POLAND



NUMBER **10** (20)

OCTOBER 2017

The President responded to the criticisms that his bills on The Judicial Council of Poland and Supreme Court were unconstitutional. And in response to those he prepared... a bill to amend the Constitution. It is the first time in the short history of Polish democracy that the Constitution is required to adapt itself to new legislation and not vice versa. Two conclusions can be drawn here – both could be seen as reassuring.

the essence of the problem in question! Politicians will still be responsible for nominating judges and it is irrelevant whether they represent one or two parties.

The second conclusion is such that Mr Duda is desperately fighting for his position in the government camp. His project of "reforming" the judicial system is very similar to the one proposed by the leading party.

LESSER OF TWO EVILS? RATHER NOT

Conclusion number one – the President has noticed that the idea that the MPs are to choose The Judicial Council of Poland members might be unconstitutional. It is a shame that his only answer to the problem is the introduction of a qualifying majority requirement of 3/5. Dear Mr President, this really does not solve

There is one problem with the above: the President asked for amendments, the parliament apparently accepted them, but then changed them to such a degree that they lost their value. Mr Duda could not handle an insult so deep and decided to show who's the boss.

This is all when it comes to encouraging pieces of news regarding the situation of the judiciary system in Poland. An entry regarding the shortening of term for judges of the Supreme Court on the pretext of an age limit (it so happens that the First President of the Supreme Court is turning 65 this year). On top of this, new ideas have arisen: the control chamber of the Supreme Court, that is meant to be responsible for the validity of the general elections - will have its members chosen by the PIS party. Moreover, a new institution has arisen, responsible for the possibility of extraordinary appeal which will enable to appeal against any final legal judgment to the Supreme Court. Eventually, appeal is meant to be possible for up to 5 years from the sentence date, and at the moment of the bill being passed, for cases even 20 years old! From mafia activity to inheritance cases – everything that took place in courts over the last 20 years now has a chance to be undermined.

And that is meant to be the acceleration of the legal processes we are waiting for?

Maciej Pokrzywa