1) participate during the trial in the questioning of prosecution witnesses and demand from the court their questioning, or the summoning and questioning of defense witnesses;

2) collect and submit evidence to the court;

3) express one's opinion regarding the motions of other participants in court proceedings.

As for the duties, he has the same duties as the suspect, i.e. to arrive on summons, perform procedural duties, etc.

Conclusion. So, the procedure for acquiring the status of suspect and accused is a sufficiently regulated process that contains certain features and shortcomings. The above rights and obligations make it clear that the suspect and the accused are not deprived of constitutional norms and have a fairly broad procedural status in criminal proceedings.

References:

1. Кримінальний процесуальний кодекс України: Закон України від 01.01.2023, Відомості Верховної Ради України (ВВР), 2013, № 9-10, № 11-12, № 13, ст.88.

2. Кастарнов Д. Б. Поняття «Особа підозрюваного (обвинуваченого)» в кримінальному судочинстві // Юридична наука №4, - 2014, - с. 16-23.

3. Гузела М. В. Міжнародні стандарти забезпечення прав підозрюваного в кримінальному провадженні.

4. Європейська конвенція з прав людини: Документ від 01.08.2021.

5. Сучасний англо-український юридичний словник : понад 75 тисяч англійських термінів і стійких словосполучень / уклад. Леся Василівна Мисик, Ірина Володимирівна Савка ; за наук. ред. В. Т. Нора; Львів. нац. ун-т ім. І. Франка. – К. : Ін Юре, 2018. – 1350 с. – (Б-ка словників "Ін Юре").

PECULIARITIES OF THE PROOF PROCESS IN CASES OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFENCES

KHRYSTYNA VASYLTSIV, student
BOHDAN HUDZ, Assistant, PhD in Law, Scientific Adviser
LILIA KUZNETSOVA, Associate Professor, PhD in Philology
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

Introduction. Since administrative law regulates a very wide range of public-law relations, problems with the violation of the rights of individuals or the emergence of controversial situations during the interaction between individuals and the state occur very often. For example, in 2018, among the judges of the Cassation Courts of Supreme Court , the Civil Court of Cassation had 2,674 cases, the Criminal Court of Cassation – 1,053 cases, while the Administrative Court of Cassation had 7,997 cases. Since the lion's share of court cases in Ukraine falls precisely on cases of administrative offenses, it is appropriate to consider the process of proof and its features in cases of administrative offenses as one of the

key stages of consideration of the case in court. The importance of this process lies in the fact that it is possible to ensure a correct and fair consideration of the case, which will comply with the basic principles of administrative proceedings (the rule of law, the equality of the participants in the legal process before the law and the court, the adversarial nature of the parties and the official clarification of all the circumstances in the case) evidence base and its reliability. Establishing all the circumstances in the case is a very complex process, which requires the analysis of all the data provided by the parties in terms of whether they fall under the concept of evidence and whether this evidence is proper, admissible, reliable and sufficient. The significance of the evidence is that it is based on it that the court makes a final decision in the case, accordingly, whether the collection, research and evaluation of the evidence will comply with regulatory prescriptions and principles of law depends on how fair and legal the decision will be.

Objectives. The main tasks are to research and understand the concept of proof, the definition of key features and problematic issues of this process in administrative proceedings, the general characterization of the concept of evidence, its features and types, as well as the obligation of proof based on legislation.

Methods. The main methods used in the study are description, analysis, abstraction and generalization.

In legal science, there are many definitions and approaches to the concept of proof. O. M. Dubenko defines the legal category of evidence in administrative proceedings as an activity regulated by procedural legislation, subject to the laws of logic, aimed at establishing the objective truth in an administrative case and making a well-founded and legal decision. I. O. Koretskyi considers the process of proof as a complex activity consisting of separate cognitive acts connected with each other, related to the solution of separate tasks, establishment of separate circumstances that are subject to proof in the case. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that proof is precisely a cognitive activity that is carried out on the basis of normative prescriptions and conclusions from which are derived in accordance with the laws of logic. Exclusion of any of these signs will not allow establishing the truth in the case. Researchers distinguish 3 main stages of proof: collection and consolidation of evidence, research of evidence and evaluation of evidence. In this case, it is important to understand what evidence is. The Code of Administrative Procedure of Ukraine defines evidence as any data on the basis of which the court establishes the presence or absence of circumstances (facts) that justify the claims and objections of the participants in the case, and other circumstances that are important for the correct resolution of the case. In accordance with Part 2 of Article 72 of this Code, these data are established by the following means:

1) written, physical and electronic evidence;

2) conclusions of experts;

3) testimony of witnesses.

There are often certain discrepancies in the approach to electronic evidence and ways of presenting it in the literature and in practice. Article 99 of the Code of

Administrative Procedure regulates this issue. According to it, electronic evidence is submitted in the original or in an electronic copy certified by an electronic signature, equivalent to a handwritten signature. The participants in the case have the right to submit electronic evidence in paper copies, certified in the manner specified by law. A paper copy of electronic evidence is not considered written evidence. As for witness testimony, it is important to note that testimony cannot be evidence, in the case when a person cannot name the source of his knowledge, nor is testimony from someone else's words recognized as admissible evidence.

Evidence can be classified into direct and indirect. On the basis of direct evidence, a reliable conclusion can be made about the existence or absence of a circumstance, on the basis of indirect evidence, only an indirect conclusion can be made. Depending from circumstances aggravating or mitigating the responsibility incriminating and exculpatory evidence.

Conclusions. After conducting an analysis of legislation and scientific literature, it becomes clear that proofing is a complex cognitive intellectual process that plays a leading role in solving cases of administrative offenses. It is possible to solve the case of an administrative offense qualitatively and fairly only after establishing the evidence in accordance with the prescriptions of the law, the principles of law and the laws of logic.

References:

1. Кодекс адміністративного судочинства України(дата звернення : 25.03.2023)

2. Козинець І.Г., Кравченко В.Я. Окремі питання доказів та доказування в адміністративному судочинстві на сучасному етапі. Юридичний науковий електронний журнал. Режим доступу : http://www.lsej.org.ua/2_2021/42.pdf

3. Висоцький В. М., Гнатюк С. С., Гурковська К. А. Гурковський М. П., Грищук А. Б., Дідик Н. І., Йосифович Д. І., Мороз О. Б., Назар Ю. С., Хатнюк Ю. А., Хитра О. Л., Середа В. В. Адміністративний процес України. Львівський державний університет внутрішніх справ, 2021. Ст. 435-483

4. У Верховному Суді розподілили справи. https://jurliga.ligazakon.net/news/167676_u-verkhovnomu-sud-rozpodlili-spravi

NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE CINEMA AS A BASIS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

STANISLAV VASYURKO, student
NATALIIA VOITOVYCH, Associate Professor, PhD Social Communication Studies, Scientific Adviser
OLENA IVASYUTA, Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Language Adviser
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

Since time immemorial, the enemy has been working against us in various spheres to undermine our nationhood, identity and democracy. And the field of cinematography was no exception. Through Russian propaganda, stereotypes and