The expert conclusion, which contains definite answers to the questions of the investigator or prosecutor, plays an important role in clarifying those circumstances, the establishment of which requires the use of specific expertise. The Article aims to clarify the peculiarities of involving a forensic expert in investigating crimes committed against law enforcement officers and to determine the place and role of expert conclusions in the system of criminal procedural means of proof for crimes in this category. Through the synthesis of theoretical materials, we identify the typical expert studies during investigations of crimes within the researched group. We also establish the conditions that must be observed to recognize obtained expert conclusions as admissible sources of evidence.
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Research Problem Formulation. Law enforcement officers, being the embodiment of the state and law, are subject to special criminal-law protection. However, this does not completely address the issue of providing adequate protection for them from unlawful encroachments. Thus, criminal offenses against the authority of state agencies in the field of law enforcement have persistently prevailed for a considerable period, remaining widespread in the overall number of recorded crimes and criminal offenses. According to statistics from the Office of the Prosecutor General, the total number of crimes in 2013 was 939, accounting for 0.17% of the overall number recorded that year. In 2014, this number increased to 3,106 (0.59%); in 2015: 2,794 (0.49%); in 2016: 1,920 (0.32%); in 2017: 1,578 (0.34%); in 2018: 1,536 (0.31%); in 2019: 1,392 (0.31%); in 2020: 1,438 (this is 0.4% of the overall number of recorded criminal offenses). In 2021, this number rose again to 1,174 (0.38%); in 2022, it decreased to 796 (0.22%); and for the 11 calendar months of 2023, it remained at 800 (0.18%). And although there has been a decrease in the number of crimes in this category over the past few years, their percentage remains high, indicating the need for both intensifying activities related to efficient investigation and proving during trial.

Crimes committed against law enforcement officers include the following: resistance to a law enforcement officer during the performance of his/her official duties (Part 2 of Article 342 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine); threats or violence against a law enforcement officer (Article 345 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine); intended destruction or damage to the property of a law enforcement officer (Article 347 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine); trespass
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Against life of a law enforcement officer (Article 348 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine); hostage taking of a law enforcement officer (Article 349 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine); unauthorised assuming of an office or official title related to the use of uniforms or an identity card of a law enforcement officer (Part 2 of Article 353 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine). These crimes require immediate attention because they are the most numerous within the category of crimes against the authority of state bodies involved in law enforcement activities. What is more, considering peculiarities in the mechanism of their commission, it is not without reason to note that elucidation of a criminal offense event, the qualification of which falls under the specified articles of the Criminal Code of Ukraine, is a complex undertaking. Resolving it requires specific expertise application, overcoming external counteraction to investigation, and addressing many other tactical tasks.

Analysis of Essential Research and Publications.


Various aspects of involving a forensic expert in conducting forensic examinations and utilizing obtained conclusions in criminal offenses where the victims are law enforcement officers are discussed in papers by V. O. Husieva 2, S. V. Kobts 3, A. P. Chyzh 4, and others. At the same time, the place and role of expert conclusions in the system of criminal procedural means of proof in this category of criminal offenses have not yet been clarified by Ukrainian scientists.

The Article Purpose is to study peculiarities of involving a forensic expert in investigation of crimes committed against law enforcement officers and to determine the place and role of obtained expert conclusion in the system of criminal procedural means of proof for crimes of this category.

Main Content Presentation. The current Criminal Procedure Code defines the expert conclusion as a comprehensive outline of studies conducted by forensic experts and conclusions drawn based on their findings. These findings provide reasoned answers to questions posed by a person who engaged the forensic expert,
investigating judge, or court that commissioned a forensic examination. Based on the adversarial principle, it is important to emphasize that forensic examination, as a qualified study preceding the development of a specific conclusion, can be carried out both at the initiative of the investigator or prosecutor, upon the motion of the defense counsel, during pre-trial investigation, as well as at the stage of court proceedings, i.e., in court. At the same time, providing an objective evaluation of collected evidence, including an expert conclusion, is crucial, even at the stage of pre-trial investigation, as it may serve as grounds for making relevant procedural decisions.

As emphasized in the scientific literature, one of the criteria for evaluating evidence is its admissibility. As a rule, legal experts recommend focusing on specific aspects of an expert conclusion, particularly those that describe the procedure of its development. However, M. H. Shcherbakovskyi, M. V. Dementiev, A. M. Protsenko, relying on a systemic analysis of judicial practice, has clarified that the most common shortcomings in law enforcement, leading to the loss of expert conclusion probative value from the perspective of admissibility, are:

1) depending on the stages of conducting a forensic examination: preparation and appointment of a forensic examination; conducting a forensic examination; using the expert conclusion in proving;

2) depending on the severity of consequences, such as: a) obvious violations, including substantial violations that cannot be rectified and lead to the unequivocal inadmissibility of the expert conclusion; b) conditional violations that can be rectified through procedural actions and allow recognizing the expert conclusion as an admissible source of evidence; c) minor violations that do not require rectification and allow recognizing the expert conclusion as admissible, despite certain of its components not being formally consistent with procedural requirements.

Based on the synthesis of theoretical developments by Ukrainian scholars, we can note that a common practice during investigation of crimes against law enforcement officers is the appointment of forensic examinations, including forensic medical examinations, forensic psychiatric examinations, criminalistics examinations, etc. Therefore, relying on the study of forensic investigative practices, it is important to identify factors hindering recognition of the expert conclusion as proper and admissible evidence in criminal proceedings of the category under consideration.

The prevalence of appointing forensic medical examinations during investigation of criminal offenses in the category under consideration is determined by the need to clarify the severity and nature of bodily injuries inflicted in cases of violence against law enforcement officers, trespass against life of a law enforcement officer, hostage taking of a law enforcement officer, or resistance accompanied by violence, etc. Moreover, this is one of the grounds for mandatory appointment of a forensic medical examination (clause 2 of Part 2 of Article 242 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine). In the legal literature, it is summarized that typical objects of study for medical examiners encompass corpses, their parts, specimens from the human body,
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...traces of biological origin (blood, saliva, hair, epidermis), and living persons (suspects, victims). In case of murdering a law enforcement officer, the objects of study are the corpse, parts of the corpse of identified individuals who died violently, suddenly, or under unexplained circumstances, as well as corpses of unidentified persons that need to be thoroughly examined both at the scene and during a forensic examination 9.

At the same time, a forensic medical examination is frequently ordered on the basis of medical records received by the investigator when the victim, law enforcement officer, is undergoing outpatient or inpatient treatment. They become the object of a forensic medical examination subject to qualified expert study. Given the importance of these medical records, particularly in proving specific circumstances of a criminal offense, it is essential to emphasize that all records examined by the medical examiner should be stored in case materials and subsequently made available to the defense counsel in accordance with Article 290 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine. We believe that such an approach aligns with the provisions of the current legislation. This is despite the fact that the Criminal Cassation Court within the Supreme Court, when recognizing evidence as inadmissible (for the period from 2018 to June 2021), during the review of judicial practices stated, "the lack of medical records in criminal proceeding materials, on the basis of which the expert conclusion has been developed, and the non-disclosure of these documents to the defense counsel at the stage of enforcing Article 290 of the Criminal Procedure Code does not automatically result in the recognition of expert research as inadmissible evidence if these records have been obtained in accordance with the specified Criminal Procedure Code procedure, and the defense did not request access to them during pre-trial investigation or was provided with the opportunity to exercise the right to familiarize himself/herself with such records during a proceeding" 10. Our approach can be justified by several circumstances. Firstly, it will prevent their loss or damage (if they were kept by the victim). Secondly, if the defense party submits a motion for the appointment of a repeated or additional examination, there will be no need, based on a court ruling, for additional seizure of evidence from the rightful owner, which may affect the prolongation of the trial period. Thirdly, if the defense alleges signs of forgery, they can promptly be subjected to expert research based on a court ruling, aiming to refute any expressed suspicions, etc.

It is worth emphasizing the need for procedural seizure of objects for subsequent expert research. Because if the expert conclusion is based on objects obtained with a gross violation of the Criminal Procedure Code provisions or obtained in a non-procedural manner, this is a reason to recognize them as inadmissible evidence 11. This applies to both medical records that may be directed for examination by a medical examiner,

10 Огляд судової практики Касаційного кримінального суду у складі Верховного Суду щодо визнання доказів недопустимими. Рішення, внесені до ЄДРСР, за період з 2018 року по червень 2021 року / упоряд. заступник голови Касаційного кримінального суду у складі Верховного Суду, канд. юрид. наук В. Щепоткіна, правове управління (ІІІ) департаменту аналітичної та правової роботи апарату Верховного Суду. Київ, 2021. С. 43-44.
11 Там само. С. 45.
forensic psychiatrist, as well as physical objects submitted for a forensic examination, including photographic images and audio-visual materials. Therefore, it is worth mentioning that physical evidence should only be seized during investigative (search) actions, covert investigative (search) activities, measures to secure a criminal proceeding. Such actions must be authorized and directly implemented in compliance with all legislative principles and requirements. This is particularly true of inspections and searches that have led to the seizure of firearms, ammunition, explosives and explosive substances, which are often instruments used in commission of crimes of the category under consideration.

Regarding obtaining medical records from the victim, its seizure based on the ruling of the investigating judge on granting temporary access to records is not a mandatory requirement. As noted by the Supreme Court in its ruling, “the victim is entitled to directly provide the investigator with medical records to confirm facts related to the harm caused to his/her health resulted from a crime, and the investigator is obliged to accept these documents to clarify all circumstances that, according to Article 91 of the Criminal Procedure Code, belong to the subject of proof, including by appointing a forensic medical examination relying on the medical record. If the victim refuses to submit necessary records at his/her disposal, the investigator shall apply to the court for permission to temporarily access them in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 15 of Section II of the Criminal Procedure Code.”

Thus, according to the procedure set out in Articles 55, 56, 220 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine, in the presence of a request from the investigator, the victim may voluntarily provide them, even without filing a motion for this purpose.

It is worth paying attention to the procedure for collecting samples for expert research, especially biological ones, as they are more frequently sent for qualified expert analysis compared to others. To prevent the expert conclusion based on the analysis of collected biological samples from being deemed inadmissible, it is essential to adhere to a set of requirements. Among them, in particular, there are the following: collecting them by a relevant entity; obtaining them from a person with the procedural status required to provide samples in a case; adhering to the conditions established by the criminal procedural legislation of Ukraine. Emphasis should be made on a person’s status, as, as envisaged in Part 3 of Article 245 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine, biological samples shall be taken from a person in accordance with rules prescribed by Article 241 Examination of an individual. Moreover, according to Part 1 of the same article, representatives of the prosecution shall have the right to examine the suspect, witness, or victim. However, relying on clarifications from the Cassation Criminal Court within the Supreme Court regarding the recognition of evidence as inadmissible, the absence of witnesses during collection of biological samples from a person is not a basis for deeming the expert conclusion as inadmissible evidence. This
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is because such a requirement is not stipulated in the criminal procedural legislation of Ukraine. There is no requirement for the presence of defense counsel during such a proceeding. Consequently, this does not render the expert conclusion inadmissible, as affirmed by the Supreme Court in its ruling: “Blood samples contain information which content is independent of the will of a person from whom they are taken”.

To ensure the use of the expert conclusion in the proving procedure during trial, it is crucial to disclose it to the parties during the familiarization stage and provide access to materials of a criminal proceeding. At the same time, this applies to cases where such a conclusion is obtained by one of the parties. In practice, there are often situations when the prosecutor, recognizing that the evidence collected during pre-trial investigation is sufficient, decides to grant access to the pre-trial investigation materials before obtaining certain expert conclusions. This includes the results of forensic examinations initiated during the pre-trial investigation. As a rule, they are attached during trial. This is fully consistent with the legal conclusions of the Supreme Court of Ukraine, as outlined in rulings No. 5-364кс16 dated March 16, 2017, and No. 5-237кcx(15) dated October 12, 2017. As set out in these rulings, parties to a criminal proceeding have the right to submit materials in court that were not disclosed earlier because the current criminal procedural legislation does not contain such prohibitions. According to Part 12 of Article 290 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine, where either party to criminal proceedings does not disclose materials under this Article, the court shall have no right to accept information contained therein as evidence.

Another important condition for the recognition of expert conclusions as admissible evidence is that it is drawn up by a competent, authorized body. Regarding forensic examinations commonly appointed during investigation of crimes involving law enforcement officials, it is crucial to note that forensic medical examinations, forensic psychiatric examinations, as well as criminalistics examinations, in accordance with Article 7 of the Law of Ukraine On Judicial Examination, shall be appointed exclusively by
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Specialized state institutions. Thus, the prosecution parties should take this into account when making relevant rulings and initiating appropriate motions.

Conclusions. Using the expert conclusion obtained during investigation of crimes against law enforcement officials, both the prosecution and defense counsel establish circumstances that required application of specific expertise. Appointment of forensic medical, forensic psychiatric, and criminalistics examinations is common during pre-trial investigation of crimes committed against law enforcement officers, such as: resistance to a law enforcement officer during the performance of his/her official duties; threats or violence against a law enforcement officer; intended destruction or damage to the property of a law enforcement officer; trespass against life of a law enforcement officer; hostage taking of a law enforcement officer; unauthorised assuming of an office or official title related to the use of uniforms or an identity card of a law enforcement officer. The entities authorized to conduct these types of expert research are exclusively state specialized forensic science institutions. This circumstance is crucial for the subsequent recognition of the expert conclusion as admissible evidence by the court. Additionally, these conditions should include: submitting for forensic examination only those samples and objects seized during authorized investigative (search) actions, covert investigative (search) actions, measures to secure a criminal proceeding, while complying with all legal principles and requirements; timely consideration of the expert conclusion by the parties during the familiarization stage and providing access to materials of a criminal proceeding (if obtained by the parties at this stage); and inclusion in the expert conclusion of a warning about criminal liability under Articles 383, 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine, etc.

All samples, including biological ones, that are to be submitted for a forensic examination must be properly obtained (collected, seized), as this affects the subsequent admissibility of obtained evidence.

A crucial step after receiving the expert conclusion is its correlation with other factual data established during pre-trial investigation, as any inconsistencies between them may be considered sufficient grounds for conducting additional forensic examinations, further investigative (search) actions, etc. At the same time, none of the pieces of evidence has a predetermined weight and, therefore, cannot be considered more important than others.
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