

“EDA” REFORM

1. PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT

This document aims to present the core principles of the EDA reform (EC, DoJ, AD). It is intended to help every member of the SV community understand the structure and functioning of the new system, along with the opportunities it offers in the exercise of their rights and duties. With the implementation of the EDA, the processes related to appeals, administrative oversight, and penitentiary matters within SV have been significantly simplified and clarified.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE COURT

The Administrative Court (AC) has been established to uphold high standards of governance and ensure consistency across all areas of public administration. It serves as a key body for oversight, correction, and legal accountability within the administrative sector.

The AC is responsible for adjudicating the following matters:

1. Resolution of Competence Disputes

The court handles disputes regarding jurisdiction or authority between departments, offices, or administrative entities, thereby maintaining order and coherence in the system of governance.

2. Review of Departmental Conduct

It considers formal reports or complaints concerning incompetence, lack of diligence, negligence, or other deficiencies in the functioning of administrative bodies.

3. Review of Legal Amendments

The AC processes formal applications for the amendment or revision of legal acts, ensuring that the body of administrative law remains effective, relevant, and in the public interest.

4. Additional Responsibilities

Other duties of the Administrative Court are specified in the Code of Administrative Procedure and cover a broader range of administrative review and regulation.

Cases are reviewed by a judicial panel composed of three representatives: one from the EC, one from the DoJ, and one from the AD. This tri-institutional structure ensures balanced and impartial rulings. Detailed procedures, jurisdictional rules, and operational structures are fully outlined in the Code of Administrative Procedure.

3. CIVIL-CRIMINAL DIVISION (CCD)

As part of the structural reform, the former Civil and Criminal Divisions have been merged into a single body: the Combined Civil and Criminal Division (CCD). This unification is designed to streamline judicial processes, increase transparency, and promote consistency in the administration of justice.

All cases submitted to the CCD must fulfill the following essential criteria:

1. Presence of Two Legal Parties

Each case must involve a plaintiff (or prosecutor in form of EC) and a defendant. Significant legal matters concerning punishment or prosecution must always be resolved through official proceedings and timely court hearings.

2. Defined Legal Basis

Every case must be grounded in a specific legal framework. Claims lacking a clear legal foundation will not be considered.

3. Supporting Evidence

All submissions must be accompanied by relevant evidence. Cases without proper documentation or proof may be dismissed.

4. Public Hearings. All court hearings are conducted openly. Confidential or closed sessions are not allowed under any circumstance, in line with the CCD's commitment to transparency.

5. Class Action Capability

The CCD permits class action lawsuits, allowing multiple individuals to pursue justice collectively under a unified legal action.

Each legal application is subject to a preliminary review by a panel of judges to assess its seriousness and legal merit. Frivolous, absurd, or satirical submissions will be dismissed. All court rulings will be announced publicly, and members of the community are encouraged to attend hearings as observers. Plaintiffs may also request the formal involvement of a prosecutor in the case by submitting a request in EC format.

All procedural specifics, structural arrangements, and additional guidelines are comprehensively detailed in the Code of CCD Procedure.

4. EXAMPLE OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

For illustration, consider the following example:

An employee (referred to as Personnel A) submits a formal complaint to the Administrative Court (AC), citing negligence or poor performance by Department A. The court examines the evidence and determines whether the case warrants further investigation.

If the complaint is deemed valid, the court orders an inquiry team—comprising representatives from both the EC and the AD—to assess the situation within the department and verify the reported issues.

Should the investigation confirm significant shortcomings, the court issues a final ruling that assigns the AD responsibility for addressing the problem. The AD is then required to draft and implement legally binding directives, specifying exactly what needs to be corrected, the manner of those corrections, and the structural or procedural reforms necessary to ensure lasting improvement.

This serves as a clear example of how administrative procedures are carried out in practice.

5. BRIEF SUMMARY

This document was created to provide a quick and simplified overview of the reform. It does not cover all changes or details, as many of them will be addressed in separate, dedicated documents. The success of this reform relies not only on cooperation between the EC, DoJ, and AD, but on active collaboration across all departments.

Chief Justice: *Void*

Deputy Justice: *CasioMRC*

O5-7: *darri*

EC Chairman: *Zay*