TEL.: +380 (44) 253 11 75 P0 B0X #29, KYIV, 01021 antac.ua@gmail.com



Specialized Anti-corruption Courts

Purpose and general idea

Following the conditionalities of international aid, including that from IMF, Ukraine established new institutional framework for prevention and investigation of top corruption. National Anti-Corruption Bureau already filed several cases to courts and finalizes more complicated cases. Now effectiveness of new anti-corruption institutions of depends from courts.

Unfortunately, presently courts not only fail to punish top officials following NABU investigations, but also block NABU's investigations. Since February 2016 more than 30 cases were filed to courts. As of beginning of September 2016 only 6 NABU cases were considered (of which 5 are those where suspects recognized themselves guilty), while remaining cases are still waiting for hearings to start.

Courts use every opportunity to block NABU investigations. Since NABU is legally obliged to receive court warrants on number of investigative activities to collect evidences, courts have powerful tools to undermine cases of NABU even before they are submitted to courts. Below are just few examples.

On July 13th Appeal court of Ukraine restored on position K. Kylik, military prosecutor of Prosecutor's general office, suspected by NABU in illicit enrichment. Earlier before Solomiansly district court followed NABU request and removed Kylik from his position in order to prevent him from influencing the investigation against him. However, Appeal Court of Kyliv restored Kylik on his position, disregarding NABU's evidences that Kylik have continuously attempted to influence the investigation (NABU presented results of intersection of Kylik's communications, which included his requests to help him "solve the issue").

On February 23 Solomiansky district court refused NABU in access to files from the cell phone of assistant to the influential MP Granovsky. NABU took this phone during search in the case regarding embezzlement of funds in Odessa portside plant. Despite NABU's claims that information from that phone may help to investigate further transactions with money embezzled though the plant, the court prohibited NABU to receive information from the phone.

Courts create opportunities for NABU suspects to escape from prosecution. When NABU files requests for detention of well-connected suspects, courts frequently establish small bails that are incompatible with gain the suspect achieved through corruption. Therefore, suspect receives an opportunity to pay an easy pledge and leave the county.

Upcoming judicial reform in Ukraine will take another three to five years. First instance courts are not rebooted instantly. New judges are going to be selected by judges of regime of Yanykovych, who are used to implementing political requests.

Concept

TEL.: +380 (44) 253 11 75 P0 B0X #29, KYIV, 01021 antac.ua@gmail.com



In such a situation new anticorruption institutions will fail to deliver results in the form of putting corrupt officials into jail and recovering assets that were stolen from the state. If new anticorruption institutions are thus left fruitless, political leadership will receive much wanted pretext to intervene or even close down NABU and SAP.

Therefore, corrupt courts will not only account for failed punishments for corrupt public officials, but also may bring about general backsliding in anti-corruption policies in Ukraine.

To prevent this scenario, it is necessary to create special anticorruption courts to consider cases of top corruption. Judges for these courts should be selected transparently, apart from existing system of selection of judges and with participation of representatives of international partners of Ukraine.

Jurisdiction of anti-corruption courts

Cases under investigative jurisdiction of National Anti-Corruption Bureau.

Anti-corruption court chambers within judicial system of Ukraine

Anti-corruption investigative judges (sanction investigative activities that need special legal permits)	First instance	Highest Anticorruption Court
	Second instance (appeals)	Anticorruption Chamber within Criminal Court within the Supreme Court of Ukraine
Hearings on cases of corruption	First instance	Highest Anticorruption Court
	Second instance (appeals)	Anticorruption Chamber within Criminal Court within the Supreme Court of Ukraine

NB: One judge must not act as an investigative judge and a judge regarding the same case.

Legal framework

Establishment of anti-corruption court chambers in possible within the framework of effective Constitution of Ukraine. New law on judicial system and some other laws need to revised and amended.

Concept 2

TEL.: +380 (44) 253 11 75 P0 B0X #29, KYIV, 01021 antac.ua@gmail.com



Selection of anti-corruption judges: general provisions and criteria

Anticorruption judges of all instances should be selected by a special selection commission.

The President and the Parliament shall delegate three members of the commission each. Three members should be nominated by the Ministry of Justice upon positive recommendations from the delegation of the European Commission, the US Embassy in Ukraine and the Embassy of Canada in Ukraine. For this, the Ministry is obliged to file requests for recommendations to mentioned embassies; people should be selected by the embassies and the delegation and may not be proposed for adoption by the Ministry of Justice. Diplomatic institutions either nominate either foreigners or Ukrainians.

Commission should be rightful after 7 its members are appointed and shall need 7 voices for each its decision. People backed by international community shall have blocking voices within commission.

People with or without previous experience as a judge are eligible to apply for positions of anticorruption judges.

Selection criteria:

- Righteousness candidates should pass special scrutiny on whether they have unjustified assets and whether
 their way of living corresponds their declared incomes. Information shall be collected by National Agency for
 Prevention of Corruption, National Anti-Corruption Bureau and ARO-AMO. This information should be provided
 to and evaluated by the contest commission.
- Proficiency candidates shall pass special test on criminal legislation, anti-corruption legislation and general
 skills. Quality of previous rulings of judges should be checked (whether the judges made politically-motivated
 rulings, whether and how many of his previous rulings were cancelled by higher courts or European Court of
 Human Rights). Both test and assessment of previous rulings should be organized by existing qualification
 commission of judges, but final consideration of this information should be within mandate of the commission.
- Motivation candidates should pass value motivation test and interview with contest commission.

Based on the information listed above contest commission selects judges as well as decides on exact position for each of selected judges. Decision of contest commission in binding and mandatory for Supreme Council of Justice and the President of Ukraine/the Parliament.

oncept 3

TEL.: +380 (44) 253 11 75 PO BOX #29, KYIV, 01021 antac.ua@gmail.com



Special guarantees for anti-corruption judges

Wages and social security guarantees	 Wages equal to that of the judges of the Supreme Court of Ukraine (for all anticorruption judges) Half of the price of medical insurance for a judge and his family members shall be covered by the state
Additional guarantees of independence and non-disclosure	 Separate premises for both High Anticorruption court and anticorruption chamber within Criminal Court within Supreme Court of Ukraine Amount of funding for both the court and the chamber are to be established directly in the law on state budget Anti-corruption court and chamber should be resources with their own administrative staff. Head of administrative units of both the court and the chamber are to be selected by the same selection commission as anticorruption judges.
Personal and family security	 24/7 guards for a judge and his family members as well as for his residence; Possibility for moving abroad in case if a judge of his family members are under threat.

oncept 4