


Procedure and Specific Features of Conducting Expert Examination in The Legislation of Uzbekistan

 Fatullayev Shodmonbek Madatovich

Independent researcher for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Tashkent State University of Law, Uzbekistan

Received: 28 Feb 2026 | Received Revised Version: 16 Mar 2026 | Accepted: 04 Apr 2026 | Published: 30 Apr 2026

Volume 08 Issue 04 2026 | Crossref DOI: 10.37547/tajpslc/Volume08Issue04-11

Abstract

This article provides a systematic analysis of the role, significance, and procedural framework of forensic examination in criminal proceedings. The author examines the stages of appointing and conducting an examination, the rights and duties of the expert, as well as the role of the investigator and the court and issues of their interaction on a scientific basis. Furthermore, the norms of current criminal procedure legislation, particularly those regulating forensic examination, are analyzed, and existing gaps are identified. The author proposes the introduction of an additional provision into the Criminal Procedure Code aimed at clearly defining the concept of forensic examination, its stages, and the procedure for its initiation and completion. In addition, the article discusses the specific features of conducting examinations at the trial stage, the criteria for evaluating expert opinions, and practical challenges encountered in this field. Based on the research, scientific and practical conclusions and recommendations for improving the institution of forensic examination are developed.

Keywords: Criminal procedure, forensic examination, appointment of examination, stages of examination, expert opinion, examination as evidence, forensic expertise, investigator-expert interaction, special knowledge, procedural status of an expert, expert independence, additional and repeated examination, trial proceedings, evaluation of evidence.

© 2026 Fatullayev Shodmonbek Madatovich. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The authors retain copyright and allow others to share, adapt, or redistribute the work with proper attribution.

Cite This Article: Fatullayev Shodmonbek Madatovich. (2026). Procedure and Specific Features of Conducting Expert Examination in The Legislation of Uzbekistan. *The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology*, 8(04), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajpslc/Volume08Issue04-11>

1. Introduction

In modern criminal proceedings, establishing the truth and ensuring a comprehensive, complete, and impartial examination of a case constitute one of the primary objectives of investigative and judicial authorities. Achieving this objective increasingly requires the use of specialized knowledge. In this regard, the institution of forensic examination plays a crucial role as an integral component of the criminal justice system. Certain circumstances cannot be determined solely on the basis of legal knowledge possessed by investigators or judges,

as they require specific scientific, technical, or professional expertise.

Forensic examination serves as an essential tool in the process of identifying, verifying, and evaluating evidence in criminal cases. It enables the determination of facts significant to the case, provides scientifically grounded explanations of existing evidence, and ensures objectivity and reliability in decision-making. Moreover, forensic examination is not limited to the pre-trial stage but also holds significant importance during court proceedings.

Although current criminal procedural legislation provides a number of norms governing the appointment and conduct of forensic examinations, certain aspects remain insufficiently systematized or inadequately regulated. In particular, issues such as the stages of conducting an examination, the procedure for its initiation and completion, as well as the role of investigators and judges in this process, are not fully elaborated in legal doctrine and practice.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the role and significance of the institution of forensic examination in criminal proceedings, to examine the procedural framework for its appointment and conduct, to identify existing problems, and to develop scientific and practical recommendations for their resolution. The study provides a comprehensive analysis of the theoretical foundations, practical aspects, and legal regulation of forensic examination.

The scientific novelty of this research lies in the systematic substantiation of the stages of the forensic examination process and the development of specific proposals aimed at improving criminal procedural legislation. In particular, the necessity of introducing a separate legal provision defining the concept of forensic examination, as well as the procedure for its initiation and completion, is justified

2. Method

The introduction of the institution of forensic examination in criminal proceedings is aimed at ensuring the scientific substantiation of investigative and judicial activities and is considered one of the essential conditions for a comprehensive, complete, and impartial examination of a criminal case. Forensic examination serves to study circumstances that cannot be directly determined by an investigator or a judge and require specialized knowledge.

The first stage of conducting a forensic examination is the adoption of a procedural decision on its appointment. This decision must be well-reasoned, meaning that it should clearly indicate the essence of the circumstances to be established by the investigator and explain why the issue cannot be resolved without the use of specialized knowledge. The questions posed to the expert must be formulated clearly, precisely, and without any legal evaluation.

The next stage is related to providing the expert with the necessary materials. In this process, the objects of

examination, case documents, and required samples must be submitted in a complete and intact condition. The investigator must also indicate the origin of the objects, the conditions of their storage, and information confirming their authenticity.

During the forensic examination, modern scientific and technical methods are applied. This is reflected in various types of examinations, including forensic medical, criminalistic, and economic examinations. For example, a forensic medical examination serves to determine the mechanism of injuries on the human body, while an economic examination helps to identify the falsification of financial documents or reveal the mechanisms of economic crimes.

According to Article 174 of the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC), an expert may be a specialist from a state forensic institution, an employee of another enterprise, institution or organization, or another individual. Persons declared legally incapable or with limited legal capacity in accordance with established procedures, as well as persons with an unexpunged or outstanding conviction for intentional crimes, may not be engaged as experts. Forensic medical, forensic psychiatric, forensic psychological, forensic automotive, forensic economic, and criminalistic examinations shall be conducted only by specialists of state forensic institutions, and in exceptional cases by specialists of other enterprises, institutions, or organizations. Such exceptional cases must be justified in the decision or ruling appointing the examination. The requirement of an inquiry officer, investigator, or court to summon a person appointed as an expert and to ensure the conduct of the examination is mandatory for the head of the enterprise, institution, or organization where that person works.

According to Article 182 of the CPC, which regulates the conduct of examinations in state forensic institutions or other organizations, the official conducting the pre-investigation inquiry, the inquirer, investigator, or the court shall send the decision or ruling on the appointment of the examination, along with the objects of examination and, if necessary, the criminal case materials, to the head of the relevant institution. If a specific expert is not indicated in the decision or ruling, the head of the institution shall designate an appropriate employee to conduct the examination and inform the appointing authority accordingly.

The head of the state forensic institution or other organization organizes the conduct of the examination,

ensures the preservation of the examination objects, determines the time limits for conducting the examination, and upon completion of the expert study, sends the expert opinion together with the objects and case materials to the authority that appointed the examination.

If the institution lacks the necessary specialists, technical resources, or special conditions required for conducting the examination, the head has the right to return the decision or ruling and the submitted materials within three days without execution, as well as to request the appointing authority to include external experts, including foreign specialists, in the expert commission if their specialized knowledge is required.

At the same time, the head of the institution is not entitled, without the consent of the appointing authority, to involve external specialists or to request additional examination objects without a formal decision or ruling.

Although Article 182 of the CPC regulates certain aspects of conducting examinations, it does not clearly define the concept, stages, commencement, and completion of the examination process. Therefore, it is proposed to introduce a new Article 182¹ into the CPC with the following provisions:

The appointment of an examination shall be carried out on the basis of a reasoned decision of the official conducting the pre-investigation inquiry, the inquirer, investigator, or prosecutor, as well as a court ruling. The examination may be conducted by a state forensic institution, another specialized state organization, or an individual expert possessing special knowledge.

The examination process begins after the formalization of the decision (or court ruling), the explanation to the expert of their procedural rights and obligations, and a warning about criminal liability for knowingly providing a false conclusion or testimony.

In cases provided for by law, the time limit for conducting the examination may be suspended, and such suspension shall not be included in the overall duration of the examination. The examination is considered completed from the moment the expert prepares and submits the conclusion to the appointing authority or court.

According to Article 183 of the CPC, if the examination is conducted outside an expert institution, the competent authority summons the expert, verifies their identity,

qualifications, and possible grounds for disqualification, and provides them with the decision or ruling, explaining their rights and obligations and warning them about liability for violations, including disclosure of confidential information or refusal to provide an opinion.

If necessary, the authority must ensure the appearance of suspects, accused persons, defendants, victims, or witnesses for examination.

In some cases, the participation of the investigator in the examination process may be appropriate. However, the current CPC does not explicitly regulate the participation of investigators or judges in the examination process, which suggests the need for additional legal provisions.

The investigator's participation may include explaining the purpose and scope of the examination, determining whether additional materials are needed, ensuring proper documentation and preservation of objects, and assisting the expert in obtaining necessary information. The investigator may also familiarize themselves with interim results to assess the completeness and methodological validity of the study.

At the same time, the investigator must not interfere with the independence of the expert by imposing methods or influencing the results.

If the expert identifies facts beyond the scope of the questions posed but relevant to the case, they must include them in the conclusion.

In practice, there are cases where examination orders are sent to institutions lacking appropriate specialization. To prevent such shortcomings, investigators should consult experts when selecting the appropriate institution and specialist.

As noted by A.R. Shlyakhov, "the investigator must not only formulate the tasks of the examination but also create proper conditions for their effective resolution."

First of all, it is important that the investigator timely provides the expert with evidentiary items, comparative samples, and objects related to the criminal case. Materials presented in this way allow the expert to begin the investigation on time and conduct it effectively, ensuring that the results of the study are accurate and reliable, and facilitate the prompt preparation of the conclusion.

After the decision to appoint an expert examination is made, the investigator must not only acquaint the suspect

or the accused with this decision but also explain their rights and obligations in the course of the process. The procedure of familiarization with the decision is recorded in a protocol, and any requests or applications of the accused are attached. This, in turn, serves as a guarantee that the expert fully and correctly understands the criminal case.

Once the familiarization with the decision has been carried out, it is sent to the expert. If the examination is not to be conducted at the expert institution, the investigator summons the designated expert, hands over the decision, explains the expert's rights and obligations, and warns them of potential liability in case of violations of legal requirements in accordance with Article 68 of the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC).

If, however, the object must be examined at an expert institution, the decision to appoint the expert examination, together with the evidentiary materials and objects, is sent to the head of the institution in accordance with Article 182 of the CPC. The decision sent must be reviewed by the head of the expert institution in a mandatory manner.

In certain cases, the head of the expert institution or the expert may submit a document indicating their inability to accept the materials and objects sent for examination or to provide a conclusion. The reasons may include: the questions posed to the expert cannot be resolved within the scope of their special knowledge, the materials or objects provided are insufficient to reach a conclusion, it is impossible to supplement them, or the questions cannot be answered based on scientific and forensic practice.

It is also necessary to consider the conduct of expert examinations during the trial phase. Indeed, conducting an expert examination in court is of significant importance, as it contributes to the fair resolution of the criminal case and ensures the protection of citizens' rights and freedoms through judicial activity. Court-appointed expert examinations are carried out in accordance with Articles 172–187 of the CPC.

During the trial, an expert examination may be appointed either at the request of the parties or on the initiative of the judge if there is a need for specialized knowledge to clarify a particular circumstance of the case or to review and evaluate the actions of an expert who conducted an investigation during the pre-trial process. In such cases, the judge issues a ruling to involve the expert in the

proceedings.

Furthermore, as mentioned above, we proposed adding Article 1821 to the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC) to clarify the concept of expert examination, its stages, as well as its initiation and completion procedures. The content of this provision should also be incorporated into Article 4057, titled "Suspension of Criminal Proceedings." Accordingly, it is appropriate to add a clause stating: "In cases where expert examination is required and the period for obtaining this conclusion exceeds the overall term of the court trial, the judge shall issue a ruling to suspend the proceedings."

It is advisable for the issue of conducting an expert examination to be planned by the judge starting from the preparatory stage of the court session. Even if the expert examination is appointed during the trial stage, the expert usually conducts the examination in their institution. Typically, after presenting the conclusion of the expert examination, the expert is allowed to leave the courtroom. However, if the judge deems it necessary to question the expert or at the request of the parties, the expert may remain in the courtroom.

Considering the possible unsuitability of the objects sent for examination or the unclear or incorrectly stated questions in the ruling, the judge must carefully and thoroughly review the criminal case and all attached documents. During the trial, the questions posed to the expert for investigation should not automatically be considered as appointing an expert examination. In fact, the need for an expert or a person with special knowledge during the trial usually arises to verify and reassess the conclusions of the expert examination conducted during the preliminary investigation.

During the trial, the judge must resolve the following issues: establish the expert's participation in the proceedings; explain their rights and duties; inform the parties of the right to challenge the expert; warn the expert of potential criminal liability for providing false conclusions; review petitions regarding the conduct of the examination; and determine whether the expert should remain in or leave the courtroom.

In general, an expert's participation in court can be conditionally divided into two categories: first, giving testimony or reporting on actions taken during the preliminary investigation; second, performing additional investigations if necessary by persons with special knowledge during the court proceedings. Every

interaction with the expert and all actions taken must be recorded in the minutes.

During the trial, expert examination may be conducted by experts who provided conclusions during the preliminary investigation, by new experts appointed by the court, or jointly by both previous and newly appointed experts. At the request of any party or on its own initiative, the court issues a ruling appointing an expert examination and reads it aloud in the courtroom. The ruling specifies the expert or expert institution assigned to conduct the examination and outlines the questions to be addressed. The court explains to the parties their rights to challenge the expert, to request additional experts, to pose additional questions to the expert, to request that the examination be conducted in the presence of the parties, and to receive explanations during the examination.

During the court investigation, the expert has the right to question persons being examined, to review written evidence, records of investigative actions, conclusions of other experts, to conduct inspections, experiments, and to participate in other court actions related to the subject of the expert examination.

According to A.Ya. Paliashvili, the following stages of conducting an expert examination during a court investigation can be distinguished:

- Preparation for the appointment of the expert examination;
 - Formulation of the questions to be reflected in the court order, their discussion, and arranging them in a systematic sequence;
 - Conducting the expert examination and preparing the conclusion resulting from it;
 - Questioning the expert regarding the research they conducted;
 - Evaluation of the expert's conclusion.
- V.M. Bozrov and V.M. Kobayakov divide the stages of an expert examination into three parts:
- Investigation of the circumstances related to the subject of the examination;
 - Formulation of the questions to be posed to the expert;
 - Preparation of the expert's conclusion, its

reading in court, and questioning of the expert.

V.A. Nazarov identifies the following stages in the appointment and conduct of an expert examination:

1. Activities of the expert;
2. Activities of the judge;
3. Activities of other participants in the criminal process.

The basis for dividing the appointment and conduct of an expert examination into specific stages can be outlined as follows: selecting the expert required to conduct the examination and issuing a decision to appoint them; the expert's participation in examining the evidence in the criminal case; properly formulating the questions to be posed to the expert; conducting the expert examination and preparing the conclusion; reading the expert's conclusion aloud and questioning the expert. Correctly applying these stages in a timely manner, in turn, serves to increase the efficiency of solving the crime.

Once the examination of the circumstances related to the subject of the expertise is completed, the court grants the expert time to prepare their conclusion. If laboratory research is required for this purpose, the court provides the relevant objects to the expert. The expert reads the conclusion aloud in the courtroom, and the conclusion is appended to the minutes of the court session. After providing the conclusion, the expert may be questioned regarding the matters stated therein.

At the trial stage, the expert examination generally considers whether the information collected during the preliminary investigation has been compiled, verified, and evaluated; and whether there is a need to re-examine this evidence or examine additional evidence through expert investigation. Questioning the expert during the trial clarifies the chosen method of examination and a range of organizational issues.

Verifying the expert's conclusion is very important, and the judge should pay attention to the following: whether the examination was conducted in circumstances requiring special knowledge; whether it was carried out to identify circumstances significant for the criminal case; whether the expert conclusion was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Criminal Procedure Code; whether the expert conducting the examination is impartial, qualified, and free from any obstacles that would prevent participation in the case; whether all questions posed to the expert have been fully

answered; whether the expert conclusion interferes with other sources of evidence; and whether there are grounds to doubt the legality and validity of the expert conclusion. In our opinion, it is also necessary to pay attention to whether circumstances requiring mandatory expert examination have been taken into account.

The failure to carry out such actions may, in some cases, serve as a basis for returning the criminal case for additional investigation. According to A.Ya. Paliashvili, "at the trial stage, many motions and requests are submitted, specifically: conducting initial, additional, or repeated expert examinations; requesting that new or additional questions be posed to the expert; addressing violations of legal requirements during the expert examination process; involving the expert during the trial stage; examining additional information through expert investigation; and returning the criminal case for preliminary investigation." If the need for an expert examination arises during the trial, the judge must address two types of questions.

First, "to request additional information relevant to the case and create conditions for conducting the expert examination; and second, to summon the expert to participate in the courtroom. If the judge decides to conduct an initial, additional, or repeated expert examination in the courtroom, the following issues must be clarified: what specific information and documents need to be requested for the expert examination; from where they should be obtained; whether the results of the expert examination will require additional procedural actions (for example, parties visiting the crime scene); what new or additional questions the expert should answer; what type of expert examination should be conducted and by which specific expert; where the expert examination will take place; what else the expert may need; and Although summoning the expert to the court session is not a mandatory procedural action, their direct participation serves to clarify a number of issues that are important for the court. In particular, the expert can immediately answer questions arising regarding their conclusion, which allows for a prompt assessment and enables the expert to demonstrate their special knowledge and skills during other investigative actions. If it is not possible to ensure the expert's participation in the court session, the expert's conclusion is read aloud in court.

Based on the above, A.Ya. Paliashvili identified situations in which it is not necessary to ensure the expert's participation in the court hearing: "the expert's

conclusion is corroborated by other sources of evidence that also contain signs proving the same facts; the defendant and other participants have reviewed the expert's conclusion and have no questions or objections and are satisfied with the conclusion; all questions within the expert's field of specialization have been answered; the objects provided to the expert are unsuitable for research."

M.G. Lyubarskiy described the situations in which it is necessary to involve an expert during court proceedings as follows: "if it is required to question the expert; if there is doubt regarding the accuracy of the expert's conclusion or if it contradicts other evidence and information collected in the case; if the expert's conclusion reveals circumstances significant for the case; if there is a need to appoint initial or other types of expert examinations during the trial; if one or several expert examinations have been conducted and their results contradict each other; if, during a commission (panel) examination, the opinions of the experts conflict and each has prepared a separate conclusion; if participants defending their interests have questions for the expert and submit a request to the court regarding this; if the expert's conclusion is based on the testimony of the accused, victim, or witnesses, and changes in such testimony are expected during the trial."

If disagreements arise among experts during a commission (panel) examination, it is necessary to summon all the experts to the court session. However, if they reach a unanimous conclusion and express a common opinion, summoning only one expert is sufficient. When a new type of expert examination is appointed on the judge's initiative, the task of the newly appointed expert cannot be to verify the accuracy of the previous expert's conclusion. This is because comparing the new conclusion with the previous one and determining which of them is valid falls within the court's authority. At the same time, if there is a possibility that the newly appointed expert may make mistakes similar to the previous expert, they are allowed to be acquainted with the previous conclusion and the research methods applied. According to A.Ya. Paliashvili, "for returning a criminal case to the preliminary investigation: firstly, expert examination was not conducted in cases where it was mandatory; secondly, the conducting of an expert examination was refused in cases where it was important."

Prohibited actions during the conduct of an expert examination include:

- a) the expert acting beyond their authority or the examination being conducted by an inexperienced expert;
- b) the examination being conducted without the appropriate decision or ruling;
- c) the accused not being familiarized with the expert's conclusions;
- d) even if the rights of the expert and the accused were explained, the opportunity to exercise them was not provided;
- e) the investigator, inquirer, or prosecutor rejecting the expert's lawful and justified requests.

Yu.K. Orlov notes that "in many cases, whether the rights and duties of the expert were explained during the preliminary investigation is often overlooked by judges."

Additionally, the participation of an expert in court proceedings can be divided into the following stages: preparation for the appointment of the expert examination; forming, discussing, and systematizing the questions that need to be addressed to the expert; the expert conducting the examination and issuing a written conclusion; reading out the expert's conclusion during the court hearing; questioning the expert; and evaluating the expert's conclusion.

During the court proceedings, the parties may ask the expert questions on matters of interest to them. According to Article 442 of the Criminal Procedure Code, the expert has the right to be present in the courtroom from the beginning to the end of the court session and to be present at all questioning. At the request of the parties or on the initiative of the court, the presiding judge, one of the lay assessors, or the court clerk reads out written evidence, expert conclusions, and investigation reports that were attached to the preliminary investigation and considered relevant to the case.

The expert must ask questions in a clear and understandable manner for the participants in the criminal process. Misunderstandings can negatively affect the conclusion. Every word of the expert must be precise and clear. The expert answers only the questions within their competence; if the question falls outside their knowledge or concerns objects not included in the investigation, the expert may refuse to answer, explaining the reason. If circumstances related to the

subject of the expert examination change, the appointed expert is notified during the court proceedings. Questioning the expert during the trial is one of the key procedural actions. During the court investigation, the expert has the right to ask questions to witnesses, review written evidence, investigation reports, and other expert conclusions, inspect objects, participate in experiments, and engage in other procedural actions related to the subject of the examination. Additional questions may be posed to the expert during the trial. After the examination of the objects is complete, the court grants the expert time to prepare a conclusion; if laboratory tests are necessary, the court provides the relevant objects.

Questioning the expert during the trial differs from questioning during the preliminary investigation: first, the questioning in court is conducted openly, in the direct presence of other participants in the criminal process; second, the procedure may involve clarifying complex points written in the conclusion, explaining them, or conducting additional investigation to obtain information about the case or answer questions from participants. If the court obtains all necessary information by explaining the conclusion, it may limit itself to questioning the expert without conducting an additional examination. In any case, after the expert reads their conclusion, they may be questioned with the permission of the presiding judge.

Collecting samples for the expert examination is, by its nature, a logical continuation of the examination process and is often conducted after the investigator or judge provides the samples to the expert. Therefore, it seems appropriate to include the procedural action "collection of samples for the expert examination" alongside the examination under Article 329 of the Criminal Procedure Code, which concerns actions that may be performed before initiating a criminal case. Without collecting the necessary samples, conducting an examination is impossible.

Thus, the expert examination appointed before initiating a criminal case is primarily aimed at determining whether elements of a crime are present in the incident. The examination conducted during the investigation stage serves to thoroughly study all materials and objects in the case, analyzing their type, characteristics, origin, processing method, quantity, and quality. The examination during court proceedings is mainly aimed at verifying the validity of expert conclusions obtained during the preliminary investigation and conducting comparative evaluations.

Another important feature of the expert examination is the expert's independence and impartiality. Unlike participants in the criminal process, the expert is a procedurally independent subject who draws conclusions solely based on scientific knowledge and professional experience. Influence by the investigator or the court undermines the evidentiary value of the expert's conclusion.

In conclusion, expert examinations in criminal cases are an essential investigative measure that can be conducted before initiating a criminal case, during the preliminary investigation, and at the trial stage, playing a unique role in establishing the truth in criminal proceedings.

3. Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the literature and legislative framework regarding expert examinations in criminal proceedings, it is evident that forensic expertise plays a critical role in establishing the truth and ensuring justice. Scholars such as A.Ya. Paliashvili, V.M. Bozrov, V.M. Kobayakov, M.G. Lyubarskiy, and others have emphasized that the procedure for conducting expert examinations consists of multiple stages, including preparation for the examination, formulation and discussion of questions, conducting the research, preparing written conclusions, presenting the conclusions in court, and examining the expert's testimony.

The literature highlights that expert participation during court proceedings is essential for clarifying complex issues, verifying previous findings, and ensuring the credibility of evidence. Experts must act independently, basing their conclusions solely on their scientific knowledge and professional experience. It is also noted that the failure to conduct mandatory examinations, refusal to carry out essential expert research, or violations of procedural requirements can significantly affect the course of criminal proceedings and may justify the return of the case for further investigation.

Based on the review, the following recommendations are proposed:

- Inclusion of Article 182¹ of the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC) to formalize the stages, initiation, and completion of expert examinations, ensuring that all procedural steps are properly documented.
- Amendment of Article 405⁷ of the CPC to include provisions allowing a judge to suspend

proceedings if the examination cannot be completed within the statutory timeframe.

- Integration of "collection of samples for expert examination" as a procedural step before initiating criminal proceedings, as stipulated in Article 329 of the CPC, to ensure that examinations are conducted effectively and without procedural obstacles.
- Ensuring expert independence and impartiality throughout the investigation and trial stages, protecting the evidentiary value of the conclusions.
- Structured court procedures for expert participation, including the possibility of additional, repeated, or commission-based examinations, as well as clear guidelines on formulating questions and presenting results in court.

In conclusion, forensic examinations constitute a fundamental investigative action in criminal proceedings, spanning pre-trial investigations and trial stages. Proper implementation of the proposed measures will enhance the accuracy, reliability, and efficiency of expert conclusions, ultimately contributing to the fair administration of justice.

References

1. Zinin A.M., Omelyanyuk G.G., Pakhomov A.V. Introduction to Forensic Examination. – Moscow: MPSI, 2002. – p. 118.
2. Shlyakhov A.R. Forensic Examination: Organization and Conduct. – Moscow: Yuridicheskaya Literatura, 1979. – p. 11.
3. Arinushkina, G.P., Vinberg, L.I., Shlyakhova, A.R. Appointment and Conduct of Forensic Examinations. Moscow: Yurid. Lit, 1975. – p. 20.
4. Bozrov, V.M., Kobayakov, V.M. Judicial Investigation. Yekaterinburg, 1992. – p. 26.
5. Inog'omjonova, Z.F., Abdumajidov, G.A., To'laganova, G.Z., Xidoyatov, B.B., Allamuradov, A.T., Madaliyev, O.M., Qo'shayev, N.M., Narziyev, Y., Shaxobiddinov, N.S. Criminal Procedure. Special Part: Textbook for Students of Law Institutes and Faculties / under the general editorship of Z.F. Inog'omjonova. Tashkent: TDYUI, 2008 – p. 191.
6. Paliashvili, A.Ya. Forensic Examination in Criminal Court. Moscow: Yurid. Lit., 1973. – p. 80;
7. Bozrov, V.M., & Kobayakov, V.M. Judicial Investigation. Yekaterinburg, 1992. – pp. 30-38;
8. Nazarov, V.I. Appointment and Conduct of

Expertise in Criminal Proceedings: Author's
Abstract of Candidate of Law Dissertation.. наук. –
M.: ПГБ, 2003. – С. 12.

9. Paliashvili, A.Ya. Forensic Examination in Criminal Court. Moscow: Yurid. Lit., 1973. – P. 53.
10. A.Ya. Paliashvili. Expert Examination in Criminal Court. – Moscow: Yuryd. Lit., 1973. – P. 56.
11. A.Ya. Paliashvili, Expert Examination in Criminal Court Proceedings, Moscow: Yuryd. lit., 1973, p. 60.
12. M.G. Lyubarskiy. The activity of the defense attorney during the conduct of expert examinations in criminal cases in a court of first instance. – Leningrad: LGU, 1970. – P. 57.
13. A.Ya. Paliashvili. Expert Examination in Criminal Court Proceedings. – Moscow: Yuryd. Lit., 1973. – P. 53.
14. Orlov Yu.K. Controversial Issues of Forensic Examination // Russian Justice. – Moscow, 1995. – No. 1. – P. 41.