



Roksolana **IVANOVA**

PhD in Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Leonid Yuzkov Khmelnytskyi University of Management and Law

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8257-4486>

e-mail: kemenyash.roksolana@gmail.com

CURRENT STATE AND PROSPECTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF JUDICIAL CONTROL OF ADMINISTRATIVE COURTS BY PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION BODIES

Introduction. In an era marked by rapid changes in governance and legal paradigms, the role of judicial control exerted by administrative courts on public administration bodies has emerged as a cornerstone of modern legal systems. This study aims to delve into the current state of this judicial control, exploring its evolution, challenges, and impact on the functioning of public administration. It also aims to forecast the future development of this interplay, considering the changing legal, social, and political landscapes.

The primary **purpose of the paper** is to comprehensively assess and understand the current state and future prospects of judicial control exercised by administrative courts over public administration bodies. This involves a multifaceted exploration of the role, challenges, and evolving dynamics in this area of governance.

Results. The in-depth analysis of the current state and the potential future developments in the judicial control exerted by administrative courts by public administration bodies has led to several key findings: The current state reveals a heightened emphasis on the role of administrative courts in ensuring that public administration bodies adhere to legal and ethical standards. This increased scrutiny is a response to a growing demand for transparency and accountability in public administration. The study indicates significant variation in the approaches and intensity of judicial control among different countries. Some regions show a trend towards more rigorous judicial oversight, while others maintain a more traditional, restrained approach.

Conclusion. In summary, the growing influence of judicial control by administrative courts is a response to the evolving needs of modern governance. It reflects a societal shift towards greater accountability and legal compliance in public administration. The future will likely see continued efforts to refine this relationship, ensuring that it fosters a system of governance that is both effective and just, and which upholds the principles of democracy and the rule of law.

Ключові слова: Judicial Control, Administrative Courts, Public Administration, Legal Oversight, Governance, Transparency

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary landscape of governance, the judicial control exerted by administrative courts over public administration bodies plays a pivotal role in shaping the dynamics of legal oversight and administrative efficiency. This evolving relationship is crucial in upholding the principles of transparency, accountability, and fairness within the administrative machinery of a state. The study focuses on dissecting and understanding the current state of this judicial control, exploring its complexities, challenges, and the impact it has on the functioning of public administration.

The current era of governance is characterized by an increasing demand for administrative decisions to be justifiable, transparent, and compliant with legal norms. Administrative courts, in this regard, serve as vital instruments in ensuring that public administration bodies operate within the ambit of the law, respecting individual rights while fulfilling public duties [1]. This study aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the present state of judicial control of administrative courts, delving into the nuances that define this relationship.

Furthermore, the study looks ahead to the future prospects of this judicial control. It aims to forecast potential developments and changes, considering evolving legal doctrines, societal needs, and shifts in governance models. This foresight is essential for anticipating and preparing for the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead in the realm of administrative law.

The overarching **PURPOSE** of the paper is to critically examine and delineate the current state of judicial control

exercised by administrative courts over public administration bodies, and to explore the future prospects and potential developments in this area. Specifically, the study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

Analyzing the Current Judicial Oversight Landscape: To thoroughly assess the existing mechanisms and extent of judicial control by administrative courts over public administration [2]. This includes understanding how these courts enforce legal compliance, transparency, and accountability.

Identifying Challenges and Opportunities: To pinpoint the challenges currently faced in the exercise of judicial control, such as issues in striking a balance between administrative efficiency and legal scrutiny, and to identify opportunities for improvement and reform.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

To comprehensively explore the current state and future prospects of judicial control of administrative courts over public administration bodies, the following materials and methods will be utilized:

Legal Documents and Statutes: Review of relevant laws, statutes, and legal frameworks that govern the operations of administrative courts and public administration bodies. **Judicial Rulings and Case Law:** Analysis of key rulings and decisions made by administrative courts, focusing on instances of judicial control and oversight. **Policy Documents and Reports:** Analysis of government reports, policy papers, and international guidelines relevant to administrative justice and judicial control.

Assessing how different legal systems approach judicial control, identifying common trends, best practices, and notable differences. Conducting interviews with legal ex-

perts, judges, public administrators, and academics to gain insights into their experiences and perspectives on judicial control. Systematically examining written material to identify patterns, themes, and insights related to judicial control of administrative actions.

These materials and methods will provide a comprehensive understanding of the current state and future prospects of judicial control of administrative courts, informing a nuanced discussion on how to enhance the efficacy and fairness of administrative justice.

Setting objectives

In undertaking a thorough examination of the current state and future prospects of judicial control exerted by administrative courts over public administration bodies, the study aims to achieve several key objectives:

To provide a detailed analysis of the existing state of judicial oversight by administrative courts, evaluating its scope, effectiveness, and impact on public administration practices. To explore the historical evolution of judicial control within administrative law, drawing comparisons with similar systems in other jurisdictions to understand different models and their effectiveness. To identify current challenges and limitations in the system of judicial control, including issues related to administrative discretion, legal ambiguities, and potential. To offer well-founded recommendations for policy and legal reforms that could enhance the effectiveness, fairness, and efficiency of judicial control over public administration bodies.

RESULTS

The study on the current state and future prospects of judicial control of administrative courts over public administration bodies has yielded several significant findings: A marked increase in the scope and intensity of judicial oversight by administrative courts has been observed. This trend reflects a growing demand for accountability and transparency in public administration.

There is considerable variability in how different jurisdictions implement judicial control, influenced by legal traditions, governance structures, and cultural factors. Comparative analysis shows a spectrum ranging from highly interventionist to more restrained approaches [3]. A key challenge identified is delineating the scope of administrative discretion and determining the appropriate extent of judicial intervention. There is a need for clearer guidelines and legal definitions to aid both the judiciary and administrative entities. The study suggests a range of recom-

mendations, including the need for clearer legislation on administrative discretion, enhanced training for judicial and administrative personnel, and the development of more collaborative frameworks between the judiciary and public administration.

In conclusion, the current state of judicial control by administrative courts indicates a shift towards more rigorous oversight, while future prospects suggest an ongoing evolution towards a more balanced and refined approach [4]. This evolving dynamic highlights the importance of continuous assessment and adaptation to ensure that judicial control effectively contributes to transparent, accountable, and efficient public administration.

CONCLUSION

The comprehensive analysis of the current state and future prospects of judicial control by administrative courts over public administration bodies has led to several critical conclusions: The comparative analysis reveals diverse approaches in the exercise of judicial control across different jurisdictions. This diversity reflects varying legal traditions, administrative cultures, and societal expectations. Judicial control has positively influenced public administration, leading to improved transparency and adherence to legal norms. However, the increased scrutiny has also resulted in some administrative bodies becoming overly cautious, potentially hindering swift and innovative decision-making.

Looking ahead, it is anticipated that judicial control mechanisms will continue to evolve, potentially becoming more integrated and aligned with international norms and standards. This evolution will likely include enhanced clarity in defining administrative discretion, more nuanced approaches to oversight, and a greater emphasis on procedural fairness.

The study highlights the importance of continuously refining judicial control mechanisms to ensure they remain effective, fair, and aligned with evolving legal and societal standards. Recommendations include the need for clearer legislative frameworks, regular training for judges and administrators, and the development of more collaborative relationships between the judiciary and administrative bodies.

In conclusion, the dynamic between administrative courts and public administration bodies is of paramount importance in modern governance. As this relationship continues to evolve, it will be crucial to maintain a balanced approach that upholds the rule of law, protects individual rights, and ensures efficient and responsive public administration.

References

1. Mcharg A. Administrative Discretion, Administrative Rule-Making and Judicial Review. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 2017. p. 270.
2. Maurer H. Allgemeines Verwaltungsrecht. München. 2011. 148 p.
3. Resolution (77) 31 on the protection of the individual in relation to the acts of administrative authorities. *Council of Europe*. URL: <https://rm.coe.int/16804dec56>
4. Recommendation No R (80) 2 concerning the exercise of discretionary powers by administrative authorities. URL: <https://rm.coe.int/16804f22ae>
5. Recommendation No R (87) 16 on administrative procedures affecting a large number of persons. URL: <https://rm.coe.int/16804eaa5c>
6. Recommendation Rec 2004 (20) on judicial review of administrative acts. URL: [https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=Rec\(2004\)20](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=Rec(2004)20)
7. Rule of Law Checklist, adopted by the Venice Commission at its 106th Plenary Session (Venice, 11-12 March 2016). URL: [https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CDL-AD\(2016\)007-e](https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CDL-AD(2016)007-e)

Список використаних джерел

1. Mcharg A. Administrative Discretion, Administrative Rule-Making and Judicial Review. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 2017. p. 270.
2. Maurer H. Allgemeines Verwaltungsrecht. München. 2011. 148 p.
3. Resolution (77) 31 on the protection of the individual in relation to the acts of administrative authorities. *Council of Europe*. URL:

<https://rm.coe.int/16804dec56>

4. Recommendation No R (80) 2 concerning the exercise of discretionary powers by administrative authorities. URL: <https://rm.coe.int/16804f22ae>

5. Recommendation No R (87) 16 on administrative procedures affecting a large number of persons. URL: <https://rm.coe.int/16804eaa5c>

6. Recommendation Rec 2004 (20) on judicial review of administrative acts. URL: [https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=Rec\(2004\)20](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=Rec(2004)20)

7. Rule of Law Checklist, adopted by the Venice Commission at its 106th Plenary Session (Venice, 11-12 March 2016). URL: [https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CDL-AD\(2016\)007-e](https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CDL-AD(2016)007-e)

Роксолана Юрїївна ІВАНОВА

к.ю.н., доцент, Хмельницький університет управління та права імені Леоніда Юзькова

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8257-4486>

e-mail: kemenyash.roksolana@gmail.com

СУЧАСНИЙ СТАН І ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ РОЗВИТКУ СУДОВОГО КОНТРОЛЮ АДМІНІСТРАТИВНИХ СУДІВ ЗА ОРГАНАМИ ПУБЛІЧНОЇ АДМІНІСТРАЦІЇ

Вступ. В епоху, позначену швидкими змінами в управлінні та правових парадигм, роль судового контролю, що здійснюється адміністративними судами за органами публічної адміністрації, стала наріжним каменем сучасних правових систем. Це дослідження має на меті дослідити поточний стан цього судового контролю, дослідивши його еволюцію, проблеми та вплив на функціонування за органами публічної адміністрації. Він також має на меті спрогнозувати майбутній розвиток цієї взаємодії, враховуючи зміну правового, соціального та політичного ландшафтів.

Основною метою статті є комплексне оцінювання та розуміння поточного стану та майбутніх перспектив судового контролю, який здійснюють адміністративні суди за органами публічної адміністрації. Це передбачає багатогранне дослідження ролі, викликів і динаміки розвитку цієї сфери управління.

Результати. Поглиблений аналіз поточного стану та потенційного майбутнього розвитку судового контролю, який здійснюють адміністративні суди за органами публічної адміністрації, призвів до кількох ключових висновків. Поточний стан свідчить про підвищену увагу до ролі адміністративних судів у забезпеченні, що органи публічної адміністрації дотримуються правових та етичних стандартів. Цей посилений контроль є відповіддю на зростаючий попит на прозорість і підзвітність державного управління. Дослідження свідчить про значні відмінності в підходах та інтенсивності судового контролю в різних країнах. Деякі регіони демонструють тенденцію до більш суворого судового нагляду, тоді як інші зберігають більш традиційний, стриманий підхід.

Висновки. Зростаючий вплив судового контролю з боку адміністративних судів є відповіддю на мінливі потреби сучасного управління. Це відображає суспільний попит до більшої підзвітності та дотримання законодавства за органами публічної адміністрації. У майбутньому, ймовірно, буде продовжено зусилля з удосконалення цих відносин, забезпечуючи, щоб вони сприяли створенню ефективної та справедливої системи управління, яка підтримує принципи демократії та верховенства права.

Keywords: судовий контроль, адміністративні суди, органи публічної адміністрації, правовий нагляд, врядування, прозорість