



Court Law Review

ISSN: 3061-0893

E-ISSN: 3061-0907

Journal homepage <https://courtlawreview-aip.com/>

Editorial

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE X ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE "CURRENT ISSUES OF COURT LAW"

*Oksana Khotynska-Nor and Bohdana Zahrebelna**

ABSTRACT

Background. *The 10th Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues of Court Law", held in Kyiv on April 25, 2025, served as a crucial platform for legal scholars, practitioners, and emerging researchers to examine the challenges and opportunities of judicial reform, transitional justice and the digitalization of justice in Ukraine. The conference aimed to facilitate knowledge exchange, comparative analysis, and the development of practical recommendations to guide Ukraine's judicial reforms and support post-conflict recovery. This report provides an overview of the event, highlighting the contributions of key speakers and the main themes addressed during the discussions.*

Methods. *This report synthesizes and analyzes presentations delivered by distinguished speakers from Ukraine, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Lithuania, Kosovo, and Saudi Arabia. The contributions consisted of keynote speeches addressing judicial reform, transitional justice, digitalization of justice, and the alignment of Ukrainian legal frameworks with European standards. The analysis draws on both theoretical legal scholarship and practical experience, highlighting lessons and best practices from diverse international contexts to inform Ukraine's ongoing judicial reforms and support post-conflict recovery efforts.*

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.33327/CLR/3061-0907/2025/1-00010>

Date of publication: 10 Oct 2025

Disclaimer:

The authors declare that their opinion and views expressed in this manuscript are free of any impact of any organizations.

Copyright:

© 2025 Oksana Khotynska-Nor and Bohdana Zahrebelna



Results and Conclusions. *The conference featured plenary sessions and panels with contributions from distinguished speakers from Ukraine, Germany, Poland, Austria, Albania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Lithuania and Great Britain. Key discussions underlined the need for evidence-based policy-making, strengthened institutional independence and public trust to ensure sustainable post-conflict recovery. Equally important, the comparative insights shared by international experts highlighted the strategic dimension of Ukraine's integration into the European Union and the broader European Research Area. The exchange of lessons learned and best practices proved invaluable for shaping Ukraine's judicial and institutional transformations, offering both a roadmap for reform and a platform for consolidating Ukraine's place within the European legal and academic community. Overall, the conference reinforced the critical role of international scholarly cooperation in informing and guiding Ukraine's judicial transformation.*

1 INTRODUCTION

The ongoing European accession of Ukraine, combined with the challenges of the war, makes the role of international academic forums and conferences more vital than ever. They not only provide an opportunity for knowledge exchange and sharing of best practices but also contribute to harmonization with EU standards and addressing the pressing tasks of post-war recovery and transitional justice. As repeatedly emphasized by the European Commission, judiciary along with many other spheres must undergo comprehensive reforms to strengthen the rule of law and ensure full alignment with European values.¹ In parallel, the integration of Ukrainian academia into the broader European Research Area plays a crucial role, fostering joint scientific initiatives, advancing research quality and promoting the dissemination of knowledge. Together, these processes underscore the importance of academic and professional dialogue as a cornerstone for building sustainable institutions and reinforcing Ukraine's path towards Europe.

Against this background, on April 25, 2025, the 10th Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference “*Current Issues of Court Law*”² was held in Kyiv. As has already become tradition, the event brought together both young researchers and leading experts from Ukraine and abroad, providing a vital platform for dialogue on the challenges of judicial law and reform. The conference was jointly organized by the Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, the National University “Odesa Law Academy”, the German-Ukrainian Lawyers' Association, and supported by *Access to*

1 European Commission, ‘Commission Opinion on Ukraine's Application for Membership of the European Union’ (COM(2022) 407 final, 17 June 2022) <<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52022DC0407>> accessed 20 August 2025.

2 ‘The International Conference “Current Issues in Court Law”’ (*Court Law Review (CLR)*, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/index.php/courtlawreview-aip/en/conference>> accessed 20 August 2025.

Justice in Eastern Europe Journal (AJEE). Participants included representatives of academic institutions from Ukraine, Germany, Poland, Austria, Albania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Lithuania and Great Britain.

Academics, legal professionals and young researchers from diverse national contexts participated in a full day of active discussions. The conference aimed to bring together the academic community and experts, both Ukrainian and international, to address judicial reform in Ukraine in light of European integration, digitalization of justice and transitional justice challenges, while exploring international best practices. A selection of keynote presentations and scholarly papers from the event will be published in the peer-reviewed journal *Court Law Review*, ensuring broader dissemination of the insights shared.

The conference's plenary session was divided into morning and afternoon segments, covering three key panels: European practices in justice, digitalization of justice and transitional justice. Presentations addressed pressing challenges facing judicial systems, including authoritarian pressures, transnational legal cooperation, and the ongoing need for reform.

The morning plenary session featured welcoming remarks from the organizers and prominent speakers from Ukraine and the European Union, offering their perspectives on these challenges.

The first panel focused on European practices in the justice system and analyzed their relevance to Ukraine's EU integration path. The second panel explored the digitalization of justice, covering the transformation of judicial procedures, the implementation of electronic services, and innovative tools in European countries. The third panel was dedicated to transitional justice, addressing issues of combating impunity, restoring justice, and lessons Ukraine can learn from international experiences in post-conflict justice.

2 KEY PRESENTATIONS

The plenary session opened with welcoming remarks from the organizers and distinguished guests, setting the tone for an intensive day of academic dialogue. The first keynote address was delivered by one of the co-authors, **Professor Oksana Khotynska-Nor** from Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. In her presentation "*Judicial Law as an Integral Concept*", she introduced a collective monograph offering a comprehensive overview of the multifaceted nature of judicial law. Professor Khotynska-Nor emphasized both the institutional and functional dimensions of judicial law, highlighting the contributions of numerous scholars to the development of this field.

The welcoming session continued with presentations from **Professor Silvia von Steinsdorff** of Humboldt University of Berlin, **Professor Gilles Cuniberti**, President of the European Association of Private International Law (University of Luxembourg), and



Denys Maslov, Member of Parliament of Ukraine and Chair of the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Legal Policy.

Professor Silvia von Steinsdorff of Humboldt University of Berlin discussed “*Judicial Autonomy Under Authoritarian Threats: Common Patterns and Possible Strategies for Resilience*”³ and introduced a research project aimed at mapping judicial autonomy patterns across Europe, clustering cross-case patterns of “legal engineering”, identifying “toxic” combinations of reforms, and developing strategies to defend judicial autonomy. Her analysis covered the effects of political system changes, judicial reforms and the risks of rule-of-law backsliding. A key focus was on how to measure judicial autonomy consistently, considering both *de jure* and *de facto* independence. Her conclusions emphasized that a consistent conceptualization of judicial autonomy is crucial, *de jure* autonomy significantly impacts *de facto* independence, and careful balancing of qualitative and quantitative approaches is required.

Professor Gilles Cuniberti, President of the European Association of Private International Law, followed with a presentation on the “*2005 Hague Choice of Court Convention*”⁴. He highlighted its significance for strengthening legal certainty and transnational cooperation in private international law, with a particular focus on Ukraine, where the Convention entered into force on August 1, 2023. Professor Cuniberti explained that the Convention regulates the enforcement of exclusive choice of court agreements and resulting judgments in international commercial cases. He detailed its scope, noting that it applies to cases with elements connected to multiple states while excluding matters such as employment, consumer, and family law. He also outlined the Convention’s provisions on jurisdiction and the limited grounds for refusing to recognize foreign judgments.

Finally, **Denys Maslov**, MP and Chair of the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Legal Policy, offered an address on “*The Evolution of the Judiciary in Ukraine: Reality and Future Perspectives*”. He reflected on ongoing reforms, the challenges they face, and the strategic priorities for aligning Ukraine’s judiciary with European standards.

Digitalization of justice session brought together leading European and Ukrainian scholars to discuss the opportunities and challenges of digital technologies in the justice sector.

Dr. Alina Ontanu (Tilburg University), in her talk “*Digitalisation and Beyond: An Overview of the European Dispute Resolution Landscape*”, highlighted the challenges and complexities

3 Silvia von Steinsdorff, ‘How to Measure Judicial Autonomy The Operationalisation of a Multidimensional Concept’ (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference “Current Issues on Court Law”, Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Silvia%20von%20Steinsdorff.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.

4 Gilles Cuniberti, ‘2005 Hague Choice of Court Convention’ (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference “Current Issues on Court Law”, Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Gilles%20Cuniberti.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.

of e-justice in Europe. She noted that despite the EU's adoption of over 20 procedural and technological regulations, justice systems remain fragmented across 26 national jurisdictions, which complicates cross-border litigation. She also emphasized that while technology can enhance efficiency, it must always comply with human rights guarantees, particularly Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Prof. Lidiia Moskvych (Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University) presented on "*Cyberjustice as a Mechanism for Enhancing the Efficiency of Judicial Proceedings*", addressing the role of digital tools in streamlining procedures and ensuring more effective administration of justice.

An insightful comparative perspective was offered by **Prof. Anna Nylund** (University of Bergen), who spoke on "*Digitalisation and Other Steps Enhancing Efficiency in the Norwegian (and Scandinavian) Context*"⁵. She provided a detailed overview of Norway's fully digitized case management system, where attorneys are required to file documents electronically and remote testimony has become a common practice. Court case management and hearings are conducted almost exclusively in a digital environment, reflecting a high degree of technological integration in judicial proceedings.

At the same time, Professor Nylund drew attention to significant challenges, particularly the phenomenon of so-called "*file packing*", where digital systems lead to excessively long case files overloaded with written submissions. As a potential solution, she highlighted the Swedish model, where courts compile a concise case summary and limit the right to submit additional statements strictly to specific issues in dispute.

Professor Nylund underscored the importance of broader efficiency mechanisms within judicial proceedings, which include procedural case management, early planning of litigation strategies and an active role of judges in promoting timely settlements. Her comparative Scandinavian perspective demonstrated that while digitalisation can significantly enhance efficiency, its success ultimately depends on a balanced approach that combines technological solutions with sound procedural practices.

Dr. Vigita Vebrate (Vilnius University) delivered a presentation on the "*(Un)Efficiency of E-CODEX in Cross-Border Justice*"⁶. She explained the functioning of E-CODEX as a decentralized and interoperable system for judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters across the EU, stressing its advantages as a free-of-charge tool for secure cross-border communication and its potential relevance for Ukraine's EU integration path.

5 Anna Nylund, 'Digitalisation and Other Steps Enhancing Efficiency in the Norwegian (and Scandinavian) Context' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Anna%20Nylund.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.

6 Vigita Vebrate, '(Un)Efficiency of E-CODEX in Cross-Border Justice' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Vigita%20Vebrate.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.



The Ukrainian context was further explored through a series of national presentations. **Professor Maryna Stefanchuk** (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv) examined “*Administration of the Public Prosecution System in Ukraine: European Integration Trends*”. **Dr. Semen Khanin** (Attorney, Managing Partner, Amber Law Firm) addressed “*Contemporary Challenges in Criminal and Criminal Procedural Law: Trends in Judicial Practice and Possible Solutions*”. **Professor Ivan Nazarov** (National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance) presented on “*Integrity Screening as Access to the Judicial Profession: Challenges and Prospects*”.

Taken together, these contributions underscored both the promise of digital transformation in justice systems and the need for safeguards, comparative learning and thoughtful implementation in the course of Ukraine’s ongoing judicial reforms.

The final panel focused on the crucial topic of **transitional justice**, addressing accountability, restoration of justice, and lessons from international post-conflict experiences.

The session opened with **Professor Geoff Dancy** (Project Director, University of Toronto), who presented on “*Assessment Tools for Transitional Justice*”. He introduced the Transitional Justice Evaluation Tools (TJET)⁷ project, which combines global and local data on transitional justice mechanisms such as criminal prosecutions, truth commissions, reparations, amnesties, and vetting. Drawing on mixed-method studies—including surveys of over 75,000 respondents and more than 40,000 case records—Professor Dancy outlined several key findings.

First, he emphasized that popular demand for justice is persistent, though opinions differ on the appropriate forms of punishment and venues for trials. For example, TJET surveys in Ukraine revealed strong expectations for accountability, particularly concerning Russians responsible for serious crimes and domestic collaborators. Comparative data from Ethiopia suggested cautious optimism for justice but highlighted disagreements about which time periods and venues to prioritize.

Second, Professor Dancy argued that transitional justice can improve human rights protections and reduce the risk of conflict recurrence. Empirical evidence shows that trials, truth commissions, and reparations are correlated with greater respect for human rights and fewer democratic breakdowns. While transitional justice often promotes broader political engagement, it can also foster polarization, especially in societies with deep pre-existing divisions. Notably, prosecutions of state agents and victim-focused truth commissions are associated with a lower risk of renewed conflict.

7 Geoff Dancy and others, ‘The Transitional Justice Research Collaborative Dataset’ (TJRC, 2014) <<https://transitionaljusticedata.com/download.html#citation-of-browse-data>> accessed 20 August 2025.

Finally, he highlighted a concerning global decline in human rights prosecutions, cautioning that political leaders too often overlook the tangible benefits of transitional justice. He concluded that the demand for justice will not disappear, inclusivity is essential, and the proven impacts of transitional justice should be acknowledged and supported rather than ignored by policymakers.

Professor Qerim Qerimi from the University of Pristina, a member of the Working Group on Minority Rights Protection of the Venice Commission, spoke on "Kosovo's National Strategy on Transitional Justice: Lessons for Ukraine".⁸ He analyzed Kosovo's recently adopted 2024–2034 strategy,⁹ which, despite being launched 25 years after the war, offers valuable insights into a victim-centered and inclusive approach. He highlighted the strategy's foundational pillars of truth, justice, reparation, and non-recurrence and emphasized the importance for Ukraine of early, inclusive engagement, clear institutional design, and sustained political will to build a transformative future.

He noted that the delayed implementation in Kosovo led to fragmented initiatives, vague mandates such as those of the Truth Commission, civil society skepticism, and political inertia, and that the ultimate success of the strategy depends on funding, independence and accountability. For Ukraine, he stressed the importance of acting early, involving victims as active participants rather than mere subjects, clarifying institutions and mandates from the start, beginning evidence collection immediately and designing mechanisms suited to the Ukrainian context.

Professor Qerimi also discussed policy innovations in Kosovo, including trials in absentia for genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes, the memorialization of children killed or missing, and the recognition of political realities in strategy design. He concluded that transitional justice serves as a moral infrastructure, that Kosovo's journey reflects both ambition and ambivalence, and that Ukraine has the opportunity to pursue bold, early, and inclusive justice, which must be built with courage and commitment.

Dr. Mohamad Almohawes from Al Yamamah University, Saudi Arabia, presented on "Genocide Trials in Srebrenica and Al-Anfal: Lessons for Ukraine's Post-War Restoration".¹⁰ He analyzed how these trials addressed mass atrocities - the Srebrenica

8 Qerim Qerimi, 'Kosovo's National Strategy on Transitional Justice: Lessons for Ukraine' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/index.php/courtlawreview-aip/en/Presentations>> accessed 20 August 2025.

9 Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Kosovo, 'Republic of Kosovo Strategy on Transitional Justice, 2024-2034' (*Office of the Prime Minister*, June 2024) <<https://kryeministri.rks-gov.net/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/STRATEGY-ON-TRANSITIONAL-JUSTICE-IN-REPUBLIC-OF-KOSOVO-2024-2034.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.

10 Mohamad Almohawes, 'Genocide Trials in Srebrenica and Al-Anfal: Lessons for Ukraine's Post-War Restoration' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Mohamad%20Almohawes.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.



genocide in 1995, where over 8,000 Bosnian Muslims were killed, and the Al-Anfal campaign in 1987–1988, which caused around 150,000 Kurdish deaths-and how the structure and fairness of the trials shaped their societal impact. The Srebrenica trial was conducted internationally by the ICTY, while Al-Anfal was tried domestically by the Iraqi High Tribunal.

Dr. Almohawes highlighted key lessons for Ukraine, emphasizing the need for early and inclusive justice processes, clear institutional frameworks, international support and public trust. He stressed that justice should be independent, fair, and restorative, combining trials with truth commissions, reparations, and institutional reforms to support social healing and long-term peace. Unfair or politicized trials risk deepening divisions, whereas credible, transparent justice strengthens the rule of law and fosters reconciliation.

Other speakers on the panel, including **Professor Oleksandra Yanovska**, Judge of the Supreme Court of Ukraine, and **Dr. Pavlo Pushkar**, Head of the Division for the Execution of Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, contributed important insights that complemented the discussions, reinforcing key themes of accountability, the role of national and international judicial mechanisms, and the ongoing efforts to combat impunity for human rights violations.

Dr. Rainer Birke, Chairman of the German-Ukrainian Bar Association, also contributed to the panel, presenting on "War Crimes in Ukraine: Competence of National and Supranational Jurisdiction", highlighting key considerations regarding the roles of domestic and international judicial mechanisms.

3 SIGNIFICANCE AND OUTCOMES OF THE PANEL CONTRIBUTIONS

The conference provided a comprehensive and multifaceted overview of the current challenges and trends in judicial law. The contributions from the three panels collectively highlighted that judicial reform is a complex and multidimensional process that requires simultaneous attention to legal theory, international cooperation, technological innovation, and transitional justice.

The morning panel underscored that while Ukraine is advancing along the path to EU integration, it continues to face persistent challenges similar to those of other European countries, particularly regarding the safeguarding of judicial independence from political or authoritarian pressures. Discussions on judicial autonomy and the risks of rule-of-law backsliding provided valuable analytical tools and comparative strategies.

From Ukraine's perspective, these insights are especially significant, as judicial independence is a key benchmark under Chapter 23 - Justice and Fundamental Rights and forms part of the justice cluster of accession negotiations. The EU has consistently underlined the need for Ukraine to improve judicial governance, strengthen impartiality

and accountability, and build effective mechanisms to safeguard independence both in law and in practice¹¹. In this regard, the conference discussions not only confirmed the relevance of these priorities but also offered comparative experiences and recommendations that may guide Ukraine in refining its reform strategy and restoring public trust in the judiciary.

The analysis of the 2005 Hague Choice of Court Convention was of particular importance in Ukraine's context, following its ratification in 2023 as for Ukraine its ratification represents a significant step toward greater legal predictability in cross-border litigation and deeper integration into the European legal space. Equally important, the insights shared by Prof. Cuniberti on its practical application offered invaluable guidance for Ukrainian policymakers and practitioners, highlighting how international instruments can be leveraged to support domestic reforms and enhance the credibility of Ukraine's judiciary in the eyes of both citizens and international partners. Finally, Denys Maslov presentation "*The Evolution of the Judiciary in Ukraine: Reality and Future Perspectives*" reinforced the panel's broader message that Ukraine's successful EU integration depends not only on legislative harmonization, but also on sustained institutional resilience, political commitment and a long-term vision of justice reform.

The second panel demonstrated that digitalization, while a powerful tool for efficiency and access to justice, comes with its own set of challenges, from fragmentation across national systems to the risk of "file packing." The insights from the Norwegian and broader Scandinavian contexts provided practical solutions and underscored the importance of integrating technology with robust procedural management and crisis preparedness.

For Ukraine, these discussions are particularly relevant. The war and the temporary occupation of territories have accelerated the shift toward digital justice, with lawyers and state actors now required to maintain electronic accounts and participate in proceedings through a unified electronic system.¹² While shortcomings remain, such as uneven access to technology and persistent infrastructural gaps, the comparative experience offered valuable lessons for strengthening digital justice. According to the 2024 CEPEJ Evaluation Report, General ICT Deployment Index in Ukraine currently ranks among the lowest 20% of states,¹³ scoring below 2.5, which highlights the scale of the challenges ahead.

11 European Commission, 'Ukraine 2024 Report: 2024 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy' (SWD(2024) 699 final, 30 October 2024) <<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52024SC0699>> accessed 20 August 2025.

12 Law of Ukraine No 3200-IX 'On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine Regarding Mandatory Registration and Use of Electronic Cabinets in the Unified Judicial Information and Telecommunications System or Its Separate Subsystem (Module) Providing Document Exchange' (29 June 2023) [2023] Official Gazette of Ukraine 70/4041.

13 European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice, *European Judicial Systems: CEPEJ Evaluation Report: 2024 Evaluation Cycle (2022 data), pt 1: General Analyses* (Council of Europe 2024) <<https://www.coe.int/en/web/cepej/special-file>> accessed 20 August 2025.



Nevertheless, the reforms under way, coupled with international insights and support, point toward an opportunity to build a more resilient, transparent, and accessible justice system through digital transformation.

Finally, the third panel addressed the critical issue of transitional justice, emphasizing that the demand for accountability is a persistent force. The data presented by Professor Dancy offered compelling evidence that transitional justice mechanisms can indeed improve human rights and prevent conflict recurrence. The lessons from Kosovo's experience, as shared by Professor Qerimi, provided a cautionary tale about the costs of delay and a powerful call for urgency in designing and implementing a comprehensive justice strategy. For Ukraine, these insights are of particular importance: transitional justice is not only a matter of addressing past violations but also a cornerstone for sustainable post-war recovery. The comparative experiences presented at the conference highlight the urgent need for Ukraine to adopt timely, inclusive, and victim-centered mechanisms that will secure accountability, strengthen the rule of law, and lay the foundation for long-term peace and reconciliation.

4 CONCLUSION

The 10th Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference “Current Issues of Court Law” demonstrated that Ukraine’s path toward judicial reform, EU integration and post-war recovery requires a multidimensional approach, combining institutional resilience, digital transformation, and transitional justice. The insights shared by leading international and Ukrainian experts emphasized that judicial independence remains a cornerstone of democratic governance and EU accession, while digitalization offers both opportunities and risks that must be addressed through careful procedural management and robust infrastructure. Equally, transitional justice was highlighted as a moral and legal imperative to ensure accountability, safeguard human rights and build long-term reconciliation.

The comparative experiences presented at the conference provided Ukraine with practical guidance and strategic lessons, underscoring that reforms cannot be delayed and must be inclusive, victim-centered and supported by strong political will. Importantly, the event reaffirmed that Ukraine’s judicial transformation is not an isolated national effort but part of a broader European and global legal conversation.

Beyond the substantive outcomes, the conference also highlighted the critical role of such forums in fostering international scholarly exchange. Platforms that bring together legal scholars, practitioners and policymakers create opportunities for mutual learning, comparative analysis and the transfer of best practices. For Ukraine, active engagement in these academic and professional networks is not only a source of valuable expertise but also a pathway to deeper integration into the European and global research space, strengthening the country’s role in shaping the future of law and justice.

REFERENCES

1. Almohawes M, 'Genocide Trials in Srebrenica and Al-Anfal: Lessons for Ukraine's Post-War Restoration' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Mohamad%20Almohawes.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.
2. Cuniberti G, '2005 Hague Choice of Court Convention' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Gilles%20Cuniberti.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.
3. Dancy G and others, 'The Transitional Justice Research Collaborative Dataset' (*TJRC*, 2014) <<https://transitionaljusticedata.com/download.html#citation-of-browse-data>> accessed 20 August 2025.
4. Nylund A, 'Digitalisation and Other Steps Enhancing Efficiency in the Norwegian (and Scandinavian) Context' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Anna%20Nylund.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.
5. Qerimi Q, 'Kosovo's National Strategy on Transitional Justice: Lessons for Ukraine' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/index.php/courtlawreview-aip/en/Presentations>> accessed 20 August 2025.
6. Steinsdorff S, 'How to Measure Judicial Autonomy The Operationalisation of a Multidimensional Concept' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Silvia%20von%20Steinsdorff.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.
7. Vebrate V, '(Un)Efficiency of E-CODEX in Cross-Border Justice' (X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues on Court Law", Ukraine, April 25, 2025) <<https://courtlawreview-aip.com/pdf/Vigita%20Vebrate.pdf>> accessed 20 August 2025.

AUTHORS INFORMATION

Oksana Khotynska-Nor

Professor, Dr. Sc (Law), Head of the Department of Justice, Law School, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

EiC of Court Law Review

oksananor@knu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4480-6677>

Co-author, responsible for conceptualisation, methodology, writing – review.



Bohdana Zahrebelna*

Mag. (Law), Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine

East European Law Research Center

Managing Editor of Court Law Review

bogdanazagrebelna106@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1011-9965>

Corresponding author, responsible for investigation, conceptualisation, writing – original draft, methodology.

Competing interests: Oksana Khotynska-Nor (Editor-in-Chief) and Bohdana Zahrebelna (Managing Editor) are the authors of this editorial. The decision to publish was handled by an independent member of the editorial board to manage the conflict of interest.

Peer-review statement: This article is an editorial and expresses the opinions of the authors. As such, it did not undergo external peer review.

Disclaimer: The authors declare that opinion and views expressed in this manuscript are free of any impact of any organizations.

RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS

Copyright: © 2025 Oksana Khotynska-Nor and Bohdana Zahrebelna. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

ABOUT THIS ARTICLE

Cite this article

Khotynska-Nor O and Zahrebelna B, ‘Conference Report on the X Annual International Scientific and Practical Conference “Current Issues of Court Law”’ (2025) 1(1) Court Law Review 1-13 <<https://doi.org/10.33327/CLR/3061-0907/2025/1-00010>> Published Online 10 Oct 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33327/CLR/3061-0907/2025/1-00010>

Summary: 1. Introduction. – 2. Key Presentations. – 3. Significance and Outcomes of the Panel Contributions. – 4. Conclusion.

Keywords: *Ukraine, EU integration, procedural law, transitional justice, digitalisation of justice.*

АНОТАЦІЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОЮ МОВОЮ

Коментар

ЗВІТ ПРО X МІЖНАРОДНУ НАУКОВО-ПРАКТИЧНУ КОНФЕРЕНЦІЮ «АКТУАЛЬНІ ПИТАННЯ СУДОВОГО ПРАВА»

Оксана Хотинська-Нор та Богдана Загребельна*

АНОТАЦІЯ

Вступ. Десята щорічна Міжнародна науково-практична конференція «Актуальні питання судового права», що відбулася в Києві 25 квітня 2025 року, стала важливою платформою для правників, практиків та молодих дослідників для обговорення викликів і можливостей судової реформи, перехідного правосуддя та цифровізації правосуддя в Україні. Метою конференції було сприяння обміну знаннями, порівняльному аналізу та розробці практичних рекомендацій для проведення судової реформи в Україні та підтримки поствоєнного відновлення. У цьому звіті подано огляд заходу, зокрема внесок ключових спікерів та основні теми обговорень.

Методи. Звіт узагальнює та аналізує виступи провідних спікерів з України, Німеччини, Люксембургу, Нідерландів, Норвегії, Литви, Косово та Саудівської Аравії. Виступи склалися з ключових доповідей щодо судової реформи, перехідного правосуддя, цифровізації правосуддя та гармонізації українських правових рамок із європейськими стандартами. Аналіз спирається як на теоретичні правознавчі дослідження, так і на практичний досвід, підкреслюючи уроки та кращі практики з різних міжнародних контекстів для інформування поточної судової реформи в Україні та підтримки постконфліктного відновлення.

Результати та висновки. Конференція включала пленарні засідання та панельні дискусії за участю провідних спікерів з України, Німеччини, Польщі, Австрії, Албанії, Люксембургу, Нідерландів, Боснії і Герцеговини, Косово, Норвегії, Саудівської Аравії, Литви та Великої Британії. Основні обговорення підкреслили необхідність політики, заснованої на доказах, посилення незалежності інституцій та довіри громадськості для забезпечення сталого поствоєнного відновлення. Не менш важливим було те, що порівняльні знання, подані міжнародними експертами, висвітлили стратегічний вимір інтеграції України до Європейського Союзу та ширшого Європейського наукового простору. Обмін уроками та кращими практиками виявився надзвичайно цінним для формування судових та інституційних трансформацій в Україні, надаючи як дорожню карту для реформ, так і платформу для закріплення місця України в європейській правовій та академічній спільноті. Загалом конференція підкреслила критичну роль міжнародної наукової співпраці у формуванні та підтримці судової трансформації України.

Ключові слова: Україна, європейська інтеграція, процесуальне право, перехідне правосуддя, цифровізація правосуддя.