

mgr Mateusz Grabarczyk

Title of dissertation: *Normative Model of Judicial Accountability: Transitional Justice Perspective*

Summary of the doctoral thesis in English

Over the past 40 years, many countries have undergone radical political transitions due to the fall of undemocratic regimes or the end of armed conflict. Democratization processes - transforming instability and injustice into those based on the rule of law - rely on mechanisms rooted in the concept of justice, commonly referred to as transitional justice. While the goals of transitional justice may vary depending on the context, several core features remain consistent: recognition of individual dignity, sensitivity to the pursuit of justice, acknowledgement of past violations, and a commitment to preventing their recurrence.

Transitional justice mechanisms - particularly those concerning judicial reform and judges' accountability - are highly complex and can cause new social divisions. Nevertheless, they are essential for building a liberal democracy founded on the rule of law, widely regarded as the paradigmatic aim of political transition. In such systems, the judiciary plays a unique role, and principles like independence and irremovability must be balanced against the need to hold accountable those judges who enabled or sustained oppressive regimes. Consequently, judicial reform and accountability are issues that often provoke categorical and polarized responses.

This dissertation explores how transitional justice intersects with judicial accountability for failures to fulfil the judicial role - especially where judicial independence has been compromised - in pre-transition periods. The primary objective is to develop a normative model of judicial accountability that can be applied across diverse transitional contexts. The project draws upon extensive legal scholarship, statutes, case law, and historical case studies to achieve this.

The dissertation is structured into seven chapters. Chapter I introduces transitional justice as a form of justice inherently linked to periods of regime change. It focuses on examining transitional justice through the prism of its objectives, serving as a foundation for understanding the rationale behind holding judges legally accountable. One of the central goals of transitional justice is the (re)construction of the rule of law, liberal democracy and trust in institutions. In consequence, chapter II reconstructs the concepts of liberal democracy and the rule of law from a teleological perspective, outlining judges' expected roles, responsibilities, and virtues in such systems. The teleological approach to the rule of law is emphasized as particularly relevant in transitional contexts. Chapter III analyzes the situation of judges and their conduct in non-democratic regimes, aiming to navigate the complexity of such cases by avoiding both underestimation and overestimation of judicial capabilities under repressive systems. Chapter IV develops a nuanced understanding of judicial accountability and legal responsibility, conceptualizing it as a legal relationship involving multiple actors situated in diverse legal contexts. This framework encompasses a broader range of responsibility types than classical definitions typically allow. Building on Chapter II, Chapter V distinguishes between the rule of law in stable democracies and in transitional periods, thereby laying the theoretical groundwork for understanding judicial accountability in times of transition. Chapter VI reconstructs

descriptive models of judicial accountability as applied in various countries. Each model is characterized by its specific accountability mechanisms and is based on empirical and historical evidence. These descriptive models serve as the foundation for the normative model proposed in the next chapter. Finally, Chapter VII presents the proposed normative model of judicial accountability from a transitional justice perspective, positioning it as part of a comprehensive judicial reform that prioritizes justice-sensitive and victim-oriented approaches.

The model integrates social, administrative, and tort (criminal and disciplinary) responsibility. It calls for a justice-sensitive strategy focused on four key domains: integrity, accountability, legitimacy, and citizen empowerment. The model employs the CIS matrix, which assesses capacity and integrity at individual, organizational, and external levels, along with sustainability at personal and organizational levels. The model consists of several sequential, yet independently functional, stages: social, criminal, administrative, and disciplinary.

This research contributes to the field of transitional justice by offering a functional model for judicial reform in post-repressive societies. It also engages with contemporary legal debates, where judicial accountability and reform frequently invoke the language of transitional justice while raising critical questions about the rule of law.