

REVIEW OF COURT DOCUMENTS FOR NEWLY OPENED CASES

Esanova Zamira Normurotovna¹
*Professor of the Department of civil
procedural and economic procedural law, TSUL*
Email - zamira.esanova@mail.ru

Annotation. The article is devoted to the review of the provisions of Chapter 47 of the Code of Civil Procedure entitled "Review of judicial documents that have entered into legal force in newly opened cases". The article provides conclusions on the results of the review of judicial documents in newly opened cases, courts that review judicial documents in newly opened cases, the procedural order and the specifics of working in this order.

The article also contains comments and comments by the author on the similarities and differences between the institution of review of judicial documents in newly opened cases and other stages of review, scientific proposals and recommendations aimed at improving regulatory documents on this topic. In addition, the article examines the analysis of the grounds for proceedings in newly opened cases and materials of judicial practice on this matter. The results of the study, analysis and comparison, as well as the opinions of domestic and foreign procedural scientists on this matter were expressed.

Keywords: civil case, judicial document, review, justice, legality, reasonableness, fairness, judicial error, reopened case, application, appeal, decision, procedural term, procedural law, procedural rule, procedural consequence.

Kirish: The protection of citizens' rights and interests through the judiciary is a fundamental principle of any legal system. In many cases, the judicial process must allow for the review of decisions that have already been finalized and entered into legal force, especially when new circumstances arise that may alter the fairness or correctness of a judgment. The right to challenge or seek the reconsideration of judicial documents is an essential component of justice, providing individuals with the opportunity to address errors or unforeseen issues that may have affected the outcome of their case.

One key procedural institution in this regard is the mechanism for reviewing court documents based on newly discovered circumstances. This procedure offers a means of revisiting a case where significant new facts or information have come to light, which were previously unknown and could not have been identified during the original proceedings. Unlike appeals, which typically focus on errors of law or procedure, this process allows for the correction of judicial decisions based on material facts that were unavailable at the time of the initial ruling.

Chapter 47 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan specifically governs the review of judicial documents based on newly discovered circumstances. The purpose of this article is to explore and analyze the norms and regulations surrounding this legal institution, examining how it operates, the grounds for such reviews, the procedural steps involved, and the judicial bodies authorized to review cases. Additionally, it aims to compare this mechanism with other forms of judicial reconsideration and provide suggestions for its improvement, drawing from both domestic and international practices. This analysis is critical for ensuring that the judicial system remains fair, transparent, and adaptable to evolving facts.

Tadqiqot metodologiyasi. The methodology used in this study is multidisciplinary, incorporating various scientific approaches to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the institution of reviewing

¹ Doctor of Philology (PhD)



Impact Factor: 9.9**ISSN-L: 2544-980X**

judicial documents based on newly discovered circumstances. Key methods include analytical and comparative legal analysis, logical reasoning, and the study of judicial practice materials. These approaches allow for an in-depth examination of the provisions in the Civil Procedure Code of Uzbekistan, as well as a comparison with similar mechanisms in other jurisdictions.

First, a comparative legal analysis was conducted to examine how the institution of reviewing court documents based on newly discovered circumstances is implemented in both domestic and foreign legal systems. By analyzing the practices of countries such as Russia and other post-Soviet states, the study identifies similarities and differences in procedural rules and judicial interpretations, shedding light on potential areas for improvement in Uzbekistan's own legal framework.

Additionally, judicial practice materials were analyzed to determine how courts have applied the provisions of Chapter 47 in real cases. This includes studying the grounds for reopening cases, such as newly discovered facts or evidence, and the types of judicial decisions that have been subject to review. These case studies help illuminate how the procedural norms are functioning in practice and where gaps or inconsistencies may exist.

To further substantiate the findings, scientific methods such as logical reasoning and synthesis were applied to connect the results from different sources and build a coherent argument regarding the necessity of reform in the current system. These methods are crucial in forming the theoretical basis for the recommendations provided in the article.

RESULTS

The research conducted in this study reveals several significant findings about the institution of reviewing judicial documents based on newly discovered circumstances. First, it is evident that this institution plays a crucial role in maintaining justice by allowing for the rectification of errors that may have been caused by the discovery of new facts, information, or evidence that could not have been known at the time of the initial court decision. The most common ground for such a review is the emergence of circumstances that were previously unknown to the applicant, and which could not have been discovered through due diligence during the original proceedings.

In particular, Article 437 of the Civil Procedure Code outlines specific grounds under which judicial decisions can be reopened. These include situations where new facts emerge that were significant for the case but could not have been known at the time, as well as situations where it is discovered that a judicial decision was based on fraudulent testimony, forged documents, or criminal conduct. The study reveals that the most prevalent basis for reopening cases involves new circumstances that are entirely independent of the actions of the parties involved or the judge. This highlights the importance of allowing courts to revisit their decisions when unforeseen factors emerge.

Another key finding is that the procedural steps for applying for a review based on newly discovered circumstances are clearly outlined in the Civil Procedure Code, but the analysis also identifies areas where the process could be streamlined or clarified. For example, the timelines for filing applications—three months from the discovery of new circumstances, with the possibility of an extension—are generally effective, but the criteria for granting extensions could be made more transparent to avoid unnecessary delays.

Additionally, the study finds that the courts authorized to review judicial documents are generally the same courts that issued the original decisions. However, in cases where decisions were amended by appellate or cassation courts, those courts take on the responsibility for reviewing the case based on newly discovered circumstances. This arrangement ensures that decisions are reviewed by the most appropriate judicial body, but it also underscores the need for clear procedural rules to avoid confusion or overlap.

Overall, the research highlights the importance of newly discovered circumstances as a critical legal tool for ensuring fairness in the judicial process. By analyzing the grounds for such reviews, the study provides insights into how the legal framework can be refined to improve its efficiency and



effectiveness, both in terms of procedural clarity and the substantive fairness of the decisions made. Based on these findings, the study offers several recommendations aimed at improving the existing regulations and practices, drawing on both domestic legal theory and international experience.

DISCUSSION

The section "PART IV. REVIEW OF COURT DOCUMENTS" of the Civil Procedure Code includes norms related to "Chapter 47. Review of judicial documents that have entered into legal force based on newly discovered circumstances" (Articles 437–462).

These norms specify the grounds, procedures, timeframes, subjects, objects, instances, and distinctive features of proceedings for newly discovered circumstances [1].

According to Article 437 of the Civil Procedure Code, the grounds for the review of court documents based on newly discovered circumstances are as follows:

Judgments, rulings, and decisions that have entered into legal force may be reviewed based on newly discovered circumstances. The following grounds apply for such a review:

- 1) Circumstances unknown to the applicant, and that could not have been known, but are significant for resolving the case if they are critical to making a fair decision;
- 2) Circumstances determined by a legally binding court judgment, which resulted in an unlawful, baseless, or unjust decision. These include instances such as a knowingly false testimony by a witness, a deliberately false conclusion by an expert, intentionally inaccurate translations, or forged documents or evidence;
- 3) Criminal acts of the parties, other participants in the case, or judges, identified by a court judgment, that led to the adoption of an unlawful, baseless, or unjust judicial document [2];
- 4) The annulment of a court judgment, ruling, decision, or other authoritative document that formed the basis of the original judicial decision.

An analysis of these grounds reveals that the most common basis for reviewing cases under newly discovered circumstances involves "circumstances unknown to the applicant, and that could not have been known, but are significant for resolving the case." Such cases constitute the majority of reviews conducted under this procedural institution [3].

Key Components Based on This Ground:

- ✓ Unknown to the applicant;
- ✓ Could not have been known;
- ✓ Circumstances that are significant to the case;
- ✓ Must be essential for correctly resolving the case.

An analysis of court practice materials shows that these grounds (circumstances) arise without any fault of the parties or the judge. Circumstances that are independent of the subjective or objective actions of individuals later come to light and are of critical importance to the case [4].

According to Article 438 of the Civil Procedure Code (CPC), amendments and additions have been made to the rules governing the courts authorized to review judicial documents based on newly discovered circumstances. Judicial decisions that have entered into legal force are reviewed by the same court that issued the original decision. If the judgment, ruling, or decision was amended or a new decision was issued by an appellate, cassation, or supervisory instance court, the review based on newly discovered circumstances is carried out by the court that amended the document or issued the new decision.

Article 439 of the CPC specifies the subjects authorized to submit applications for the review of judicial documents and the applicable deadlines. Applications to review a judgment, ruling, or decision based on newly discovered circumstances must be submitted to the court that issued the original judicial document by participants in the case [5].

Such applications must be filed within three months from the day the circumstances forming the basis for the review become known. If the deadline for submission has passed, the court may restore the



Impact Factor: 9.9**ISSN-L: 2544-980X**

missed period upon the applicant's request, provided the application is submitted no later than six months from the date the circumstances are discovered and the court deems the reasons for the delay valid [6].

The object of the review institution is judicial documents that have entered into legal force (judgments, rulings, or decisions). According to Article 6 of the CPC, the types of judicial documents include judgments, rulings, decisions, and orders issued by the court in the resolution of cases. However, court orders are not subject to review as judicial documents, including on the grounds of newly discovered circumstances, as the provisions of this chapter specifically cover the review of judgments, rulings, and decisions [7].

The procedure for handling newly discovered circumstances is as follows:

- Submission of an application by the parties involved in the case;
- Consideration of the application by the court;
- The court either annuls the decision, ruling, or judgment or refuses to reopen the case;
- Issuance of a ruling regarding the reopening of the decision, ruling, or judgment;
- Appeal against the court's ruling [8];

If the application to reopen the decision, ruling, or judgment is granted, the case will be reconsidered by the court under general procedures. An application based on newly discovered circumstances is subject to specific requirements, as stipulated in Article 441 of the Civil Procedure Code (CPC). The form and content of the application must comply with six conditional requirements, and two supplementary documents must be attached [9]. It is specifically noted that the application must include copies of documents confirming the newly discovered circumstances. If the application is signed by a representative, documents confirming the representative's authority to sign must also be attached [10]. According to Article 442 of the CPC, the process and timeframe for considering the application are outlined. The application to reopen the decision, ruling, or judgment based on newly discovered circumstances must be reviewed in a court session no later than one month from the date of its submission to the court. The applicant and the parties involved in the case must be notified, but their absence does not hinder the review of the application.

As a procedural consequence, the court, after considering the application based on newly discovered circumstances, may grant the application, annul the decision, ruling, or judgment, or refuse to reopen the case. The ruling is delivered to the parties involved in the case against their acknowledgment of receipt or sent via postal service or electronic document format [11].

An appeal (or protest) may be filed against the court's ruling on granting or refusing the application to reopen the decision, ruling, or judgment based on newly discovered circumstances.

If the application to reopen the decision, ruling, or judgment is granted, the case will be reconsidered by the court under general procedures.

The above grounds can be classified as objective and subjective factors (grounds):

1) Circumstances unknown to the applicant and that could not have been known but are significant for resolving the case correctly;

This ground is classified as an objective factor and is the most common ground encountered in practice. In such cases, the applicant does not bear subjective fault, and the situation can still be corrected later [12].

The following grounds are linked to specific facts, court documents, the issuance and entry into legal force of documents by certain authorities, as well as the annulment of other documents that served as the basis for the issuance of a court decision [13].

2) Circumstances identified by a court judgment that has entered into legal force and demonstrate that the decision, ruling, or judgment was unlawful, unfounded, or unjust. These include: knowingly false testimony by a witness, knowingly false conclusions provided by an expert; deliberately incorrect translation; forged documents or evidence [14];



Impact Factor: 9.9**ISSN-L: 2544-980X**

- 3) Criminal acts by parties, other participants in the case, or judges that, as identified by a court judgment that has entered into legal force, led to the adoption of an unlawful, unfounded, or unjust judicial act in the case;
- 4) the annulment of the decision, ruling, or judgment, or of another authority's decision that served as the basis for the issuance of the court decision, ruling, or judgment [15];

FOREIGN EXPERIENCE

In the legislation and practice of Russia and some other countries, there are two types of reconsideration of court decisions:

- Reconsideration of judicial acts based on new evidence;
- Reconsideration of judicial acts based on newly discovered circumstances.

CONCLUSION

Theoretical and practical analyses indicate the following prerequisites for proceedings based on newly discovered circumstances:

- The fact must have been identified after the court's decision on the case was issued;
- The fact must not have been known during the case proceedings for objective reasons.

For a circumstance to be considered newly discovered, the following conditions must be met:

Facts that were unknown at the time of the case proceedings due to objective reasons;

Facts that arose after the decision on the case was issued.

Newly discovered circumstances are accepted if they result in the emergence, modification, or termination of rights and obligations of the parties involved in the case. New evidence must be facts identified or presented by the court, which are significant for resolving the case.

However, under Article 437 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the grounds and procedures for reconsidering judicial acts based on newly discovered circumstances are explicitly defined.

The appearance of new evidence is associated with the grounds for annulment or modification of judicial acts in the Civil Procedure Code.

Based on this, it is reasonable to introduce an institution titled "Reconsideration of Judicial Acts that Have Entered into Legal Force Based on New Evidence" into Chapter 47 of the Civil Procedure Code, which currently addresses "Reconsideration of Judicial Acts that Have Entered into Legal Force Based on Newly Discovered Circumstances."

List of used literature:

1. Civil Procedure: Textbook / Edited by A.G. Kovalenko, A.A. Mokhov, P.M. Filippov. — Moscow: Legal Firm "CONTRACT", INFRA-M, 2008.
2. Civil Procedure: Textbook / V.V. Argunov, E.A. Borisova, N.S. Bocharova [et al.]; Edited by M.K. Treushnikov. — 5th edition, revised and supplemented. — Moscow: Statut, 2014. — 960 pages.
3. Civil Procedure: Practical Guide: Study Manual / Edited by Prof. V.V. Yarkov, Assoc. Prof. A.G. Pleshanov; Ural State Law University. — 5th edition, revised and supplemented. — Moscow: Statut, 2017.
4. Maleshin D.Ya. Comparative Civil Procedure: Educational and Methodological Complex. — Moscow: Statut, 2017.
5. Mamasiddiqov M.M., Yodgorov X.B., Davletov O'.M. Civil Procedural Law. General Part. Textbook. — Tashkent, Military-Technical Institute of the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2018. — 400 pages.
6. Mamasiddiqov M.M., Yodgorov X.B., Davletov O'.M. Civil Procedural Law. Special Part. Textbook. — Tashkent, Military-Technical Institute of the National Guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2018. — 322 pages.



Impact Factor: 9.9**ISSN-L: 2544-980X**

7. Эсанова З. The role of some procedural institutions in conducting court cases: on the example of civil cases. //Юридик фанлар ахборотномаси. – 2018. – №. 2. – С. 24-28.
8. Esonova Z.N., Mamasiddiqov M.M., D.Yu. Khabibullaev. Civil Procedural Law. Textbook. – Tashkent: Tashkent State University of Law, 2019. – 250 pages.
9. Zhilin G.A. Goals of Civil Proceedings and Their Implementation in the Court of First Instance: Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation in Legal Sciences / G.A. Zhilin. – Moscow, 2000. – 70 pages.
10. Mogilevsky G.A., Sanin E.P. New Evidence or Newly Discovered Circumstances in Civil Procedure. / International Journal of Humanities and Natural Sciences, vol. 6-3 (45), 2020. – pp. 131-133.
11. Civil Procedural Law: Textbook: [in 2 volumes] Volume 1: General Part / Edited by P.V. Krashenninikov. – 2nd edition, revised and supplemented. – Moscow: Statut, 2022.
12. Esanova Z.N. Prospects for the improvement of civil justice: the interpretation of new procedural institutions //Юриспруденция: актуальные вопросы теории и практики. – 2022. – С. 21-24.
13. Esanova Z.N. Civil Procedural Law (General Part). Textbook. – Tashkent: TSUL, 2022. – 328 pages.
14. Gerasimov A.V., Danilov D.B. Revision of Judicial Decisions Based on Newly Discovered or New Circumstances under the Procedural Legislation of the Russian Federation. / Bulletin of the Krasnodar University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, 2018, No. 3(41). – pp. 113-115.
15. Эсанова З.Н. Институт пересмотра судебных актов (анализ деятельности ревизионной инстанции). // Institute for Review of Judicial Acts (Analysis of the Activities of the Inspection Instance)., 2024, No. 4. – pp. 94–105.

