

<https://doi.org/10.25143/socr.14.2019.2-023-034>

Tactics and Methods Used by Defence Attorneys to Prevent Judicial Mistakes in the First Instance Court

Irīna Poļevaja

Daugavpils University
polevajairina1@gmail.com

Abstract

A defence attorney is a significant and notable figure in criminal proceedings who for the whole procedural activity in a criminal case, in theory, should facilitate detecting and correcting possible judicial mistakes. In this respect, it is vital to conduct a series of research in order to highlight prevalent problems and issues of a defence attorney's participation in criminal trials and to work out relevant recommendations for trial attorneys that would help to forestall, detect and prevent judicial mistakes. A specific condition of a defence attorney's activity in the process of evidencing at a judicial examination is his awareness of the entire system of evidences presented by the prosecution and accusation conclusions in disputable classification situations. They should rely upon the fact that a judicial examination is performed under circumstances of direct examination of evidence, oral proceedings, publicity, invariability of the body of the court, as well as the fact that both the court and the representatives of the parties take part at the examination. Rather short deadlines of a judicial examination entails working under circumstances when decisions must be taken under extreme conditions, by applying tricks and methods that would allow examining all evidence in the most productive way. It makes sense for a defence attorney to state his activity position and determination of taking an active part in evidencing already at the beginning of court hearings, by filing a motion to summoning new witnesses, experts and specialists, disclosure of material evidence and documents or exclusion of evidence obtained in the way of violating the law.

The author of the study applied general scientific methods of studying objective reality, peculiar to legal sciences: systematic document analysis, structural-functional analysis, critical approach, generalisation and prediction. As a result, the author provides

numerous recommendations and rules for successful and immaculate defence in criminal trials.

Keywords: prevention of judicial errors, criminal trial, defence attorney, line of defence, tactics and methods of examining evidence, assessment of evidence, judicial investigation.

Introduction

When getting into the process of evidencing, after the public prosecutor has stated accusations to the accused and the presiding judges question the accused if he understands the accusation, finds himself guilty and if his defence attorney wants to express his position regarding the accusation presented, the attorney should exercise this right and assess the set of evidences collected in the case and sufficiency thereof.

In this regard the position of L. V. Krechetova [4, 110–111] is of particular interest, as she offers a defence attorney to draw up and present in writing the defence conclusions (defence objections) to the court in reply to the indictment. She believes that they should reflect the issues of substantiation of the indictment theses in the part of sufficiency for initiating court proceedings.

In this regard, it should be noted that according to the effective legislation, a defence attorney is not restricted in choice of means, methods or forms of exercising his right to stating his position towards the presented charge. Besides, the defence attorney should choose the ones that allow for the most efficient influence on neutrality of examining circumstances in a criminal matter and prevent potential judicial errors.

The author believes that one of the methods that can predetermine neutrality of examining circumstances in a criminal matter, and therefore prevent judicial errors, is a written objection of the defence attorney to the presented accusation, and it is useful to express it after the prosecution statement and request including the text in the court hearing transcript. The essence of this document can be presented in the form of defence objections to the prosecution statement, containing defence position grounded in the required exculpatory evidence, as opposed to the prosecution position. In this document, it is useful to show the pressed charge as ungrounded, built on an insufficient set of the evidence collected in the matter, and unreliability thereof.

However, in practice that sometimes causes perplexity to the court and objections from the prosecution. Therefore, it is proposed to amend Section 498 Part 1 of the *Criminal Procedure Law*, and put it in the following wording:

“The presiding judge asks the accused if he understands the accusation, finds himself guilty, and offers him or his defence attorney to state their position regarding the accusation presented and present the defence objections which after stating thereof shall be included in the criminal case materials”.

Role of a Defence Attorney in Examination of Evidence: Possible Tactics and Methods

When discussing the procedure for examining evidence, the defence attorney has rather limited opportunities to influence amending the procedure. According to the law, first the prosecution presents the evidence. However, if the accused agrees, he can testify first, and, therefore, set the tone of the expected examination and to some degree even set the sequence of examining the prosecution evidence.

Therefore, a strict establishment of the procedure for evidence examination is rather relative, as the same evidence can attest both the guilt of a person and on the contrary, it can simultaneously indicate circumstances requiring classification according to a Section, stipulating milder punishment or mitigating circumstances. The brightest example of such evidence is the statement of the accused. Therefore, the sequence of questioning the accused can depend on particular circumstances and complexity of the matter, the situational development as of the moment of conducting the judicial examination. In this case, the defence attorney must skilfully (professionally) exercise his authority.

Literary sources contain different points of view regarding this. For instance, Y. F. Lubshev believes:

“If the defendant not admitting his guilt is not questioned first, this always makes the court-work look as exposing a criminal with other evidence. For criminal proceedings to be really adversary after the indictment that in fact is accusing a person at the court, always, in all cases this person should be interrogated, in order to understand his position, conclusions, and objections, and only afterwards look what other evidence says about this person’s crime.” [6, 203]

Opposing points of view state that the accused should not be interrogated at the beginning of the judicial examination, as while interrogating the accused, the court often takes accusative direction, the person asking the questions can lead the questioning by applying the method of pressure, creating an impression that he doubts faithfulness of his testimony. Psychologist studies show that approximately 4/5 of judges subconsciously show negative attitude towards the accused, thus most of the judges *apriori* see the accused as a person who has committed a crime. [8, 58–63]

After examining the prosecution evidence, according to the effective legislation, the evidence presented by the defence should be examined. The order of presenting the evidence by the defence attorney can be set depending on the sequence of circumstances underlying the fact to be proven or depending on the defence position.

In this case, based on the possibility of psychological influence on the trial participants, it would be reasonable to note such a method of presenting defence evidence by influencing the judges’ beliefs, moving from weak to more convincing.

When choosing a tactic, the defence attorney should take into account that interrogation of accused and examination and evaluation of his testimony rank among the most important aspects in legal actions when establishing the guilt of the defendant in committing a crime or innocence. This is explained by the necessity of establishing the main fact in criminal proceedings that is the issue of finding the accused guilty or not guilty. The defence attorney's task when interrogating the accused is to explore the defence position regarding the presented accusation.

Therefore, testifying is the right and not the obligation of the accused, as with his testimony he defends himself against the presented accusation. When the defence attorney starts interrogating his defendant, he should consider the contents of the presented accusation and the defendant's attitude thereto.

From this follows that the testimony of the accused can be used as means of defence, as proof of innocence or as means of establishing other circumstances subject to proof and of significance to solving the matter on merits.

In addition to the above, one should remember that the subject of interrogation are the circumstances included in the subject to be proven and circumstances required for verifying and assessing the evidence, including the circumstances that can lead to exemption from criminal liability and remission of penalty, as well as personality characterising circumstances.

Questions should be asked following a certain logical sequence: after the main question – additional, specifying and reminding, without using any suggestive questions. It is important to frame each question correctly and contemplate in advance. The goal of the questions is to reconstruct gaps made in the process of the free narration and detailing the interrogatee's testimony.

The degree of correctness of stating the question determines the correctness of the answer that will be heard and included in the court hearing transcript and afterwards assessed by the court. Preliminary agreed and adjusted sequence of questions that the defence attorney asks the accused, and presentation of the evidence at the defence disposal as proof of the received answers are designed to convince the court of the validity of the taken position.

Methods used by the defence attorney during interrogation cannot be directed to justification of committing the crime, understating its peril to public or giving false evidence by the accused.

The defence attorney's participation at the accused interrogation is determined by the position the defence attorney takes regarding the developing defending situation depending on whether the defendant does or does not admit his guilt completely or partly.

The defence attorney's participation at the accused interrogation should be planned in advance, adjusting his questions rationally to the circumstances to be proven on a mandatory basis in the particular criminal case, and he should ask questions that are indicating lack of constituent elements of offence in his activities or presence of circumstances excluding criminal activity, or circumstances mitigating liability.

Statement of evidence of the accused, made within the framework of conducting preliminary examination, as well as presentation of photo, audio and (or) video recording materials, videotaping his testimony enclosed to the interrogation protocol can be included in procedural requests of the parties in cases stipulated in Section 501 of the Criminal Procedure Law.

The defence attorney's participation at the interrogation of witnesses and victims should largely regard the stages of witness and victim evidence formation that are developed and described in the course of the Soviet criminal proceedings by M. S. Strogovich [9, 401–411].

When interrogating witnesses, it is reasonable to identify the sequence that corresponds to the sequence of the events that are committed and being examined in the criminal case as stated by the accused, of what the defence attorney has to file a request. Besides, the witnesses in their testimonies will be able to confirm one or another statement of the accused.

When witnesses are interrogated by the prosecution, the prosecutor starts the interrogation. In this case, the defence attorney's questions should be directed towards identifying non-compliance of their evidence with other evidence in the matter, as well as to identifying circumstances mitigating liability of the accused. For the purpose of assessing the reliability of a witness's evidence, questions should be focused on identifying the witness's relation to the accused, finding objective and subjective facts under which one or another fact was interpreted, on finding out how much time has passed from the moment of perception to the moment of interrogation, with whom of the participants of the court proceedings the particular witness has discussed any moments of the occurred event.

In this situation, in case of finding any contradiction in the evidence among the prosecution witnesses, as well as between the evidence of the prosecution witnesses and the evidence of the defence witnesses, both cross-examination and staggered (*checkerboard*) examination interrogations can be applied. The essence of staggered interrogation lies in the fact that for the purpose of identifying and matching evidence with the previously given evidence, the defence attorney asks several persons about the same circumstances. By applying the staggered interrogation method, the defence attorney can doubt the evidences given by the prosecution witnesses, thereby convincing the court of the necessity of eliminating contradictions among different evidences by obtaining new ones, requesting disclosure of documents, items, summoning new witnesses, necessity of appointing an expert examination.

Whereas in some cases the staggered interrogation is complicated by the fact that the interrogated witnesses leave the court hearings room, it is reasonable if the defence attorney foresees in advance the option of the staggered interrogation and requests that the interrogated witnesses stay in the court room for the purpose of preventing contradictions in their testimony.

During a cross-examination interrogation, one interrogatee is asked questions by the trial participants of the prosecution and defence in turns.

However, when conducting a cross-examination interrogation, the defence attorney should skilfully use his opportunities, as

“for honest and skilful people that is a means of exploring facts that without it would have not been available to the court, nevertheless such an interrogation may turn into the art that makes a person renounce of everything he knows and call himself in a stranger name”. [7, 151]

Statement of previously given testimony of a victim and witness, as well as demonstration of photo copies and images, diapositives made during interrogations, playback audio and (or) video recordings, and videotaping interrogations are only allowed in cases if these individuals do not arrive at the hearings and only with a consent of the parties thereto.

This situation gives the defence attorney the opportunity to object to disclosure of evidence of the victim or witness and request them to attend the hearings if this goes in line with the chosen line of defence.

Nevertheless, in practice, when disclosing evidence of the victim and witnesses the requirements of Section 501 of the *Criminal Procedure Law* are not always met, even though they are clearly stated in the law.

Therefore, the position of the European Court of Human Rights can be fully applied to solving this issue, according to which a judgement can be based on the evidence of a witness or victim disclosed at the court hearings disregarding the defence attorney's objections, if the accused has had the opportunity of asking questions to the witness or victim during preliminary examination and all measures have been taken for establishing their residences of and arriving at the court. Yet, if the accused or his defence attorney has not had any chances of interrogating individuals whose evidence had been used as proofs during any stage of the criminal case proceedings, the court should reject satisfying the request of the prosecution for disclosing evidence of the referred individuals if they fail arriving at the court hearings [5, 46–48].

When allowing requesting disclosure of evidence of a witness or a victim that has not arrived at the hearings, the court, in addition to identifying existence of grounds for that, must also verify if the requirements of the *Criminal Procedure Law* stipulating the procedure for conducting an interrogation have been followed when conducting interrogation of a person in question, for example, if clauses of Section 110 Part 2 of the *Criminal Procedure Law* have been explained. If any violations of the law are discovered, it is reasonable for the defence attorney to request exclusion of disclosure of evidence from the interrogation report and refusing the request for disclosure thereof.

This way, when the court receives a request for disclosure of evidence of a not-attending witness or victim provided during pre-trial proceedings, the court should base on whether this evidence is allowed by proofs and has the accused's right of interrogating the individuals testifying against him during previous stages of the criminal proceedings been ensured.

In order to eliminate contradictions between earlier evidence of the stated individuals and their evidence at trial a request from one party, providing reasoning in what exactly the evidence at trial contradicts the previous evidence is enough. If the party that has presented a request for disclosure of evidence fails in indicating the case materials reflecting thereof, this deprives the request of substantiation, and the court is entitled not to disclose the evidence.

In practice, court actions, such as inspection of material evidence, disclosure of the reports of investigative activity and other documents, are performed at the end of judicial investigation and have little effect on the court position in the criminal case articulated at the end of the investigation. In this regard, it is reasonable for the defence attorney to request inspection of material evidence simultaneously with the interrogation of the accused, victim, witness or expert, as that will significantly widen to opportunity of verifying the evidence of these subjects. Documents should be disclosed not at once, but subsequently, according to studying the case circumstances they referred to, and if necessary, simultaneously with interrogation of the respective subjects.

During such proceeding actions, the inspection participants may be asked questions in relation to signs of material evidence or circumstances related thereto. They are entitled to drawing the court's attention to certain signs or circumstances related to the material evidence and ask to reflect them in the court hearing transcript.

The defence attorney's participation in examining evidence by the court is implemented by matching the other evidence present in the criminal matter, identifying sources thereof and obtaining other evidence confirming or disproving the evidence being verified. Moreover, the defence attorney verifies the prosecution evidence under the angle of unreliability of such evidence, and exculpatory-reliability thereof.

The defence attorney's participation in evidence assessment at judicial and preliminary investigations is important, as in the law one is not listed as a subject in evidence assessment and does not have any authority required for evidencing, the results of their activity in assessing evidence are expressed in requests aimed at convincing the court of the correctness of his position and urging to pass a procedural judgement in the interests of the defendant.

Moreover, the defence attorney's activity has a unilateral nature, as he assesses evidence only for the purpose of defending the rights and statutory interests of the defendant, but in doing this is guided by single criteria of relevance, admissibility, reliability and sufficiency as stipulated in the law.

If any doubts arise regarding reliability of the prosecution evidence, the defence attorney must not provide the grounds to the prosecution for performing any activities allowing him to eliminate the arisen doubts. When stating the request, the defence attorney should not encourage resolving the doubt in favour of the accusation. If concerns exist regarding any of the above stated issues, it is best not to conduct verification at all, and instead provide evidence assessment in the speech of the defence, singling out the existing doubts regarding reliability of the prosecution evidence and that the

doubts have not been eliminated during the court examination, consequently should be interpreted in favour of the accused, as stipulated in Section 19 Part 3 of the *Criminal Procedure Law*.

Limits of evidencing are supposed to be the required and sufficient set of evidence allowing taking a correct, grounded and legal procedural judgement in the matter.

The limits of evidencing depend on a range of factors, the key ones of which are: (1) category and nature of the criminal offence; (2) area of actual circumstances in the composition of the subject to be proven in the particular matter; (3) circumstances relevant to the matter and acknowledging the information giving grounds to the most essential circumstances to be proven; (4) existence of sufficient and reliable evidence required for establishing actual data; and (5) positive solution of the issue on admissibility of the existing evidence.

The defence attorney should treat disclosing each request very prudently, carefully substantiating the subject thereof and choosing a tactically correct moment for presenting the request in order to convince the court of the necessity of satisfying it.

Because the meaning of a request is demonstrated through legal consequences of satisfying thereof. An unsatisfied request can make grounds for challenging the judgement aimed at correcting a judicial error.

The next stage in adjudication of a criminal matter are arguments of the parties and the last plea of the defendant. The purpose of the defence attorney's participation at this stage, in particular, is communicating to the court all the finally articulated evidence of the legal position of the defence on the results of all investigated at the court hearings, articulation and grounds of the position.

Analysis of evidence during the arguments of the parties in the speech of defence should be pointed out in particular. It is exactly the speech of defence where the defence attorney assesses the evidence influencing the judge's beliefs when passing the judgement.

In Part 506 Part 4, the *Criminal Procedure Law* does not define the contents or structure of the speech of defence, it just indicates that the participants of discussion are not entitled to referring to evidence that has not been adjudicated at the court hearings or that has been found inadmissible by the court.

Upon analysing different points of view of scientists, the author concludes that it is reasonable to base the defence attorney's speech on the chosen strategic line of defence, circumstances of the criminal matter and judicial investigation data. In the speech, the defence attorney can: (1) question the accusation in full, insist on the accused's innocence and absolution; (2) question certain points of the prosecution (by reasoning the necessity of exclusion thereof from the accusation); (3) by not questioning the accusation on its merits, otherwise than the prosecutor, communicate and explain the actions of the accused; (4) question the offence classification, make conclusions in favour of reclassifying the offence according to the Criminal Law provision stipulating a milder punishment; (5) present circumstances mitigating the punishment.

The key part of the defence speech can be devoted to evidence analysis and assessment. Literary sources contain different points of view regarding the contents of the defence attorney's speech and structure thereof, finding it to be a creative and individual activity, yet majority of the authors note that the speech should depend on the position of the defence.

If the accused admits his guilt, the defence attorney should pay the main attention to evidencing mitigating circumstances and personality of his defendant. It makes sense to analyse aggravating circumstances and assessment of evidencing thereof.

The defendant's personality should be portrayed in the best favourable light. Social evaluation of the defendant's personality should be provided, not limiting only to external features.

It is important to show that the crime committed by the defendant has been a forced action or external circumstances have provoked the defendant's criminal behaviour. When it comes to circumstances facilitating committing the offence, the defence attorney can point them out in his speech and analyse the facts evidencing thereof.

If the offence has been committed and it has been committed by the defendant but the facts in the case proven by evidence show the need for reclassifying the offence to a section of the Criminal Law envisaging less serious offence, the main focus in the defence attorney's speech should be paid to analysing the evidence lying in the basis of the accusation and rebutting thereof by using the evidence investigated during the judicial investigation.

In this case, the defence attorney should not only doubt the prosecution conclusions but also state his conclusions. The Soviet time legal literature indicated that

“the public prosecutor must prove the accusation in a positive form, i.e., prove that the facts he is stating have actually taken place. The defence attorney's situation is different. According to the presumption of innocence, the defendant is considered not guilty until his guilt is proven; therefore, the defence attorney can use rebuttal of the prosecution conclusions as a basis of his speech, and he can insist on the fact that the prosecutor has not proven his statements.” [10, 316]

Yet such a position must be grounded.

“A lawyer, when making a speech at court, is proving the points suggested by him. If he is defending the position of non-proven accusation, the speech of defence should include grounds for this thesis, i.e., indicating why the defendant cannot be found guilty, where the contradiction, insufficiency and doubtfulness of the prosecution accusation lies and what proves that.” [2, 128]

It is better to make a speech as a result of active position of the defence attorney in the matter as a participant to the evidencing process, when one substantiates their statements by evidence verified during the judicial investigation.

When the defendant does not admit one's guilt and the court must pass an acquittal judgement, the literature sources indicate that depending on the version in the matter presented by the prosecution and defence, two versions of analysis and assessment

of evidence are possible. In the first version, the prosecution conclusions are rebutted first, and then analysis and assessment of the evidence is provided, indicating on mitigating circumstances and circumstances justifying the defendant. In the second variant, first the defence evidences are presented and analysed, and then the prosecution conclusions are rebutted [7, 208].

When deciding on the sequence of presentation, it is useful to consider that information presented at the beginning or in the end of the presentation is remembered the best. Consequently, depending on the situation, less important arguments should be stated at the beginning and more important ones – in the end, or *vice versa*.

Conclusion

Analysis and generalisation of the mentioned shows that the defence attorney should follow some rules:

1. The sequence of analysis and assessment of evidence examined during the judicial investigation should be selected according to the line of the defence.
2. When performing evidence analysis, not only the prosecution conclusions should be rebutted and questioned in a substantiated way, but also the defence position should be reasoned, stating the contents of evidence proving the non-culpability if the defendant or presence of mitigating circumstances.
3. Upon analysing the defendant's personality, attention should be drawn to the characteristics indicating the accidental nature of the particular behaviour of the subject which is the subject of the lawsuit if the defendant finds himself guilty. If the defence attorney insists on the defendant's absolution, personality analysis is required for the purpose of demonstrating the impossibility of committing an offence by this particular subject.
4. If evidence analysis envisages high volumes of numerical or other types of documented information for substantiating the conclusions, that can be presented in writing and offered to the court in addition to the oral speech.
5. Repeating the main thesis of defence increases the credibility of the position.
6. Evidence analysis structure must be planned in advance.
7. It should be taken into account that emotional (dramatic) assessment of the facts should be avoided in front of a professional judge. Substantiation of one's conclusions by evidence will be the strong side of the speech. Only facts, evidence and analysis thereof, as well as logics of presentation, can influence the court in taking their decisions.
8. Apart from arguments of the parties, the law grants the prosecution and defence the right of reply that is an important additional element facilitating defending one's line of defence. A reply can only be made by the participant of proceedings from the defence who has participated in the arguments of the parties. The reply can only be made regarding what has been said in the speeches

of other participants of the criminal proceedings and should only be related to circumstances that have been expressed in the arguments by other participants of the proceedings.

9. The next independent stage in the litigation of a criminal matter, following the arguments of the parties is the last plea of the defendant. The last plea of the defendant is not only a means for explaining his attitude towards the circumstances of the adjudicated criminal matter, but also a means of discovering new circumstances that are significant in the matter, or new evidence that may lead to reinstating of the judicial investigation.
10. The law vests the defendant with the right to present his last plea irrespective if he has participated in the oral arguments or not. The last plea of the defendant is an important and independent means of defence against the accusation, as well as against the potential unjust punishment. Not giving the defendant the opportunity for the last plea is a violation of the defendant's rights to defence and entails unconditional revocation of the court verdict. Therefore, actual deprivation of the defendant of the opportunity of exercising his last plea is considered as rejection of satisfying the defendant's request for postponing litigation in order to prepare his statement.

Consequently, the defence can offer the court its vision of the circumstances of the criminal matter, based on evidence examined in the court that is subject to mandatory adjudication by the court in the deliberations room. This rather efficient method of defence is recommended to be exercised by the defence attorney.

Aizstāvju izmantotā taktika un metodes tiesas kļūdu novēršanai pirmās instances tiesā

Kopsavilkums

Aizstāvis ir nozīmīga, ievērojama figūra kriminālprocesā, jo aizstāvja procesuālajai darbībai krimināllietā teorētiski būtu jāatvieglo iespējamo tiesas kļūdu konstatēšana un labošana. Un šajā sakarā ir vitāli svarīgi veikt virkni pētījumu, lai izceltu problēmjasūtājumus, kas saistīti ar aizstāvja piedalīšanos krimināllietās, un izstrādātu tādas rekomendācijas aizstāvjiem, kas praktiskajā darbībā sekmētu tiesas kļūdu paredzēšanu, konstatēšanu un novēršanu.

Par specifisku priekšnoteikumu aizstāvja darbībai pierādīšanas procesā tiesas izmeklēšanā ir uzskatāma viņa pilnā informētība par visu pierādījumu sistēmu lietā, kuru piedāvā valsts apsūdzība, un par valsts apsūdzības apsvērumiem strīdus krimināltiesiskās kvalifikācijas gadījumos. Aizstāvim jāņem vērā, ka tiesas izmeklēšana norit pierādījumu tiesas un nepastarpinātas pārbaudes apstākļos, ievērojot mutiskuma, publicitātes un tiesas

sastāva nemainīguma principus. Pierādījumu pārbaudē piedalās gan tiesa, gan visi pārējie procesa dalībnieki, kas nav aizstāvības pusē. Likuma prasība ievērot saprātīgus lietas iztiesāšanas termiņus paredz saspringtu darbu, svarīgus lēmumus pieņemot ekstremālos procesuālos apstākļos, izmantojot tādus paņēmienus un metodes, kas veicinātu efektīvu pierādījumu kopuma pārbaudi un novērtēšanu. Aizstāvim būtu ieteicams deklarēt savu aktīvu procesuālo pozīciju un paust gatavību aktīvi piedalīties pierādīšanā jau tiesas izmeklēšanas sākumā, piesakot lūgumus par jauno liecinieku, ekspertu un/vai speciālistu aicināšanu uz tiesas sēdi, kā arī piesakot lūgumus par lietisko pierādījumu un/vai dokumentu pieprasīšanu un par pierādījumu, kas iegūti, pārkāpjot likumu, izslēgšanu no pierādījumu kopuma.

Šajā pētījumā ir izmantotas vispārīgās zinātniskās metodes, kas sekmē objektīvās realitātes izziņāšanu un ir raksturīgas tiesību zinātnei, proti: sistēmiskā dokumentu analīze, strukturāli funkcionālā analīze, kritiskā pieeja, vispārināšana un prognozēšana. Secinājumos tiek piedāvātas vairākas rekomendācijas veiksmīgai, efektīvai un nevainojamai aizstāvībai pirmās instances tiesā.

Atslēgvārdi: tiesas kļūdu prevencija, krimināllietas izskatīšana tiesā, aizstāvis, aizstāvības pozīcija, pierādījumu pārbaudes taktika un metodes, pierādījumu novērtēšana, tiesas izmeklēšana.

References

1. Latvijas Republika. (11.05.2005). Kriminālprocesa likums: Latvijas Republikas likums (Eng. Criminal Procedure Law: Law of the Republic of Latvia). *Latvijas Vēstnesis*. 74(3232).
2. Алексеев, Н. С. и Макарова, З. В. (1985.) *Ораторское искусство в суде* (Eng. The art of speech in court). Ленинград.
3. Корневский, Ю. В. и Падва, Г. П. (2004). *Участие защитника в доказывании по новому уголовно-процессуальному законодательству* (Eng. Participation of counsel in the evidence under the new criminal procedure law). Москва: Юрист.
4. Кречетова, Л. В. (2000). *Механизм функции защиты в судебном разбирательстве: диссертация кандидата наук: специальность – юридические науки* (Eng. Mechanism of defense function in the trial: dissertation of the candidate of science: specialty – law). Оренбург.
5. Курочкина, Л. (2004). Оглашение показаний потерпевшего и свидетеля (Eng. Proclamation of testimony of the victim and witness). *Законность*. 9, 46–48.
6. Лубшев, Ю. Ф. (1997). *Адвокат в уголовном деле* (Eng. Criminal Lawyer). Москва: Юристь.
7. Сергеев, П. (1988). *Искусство речи на суде* (Eng. The art of speech in court). Москва: Наука.
8. Смирнов, В. П. (1994). Противоборство сторон как сущность принципа состязательности уголовного судопроизводства (Eng. Confrontation of the parties as the essence of the principle of adversarial criminal proceedings). *Государство и право*. 3, 58–63.
9. Строгович, М. С. (1968). *Курс советского уголовного процесса* (Eng. Course of the Soviet criminal trial). Т. 1. Москва: Наука.
10. Строгович, М. С. (1968). *Курс советского уголовного процесса* (Eng. Course of the Soviet criminal trial). Т. 2. Москва: Наука.