Vilnius University Press

Contents lists available at Vilnius University Press

Teisė
2025, vol. 137, pp. 119–129

ISSN 1392-1274 eISSN 2424-6050
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15388/Teise.2025.137.8

Teisės aktualijos / Problems of Law

Reopening Criminal Cases in Azerbaijan: Legal Framework and Procedural Considerations

Lala Mammadova

ORCID: 0009-0007-3995-3342
Ph.D. in Law, Lecturer
Karabakh University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Science
Khankendi, Azerbaijan
Associate Professor, Baku State University, Faculty of Law
Baku, Azerbaijan
E-mail: lala.mammadova@karabakh.edu.az

Reopening Criminal Cases in Azerbaijan: Legal Framework and Procedural Considerations

Lala Mammadova
(Karabakh University (Azerbaijan))
(Baku State University (Azerbaijan))

In modern criminal justice systems, maintaining a balance between legal finality and substantive justice remains a fundamental challenge. While the principle of *res judicata* ensures stability and legal certainty, mechanisms for reopening finalized criminal cases are essential to correct miscarriages of justice and safeguard human rights.

This article examines the legal framework governing the reopening of criminal cases in the Republic of Azerbaijan, with particular emphasis on proceedings based on newly discovered circumstances. Drawing on Chapter LIV of the Azerbaijani Criminal Procedure Code, the study analyzes the substantive and procedural grounds for retrial, including the criteria for newly discovered evidence and institutional decision-making processes.

The article further situates Azerbaijan's retrial mechanism within the context of international human rights law, with specific reference to Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Several structural and normative deficiencies have been identified, such as the absence of a precise legal definition of newly discovered circumstances and limited procedural safeguards at the preliminary review stage.

The paper argues that strengthening retrial procedures is essential for enhancing judicial fairness, accountability, and alignment with the European legal standards.

Keywords: newly discovered circumstances, criminal retrial, procedural safeguards, legal remedies, criminal case reopening, miscarriage of justice, fair trial guarantees.

Baudžiamųjų bylų atnaujinimas Azerbaidžane: teisinis pagrindas ir procedūriniai aspektai

Lala Mammadova
(Karabacho universitetas (Azerbaidžanas))
(Baku valstybinis universitetas (Azerbaidžanas))

Šiuolaikinėse baudžiamojo teisingumo sistemose galutinio įsiteisėjusio teismo sprendimo ir materialinio teisingumo pusiausvyros išlaikymas išlieka esminiu iššūkiu. Nors *res judicata* principas užtikrina stabilumą ir teisinį tikrumą, galutinių baudžiamųjų bylų atnaujinimo mechanizmai yra būtini siekiant ištaisyti teisingumo klaidas ir apsaugoti žmogaus teises.

Received: 24/10/2025. **Accepted:** 12/12/2025

Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjama baudžiamųjų bylų atnaujinimą reglamentuojanti teisinė sistema Azerbaidžano Respublikoje, ypatingą dėmesį skiriant procesams, grindžiamiems naujai paaiškėjusiomis aplinkybėmis. Remiantis Azerbaidžano baudžiamojo proceso kodekso LIV skyriumi, analizuojami materialiniai ir procesiniai pakartotinio bylos nagrinėjimo pagrindai, įskaitant naujai paaiškėjusių įrodymų kriterijus ir institucinius sprendimų priėmimo procesus.

Straipsnyje taip pat aptariamas Azerbaidžano bylos atnaujinimo mechanizmas tarptautinės žmogaus teisių teisės kontekste, ypatingą dėmesį skiriant Europos žmogaus teisių konvencijos 6 straipsniui. Nustatomi keli struktūriniai ir norminiai trūkumai, tokie kaip tikslaus naujai paaiškėjusių aplinkybių teisinio apibrėžimo nebuvimas ir ribotos procesinės garantijos preliminarios peržiūros etape.

Straipsnyje teigiama, kad pakartotinio bylos nagrinėjimo procedūrų stiprinimas yra būtinas siekiant didesnio teisminio teisingumo, atskaitomybės ir atitikties Europos teisės standartams.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: naujai paaiškėjusios aplinkybės, baudžiamosios bylos pakartotinis nagrinėjimas, procesinės apsaugos priemonės, teisinės gynybos priemonės, baudžiamosios bylos atnaujinimas, teisingumo klaidinimas, teisingo teismo garantijos.

Introduction

The principle of legal finality, which guarantees the stability and authority of judicial decisions, is a cornerstone of the criminal procedure in democratic legal systems. However, this principle must be carefully balanced against the imperative of achieving substantive justice – especially in cases where new facts emerge that cast doubt on the fairness or correctness of a final judgment. In such situations, the legal system must provide an effective procedural mechanism to review and potentially revise decisions that may have resulted in a miscarriage of justice.

In the Republic of Azerbaijan, the institution of reopening criminal proceedings based on newly discovered circumstances is regulated under Chapter LIV of the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC). This exceptional legal remedy is designed to address cases where significant facts or evidence, which existed at the time of the original trial but were unknown to the court, subsequently come to light and raise serious concerns about the correctness of the conviction or the legality of the decision. Article 461 of the CPC outlines the legal grounds and conditions for such proceedings, thereby establishing an avenue for redress and correction of judicial errors.

This article explores the normative and procedural framework governing the reopening of criminal cases in Azerbaijan. It provides a detailed examination of the nature of 'newly discovered circumstances', the evidentiary thresholds required to initiate a retrial, and the legal consequences arising from such proceedings. The analysis is grounded in both domestic legal doctrine and comparative legal perspectives, particularly drawing on international standards such as Article 6 of the *European Convention on Human Rights* (ECHR), which guarantees the right to a fair trial.

In addition, the paper discusses the institutional practices and challenges in the Azerbaijani legal system related to the effective use of this remedy. Particular attention is paid to the role of judicial discretion, the absence of clear procedural safeguards in preliminary assessment stages, and the limitations imposed by the current legal provisions regarding appeals against denials of retrial applications.

By critically evaluating the existing legal mechanisms and identifying legislative gaps, the article aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on ensuring justice in post-conviction processes. The broader objective is to promote the development of a more responsive and rights-based approach to criminal justice in Azerbaijan – one that acknowledges the fallibility of legal systems and reinforces the state's obligation to uphold human dignity, fairness, and the rule of law.

In criminal justice systems, the treatment of offenders with mental disorders who lack legal responsibility poses profound legal, ethical, and procedural challenges. These individuals often cannot be held criminally liable due to their mental state at the time of the offense or their subsequent psychiatric

deterioration, yet they may still present a danger to society or themselves. Therefore, modern legal systems have developed special procedural mechanisms to address this category of offenders through medical coercive measures rather than conventional punitive sanctions.

1. Literature Review

The reopening of criminal proceedings based on newly discovered circumstances represents a critical intersection between legal finality and the right to a fair trial. Academic discourse on this subject has primarily emerged from jurisdictions with established procedural safeguards and a strong tradition of human rights protection. Existing scholarship addresses both the normative frameworks that permit retrials and the broader theoretical and practical implications of revisiting finalized judgments.

A foundational point of discussion in legal theory concerns the tension between the principle of *res judicata* – which emphasizes the finality of judicial decisions – and the moral imperative to correct miscarriages of justice. Legal philosophers, among whom, Dworkin (1986) and Duff (2001), have argued that substantive justice may occasionally override procedural closure, especially when new evidence emerges casting doubt on the integrity of a conviction. In this context, comparative scholars, e.g., Ambos (2016) and Jackson and Summers (2012), reinforce this view by asserting that legal systems must strike a balance between finality and fairness, particularly by allowing exceptional remedies in rare but serious cases.

In the context of the *European Convention on Human Rights* (ECHR), the *European Court of Human Rights* (ECtHR) has clarified in cases such as *Moreira Ferreira v. Portugal (No. 2)* and *Kaçapor v. Serbia* that retrial procedures must be compatible with Article 6 rights, including fairness, equality of arms, and access to effective legal remedies. Bernardini (2021) has proposed that the principle of *ne bis in idem* may be evolving towards a weaker form of *res judicata* in Europe, thus allowing broader discretion for reopening cases under certain human rights conditions. Pilkov (2022) similarly explores the legal and political foundations for reopening cases after ECtHR judgments, thereby suggesting a trend toward a shared European consensus.

Turkish procedural doctrine also provides valuable insights into retrial mechanisms. Sevi Bakım (2013) offers a comprehensive analysis of retrial in Turkish law, highlighting procedural guarantees and challenges. Similarly, Centel and Zafer (2020) examine the institutional design and legal criteria for reopening proceedings in Turkish criminal justice, while emphasizing the need for clarity in the legal definition of newly discovered facts.

Comparative European studies, such as the work of Cavallaro and Palermo (2015), investigate retrial mechanisms from a transnational perspective and demonstrate the diversity of legal standards and procedural thresholds across Europe. Their work is instrumental in identifying commonalities that may serve as guidance for reform in emerging legal systems.

In the post-Soviet legal context, literature on criminal retrials often intersects with issues of transitional justice, institutional reform, and the politicization of criminal trials. Azerbaijani scholars, such as Mammadova (2024) and Abbasova (2016), have drawn attention to systemic deficiencies in investigative procedures and the absence of robust judicial oversight during retrial phases.

Canadian case law also enriches this discourse. Landmark judgments, such as *R v Palmer* (1980), *R v Kowall* (1996), and *R v Chan* (2019), offer nuanced interpretations of what constitutes 'new evidence' sufficient to warrant reopening a case. These rulings underline the importance of establishing a reasonable probability that the new evidence would have affected the outcome of the trial, which is a principle relevant across jurisdictions.

Despite this growing body of scholarship, a significant gap persists in academic literature specifically addressing the Azerbaijani framework from a comparative and human rights-oriented perspective. Most domestic commentaries focus on the doctrinal interpretation of Article 461 of the Criminal Procedure Code but fall short in analyzing its practical implementation or alignment with international standards.

The present study aims to fill this gap by providing an integrated analysis of Azerbaijan's retrial mechanisms, drawing from European and international legal experiences. In doing so, it contributes to the broader academic discourse on procedural justice, particularly in transitional legal systems seeking to align themselves with the global human rights norms.

2. Methods

This research adopts a doctrinal legal methodology, with a focus on the analysis of statutory provisions, judicial practice, and academic commentary pertaining to the reopening of criminal cases based on newly discovered circumstances in the Republic of Azerbaijan. The primary legal source for this study is Chapter LIV of the *Azerbaijani Criminal Procedure Code* (CPC), particularly Articles 461 through 467, which regulate the grounds, procedures, and limits for retrial applications.

The study is structured around three core methodological pillars:

1. **Normative Analysis** – A detailed examination of the relevant legal provisions within the Azerbaijani CPC was conducted to identify the formal conditions, definitions, and procedural safeguards (or lack thereof) concerning the reopening of finalized criminal judgments. Special attention is paid to the concept of 'newly discovered circumstances' and its practical interpretation in domestic law.
2. **Comparative Legal Method** – With the objective to assess the conformity of Azerbaijani legal norms with international human rights standards, the study incorporates a comparative review of relevant provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights (especially Article 6) and selected legal frameworks from the Council of Europe member states such as Germany, France, and Turkey. This method enables the identification of best practices and potential reforms.
3. **Case-Based and Institutional Assessment** – Wherever applicable, the research integrates judicial decisions and institutional practices from Azerbaijani courts to evaluate how retrial mechanisms operate in practice. This includes an assessment of the procedural stages, roles of judicial actors, and existing limitations concerning appeals, judicial discretion, and evidentiary thresholds.

Additional empirical insight is gained through examining national reports, scholarly publications, and statistical data, wherever available, regarding the frequency, success rates, and institutional mechanisms for reopening cases in Azerbaijan and selected European jurisdictions. This combined methodological design ensures that the findings are not only legally grounded but also practically relevant.

A combination of normative, comparative, and applied legal analysis allows for a comprehensive understanding of both the legal architecture and the operational challenges of reopening criminal cases in Azerbaijan. This multifaceted approach enhances the scholarly contribution of the paper by situating national law within a broader regional and international context, and by identifying specific areas for legislative and institutional improvement.

3. Results and Discussion

The reopening of criminal proceedings based on newly discovered circumstances in the Republic of Azerbaijan is formally regulated under Chapter LIV of the *Criminal Procedure Code* (CPC), encompassing Articles 461 to 467. While this legal framework aligns with the conceptual foundations found in comparative criminal procedure systems, its practical implementation reveals significant substantive and procedural shortcomings. These deficiencies hinder the remedy's effectiveness in correcting miscarriages of justice and ensuring conformity with the principles of the rule of law and human rights protection.

1. Conceptual Ambiguity of 'Newly Discovered Circumstances'. One of the most pressing problems in the Azerbaijani system is the lack of a clear statutory definition of what constitutes 'newly discovered circumstances'. Although Article 461 of the CPC allows for a retrial if new facts emerge that could have materially influenced the original verdict, the law does not specify what qualifies as 'new' or 'previously undiscoverable' evidence. This results in inconsistent judicial interpretation and legal uncertainty.

In jurisdictions such as Germany, newly discovered evidence must be both unknown at the time of trial and likely to lead to an acquittal or reduced sentence. Canadian courts, in cases such as *R v Palmer* (1980) and *R v Kowall* (1996), have emphasized that such evidence must be credible and likely to affect the outcome. Similarly, in Poland, the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that reopening is only possible based on facts or evidence that were objectively inaccessible during the original trial, and the Supreme Court has clarified the interpretive framework through case law. In the Netherlands, the Supreme Court (*Hoge Raad*) has emphasized that new facts must be genuinely capable of leading to a different verdict.

The lack of similar guidance in Azerbaijani law permits an overly narrow or subjective interpretation, thereby diminishing the accessibility and predictability of the remedy.

2. Procedural Safeguards and Preliminary Review. Article 464 of the CPC authorizes the same court that issued the final decision to conduct the preliminary review of retrial applications. However, the CPC does not establish procedural safeguards such as adversarial hearings, access to evidence, or the right to be heard during this stage. This creates a risk of non-transparent and unilateral assessments where applicants are denied procedural participation.

By contrast, legal systems in France and Turkey provide more structured stages in the retrial process, often requiring oral hearings and judicial reasoning at each phase. The *European Court of Human Rights* (ECtHR) has consistently stressed the importance of fairness, equality of arms, and adversarial procedure even in extraordinary legal remedies. In *Shabelnik v. Ukraine* and *Löffler v. Austria*, the ECtHR emphasized that post-conviction proceedings must not be perfunctory, and that they must offer a realistic opportunity to contest prior findings. The absence of such guarantees in Azerbaijani law may render retrial proceedings incompatible with Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

3. Limitations on the Right to Appeal. Another significant barrier in Azerbaijan's retrial mechanism is the absence of a right to appeal decisions rejecting retrial requests. Once a court has denied the application, the applicant has no further recourse unless procedural violations can be demonstrated. This creates a situation in which potentially meritorious claims can be dismissed with no possibility for external review.

In comparison, many legal systems provide a limited right of appeal against retrial denials, thereby ensuring oversight and judicial accountability. For example, in Turkey and Canada, higher courts may review such denials, thereby enhancing procedural fairness and public trust in the justice system. The

ECtHR ruling in *Moreira Ferreira v. Portugal (No. 2)* and *Köksal v. Turkey* reinforced that post-conviction proceedings must not be purely formalistic or devoid of effective remedies. These rulings also reaffirm the relevance of Article 13 of the ECHR, which guarantees the right to an effective remedy before national authorities.

4. Judicial Discretion and Institutional Challenges. Azerbaijan's CPC lacks standardized criteria for assessing the sufficiency and credibility of new evidence. This leaves considerable room for judicial discretion, leading to divergent outcomes and inconsistent jurisprudence. The absence of institutional guidelines or a specialized body to review retrial applications means that decisions are often taken by the same courts that have previously issued the contested judgments – thereby raising concerns about impartiality and judicial bias.

In some European countries, such as the United Kingdom and Norway, independent commissions have been established to assess post-conviction reviews. These models provide objective scrutiny and minimize institutional conflicts of interest. In Poland, the Commissioner for Human Rights may support applications for retrial, by offering an independent layer of review. The introduction of such an independent mechanism in Azerbaijan could increase transparency, impartiality, and consistency in the administration of retrial procedures.

5. Practical Challenges in Legal Representation and Evidence Access. Effective use of retrial procedures also depends on the applicant's ability to access legal counsel and gather new evidence. Azerbaijani law does not provide for state-funded legal aid in retrial proceedings, nor does it impose an obligation on investigative bodies to assist in post-conviction discovery. These procedural gaps are especially problematic for individuals from vulnerable groups – such as indigent defendants, ethnic minorities, or those subjected to politically motivated prosecutions.

Comparative systems increasingly recognize the need for procedural tools, such as post-conviction discovery, expert re-examination of evidence, and independent forensic reviews. Their absence in Azerbaijani law diminishes the practical utility of the retrial mechanism and reduces the chances of identifying miscarriages of justice. According to limited available data, only a small number of retrial requests in Azerbaijan are granted annually, and no comprehensive institutional statistics are published, which raises concerns about transparency and accountability.

6. Institutional Centralization and Judicial Workload. Under current legislation, retrial requests are submitted to the Supreme Court of Azerbaijan, which serves as both the court of last instance and the court of retrial application. This centralization creates administrative bottlenecks and may compromise the quality of judicial review. Decentralized models, as practiced in Germany or Italy, allow lower courts to conduct initial evaluations, leaving the supreme courts to focus on complex legal or constitutional matters. A shift toward a decentralized and tiered review system in Azerbaijan could increase procedural efficiency and reduce delays.

7. Insights from the Italian Legal Model. Another key finding from the comparative analysis of Italy's legal framework is the structured and narrow nature of grounds for reopening criminal cases. Article 630 of the Italian Code of Criminal Procedure provides an exhaustive list of circumstances under which a final conviction may be reviewed. These include contradictory final judgments concerning the same individual, convictions based on forged evidence or false testimony, criminal acts committed by judicial officials influencing the judgment, newly discovered evidence that could lead to acquittal, and – most notably, since 2011 – violations of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) as recognized by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR).

The Italian model demonstrates how a legal system can preserve the principle of *res judicata* while allowing a narrowly tailored mechanism for correcting miscarriages of justice. This approach

underscores a critical balance between legal certainty and substantive justice. The inclusion of ECtHR violations as a valid ground for reopening – following the Constitutional Court's Decision No. 113/2011 – further exemplifies Italy's effort to harmonize national procedural law with supranational human rights standards. Such integration not only reinforces the legitimacy of domestic judicial processes but also fosters compliance with European human rights obligations.

In terms of incorporating these insights into the Azerbaijani context, it becomes evident that the current procedure – where a single judge of the Supreme Court collegium can dismiss a reopening request without the possibility of appeal – stands in stark contrast with the Italian model's procedural guarantees. To ensure fairness and institutional trust, Azerbaijani law should be revised to include (i) collective judicial decision-making at the initial stage of review, (ii) the right to challenge rejections of reopening requests, and (iii) explicit legal grounds requiring the justification of such rejections.

Additionally, Azerbaijan could benefit from the establishment of an independent body tasked with evaluating post-conviction claims, modeled on the Criminal Cases Review Commission in the UK or its equivalents in Scandinavian countries. Furthermore, the collection and publication of institutional data regarding the frequency, grounds, and success rates of retrial applications would increase the public trust, enhance accountability, and provide a factual basis for a future legal reform.

Table 1. Procedural safeguards and appeal mechanisms

Jurisdiction	Preliminary Review Mechanism	Right to Appeal Denial	Adversarial Hearing Provision
Azerbaijan	**Same court (final decision)**	**No**	**Not guaranteed**
Germany	**Appellate or trial court**	**Yes**	**Yes**
France	**Multi-stage judicial review**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Turkey	**Criminal courts**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Canada	**Appellate courts**	**Yes**	**Yes**

Conclusions

Although the institution of retrial based on newly discovered circumstances serves similar legal objectives across the three jurisdictions examined, its procedural mechanisms, the scope of the right to defence, and patterns of judicial practice reveal considerable divergences. The effective application of this extraordinary remedy is of critical importance in balancing legal certainty with substantive justice.

In Italian criminal law, the review procedure is not merely a legal mechanism but, instead, a powerful indicator of a justice system's willingness to acknowledge and correct its own mistakes. As an exceptional legal remedy, it stands outside the ordinary appeal process, yet plays a vital role in preserving the legitimacy of criminal convictions. Its very existence acknowledges a difficult truth: even well-functioning legal systems can occasionally produce flawed outcomes, and justice demands a structured process to re-examine such cases whenever warranted.

Articles 629–634 of the Italian Code of Criminal Procedure establish a precise and cautious framework for accessing retrial. The conditions are intentionally rigorous: the grounds must be compelling, the evidence credible, and procedural requirements meticulously observed. This reflects a deliberate

balance between safeguarding the finality of judgments and preventing justice from being sacrificed in the name of closure.

Importantly, the evolution of the retrial procedure (it. *revisione*) in Italy also demonstrates the influence of supranational legal norms – especially the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). The year 2011 decision of the Italian Constitutional Court, which enabled retrials based on ECtHR judgments, marked a significant turning point in the integration of international human rights obligations into domestic judicial review. In this respect, retrial functions not only as a procedural safeguard but also as a bridge between national law and international justice.

Nonetheless, certain challenges persist. Despite a strong legal basis, practical access to retrial may remain limited, especially for those without legal representation or in cases involving complex human rights violations. While case law is generally open to such remedies, there is a need for more empirical data to assess the frequency, success rate, and real-world impact of retrial procedures prompted by ECtHR judgments.

Ultimately, the institution of retrial embodies a core principle of democratic legal systems: justice must not only be done but must also be redone when new facts emerge. In times of declining public trust, the legal system's capacity to correct its own errors is not a sign of weakness but, to the contrary, that of strength. Italy's model, with its well-defined legal boundaries and openness to human rights integration, serves as an instructive example of how justice systems can evolve without compromising their foundational values.

In the context of Azerbaijan, the Criminal Procedure Code emphasizes the finality of the decision rendered by the Supreme Court judge who initially assesses the retrial application, explicitly denying the right to lodge a complaint or protest against that decision. However, this structure gives rise to critical procedural shortcomings. It would be more appropriate if preliminary reviews were conducted not by a single judge, but by a panel of at least three judges.

Moreover, the law provides no requirement for the judge to justify the rejection of a retrial application. We propose that, where the Supreme Court judge determines that the application does not raise sufficient doubt about the validity of the original judgment, the applicant should have the right to appeal this decision. To ensure compliance with Article 60 of the Constitution of Azerbaijan – which guarantees the right of access to court – the legislation must introduce mechanisms allowing complaints or protests in such cases.

Furthermore, the law should expressly provide that, following the preliminary review of a retrial request based on newly discovered circumstances, the applicant must be able to lodge a complaint or protest with the President of the Supreme Court against the decision of the reviewing judge.

Retrial procedures are essential for addressing judicial errors in final judgments. By enabling the reopening of proceedings where wrongful convictions have occurred, the retrial mechanism not only restores public trust in the justice system but also contributes to social peace. It embodies the criminal procedural law's purpose: to discover material truth while respecting the rights of suspects and the accused.

By its nature, retrial constitutes an exception to the principle of *non bis in idem* – the right not to be tried twice for the same offense. However, in order to eliminate judicial errors contained in final convictions, retrials are initiated through a restricted list of grounds specified in the CPC, and they usually commence in the court that issued the original verdict. Upon acceptance of the request, the court re-examines the claim. If the asserted error is confirmed, the prior decision is annulled, and a new judgment is issued. If not, the original judgment is upheld. In both scenarios, the mechanism corrects miscarriages of justice and protects public confidence in the judiciary.

Regarding compensation, Article 323.3 of the CPC currently limits the right to claim compensation for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages only to cases where the person is fully acquitted, or where the sentence is deemed unnecessary. This regulation, however, does not encompass those whose sentence has been partially served or unjustly increased. We argue that individuals who have served more time than warranted due to flawed judgments should also be entitled to compensation, and this should be explicitly enshrined in the law.

Although the retrial mechanism is designed to reconcile justice and legal certainty, gaps and normative deficiencies in its application prevent it from fully achieving this objective. For this reason, legal reforms should be pursued in the following key areas:

1. **Right to appeal decisions on the suspension of sentence execution**: Current legislation does not provide any means to appeal decisions on the suspension or non-suspension of execution during the pendency of retrial applications. This may cause irreparable harm, especially in cases of unjust imprisonment.
2. **Expansion of the right to compensation**: According to Article 56 of the CPC, the right to claim damages is limited to cases of acquittal or absence of grounds for punishment. However, unjust sentencing – such as when the retrial results in a reduced sentence – also constitutes a violation of justice. Therefore, compensation rights should be extended to individuals affected by excessive or unjust punishment.

In conclusion, the retrial procedure – when properly framed and effectively applied – serves as a powerful tool for redressing injustice and reinforcing the rule of law. Ensuring transparency, accessibility, and human rights compliance in this process will be vital for strengthening Azerbaijan's legal system in line with European and international standards.

Bibliography

AKBULUT, Berrin (2021). *General Provisions of Criminal Law* (8th ed.). Ankara: Adalet Publishing.

AMBOS, Kai (2016). *Foundations of Criminal Law in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BAKIM, Saim (2013). Retrial in criminal procedure law. *Marmara University Faculty of Law Journal*, 19(2), 919–951.

BERNARDINI, Lorenzo (2022). Reopening criminal proceedings and *ne bis in idem*: Towards a weaker *res iudicata* in Europe? *European Criminal Law Review*, 12(1), 34–59.

CAVALLARO, Marco; PALERMO, Francesco (2015). Reopening procedures in European criminal law: Comparative approaches. *European Journal of Criminal Law*, 22(3), 255–278.

CENTEL, Nur; ZAFER, Hamide (2020). *Criminal Procedure Law* (18th ed.). Istanbul: Beta Publishing.

DWORKIN, Ronald (1986). *Law's Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

DUFF, Antony (2001). *Punishment, Communication, and Community*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ERSOY, Yener (2020). Evaluation of amendments made by Law No. 7188 in criminal procedure law. *Istanbul Law Journal*, 78(2), 113–134.

JACKSON, John; SUMMERS, Sarah (2012). Due process and fair trial in criminal proceedings. *Cambridge Law Review*, 64(4), 459–482.

ÖZTÜRK, Bahri; ERDEM, Mustafa Ruhan (2021). *Applied Criminal Law and Security Measures Law* (21st ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.

PILKOV, Kostiantyn (2022). Reopening cases following judgments of the European Court of Human Rights: Room for a European consensus? *Human Rights Review*, 24(2), 143–165.

SMITH, Frank M.; JONES, William (2004). The college student. In: WOOD, Charles; MEYER, Michael (Eds.). *Cross-cultural education*. London, Canada: MacMillan, 75–105.

YENISEY, Feridun; NUHOĞLU, Ayşe (2014). Retrial procedure in Turkish criminal procedure law. *Bahcesehir University Faculty of Law Journal*, 9(123–124), 7–35.

Legal Instruments and Case Law

Azerbaijan Criminal Procedure Code. (2025). Chapter LIV – Proceedings on newly discovered circumstances, Articles 461–467.

European Convention on Human Rights. (1950). Article 6: Right to a fair trial [online]. https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/convention_eng.pdf

European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). *Sejdovic v. Italy*, Application no. 56581/00, Judgment of 1 March 2006.

European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). *Moreira Ferreira v. Portugal (No. 2)*, Application no. 19867/12, Judgment of 11 July 2017.

Council of Europe. (2000). *Recommendation No. R(2000)2 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the Re-Examination or Reopening of Certain Cases at Domestic Level Following Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights*. Strasbourg.

Italian Constitutional Court. (2011). Decision No. 113/2011 on the Reopening of Criminal Cases in Light of ECtHR Judgments.

Germany. *Strafprozessordnung* (StPO) – German Code of Criminal Procedure. Section 359 – Reopening of Proceedings. Berlin: Federal Ministry of Justice.

Canada. *R v Palmer*, [1980] 1 SCR 759; *R v Kowall*, [1996] ABCA 166.

European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). *Köksal v. Turkey*, Application no. 64150/00, Judgment of 2 March 2011.

European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). *Löffler v. Austria*, Application no. 30546/03, Judgment of 3 October 2013.

European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). *Shabelnik v. Ukraine*, Application no. 16404/03, Judgment of 19 February 2009.

Polish Code of Criminal Procedure. (2020). Article 540 – Reopening of Proceedings. Warsaw: Sejm Publishing Office.

Since 2010, Lala Mammadova has been serving as a lecturer, and subsequently promoted to a senior lecturer and Associate Professor at Baku State University, at the Department of Criminal Procedure in Faculty of Law. She has successfully combined her pedagogical activities with rigorous scientific research. On June 16, 2016, she defended her thesis entitled "*Features of Proceedings in the Criminal Process of the Republic of Azerbaijan Concerning Certain Categories of Individuals*" and became PhD in Law. Dr. Mammadova is the author of a textbook, a monograph, a methodological guide, 4 teaching programs, and over 40 scientific articles, including articles indexed in the *Scopus* and *Web of Science* databases. She delivers lectures and conducts seminars for undergraduate courses "*Law Enforcement Agencies*", "*Criminal Procedural Law-1*", "*Criminal Procedural Law-2*", "*The Judicial System of the Republic of Azerbaijan*", and "*Judicial Oversight*". At the graduate level, she teaches specialized courses "*International Criminal Tribunals*. Lala Mammadova has presented her works at numerous international scientific-practical conferences. For now, Dr. Mamedova is pursuing the attainment of a Doctor of Legal Sciences degree. Currently, as part of her doctoral program in "*Criminal Procedure, Criminalistics, Forensic Expertise, and Operational-Search Activities*", Dr. Mammadova is undertaking research for her dissertation on the subject of "*Special Proceedings in Criminal Justice*". Since September 2025, she has also been lecturing at Karabakh University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (Azerbaijan). Her research interests include criminal procedure, special proceedings, retrial mechanisms, and human rights protection. She is currently pursuing a Doctor of Legal Sciences degree.

Nuo 2010 metų Lala Mammadova dirba dėstytoja, vėliau vyresniąja dėstytoja ir docente Baku valstybinio universiteto Teisės fakulteto Baudžiamojo proceso katedroje. Ji sėkmingai derina pedagoginę veiklą su kryptingais moksliniais tyrimais. 2016 m. birželio 16 d. ji apgynė disertaciją tema „Proceso ypatumai Azerbaidžano Respublikos baudžiamajame procese tam tikrų asmenų kategorijų atžvilgiu“ ir įgijo teisės mokslų daktaro (PhD) laipsnį.

Dr. Mammadova yra vieno vadovėlio, vienos monografijos, vieno metodinio leidinio, trijų studijų programų ir daugiau kaip 40 mokslinių straipsnių autorė, įskaitant publikacijas, indeksuotas *Scopus* ir *Web of Science* duomenų bazėse. Ji skaito paskaitas ir veda bakalauro studijų dalykų „Teisėsaugos institucijos“, „Baudžiamojo proceso teisė I“, „Baudžiamojo proceso teisė II“, „Azerbaidžano Respublikos teismų sistema“ ir „Teisminė priežiūra“ seminarus. Magistrantūros studijų lygmeniu autorė dėsto specializuotą kursą „Tarptautiniai baudžiamieji tribunolai“ bei pristatė savo mokslinius darbus daugelyje tarptautinių mokslinių-praktinių konferencijų.

Šiuo metu dr. Mammadova siekia teisės mokslų daktaro (*Doctor of Legal Sciences*) laipsnio. Vykdydama doktorantūros studijas pagal programą „Baudžiamasis procesas, kriminalistika, teismo ekspertizė ir operatyvinė paieškos veikla“, ji rengia disertaciją tema „Specialiosios baudžiamojo teisingumo procedūros“. Nuo 2025 m. rugsėjo mėn. ji taip pat dėsto Karabacho universiteto Humanitarinių ir socialinių mokslų fakultete. Jos moksliniai interesai apima baudžiamąjį procesą, specialiąsias procedūras, bylų atnaujinimo mechanizmus ir žmogaus teisių apsaugą