveal the content of legislative mandates regarding organisation and functioning of the Court Security Services and their counterparts, and thanks to the method of comparative jurisprudence, their similarities and differences were revealed. German and Austrian legislation on criminal liability for criminal offences against justice was also researched using the comparative legal method.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

First of all, it should be noted that in the European region countries, the need to intensify cooperation between police forces and Security staff in courts is constantly being updated. In particular, in 2023 alone, several incidents related to security occurred in German courts. For example, due to two cases of escape of defendants from the courthouse in Bavaria, the Minister of Justice ordered a comprehensive security review of all courts and emphasised the need to review operational concepts of security in cooperation with the police ([Friz, 2023](#)). In the same year, during the announcement of the sentence at the Ludenscheid District Court, the defendant jumped over the barrier to the judge's desk and attacked the judge, knocking him to the ground, biting his hand and trying to hit him. ([Tylchyk, et al., 2022](#))

Police officers stopped this attack and were present in the courtroom as witnesses in the case under consideration. ([Krumm, 2023](#)) A similar high-profile extraordinary incident happened in Ukraine this year. In particular, in the Shevchenkivskyi District Court of Kyiv, the accused attempted to escape from custody in the court premises with the help of an explosive device. As a result of the explosion, he died on the spot, and two law enforcement officers were injured (About the extraordinary event that occurred on 05 July 2023 in the Shevchenkivsky District Court of Kyiv and regarding the duration of the trial). At the same time, it should be emphasised that it was possible to prevent human casualties among the meeting participants, judges, staff members, and court visitors thanks to the coordinated actions of representatives of the National Police, special-purpose divisions, and the Court Security Service. ([Salnikov, 2023](#))

Moving on to the analysis of the experience acquired by the countries of the European region regarding implementing standards of ensuring the security of justice recognised by the international community, it should be noted that in most of these countries, execution of this criminological function is entrusted to unique entities—court Security Services and their counterparts, each of which has its organisational and functional features. ([Kobrusieva et al., 2021](#))

Thus, in Germany, the Judicial Sergeant Service carries out the task of maintaining security and order in court buildings, including the corresponding enclosed outdoor areas. In addition, employees under a collective agreement (for example, in the courts and prosecutors' offices of the state of Brandenburg (Chapter XI of the Service Regulations for Sergeant Service 2011) and employees of the general judicial service can be involved in the performance of

security tasks and equated to the court security services, (e.g. under the content of paragraph 28 “Powers concerning prisoners and detainees” and paragraph 29 “Application of direct coercion” of the Justice Act in the state of Berlin. ([Justice Act in the state of Berlin, 2021](#)))

Organisation and functioning of the above-mentioned service are regulated at the level of the law of the respective federal state (by the Act on the Powers of the Sergeant Service, adopted by the Parliament of the state of Brandenburg 2019) and/or by a decree, issued by the minister of justice of the respective state (for example, Service Regulations for the Sergeant’s Service 2011), taking into account the requirements of the Constitution of the federal state on the protection of personal rights and data protection, as well as by relevant provisions of federal legislation, for example, the Law Regulating the Status of Civil Servants in the Federal States. ([The Law Regulating the Status of Civil Servants in the Federal States, 2008](#))

For comparison, in Ukraine, in the absence of the law “On the Court Security Service”, the legal status of this service is regulated by separate provisions of such normative legal acts as the Law of Ukraine “On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges” (Chapter 4 “Court Security Service” of Section XI “Organizational Support to the Activities of Courts”) (On the Judiciary and the Status of Judges, 2016); Regulation “On the Court Security Service”, approved by the Decision of the Supreme Council of Justice (Regulation on the Court Security Service, 2019); as well as the Laws of Ukraine “On the National Police” (in terms of the use of coercive police measures, etc.), “On security activities”, “On civil service”, “On trade unions, their rights and guarantees of activity”, and “On prevention of corruption.” ([Horbalinskiy, et al., 2023](#))

According to the results of the analysis of the legal support of the organisation and functioning of unique entities authorised to carry out criminological activities to ensure security of justice carried out within the scope of this research, it is necessary to note the positive experience of Germany regarding the regulation at the legislative level of the legal status of the Security staff of the Judicial Sergeant Service and the general judicial service, in terms of their performance of security tasks as law enforcement officers, as well as the determination of their powers at the legislative level (for example, in Section 5 “Security and Order” of the Law on Justice in the state of Berlin ([Justice Act in the state of Berlin 2021](#)); subparagraph 1.1. (b) Paragraph 1 “Tasks” of the Service regulations on the service of a sergeant of the Ministry of Justice of the state of Rhineland-Palatinate (Service regulations on the service of a sergeant of the Ministry of Justice of the state of Rhineland-Palatinate 2021) etc.

For example, in Ukraine, the issue of the legal status of Court Security Service staff members remains without a proper solution, which has been repeatedly emphasised by scientists who have devoted their work to the research of this issue ([Titarenko, 2021](#)), as well as by the leadership of the Service, with proposals made to include it in the list of law enforcement agencies provided for in Part 1 of Article 2 of the Law of Ukraine “On State Protection of Court Employees and Law Enforcement Agencies”, supplementing it in the prescribed manner with the text of the appropriate content. ([Matviichuk et al., 2022](#))

The legal regulation concerning the obligation of leaders to conduct quarterly meetings with all service employees deserves special attention. This practice, outlined in Chapter IX, titled "Service Meetings" of the Service Regulations for Sergeant Service of the state of Brandenburg, provides a structured framework for ensuring consistency and efficiency in implementing regulations. During these quarterly meetings, leaders must discuss the current regulations governing the sergeant's service, providing an opportunity to clarify their provisions and address any uncertainties. Furthermore, these meetings involve analysing the practical application of these regulations, allowing for the identification of challenges and sharing of best practices. This approach not only enhances the effectiveness of the regulations but also fosters a collaborative learning environment, enabling employees to deepen their understanding of the rules and responsibilities associated with their roles. By institutionalising these service meetings, Brandenburg ensures that sergeants remain well-informed, competent, and aligned with the broader objectives of the service. This practice is an excellent example of how regular engagement and dialogue can strengthen employees' professional capabilities while ensuring compliance with legal and procedural standards. ([Service Regulations for Sergeant Service, 2011](#))

The Berlin Senate's experience developing and presenting the framework concept of security for courts and law enforcement agencies in 2018 should be taken as a positive point ([Zadyraka et al., 2023](#)). (Framework concept of security for courts and law enforcement agencies in Berlin 2018); this concept developed with the involvement of both representatives from the specified spheres of activity and independent experts allows to make fundamental, innovative decisions to solve important issues for ensuring the security of Justice (The response of the Berlin Senate to the written request of MP Mike Penn 2019). In particular, it is noteworthy that the stated security concept is based on the design characteristics of court buildings (for example, the size and risks associated with their use), proposed are minimum safety standards for the

construction of court buildings and government bodies, as well as for the entrance control, alarm systems, emergency action plans, court sergeant's service, etc. Implementing this Concept is monitored by a steering committee for judicial security issues, which updates it and responds to changes in the security situation in the Berlin justice system. ([The Berlin Senate's response to the written request of MP Mike Penn, 2019](#))

In Austria, specific entities are authorised to conduct security checks in court buildings to ensure the safety of judicial facilities. These responsibilities are carried out by designated control bodies, which include court employees and security personnel. Court employees tasked with these duties are appointed directly by the court building administrator. Additionally, security companies are involved in performing these security inspections, having been entrusted with the responsibility of the heads of higher regional courts. These companies operate under a contractual agreement reviewed and approved by the Federal Minister of Justice. The collaborative efforts between court-appointed employees and contracted security personnel create a structured system for maintaining security and vigilance in court premises. This dual approach ensures that internal and external experts contribute to the security process, safeguarding judicial buildings and the individuals working within them against potential threats or disruptions. ([§§ 3, 9 Court Organization Act, 1896](#))

It is worth noting that the first subsection of the first section of the Austrian Court Organization Act is dedicated to security in court buildings and external court proceedings, thereby emphasising its importance for the organisation of the administration of justice. Also worthy of attention is the regulation at the legislative level of the specifics of documenting and registering attacks and serious threats against justice and prosecutor's offices, as well as other employees working in the judicial system and participants in court proceedings, as well as any other form of violent confrontation, damage to property in a court or prosecutor's office and the adjacent territories ([§ 15 Court Organization Act 1896](#)). It also states that the Federal Minister of Justice should regulate more detailed requirements for security standards in court buildings in security instructions. ([Leheza et al., 2022](#))

Speaking about the criminal-legal protection of justice, it should be noted that the German Criminal Code does not have a separate section dedicated to such norms. They are scattered in different sections of its Special Part. Thus, the norms on criminal liability for acts that interfere with justice are contained in the following sections: the seventh one, "Offences against public

order”, the ninth one, “False unsworn testimony and perjury”, the tenth one “Casting false suspicion”, the twenty-first one “Aiding after the fact and handling stolen goods” and the thirtieth one “Offenses committed in public office” ([Law of Germany, 1998](#)). For comparison, the Special Part of the Criminal Code of Ukraine has a separate chapter, XVIII, “Criminal offences against justice.” ([Law of Ukraine, 2001](#))

Regarding the differentiation of criminal responsibility both for criminal offences against justice and for corruption criminal offences committed by a special subject - judges, the norms of section 332, “Taking bribes” of the Special Part of the German Criminal Code is worth noting; according to the second part of this section judges are subject to more severe punishment in the form of imprisonment for a term of one to ten years. ([Law of Germany, 1998](#))

In turn, judges are criminally liable for violating the law to the benefit or detriment of the parties during the conduct or resolution of a legal case. Section 339, “Judicial perversion of justice,” of the thirtieth Chapter, “Offenses committed in public office,” of the Special Part of the German Criminal Code provides this. Punishment is prescribed as deprivation of liberty for one to five years for the commission of a mentioned act. ([Law of Germany, 1998](#))

For comparison, in Ukraine, Article 375, “Provision by a judge (judges) of a knowingly unjust sentence, decision, ruling or resolution” of the Special Part of the Criminal Code, which determines responsibility for taking such actions for selfish motives and other personal interests, is excluded ([Law of Ukraine, 2001](#)), since the Constitutional Court of Ukraine recognised it as inconsistent with the Constitution of Ukraine (it is unconstitutional), creating risks and opportunities to influence judges due to the vagueness and ambiguity of the disposition (Decision of the Constitutional Court 2020). Thus, today in Ukraine, the issue of criminal liability of a judge for a notoriously unjust decision has remained without proper legislative regulation. Currently, the agenda of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine includes four draft laws (No. 3500; No. 3500-1; No. 3500-2; No. 3500-3) on making relevant changes to the Criminal Code (On the agenda of the tenth session of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine of the ninth convocation 2023).

In the Criminal Code of Austria, in contrast to the criminal legislation of Germany, the rules on responsibility for criminal offences against justice are allocated to a separate (twenty-first) section, “Criminal acts against justice” ([Law of Austria, 1974](#)). When it comes to the experience of Austria regarding the criminal-legal protection of justice, a positive point, in our opinion, consists in the establishment of the responsibility (in § 301 of the Criminal Code) for

prohibited publication of a message about the content of a court hearing, which was closed to the public, about the discussion of court proceedings in a printed edition, on the radio or in another way accessible to the general public. ([Law of Austria, 1974](#))

D. CONCLUSIONS

According to the results of analysing the experience of individual countries of the European region (Germany and Austria) regarding the implementation of international standards for ensuring criminological and criminal-legal protection of justice, the following can be stated that in the mentioned countries, the execution of this criminological function is entrusted to specially authorised services in the Ministry of Justice's system. In particular, in Germany it is the Judicial Sergeant Service “Justizwachtmeisterdienstes”, which can involve both court sergeants and security staff equivalent to them under a collective agreement (*vergleichbare tariflich Beschäftigte*), as well as employees of the general judicial service (“*allgemeinen Justizdienstes*”), and in Austria, these are the control bodies “Kontrollorgane”, represented by both court employees and employees of security companies.

In Germany, a separate law is dedicated to legal regulation of the status of these services and their employees. A framework concept of security for courts and law enforcement agencies has been implemented. In Austria, the powers and tasks of control bodies and security measures in court buildings and external court proceedings are defined in the Court Organization Act. In contrast to the criminal legislation of Austria, the Criminal Code of Germany does not have a separate section dedicated to criminal acts against justice. Norms on responsibility for such acts are scattered in different sections of its Special Part.

In general, a comparative analysis of the criminal legislation of Germany, Austria, and Ukraine demonstrated that different types and sizes of punishments were established for certain similar criminal offences against justice due to the state policy of these countries regarding the criminal-legal protection of justice. In order to improve the activity of the Court Security Service of Ukraine, taking into account the standards of ensuring the security of justice recognised by the international community, we consider that it would be prospective to introduce the following points of foreign experience to the national legislation:

Development (in cooperation with subjects and independent experts involved in the implementation of the criminological function of ensuring security of justice) and implementation of the Concept of ensuring security and countering criminal offences against justice in Ukraine. This concept should presuppose the determination of minimum security standards for the construction of court buildings, ensuring their various levels of security, including alarm systems, security systems, data protection systems and organisational systems, including electronic justice, as well as zonal security measures, emergency action plans, standards for training and advanced training of employees of the Court Security Service, their interaction with employees of the National Police, the National Guard, the State Emergency Service of Ukraine, the Security Service of Ukraine. In addition, in order to monitor changes in the security situation and promptly respond to such changes (at the local, regional, and national levels), it is advisable to create a separate subcommittee on justice and security of judicial activities within the structure of the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Legal Policy and Justice considering issues of the judicial system;

Regulation at the legislative level of the status of the Court Security Service and its employees as one of the bodies with law enforcement functions and the classification of its staff as employees of a law enforcement agency; Preservation of the monopoly on issues of ensuring criminological security of justice by a unique entity - the Court Security Service, but with the possibility for other entities of the state and non-state sectors to be involved in this activity. To improve the criminal-legal provision of the security of justice within the existing new judicial reform, which lasts from 2021 to 2023, it should be considered appropriate to provide for the appropriate differentiation of criminal liability in the current Criminal Code of Ukraine both for criminal offences against justice and for corruption criminal offences committed by a special subject—judges.

REFERENCES:

About the extraordinary event that occurred on 05 July 2023 in the Shevchenkivsky district court of Kyiv and regarding the duration of the trial. The Shevchenkivskyi District Court of Kyiv: website. URL: <https://sh.ki.court.gov.ua/sud2610/pres-centr/news/1447651/>.

Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Act on the powers of the sergeant service. 2019. URL: <https://bravors.brandenburg.de/gesetze/jwmbg>. Consultation date:

28/09/2023

Court organization act. 1896. URL: <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10000009> Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Horbalskiy, Volodymyr. Leshchenko, Oleksandr. Mashchenko, olha. Leheza, yevhen. Prymakov, kamil. 2023. Ways to protect the rights of individuals in administrative proceedings: legal regulation and international experience international experience: vías de protección de los derechos de las personas en los procesos administrativos: regulación jurídica y experiencia internacional. *Cuestiones políticas*, 41(77), 324-334 doi: <https://doi.org/10.46398/cuestpol.4177.22>

Decision of the constitutional court. 2020. The decision of the constitutional court no. 7-p/2020 dated 11/06/2020 in the case is based on the constitutional submission of 55 people's deputies of Ukraine regarding the conformity of article 375 of the criminal code of Ukraine with the constitution of Ukraine (constitutionality). Url: consultation date: 28/09/2023

Framework concept of security for courts and law enforcement agencies in Berlin. 2018. Url: <https://www.parlament-berlin.de/adosservice/18/haupt/vorgang/h18-1315.a-v.pdf> Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Friz armin, rössert magdalena (2023) nach flucht aus gericht: justizminister fordert mehr sicherheit. Der br24 newsletter. Url: <https://www.br.de/nachrichten/bayern/nach-flucht-aus-gericht-justizminister-fordert-mehr-sicherheit,twq0prs>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Justice act in the state of Berlin. 2021 url: <https://gesetze.berlin.de/bsbe/document/jlr-justizgebep26/part/x>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Khrystova, yuliia. 2023. International standards for ensuring security of justice. Scientific bulletin of the dnipro petrovsk state university of internal affairs. 2023. No 2. P. 234–243. Doi: 10.31733/2078-3566-2023-2-234-243

Khrystova, yuliia. 2022. Foreign Experience of Criminological Protection of Justice. Scientific Bulletin of Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs. 2022. Special Issue № 1. P. 190–197. DOI 10.31733/2078-3566-2022-5-190-197

- Kobrusieva, Yevheniia. Leheza, Yevhen. Rudoi, Kateryna. Shamara, Oleksandr. Chalavan, Viktor. 2021. International standards of social protection of internally displaced persons: administrative and criminal aspects. *Jurnal cita hukum indonesian law journal*. Vol 9, No 3, 461-484. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15408/jch.v9i3.23752>
- Krumm, Thomas. 2023. Im Gerichtssaal in Lüdenscheid: Angeklagter beißt Richter und Polizisten in die Hand. URL: <https://www.come-on.de/luedenscheid/angriff-amtsgericht-luedenscheid-amtsrichter-angegriffen-und-verletzt-92422866.html>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- Law of Austria. 1974. Criminal Code of Austria. URL: <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10002296>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- Law of Germany. 1998. Criminal Code of Germany. URL: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_stgb/englisch_stgb.html. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- Law of Ukraine. 2001 Criminal Code of Ukraine URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2341-14#Text>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- Leheza, Yevhen. Pisotska, Karina. Dubenko, Oleksandr. Dakhno, Oleksandr. Sotskyi, ARTUR 2022. The Essence of the Principles of Ukrainian Law in Modern Jurisprudence. *Revista Jurídica Portucalense*, December, 342-363. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.34625/issn.2183-2705\(32\)2022.ic-15](https://doi.org/10.34625/issn.2183-2705(32)2022.ic-15)
- Matviichuk, Anatolii. Shcherbak, Viktor. Sirko, Viktoria. Malieieva, Hanna. Leheza, Yevhen. 2022. Human principles of law as a universal normative framework: Principios humanos del derecho como marco normativo universal. *Cuestiones Políticas*, 40(75), 221-231. <https://doi.org/10.46398/cuestpol.4075.14>
- On Accelerating Judicial Reform and Overcoming Corruption In The Justice System. 2023. Decision of the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine dated 23 June, 2023, implemented by the Decree of the President of Ukraine dated 30 June 30, 2023 No. 359/20233. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/n0033525-23#Text>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- On The Agenda of The Tenth Session Of The Verkhovna Rada Of Ukraine Of The Ninth Convocation. 2023. Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine dated 05 September, 2023 No. 3369-IX. URL: Consultation date:

28/09/2023

Order of the State Judicial Administration of Ukraine, the Court Security Service, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine, the Security Service of Ukraine dated 27 February, 2020. No 96/112/194/60.

On The Judiciary and The Status Of Judges. 2016. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1402-19#Text>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023

On The Judiciary and The Status Of Judges. 2022. The Law of Ukraine dated 02 June, 2016 No 1402-VIII (in the edition of 15 December, 2022). *the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine*: website. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1402-19#Text>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Recommendations on the effective implementation of the basic principles regarding independence of judicial bodies. 1989. Resolution of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations 1989/60 and approved by the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations 44/162 dated 15 December, 1989. URL: <http://www.judges.org.ua/article/d4.htm>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Regulation on the court security service. 2019. *The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine*: website. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/rada/show/v1051910-19#Text>. URL: Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Report Of The Fourteenth United Nations Congress On Crime Prevention And Criminal Justice. 2021. Kyoto, March 7–12. URL: https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/Congress/documents/A_CONF234_16_V2102028.pdf. Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Salnikov, Oleksii. 2023. Coordinated actions of representatives of the National Police, special forces, representatives of the Special Operations Forces (SOF) prevented human casualties among the participants of the meeting, the judges, the staff of the apparatus, and the court visitors. *The State Judicial Administration of Ukraine*: website. URL: <https://dsa.court.gov.ua/dsa/pres-centr/news/1447081/> Consultation date: 28/09/2023

Service Regulations For The Sergeant's Service. 2011. URL: <https://bravors.brandenburg.de/verwaltungsvorschriften/dojustizwachtm eisterdienst>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023

- Service regulations on the service of a sergeant of the ministry of justice of the state of rhineland-palatinate. 2021. URL: https://jm.rlp.de/fileadmin/05/Publikationen/Justizblatt/2021/Justizblatt_04-75_ohne_PN.pdf. Consultation date: 28/09/2023.
- Strategy for the development of the justice system and constitutional justice for 2021 – 2023. Decree of the President of Ukraine dated 11 June 2021. № 231/2021. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/231/2021#Text>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- The Law Regulating The Status Of Civil Servants In The Federal States. 2008. URL: <https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/beamstsg/>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- The Main Principles Of Independence Of Judicial Bodies. 1985. Resolutions 40/32 and 40/146 of the UN General Assembly on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders dated November 29. and December 13. 1985. URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_201#Text. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- The Main Principles of Independence of Judicial Bodies. 1985. Resolutions 40/32 and 40/146 of the UN General Assembly on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders dated 29 November and 13 December, 1985. URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_201#Text. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- The Response of The Berlin Senate To The Written Request Of Mp Mike Penn. 2019. URL: <https://kleineanfragen.de/berlin/18/20809-sicherheitskonzept-fuer-gerichte-und-oeffentliche-gebaeude-nur-zukunftsvisionen-oder-auch-bald-real.txt>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- The Universal Charter of Judges. 1999. URL: <https://www.icj.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/IAJ-Universal-Charter-of-the-Judge-instruments-1989-eng.pdf>. Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- Titarenko, Oleksii. (2021). Court Security Service in the System of National Security Entities (Issues of Attribution and Definition of Competence) International and National Security: Theoretical and Applied Aspects. Materials of the V International Scientific and Practical Conference DSUIA (Dniprocivity, 12 March 2021). 135–137. URL: <https://er.dduvs.in.ua/handle/123456789/6259> Consultation date: 28/09/2023
- Tylchuk, Vyacheslav. Matselyk, Tetiana. Hryshchuk, Viktor. Lomakina, Olena.

Sydor, Markiiian. Leheza, Yevhen. 2022. Administrative and legal regulation of public financial activity: Regulación administrativa y legal de la actividad financiera pública. *Cuestiones Políticas*, 40(72), 573-581. <https://doi.org/10.46398/cuestpol.4072.33>

Zadyraka, Nataliia. Leheza, Yevhen. Bykovskiy, Mykola. Zheliezniak, Yevhenii. Leheza, Yulia. 2023. Correlation of Legal Concepts of Administrative Procedure and Administrative Liability in the Sphere of Urban Planning. *Jurnal cita hukum indonesian law journal*. Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 33-44, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15408/jch.v11i1.31784>