

UDC УДК 342.9(44)(091)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33098/3083-726X.2025.1.32.75-84>

ADMINISTRATIVE-JURISDICTIONAL PROCEDURE: CONCEPT, STRUCTURE AND RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER TYPES OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Markova Olena*

*Doctor of Science of Law, Associate Professor, Sumy Branch of the Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs (Kharkiv, Ukraine) ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9970-0944>

The article offers a theoretical and conceptual analysis of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure as an autonomous type of administrative procedure. It is emphasised that, despite the adoption of the unified Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”, a substantial body of procedural regulation remains dispersed across numerous special acts. This complicates the formation of a coherent doctrine of administrative jurisdiction and creates risks for the effective protection of individual rights in out-of-court proceedings. It is demonstrated that, in a context of conflict-ridden public-law relations, a significant share of disputes and offences is resolved precisely within the framework of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure. On the basis of an analysis of the etymology of the category of “jurisdiction”, the cross-sectoral nature of its use in Ukrainian law, and comparative-legal approaches developed in Germany, France and Poland, a functional understanding of jurisdiction is proposed as state-authoritative activity of a competent body aimed at resolving a legal conflict through the application of legal norms and the adoption of an individual binding act. The article identifies the core features of administrative-jurisdictional activity: the presence of an administrative-law conflict whose resolution is linked to the exercise of public powers; performance of this activity by a specially authorised body; procedural mediation through administrative-jurisdictional proceedings; the predominantly out-of-court nature of jurisdiction; adversarial procedure; and the adoption of an individual jurisdictional act as the outcome. The dual character of administrative jurisdiction is substantiated: it combines law-applying and law-enforcement components, thereby performing the regulatory and protective functions of law. The author’s definition of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure is justified as a legally established order of activity of executive authorities and other authorised public bodies aimed at resolving an administrative-law conflict and adopting an individual jurisdictional act in a form prescribed by law. A structural model of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure is proposed in the form of the system “procedure – proceedings – stages – steps”, with a universal four-stage cycle (institution of the case and investigation; consideration and adoption of the act; appeal; enforcement of the act). The administrative-jurisdictional procedure is compared with norm-making and regulatory administrative procedures according to the criteria of purpose, outcome and nature of legal relations, which allows its autonomy within the system of administrative procedures to be substantiated. The article generalises the approach to understanding the subjects of administrative jurisdiction and their competence, and identifies the structural elements of competence (teleological, functional, territorial, procedural and organisational) that ensure the procedural implementation of administrative-jurisdictional activity. It is concluded that there is a need for further development of a unified general procedural standard for administrative proceedings, laid down in the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”, in particular as regards the specification of requirements for administrative-jurisdictional proceedings and guarantees of the protection of individual rights.

Key words: administrative procedure, administrative jurisdiction, administrative-jurisdictional procedure, administrative-jurisdictional proceedings, law application, law-enforcement function, jurisdictional act, competence of a public authority.

© Markova O., 2025

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії CC BY 4.0

Markova O. Administrative-jurisdictional procedure: concept, structure and relationship with other types of administrative procedures. *Art of Justice*. Редакційно-видавничий відділ Університету Короля Данила, 2025. Вип. 1 (32). С. 75-84. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33098/3083-726X.2025.1.32.75-84>

Problem Statement

The quality of research into the typological diversity of administrative procedures, including administrative-jurisdictional procedures, directly depends on the chosen theoretical and methodological approach. In the Ukrainian legal order, the unified Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure” [16] has already been adopted; however, alongside it, a significant number of special normative legal acts remain in force that contain procedural norms for individual types of administrative proceedings. This preserves the fragmentation of regulation,

the heterogeneity of approaches to jurisdictional proceedings, and complicates the formation of a coherent doctrine of administrative procedure, particularly in the sphere of out-of-court dispute resolution.

During the exercise of public-administration functions, conflicts inevitably arise disputes over rights and interests, service-related conflicts within the civil service, as well as conflicts in relations between public authorities and natural or legal persons. A substantial part of such conflict situations is resolved within the framework of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure, through various types of administrative-jurisdictional proceedings. In everyday life, relations between subjects may become contentious, deviate from the established legal order or directly violate legal norms, thereby infringing the rights, freedoms and legitimate interests of other persons. The administrative-jurisdictional procedure is precisely the instrument designed to secure the restoration and protection of those rights.

The lack of clarity in the doctrinal understanding of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure, its relationship with such categories of administrative law as “jurisdiction”, “administrative-jurisdictional activity”, “administrative jurisdictional proceedings”, as well as the need to strengthen the regime of legality and legal order, determine the necessity of constructing a coherent, internally consistent theoretical model of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure aligned with the provisions of the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”.

This task is not only of theoretical, but also of direct practical importance: the clarity of doctrinal understanding of the procedure determines the quality of law-making, the systemic nature of further reform of administrative legislation, and the effectiveness of protecting individual rights in out-of-court proceedings.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications

In the science of administrative law, the category of “jurisdiction” has traditionally been among the central and debated notions. Its origin is linked to the Latin *jurisdictio*. The literature offers various approaches to interpreting this term: as “judicature”, “conduct of a court”; as a combination of *jus + dicere* (“resolving a conflict or applying rules established by the proper authority”); as a combination of *juris* (law) and *dico* (I declare), which emphasises the authoritative character of pronouncing legal prescriptions.

In the theory of administrative law, jurisdiction is most often defined as: a) the aggregate of powers of a public authority;

b) activity aimed at the exercise of state bodies’ powers to resolve legal disputes and cases concerning offences, to assess the behaviour of subjects from the perspective of its lawfulness and apply sanctions;

c) an independent type of state-authoritative, subordinate, law-applying and law-enforcement activity.

In modern Ukrainian administrative-law doctrine, the category of jurisdiction is analysed in the works of V. B. Averyanov, Yu. P. Bytiak, V. K. Kolpakov, O. V. Kuzmenko, V. V. Halunko, V. P. Tymoshchuk, O. O. Pukhtetska, who emphasise the authoritative, procedural and conflict-related nature of jurisdictional powers. The administrative-delict jurisdiction and procedural aspects of the consideration of individual cases have been studied by S. T. Honcharuk, A. T. Komziuk, O. M. Bandurka, M. M. Tyshchenko, V. D. Babayev, O. V. Mykolenko, which has made it possible to form a comprehensive understanding of the administrative-law conflict and its procedural forms. The works of Ukrainian scholars also reveal a discernible tendency towards the convergence of administrative-procedural and jurisdictional approaches, a trend that has

intensified after the adoption of the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”, which laid down the general foundations of administrative procedures but did not specify the features of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure (Averyanov, 2004).

Foreign legal systems have developed their own approaches to understanding jurisdiction. In German law, the terms *Gerichtsbarekeit* (jurisdiction, primarily judicial), *Anordnungsbefugnis* (authoritative power to issue binding orders), and *Rechtsprechung* (judicature – a literal equivalent of *jus dicere*) are used, inter alia. A substantial contribution to the development of the conceptual foundations of jurisdiction has been made by representatives of the German administrative-law school – O. Mayer, E. Forsthoff, H. Maurer, E. Schmidt-Aßmann. Their works underscore the functional essence of jurisdiction as activity directed at resolving conflicts in the form of an individual administrative act, which is integrated into a broader system of protection of individual rights (Schmidt, 2006).

The French scholarly tradition (J. Rivero, R. Chapus, J.-M. Auby, M. Long) examines jurisdiction through the prism of the activity of *juridictions administratives*, which historically combines the authoritative competence of administrative bodies and mechanisms for controlling administrative action. In this tradition, jurisdiction is closely connected with the category of *compétence* and with procedural guarantees necessary for the adoption of a fair administrative decision (Rivero, 2019).

In Polish administrative-law doctrine (J. Zimmermann, J. Jagielski, M. Wierzbowski), jurisdiction is understood as an element of the functioning of public administration bodies within which individual cases are resolved and procedural guarantees for the parties are ensured (Zimmermann, 2019). The Polish approach is close to the Ukrainian one in terms of the logic of constructing administrative proceedings and the understanding of standards of procedural fairness.

In Ukrainian law, the concept of jurisdiction has a cross-sectoral character and is used in international, administrative, criminal, civil law and in all procedural branches. In all these cases, the underlying Roman-law idea is evident: jurisdiction is the resolution of a conflict through the application of established norms by a competent authority.

At the same time, Ukrainian doctrine has not sufficiently elaborated the issues related to distinguishing the administrative-jurisdictional procedure as a specific type of administrative procedure, to defining its structure, stages and features, and to clarifying its relationship with other types of administrative procedures (norm-making, regulatory, incentive, etc.). A considerable body of research focuses on individual types of proceedings (complaint procedures, proceedings in cases of administrative offences, disciplinary proceedings), which in fact leaves theoretical generalisation at the level of a general procedural model on the periphery, despite the existence of already codified general approaches in the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”.

Despite the existing developments regarding the concept of jurisdiction and individual administrative-jurisdictional proceedings, as well as the introduction of a general administrative-procedural statute, several key issues remain unresolved:

- there is no settled doctrinal definition of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure as an integral legal phenomenon;
- the system of features of administrative-jurisdictional activity that would make it possible to distinguish it from other types of administrative activity remains insufficiently defined;
- no general structural model of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure (relationship between procedure, proceedings, stages, steps) has been formulated that would be universal for various types of administrative jurisdictional proceedings and, at the same time, aligned with the

general principles laid down in the Law; – the relationship between the administrative-jurisdictional procedure and norm-making and regulatory administrative procedures requires clarification, taking into account their purposes, orientation and outcomes;

– the competence of subjects of administrative jurisdiction has been examined only fragmentarily in its procedural dimension, as an element of the general model of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure.

These gaps complicate both the further development of administrative-law doctrine and the elaboration of coherent procedural standards for law application in the jurisdictional sphere based on the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”.

Purpose of the Article

The purpose of the article is to provide a theoretical and conceptual justification of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure as an independent type of administrative procedure by:

- formulating an author’s definition of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure;
- identifying its key features and revealing the dual (law-applying and law-enforcement) nature of administrative jurisdiction;
- constructing a general model of the structure of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure (“procedure – proceedings – stages – steps”);
- clarifying the relationship between the administrative-jurisdictional procedure and other types of administrative procedures;
- outlining the general characteristics of the subjects of administrative jurisdiction and their competence in the context of the procedure under study.

Presentation of the Main Research Material

1. Jurisdiction as a Basic Category of Administrative Law. In a broad sense, jurisdiction is an instrument for resolving legal conflicts and a means of ensuring the operation of law through individual acts. In the realm of administrative law, it manifests itself as the activity of public authorities in considering administrative-law disputes and cases concerning offences, assessing the lawfulness of the conduct of participants in public-law relations, and applying state coercive measures prescribed by law.

Comparative-legal analysis of the approaches in Germany, France and Poland shows that jurisdiction may be understood as: the exercise of judicature (the sphere of courts’ activity); the competence of a body to decide legal matters; the territorial scope of powers. This multidimensionality reflects both the organisational and functional aspects of jurisdiction.

Considering the cross-sectoral character of the term “jurisdiction” in Ukrainian law, it is reasonable to proceed from its functional essence: jurisdiction is state-authoritative activity aimed at resolving a legal conflict through the application of legal norms by a competent body and the adoption of individual binding decisions. In this sense, jurisdiction serves as the methodological basis for constructing a model of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure.

2. Concept and Features of Administrative-Jurisdictional Activity.

The object of this study is the administrative-jurisdictional procedure, which is grounded in administrative jurisdiction as an independent type of law-applying and law-enforcement activity carried out by authorised state bodies.

Administrative-jurisdictional activity is characterised by the following features (Kolpakov, 2003).

First, the existence of an administrative-law conflict. The source of administrative jurisdiction is an administrative-law conflict, which may manifest itself in the form of an administrative offence, an administrative-law dispute, a disciplinary misconduct, etc. For a conflict to be recognised as administrative, it is necessary that the substantive-law relations that form its subject be administrative-law in nature, that is, related to public powers and their exercise.

Second, resolution of the conflict by a specially authorised body. The circle of jurisdictional bodies and their powers is defined by law. Only those subjects whose competence is directly established by legislation may consider cases and adopt binding decisions; at the same time, they are vested with the authority to apply coercive measures.

Third, the performance of activity within the framework of an administrative-jurisdictional procedure. The activity of authorised bodies in considering individual cases takes place in an established normative order. The form of implementation of the procedure is constituted by the relevant administrative-jurisdictional proceedings, whose content consists of individual cases underlying administrative-law conflicts [Kolpakov, 2004].

Fourth, the predominantly out-of-court nature of conflict resolution. Although several administrative-law conflicts may be resolved by courts, the predominant form is the out-of-court jurisdiction exercised by executive authorities and other public-administration bodies.

Fifth, the adversarial nature of the proceedings. Within administrative-jurisdictional activity, adversarial consideration of the case is ensured, including the parties' ability to substantiate their position, submit evidence and challenge the arguments of the opposing side.

Sixth, the adoption of an individual jurisdictional act. The outcome of administrative-jurisdictional activity is an individual, non-normative act (decision, ruling, etc.) that has a state-authoritative, binding character and creates, modifies or terminates specific legal relations between the body of administrative jurisdiction, the offender (or another party to the dispute) and the bodies responsible for enforcing the relevant decision.

These features make it possible to distinguish administrative-jurisdictional activity from other types of administrative activity, primarily from internal organisational, managerial or service-provision activity.

3. The Dual Nature of Administrative Jurisdiction and Its Functions.

From the perspective of the forms of law implementation, administrative-jurisdictional activity is a type of law application, since it consists in the concretisation of general statutory prescriptions in individual decisions concerning a legal conflict. At the same time, it forms part of the law-enforcement function of the state, as it is directed at protecting the rights and interests of subjects, restoring violated legal relations, applying sanctions to offenders, as well as eliminating the causes and conditions that contributed to the emergence of the conflict (Tymoschuk, 2003).

Administrative jurisdiction thus has a dual character:

– as law-applying activity, it ensures the transition from normative prescriptions to specific legal relations through individual regulation; – as law-enforcement activity, it performs protective, preventive and educative functions in respect of participants in public-law relations.

The regulatory function of administrative jurisdiction is derivative of the corresponding function of law. In the model of legal governance, the norm acts as the primary “signal” setting patterns of proper conduct. When this signal fails and a deviation from the established model occurs, a “corrective signal” is triggered – the act of the jurisdictional body, which obliges the subject to remedy the violation (pay a fine, compensate damage, etc.) and thus restores legal order, eliminating the “disturbance” in the legal system.

The protective function of administrative jurisdiction is realised through the resolution of cases concerning offences, the provision of legal protection for contested rights and legitimate interests, the application of legal sanctions, as well as the adoption of measures aimed at eliminating the causes and conditions that gave rise to the conflict. The statutory duty of jurisdictional bodies not to confine themselves to merely “settling the dispute”, but also to identify the causes and conditions of its emergence, strengthens the preventive potential of administrative jurisdiction.

4. Concept and Structure of the Administrative-Jurisdictional Procedure.

Administrative-jurisdictional activity is carried out within the framework of a corresponding procedure. The following author’s definition is proposed:

Administrative-jurisdictional procedure is a legally established order of activity of executive authorities and other authorised public bodies aimed at resolving an administrative-law conflict and adopting an individual jurisdictional act in a form prescribed by law.

Within the system of administrative procedures, this type of procedure occupies a distinct place alongside norm-making and regulatory administrative procedures (Bevzenko, 2013).

What is common to all types of administrative procedures is the presence of an internal structure that organises the activity and ensures its sequence and coherence. The structural elements are:

- **proceedings** – the form of implementation of an administrative procedure in relation to a particular category of cases;

- **stages of proceedings** – relatively autonomous parts of the procedural cycle associated with the achievement of an intermediate objective (institution of the case, consideration on the merits, appeal, enforcement);

- **steps (phases)** – successive procedural acts within a given stage.

In substantive terms, an administrative-jurisdictional proceeding generally includes the following stages:

1. **Institution of an administrative case and its investigation.** The initiator may be any subject of administrative-jurisdictional legal relations – a natural or legal person, an executive authority, etc. At this stage, materials are collected confirming the existence and relevance of the case, preparatory actions are carried out, and the grounds and reasons for opening the proceedings are clarified.

2. **Consideration of the case and adoption of an act (decision, ruling).** The authorised body must examine all the circumstances of the case, collect additional materials, if necessary, ensure the establishment of the objective truth and based on the results, adopt an individual jurisdictional act.

3. **Appeal (review) of the act.** Participants in the proceedings and other interested persons may appeal the decision in the prescribed manner. This stage is optional and is realised only where there is appropriate initiative.

4. **Enforcement of the act.** This final stage is associated with the application of measures for compulsory or voluntary enforcement. A decision is not subject to enforcement if the limitation period for its compulsory execution has expired.

Not all cases go through all possible stages; in the case of simplified or expedited procedures certain stages may be merged or have a minimal content. At the same time, the general four-stage cycle represents a universal model for describing the structure of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure.

5. Relationship between the Administrative-Jurisdictional Procedure and Other Types of Administrative Procedures.

To determine the place of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure within the system of administrative procedures, it is appropriate to compare it with norm-making and regulatory procedures.

In terms of **purpose**, norm-making procedures have a predominantly positive orientation and relate to the adoption of normative acts of administration. Regulatory procedures are aimed at the provision of public services, the exercise of licensing, registration, incentive and other powers necessary for the normal functioning of public administration. By contrast, the administrative-jurisdictional procedure has a predominantly protective orientation: it arises in the presence of a dispute or breach of a legal norm and is directed at resolving the conflict, applying sanctions and restoring violated rights.

In terms of the **outcome** of objective manifestation, a norm-making procedure results in the adoption of a normative act of administration; a regulatory procedure results in a non-normative individual act relating to the provision of a public service or the performance of another positive function of the body; an administrative-jurisdictional procedure culminates in a non-normative individual jurisdictional act aimed at resolving a dispute and/or applying measures of state coercion (administrative, disciplinary, pecuniary, etc.).

In terms of the **content and nature of legal relations**, norm-making and regulatory procedures are predominantly connected with non-conflict administrative relations, whereas the administrative-jurisdictional procedure is invariably embedded in a conflictual context, since its precondition is an infringement of, or dispute concerning, the legal status of subjects.

Accordingly, the administrative-jurisdictional procedure should be recognised as an autonomous type of administrative procedure which differs in its purpose, outcome and nature of legal relations and which ought to be consistently integrated into the general system of procedures established by the Law of Ukraine "On Administrative Procedure".

6. Subjects of Administrative Jurisdiction and Their Competence in the Context of the Procedure.

Administrative proceedings are conducted by special subjects – bodies and officials endowed with public powers to consider and resolve administrative cases and disputes and to apply measures of state coercion. Among them, executive authorities occupy a special place, as they directly or indirectly participate in most administrative-jurisdictional proceedings (Gudyma, 2019).

Within the system of subjects of administrative-jurisdictional legal relations, two main groups can be distinguished:

- subjects of administrative jurisdiction – public authorities and officials empowered to adopt authoritative decisions in administrative disputes, to apply or refuse to apply measures of administrative coercion.
- subjects in respect of whom administrative-jurisdictional proceedings are conducted – natural and legal persons whose conduct or legal status is the subject of consideration.

The administrative-law status of subjects of administrative jurisdiction is determined by the totality of their public powers (rights and duties) relating to the consideration of specific categories of cases. The core of this status is **competence**, understood as the legally established set of powers of a body to consider cases within its jurisdiction and to adopt decisions in forms and procedures prescribed by law.

In structural terms, the competence of subjects of administrative jurisdiction includes:

- a **teleological element** – the objectives for which jurisdictional activity is conducted;

- a **functional element** – the content of powers concerning the consideration and resolution of cases;
- a **territorial element** – the geographical scope of the powers;
- a **procedural element** – powers to perform individual procedural actions within the proceedings;
- an **organisational element** – the internal structure and rules of procedure of the body.

Competence norms defining the powers of bodies and officials in the sphere of administrative jurisdiction form an independent group of administrative-law norms. A special place among them is occupied by administrative-delict competence norms, which determine the subject-matter and powers of a body to consider cases concerning administrative offences and to adopt decisions based on their outcome. It is precisely through such norms that the procedural implementation of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure is ensured in accordance with the logic laid down in the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”.

Conclusions

1. The administrative-jurisdictional procedure is an independent type of administrative procedure with a specific purpose – the resolution of administrative-law conflicts, the application of measures of state coercion and the restoration of violated rights.

2. The category of “jurisdiction” serves as the basis for understanding the administrative-jurisdictional procedure and should be defined as state-authoritative activity of a competent body aimed at resolving a legal conflict through the application of legal norms and the adoption of an individual binding act.

3. Administrative-jurisdictional activity is characterised by a set of features: the presence of an administrative-law conflict; a specially authorised body; the conduct of activity within an established procedure; predominantly out-of-court consideration; an adversarial character; and the adoption of an individual jurisdictional act.

4. Administrative jurisdiction has a dual nature: it is simultaneously law-applying and law-enforcement activity, implementing the regulatory and protective functions of law and performing the role of a corrective mechanism of legal governance.

5. The structure of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure can be described through the model “procedure – proceedings – stages – steps”, in which the universal four-stage cycle (institution of the case and investigation; consideration and adoption of the act; appeal – if applicable; enforcement of the act) is complemented by the possibility of simplified and expedited proceedings.

6. Comparison of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure with norm-making and regulatory administrative procedures demonstrates differences in purpose, nature of legal relations and outcomes, which confirms its autonomy within the system of administrative procedures and the need for its clear integration into the general procedural framework established by the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”.

7. The subjects of administrative jurisdiction possess a special administrative-law status, the core of which is competence structurally linked to objectives, functions, territorial reach, procedural and organisational elements. Competence norms are a key instrument for the procedural implementation of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure.

Prospects for Further Scientific Research

Further research should be directed towards:

– detailing the proposed general model of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure at the level of individual types of proceedings (complaint procedures, proceedings in cases of administrative offences, disciplinary proceedings, etc.) taking into account the requirements of the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”; – developing a unified general procedural standard for administrative proceedings, embedded in the said Law, in particular regarding minimum guarantees for all types of administrative-jurisdictional activity irrespective of the regulatory sector; – conducting a comparative-legal analysis of administrative-jurisdictional procedures in Ukraine and EU Member States with a view to implementing best practices into national legislation;

– examining the procedural status of participants in administrative-jurisdictional proceedings, standards of proof, requirements for the reasoning of jurisdictional acts and mechanisms for their appeal.

The development of the theory of the administrative-jurisdictional procedure and the further specification of its models provide a foundation for the deeper implementation of the provisions of the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Procedure”, the codification of administrative procedures in special legislation, and the formation of a systematic and predictable practice of protecting individual rights in public administration.

References

1. Averyanov, V. B. (Ed.). (2004). *Administrativne pravo Ukrainy. Akademichnyi kurs* [Administrative Law of Ukraine. Academic Course] (Vol. 1: General Part). Kyiv: Yurydychna Dumka. 584 p. [in Ukrainian].
2. Averyanov, V. B. (Ed.). (2002). *Vykonavcha vlada i administrativne pravo* [Executive Power and Administrative Law]. Kyiv: In Yure Publishing House. 668 p. [in Ukrainian].
3. Averyanov, V. B. (Ed.). (2003). *Publichne administruvannia: problemy administrativno-pravovoi teorii ta praktyky* [Public Administration: Problems of Administrative-Legal Theory and Practice]. Kyiv: Fakt. 384 p. [in Ukrainian].
4. Bytiak, Yu. P., Honcharuk, S. T., & Komziuk, A. T. (2010). *Administrativne pravo Ukrainy: pidruchnyk* [Administrative Law of Ukraine: Textbook]. Kharkiv: Pravo. 624 p. [in Ukrainian].
5. Kolpakov, V. K. (2003). Administrativna yurydyktsiia: paradyhma kontseptsii [Administrative Jurisdiction: Paradigm of the Concept]. *Yurydychna Ukraina*, 7, 32–34. [in Ukrainian].
6. Kolpakov, V. K. (2004). *Administrativno-deliktne pravove yavyshe* [The Administrative-Delict Legal Phenomenon]. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter. 528 p. [in Ukrainian].
7. Tymoshchuk, V. P. (2003). *Administrativna protsedura ta administrativni poslugy: zarubizhnyi dosvid i propozytsii dlia Ukrainy* [Administrative Procedure and Administrative Services: Foreign Experience and Proposals for Ukraine]. Kyiv: Fakt. 496 p. [in Ukrainian].
8. Bevenko, V. M. (2013). Administrativna yurydyktsiia: poniattia, sutnist, problemy rozmezhuvannia [Administrative Jurisdiction: Concept, Essence, Problems of Differentiation]. *Visnyk Vysshchoho administrativnoho sudu Ukrainy* [Bulletin of the High Administrative Court of Ukraine], 2(31), 32–41. [in Ukrainian].
9. Pukhtetska, A. A. (2010). Yevropeiski pryntsypy administrativnoho prava ta yikh znachennia dlia Ukrainy [European Principles of Administrative Law and Their Significance for Ukraine]. *Pravo Ukrainy*, 3. [in Ukrainian].
10. Gudyma, I. (2019). Administrative Jurisdiction and the Code of Administrative Legal Proceedings of Ukraine as Revised in 2017: Is It a New Solution or Old Challenges? *Środkowoeuropejskie Studia Polityczne*, 4, 151–167.
11. Maurer, H. (2011). *Allgemeines Verwaltungsrecht* [General Administrative Law] (18th rev. ed.). Munich: C. H. Beck.
12. Schmidt-Aßmann, E. (2006). *Allgemeines Verwaltungsrecht als Ordnungs idee* [General Administrative Law as an Idea of Order] (2nd ed.). Heidelberg: Springer.
13. Rivero, J., & Waline, J. (2004). *Droit administratif* [Administrative Law] (20th ed.). Paris: Dalloz.
14. Zimmermann, J. (2019). *Prawo administracyjne* [Administrative Law] (7th ed.). Warsaw: Wolters Kluwer.

15. Mykolenko, O. I. (2010). *Teoriia administratyvnoho protsesualnoho prava* [Theory of Administrative Procedural Law]. Kharkiv: Odissey. 336 p. [in Ukrainian].

16. Zakon Ukrainy "Pro administratyvnu protseduru" vid 17 liutoho 2022 r. No. 2073-IX [Law of Ukraine "On Administrative Procedure" of 17 February 2022 No. 2073-IX]. *Holos Ukrainy*, 62. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2073-20> [in Ukrainian]

АДМІНІСТРАТИВНО-ЮРИСДИКЦІЙНА ПРОЦЕДУРА: ПОНЯТТЯ, СТРУКТУРА ТА СПІВВІДНОШЕННЯ З ІНШИМИ ВИДАМИ АДМІНІСТРАТИВНИХ ПРОЦЕДУР

Маркова Олена*

*доктор юридичних наук, доцент, Сумська філія Харківського національного університету внутрішніх справ (Харків, Україна) ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9970-0944>

У статті здійснено теоретико-концептуальний аналіз адміністративно-юрисдикційної процедури як автономного виду адміністративної процедури. Показано, що попри прийняття Закону України «Про адміністративну процедуру» значний масив процедурних норм залишається розпорошеним у спеціальному законодавстві, що ускладнює формування цілісної доктрини адміністративної юрисдикції та створює ризики для забезпечення ефективного позасудового захисту прав. Обґрунтовано, що в умовах конфліктних публічно-правових відносин істотною частиною спорів і правопорушень вирішується саме в межах адміністративно-юрисдикційної процедури. На основі етимологічного аналізу категорії «юрисдикція», міжгалузевого характеру її застосування в українському праві та компаративних підходів Німеччини, Франції й Польщі запропоновано функціональне розуміння юрисдикції як державно-владної діяльності компетентного органу, спрямованої на розв'язання юридичного конфлікту шляхом застосування правових норм і прийняття індивідуального обов'язкового акта. Виокремлено основні ознаки адміністративно-юрисдикційної діяльності та доведено її дуалістичний характер, що поєднує правозастосовний і правоохоронний компоненти. Сформульовано авторське визначення адміністративно-юрисдикційної процедури як встановленого законом порядку діяльності органів виконавчої влади та інших уповноважених суб'єктів, спрямованого на розв'язання адміністративно-правового конфлікту і прийняття індивідуального юрисдикційного акта. Запропоновано структурну модель адміністративно-юрисдикційної процедури, що охоплює систему «процедура – провадження – стадії – етапи» та універсальний чотиристадійний цикл. Процедурі зіставлено з нормотворчими та регулятивними адміністративними процедурами за критеріями мети, результату й характеру правовідносин, що дає можливість обґрунтувати її автономію в системі адміністративних процедур. Уточнено підходи до визначення суб'єктів адміністративної юрисдикції та структури їхньої компетенції. Зроблено висновок про необхідність подальшого розвитку єдиного загального процесуального стандарту адміністративного провадження, закладеного у Законі України «Про адміністративну процедуру», зокрема щодо вимог до адміністративно-юрисдикційних проваджень та гарантій захисту прав особи.

Ключові слова: адміністративна процедура, адміністративна юрисдикція, адміністративно-юрисдикційна процедура, адміністративно-юрисдикційне провадження, юрисдикційний акт.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 27.11.2025
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 11.12.2025
Дата публікації: 10.02.2026