

ORGANIZATIONAL AND LEGAL FORMS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL STATUS OF THE TERRITORIAL BODIES OF THE FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AUTHORITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Andrey P. Demin

Northern Institute (branch) of the All-Russian State University of Justice (RLA of the Ministry of Justice of Russia), Petrozavodsk, Russia

Article info

Received –

2022 December 28

Accepted –

2023 June 20

Available online –

2023 September 20

Keywords

Separation of powers, executive power, public law formations, administrative-legal status, federal executive body, public administration, territorial body, law, by-law

The subject of the study is the norms of administrative legislation regulating the territorial features of public administration in Russia. The chosen topic receives a certain update against the background of the formation of the definition of "system of public authority", which is not fully covered at the doctrinal level. The purpose of the study is to assess the current state of legal regulation of the activities of territorial bodies of federal executive bodies. In the context of the functioning of the power vertical, there is a need to unify their administrative and legal status, since the unity of the public authority system is the achieved result of the constitutional reform of 2020.

Methodology and research methods. As the basis of the research methodology, the author chose the formal legal method, based on the established principles of dialectical cognition. With its help, the non-transparency of the organization of territorial bodies exercising the fullness of state administration in the subjects of the federation was revealed.

The main scientific results of the study are built around the hypothesis of excessive institutionalization of the territorial and central divisions of the executive authorities with the priority of subordinate legal regulation. It has been proved that in this case, both the efficiency of public administration and the trust in public law institutions on the part of civil society may decrease.

Conclusions. Based on the legal nature of the territorial bodies of the federal executive authorities, it can be concluded that they are in hierarchical subordination, but at the same time they are endowed with the full implementation of the powers attributed by law to their jurisdiction. In the absence of a single normative act that would detail the constitutional foundations for the exercise of public authority, most of them are established in the manner prescribed by the normative act issued by the entity that manages the activities of the relevant federal executive authority. This practice has hidden defects that reduce the effectiveness of public administration. The best way to create a transparent mechanism of public administration is to abandon the practice of legal regulation of the administrative and legal status of the territorial bodies of federal executive authorities by by-laws. By-laws may have a certain potential in terms of the distribution of powers within the structure of the territorial body of the federal executive authority, however, "status" norms should be present in the provisions of a separate federal law regulating the procedure for the establishment, transformation and liquidation of the territorial bodies of the federal executive authority.

1. Introduction. The system of administrative and legal means that ensure the effective functioning of the executive power, ideally, should guarantee both balanced public administration and the isolation of public-legal and private-legal spheres of public relations. Russian President Vladimir Putin rightly drew attention to the issues of improving public administration in his Message to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on January 15, 2020, which became the starting point for a large-scale constitutional reform that determined the long-term prospects for the development of the state¹. The tiered mechanism of public administration, formed in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the Russian Federation of 1993, did not fully take into account modern realities, therefore its modernization during the constitutional reform was inevitable.

Administrative scientists have substantiated the need for the formation of comfortable interaction between society and the state [1, p. 6], improvement of the territorial foundations of federal public administration [2, p. 143], unification of constitutional and legal models of interaction of executive authorities of the subjects of the Russian Federation with federal public authorities [3, p. 121]. The constitutional foundations of interaction between the central and federal links of federal executive bodies have also been comprehended [4, pp. 198-199].

However, the aspects listed above have not been studied in detail in modern legal literature and are disclosed only in fragments – in the context of their stability [5, pp. 96-103], the implementation of individual functions [6, pp. 87-95], organizational relations within the system [7, pp. 203-206]. Interestingly enough, the need to adopt a separate federal law regulating the basics of the organization of the system of federal executive bodies (hereinafter – FEB) was justified virtually immediately after its establishment by a by-law (presidential decree) and still has scientific

relevance [8, pp. 12-17; 9, pp. 16-57; 10, pp. 136-159].

The system and structure of executive authorities were created in 2004, for which a special decree of the head of state was issued². In the subsequent period, its parameters were adjusted a total of 17 times, but this process was of a point nature. The text of the decree contains a reference to the constitutional provisions and norms of the Federal Constitutional Law "About the Government of the Russian Federation"³; the list of state functions that are dispersed between federal executive authorities is given. However, this document does not pay significant attention to the issues of their territorial organization and management within the scope of the competence provided, as a result of which its framework nature can be stated.

In connection with the above, it seems necessary to turn to the study of the administrative and legal status of territorial bodies of federal executive authorities⁴. The research topic is significantly updated in relation to the peculiarities of the organization of their activities and the evaluation of the effectiveness of their functions and powers.

2. Organization of the activities of the FEB and their territorial bodies in modern socio-economic realities. During the constitutional reform of 2020, a number of ambitious goals were set, the achievement of which is impossible in the absence of an effectively functioning system of public administration. Its effectiveness can be assessed in several ways: firstly, based on the results of the analysis of the norms of the current legislation; secondly, based on the results of law enforcement activities characterizing their activity in the field of

² On the system and structure of federal executive bodies: Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 314 of 09.03.2004 (according to comp. on 20.11.2020). Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 2004. March, 10.

³ On the Government of the Russian Federation: Federal Constitutional Law No. 2-FKZ of 17.12.1997 [adopted by the State Duma of the Russian Federation on 11.04.1997] (according to comp. on 12/28/2016, expired). Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 1997. December, 18.

⁴ Next – the territorial bodies of the FEB. Author's note.

¹ Message of the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation dated 15.01.2020. Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 2020, January, 16.

detection and suppression of offenses; thirdly, on the basis of the sociological measurement of trust in public authorities on the part of civil society.

With regard to the norms of the current legislation regulating the legal basis of the activities of the territorial bodies of the Federal Tax Service, the following considerations can be made. The basis for establishing legal regulation in this case is represented by constitutional norms, federal constitutional laws, federal laws and subordinate regulatory acts. At the same time, these sources pay the necessary attention to the functioning of the FEB directly, whereas their territorial divisions often do not fall into the sphere of "status" legal regulation. Thus, by virtue of Part 1 of Article 112 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation, the Government of the Russian Federation develops proposals on the structure of the FEB, which it sends to the head of state.

In the modern constitutional and legal configuration of the separation of powers mechanism, the President of the Russian Federation ensures the coordinated functioning and interaction of public authorities (Part 2 of Article 80 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation), approves the structure of the FEB (Article 83 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation), exercises general management of the activities of the Government of the Russian Federation (Part 1 of Article 110 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation). Part 1 of Article 1 of the Federal Constitutional Law "On the Government of the Russian Federation" establishes the principles of granting the Government powers related to the sphere of executive power. The law establishes a list of general powers of the Government of the Russian Federation and 13 specific areas of its activities (for example, in the field of environmental protection, combating crime, etc.). At the same time, for example, Article 22 of the mentioned Law provides for 7 powers of the Government in the field of environmental protection and nature management, but among them are not named those that have organizational orientation. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology and the Federal Service for Supervision in the Field of Nature Management are included in the branch of

the structure of the FEB, whose activities are managed by the Government of the Russian Federation⁵. It follows from this that the list of organizational powers of the Government of the Russian Federation should include those that relate to the sphere of legal support of their activities. At the same time, the Regulation on the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology was approved by a decree of the Government of the Russian Federation and only departments in the main areas of activity are allocated in its structure. The creation of territorial bodies of the Ministry is provided only for the purpose of coordinating the activities of federal services subordinate to it. For comparison, the Federal Law "About Environmental Protection" ⁶ contains a reference norm relating to entities exercising state administration in the field of environmental protection, bodies named in the Constitution of the Russian Federation and the Federal Law "On the Government of the Russian Federation".

Accordingly, the characteristics of the functional purpose and content of the powers of these subjects are artificially brought to the subordinate level. This gives rise to potential gaps in legal regulation, possible arbitrary exercise of powers, as well as possible corruption-induced impact on the object of their implementation. For example, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology approved the Regulations on the Federal Service for Supervision of Nature Management⁷, as well as a Model Regulation on its territorial body⁸,

⁵ The structure of the Federal Executive authorities: approved. Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 21 dated 21.01.2020 (according to comp. on 10/20/2022). Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 2020. January, 22.

⁶ On Environmental Protection: Federal Law No. 7-FZ of 10.01.2002 [adopted by the State Duma on 26.12.2001] (according to comp. on 26.08.2022). Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 2002. January, 11.

⁷ Regulations on the Federal Service for Supervision of Environmental Management: approved post. Government of the Russian Federation No. 400 dated 30.07.2004 (according to comp. on 12/28/2020). Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 2004. 31 Aug.

⁸ Model regulation on the territorial body of the federal supervision service in the field of Environmental Management: approved by the government of the Russian Federation. by the order of the Ministry of nature of the

and their joint orders – regulations on the territorial bodies of Rosprirodnazor. In turn, the Model Regulations of the Internal Organization of federal executive authorities⁹ contain only framework provisions on the structure of the Federal Executive Service and its territorial bodies.

Summarizing, we note that the main provisions regulating the activities of the FEB have a regulatory framework at the constitutional or legislative level, while the issues of the implementation of the activities of their territorial bodies are closed to the level of subordinate regulation.

The above multi-stage mechanism for the legal registration of the powers of the territorial bodies of the FEB is quite complex, opaque and creates clear ideas only about their territorial jurisdiction. Researchers have already drawn attention to this drawback [11, pp. 158-161; 12, pp. 109-125; 13, pp. 74-80]. Although in the modern period, many administrative procedures have received a simplified and visual implementation scheme, the activities of the territorial bodies of the Federal Tax Service are not fully algorithmized. The direct structure of the FEB, which has traditionally developed in the mechanism of public administration, includes federal ministries, federal services, federal agencies, between which a hierarchy of subordination is built, which allows solving urgent problems arising in the implementation of management functions.

This leads to disputes of an administrative and legal nature, during the consideration of which the courts often take the side of economic entities or citizens who appeal against the legality of the actions of officials of territorial bodies of the Federal Tax Service. For example, in 2021, the courts considered more than 195 thousand administrative claims arising from administrative and other public legal relations, 141 thousand of

them decided to satisfy the stated claims¹⁰. This means that the established law enforcement stereotype (arbitrary application of control and supervisory powers by the territorial bodies of the Federal Security Service) continues to persist, which leads to disproportionate and illegal restriction of the rights and legitimate interests of citizens and organizations.

In addition, under these circumstances, the trust of citizens in the system of public authorities in general and the territorial bodies of the Federal Security Service in particular remains insufficiently high [14, p. 164]. According to sociological research, the maximum trust among citizens is caused by the activities of the head of state, while the ratings of the FEB in this part have low indices, due to which the level of institutional trust does not exceed 48% [15, pp. 98-119; 16, pp. 248-253]. Based on the above, it is possible to draw an interim conclusion that in the new socio-economic realities, the activities of the FEB have received a framework legal regulation, carried out according to the general scheme. In their internal structure, the central apparatus and territorial bodies are allocated, endowed with the necessary amount of authority within the subject of the federation or the federal district. Territorial bodies and the administrations allocated in their structure exercise these powers, guided by by-laws, which reduces the effectiveness of their activities or does not allow creating ideas about it.

3. Legal characteristics of the administrative and legal status of the territorial bodies of the FEB. In the modern period, the reorganization of the system and structure of the FEB can be recognized as corresponding to the established constitutional and legal configuration of the separation of powers. The methods of modernization that have been practically tested have turned out to be both the formation of new FEBs and the redistribution of individual functions or the subordination of existing FEBs. The abolition of some of them (for example, the Federal Drug

Russian Federation dated 24.03.2020 № 159. Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 2020. 12 Sep.

⁹ Model regulations of the internal organization of federal executive bodies: approved post. The Government of the Russian Federation dated 28.07.2005 No. 452 (according to comp. on 18.03.2022). Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 2005. 2 Aug.

¹⁰ Report on the work of the courts of general jurisdiction on the consideration of civil, administrative cases in the first instance for 12 months of 2021. Moscow: Judicial Department at the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, 2022. p. 54.

Control Service of Russia in 2016) does not mean the simultaneous liquidation of the relevant public functions. These procedures have a certain importance for the territorial bodies of the Federal Tax Service, since they influence the implementation of the relevant powers in the field of public administration in a certain region or federal district. It is the territorial bodies that ensure the proper functioning of the FEB in whose structure they are, and they must directly solve the tasks assigned to its competence in a certain territory. The presence of territorial units ensures that the subjects of public administration are equipped with a mechanism that contributes to the organization of the process of executive and administrative activities [17, pp. 8-24].

The concept of territorial FEB is not disclosed at the regulatory level: in clause 5.1 of the Model Regulations for Interaction of Federal Executive Authorities, it is defined as a state body subordinate to the FEB. In the legal doctrine, the concept of "organ of the state" has been interpreted as a link in the mechanism of the state [18, p. 86] and as a collective that is an independent part of the state apparatus [19, p. 154].

The activity of the territorial bodies of the FEB has a spatial limitation, which subordinates the scale of the implementation of the functions and powers granted to the FEB, of which they are a subdivision. At the same time, they act as an independent subject of administrative and legal relations, exercising power and organizational and administrative powers, and their activities are most often organized on the basis of unity of command. The powers of the territorial authority are derived from the powers of the relevant FEB.

In the scientific literature, definitions of the territorial bodies of the FEB are formulated, based on the recognition of their vertically subordinate structural units of the FEB [20, p. 10], organizational and territorial separation and geographical dispersion in order to implement the functions and powers of the corresponding FEB [21, p. 28], hierarchical subordination to higher bodies [22, p. 161]. The content of their administrative and legal status can be considered taking into account the traditionally established

identification of this definition with the category of administrative legal personality. Provided that the concept of "subject of law" has an intersectoral legal nature [23, p. 35], in administrative law, a subject is a participant in managerial relations.

Accordingly, the status of a participant in management relations is regulated by the norms of administrative law, dispersed in federal laws and regulations of executive authorities that have a constitutional and legal basis and are based on the concept of public administration implemented in the state mechanism. The constituent blocks of this status are competence and powers, rights and obligations, the main areas of activity, as well as elements of public legal responsibility. Legal restrictions and the scope of responsibility to society are rightly recognized as necessary elements of the administrative and legal status of the territorial bodies of the FEB [24, p. 118]. And this is confirmed in the norms of the current legislation: for example, in accordance with Part 3 of Article 8 of the Federal Law "About the Police"¹¹, it is obliged to report on its activities to the legislative (representative) state authorities of the subjects of the federation, municipalities and citizens. In order to provide organizational support for this activity, the instruction approved by the order of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia has been put into effect¹².

In other words, the administrative and legal status of the territorial body of the FEB was formed in the system of current legal regulation as a set of functional rights and obligations, through which the proper implementation of the competence and powers of the FEB provided by law is ensured, the structural subdivision of which they are in accordance with the normative act defining the main directions of their activities. The unified

¹¹ About the police: Federal Law No. 3-FZ of 07.02.2011 [adopted by the State Duma on 28.01.2011] (according to comp. on 21.12.2021). Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 2011. February 10.

¹² Instructions for organizing and conducting reports of officials of territorial bodies of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia: approved by Order of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia dated 30.08.2011 No. 975 (according to comp. on 25.01.2021) // Electronic Fund of legal and regulatory documents URL: <https://docs.cntd.ru/document/902298668> (Accessed: 12/21/2022).

system of public power as a normative concept in the modern period has not completed its evolutionary development [25, p. 49-62], therefore, in the future it is possible to predict the emergence of a trend towards a certain unification of "status" regulations with priority given to legislative rather than subordinate regulation of this issue. For example, scientists have justified the need for the adoption of the Federal Law "On Public Administration in the Russian Federation" [26, pp. 55-77]; at the same time, the definition of "administrative and public bodies" has been proposed, covering both FEB and their territorial divisions. Despite the fact that the use of the new terminology will not entail a fundamental change in the content of the activity to which it is applied, this circumstance suggests a further complication of the administrative and legal regulation of the legal personality of both the FEB and their territorial divisions.

4. Organizational and legal forms of the territorial bodies of the FEB. Having analyzed the features of the structure of the FEB, we can agree with the authors who claim that it identifies typical and atypical territorial bodies [27, pp. 83-95]. Cardinal differences in legal regulation have not been established in relation to either of them [28, pp. 152-156]. Despite numerous transformations of both the FEB themselves and their territorial bodies, motivated by the need to build an effective model of public administration [29, p. 7-13], there was no significant dichotomy in managerial and administrative-legal relations with their participation.

In the modern period, typical territorial bodies of the FEB are departments (depending on the jurisdiction – main, linear, interregional, regional, territorial), departments (according to the profile of activity), branches and departments (can be created as structural divisions of territorial bodies of the FEB at a certain level). As atypical, researchers call military commissariats and inspections [21, pp. 91-100; 30, pp. 37-40]. It seems that the differences between them are terminological in nature, and the similarity is determined by the general principle of vertical subordination, as well as legal and technical aspects of the legal regulation of management

activities.

For terminological unification, it seems logical to use a technique by which territorial administrations would be allocated in the structure of the FEB, regardless of which entity manages their activities. In their composition, in turn, it is possible to separate departments that are in subordination relations with them. Such a structure has terminological simplicity and mathematical accuracy; with its use, the functional composition of the powers of the territorial body of the FEB would receive dispersion, and the competence of the FEB distributed in the spatial aspect would receive integration and uniform implementation.

Public administration as a process in the modern period is not regulated by the norms of law, therefore it is carried out using the legal framework that has been created for the exercise of powers in this area. The concentration of the powers of the executive power exclusively in the status of subjects who have the right to exercise it requires some transformations affecting the organizational and legal forms of the territorial bodies of the Federal Tax Service. Those listed above (management, department) can be called ordinary or standard. In turn, the formation of extraordinary or non-standard ones is required only in cases where there is an objective need in a certain territory and in connection with unexpected circumstances (for example, in 2022 such precedents were on the territory of new subjects of the Russian Federation: Donetsk People's Republic, Luhanskaya People's Republic, Kherson oblast).

5. Conclusions. Based on the legal nature of the territorial bodies of the Federal Tax Service, it can be concluded that they are in hierarchical subordination, but at the same time they are endowed with the full implementation of the powers assigned by law to their jurisdiction. In the absence of a single normative act that would detail the constitutional basis for the exercise of public power, most of them are established in accordance with the procedure provided for by the normative act issued by the entity that manages the activities of the relevant FEB. This practice has hidden defects that reduce the effectiveness of public administration.

In the subsystem of federal executive

bodies, territorial bodies are the main participants in administrative and legal relations arising from the exercise of their powers in the field of public administration, localized within the subject of the federation (several subjects, the federal district). Their combined jurisdiction covers the entire territory of the State, and competence is distributed taking into account the geographical (spatial) factor.

In order to create a transparent mechanism of public administration, there is a need to unify the structure of the territorial bodies of the Federal Tax Service with the preservation of two standard units in it – departments (at the level of the subject of the federation) and departments (divisions within departments endowed with specialized powers that are implemented in a specific territory).

The best way to create a transparent mechanism of public administration is to abandon the practice of legal regulation of the administrative and legal status of territorial bodies of the Federal Tax Service by by-laws. By-laws may have a certain potential in terms of the distribution of powers within the structure of the territorial body of the FEB, however, "status" norms should be present in the provisions of a separate federal law regulating the procedure for the establishment, transformation and liquidation of territorial bodies of the FEB.

REFERENCES

1. Soboleva Yu.V. *Administrative and legal status of non-governmental organizations*, Doct. Diss. Saratov, 2018. 434 p. (In Russ.).
2. Cherkasov K.V. *Public administration at the level of the federal district: administrative and legal research*, Doct. Diss. Moscow, 2009. 600 p. (In Russ.).
3. Churakov K.V. *Constitutional and legal models of interaction between the executive authorities of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation and federal government authorities*, Cand. Diss. Belgorod, 2010. 178 p. (In Russ.).
4. Cheprasov K.V. *Constitutionalization of interaction between federal executive authorities and executive authorities of the Russian Federation: essence, development, constitutional and judicial influence*, Cand. Diss. Barnaul, 2014. 246 p. (In Russ.).
5. Spiridonov P.E. Modern issues of development of the system of federal executive authorities in the Russian Federation. *Vestnik Universiteta im. O.E. Kutafina (MGYuA) = Courier of the Kutafin Moscow State Law University (MSAL)*, 2019, no. 6, pp. 96–103. (In Russ.).
6. Vedyashkin S.V. Human rights advocacy and law-enforcement functions of the federal government authorities. *Vestnik Universiteta imeni O.E. Kutafina (MGYuA) = Courier of Kutafin Moscow State Law University (MSAL)*, 2019, no. 6, pp. 87–95. (In Russ.).
7. Skvortsova A.P., Konyakina T.Ya., Guseva S.V. On the system of executive branch authorities in the Russian Federation. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta MVD Rossii = Bulletin of the Moscow University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia*, 2018, no. 5, pp. 203–206. (In Russ.).
8. Lapina M.A. Administrative reform: analysis of the first results and problems facing the subjects of executive power. *Pravo i politika = Law and Politics*, 2005, no. 10, pp. 12–17. (In Russ.).
9. Starilov Yu.N. The system of federal executive bodies: formation in order of transparent lawmaking or government procedures?. *Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya "Pravo" = Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series "Law"*, 2016, no. 3, pp. 16–57. (In Russ.).
10. Tikhomirov Yu.A. Control vectors in the focus of law. *Voprosy gosudarstvennogo i munitsipal'nogo upravleniya = Public Administration Issues*, 2019, no. 1, pp. 136–159. (In Russ.).
11. Miftakhov R.L. Factors influencing the reformation of federal executive authorities. *Vestnik ekonomiki, prava i sotsiologii = Bulletin of Economics, Law and Sociology*, 2016, no. 4, pp. 158–161. (In Russ.).
12. Knutov A.V., Sinyatullina L.Kh. Federal executive bodies' powers: quantitative analysis and classification. *Voprosy gosudarstvennogo i munitsipal'nogo upravleniya = Public Administration Issues*, 2018, no. 1, pp. 109–125. (In Russ.).
13. Petrov M.P. Issues of improving the structure of federal executive authorities. *Vestnik Saratovskoi gosudarstvennoi yuridicheskoi akademii = Bulletin of the Saratov State Law Academy*, 2012, no. 1, pp. 74–80. (In Russ.).
14. Moskaev A.N. *Law enforcement activities of executive authorities: theory questions*, Cand. Diss. Moscow, 2008. 210 p. (In Russ.).
15. Mersiyanova I.V., Yakimets E.N., Pakhomova E.I. Citizens' trust public servants' performance. *Voprosy gosudarstvennogo i munitsipal'nogo upravleniya = Public Administration Issues*, 2012, no. 4, pp. 98–119. (In Russ.).
16. Yaroshenko G.V., Reva A.S., Tur A.D. Institutional trust in the assessments of student youth. *Gosudarstvennoe i munitsipal'noe upravlenie. Uchenye zapiski = State and Municipal Management. Scholar Notes*, 2021, no. 3, pp. 248–253. DOI: 10.22394/2079-1690-2021-1-3-248-253. (In Russ.).
17. Kozlov Yu.M. Executive power: essence, functions. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 11. Pravo = Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 11. Law*, 1992, no. 4, pp. 8–24. (In Russ.).
18. Matuzov N.I., Malko A.V. *Theory of state and law*. Moscow, Yurist Publ., 2004. 542 p. (In Russ.).
19. Bakhrakh D.N. *Administrative law of Russia*. Moscow, Eksmo Publ., 2007. 672 p. (In Russ.).
20. Ovsyanko D.M. *Administrative law*. Moscow, Norma Publ., 2002. 401 p. (In Russ.).
21. Zakharova M.A. *Administrative and legal status of territorial bodies of federal executive bodies*, Cand. Diss. Saratov, 2016. 241 p. (In Russ.).
22. Smirnov D.A. *Principles of Russian tax law*. Moscow, Yurlitinform Publ., 2009. 312 p. (In Russ.).
23. Chirkin V.E. *Legal entity of public law*. Moscow, Norma Publ., 2007. 342 p. (In Russ.).
24. Rossinsky S.B., Starilov Yu.N. *Administrative law*. Moscow, Norma Publ., 2017. 640 p. (In Russ.).
25. Kozhevnikov O.A., Kostyukov A.N., Larichev A.A. Unified system of public authority: debatable aspects of

legal regulation. *Pravoprimenenie = Law Enforcement Review*, 2022, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 49–62. DOI: 10.52468/2542-1514.2022.6(3).49-62. (In Russ.).

26. Stakhov A.I., Landerson I.V., Domrachev D.G. Public administration in Russia as a subject of administrative procedure. *Pravoprimenenie = Law Enforcement Review*, 2021, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 55–77. DOI: 10.52468/2542-1514.2021.5(4).55-77. (In Russ.).

27. Frolov I.V. On the types of administrative and legal management. *Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya «Pravo» = Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series "Law"*, 2014, no. 3, pp. 83–95. (In Russ.).

28. Firsov M.V. Legal basis for the functioning of territorial bodies of federal executive authorities. *Biznes v zakone*, 2016, no. 5, pp. 152–156. (In Russ.).

29. Korchagina K.A. Some of the problems of building an effective system and structure of federal executive bodies. *Filosofiya prava = Philosophy of Law*, 2019, no. 2, pp. 7–13. (In Russ.).

30. Kopylova O.N. Organization of activities of territorial bodies of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia: problems and prospects. *Vestnik instituta: prestuplenie, nakazanie, ispravlenie*, 2015, no. 1, pp. 37–40. (In Russ.).

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHOR

Andrey P. Demin – PhD in Law, Director, Centre of Additional Education

Northern Institute (branch) of the All-Russian State University of Justice (RLA of the Ministry of Justice of Russia)

51, Onezhskoi flotilii ul., Petrozavodsk, 185034, Russia

E-mail: demin.mail@yandex.ru

RSCI SPIN-code: 8954-0343; AuthorID: 309759

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Demin A.P. Organizational and legal forms and differences in the administrative and legal status of the territorial bodies of the federal executive authorities of the Russian Federation. *Pravoprimenenie = Law Enforcement Review*, 2023, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 65–74. DOI: 10.52468/2542-1514.2023.7(3).65-74. (In Russ.).