

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
МИКОЛАЇВСЬКИЙ НАВЧАЛЬНО-НАУКОВИЙ ІНСТИТУТ ПРАВА
НАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ
«ОДЕСЬКА ЮРИДИЧНА АКАДЕМІЯ»
ГРОМАДСЬКА ОРГАНІЗАЦІЯ
«ВСЕУКРАЇНСЬКА АСОЦІАЦІЯ КРИМІНАЛЬНОГО ПРАВА»
МИКОЛАЇВСЬКИЙ ОСЕРЕДОК

Новітні кримінально-правові дослідження – 2025

АЛЬМАНАХ НАУКОВИХ ПРАЦЬ

Миколаїв
МННП НУ «ОЮА»
2025

Редакційна колегія:

В.о. директора Миколаївського навчально-наукового інституту права Національного університету «Одеська юридична академія», голова Миколаївського осередку громадської організації «Всеукраїнська асоціація кримінального права», доктор юридичних наук, професор **Олександр Козаченко**

В.о. завідувача кафедри кримінального права та інших кримінально-правових дисциплін Миколаївського навчально-наукового інституту права Національного університету «Одеська юридична академія», секретарка Миколаївського осередку громадської організації «Всеукраїнська асоціація кримінального права», докторка філософії (PhD) в галузі права, доцентка **Ольга Мусиченко**

Схвалено та рекомендовано до видання кафедрою кримінального права та інших кримінально-правових дисциплін Миколаївського навчально-наукового інституту права Національного університету «Одеська юридична академія» (протокол засідання кафедри № 08 від 06 травня 2025 року)

Новітні кримінально-правові дослідження – 2025 : Альманах
Н73 наукових праць / за ред. д.ю.н., професора О. Козаченка, доктора філософії (PhD) в галузі права, доцента О. Мусиченко. – Миколаїв : МННП НУ «ОЮА», 2025. – 169 с.

До ювілейного, 10-го за ліком Альманаху наукових праць, увійшли матеріали, присвячені різноманітним проблемам як сучасної науки кримінального права, так і практики його застосування. Автори репрезентованих в Альманасі наукових праць, якими виступили як відомі дослідники проблем кримінального права в їх теоретичній та прикладній площині, так і молоді науковці, які роблять перші кроки у формуванні власної теоретичної та практичної правосвідомості, досліджують актуальні питання становлення, сучасного стану та перспектив подальшого розвитку кримінального права України, пропонуючи власні моделі вирішення нагальних проблем, сформованих соціально-політичним викликом сьогодення, одним з яких є продовження розпочатої до повномасштабної війни активної діяльності з формування нового за змістом та формою кримінального закону України.

Видання може викликати зацікавленість вчених, аспірантів і студентів, співробітників судових та правоохоронних органів, державних службовців, а також всіх тих, хто замислюється над проблемами українського кримінального права та практики його застосування в сучасних умовах воєнного часу в Україні та шукає відповіді на питання, поставлені необхідністю підвищення ефективності кримінально-правового регулювання.

УДК 343

*Публікації наведено в авторській редакції з незначними коректорськими правками.
Редакційна колегія не завжди поділяє погляди авторів публікацій.
За достовірність наукового матеріалу, професійного формулювання, фактичних даних,
цитат, власних імен тощо відповідають автори публікацій та їх наукові керівники.*

© Миколаївський навчально-науковий інститут права
Національного університету «Одеська юридична академія»
© ГО «Всеукраїнська асоціація кримінального права»,
Миколаївський осередок

PATH TO THE EU: PROTECTION AND SUPPORT FOR CRIME VICTIMS

This paper examines the critical issue of crime victim compensation within the European Union legal framework and analyzes Ukraine's current legislative gaps in this domain. The research highlights a recent landmark ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), which established that member states must provide fair and appropriate compensation to both direct victims of violent crimes and their close relatives who suffer as indirect victims. The study contrasts the EU's comprehensive victim protection framework—including the Victims' Rights Directive, the Compensation Directive, and the EU Strategy on Victims' Rights (2020-2025)—with Ukraine's underdeveloped legislation in this area. Despite constitutional provisions and Civil Code articles theoretically guaranteeing victim compensation, Ukraine lacks specific implementation mechanisms, rendering these protections largely symbolic. The paper notes that Ukraine signed the European Convention on the Compensation of Victims of Violent Crimes in 1985 but has yet to ratify it 39 years later. This legislative vacuum not only contradicts Ukraine's European integration aspirations but also undermines public trust in state institutions, as recognized by the Constitutional Court of Ukraine. The research concludes that adopting comprehensive victim compensation legislation is an urgent priority for Ukraine's alignment with EU standards and for fulfilling its obligations under ratified international agreements, including the Istanbul Convention. This legislative gap represents a significant obstacle in Ukraine's path toward EU membership and in ensuring justice for crime victims within its borders.

Keywords: *Victim compensation, Criminal Policy, European Union law, Ukrainian legislation, transitional justice, European integration.*

У цій статті досліджується критичне питання компенсації жертвам злочинів у рамках правової системи Європейського Союзу та аналізуються поточні законодавчі прогалини України у цій сфері. Дослідження висвітлює нещодавнє знакове рішення Суду Європейського Союзу (CJEU), яке встановило, що держави-члени повинні забезпечувати справедливу та належну компенсацію як безпосереднім жертвам насильницьких злочинів, так і їхнім близьким родичам, які страждають як непрямі жертви. У дослідженні порівнюється комплексна структура захисту жертв ЄС — включаючи Директиву про права жертв, Директиву про компенсацію та Стратегію ЄС щодо прав жертв (2020-2025) — із недостатньо розвиненим законодавством України у цій сфері. Незважаючи на конституційні положення та статті Цивільного кодексу, які теоретично гарантують компенсацію жертвам, Україні бракує конкретних механізмів імплементації, що робить ці захисні заходи переважно символічними. У статті зазначається, що Україна підписала Європейську конвенцію про компенсацію жертвам насильницьких злочинів у 1985 році, але ще не ратифікувала її через 39 років. Цей законодавчий вакуум не лише суперечить прагненням України до європейської інтеграції, але й підриває суспільну довіру до державних інституцій, як це визнано Конституційним Судом України. Дослідження доходить висновку, що прийняття комплексного законодавства щодо

компенсації жертвам є невідкладним пріоритетом для узгодження України зі стандартами ЄС та виконання її зобов'язань за ратифікованими міжнародними угодами, включаючи Стамбульську конвенцію. Ця законодавча прогалина становить значну перешкоду на шляху України до членства в ЄС та забезпечення справедливості для жертв злочинів у межах її кордонів.

Ключові слова: *Компенсація жертвам, Кримінальна політика, право Європейського Союзу, українське законодавство, перехідне правосуддя, європейська інтеграція.*

Intro

In 2018, an Italian court ordered a man convicted of murdering his former partner to pay compensation to the victim's family members. Since the convicted man was found insolvent, the Italian state paid a reduced compensation, initially allocated only to the victim's children and her ex-husband, from whom she had separated years earlier. The victim's parents, sister and children appealed to the Venice District Court in Italy, seeking a "fair and adequate" compensation to reflect the harm they suffered as a result of the murder. In this context, the Italian court referred a question to the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU): Does national legislation that automatically excludes certain family members of a victim of a violent crime from receiving compensation if the victim died as a result of that crime comply with the EU Crime Victims Compensation Directive? On November 7, 2024, the CJEU ruled that this directive requires member states to establish a national compensation scheme that can cover not only direct victims of violent intentional crimes but also their close relatives who suffer as indirect victims due to the consequences of the crime. Additionally, the Court reiterated that this directive obligates each member state to create a compensation scheme for victims of violent intentional crimes that guarantees fair and appropriate compensation. Although member states have some discretion in this regard, they may not limit themselves to purely symbolic or clearly inadequate compensation given the gravity of the crime's impact on these victims. The compensation must adequately redress the suffering experienced by these victims to restore both the material and moral damages caused. Furthermore, if a national scheme sets compensation at a fixed rate, the compensation scale must be sufficiently detailed to avoid any scenario in which the compensation awarded for a particular type of violence would be clearly insufficient. Thus, the Court held that a national system that automatically excludes certain family members from any right to compensation solely due to the existence of other family members, without considering additional factors (such as the financial consequences for these family members due to the victim's death, or the fact that they were financially dependent

on or living with the deceased), cannot achieve "fair and appropriate" compensation [1].

Following the victimhood

By the way, political differentiation in the understanding and adopting measures of protection and satisfaction for victims of crime is the specifics of Italian criminal policy. Let's look at the concept of femicide criminalization. Femicide as a medical-legal term and social phenomenon is a trend in many studies of women's rights violations, especially when the pandemic and frustration risks have led to an increase in domestic violence. The term "femicide" (femicidio) was particularly adopted in Latin America as a useful tool in response to the alarming escalation of murders of women and girls. In parallel, the word "feminicidio" was introduced to denote the element of impunity and institutional violence due to the lack of accountability and adequate response from the state when such killings occur. This term is used by human rights experts at the moment when it comes to state responsibility. Along with this, with the current relatively negative dynamics of women's murders, it is men who dominate in the distribution of victims of criminal violence. By the way, none of the European countries has introduced femicide as an independent norm in the Criminal Code (see the study by the European Institute for Gender Equality) [2].

But here is Italy (bellissimo!), - legislators of legal positivism and multi-track approach in criminal law since the times of Enrico Ferri made a "gift" on March 8, 2025 (this is not a joke - because it was on March 8 that the Italian government announced its intention to do this) [3]. Dr. Nicolo Canestrini, one of the most well-known experts in international criminal law [4] analyzes the arguments against this step by the Italian government from Professor Giovanni Fiandaca [5] who is definitely not one of those who falls for trendy legal tendencies and expressed his skeptical "ma non capisco" (but I don't understand). Fiandaca believes that Italian criminal law should not be turned into a political tool.

Criminal law as a political label. Fiandaca emphasizes: that politicians like to appear active, especially when they need to "do something." Therefore, they quickly "patch" new crimes into the criminal code instead of long-term measures like educational reforms or economic support. One wants to say: "Sew faster, or you'll rip it apart!" This creates the illusion of decisive action but shifts responsibility to the courts, which already suffer from "flight overload." *Legal and constitutional misunderstandings.* Experts seem to think that the new law has been slightly "dressed up," but in reality, it is legally "limping on both feet." The

proposal considers femicide a particularly serious crime due to motives of hatred towards women. But here's the problem: how can judges understand that someone was motivated precisely by hatred? Here you need not a judge, but Sherlock Holmes with a couple of psychological experts. However, even they will not always understand where dislike ends and gender hatred begins. *Criminal law should not be social engineering* According to Fiandaca, the criminal code should not be like a "universal key" to social problems. If you start punishing for ideological motives, it's already similar to an attempt to correct thinking by force - as in the famous Odessa anecdote about forbidding cats to eat fish, but they still meow. The fight for gender equality is better conducted through education, cultural changes, and reforms, not through expanding the Criminal Code [6]. In conclusion, the professor does not hide his surprise: why invent a new crime when the old ones already work perfectly? "The Criminal Code is not the only tool in the kitchen of justice!" he says [6]. Therefore, instead of cutting new articles, it would be better to engage in supporting scientifically based programs and systemic changes. As a familiar grandmother from Moldavanka used to say: "Not everyone who shouts loudly knows the way to the Privoz" Such a legal "cappuccino" with femicide - a lot of foam, and the essence is somewhere at the bottom of the cup. The problem really exists, the problem is serious.

But whether we should use criminal sanctions as a political lever to counter victimization without appropriate professional criminological and legal expertise - must be decided carefully.

Models of treatment

The criminalisation of rape and the establishment of protective measures for victims remain critical areas in penal law, requiring a nuanced understanding of how societal narratives and institutional frameworks shape victimisation. Victimisation operates on multiple levels: as a societal institution, through its portrayal in the media, and as a lived reality for individuals. These dimensions often exist independently but intersect through prejudices and social structures that influence public perceptions and policy decisions. Media representations, in particular, play a pivotal role in amplifying certain narratives while suppressing others, often creating stereotypes of "worthy" and "unworthy" victims. This dynamic can obscure the systemic causes of violence, reinforce harmful societal norms, and shape the criminal justice response.

Prejudice and fear further compound these issues. Prejudices about victims often manifest as stigmas, isolating individuals or blaming them for their circumstances, especially in socially contentious cases such as prostitution or

migration. Fear, propagated through media narratives or societal rumours, creates a "culture of fear" that justifies control over vulnerable groups, legitimises violence, and perpetuates systemic inequalities. For instance, the portrayal of certain groups as inherently vulnerable or criminal can lead to heightened discrimination and marginalisation. These dynamics not only affect individual experiences of victimisation but also influence societal responses, including legal frameworks.

The Nordic model, which criminalises the purchase of sexual acts rather than the sale, provides an instructive case study. By shifting criminal liability to the client, this approach reframes sex workers as victims of systemic exploitation rather than as offenders. It addresses the stigma associated with sex work and seeks to dismantle the structures enabling exploitation. The European Court of Human Rights' judgment in *M.A. and Others v. France* [7] affirmed this approach, ruling that the criminalization of prostitutes' clients does not violate the European Convention on Human Rights. The Court emphasized the legitimacy of such laws in protecting human dignity, preventing exploitation, and promoting gender equality. It recognized that these measures are proportional, balancing the rights of sex workers with the broader societal interest in reducing harm.

The Court was fully aware of the undeniable difficulties and risks that individuals involved in prostitution faced during their activities. However, despite ongoing review of the law's application by relevant actors on the ground, there was no consensus on whether the negative effects described by the applicants were directly caused by the law in question or whether they stemmed from other factors that existed before the law's enactment. Furthermore, while the Court acknowledged that the principle of personal autonomy includes the right to freely choose how to exercise one's sexuality, it was not convinced by the applicants' argument that the ability to engage in prostitution, freely and with consenting adults, impacted fundamental aspects of private life that required additional protection or warranted limiting the State's margin of appreciation. Ultimately, the applicants primarily complained about being unable to pursue prostitution as a profession due to the impugned measure, citing examples of countries where prostitution was regulated similarly to any other economic activity [7].

This legal precedent underscores the need for comprehensive strategies to address victimization. Media accountability must be part of this effort, with ethical guidelines to ensure balanced and non-stereotypical portrayals of victims. Simultaneously, legal reforms should target manipulative practices that exploit

societal fears and prejudices. This integrated approach offers a path forward in addressing the complexities of victimization in contemporary society.

Fair compensation

Indeed, in EU countries, crime victims face certain challenges in accessing fair satisfaction and compensation.

On the one hand, the EU has already adopted a robust set of legislation on victims' rights. The Victims' Rights Directive (Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support, and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA) includes the right to access information, support, and protection according to the victims' individual needs, as well as a range of procedural rights. Other relevant EU instruments include the Compensation Directive (Council Directive 2004/80/EC of 29 April 2004 relating to compensation to crime victims), EU rules on European Protection Orders (Directive 2011/99/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the European Protection Order and Regulation (EU) No 606/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 June 2013 on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters), among others.

Moreover, recognizing the challenges in implementing Directive 2012/29, the EU has adopted tools to further protect victims' interests in specific crime contexts (e.g., terrorism, sexual violence). Despite this progress, recent reports indicate that victims of crime still cannot fully rely on their rights in the EU. Victims' difficulties in accessing justice are mainly related to a lack of information, insufficient support, and inadequate protection.

For this reason, the EU Strategy on Victims' Rights (2020–2025) aims to further develop and improve member states' legislation on effective communication with victims, creating a safe environment for victims to report crimes, improving support and protection for the most vulnerable victims, facilitating victims' access to compensation, strengthening cooperation and coordination between all relevant actors, and enhancing international protection of victims' rights [8].

What about Ukrainian legislation?

Beyond special issues regarding victim protection during wartime (noting that the ratification of the Rome Statute would directly require compensation, restitution, and satisfaction for victims of crimes against peace and humanity), these are urgent issues of transitional justice that must be addressed. Provisions of the Law of Ukraine "On Ensuring the Rights and Freedoms of Citizens and the

Legal Regime in the Temporarily Occupied Territory of Ukraine" stipulate a special rule whereby the Russian Federation, as the occupying state, bears full responsibility for compensating Ukraine, legal entities, public associations, Ukrainian citizens, foreign nationals, and stateless persons for material and moral harm resulting from temporary occupation, with relevant court practice in place.

However, there are also general issues that require analysis and consistent implementation by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. The Civil Code of Ukraine in Article 1177 stipulates that damage caused to an individual as a result of a criminal offense shall be compensated from the State Budget of Ukraine in cases and in the manner prescribed by law. The obligation of the state to compensate for harm caused by injury, other health impairments, or death resulting from a crime is enshrined in Article 1207 of the Civil Code of Ukraine. These provisions are merely referential!

The absence of relevant regulations has been widely criticized. The problem is not just a lack of funds. It is intriguing to consider where fines, often substantial, are allocated. A rhetorical question, perhaps, and no wish to comment on the gap between the slogan "4000 dollars for teachers" and the hypothetical \$4000 payments received by numerous elites. The meme "pensions for prosecutors" has become widespread. Not to mention... You know what I mean.

However, the starting point should be the adoption of the Law of Ukraine on compensation for damage to victims of criminal offenses.

Ultimately, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine needs to ratify the European Convention on the Compensation of Victims of Violent Crimes (ETS No 116) of 24 November 1983 [9].

Notably, Ukraine signed this Convention in 1985! Yet, 39 years later, ratification remains pending. While Bill No. 3892 -- the Draft Law of Ukraine "On Compensation to Victims of Violent Criminal Offenses" and related bills [10] exists, it was removed from consideration. For some reason... although the ratified Istanbul Convention demands it.

Finally: "The state's failure to provide such compensation undermines trust in the state and government authorities and contradicts the Constitution of Ukraine." This phrase from the Constitutional Court of Ukraine's Decision No. 4-r(II)/21 [11] highlights the significance of a fair evaluation of the neglect of victims' rights.

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) adds: "Thus, the court notes that the absence of a quality law establishing the procedure and conditions for the state to compensate the harm caused to the victim of a crime in the event

of the offender's insolvency precludes the issuance of a justified, fair, and lawful court decision to recover funds as compensation for such harm from the state represented by the State Treasury of Ukraine. Therefore, the claim must be denied." [12]

Conclusion

The analysis of victim compensation frameworks highlights a stark contrast between EU standards and Ukraine's current legislative reality. While the EU has developed a comprehensive system for protecting and compensating crime victims, Ukraine's legal framework remains largely symbolic, lacking the necessary implementation mechanisms to provide genuine relief to those who have suffered from criminal acts. This gap not only contradicts Ukraine's EU integration aspirations but also undermines the fundamental rights of its citizens.

The CJEU's recent ruling further underscores the legal and moral obligation for states to provide fair and appropriate compensation to both direct victims and their close relatives affected by violent crimes. This ruling sets a clear standard that Ukraine must meet to align with EU expectations and norms.

The persistent failure to ratify the European Convention on the Compensation of Victims of Violent Crimes, despite signing it nearly four decades ago, represents a significant obstacle in Ukraine's path toward EU membership. This legislative vacuum is not merely a technical issue but a fundamental flaw that erodes public trust in state institutions, as acknowledged by Ukraine's own Constitutional Court.

As Ukraine continues its European integration journey amidst challenging circumstances, addressing victim compensation must become a priority. The implementation of comprehensive victim protection legislation is not only a requirement for EU membership but also a moral imperative to ensure justice for those who have suffered from criminal acts. The ratification of relevant international instruments and the development of effective compensation mechanisms would demonstrate Ukraine's commitment to upholding the rights and dignity of crime victims, bringing the country one step closer to full alignment with European standards and values.

References

1. Case C-126/23 [Burdene]. Available at: <https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?jsessionid=E69FCD6BA15FF9E63F3A091AEF7A73BE?text=&docid=292051&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=req&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=4931148>
2. European Institute for Gender Equality. "Femicide." Available at: <https://eige.europa.eu/publications/thesaurus/terms/1192>

3. Associated Press. "Italy Femicide Crime Life Prison." Available at: <https://apnews.com/article/italy-femicide-crime-life-prison>
4. Canestrini, N. "Why the New "Feminicide" Offense Should Be Rejected". Available at https://www.linkedin.com/posts/nicolacaneestrini_why-the-new-feminicide-offense-should-be-activity-7306582730278952960-AaJH?utm_source=social_share_send&utm_medium=member_desktop_web&rcm=ACoAAAcWsQIB1OVTTx9sJruUkY3ZRAeWCRy9pJU5. Wikipedia. "Giovanni Fiandaca." Available at: https://it.wikipedia.org/wiki/Giovanni_Fiandaca
6. Fiandaca, G. Cari prof. di diritto penale, è ora di protestare contro il delitto di femminicidio Available at <https://www.sistemapenale.it/it/articolo/fiandaca-cari-prof-di-diritto-penale-e-ora-di-protestare-contro-il-delitto-di-femminicidio?fbclid=IwY2xjawJCnPNleHRuA2FlbQIxMAABHTUAu f 5xskXYT DochZ SWmtrmU4fY2mbFFXami3lr-4ut0vHy-OOuuYw aem Br zPsouzUu0ywTB 6VGMQ>
7. European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) M.A. and Others v. France - 63664/19, 64450/19, 24387/20 et al. Judgment 25.7.2024 Available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=002-14363>
8. EU Strategy on Victims' Rights (2020-2025). Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0258>
9. European Convention on the Compensation of Victims of Violent Crimes. Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/994_319#Text
10. Draft Law of Ukraine "On Compensation to Victims of Violent Criminal Offenses." Available at: https://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_1?pf3511=69541
11. Constitutional Court of Ukraine's Decision No. 4-r(II)/21. Available at: https://ccu.gov.ua/sites/default/files/docs/4_p2_2021.pdf
12. European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), Zolotyuk v. Ukraine 3958/13, Judgement 16/12/2014. Available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-150834>

ЗМІСТ

Переднє слово.....	3
--------------------	---

Розділ І

ФУНДАМЕНТАЛЬНІ НОВІТНІ КРИМІНАЛЬНО-ПРАВОВІ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Баулін Юрій

ПРИНЦИПОВІ ВІДМІННОСТІ ПРОЄКТУ НОВОГО КК ВІД ЧИННОГО КК УКРАЇНИ.....	7
---	---

Козаченко Олександр

ІНФОРМАЦІЙНА ТАКСОНОМІЧНА СИСТЕМА ЗАХОДІВ СОЦІАЛЬНОГО ВПЛИВУ: КРИМІНАЛЬНО-ПРАВОВИЙ КОМПОНЕНТ	18
--	----

Колб Олександр, Пирожик Олександр, Дучимінська Леся

ПРО НЕОБХІДНІСТЬ ЗАПОБІГАННЯ ВПЛИВУ НА УКРАЇНЦІВ СПОТВОРЕНОЇ ПАРАЛЕЛЬНОЇ ІНФОРМАЦІЙНОЇ РЕАЛЬНОСТІ В УМОВАХ ВОЄННОГО СТАНУ	28
---	----

Топчій Василь, Колб Олександр, Svoboda Ivo

КРИМІНОЛОГІЧНА ОЦІНКА ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ СУДОВОЇ ВЛАДИ УКРАЇНИ В УМОВАХ ПЕРМАНЕНТНОЇ ВІЙНИ З РОСІЙСЬКОЮ ФЕДЕРАЦІЄЮ (2014-2025 Р.Р.)	37
---	----

Tuliakov Viacheslav

PATH TO THE EU: PROTECTION AND SUPPORT FOR CRIME VICTIMS	46
---	----

Александренко Олена, Женунтій Володимир

КРИМІНАЛЬНА ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНІСТЬ ЗА НЕВИКОНАННЯ СУДОВОГО РІШЕННЯ У ЗАКОНОДАВСТВІ УКРАЇНИ: ІСТОРИКО- ПРАВОВИЙ АСПЕКТ	55
---	----

Василяка Олеся, Бородіна Вікторія

КРИМІНАЛЬНО-ПРАВОВИЙ МЕНТАЛІТЕТ.....	60
--------------------------------------	----

Мусиченко Ольга, Мусиченко Віталій

СУЧАСНА НОРМАТИВНА ТАКСОНОМІЯ КРИМІНАЛЬНО- ПРАВОВИХ ЗАХОДІВ.....	65
---	----

Супрун-Ковальчук Тетяна, Бойко Валерія

ЕВОЛЮЦІЯ КРИМІНАЛЬНОГО ПРАВА УКРАЇНИ В КОНТЕКСТІ БОРОТЬБИ З КІБЕРЗЛОЧИННІСТЮ.....	82
--	----