

## ANNEX 1

### Criticisms by International Organisations and Others

1. Following the election of the Communists and President Voronin, a wide range of international organisations and other bodies have expressed deep concern at apparently regressive developments concerning the judicial system in Moldova.

United National Human Rights Committee, 2002<sup>1</sup>

“12. The Committee is concerned at provisions in the State party's law which raise doubts as to the full independence and impartiality of its judges, as required by article 14, paragraph 1, of the Covenant. In particular, the Committee is concerned at short initial appointments for judges, beyond which they must satisfy certain criteria in order to gain an extension of their term.

The State party should revise its law to ensure that judges' tenure is sufficiently long to ensure their independence, in compliance with the requirements of article 14, paragraph 1. The Committee emphasizes that judges should be removed only in accordance with an objective, independent procedure prescribed by law.”

Council of Europe Report, April 2002<sup>2</sup>

2. “F. Independence of the judiciary
3. 142. This subject needs to be briefly raised in this report, firstly because of the severe criticisms expressed in the country about the judiciary's independence from the political authorities and financial spheres and, secondly, because of the supposed reform projects in this sphere, about which we are bound to have some misgivings.
4. 143. The reforms of the status of judges and of the High Judicial Council, in particular, are not very clear. It was frequently pointed out during our visits that the reforms sought to increase centralization of the judicial system and that certain provisions, such as the removal of judges' immunity, could seriously jeopardize the independence of the judiciary. The authorities were less than frank, emphasizing that no reform had yet been introduced concerning the status of the judiciary or the appointment of judges.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee: Republic of Moldova. 26/07/2002. CCPR/CO/75/MDA. (Concluding Observations/Comments) Distr.GENERAL CCPR/CO/75/MDA 26 July 2002

<sup>2</sup> Doc. 9418, 23 April 2002, Report of the Committee on the Honouring of Obligations and Commitments by Member States of the Council of Europe, rapporteurs: Mrs Durrieu and Mr Vahtre, Functioning of democratic institutions in Moldova, <http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/WorkingDocs/doc02/EDOC9418.htm>

Consultative Council of European Judges (CCEJ), 2003<sup>3</sup> b) Exchange of views on the situation of the judiciary in Moldova

5. “66. After hearing a statement by the Moldovan delegation on the country's judicial system and system for appointing judges, the CCJE noted that the arrangements for the appointment of judges and composition of Moldova's Judicial Service Commission were not consistent with the requirements of the European Charter on the Statute for Judges or its own Opinion No. 1 (2001). It noted that the executive (in particular the President of the Republic) and the legislature could freely intervene in the process of appointing judges and that reform necessitated amendment of the Constitution.
6. 67. Having noted that the Council of Europe was working closely with Moldova in order to reinforce guarantees of judicial independence, the CCJE expressed satisfaction that the relevant Moldovan authorities had confirmed their desire to bring national law, including the Constitution, into line with Council of Europe requirements. The CCJE would closely monitor developments in this field and was prepared to give an opinion on any proposed reforms.”

OSCE, August 2003<sup>4</sup>

7. “In addition, an important structural reform of the judiciary was in the process of implementation at the time of the elections. The existing four-level judicial system was to be replaced by a three-level one, with a “Supreme Court of Justice” as the third and final instance. The restructuring of the judicial system and potential reduction of the number of judges raised concerns regarding the independence of the judiciary and a further weakening of the separation of powers.”

Freedom House, 2003<sup>5</sup>

8. “In 2002, the principle of the rule of law was under challenge in Moldova. This was evidenced by the rising number of cases filed by Moldovan citizens in the European Court of Human Rights and actions taken by the Parliament and government to suppress judicial independence. Also affecting the fragile balance of power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government in 2002 were a series of judicial nominations based on loyalty to the ruling party, the dismissal of the ombudsman, and attempts to limit the independence of the Constitutional Court. The first signal that the Communist government would use judicial institutions to serve its political interests in 2002 was the minister of justice's suspension in January of the CDPP, the main opposition political party,

---

<sup>3</sup> Report of the 4th meeting Strasbourg, 24-28 November 2003, Strasbourg, 15 December 2003 CCJE (2003) 43 [ccje/doc2003/ccje(2003)43e]

<sup>4</sup> OSCE 2003 Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA LOCAL ELECTIONS 25 May and 8 June 2003 OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Report Warsaw 14 August 2003

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/nitransit/2003/moldova2003.pdf>

for organizing unauthorized rallies against government's efforts to bring the country closer to Russia. The ban on the party's activities was lifted in February after the Council of Europe asked the government of Moldova to explain how restrictions on the party complied with articles of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms concerning elections and freedom of thought, expression, and association. The European Union (EU) asked the government to reverse the Ministry of Justice's decision as well. In a letter sent to Moldovan authorities, the EU suggested that measures incompatible with respect for political pluralism and freedom of expression would affect future European Union policies toward the Republic of Moldova."

9. "In April 2002, the Moldovan Association of Judges (MAJ) signalled that the government had started a process of "mass cleansing" in the judicial sector. Seven judges lost their jobs, including Tudor Lazar, a member of the court of appeals, and Gheorghe Ulianovschi, the chairman of the Chisinau Tribunal. In the case of Lazar, the move was likely revenge for decisions by the court of appeals that favored the Basarabian Metropolitan Church and local oil importers over the government. The situation worsened when President Voronin refused to prolong the mandates of 57 other judges. The MAJ conveyed a statement on the matter to COE rapporteurs who were in Chisinau at the time on a fact-finding mission. The government instructed the Ministry of Justice to delay court decisions related to the payment of material damages by state institutions. In October, Gheorghe Susarenco, chairman of the Moldovan Association of Judges, stated at a press conference that senior government officials were pressuring judges to issue rulings that favored government bodies. In December, President Voronin promulgated a constitutional amendment giving him the right to appoint judges. Under the amendment, the head of state will appoint the chairs of courts, their deputies, and lower-ranking judges for four-year terms at the recommendation of the Higher Council of Magistrates. Parliament will appoint for four-year terms members of the Supreme Court of Justice, including the chief of the Supreme Court of Justice, the prosecutor-general, and the minister of justice. These changes provide evidence that the country's Communist leaders are weakening judicial independence and subordinating this branch of governance to their authority."

United States, Country Report on Human Rights, 2004<sup>6</sup>

"e. Denial of Fair Public Trial

The Constitution provides for an independent judiciary; however, official pressure and corruption of judges remained a problem. There continued to be

---

<sup>6</sup> Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2003 Released by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor February 25, 2004 <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2003/27854pf.htm>

credible reports that local prosecutors and judges extorted bribes for reducing charges or sentences.

Following a major reorganization in May 2003, the judiciary consists of three levels: lower courts, courts of appeals, and the Supreme Court. A separate Constitutional Court has exclusive authority in cases regarding the constitutionality of draft and final legislation, decrees, and other government acts. While the Constitutional Court was generally regarded as fair and objective, observers frequently charged that other courts were corrupt or politically influenced.

The Constitution authorizes the President, acting on the nomination of the Superior Court of Magistrates, to appoint judges for an initial period of 5 years. Before being reappointed, judges must undertake specialized judicial training and pass a test evaluated by the Superior Council of Judges. Political factors have played a large role in the reappointment of judges.

There is no juvenile justice system. Children accused of crimes usually were tried by the criminal courts.

The Prosecutor General's office is autonomous and answers to Parliament, and is responsible for criminal prosecution, the presentation of formal charges before a court, and the overall protection of the rule of law and civil freedoms. Prosecutors may open and close investigations without bringing the matter before a court, giving them considerable influence over the judicial process.

By law, defendants in criminal cases are presumed innocent; in practice, prosecutors' recommendations carried considerable weight and limited the defendant's actual presumption of innocence. Trials generally were open to the public. Defendants have the right to a lawyer and the right to attend proceedings, confront witnesses, and present evidence. The Government requires the local bar association to provide an attorney to defendants that are unable to afford one. However, the Government was unable to pay ongoing legal fees, and defendants often did not have adequate counsel. Prosecutors occasionally used bureaucratic manoeuvres to restrict lawyers' access to clients. Defence attorneys were able to review the evidence against their clients when preparing cases. The accused has the right to appeal to a higher court. The Constitution provides for the right of the accused to have an interpreter both at the trial and when reviewing documents of the case. If the majority of the participants agree, trials may take place in Russian or another language instead of Romanian.

Due to a lack of funding for facilities and personnel, there was a large backlog of cases at the tribunal and Higher Appeals Court levels. According to the Justice Ministry, only approximately 75 percent of all court rulings were carried out due to either a lack of judicial and prosecutorial resources or because the subjects were not in the country.”

Report by Open Society Justice Initiative and Freedom House Moldova, 2003<sup>7</sup>

10. A passage from this Report which gave the Mission special cause for concern reads as follows:

“... there has been instituted the practice of “taking under control” certain files, presenting interest to the Communist leaders or to state authorities. This practice implies the following: the High Council of the Magistracy (HCM) or the Supreme Court (both institutions are chaired by the same person) receives instructions from the President’s office, from Government or Parliament, referring to the concerned case and required solution (such instructions also exist in oral form). Following these instructions, the Supreme Court or HCM addresses directly to the chairman of the court, where the particular case is being considered with the order to “take under personal control” the examination of one or other particular file. The so-called “taking under control” in fact represents direct instructions on solutions for specific cases.”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Gheorghe Susarenco, Alexandru Tanase “Monitoring the judicial independence in the Republic of Moldova”, National Report 2003, Open Society Justice Initiative and Freedom House Moldova – in Romanian, English and Russian, p.82

<sup>8</sup> The authors state “Due to the imminence of reprisals, this report will not quote names or other sources of this information. We will only mention that these actions are not singular and bear a general character.” – p.82

## ANNEX 2

### CONSTITUTION OF MOLDOVA

#### CHAPTER IX – JUDICIAL AUTHORITY

##### FIRST SECTION – Courts of Law

###### Article 114. Administration of Justice

Justice shall be administered in the name of the law by courts of law only.

###### Article 115. Courts of Law

- (1) Justice shall be administered by the Supreme Court of Justice, the Court of Appeal, by tribunals and the courts of law.
- (2) To hear certain categories of cases special courts may be set up under the law.
- (3) It is forbidden to set up courts of exception.
- (4) The structure of the courts of law, their areas of competence and the corresponding judicial procedures shall be established by organic law.

###### Article 116. Status of Judges

- (1) Judges sitting in the courts of law are independent, impartial, and irremovable under the law.
- (2) The judges sitting in the courts of law are appointed by the President of the Republic of Moldova following a proposal submitted to him by the Higher Magistrates Council. Those judges who have passed the judicature entry test are appointed in their positions at first for a 5-year term, and subsequently for a 10-year term. After 15 years judges will be appointed for a term of office which expires with their reaching the age limit.
- (3) Both the President and the members of the Supreme Court of Justice shall be appointed by Parliament following a proposal submitted by the Higher Magistrates Council. They must provide evidence of work experience in courts of law that is not less than 15 years long.
- (4) Judges may be promoted or transferred at their own consent only.
- (5) Judges may be punished as provided for under the rule of law.
- (6) The office of judge is incompatible with holding

another public or private remunerated position, except in the area of teaching or scientific research.

Article 117. Public Character of Legal Proceedings

Legal Hearings in all courts of law are public. Cases may be heard behind closed doors only as stipulated by law under compliance with all established legal procedures.

Article 118. Language used in Hearings and Right to Use an Interpreter.

- (2) Legal cases will be heard in the Moldovan language.
- (2) Those persons who do not know or are unable to speak Moldovan have the right to take knowledge of all documents and items on file and to talk to the court through an interpreter.
- (3) In accordance with the law legal hearings may also be conducted in a language that is found to be acceptable by the majority of the persons participating in the hearing.

Article 119. Appealing

The parties involved in a case and the state authorities may appeal against sentences pronounced in courts of law in accordance with the law.

Article 120. Compulsory Character of Sentences and of Other Final Legal Rulings

It is compulsory to abide by the sentences and the other final legal rulings pronounced in courts of law and to cooperate with the latter at their specific request during trials, the execution of sentences and other final rulings of justice.

Article 121. The Budget of the Courts of Law, Compensation and Other Rights

- (3) The budget of the courts of law is approved by Parliament and is included in the national budget.
- (2) The compensations and other rights of judges are established by law.
- (3) The courts of law have control over the police forces placed at their disposal.

**SECOND SECTION – The Higher Magistrates’ Council**

Article 122. Composition

- (4) The Higher Magistrates' Council is composed of 11 magistrates whose mandate is valid for 5 years.
- (2) The following belong by right to the Higher Magistrates' Court: the Minister of Justice, the President of the Supreme Court of Justice, the President of the Court of Appeal, the President of the Court of Business Audit, the P r o s e c u t o r G e n e r a l .
- (3) Furthermore, the reunited colleges of the Supreme Court Justice select by secret ballot three more magistrates, and another three are selected by Parliament from amongst accredited university professors.

#### Article 123. Powers

The Higher Magistrates' Council in accordance with regulations established in the organization of the judiciary performs the appointments, transfers, promotions of judges, as well as the disciplinary actions against them.

### **THIRD SECTION – The Public Prosecution Office**

#### Article 124. Powers and Structure

- (1) The Prosecutor General and the public prosecutors under him exercise control over the exact and uniform enactment of laws by public administration authorities, by juridical and physical entities and their associations, while defending legal order, the rights and freedoms of citizens and supporting the enforcement of justice under the law.
- (2) The public prosecution system is composed of the General Prosecution Office, territorial prosecution offices and specialized prosecution offices.
- (3) The structure, powers and activities of the prosecution offices are established by law.

#### Article 125. Mandate of Public Prosecutors

- (5) The Prosecutor General is appointed by Parliament following a proposal submitted to the latter by its President
- (2) The other public prosecutors are subordinated to the Prosecutor General, and appointed by him.
- (3) The public prosecutors receive their mandate for a p e r i o d o f 5 y e a r s .
- (4) The office of public prosecutor is incompatible with holding any other remunerated position, be it public or private, except in teaching or scientific research.
- (5) In exercising their powers public prosecutors may submit before the law only.



## **ANNEX 3**

### **UN Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary (1985)**

**Adopted by the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders held at Milan from 26 August to 6 September 1985 and endorsed by General Assembly resolutions 40/32 of 29 November 1985 and 40/146 of 13 December 1985**

Whereas in the Charter of the United Nations the peoples of the world affirm, inter alia, their determination to establish conditions under which justice can be maintained to achieve international co-operation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms without any discrimination,

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights enshrines in particular the principles of equality before the law, of the presumption of innocence and of the right to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law,

Whereas the International Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and on Civil and Political Rights both guarantee the exercise of those rights, and in addition, the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights further guarantees the right to be tried without undue delay,

Whereas frequently there still exists a gap between the vision underlying those principles and the actual situation,

Whereas the organization and administration of justice in every country should be inspired by those principles, and efforts should be undertaken to translate them fully into reality,

Whereas rules concerning the exercise of judicial office should aim at enabling judges to act in accordance with those principles,

Whereas judges are charged with the ultimate decision over life, freedoms, rights, duties and property of citizens,

Whereas the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, by its resolution 16, called upon the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control to include among its priorities the elaboration of guidelines relating to the independence of judges and the selection, professional training and status of judges and prosecutors,

Whereas it is, therefore, appropriate that consideration be first given to the role of judges in relation to the system of justice and to the importance of their selection, training and conduct,

The following basic principles, formulated to assist Member States in their task of securing and promoting the independence of the judiciary should be taken into account and respected by Governments within the framework of their national legislation and practice and be brought to the attention of judges, lawyers, members of the executive and the legislature and the public in general. The principles have been formulated principally with professional judges in mind, but they apply equally, as appropriate, to lay judges, where they exist.

### ***Independence of the judiciary***

1. The independence of the judiciary shall be guaranteed by the State and enshrined in the Constitution or the law of the country. It is the duty of all governmental and other institutions to respect and observe the independence of the judiciary.
2. The judiciary shall decide matters before them impartially, on the basis of facts and in accordance with the law, without any restrictions, improper influences, inducements, pressures, threats or interferences, direct or indirect, from any quarter or for any reason.
3. The judiciary shall have jurisdiction over all issues of a judicial nature and shall have exclusive authority to decide whether an issue submitted for its decision is within its competence as defined by law.
4. There shall not be any inappropriate or unwarranted interference with the judicial process, nor shall judicial decisions by the courts be subject to revision. This principle is without prejudice to judicial review or to mitigation or commutation by competent authorities of sentences imposed by the judiciary, in accordance with the law.
5. Everyone shall have the right to be tried by ordinary courts or tribunals using established legal procedures. Tribunals that do not use the duly established procedures of the legal process shall not be created to displace the jurisdiction belonging to the ordinary courts or judicial tribunals.
6. The principle of the independence of the judiciary entitles and requires the judiciary to ensure that judicial proceedings are conducted fairly and that the rights of the parties are respected.
7. It is the duty of each Member State to provide adequate resources to enable the judiciary to properly perform its functions.

### ***Freedom of expression and association***

8. In accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, members of the judiciary are like other citizens entitled to freedom of expression, belief, association and assembly; provided, however, that in exercising such rights, judges shall always conduct themselves in such a manner as to preserve the dignity of their office and the impartiality and independence of the judiciary.

9. Judges shall be free to form and join associations of judges or other organizations to represent their interests, to promote their professional training and to protect their judicial independence.

### ***Qualifications, selection and training***

10. Persons selected for judicial office shall be individuals of integrity and ability with appropriate training or qualifications in law. Any method of judicial selection shall safeguard against judicial appointments for improper motives. In the selection of judges, there shall be no discrimination against a person on the grounds of race, colour, sex, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or status, except that a requirement, that a candidate for judicial office must be a national of the country concerned, shall not be considered discriminatory.

### ***Conditions of service and tenure***

11. The term of office of judges, their independence, security, adequate remuneration, conditions of service, pensions and the age of retirement shall be adequately secured by law.

12. Judges, whether appointed or elected, shall have guaranteed tenure until a mandatory retirement age or the expiry of their term of office, where such exists.

13. Promotion of judges, wherever such a system exists, should be based on objective factors, in particular ability, integrity and experience.

14. The assignment of cases to judges within the court to which they belong is an internal matter of judicial administration. Professional secrecy and immunity

15. The judiciary shall be bound by professional secrecy with regard to their deliberations and to confidential information acquired in the course of their duties other than in public proceedings, and shall not be compelled to testify on such matters.

16. Without prejudice to any disciplinary procedure or to any right of appeal or to compensation from the State, in accordance with national law, judges should enjoy personal immunity from civil suits for monetary damages for improper acts or omissions in the exercise of their judicial functions.

### ***Discipline, suspension and removal***

17. A charge or complaint made against a judge in his/her judicial and professional capacity shall be processed expeditiously and fairly under an appropriate procedure. The judge shall have the right to a fair hearing. The examination of the matter at its initial stage shall be kept confidential, unless otherwise requested by the judge.

18. Judges shall be subject to suspension or removal only for reasons of incapacity or behaviour that renders them unfit to discharge their duties.

19. All disciplinary, suspension or removal proceedings shall be determined in accordance with established standards of judicial conduct.

20. Decisions in disciplinary, suspension or removal proceedings should be subject to an independent review. This principle may not apply to the decisions of the highest court and those of the legislature in impeachment or similar proceedings.

## **ANNEX 4**

### **THE BANGALORE PRINCIPLES**

#### **OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT**

**2002**

*(The Bangalore Draft Code of Judicial Conduct 2001  
adopted by the Judicial Group on Strengthening Judicial Integrity,  
as revised at the Round Table Meeting of Chief Justices  
held at the Peace Palace, The Hague, November 25-26, 2002)*

#### ***Preamble***

WHEREAS the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* recognizes as fundamental the principle that everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of rights and obligations and of any criminal charge.

WHEREAS the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* guarantees that all persons shall be equal before the courts, and that in the determination of any criminal charge or of rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone shall be entitled, without undue delay, to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law.

WHEREAS the foregoing fundamental principles and rights are also recognized or reflected in regional human rights instruments, in domestic constitutional, statutory and common law, and in judicial conventions and traditions.

WHEREAS the importance of a competent, independent and impartial judiciary to the protection of human rights is given emphasis by the fact that the implementation of all the other rights ultimately depends upon the proper administration of justice.

WHEREAS a competent, independent and impartial judiciary is likewise essential if the courts are to fulfil their role in upholding constitutionalism and the rule of law.

WHEREAS public confidence in the judicial system and in the moral authority and integrity of the judiciary is of the utmost importance in a modern democratic society.

WHEREAS it is essential that judges, individually and collectively, respect and honour judicial office as a public trust and strive to enhance and maintain confidence in the judicial system.

WHEREAS the primary responsibility for the promotion and maintenance of high standards of judicial conduct lies with the judiciary in each country.

AND WHEREAS the *United Nations Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary* are designed to secure and promote the independence of the judiciary, and are addressed primarily to States.

THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES are intended to establish standards for ethical conduct of judges. They are designed to provide guidance to judges and to afford the judiciary a framework for regulating judicial conduct. They are also intended to assist members of the executive and the legislature, and lawyers and the public in general, to better understand and support the judiciary. These principles presuppose that judges are accountable for their conduct to appropriate institutions established to maintain judicial standards, which are themselves independent and impartial, and are intended to supplement and not to derogate from existing rules of law and conduct which bind the judge.

*Value 1:*

## **INDEPENDENCE**

*Principle:*

Judicial independence is a pre-requisite to the rule of law and a fundamental guarantee of a fair trial. A judge shall therefore uphold and exemplify judicial independence in both its individual and institutional aspects.

### **Application:**

- 1.1 A judge shall exercise the judicial function independently on the basis of the judge's assessment of the facts and in accordance with a conscientious understanding of the law, free of any extraneous influences, inducements, pressures, threats or interference, direct or indirect, from any quarter or for any reason.
- 1.2 A judge shall be independent in relation to society in general and in relation to the particular parties to a dispute which the judge has to adjudicate.
- 1.3 A judge shall not only be free from inappropriate connections with, and influence by, the executive and legislative branches of government, but must also appear to a reasonable observer to be free therefrom.
- 1.4 In performing judicial duties, a judge shall be independent of judicial colleagues in respect of decisions which the judge is obliged to make independently.

- 1.5 A judge shall encourage and uphold safeguards for the discharge of judicial duties in order to maintain and enhance the institutional and operational independence of the judiciary.
- 1.6 A judge shall exhibit and promote high standards of judicial conduct in order to reinforce public confidence in the judiciary which is fundamental to the maintenance of judicial independence.

*Value 2:*

## **IMPARTIALITY**

### **Principle:**

Impartiality is essential to the proper discharge of the judicial office. It applies not only to the decision itself but also to the process by which the decision is made.

### ***Application:***

- 2.1 A judge shall perform his or her judicial duties without favour, bias or prejudice.
- 2.2 A judge shall ensure that his or her conduct, both in and out of court, maintains and enhances the confidence of the public, the legal profession and litigants in the impartiality of the judge and of the judiciary.
- 2.3 A judge shall, so far as is reasonable, so conduct himself or herself as to minimise the occasions on which it will be necessary for the judge to be disqualified from hearing or deciding cases.
- 2.4 A judge shall not knowingly, while a proceeding is before, or could come before, the judge, make any comment that might reasonably be expected to affect the outcome of such proceeding or impair the manifest fairness of the process. Nor shall the judge make any comment in public or otherwise that might affect the fair trial of any person or issue.
- 2.5 A judge shall disqualify himself or herself from participating in any proceedings in which the judge is unable to decide the matter impartially or in which it may appear to a reasonable observer that the judge is unable to decide the matter impartially. Such proceedings include, but are not limited to, instances where
  - 2.5.1 the judge has actual bias or prejudice concerning a party or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceedings;
  - 2.5.2 the judge previously served as a lawyer or was a material witness in the matter in controversy; or

2.5.3 the judge, or a member of the judge's family, has an economic interest in the outcome of the matter in controversy:

Provided that disqualification of a judge shall not be required if no other tribunal can be constituted to deal with the case or, because of urgent circumstances, failure to act could lead to a serious miscarriage of justice.

*Value 3:*

### **INTEGRITY**

*Principle:*

Integrity is essential to the proper discharge of the judicial office.

*Application:*

- 3.1 A judge shall ensure that his or her conduct is above reproach in the view of a reasonable observer.
- 3.2 The behaviour and conduct of a judge must reaffirm the people's faith in the integrity of the judiciary. Justice must not merely be done but must also be seen to be done.

*Value 4:*

### **PROPRIETY**

*Principle:*

Propriety, and the appearance of propriety, are essential to the performance of all of the activities of a judge.

*Application:*

- 4.1 A judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all of the judge's activities.
- 4.2. As a subject of constant public scrutiny, a judge must accept personal restrictions that might be viewed as burdensome by the ordinary citizen and should do so



freely and willingly. In particular, a judge shall conduct himself or herself in a way that is consistent with the dignity of the judicial office.

- 4.3. A judge shall, in his or her personal relations with individual members of the legal profession who practise regularly in the judge's court, avoid situations which might reasonably give rise to the suspicion or appearance of favouritism or partiality.
- 4.4 A judge shall not participate in the determination of a case in which any member of the judge's family represents a litigant or is associated in any manner with the case.
- 4.5 A judge shall not allow the use of the judge's residence by a member of the legal profession to receive clients or other members of the legal profession.
- 4.6 A judge, like any other citizen, is entitled to freedom of expression, belief, association and assembly, but in exercising such rights, a judge shall always conduct himself or herself in such a manner as to preserve the dignity of the judicial office and the impartiality and independence of the judiciary.
- 4.7 A judge shall inform himself or herself about the judge's personal and fiduciary financial interests and shall make reasonable efforts to be informed about the financial interests of members of the judge's family.
- 4.8 A judge shall not allow the judge's family, social or other relationships improperly to influence the judge's judicial conduct and judgment as a judge.
- 4.9 A judge shall not use or lend the prestige of the judicial office to advance the private interests of the judge, a member of the judge's family or of anyone else, nor shall a judge convey or permit others to convey the impression that anyone is in a special position improperly to influence the judge in the performance of judicial duties.
- 4.10 Confidential information acquired by a judge in the judge's judicial capacity shall not be used or disclosed by the judge for any other purpose not related to the judge's judicial duties.
- 4.11 Subject to the proper performance of judicial duties, a judge may:
  - 4.11.1 write, lecture, teach and participate in activities concerning the law, the legal system, and the administration of justice or related matters;
  - 4.11.2 appear at a public hearing before an official body concerned with matters relating to the law, the legal system, the administration of justice or related matters;

4.11.3 serve as a member of an official body, or other government commission, committee or advisory body, if such membership is not inconsistent with the perceived impartiality and political neutrality of a judge; or

4.11.4 engage in other activities if such activities do not detract from the dignity of the judicial office or otherwise interfere with the performance of judicial duties.

4.12 A judge shall not practise law whilst the holder of judicial office.

4.13 A judge may form or join associations of judges or participate in other organisations representing the interests of judges.

4.14 A judge and members of the judge's family, shall neither ask for, nor accept, any gift, bequest, loan or favour in relation to anything done or to be done or omitted to be done by the judge in connection with the performance of judicial duties.

4.15 A judge shall not knowingly permit court staff or others subject to the judge's influence, direction or authority, to ask for, or accept, any gift, bequest, loan or favour in relation to anything done or to be done or omitted to be done in connection with his or her duties or functions.

4.16 Subject to law and to any legal requirements of public disclosure, a judge may receive a token gift, award or benefit as appropriate to the occasion on which it is made provided that such gift, award or benefit might not reasonably be perceived as intended to influence the judge in the performance of judicial duties or otherwise give rise to an appearance of partiality.

*Value 5:*

## **EQUALITY**

*Principle:*

Ensuring equality of treatment to all before the courts is essential to the due performance of the judicial office.

*Application:*

5.1 A judge shall be aware of, and understand, diversity in society and differences arising from various sources, including but not limited to race, colour, sex, religion, national origin, caste, disability, age, marital status, sexual orientation, social and economic status and other like causes ("irrelevant grounds").

- 5.2 A judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct, manifest bias or prejudice towards any person or group on irrelevant grounds.
- 5.3 A judge shall carry out judicial duties with appropriate consideration for all persons, such as the parties, witnesses, lawyers, court staff and judicial colleagues, without differentiation on any irrelevant ground, immaterial to the proper performance of such duties.
- 5.4 A judge shall not knowingly permit court staff or others subject to the judge's influence, direction or control to differentiate between persons concerned, in a matter before the judge, on any irrelevant ground.
- 5.5 A judge shall require lawyers in proceedings before the court to refrain from manifesting, by words or conduct, bias or prejudice based on irrelevant grounds, except such as are legally relevant to an issue in proceedings and may be the subject of legitimate advocacy.

*Value 6:*

## **COMPETENCE AND DILIGENCE**

*Principle:*

Competence and diligence are prerequisites to the due performance of judicial office.

*Application:*

- 6.1 The judicial duties of a judge take precedence over all other activities.
- 6.2 A judge shall devote the judge's professional activity to judicial duties, which include not only the performance of judicial functions and responsibilities in court and the making of decisions, but also other tasks relevant to the judicial office or the court's operations.
- 6.3 A judge shall take reasonable steps to maintain and enhance the judge's knowledge, skills and personal qualities necessary for the proper performance of judicial duties, taking advantage for this purpose of the training and other facilities which should be made available, under judicial control, to judges.
- 6.4 A judge shall keep himself or herself informed about relevant developments of international law, including international conventions and other instruments establishing human rights norms.
- 6.5 A judge shall perform all judicial duties, including the delivery of reserved decisions, efficiently, fairly and with reasonable promptness.

- 6.6 A judge shall maintain order and decorum in all proceedings before the court and be patient, dignified and courteous in relation to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity. The judge shall require similar conduct of legal representatives, court staff and others subject to the judge's influence, direction or control.
- 6.7 A judge shall not engage in conduct incompatible with the diligent discharge of judicial duties.

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

By reason of the nature of judicial office, effective measures shall be adopted by national judiciaries to provide mechanisms to implement these principles if such mechanisms are not already in existence in their jurisdictions.

## **DEFINITIONS**

In this statement of principles, unless the context otherwise permits or requires, the following meanings shall be attributed to the words used:

"*Court staff*" includes the personal staff of the judge including law clerks.

"*Judge*" means any person exercising judicial power, however designated.

"*Judge's family*" includes a judge's spouse, son, daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, and any other close relative or person who is a companion or employee of the judge and who lives in the judge's household.

"*Judge's spouse*" includes a domestic partner of the judge or any other person of either sex in a close personal relationship with the judge.

### ***Explanatory Note***

1. At its first meeting held in Vienna in April 2000 on the invitation of the United Nations Centre for International Crime Prevention, and in conjunction with the 10<sup>th</sup> United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, the Judicial Group on Strengthening Judicial Integrity (comprising Chief Justice Latifur Rahman of Bangladesh, Chief Justice Bhaskar Rao of Karnataka State in India, Justice

Govind Bahadur Shrestha of Nepal, Chief Justice Uwais of Nigeria, Deputy Vice-President Langa of the Constitutional Court of South Africa, Chief Justice Nyalali of Tanzania, and Justice Odoki of Uganda, meeting under the chairmanship of Judge Christopher Weeramantry, Vice-President of the International Court of Justice, with Justice Michael Kirby of the High Court of Australia as rapporteur, and with the participation of Dato' Param Cumaraswamy, UN Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers) recognized the need for a code against which the conduct of judicial officers may be measured. Accordingly, the Judicial Group requested that codes of judicial conduct which had been adopted in some jurisdictions be analyzed, and a report be prepared by the Co-ordinator of the Judicial Integrity Programme, Dr Nihal Jayawickrama, concerning: (a) the core considerations which recur in such codes; and (b) the optional or additional considerations which occur in some, but not all, such codes and which may or may not be suitable for adoption in particular countries.

2. In preparing a draft code of judicial conduct in accordance with the directions set out above, reference was made to several existing codes and international instruments including, in particular, the following:

- (a) The Code of Judicial Conduct adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, August 1972.
- (b) Declaration of Principles of Judicial Independence issued by the Chief Justices of the Australian States and Territories, April 1997.
- (c) Code of Conduct for the Judges of the Supreme Court of Bangladesh, prescribed by the Supreme Judicial Council in the exercise of power under Article 96(4)(a) of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, May 2000.
- (d) Ethical Principles for Judges, drafted with the cooperation of the Canadian Judges Conference and endorsed by the Canadian Judicial Council, 1998.
- (e) The European Charter on the Statute for Judges, Council of Europe, July 1998.
- (f) The Idaho Code of Judicial Conduct 1976.
- (g) Restatement of Values of Judicial Life adopted by the Chief Justices Conference of India, 1999.
- (h) The Iowa Code of Judicial Conduct.
- (i) Code of Conduct for Judicial Officers of Kenya, July 1999.
- (j) The Judges' Code of Ethics of Malaysia, prescribed by the Yang di-Pertuan Agong on the recommendation of the Chief Justice, the President of the Court of Appeal and the Chief Judges of the High Courts, in the exercise of powers conferred by Article 125(3A) of the Federal Constitution of Malaysia, 1994.
- (k) The Code of Conduct for Magistrates in Namibia.
- (l) Rules Governing Judicial Conduct, New York State, USA.
- (m) Code of Conduct for Judicial Officers of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.
- (n) Code of Conduct to be observed by Judges of the Supreme Court and of the High Courts of Pakistan.
- (o) The Code of Judicial Conduct of the Philippines, September 1989.
- (p) The Canons of Judicial Ethics of the Philippines, proposed by the Philippines Bar Association, approved by the Judges of First Instance of Manila, and adopted for the guidance of and observance by the judges under the administrative supervision of the Supreme Court, including municipal judges and city judges.

- (q) Yandina Statement: Principles of Independence of the Judiciary in Solomon Islands, November 2000.
- (r) Guidelines for Judges of South Africa, issued by the Chief Justice, the President of the Constitutional Court, and the Presidents of High Courts, the Labour Appeal Court, and the Land Claims Court, March 2000.
- (s) Code of Conduct for Judicial Officers of Tanzania, adopted by the Judges and Magistrates Conference, 1984.
- (t) The Texas Code of Judicial Conduct
- (u) Code of Conduct for Judges, Magistrates and Other Judicial Officers of Uganda, adopted by the Judges of the Supreme Court and the High Court, July 1989.
- (v) The Code of Conduct of the Judicial Conference of the United States.
- (w) The Canons of Judicial Conduct for the Commonwealth of Virginia, adopted and promulgated by the Supreme Court of Virginia, 1998.
- (x) The Code of Judicial Conduct adopted by the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, USA, October 1995.
- (y) The Judicial (Code of Conduct) Act, enacted by the Parliament of Zambia, December 1999.
- (z) Draft Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary ("Siracusa Principles"), prepared by a committee of experts convened by the International Association of Penal Law, the International Commission of Jurists, and the Centre for the Independence of Judges and Lawyers, 1981.
- (aa) Minimum Standards of Judicial Independence adopted by the International Bar Association, 1982.
- (bb) United Nations Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, endorsed by the UN General Assembly, 1985.
- (cc) Draft Universal Declaration on the Independence of Justice ("Singhvi Declaration") prepared by Mr L.V. Singhvi, UN Special Rapporteur on the Study on the Independence of the Judiciary, 1989.
- (dd) The Beijing Statement of Principles of the Independence of the Judiciary in the Lawasia Region, adopted by the 6<sup>th</sup> Conference of Chief Justices, August 1997.
- (ee) The Latimer House Guidelines for the Commonwealth on good practice governing relations between the Executive, Parliament and the Judiciary in the promotion of good governance, the rule of law and human rights to ensure the effective implementation of the Harare Principles, 1998.
- (ff) The Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System, adopted by the expert group convened by the Centre for the Independence of Judges and Lawyers, February 2000.

At its second meeting held in Bangalore in February 2001, the Judicial Group (comprising Chief Justice Mainur Reza Chowdhury of Bangladesh, Justice Claire L'Heureux Dube of Canada, Chief Justice Reddi of Karnataka State in India, Chief Justice Upadhyay of Nepal, Chief Justice Uwais of Nigeria, Deputy Chief Justice Langa of South Africa, Chief Justice Silva of Sri Lanka, Chief Justice Samatta of Tanzania, and Chief Justice Odoki of Uganda, meeting under the chairmanship of Judge Weeramantry, with Justice Kirby as rapporteur, and with the participation of the UN Special Rapporteur and Justice Bhagwati, Chairman of the UN Human Rights Committee, representing the

UN High Commissioner for Human Rights) proceeding by way of examination of the draft placed before it, identified the core values, formulated the relevant principles, and agreed on the Bangalore Draft Code of Judicial Conduct. The Judicial Group recognized, however, that since the Bangalore Draft had been developed by judges drawn principally from common law countries, it was essential that it be scrutinized by judges of other legal traditions to enable it to assume the status of a duly authenticated international code of judicial conduct.

The Bangalore Draft was widely disseminated among judges of both common law and civil law systems and discussed at several judicial conferences. In June 2002, it was reviewed by the Working Party of the Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE-GT), comprising Vice-President Reissner of the Austrian Association of Judges, Judge Fremr of the High Court in the Czech Republic, President Lacabarats of the Cour d'Appel de Paris in France, Judge Mallmann of the Federal Administrative Court of Germany, Magistrate Sabato of Italy, Judge Virgilijus of the Lithuanian Court of Appeal, Premier Conseiller Wiwinius of the Cour d'Appel of Luxembourg, Juge Conseiller Afonso of the Court of Appeal of Portugal, Justice Ogrizek of the Supreme Court of Slovenia, President Hirschfeldt of the Svea Court of Appeal in Sweden, and Lord Justice Mance of the United Kingdom. On the initiative of the American Bar Association, the Bangalore Draft was translated into the national languages, and reviewed by judges, of the Central and Eastern European countries; in particular, of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Kosovo, Romania, Serbia and Slovakia.

The Bangalore Draft was revised in the light of the comments received from CCJE-GT and others referred to above; Opinion no.1 (2001) of CCJE on standards concerning the independence of the judiciary; the draft Opinion of CCJE on the principles and rules governing judges' professional conduct, in particular ethics, incompatible behaviour and impartiality; and by reference to more recent codes of judicial conduct including the Guide to Judicial Conduct published by the Council of Chief Justices of Australia in June 2002, the Model Rules of Conduct for Judges of the Baltic States, the Code of Judicial Ethics for Judges of the People's Republic of China, and the Code of Judicial Ethics of the Macedonian Judges Association.

The revised Bangalore Draft was placed before a Round-Table Meeting of Chief Justices (or their representatives) from the civil law system, held in the Peace Palace in The Hague, Netherlands, in November 2002, with Judge Weeramantry presiding. Those participating were Judge Vladimir de Freitas of the Federal Court of Appeal of Brazil, Chief Justice Iva Brozova of the Supreme Court of the Czech Republic, Chief Justice Mohammad Fathy Naguib of the Supreme Constitutional Court of Egypt, Conseillere Christine Chanet of the Cour de Cassation of France, President Genaro David Gongora Pimentel of the Suprema Corte de Justicia de la Nacion of Mexico, President Mario Mangaze of the Supreme Court of Mozambique, President Pim Haak of the Hoge Raad der Nederlanden, Justice Trond Dolva of the Supreme Court of Norway, and Chief Justice Hilario Davide of the Supreme Court of the Philippines. Also participating in one session were the following Judges of the International Court of Justice: Judge Ranjeva (Madagascar), Judge Herczegh (Hungary), Judge Fleischhauer (Germany), Judge

Koroma (Sierra Leone), Judge Higgins (United Kingdom), Judge Rezek (Brazil), Judge Elaraby (Egypt), and Ad-Hoc Judge Frank (USA). The UN Special Rapporteur was in attendance. The "Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct" was the product of this meeting.



## **ANNEX 5**

### **European Charter on the Statute for Judges (1998)**

Strasbourg, 8 - 10 July 1998

The participants at the multilateral meeting on the statute for judges in Europe, organized by the Council of Europe, between 8-10 July 1998,

Having regard to Article 6 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms which provides that "everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law" ;

Having regard to the United Nations Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in November 1985;

Having referred to Recommendation No R (94) 12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the independence, efficiency and role of judges, and having made their own, the objectives which it expresses;

Being concerned to see the promotion of judicial independence, necessary for the strengthening of the pre-eminence of law and for the protection of individual liberties within democratic states, made more effective;

Conscious of the necessity that provisions calculated to ensure the best guarantees of the competence, independence and impartiality of judges should be specified in a formal document intended for all European States;

Desiring to see the judges' statutes of the different European States take into account these provisions in order to ensure in concrete terms the best level of guarantees;

Have adopted the present European Charter on the statute for judges.

#### **1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

1.1. The statute for judges aims at ensuring the competence, independence and impartiality which every individual legitimately expects from the courts of law and from every judge to whom is entrusted the protection of his or her rights. It excludes every provision and every procedure liable to impair confidence in such competence, such independence and such impartiality. The present Charter is composed hereafter of the provisions which are best able to guarantee the achievement of those objectives. Its provisions aim at raising the level of guarantees in the various European States. They cannot justify modifications in national statutes tending to decrease the level of guarantees already achieved in the countries concerned.

1.2. In each European State, the fundamental principles of the statute for judges are set out in internal norms at the highest level, and its rules in norms at least at the legislative level.

1.3. In respect of every decision affecting the selection, recruitment, appointment, career progress or termination of office of a judge, the statute envisages the intervention of an

authority independent of the executive and legislative powers within which at least one half of those who sit are judges elected by their peers following methods guaranteeing the widest representation of the judiciary.

1.4. The statute gives to every judge who considers that his or her rights under the statute, or more generally his or her independence, or that of the legal process, are threatened or ignored in any way whatsoever, the possibility of making a reference to such an independent authority, with effective means available to it of remedying or proposing a remedy.

1.5. Judges must show, in discharging their duties, availability, respect for individuals, and vigilance in maintaining the high level of competence which the decision of cases requires on every occasion - decisions on which depend the guarantee of individual rights and in preserving the secrecy of information which is entrusted to them in the course of proceedings.

1.6. The State has the duty of ensuring that judges have the means necessary to accomplish their tasks properly, and in particular to deal with cases within a reasonable period.

1.7. Professional organizations set up by judges, and to which all judges may freely adhere, contribute notably to the defence of those rights which are conferred on them by their statute, in particular in relation to authorities and bodies which are involved in decisions regarding them.

1.8. Judges are associated through their representatives and their professional organizations in decisions relating to the administration of the courts and as to the determination of their means, and their allocation at a national and local level. They are consulted in the same manner over plans to modify their statute, and over the determination of the terms of their remuneration and of their social welfare.

## 2. SELECTION, RECRUITMENT, INITIAL TRAINING

2.1. The rules of the statute relating to the selection and recruitment of judges by an independent body or panel, base the choice of candidates on their ability to assess freely and impartially the legal matters which will be referred to them, and to apply the law to them with respect for individual dignity. The statute excludes any candidate being ruled out by reason only of their sex, or ethnic or social origin, or by reason of their philosophical and political opinions or religious convictions.

2.2. The statute makes provision for the conditions which guarantee, by requirements linked to educational qualifications or previous experience, the ability specifically to discharge judicial duties.

2.3. The statute ensures by means of appropriate training at the expense of the State, the preparation of the chosen candidates for the effective exercise of judicial duties. The

authority referred to at paragraph 1.3 hereof, ensures the appropriateness of training programmes and of the organization which implements them, in the light of the requirements of open-mindedness, competence and impartiality which are bound up with the exercise of judicial duties.

### 3. APPOINTMENT AND IRREMOVABILITY

3.1. The decision to appoint a selected candidate as a judge, and to assign him or her to a tribunal, are taken by the independent authority referred to at paragraph 1.3 hereof or on its proposal, or its recommendation or with its agreement or following its opinion.

3.2. The statute establishes the circumstances in which a candidate's previous activities, or those engaged in by his or her close relations, may, by reason of the legitimate and objective doubts to which they give rise as to the impartiality and independence of the candidate concerned, constitute an impediment to his or her appointment to a court.

3.3. Where the recruitment procedure provides for a trial period, necessarily short, after nomination to the position of judge but before confirmation on a permanent basis, or where recruitment is made for a limited period capable of renewal, the decision not to make a permanent appointment or not to renew, may only be taken by the independent authority referred to at paragraph 1.3 hereof, or on its proposal, or its recommendation or with its agreement or following its opinion. The provisions at point 1.4 hereof are also applicable to an individual subject to a trial period.

3.4. A judge holding office at a court may not in principle be appointed to another judicial office or assigned elsewhere, even by way of promotion, without having freely consented thereto. An exception to this principle is permitted only in the case where transfer is provided for and has been pronounced by way of a disciplinary sanction, in the case of a lawful alteration of the court system, and in the case of a temporary assignment to reinforce a neighbouring court, the maximum duration of such assignment being strictly limited by the statute, without prejudice to the application of the provisions at paragraph 1.4 hereof.

### 4. CAREER DEVELOPMENT

4.1. When it is not based on seniority, a system of promotion is based exclusively on the qualities and merits observed in the performance of duties entrusted to the judge, by means of objective appraisals performed by one or several judges and discussed with the judge concerned. Decisions as to promotion are then pronounced by the authority referred to at paragraph 1.3 hereof or on its proposal, or with its agreement. Judges who are not proposed with a view to promotion must be entitled to lodge a complaint before this authority.

4.2. Judges freely carry out activities outside their judicial mandate including those which are the embodiment of their rights as citizens. This freedom may not be limited except in

so far as such outside activities are incompatible with confidence in, or the impartiality or the independence of a judge, or his or her required availability to deal attentively and within a reasonable period with the matters put before him or her. The exercise of an outside activity, other than literary or artistic, giving rise to remuneration, must be the object of a prior authorization on conditions laid down by the statute.

4.3. Judges must refrain from any behaviour, action or expression of a kind effectively to affect confidence in their impartiality and their independence.

4.4. The statute guarantees to judges the maintenance and broadening of their knowledge, technical as well as social and cultural, needed to perform their duties, through regular access to training which the State pays for, and ensures its organization whilst respecting the conditions set out at paragraph 2.3 hereof.

## 5. LIABILITY

5.1. The dereliction by a judge of one of the duties expressly defined by the statute, may only give rise to a sanction upon the decision, following the proposal, the recommendation, or with the agreement of a tribunal or authority composed at least as to one half of elected judges, within the framework of proceedings of a character involving the full hearing of the parties, in which the judge proceeded against must be entitled to representation. The scale of sanctions which may be imposed is set out in the statute, and their imposition is subject to the principle of proportionality. The decision of an executive authority, of a tribunal, or of an authority pronouncing a sanction, as envisaged herein, is open to an appeal to a higher judicial authority.

5.2. Compensation for harm wrongfully suffered as a result of the decision or the behaviour of a judge in the exercise of his or her duties is guaranteed by the State. The statute may provide that the State has the possibility of applying, within a fixed limit, for reimbursement from the judge by way of legal proceedings in the case of a gross and inexcusable breach of the rules governing the performance of judicial duties. The submission of the claim to the competent court must form the subject of prior agreement with the authority referred to at paragraph 1.3 hereof.

5.3. Each individual must have the possibility of submitting without specific formality a complaint relating to the miscarriage of justice in a given case to an independent body. This body has the power, if a careful and close examination makes a dereliction on the part of a judge indisputably appear, such as envisaged at paragraph 5.1 hereof, to refer the matter to the disciplinary authority, or at the very least to recommend such referral to an authority normally competent in accordance with the statute, to make such a reference.

## 6. REMUNERATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE

6.1. Judges exercising judicial functions in a professional capacity are entitled to remuneration, the level of which is fixed so as to shield them from pressures aimed at

influencing their decisions and more generally their behaviour within their jurisdiction, thereby impairing their independence and impartiality.

6.2. Remuneration may vary depending on length of service, the nature of the duties which judges are assigned to discharge in a professional capacity, and the importance of the tasks which are imposed on them, assessed under transparent conditions.

6.3. The statute provides a guarantee for judges acting in a professional capacity against social risks linked with illness, maternity, invalidity, old age and death.

6.4. In particular the statute ensures that judges who have reached the legal age of judicial retirement, having performed their judicial duties for a fixed period, are paid a retirement pension, the level of which must be as close as possible to the level of their final salary as a judge.

## 7. TERMINATION OF OFFICE

7.1. A judge permanently ceases to exercise office through resignation, medical certification of physical unfitness, reaching the age limit, the expiry of a fixed legal term, or dismissal pronounced within the framework of a procedure such as envisaged at paragraph 5.1 hereof.

7.2. The occurrence of one of the causes envisaged at paragraph 7.1 hereof, other than reaching the age limit or the expiry of a fixed term of office, must be verified by the authority referred to at paragraph 1.3 hereof.

## **EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM TO THE EUROPEAN CHARTER ON THE STATUTE FOR JUDGES**

### 1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The provisions of the European Charter cover not only professional but also nonprofessional judges, because it is important that all judges should enjoy certain safeguards relating to their recruitment, incompatibilities, conduct outside, and the termination of their office. However, the Charter also lays down specific provisions on professional judges, and in fact this specificity is inherent in certain concepts such as careers.

The provisions of the Charter concern the statute for judges of all jurisdictions to which people are called to submit their case or which are called upon to decide their case, be it a civil, criminal, administrative or other jurisdiction.

1.1 The Charter endeavours to define the content of the statute for judges on the basis of the objectives to be attained: ensuring the competence, independence and impartiality which all members of the public are entitled to expect of the courts and judges entrusted with protecting their rights. The Charter is therefore not an end in itself but rather a means of guaranteeing that the individuals whose rights are to be protected by the courts and judges have the requisite safeguards on the effectiveness of such protection.

These safeguards on individuals' rights are ensured by judicial competence, in the sense of ability, independence and impartiality. These are positive references because the judge's statute must strive to guarantee them; however, they are also negative because the statute must not include any element which might adversely affect public confidence in such competence, independence and impartiality.

The question arose whether the provisions of the Charter should be mandatory, ie whether it should be made compulsory to include them in national statutes regulating the judiciary, or whether they should have the force of recommendations, so that different provisions deemed capable of ensuring equivalent guarantees could be implemented instead.

The latter approach could be justified by a reluctance to criticise national systems in which a long-standing, well-established practice has ensured effective guarantees on statutory protection of the judiciary, even if the system barely mentions such protection. However, it has also been argued that in a fair number of countries, including new Council of Europe member States, which do not regulate the exercise by political authorities of powers in the area of appointing, assigning, promoting or terminating the office of judges, the safeguards on competence, independence and impartiality are ineffective.

This is why, even though the Charter's provisions are not actually mandatory, they are presented as being the optimum means of ensuring that the aforementioned objectives are attained.

Many of the Charter's provisions are inapplicable in systems where judges are directly elected by the citizens. It would have been impossible to draw up a Charter exclusively comprising provisions compatible with such elective systems, as this would have reduced the text to the lowest common denominator. Nor is the Charter aimed at "invalidating" elective systems, because where they do exist they may be regarded by nationals of the countries concerned as "quintessentially democratic". We might consider that the provisions apply as far as possible to systems in which the judiciary is elected. For instance, the provisions set out in paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 (first sentence) are certainly applicable to such systems, for which they provide highly appropriate safeguards.

The provisions of the Charter aim to raise the level of guarantees in the various European States. The importance of such raising will depend on the level already achieved in a country. But the provisions of the Charter must not in any way serve as the basis for modifying national statutes so as on the contrary to decrease the level of guarantees already achieved in any one country.

1.2 The fundamental principles constituting a statute for judges, determining the safeguard on the competence, independence and impartiality of the judges and courts, must be enacted in the normative rules at the highest level, that is to say in the Constitution, in the case of European States which have established such a basic text. The rules included in the statute will normally be enacted at the legislative level, which is also the highest level in States with flexible constitutions.

The requirement to enshrine the fundamental principles and rules in legislation or the Constitution protects the latter from being amended under a cursory procedure unsuited to the issues at stake. In particular, where the fundamental principles are enshrined in the

Constitution, it prevents the enactment of legislation aimed at or having the effect of infringing them.

In stipulating that these principles must be included in domestic legal systems, the Charter is not prejudging the respect that is due under such systems for protective provisions set out in international instruments binding upon the European States. This is especially true because the Charter takes the foremost among these provisions as a source of inspiration, as stated in the preamble.

1.3 The Charter provides for the intervention of a body independent from the executive and the legislature where a decision is required on the selection, recruitment or appointment of judges, the development of their careers or the termination of their office. The wording of this provision is intended to cover a variety of situations, ranging from the mere provision of advice for an executive or legislative body to actual decisions by the independent body.

Account had to be taken here of certain differences in the national systems. Some countries would find it difficult to accept an independent body replacing the political body responsible for appointments. However, the requirement in such cases to obtain at least the recommendation or the opinion of an independent body is bound to be a great incentive, if not an actual obligation, for the official appointments body. In the spirit of the Charter, recommendations and opinions of the independent body do not constitute guarantees that they will in a general way be followed in practice. The political or administrative authority which does not follow such recommendation or opinion should at the very least be obliged to make known its reasons for its refusal so to do.

The wording of this provision of the Charter also enables the independent body to intervene either with a straightforward opinion, an official opinion, a recommendation, a proposal or an actual decision.

The question arose of the membership of the independent body. The Charter at this point stipulates that at least one half of the body's members should be judges elected by their peers, which means that it wants neither to allow judges to be in a minority in the independent body nor to require them to be in the majority. In view of the variety of philosophical conceptions and debates in European States, a reference to a minimum of 50% judges emerged as capable of ensuring a fairly high level of safeguards while respecting any other considerations of principle prevailing in different national systems.

The Charter states that judges who are members of the independent body should be elected by their peers, on the grounds that the requisite independence of this body precludes the election or appointment of its members by a political authority belonging to the executive or the legislature.

There would be a risk of party-political bias in the appointment and role of judges under such a procedure. Judges sitting on the independent body are expected, precisely, to refrain from seeking the favour of political parties or bodies that are themselves appointed or elected by or through such parties.

Finally, without insisting on any particular voting system, the Charter indicates that the method of electing judges to this body must guarantee the widest representation of judges.

1.4 The Charter enshrines the "right of appeal" of any judge who considers that his or her rights under the statute or more generally independence, or that of the legal process, is

threatened or infringed in any way, so that he or she can refer the matter to an independent body as described above.

This means that judges are not left defenceless against an infringement of their independence. The right of appeal is a necessary safeguard because it is mere wishful thinking to set out principles to protect the judiciary unless they are consistently backed with mechanisms to guarantee their effective implementation. The intervention of the independent body before any decision is taken on the judge's individual status does not necessarily cover all possible situations in which his or her independence is affected, and it is vital to ensure that judges can apply to this body on their own initiative.

The Charter stipulates that the body thus applied to must have the power to remedy the situation affecting the judge's independence of its own accord, or to propose that the competent authority remedy it. This formula takes account of the diversity of national systems, and even a straightforward recommendation from an independent body on a given situation provides a considerable incentive for the authority in question to remedy the situation complained of.

1.5 The Charter sets out the judge's main duties in the exercise of his or her functions.

"Availability" refers both to the time required to judge cases properly and to the attention and alertness that are obviously required for such important duties, since it is the judge's decision that safeguards individual rights. Respect for individuals is particularly vital in positions of power such as that occupied by the judge, especially since individuals often feel very vulnerable when confronted with the judicial system. This paragraph also mentions the judge's obligation to respect the confidentiality of information which comes to his or her attention in the course of proceedings. It ends by pointing out that judges must ensure that they maintain the high level of competence that the hearing of cases demands. This means that the high level of competence and of ability is a constant requirement for the judge in examining and adjudicating on cases, and also that he or she must maintain this high level, if necessary through further training. As is pointed out later in the text, judges must be granted access to training facilities.

1.6 The Charter makes it clear that the State has the duty of ensuring that judges have the means necessary to accomplish their tasks properly, and in particular to deal with cases within a reasonable period.

Without explicit indication of this obligation which is the responsibility of the State, the justifications of the propositions related to the responsibility of the judges would be deteriorated.

1.7 The Charter recognises the role of professional associations formed by judges, to which all judges are freely entitled to adhere, which precludes any form of legal discrimination vis-à-vis the right to join them. It also points out that such associations contribute in particular to the defence of judges' statutory rights before such authorities and bodies as may be involved in decisions affecting them. Judges may therefore not be prohibited from forming or adhering to professional associations.

Although the Charter does not assign these associations exclusive responsibility for defending judges' statutory rights, it does indicate that their contribution to such defence before the authorities and bodies involved in decisions affecting judges must be



recognised and respected. This applies, inter alia, to the independent authority referred to in paragraph 1.3.

1.8 The Charter provides that judges should be associated through their representatives, particularly those that are members of the authority referred to in paragraph 1.3, and through their professional associations, with any decisions taken on the administration of the courts, the determination of the courts' budgetary resources and the implementation of such decisions at the local and national levels.

Without advocating any specific legal form or degree of constraint, this provision lays down that judges should be associated in the determination of the overall judicial budget and the resources earmarked for individual courts, which implies establishing consultation or representation procedures at the national and local levels. This also applies more broadly to the administration of justice and of the courts. The Charter does not stipulate that judges should be responsible for such administration, but it does require them not to be left out of administrative decisions.

Consultation of judges by their representatives or professional associations on any proposed change in their statute or any change proposed as to the basis on which they are remunerated, or as to their social welfare, including their retirement pension, should ensure that judges are not left out of the decision-making process in these fields. Nevertheless, the Charter does not authorise encroachment on the decision-making powers vested in the national bodies responsible for such matters under the Constitution.

## 2. SELECTION, RECRUITMENT AND INITIAL TRAINING

2.1 Judicial candidates must be selected and recruited by an independent body or panel.

The Charter does not require that the latter be the independent authority referred to in paragraph 1.3, which means, for instance, that examination or selection panels can be used, provided they are independent. In practice, the selection procedure is often separate from the actual appointment procedure. It is important to specify the particular safeguards accompanying the selection procedure.

The choice made by the selection body must be based on criteria relevant to the nature of the duties to be discharged.

The main aim must be to evaluate the candidate's ability to assess independently cases heard by judges, which implies independent thinking. The ability to show impartiality in the exercise of judicial functions is also an essential element. The ability to apply the law refers both to knowledge of the law and the capacity to put it into practice, which are two different things.

The selection body must also ensure that the candidate's conduct as a judge will be based on respect for human dignity, which is vital in encounters between persons in positions of power and the litigants, who are often people in great difficulties.

Lastly, selection must not be based on discriminatory criteria relating to gender, ethnic or social origin, philosophical or political opinions or religious convictions.

2.2 In order to ensure the ability to carry out the duties involved in judicial office, the rules on selection and recruitment must set out requirements as to qualifications and

previous experience. This applies, for instance, to systems in which recruitment is conditional upon a set number of years' legal or judicial experience.

2.3 The nature of judicial office, which requires the judge to intervene in complex situations that are often difficult in terms of respect for human dignity, is such that "abstract" verification of aptitude for such office is not enough.

Candidates selected to discharge judicial duties must therefore be prepared for the task by means of appropriate training, which must be financed by the State.

Certain precautions must be taken in preparing judges for the giving of independent and impartial decisions, whereby competence, impartiality and the requisite open-mindedness are guaranteed in both the content of the training programmes and the functioning of the bodies implementing them. This is why the Charter provides that the authority referred to in paragraph 1.3 must ensure the appropriateness of training programmes and of the organization which implements them, in the light of the requirements of open-mindedness, competence and impartiality which are bound up with the exercise of judicial duties. The said authority must have the resources so to ensure. Accordingly, the rules set out in the the statute must specify the procedure for supervision by this body in relation to the requirements in question concerning the programmes and their implementation by the training bodies.

### 3. APPOINTMENT AND IRREMOVABILITY

3.1 National systems may draw a distinction between the actual selection procedure and the procedures of appointing a judge and assigning him or her to a specific court. It should be noted that decisions to appoint or assign judges are taken by the independent authority referred to at paragraph 1.3 hereof or are reached upon its proposal or recommendation or with its agreement or following its opinion.

3.2 The Charter deals with the question of incompatibilities. It discarded the hypothesis of absolute incompatibilities as this would hamper judicial appointments on the grounds of candidates' or their relatives' previous activities. On the other hand, it considers that when a judge is to be assigned to a specific court, regard must be had to the above-mentioned circumstances where they give rise to legitimate and objective doubts as to his or her impartiality and independence. For example, a lawyer who has previously practised in a given town cannot possibly be immediately assigned as a judge to a court in the same town. It is also difficult to imagine a judge being assigned to a court in a town in which his or her spouse, father or mother, for instance, is mayor or member of parliament. Therefore, where judges are to be assigned to a given court, the relevant statute must take account of situations liable to give rise to legitimate and objective doubts as to their independence and impartiality.

3.3 The recruitment procedure in some national systems provides for a probationary period before a permanent judicial appointment is made, and others recruit judges on fixed-term renewable contracts.

In such cases the decision not to make a permanent appointment or not to renew an appointment can only be taken by the independent authority referred to at paragraph 1.3

hereof or upon its proposal, recommendation or following its opinion. Clearly, the existence of probationary periods or renewal requirements presents difficulties if not dangers from the angle of the independence and impartiality of the judge in question, who is hoping to be established in post or to have his or her contract renewed. Safeguards must therefore be provided through the intervention of the independent authority. In so far as the quality as a judge of an individual who is the subject of a trial period may be under discussion, the Charter lays down that the right to make a reference to an independent authority, as referred to in paragraph 1.4, is applicable to such an individual.

3.4 The Charter enshrines the irremovability of judges, which means that a judge cannot be assigned to another court or have his or her duties changed without his or her free consent. However, exceptions must be allowed where transfer is provided for within a disciplinary framework, when a lawful re-organization of the court system takes place involving for example the closing down of a court or a temporary transfer is required to assist a neighbouring court. In the latter case, the duration of the temporary transfer must be limited by the relevant statute.

Nevertheless, since the problem of transferring a judge without his or her consent is highly sensitive, it is recalled that under the terms of paragraph 1.4 he or she has a general right of appeal before an independent authority, which can investigate the legitimacy of the transfer. In fact, this right of appeal can also remedy situations which have not been specifically catered for in the provisions of the Charter where a judge has such an excessive workload as to be unable in practice to carry out his or her responsibilities normally.

#### 4. CAREER DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Apart from cases where judges are promoted strictly on the basis of length of service, a system which the Charter did not in any way exclude because it is deemed to provide very effective protection for independence, but which presupposes that high-quality recruitment will be absolutely guaranteed in the countries concerned, it is important to ensure that the judge's independence and impartiality are not infringed in the area of promotion. It must be specified that there are two potential issues here: judges illegitimately barred from promotion, and judges unduly promoted.

This is why the Charter defines the criteria for promotion exclusively as the qualities and merits observed in the performance of judicial duties by means of objective assessments carried out by one or more judges and discussed with the judge assessed.

Decisions concerning promotion are then taken on the basis of these assessments in the light of the proposal by the independent authority referred to in paragraph 1.3 or upon its recommendation or with its agreement or following its opinion. It is expressly stipulated that a judge who is proposed with a view to promotion submitted for examination by the independent authority must be entitled to present his or her case before the said authority.

The provisions of paragraph 4.1 are obviously not intended to apply to systems in which judges are not promoted, and there is no judicial hierarchy, systems which are also in this regard highly protective of judicial independence.

4.2 The Charter deals here with activities conducted alongside judicial functions. It provides that judges may freely exercise activities outside their judicial mandate, including those which are the embodiment of their rights as citizens. This freedom, which constitutes the principle, may not know of limitation except only in so far as judges engage in outside activities incompatible either with public confidence in their impartiality and independence or with the availability required to consider the cases submitted to them with due care and within a reasonable time.

The Charter does not specify any particular type of activity. The negative effects of outside activities on the conditions under which judicial duties are discharged must be pragmatically assessed. The Charter stipulates that judges should request authorisation to engage in activities other than literary or artistic when they are remunerated.

4.3 The Charter addresses the question of what is sometimes called “judicial discretion”. It adopts a position which derives from Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights thereupon, laying down that judges must refrain from any behaviour, action or expression likely to affect public confidence in their impartiality and independence. The reference to the risk of such confidence being undermined obviates any excessive rigidity which would result in the judge becoming a social and civic outcast.

4.4 The Charter lays down “the judge’s right to in-house training”: he or she must have regular access to training courses organized at public expense, aimed at ensuring that judges can maintain and improve their technical, social and cultural skills. The State must ensure that such training programmes are so organised as to respect the conditions set out in paragraph 2.3, which relate to the role of the independent authority referred to in paragraph 1.3, in order to guarantee appropriateness in the content of training courses and in the functioning of the bodies implementing such courses, to the requirements of open-mindedness, competence and impartiality.

The definition of these guarantees set out in paragraphs 2.3 and 4.4 on training is very flexible, enabling them to be tailored to the various national training systems: training colleges administered by the Ministry of Justice, institutes operating under the higher council of judges, private law foundations, etc.

## 5. LIABILITY

5.1 The Charter deals here with the judge’s disciplinary liability. It begins with a reference to the principle of the legality of disciplinary sanctions, stipulating that the only valid reason for imposing sanctions is the failure to perform one of the duties explicitly defined in the Judges' Statute and that the scale of applicable sanctions must be set out in the judges' Statute.

Moreover, the Charter lays down guarantees on disciplinary hearings: disciplinary sanctions can only be imposed on the basis of a decision taken following a proposal or recommendation or with the agreement of a tribunal or authority, at least one half of whose members must be elected judges. The judge must be given a full hearing and be entitled to representation. If the sanction is actually imposed, it must be chosen from the scale of sanctions, having due regard to the principle of proportionality. Lastly, the Charter provides for a right of appeal to a higher judicial authority against any decision to

impose a sanction taken by an executive authority, tribunal or body, at least half of whose membership are elected judges.

The current wording of this provision does not require the availability of such a right of appeal against a sanction imposed by Parliament.

5.2 Here the Charter relates to judges' civil and pecuniary liability. It posits the principle that State compensation shall be paid for damage sustained as a result of a judge's wrongful conduct or unlawful exercise of his or her functions whilst acting as a judge. This means that it is the State which is in every case the guarantor of compensation to the victim for such damage.

In specifying that such a State guarantee applies to damage sustained as a result of a judge's wrongful conduct or unlawful exercise of his or her functions, the Charter does not necessarily refer to the wrongful or unlawful nature of the conduct or of the exercise of functions, but rather emphasises the damage sustained as a result of that "wrongful" or "unlawful" nature. This is fully compatible with liability based not upon misconduct by the judge, but upon the abnormal, special and serious nature of the damage resulting from his or her wrongful conduct or unlawful exercise of functions. This is important in the light of concerns that judges' judicial independence should not be affected through a civil liability system.

The Charter also provides that, when the damage which the State had to guarantee is the result of a gross and inexcusable breach of the rules governing the performance of judicial duties, the statute may confer on the State the possibility of bringing legal proceedings with a view to requiring the judge to reimburse it for the compensation paid within a limit fixed by the statute. The requirement for gross and inexcusable negligence and the legal nature of the proceedings to obtain reimbursement must constitute significant guarantees that the procedure is not abused. An additional guarantee is provided by way of the prior agreement which the authority referred to at paragraph 1.3 must give before a claim may be submitted to the competent court.

5.3 Here the Charter looks at the issue of complaints by members of the public about miscarriages of justice.

States have organised their complaints procedures to varying degrees, and it is not always very well organised.

This is why the Charter provides for the possibility to be open to an individual to make a complaint of miscarriage of justice in a given case to an independent body, without having to observe specific formalities. Were full and careful consideration by such a body to reveal a clear prima facie disciplinary breach by a judge, the body concerned would have the power to refer the matter to the disciplinary authority having jurisdiction over judges, or at least to a body competent, under the rules of the national statute, to make such referral. Neither this body nor this authority will be constrained to adopt the same opinion as the body to which the complaint was made. In the outcome there are genuine guarantees against the risks of the complaints procedure being led astray by those to be tried, desiring in reality to bring pressure to bear on the justice system.

The independent body concerned would not necessarily be designed specifically to verify whether judges have committed breaches. Judges have no monopoly on miscarriages of justice. It would therefore be conceivable for this same independent body similarly to

refer matters, when it considers such referral justified, to the disciplinary authority having jurisdiction over, or to the body responsible for taking proceedings against lawyers, court officials, bailiffs, etc.

The Charter, however, relating to the judges' statute, has to cover in greater detail only the matter of referral relating to judges.

## 6. REMUNERATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE

The provisions under this heading relate only to professional judges.

6.1 The Charter provides that the level of the remuneration to which judges are entitled for performing their professional judicial duties must be set so as to shield them from pressures intended to influence their decisions or judicial conduct in general, impairing their independence and impartiality.

It seemed preferable to state that the level of the remuneration paid had to be such as to shield judges from pressures, rather than to provide for this level to be set by reference to the remuneration paid to holders of senior posts in the legislature or the executive, as the holders of such posts are far from being treated on a comparable basis in the different national systems.

6.2 The level of remuneration of one judge as compared to another may be subject to variations depending on length of service, the nature of the duties which they are assigned to discharge and the importance of the tasks which are imposed on them, such as weekend duties. However, such tasks justifying higher remuneration must be assessed on the basis of transparent criteria, so as to avoid differences in treatment unconnected with considerations relating to the work done or the availability required.

6.3 The Charter provides for judges to benefit from social security, ie protection against the usual social risks, namely illness, maternity, invalidity, old age and death.

6.4 It specifies in this context that judges who have reached the age of judicial retirement after the requisite time spent as judges must benefit from payment of a retirement pension, the level of which must be as close as possible to the level of their final salary as a judge.

## 7. TERMINATION OF OFFICE

7.1 Vigilance is necessary about the conditions in which judges' employment comes to be terminated. It is important to lay down an exhaustive list of the reasons for termination of employment. These are when a judge resigns, is medically certified as physically unfit for further judicial office, reaches the age limit, comes to the end of a fixed term of office or is dismissed in the context of disciplinary liability.

7.2 On occurrence of the events which are grounds for termination of employment other than the ones - ie the reaching of the age limit or the coming to an end of a fixed term of

office - which may be ascertained without difficulty, they must be verified by the authority referred to in paragraph 1.3. This condition is easily realised when the termination of office results from a dismissal decided precisely by this authority, or on its proposal or recommendation, or with its agreement.

**ANNEX 6**  
COUNCIL OF EUROPE

COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS

---

**RECOMMENDATION No. R (94) 12 OF THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS TO MEMBER STATES ON THE INDEPENDENCE, EFFICIENCY AND ROLE OF JUDGES**

*(Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 13 October 1994  
at the 518th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies)*

The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 15.b of the Statute of the Council of Europe,

Having regard to Article 6 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (hereinafter referred to as "the Convention") which provides that "everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law";

Having regard to the United Nations Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in November 1985;

Noting the essential role of judges and other persons exercising judicial functions in ensuring the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Desiring to promote the independence of judges in order to strengthen the Rule of Law in democratic states;

Aware of the need to reinforce the position and powers of judges in order to achieve an efficient and fair legal system;

Conscious of the desirability of ensuring the proper exercise of judicial responsibilities which are a collection of judicial duties and powers aimed at protecting the interests of all persons,

Recommends that governments of member states adopt or reinforce all measures necessary to promote the role of individual judges and the judiciary as a whole and strengthen their independence and efficiency, by implementing, in particular, the following principles:

Scope of the recommendation



1. This recommendation is applicable to all persons exercising judicial functions, including those dealing with constitutional, criminal, civil, commercial and administrative law matters.
2. With respect to lay judges and other persons exercising judicial functions, the principles laid down in this recommendation apply except where it is clear from the context that they only apply to professional judges, such as regarding the principles concerning the remuneration and career of judges.

#### Principle I - General principles on the independence of judges

1. All necessary measures should be taken to respect, protect and promote the independence of judges.
2. In particular, the following measures should be taken:
  - a.* The independence of judges should be guaranteed pursuant to the provisions of the Convention and constitutional principles, for example by inserting specific provisions in the constitutions or other legislation or incorporating the provisions of this recommendation in internal law. Subject to the legal traditions of each state, such rules may provide, for instance, the following:
    - i. decisions of judges should not be the subject of any revision outside any appeals procedures as provided for by law;
    - ii. the terms of office of judges and their remuneration should be guaranteed by law;
    - iii. no organ other than the courts themselves should decide on its own competence, as defined by law;
    - iv. with the exception of decisions on amnesty, pardon or similar, the government or the administration should not be able to take any decision which invalidates judicial decisions retroactively.
  - b.* The executive and legislative powers should ensure that judges are independent and that steps are not taken which could endanger the independence of judges.
  - c.* All decisions concerning the professional career of judges should be based on objective criteria, and the selection and career of judges should be based on merit, having regard to qualifications, integrity, ability and efficiency. The authority taking the decision on the selection and career of judges should be independent of the government and the administration. In order to safeguard its independence, rules should ensure that, for

instance, its members are selected by the judiciary and that the authority decides itself on its procedural rules.

However, where the constitutional or legal provisions and traditions allow judges to be appointed by the government, there should be guarantees to ensure that the procedures to appoint judges are transparent and independent in practice and that the decisions will not be influenced by any reasons other than those related to the objective criteria mentioned above. These guarantees could be, for example, one or more of the following:

i. a special independent and competent body to give the government advice which it follows in practice; or

ii. the right for an individual to appeal against a decision to an independent authority; or

iii. the authority which makes the decision safeguards against undue or improper influences.

*d.* In the decision-making process, judges should be independent and be able to act without any restriction, improper influence, inducements, pressures, threats or interferences, direct or indirect, from any quarter or for any reason. The law should provide for sanctions against persons seeking to influence judges in any such manner. Judges should have unfettered freedom to decide cases impartially, in accordance with their conscience and their interpretation of the facts, and in pursuance of the prevailing rules of the law. Judges should not be obliged to report on the merits of their cases to anyone outside the judiciary.

*e.* The distribution of cases should not be influenced by the wishes of any party to a case or any person concerned with the results of the case. Such distribution may, for instance, be made by drawing of lots or a system for automatic distribution according to alphabetic order or some similar system.

*f.* A case should not be withdrawn from a particular judge without valid reasons, such as cases of serious illness or conflict of interest. Any such reasons and the procedures for such withdrawal should be provided for by law and may not be influenced by any interest of the government or administration. A decision to withdraw a case from a judge should be taken by an authority which enjoys the same judicial independence as judges.

3. Judges, whether appointed or elected, shall have guaranteed tenure until a mandatory retirement age or the expiry of their term of office, where such exists.

Principle II - The authority of judges

1. All persons connected with a case, including state bodies or their representatives, should be subject to the authority of the judge.
2. Judges should have sufficient powers and be able to exercise them in order to carry out their duties and maintain their authority and the dignity of the court.

#### Principle III - Proper working conditions

1. Proper conditions should be provided to enable judges to work efficiently and, in particular, by:

- a.* recruiting a sufficient number of judges and providing for appropriate training such as practical training in the courts and, where possible, with other authorities and bodies, before appointment and during their career. Such training should be free of charge to the judge and should in particular concern recent legislation and case-law. Where appropriate, the training should include study visits to European and foreign authorities as well as courts;

- b.* ensuring that the status and remuneration of judges is commensurate with the dignity of their profession and burden of responsibilities;

- c.* providing a clear career structure in order to recruit and retain able judges;

- d.* providing adequate support staff and equipment, in particular office automation and data processing facilities, to ensure that judges can act efficiently and without undue delay;

- e.* taking appropriate measures to assign non-judicial tasks to other persons, in conformity with Recommendation No. R (86) 12 concerning measures to prevent and reduce the excessive workload in the courts.

2. All necessary measures should be taken to ensure the safety of judges, such as ensuring the presence of security guards on court premises or providing police protection for judges who may become or are victims of serious threats.

#### Principle IV - Associations

Judges should be free to form associations which, either alone or with another body, have the task of safeguarding their independence and protect their interests.

#### Principle V - Judicial responsibilities

1. In proceedings, judges have the duty to protect the rights and freedoms of all persons.
2. Judges have the duty and should be given the power to exercise their judicial responsibilities to ensure that the law is properly applied and cases are dealt with fairly, efficiently and speedily.
3. Judges should in particular have the following responsibilities:
  - a. to act independently in all cases and free from any outside influence;
  - b. to conduct cases in an impartial manner in accordance with their assessment of the facts and their understanding of the law, to ensure that a fair hearing is given to all parties and that the procedural rights of the parties are respected pursuant to the provisions of the Convention;
  - c. to withdraw from a case or decline to act where there are valid reasons, and not otherwise. Such reasons should be defined by law and may, for instance, relate to serious health problems, conflicts of interest or the interests of justice;
  - d. where necessary, to explain in an impartial manner procedural matters to parties;
  - e. where appropriate, to encourage the parties to reach a friendly settlement;
  - f. except where the law or established practice otherwise provides, to give clear and complete reasons for their judgments, using language which is readily understandable;
  - g. to undergo any necessary training in order to carry out their duties in an efficient and proper manner.

#### Principle VI - Failure to carry out responsibilities and disciplinary offences

1. Where judges fail to carry out their duties in an efficient and proper manner or in the event of disciplinary offences, all necessary measures which do not prejudice judicial independence should be taken. Depending on the constitutional principles and the legal provisions and traditions of each state, such measures may include, for instance:
  - a. withdrawal of cases from the judge;
  - b. moving the judge to other judicial tasks within the court;
  - c. economic sanctions such as a reduction in salary for a temporary period;
  - d. suspension.

2. Appointed judges may not be permanently removed from office without valid reasons until mandatory retirement. Such reasons, which should be defined in precise terms by the law, could apply in countries where the judge is elected for a certain period, or may relate to incapacity to perform judicial functions, commission of criminal offences or serious infringements of disciplinary rules.

3. Where measures under paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article need to be taken, states should consider setting up, by law, a special competent body which has as its task to apply any disciplinary sanctions and measures, where they are not dealt with by a court, and whose decisions shall be controlled by a superior judicial organ, or which is a superior judicial organ itself. The law should provide for appropriate procedures to ensure that judges in question are given at least all the due process requirements of the Convention, for instance that the case should be heard within a reasonable time and that they should have a right to answer any charges.