

## THE OBSTRUCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION: PROBLEMS OF THE OBJECT AND THE OBJECTIVE SIDE

**Alexandra V. Boyarskaya**

*Dostoevsky Omsk State University, Omsk, Russia* **Article info**

Received – 2018 April 16

Accepted – 2018 May 20

Available online – 2018 August 20

### **Keywords**

Justice, crimes against justice, investigator, investigator-criminalist, prosecutor, person conducting inquiry, object of crime, objective side

The subject. The article is devoted to the investigation of the main direct object and the circle of victims are subjected of harm by criminal acts stipulated by pts. 1, 2 of art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation.

The purpose of the paper is to identify does the art. 294 of Criminal Code of the Russian Federation meets the other provisions of criminal procedure legislation.

The methodology of research includes methods of complex analysis, synthesis, as well as formal-logical, comparative legal and formal-legal methods.

Results and scope of application. The content of art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation does not comply with the provisions of the criminal procedure law. The discrepancy lies in terms of the range of participants in criminal proceedings and the functions performed by them, as well as the actual content and correlation of such stages of criminal proceedings as the initiation of criminal proceedings and preliminary investigation. In addition, the current state of art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation does not take into account the ever-widening differentiation of criminal proceedings.

The circle of victims listed in pt. 2 of art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation should be supplemented by such participants in the criminal process as a criminal investigator, the head of the investigative body, the head of the inquiry department, the head of the body of inquiry. At the same time, the author supports the position that the criminal-legal protection of the said persons should cover not only their activities at the stage of preliminary investigation, but also of the entire pre-trial proceedings as a whole.

The circle of criminal acts provided for in art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Fed-

eration, should also be specified with an indication of encroachment in the form of kidnapping, destruction or damage to such a crime as materials of criminal, civil and other cases, as well as material evidence.

Conclusions. The content of art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation does not comply with the provisions of the criminal procedure law. The author formulates the conclusion that the circle of victims listed in pt. 2 of art. 294 of the Criminal Code should be broadened and joins the position that the criminal-legal protection of these persons should cover not only their activities at the stage of preliminary investigation, but also of the entire pre-trial proceedings as a whole.

#### 1. Formulation of the problem

The object of study in this paper is Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation and the elements of crimes contained in it. There are three in total. In parts 1 and 2 Art. 294 of the Criminal Code contains the main elements, in part 3 - qualified in relation to them. The subject of this article can be designated as signs of the composition of crimes foreseen by parts 1, 2 Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, relating to such elements of the composition as an object and an objective side.

Starting your reasoning, we will immediately clarify, on the decision of what issues we will focus our attention:

- What social relations are the main direct object of these crimes?
- Who are the victims of these crimes ?
- What are the forms of committing crimes, foreseen by parts 1, 2 Art. 294 of the Criminal Code?

#### 2. The main direct object of obstructing the administration of justice or the production of a preliminary investigation

We return to the first of the questions above. It is , between the offenses provided for by parts 1 and 2 Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, there are similarities and differences.

Their common feature is the basic term on which the objective side of these compounds is built, this term is "interference", it reflects the mechanism of committing these crimes.

Differences consist mainly of the immediate object, the injured and the goal pursued by the perpetrator.

The specific object of the crimes under consideration is justice.

Such a formula of a species object is often criticized. For example, S.V. Dementiev and I.V. Dvoryanskov say that the criminal law ensures the normal functioning of not only justice, but, in fact , a much wider range of adjacent elements [1, p. 19].

However, partly agreeing with the position of these authors, we note that the point of view of L.V. Lobanova, according to which such a title of Chapter 31 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation and the species object of the corresponding group of crimes, although not free from shortcomings , but, at the same time, is quite accurate [ 2, p. 27].

In order to determine who is the victim of crimes foreseen by the parts 1 and 2 Art. 294 of the Criminal Code, let us consider the main direct object of these crimes.

The main direct object of the criminal act, provided for by Part 1 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code, A.S. Gorelik, L.V. Lobanov is called "public relations, ensuring the independence of the judiciary, the security of justice from unauthorized interference of someone" [3, p. 75-76]. A.I. Chuchayev in clarifies that the object of the crime under Part 1 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code is the normal activity of the court to review and resolve criminal, civil, arbitration cases and cases of administrative violations. As an optional object may be the interests of the individual (for example, the victim) [4].

V.V. Namnasyov points out that "the object of the crime provided for by Ch. 1 tbsp. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation can be defined as " social relations that provide for the legal system based on legislation and procedurally regulated activities aimed at resolving criminal, civil, administrative cases or cases of compliance of the normative acts of the Russian Constitution , or cases on complaints of violation of constitutional rights and freedoms " [5, p. 8].

A.I. Skakun expresses the view that "as an object of crimes provided for by Part 1 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code, the independence of the courts and the independence of judges, providing their activities in accordance with the Constitution of the Russian Federation and the laws... It is important to emphasize that the limits of the independence of the court and the independence of the prosecutor or the person investigating the criminal case are determined by law" [6, p. 8].

P.E. Kondratov briefly defines the object of the analyzed composition of the crime as "public relations that ensure the normal administration of justice by a court" [7].

It seems that the most capacious definitions of the object of the crime being investigated are proposed by A.S. Gorelik, L.V. Lobanova, it should be noted that the authors who disseminate the scope of Part 1 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation for criminal, civil, arbitration , administrative proceedings, proceedings on administrative offenses, and constitutional proceedings.

The main direct object of the crime, contained in Part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation are public relations designed to ensure the "procedural independence of the investigating person as a prerequisite for the implementation of a comprehensive, full and objective investigation of the criminal case" [3, p. 82]. As clarifies A.I. Chuchayev, the optional object may be the interests of the individual [4].

V.V. Namnasyov defines the object of the crime provided for in Part. 2 tbsp. 294 of the Criminal Code, "as an aggregate of social relations, the content of which is the activity of the prosecutor, investigator or person conducting the inquiry that promotes the implementation of justice, based on the law " [5, p. 8]. A.I. Skakun, in turn, notes that "the crimes provided for by Part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, encroach on the procedural independence of the prosecutor, the investigator or the person conducting the inquiry" [6, p. 8]. P.E. Kondratov expresses the position that the direct object of crimes provided for in the article under review is public relations that ensure the normal activities of persons who carry out preliminary investigations and supervision of criminal cases [7].

As follows from the foregoing, Part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code extends only to criminal proceedings.

Among the above positions, as the most capacious, as well as relevant to the provisions of the current criminal procedure legislation, we can name the positions of V.V. Namnasev and P.E. Kondratov.

### 3. The circle of persons who can be considered as victims of crimes, stipulated by the Part. 1, 2 Art. 294 of the Criminal Code

Having decided on the object of these crimes, let us turn to the question of who acts here as a victim. In accordance with the provisions of Part 1 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, the interference is carried out in the activities of the court. According to A.V. Brilliantov, N.R. Kosevich, victims in this composition are judges, jurors and arbitrators. [8].

In this case, as noted by I.V. Dvoryanskov, "the unfortunate wording of Part 1 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation is also expressed in the fact that it provides only

interference in the activities of the court. However, as is known, we have an institute of justices of the peace, which, according to the law of the same name, cannot be designated by the term "court". In this regard, it is useful to use the phrase "judicial activity" [9, p. 40].

Note that with the presented position is controversial, since in part 4 of Art. 4 of the Federal Constitutional Law of 31.12.1996 No. 1-FKZ "On the judicial system of the Russian Federation" states that the courts of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation include: constitutional (statutory) courts of the subjects of the Russian Federation, justices of the peace, judges of the general jurisdiction of the subjects of the Russian Federation. Thus, some uncertainty s formulations characteristic time for domestic legislation does content hours. 1 tbsp. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation is incorrect.

A few more questions arise in connection with the consideration of the range of persons acting as victims under Part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code. As such, the investigator, the person conducting the inquiry, and the prosecutor are called. Who follows understood by the investigator, the person conducting the inquiry, as well as the prosecutor is well documented in the criminal procedure and criminal law literature [4, 7, 8].

Let's note in the consideration of this problem only the following circumstances : the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation speaks not only of the investigator, but also of such a procedural figure as an investigator-criminalist.

So, in paragraph 41 of Art. 5 of the Code of Criminal Procedure states that the investigator is an official authorized to conduct a preliminary investigation in a criminal case, as well as other powers provided for in the criminal procedure law.

Separately, in paragraph 40.1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, investigator-criminalist, which means an official authorized to carry out a preliminary investigation in a criminal case, and also participate on the instructions of the head of the investigative body in the production of certain investigative and other procedural acts or conduct separate investigative and other procedural actions without taking criminal proceedings against his production.

As pointed out by A.S. Gorelik, L.V. Lobanov, the goal to prevent a comprehensive, complete, objective investigation can be expressed in an effort to induce an illegal procedural decision, to refuse to conduct a necessary investigative action, to an unjustified exclusion and evidentiary basis of a particular proof, etc. [3, p. 83-84]. It seems that these or similar actions can also be carried out by the criminal investigator, who should be included in the circle of persons listed in Part 2, Art. 294 of the Criminal Code.

By the person conducting the inquiry, the investigator and understood the body of inquiry. In this connection V.V. Namnasev correctly pointed out that "part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code protects the activities of employees of inquiry , related: first, with the production of criminal cases for which a preliminary investigation is not necessary; secondly, with the production of criminal cases for which a preliminary investigation is mandatory, but initiated and investigated by the bodies of inquiry before being transferred for investigation because of the urgency of the investigation; thirdly, with the fulfillment of certain assignments of the investigator on the criminal case at his disposal" [5, p. 162].

In accordance with Part 1 of Art. 37 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation, the Prosecutor is an official authorized within the competence of the CCP RF to carry out criminal prosecution on behalf of the state in the course of criminal proceedings, as well as overseeing the procedural activities of the preliminary investigation bodies and preliminary investigation bodies.

In the theory of the criminal process it is noted that in the pre-trial proceedings the prosecutor exercises "supervision over the procedural activity of the bodies of inquiry and preliminary investigation" ( Part 1, Article 37 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). He performs a leading role in relation to the bodies of inquiry and preliminary investigation, which is designated by the term "supervision". However, the content of this function was narrowed after the reform of 2007 (Federal Law No. 87-FZ of June 5, 2007) Currently, the prosecutor does not have the right to initiate proceedings in a criminal case, independently conduct an investigation in full or in part, give the

investigator written instructions on the direction of the investigation, the production of certain investigative actions other than when sending a case for the production of preliminary investigation (clause 2, part 1, Art. 221 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). The reasons for this state of affairs lie in the determination of the legislator to separate the investigation from supervision and after it, and also to "increase" the procedural independence of the investigator [10].

It seems that the activities of the prosecutor should be subject to criminal law protection in the performance of all these functions. The Prosecutor oversees the inquiry and the investigation, in the performance of these functions it is subject to the protection of criminal law.

In this case, we note the following: V.V. Namnyasev indicates that "the object of the crime ... offers camping to put under the criminal law protection of the activities of the prosecutor, associated with decision-making on the case, was admitted to the indictment, and his participation in the proceedings. To do this, the goal of the offense provided for in Part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code, to read as follows: "in order to prevent a full, complete and objective investigation, resolution of cases, or the consideration of the case in court" [5, p. 8-9].

It seems that the activity of the prosecutor in the case that came with the indictment, the indictment or the decision is already covered by the content of part 2 p. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, since it can be called correct the position according to which " ... with this significant authority, which combines supervisory and control principles, is the right of the prosecutor to assess the results of the investigator's activities in the criminal case from the point of view of completeness, , the correctness of his qualifications, observance of the norms of criminal procedural law during the investigation. This evaluation is given to him on the basis of examination of the materials of the criminal case, which came to him with an indictment or decision on the application of compulsory measures of a medical nature, and its results are reflected in the decisions provided for in Art. 221 and part 5 of Art. 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure" [11, p. 50-51]. Thus, the prosecutor's activities in question form a part of his supervisory functions, which means that he must already be subject to criminal law protection.

V.V. Namnyasev also expresses the position that Part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code should also protect the activities of the head of the investigation department in the period when he is investigating a criminal case or is involved in the production of separate investigative actions [5, p. 9].

However, in connection with the actual content of the criminal procedural legislation, it seems more correct to suggest AI. Horse, according to which part 2 Art. 294 of the Criminal Code should include a ban on interference in the activities of the head of the investigative body, the head of the investigative unit for the execution of his procedural powers or the investigation of criminal cases [6, p. 10]. We only believe that this list should be supplemented by the head of the inquiry body, which, in accordance with Art. 40.2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, may give to the investigator in writing instructions on the direction of the investigation and the proceedings.

It seems that not only the prosecutor, but the head of the investigation body, head and body of inquiry, the chief investigative units should be indicated in part 2, Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation as persons performing the function of implementing departmental control over the investigation, on which, in many respects, its all-roundness, completeness and objectivity depends.

I.V. Dvoryanskov also expresses the position that in Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation unjustifiably narrowed the scope of its action, since in criminalizing the analyzed interference in procedural activities, the legislator ignored lawyers and other persons performing functions to protect citizens and provide them with legal assistance [9, p. 40].

However, we believe that encroachments on these persons, due to the fact that lawyers are not vested with authority to carry out justice or preliminary investigation, should be consolidated in a separate article of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation. As mentioned by B.S. Raikes, "paragraph of the law within the meaning of moment start a preliminary investigation should be regarded as criminal proceedings (Article 156 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation), and the end point - the statement by the prosecutor of the indictment or the indictment

and directing the case to court. In this regard, the impact on the prosecutor, investigator or investigator at the stage of initiating a criminal case, at the time of receipt and recording of initial information about a crime being prepared or committed, whether the verifying actions were carried out on the subject, whether the actual occurrence of a socially dangerous act the communication and the decision to initiate a criminal case or refuse to initiate a criminal investigation will also be an interference in the implementation of the preliminary investigation" [9].

We believe that the position is controversial. The point of view is more accurate that the stage of initiating a criminal case begins with the appearance of an excuse for initiating it, and ends after carrying out appropriate actions to verify this information by adopting a final decision either to institute criminal proceedings or to refuse to initiate a criminal case. The preliminary investigation stage, thus, begins with a decision by the investigator or the investigator of the case for its production, and ends at the end of the investigation or preparation of indictment (act, regulations) and transfer the case to court, whether the termination of criminal proceedings [10].

Thus, based on the name and literal content of Part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, the activities of the victims mentioned in it must be protected only within the preliminary investigation stage. This is indicated in works of I.I. Golubov, A.A. Guliy, V.N. Kruzhihkov [14, p. 11]. Although, indeed, it would be necessary to extend the effect of the criminal law to the stage of initiating a criminal case, as discussed, for example, by L.V. Lobanova [2, p. 256] , for example, as A.V. Kuznetsov, replacing in part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, the term "preliminary investigation" for "pre-trial proceedings" [15, p. 3].

As correctly noted by Yu.A. Tsvetkov, the domestic legislator, having destroyed the integrity of the preliminary investigation, brought his separate parts to the stage of instituting criminal proceedings, giving them a completely independent existence. The author in this case refers to investigative actions, a number of which can be carried out before the institution of a criminal case. Namely: 1) inspection of the scene; 2) inspection of objects and documents; 3) inspection of the corpse; 4) survey; 5) the production of forensic examination; 6) obtaining samples for comparative study. In addition, it is permitted to produce 7) seizure of items and documents in accordance with the procedure established by the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation [16, p. 18-19].

It turns out, at present, the stage of the criminal case is becoming something like a "quasi-investigation". It should also be recalled that the latest adjustments to Part 1 of Art. 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure were introduced in 2013 in connection with the inclusion in the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation Chapter 32.1, which provides for a procedure for shortened inquiries, the specifics of which is the possibility not to conduct investigative and other procedural actions aimed at establishing factual circumstances, crime (part 3 of article 226.5 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). We believe that due to these changes before the stage of initiating a criminal case, the task of revealing the crime and exposing the person who committed it is uncharacteristic. All that has been said makes it possible to speak of an increased the importance of the relevant stage of criminal proceedings and, accordingly, the need for criminal and legal protection of its participants, vested with power, from outside interference in their activities.

4. Forms of interference with the administration of justice or the conduct of a preliminary investigation, stipulated in Art. 294 of the Criminal Code

According to A.I. Chuchaev, the direct order of the law, does not have any meaning and involves any impact that can be expressed in requests, persuasions, demands, advice, promises to render services directly addressed to a judge or assessor. Such an impact can be provided both directly and through third parties - relatives, acquaintances, colleagues, etc. [4]. At the same time, as is correctly noted in the literature, interference in the administration of justice or in preliminary investigation may not imply an impact on persons and be expressed, for example, in the abduction of materials of criminal cases [3, p. 77; 4].

The indicated moment is also noted by V.V. Nyamnyasov, according to which the theft, destruction or damage of case materials, material evidence, which is currently considered in

practice as a form of obstruction of justice and the conduct of preliminary investigation, do not fully fall within the scope of the crime provided for in Art. 294 of the Criminal Code, and should be provided for by a separate criminal law norm [5, p. 10].

Indeed, very often the obstruction of the administration of justice or preliminary investigation is associated with the acts mentioned above.

For example, citizen A., in relation to whom <...> the criminal case was considered, in the course of preparation for the debate, he submitted a petition for acquaintance with the case materials together with the defender. When acquainting himself with the materials of the case, A., knowing with certainty that after the arguments of the parties and the last word of the defendant, the verdict is decreed, in order to obstruct the implementation of justice, decided to intervene in the activities of the court, stole the volume of the criminal case from the building ..., a prefabricated dummy, took him out of the courthouse, later ordered it at his own discretion.

Accused T., realizing that the criminal case will soon be sent to the prosecutor for approval of the indictment, and then to the court, in order to avoid criminal liability decided to destroy the criminal case. Realizing his intention, on the night of March 15 to March 16, 2010, taking a bottle of petrol with him, he came to the building where the investigative department was located <...> acting deliberately, breaking the glass in the cabinet window. .> realizing that in addition to the criminal case there are other property belonging to the Novosibirsk Investigative Department of the West Siberian Department of Transport under the Prosecutor's Office of the Russian Federation <...>, wishing to destroy the criminal case, and also, assuming that as a result of his actions property located in the office can be destroyed and damaged, and set it on fire.

When the accused S. was confronted with the materials of the criminal case in the investigation room of the pre-trial detention center, citizen S. snatched from the volume No. 7 two sheets that he had burned. S. accompanied his actions with statements that because of this protocol he "sits".

In the cases under consideration, the offense was punishable by part 1 or 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code. In this case, A.I. Skakun noted that the properties listed acts not fully correspond to the indications of crime embodied in an analyzed norm [6, p. 8]. We believe that this fact should indeed be taken into account, supplementing Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation a new part, providing for a criminal act in the form of abduction, destruction or damage to case materials or material evidence.

## 5. Conclusions

Investigation of the main direct object and the circle of persons who may be harmed by criminal acts, provided for by parts 1, 2 Art. 294 of the Criminal Code allows us to conclude that the content of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code does not comply with the provisions of the criminal procedure law. The discrepancy can be seen in terms of the range of participants in criminal proceedings and the functions performed by them, as well as the actual content and correlation of such stages of criminal proceedings as the initiation of criminal proceedings and preliminary investigation.

The circle of victims listed in Part 2 of Art. 294 of the Criminal Code should be supplemented by such participants in the criminal process as a criminal investigator, head of the investigative body, head of the inquiry department, head of the body of inquiry.

At the same time, we join the position that the criminal-legal protection of these persons should cover not only their activities at the stage of preliminary investigation, but also of the entire pre-trial proceedings as a whole.

The range of criminal acts provided for in Art. 294 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation should also be specified in terms of infringement in the form of kidnapping, destruction or damage to such a crime as materials of criminal, civil and other cases, as well as material evidence.

## REFERENCES

1. Dement'ev S.V., Dvoryanskov I.V. Criminal-law aspects of criminalization of invasion of interests of judicial power. *Rossiiskii sledovatel' = Russian Investigator*, 2015, no. 12, pp. 19–22. (In Russ.).
2. Lobanova L.V. *Crimes against justice: theoretical problems of classification and legislative regulation*. Volgograd, Volgograd State University Publ., 1999. 268 p. (In Russ.).
3. Gorelik A.V., Lobanova L.V. *Crimes against justice*. St. Petersburg, Yuridicheskii tsentr Press Publ., 2005. 491 p. (In Russ.).
4. Rarog A.I. (ed.). *Handbook of the judge in criminal cases*. Moscow, Velbi Publ., Prospekt Publ., 2007. 576 p. (In Russ.).
5. Namnyasev V.V. *Obstruction of the administration of justice and the production of preliminary investigation in the Russian criminal law*, Cand. Diss. Volgograd, 1999. 209 p. (In Russ.).
6. Skakun A.I. *Criminal liability for obstructing the administration of justice and the production of preliminary investigation*, Cand. Diss. Omsk, 2008. 178 p. (In Russ.).
7. Lebedev V.M. (ed.). *Commentary on the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation*. Moscow, Yurait Publ., 2013. 1069 p. (In Russ.).
8. Brilliantov A.V. (ed.). *Commentary on the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation*, in 2 volumes. Moscow, Prospekt Publ., 2015. Vol. 2. 704 p. (In Russ.).
9. Dvoryanskov I.V. *Conceptual foundations of the criminal law protection of the interests of the judiciary*, Doct. Diss. Thesis. Moscow, 2013. 56 p. (In Russ.).
10. Golovko L.V. (ed.). *The course of the criminal process*. Moscow, Statut Publ., 2016. 1278 p. (In Russ.).
11. Karetnikov A.S., Koretnikov S.A. The essence of the powers of the prosecutor supervising the preliminary investigation: past and present. *Rossiiskaya yustitsiya = Russian Justitia*, 2015, no. 5, pp. 49–52. (In Russ.).
12. Melnichenko R.G. Criminal liability of a lawyer imposed for obstruction of justice. *Ugolovnoe pravo = Criminal Law*, 2010, no. 2, pp. 48–50. (In Russ.).
13. Galakhova A.V. (ed.). *Crimes against justice*. Moscow, NORMA Publ., 2005. 416 p. (In Russ.).
14. Golubov I.I., Gulyi A.A., Kuzhikov V.N. *Criminal responsibility for crimes against justice*. Moscow, Moscow Psychological and Social Institute Publ., Voronezh, MODEK Publ., 2011. 128 p. (In Russ.).
15. Kuznetsov A.V. *Crimes against justice*. Omsk, Omsk State University Publ., 2012. 40 p. (In Russ.).
16. Tsvetkov Yu.A. A Grin Without a Cat, or What will remain of the Preliminary Investigation? *Ugolovnoe su-doproizvodstvo = Criminal Judicial Proceeding*, 2016, no. 2, pp. 18–23. (In Russ.).

## ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

**Боярская Александра Владимировна** –  
канди-дат юридических наук, доцент  
кафедры уголов-ного права и  
криминологии  
Омский государственный университет  
им. Ф.М. Достоевского  
644077, Россия, г. Омск, пр. Мира, 55а  
e-mail: ba.omsu@gmail.com  
SPIN-код: 6139-3134; AuthorID: 790893

## БИБЛИОГРАФИЧЕСКОЕ ОПИСАНИЕ СТАТЬИ

Боярская А.В. Воспрепятствования  
осуществле-нию правосудия и

## INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHOR

**Alexandra V. Boyarskaya** – PhD in Law,  
Associate Professor, Department of  
Criminal Law and Criminology  
Dostoevsky Omsk State University  
55a, Mira pr., Omsk, 644077, Russia  
e-mail: ba.omsu@gmail.com  
SPIN-code: 6139-3134; AuthorID: 790893

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Boyarskaya A.V. The obstruction of the  
administra-tion of justice and preliminary



производству предварительного  
расследования: проблемы объекта и  
объективной стороны / А.В. Боярская // Правоприме-  
нение. – 2018. – Т. 2, № 2. –  
С. 97–105. – DOI: 10.24147/2542-  
1514.2018.2(2).97-105.

investigation: problems of the object and  
the objective side. *Pravoprimerenie = Law  
Enforcement Review*, 2018, vol. 2, no. 2,  
pp. 97–105. DOI: 10.24147/2542-  
1514.2018.2(2).97-105. (In Russ.).