

Crimes Against the Order of Governance: Legal Characteristics and Classification Issues

by Nurbol Batyrbay*, Anzhelika Tsoy**, Nurlan Tleshaliyev***, Gulzipa Duisenbayeva****, Nurlan Apakhayev*****

Abstract

In contemporary legal studies, crimes against the order of governance have gained particular relevance, as they directly impact the functioning of state authorities and societal stability. The aim of this research is to develop the legal characteristics of crimes against the order of governance and to identify the key issues in classifying such offences. The methodological foundation is based on an analysis of current legislation, academic works, and law enforcement practices in Kazakhstan and other countries. The article examines crimes against the order of governance, their legal characteristics, and classification challenges within the framework of Ukrainian legislation. Particular attention is given to the evolution of anti-corruption legislation in Kazakhstan. The study includes a comparative analysis of Kazakhstani legal norms with international law standards and the legislation of other countries. The research findings highlight the need to improve the legislative framework and implement international standards into national legislation to enhance the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures and ensure proper governance and sustainability in public administration. The practical value of this study lies in its potential application by law enforcement agencies and legislators to refine the legal regulation of crimes against the order of governance, as well as by legal scholars and students in academic settings.

* Higher School of Law “Adilet”, Caspian University, 050000, 85A Dostyk Ave., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan. E-mail: n-batyrbay@outlook.com.

** Higher School of Law “Adilet”, Caspian University, 050000, 85A Dostyk Ave., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan. E-mail: anzhelikatsoy@hotmail.com.

*** Higher School of Law “Adilet”, Caspian University, 050000, 85A Dostyk Ave., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan. E-mail: n.tleshaliyev@outlook.com.

**** Higher School of Law “Adilet”, Caspian University, 050000, 85A Dostyk Ave., Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan. E-mail: g_duisenbayeva@hotmail.com.

***** Almaty Economic-Legal and Pedagogical College, 041609, 80A Raiymbek, Batyr Str., Besagash, Republic of Kazakhstan. E-mail: nurlanapakhayev75@gmail.com

Rivista di Studi sulla Sostenibilità, (ISSNe 2239-7221), 2025, 2 Thematic Issue

Doi: 10.3280/riss2025oa21073

Key words: corruption crimes; law enforcement; criminal code; legal reform; legislative support.

First submission: 22/09/2025; *accepted:* 27/11/2025

1. Introduction

In the modern context of the dynamic development of legal systems, ensuring proper governance is of particular importance. Crimes against the order of governance constitute one of the most significant categories of offences aimed at undermining established norms and rules governing the functioning of state and public institutions. Research into these crimes helps to identify gaps in law enforcement mechanisms and develop strategies to address them. The study of such offences in the context of Kazakhstan holds great practical significance, as effective legal regulation of these violations is a key factor in maintaining public order, strengthening the rule of law, and ensuring the sustainability of citizen security and institutional trust.

Against the backdrop of Kazakhstan's integration into the global community and the process of adapting national legislation to international standards, the issue of classifying crimes against the order of governance has become particularly relevant. A clear legal characterisation of such offences contributes to improving law enforcement practices, increasing the efficiency of law enforcement agencies, and reducing the risks of abuse and violations in public administration, thereby supporting the sustainability of democratic institutions and governance processes.

Crimes against the order of governance, particularly corruption-related offences, significantly undermine public trust in government authorities and jeopardize the sustainability of legal and administrative systems by eroding institutional legitimacy and compromising the long-term resilience of governance frameworks (Ketners et al., 2025; Dudchenko et al., 2018). Studying these crimes and improving law enforcement practices will help enhance public confidence and ensure transparency in the functioning of state institutions.

The relevance of this research is confirmed by numerous academic studies examining crimes against the order of governance in various contexts. Ali et al. (2023) explore a human rights-based approach to corruption, highlighting the potential for aligning anti-corruption regulations with human rights principles. Their study examines the balance between punitive measures and the protection of fundamental rights, which is a crucial aspect in the development of an effective anti-corruption policy.

Akimova et al. (2020) highlight the negative impact of corruption on a state's economic security, emphasising that crimes against public order can significantly weaken national institutions. This study provides a crucial analysis for understanding the relationship between corruption and a country's economic resilience.

Capus and Bozinova (2023) analyse impression management by authorities involved in corporate corruption investigations. They focus on how corruption case narratives are shaped and the factors influencing prosecutorial decision-making.

Corneau (2023) explores the implementation of criminal compliance as a tool for anti-corruption policy, stressing the importance of compliance programmes in corporate governance. This research is crucial for understanding mechanisms that can prevent violations of public order.

Kussainov et al. (2023) examine anti-corruption mechanisms in the financial sector of the European Union (EU), highlighting the role of artificial intelligence in enhancing security. This study demonstrates how modern technologies can contribute to combating crimes against public order.

Thus, previous studies have focused on different aspects of corruption, ranging from its economic impact to human rights, international practices, corporate compliance, and innovative technologies for preventing corruption-related crimes.

The aim of this study is to explore the legal characteristics of crimes against the order of governance and examine the challenges in their classification.

2. Materials and Methods

In the study of crimes against the order of governance in Kazakhstan, several methodological approaches were applied to analyse legal phenomena, providing a comprehensive perspective on this complex issue.

The historical-legal method was key to examining the evolution of anti-corruption legislation in Kazakhstan. A detailed analysis was conducted on the legal acts regulating crimes against the order of governance, namely: the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1995), the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1997), Law No. 410-IV LRK “On Combating Corruption” (2008), and Law No. 107 “On Administrative Procedures” (2000). This analysis allowed for the identification of trends in strengthening liability for corruption-related offences and other crimes against the order of

governance, which are crucial for ensuring the rule of law and long-term governance sustainability.

To assess the effectiveness of Ukrainian legal norms in combating crimes against the order of governance, a comparison was made between Ukrainian legislation, particularly the Criminal Code of Ukraine (2001), and international standards as well as the legal frameworks of other countries, such as the United States of America (USA) (Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, 1977, 1980), Germany (German Criminal Code, 1998), Switzerland (Swedish Criminal Code, 1962), and Singapore (Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act, 2019). This comparative analysis helped identify the strengths and weaknesses of Ukrainian legislation in this field, particularly its capacity to support the sustainability of governance structures through effective legal mechanisms.

The analytical method was employed to identify challenges in the classification of crimes against the order of governance, particularly corruption-related offences. Special attention was given to the qualification of offences, which in some cases may fall under both administrative and criminal law, creating difficulties in law enforcement. It is important to note that ambiguity in legal qualification can lead to the improper application of the law.

The system analysis method was used to explore the interconnections between different types of crimes against the order of governance and their impact on the functioning of state institutions. This approach helped identify key factors influencing the efficiency of public administration and the effectiveness of control over officials' activities.

Together, these methodological approaches provided a multifaceted perspective on crimes against the order of governance in Kazakhstan, contributing to the identification of key issues and opportunities for improving legislation and legal practices in this area.

3. Results

Crimes against the order of governance are defined as offences aimed at undermining or violating established state norms that regulate the activities of government bodies, administrative institutions, and individual officials. Such crimes provide a considerable risk to society by undermining both the efficacy and the institutional sustainability of administrative governance, so reducing the capacity of state processes to adapt and operate under intricate socio-political and economic circumstances.

Legal doctrine presents various approaches to understanding these crimes. They are often viewed as offences that undermine public order or as acts that disrupt state governance. In some classifications, they are considered a subset of administrative offences, while in others, they are defined as a distinct category within the criminal law system. In international law, crimes against the order of governance may include aspects such as corruption, abuse of power, forgery of official documents, and other acts that hinder the proper functioning of government institutions.

The study of crimes against the order of governance in Kazakhstan aims to explore and clarify the legislative framework that regulates the functioning of state institutions and ensures the sustainability of legal order and governance. The primary legal sources for the characterisation and classification of such crimes include the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1995), the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1997), and other legal acts governing state administration.

The Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1995) serves as the fundamental law that establishes the legal foundations of state structure, citizens' rights and freedoms, and the responsibilities of government institutions. It enshrines the principles of the rule of law, which form the basis for classifying and preventing crimes against the order of governance. The Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1997) is the primary legislation that defines liability for such crimes, outlining penalties for acts that obstruct the functioning of state authorities or undermine the authority of the government.

The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 410-IV LRK "On Combating Corruption" (2008) is designed to prevent corruption by establishing strict liability measures for bribery, abuse of office, and other corruption-related offences that fall within the category of crimes against the order of governance. This law also sets out procedures for investigating and prosecuting such violations, providing legal instruments essential for the sustainability of accountability systems within public administration. Meanwhile, the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 107 "On Administrative Procedures" (2000) regulates the procedures of government bodies, the interaction between public authorities and citizens, and mechanisms for preventing violations in governance, thereby contributing to crime prevention in this domain.

Kazakhstani law defines offences against the order of governance as those that disrupt state institutions, public order, and administrative processes. These crimes try to denigrate government structures, disrupt officials' tasks, and hinder public institutions' efficiency and sustainability. Kazakhstan's criminal code defines offences against the order of governance as those that

impair or disturb state bodies and officials' administrative activities, undermine governmental authority, or interfere with their tasks. This category also includes crimes that undermine government or exploit power for personal benefit (see Table 1).

Table 1 – Main Types of Crimes Against the Rule of Law

<i>Category</i>	<i>Types and features</i>
Corruption Crimes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bribe Taking: Acceptance of material or other benefits by a public official for performing or failing to perform certain actions in the interests of third parties. – Bribe Giving: Offering a benefit to a public official in exchange for assistance in making decisions. – Mediation in Bribery: Actions aimed at organizing or facilitating the transfer of a bribe.
Abuse of Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Exceeding Authority: Performing actions beyond the granted powers, causing harm to state interests. – Abuse of Official Position: Using official powers for personal gain or for the benefit of third parties, to the detriment of public or state interests.
Obstructing State Authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Violence or Threats Against Officials: Intimidation or use of force to influence the official activities of state employees. – Obstruction of Law Enforcement: Actions that hinder law enforcement agencies from performing their duties, such as blocking their activities or sabotage.
Forgery and Falsification of Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Forgery of Official Documents: Creating or using fake documents intending to deceive government authorities or commit illegal actions. – Use of Fake Documents: Using forged documents to gain personal benefits or manipulate data for administrative purposes

Source: Compiled by the authors based on the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1997).

Crimes against the order of governance in Kazakhstan manifest in various forms, but they all aim to disrupt the lawful functioning of state institutions, undermine their authority, and destabilise public administration, thereby threatening the sustainability of institutional integrity and rule-based governance. A clear classification and definition of such crimes are crucial for maintaining legal order and protecting public interests.

In Kazakhstan's legal framework, crimes against the order of governance have distinct features that differentiate them from other types of offences. Their legal characterisation involves specific aspects of the object of encroachment, the perpetrator, legal consequences, and the influence of international regulations on their classification. These crimes target the state or public order and the stable operation of government institutions. The primary object of these offences is the public administration system that

ensures proper governance, the functioning of public authorities, and the smooth execution of administrative processes.

Many crimes against the order of governance require a special subject – an official (Denega, 2022). Public officials responsible for administrative functions or representing state authority are key actors in such offences. Their liability is heightened due to the broad and lasting impact their actions or inactions can have on public relations, institutional credibility, and the sustainability of administrative justice. However, non-officials may also be subjects of such crimes, for instance, individuals resisting lawful activities of government representatives or other officials.

Kazakhstan's legislation imposes strict penalties for these offences, including fines, imprisonment, restrictions on holding office, and additional measures such as asset confiscation in cases of corruption-related crimes. Officials bear greater responsibility for crimes against the order of governance since their actions affect the stability, sustainability, and credibility of state administration, directly influencing the durability of governance systems and the trust of future generations. This is essential for preventing abuses of power and ensuring transparency in administrative processes.

International standards play a significant role in developing effective mechanisms to combat corruption in Kazakhstan and globally (Buribayev et al., 2015; Mukhamadiyeva et al., 2017). One key initiative is the United Nations Convention against Corruption (2006), which sets out fundamental principles for countries seeking to combat corruption at all levels. The Convention emphasises the necessity of creating transparent governance systems where information about state institutions and officials is accessible to the public. This includes transparent public procurement procedures and financial oversight. The Convention mandates that states implement anti-corruption strategies and awareness-raising programmes while ensuring criminal liability for bribery, abuse of office, and related offences.

The Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (1997) contains recommendations on financial transparency, accounting, auditing, and measures to prevent money laundering. It obligates signatory states to criminalise the bribery of foreign public officials and ensure stringent oversight of financial reporting, thereby reducing the possibility of concealing illicit transactions and laundering funds. These measures promote financial transparency, uphold ethical business practices, and foster fair competition in global markets.

Kazakhstan is progressively integrating international legal standards to combat crimes against the order of governance, particularly in the realm of anti-corruption (Sloma et al., 2024; Kostiuk and Iryna, 2024). This includes

adopting global norms such as the United Nations Convention against Corruption (2006). Incorporating international standards reinforces the national legal system and aligns it with global practices in tackling governance-related offences.

One notable example is the case of Mukhtar Ablyazov, a former banker and politician. Ablyazov, who served as the head of BTA Bank, was accused of embezzling billions of dollars from the bank and using his political influence to cover up the illicit activities. He allegedly misappropriated funds through fraudulent loans and conducted financial transactions that enabled him to funnel money into offshore accounts. Ablyazov's case became an international scandal, with legal proceedings unfolding in multiple countries, including the UK, France, and Kazakhstan. His assets were frozen in various jurisdictions, and he was eventually convicted in absentia in Kazakhstan. The case highlights challenges related to international cooperation in asset recovery, the role of foreign jurisdictions in enforcing judgments, and the complexities of cross-border legal battles in corruption cases.

Kazakhstan has joined the Group of States Against Corruption (GRECO) under the Council of Europe. GRECO provides recommendations on improving anti-corruption policies and practices, and Kazakhstan actively implements these recommendations, particularly regarding corruption prevention in the public sector and among government officials. The country also adopts guidelines from the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering to combat money laundering and terrorist financing, often linked to corruption offences. Integrating these standards into national legislation enhances financial transparency, especially concerning government officials, and supports the sustainability of anti-corruption systems through long-term institutional capacity-building and accountability mechanisms.

The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) actively supports Kazakhstan in developing and implementing legislative initiatives aimed at increasing transparency in public administration. OSCE assists in formulating measures to prevent abuse of office and incorporating anti-corruption standards into Kazakhstan's legal system. Additionally, Kazakhstan participates in the Open Government Partnership, which promotes transparency in governance and citizen engagement in decision-making processes. Open government practices enhance official accountability and reduce corruption risks.

Kazakhstan cooperates with the International Anti-Corruption Academy (IACA), which provides assistance in implementing comprehensive anti-corruption standards, including measures to prevent corruption-related offences in state institutions. IACA's training programmes enable Kazakhstani officials and legal professionals to adopt best practices in anti-corruption

efforts. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) also offers anti-corruption standards and recommendations for member states and partner countries, including Kazakhstan. OECD provides guidance on transparency in public procurement and management of state resources, which Kazakhstan incorporates into its governance system to strengthen oversight of public expenditure. As part of its deepening economic and political ties with the European Union (EU), Kazakhstan is adopting European standards in public administration and anti-corruption measures. Following EU standards assists in synchronising Kazakhstan's legislation with European frameworks and promoting a more transparent and accountable governmental system, therefore strengthening the sustainability of governance reforms and institutional credibility.

Kazakhstan has made significant strides in addressing corruption through legal and institutional reforms, such as the establishment of the Anti-Corruption Agency and the adoption of the 2022-2026 Anti-Corruption Policy Concept. However, the effectiveness of these frameworks is influenced by political dynamics, as informal networks and patronage systems persist within the civil service, undermining formal legislative efforts. While transparency measures have been implemented, challenges remain in the application of whistle-blower protections and the Code of Ethics for Civil Servants, limiting the development of a robust ethical governance framework. Political will is crucial for ensuring the success of these reforms, as the independence of anti-corruption institutions and the involvement of civil society in oversight processes are essential for maintaining integrity and accountability in governance.

The classification of crimes against the order of governance in Kazakhstan can be based on several key criteria. This approach allows for the consideration of various factors such as the purpose of the crime, the degree of public danger, the object of infringement, and the specificity of the perpetrator (Table 2).

The classification of crimes against governance, particularly in the context of Kazakhstan, faces several challenges that complicate law enforcement and the clear definition of legal boundaries. There is a lack of distinction between crimes against governance and related offences, such as financial or economic crimes. For instance, abuse of office may exhibit characteristics of an economic crime, making legal qualification more difficult. The ambiguous differentiation between administrative offences and crimes under the Criminal Code creates challenges for law enforcement, as certain actions may exhibit elements of both. For example, a bribe below a certain threshold may be classified as an administrative offence, whereas a higher amount may constitute a criminal offence. The variety of approaches to handling cases related to crimes against

governance leads to inconsistencies in law enforcement, negatively affecting legal certainty and public trust in the judiciary.

Table 2 – Classification of Crimes Against the Rule of Law

Crime criteria	Forms of crime
Object of crime	Crimes can be classified depending on which public relations they violate. These may include crimes affecting: state governance (e.g., abuse of power), the conduct of public functions (e.g., corruption), or the legality of law enforcement activities.
Subject of crime	Depending on who committed the crime, the following categories can be identified: public officials (e.g., civil servants, judges), executives (e.g., company leaders), and citizens not holding official positions but violating the order of governance (e.g., bribe givers).
Form of guilt	Crimes can be classified according to the form of guilt: intentional crimes (e.g., bribery), unintentional crimes (e.g., professional negligence).
Degree of Social Danger	Classification can be based on how dangerous the crime is to society: especially dangerous crimes (e.g., organized corruption), less dangerous crimes (e.g., minor abuse of office).

Source: Compiled by the authors based on the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1997).

To improve the classification of crimes against governance, the following measures can be proposed. Legislative amendments should be introduced to clearly delineate the boundaries between administrative offences and criminal offences. This will help prevent legal conflicts and simplify the work of law enforcement agencies. Developing uniform methodological guidelines for judges and law enforcement officers in handling cases of crimes against governance will help ensure a more consistent approach in law enforcement practice. Conducting analytical research and creating a database of court decisions related to crimes against governance will aid in forming a unified judicial practice and studying trends in this area. Developing and implementing strategies aimed at preventing crimes against governance, particularly by enhancing transparency in government activities, improving control mechanisms, and ensuring public oversight.

The classification of crimes against governance is a crucial element of criminal law, assisting in shaping law enforcement practices and ensuring proper legal order. Despite the challenges in this field, improving classification will enhance the effectiveness of combating such crimes and provide legal certainty.

The enforcement of laws concerning crimes against governance in Kazakhstan, as in many other countries, encounters several issues that reduce the effectiveness of compliance and the implementation of legal norms in this area (Table 3):

Table 3 – Problems in the Application of Law Regarding Crimes Against the Rule of Law

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Main aspects</i>
Ambiguity of Legislative Norms	Some provisions of the Criminal Code are insufficiently defined, complicating their interpretation and creating a risk of ambiguous interpretation. This leads to issues with crime classification and can result in different approaches in law enforcement. For instance, certain provisions of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1997) are not consistent with other legal acts, such as the Law No. 107 “On Administrative Procedures” (2000), which can create difficulties in determining jurisdiction and the competence of authorities.
Problems with Classification and Distinction from Other Crimes	Due to the similarities in the characteristics of crimes against the rule of law and other offenses (including economic and official crimes), there are challenges in correct classification, which may lead to errors in identifying the elements of the crime. Since crimes against the rule of law often involve violations of official duties, their classification becomes more complicated and requires additional investigation into the motives and circumstances of the crime.
Low Qualification of Law Enforcement Personnel	Law enforcement officers may lack sufficient training in the classification and application of laws related to crimes against the rule of law, leading to ineffective investigations and improper evidence collection.
Imperfect Mechanisms of Proof	Many crimes against the rule of law are committed in ways that leave minimal traces or evidence, making their documentation and subsequent proof in court difficult. This is particularly relevant for corruption-related crimes, which often involve hidden schemes.
Corruption Risks in Law Enforcement Bodies	Corruption within law enforcement and judicial bodies can have a significant impact on the application of law in crimes against the rule of law. This can lead to falsification of investigation results, manipulation of evidence, or even complete avoidance of responsibility by the perpetrators.
Insufficient International Cooperation	Crimes against the rule of law, particularly corruption, are often linked to international schemes. The limited cooperation with international organizations such as Interpol or Europol restricts Kazakhstan’s ability to fight transnational crimes.

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Overcoming these challenges requires improvements to the legal framework, enhancing the qualifications of law enforcement officers, strengthening anti-corruption measures, and increasing international cooperation to ensure legal and institutional sustainability.

Additional sanctions could be introduced specifically for individuals holding high-ranking positions in government structures, as well as for

crimes related to budget management, the allocation of state contracts, and similar activities. Anti-corruption mechanisms should be improved, particularly by more actively incorporating provisions of international conventions such as the United Nations Convention against Corruption (2006) and other anti-corruption initiatives into national legislation. Kazakhstan should also strengthen cooperation with international organisations (e.g., Interpol, Europol, and the United Nations (UN)) to combat transnational crimes related to governance and facilitate information exchange and expertise in fighting corruption.

To minimise crimes against administrative order, it is imperative to improve the transparency of state institutions, ensure public access to government information, and facilitate public consultations. These actions collectively reinforce the sustainability of participatory and accountable governance. Improving legislation on crimes against administrative order will not only ensure an effective response to such offences but also establish a legal framework for fair and just governance and the sustainability of democratic institutions. The proposed measures will help reduce corruption, abuse, and violations of law and order, thereby increasing public trust in state institutions. Different countries adopt various approaches to regulating crimes against administrative order (Table 4).

Table 4 – International Experience in Regulating Crimes Against the Rule of Law

<i>Country</i>	<i>Main aspects</i>
USA	In the USA, crimes against the rule of law are regulated at both the federal and state levels. Key components include anti-corruption laws such as the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (1980), which prohibits bribery, and laws governing conflicts of interest. The focus is also on transparency in government procurement and administrative procedures, ensuring public oversight of government activities.
Germany	In Germany, crimes against the rule of law are covered by the German Criminal Code (1998), which includes provisions on abuse of office, bribery, and corruption. German law also provides for strict penalties for corruption-related offenses, including criminal penalties for officials.
Sweden	Sweden is known for its high level of transparency in government administration. Legislation provides strict rules on conflicts of interest, as well as mechanisms for overseeing government procurement, regulated by the Swedish Criminal Code (1962). Anti-corruption agencies actively investigate offenses in the country.
Singapore	Singapore is renowned for its successful fight against corruption, attributed to the implementation of strict legislative measures and effective oversight of public officials. The government actively promotes awareness campaigns about corruption and its consequences, as seen in the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act (2019).

Source: Compiled by the authors based on Capus and Bozinova (2023), Teichmann and Wittmann (2022), Lytvyn et al. (2021), Mahendra et al. (2024).

The implementation of successful foreign practices in Kazakhstan could be an important step in combating crimes against the rule of law. Legislation can be improved by adapting best practices, particularly from Germany and the USA, in anti-corruption laws and control mechanisms. This could include clearer definitions of crimes and accountability for public officials. It is also vital to implement the practice of transparent public procurement, similar to Sweden, to reduce opportunities for corruption in the public sector. This could involve open access to information on government spending and contracts. Conducting awareness campaigns about the consequences of corruption, drawing on the experience of countries with high levels of transparency, such as Sweden, could help increase awareness among citizens and officials of the importance of adhering to legislation.

Ukraine, like Kazakhstan, faces numerous challenges in combating corruption and crimes against the rule of law. However, in recent years, Ukraine has achieved some success in reforming its legislation and introducing new mechanisms to address these crimes. The implementation of successful practices could significantly improve the effectiveness of the fight against corruption and other crimes, increasing trust in state institutions and ensuring law and order.

In Ukraine, independent bodies have been established specialising in the fight against corruption. This includes the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine (NABU), which investigates corruption crimes among officials. NABU is independent from political influence and ensures effective investigation and accountability of those involved in corruption (Ivaniuk, 2024; Tymoshenko et al., 2022). It also includes the Specialized Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office (SAPO), which works alongside NABU to ensure proper judicial proceedings in anti-corruption cases. Kazakhstan should consider creating similar independent bodies to combat corruption at all levels of government, ensuring transparency and independence from political influence. However, recent developments in July 2025 have raised concerns over the undercutting of NABU and the Specialized Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office (SAPO) independence, which threatens the effectiveness of their work in combating corruption and may negatively impact public trust in Ukraine's anti-corruption efforts.

Ukraine is actively carrying out reforms aimed at increasing the transparency of state institutions. These initiatives include Transparent State Procurement (ProZorro) – an electronic procurement system that ensures maximum transparency in government spending. All participants can view the procurement process, which significantly reduces the risk of corruption. Public officials in Ukraine are required to publicly declare their income and expenses via an electronic system. These fosters increased trust from citizens

in the government. Kazakhstan could consider similar initiatives to ensure transparency in government activities, which would help reduce corruption risks and increase trust in state institutions.

Ukraine actively cooperates with international organisations, such as the UN, World Bank, European Union, and other countries in the fight against corruption. Ukraine is a signatory to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (2006) and other international agreements that ensure cooperation in the fight against corruption at the global level. Kazakhstan should become more actively integrated into international anti-corruption initiatives, which would not only improve the effectiveness of combating corruption within the country but also enhance its international reputation.

An essential component of success in the fight against corruption is changing cultural and educational standards. In Ukraine, initiatives have been launched to foster intolerance towards corruption among youth and society as a whole. Kazakhstan should also implement such educational initiatives to create an atmosphere of intolerance to corruption and ensure continuous public awareness of the importance of tackling this issue.

4. Discussion

The research identifies patterns in the development of Kazakhstan's legal framework regarding crimes against the rule of law, highlighting both the progress and the challenges related to institutional legal change. Recent amendments to anti-corruption legislation have strengthened accountability, reflecting the state's efforts to improve transparency and management effectiveness. The study examines the classification and legal characteristics of such crimes, revealing how normative conflicts and the interpretation of legislative acts complicate the enforcement of penalties. This analysis is crucial for advancing legal science, enhancing the protection of the rule of law, and fostering an effective anti-corruption system.

Damijan (2023) highlights the importance of local conditions and political will for the effective fight against corruption. This conclusion is also significant for Kazakhstan, as political will is indeed a decisive factor in the successful implementation of anti-corruption reforms. Given that corruption is one of the main obstacles to the stable development of the state and ensuring fair law enforcement, political will is a determining factor for the long-term sustainability of anti-corruption initiatives, democratic institutions, and the broader legal environment. The blurred distinction between administrative violations and criminal offences complicates the classification process of crimes against the rule of law. This is also an issue

for Kazakhstan, where such a distinction is often unclear, creating challenges in law enforcement.

Mitskaya (2023) emphasises the importance of criminal law in the fight against corruption, which is the widely accepted tool for such crimes. Accordingly, criminal law should be an important mechanism in combating abuse of power; however, Mitskaya also points out the complexity of the evidence base, which remains a current problem for Kazakhstan's law enforcement agencies.

Omelchuk et al. (2021) focus on the challenges of cooperation between law enforcement agencies in the fight against corruption-related crimes. While this is indeed a significant issue, it should also be added that not only the lack of clear procedures but also insufficient technical support for law enforcement and transparency issues play a major role in law enforcement in Kazakhstan.

Priyanto et al. (2023) stress the importance of clearly distinguishing between the competencies of government bodies to ensure the effective fight against corruption, and this issue is particularly relevant for Kazakhstan. One of the serious problems hindering effective anti-corruption policy in the country is the duplication of functions among anti-corruption bodies.

Research by Mahendra et al. (2024) shows how different Asian countries adapt mechanisms to counter corruption depending on their socio-economic conditions, historical factors, and legal systems. The experience of other countries provides Kazakhstan with important examples for implementing relevant reforms, particularly in terms of political will and the functional independence of anti-corruption bodies.

Pane and Pudjiastuti (2020) state that corruption impedes the state's ability to provide proper access to public services and the effectiveness of law enforcement agencies, which is also true for Kazakhstan. The deterioration of access to services such as law enforcement or social programmes due to corruption is a significant risk for governance. This undermines citizens' trust in state institutions and stimulates the shadow economy.

Research by Saragih et al. (2023) addresses issues related to the qualification of corruption-related crimes, which is indeed an important topic. However, in Kazakhstan's case, attention should not only be focused on the problem of distinguishing abuse of power and other crimes against the rule of law but also consider the specifics of Kazakhstan's legal culture and the low level of legal education among officials. Increasing competence in legal enforcement issues would reduce confusion in the classification of crimes.

According to Ramashov et al. (2023), the importance of strengthening the

constitutional basis for combating corruption is also highly relevant for Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan's legal framework has significant contradictions that complicate the law enforcement process. To effectively combat corruption, it is necessary to ensure clear and coherent legislative regulation with specific legal mechanisms.

While Suyanto et al. (2023) make a valid point regarding the need for the unification of criminal legislation in the fight against corruption, it should be noted that in Kazakhstan, the problem lies not only in harmonising the legislation but also in its effective implementation. The lack of clear procedures and political pressure on the judicial system creates difficulties in effectively combating corruption (Tsurkan-Saifulina and Dudchenko, 2018).

Thus, law enforcement in the fight against corruption requires not only strengthening the legislative framework but also improving cooperation between law enforcement agencies. This is confirmed by the study of Omelchuk et al. (2021), which shows the importance of coordinated action among law enforcement to combat corruption effectively.

A comparison of research findings shows that the problem of law enforcement and the classification of crimes against the rule of law is relevant both for Kazakhstan and other countries. Adopting successful practices may be useful for improving the situation in Kazakhstan.

5. Conclusion

The study highlights those crimes against the rule of law in Kazakhstan play a crucial role in maintaining law and order, ensuring governmental stability, and combating corruption. Key challenges, such as unclear legal definitions and legislative gaps, hinder effective law enforcement and accountability. Addressing these issues requires comprehensive legislative reform, consistent law application, institutional improvements, and fostering a culture of lawfulness. Drawing on international best practices, Kazakhstan can implement transparent management, establish independent oversight, and integrate modern technologies to enhance accountability.

Further research into crimes against the rule of law in Kazakhstan may play a critical role in forming a strategy for combating corruption and enhancing the effectiveness of administrative processes. Studying the impact of reforms on the level of corruption and crime will not only contribute to a better understanding of existing problems but also allow for the assessment of the effectiveness of already implemented anti-corruption initiatives. The introduction of digital platforms for submitting complaints, monitoring

public procurement, and detecting anomalies in financial flows can enhance transparency and reduce corruption risks. Countries that leverage technology to improve administrative processes demonstrate a reduction in corruption levels due to greater accountability among public officials.

Funding

None.

References

- Akimova, L.M., Litvinova, I.F., Ilchenko, H.O., Pomaza-Ponomarenko, A.L., & Yemets, O.I. (2020). The negative impact of corruption on the economic security of states. *International Journal of Management*, 11(5), 1058-1071.
- Ali, M., Mulyono, A., & Nurhidayat, S. (2023). The application of a human rights approach toward crimes of corruption: Analyzing anti-corruption regulations and judicial decisions. *Laws*, 12(4), 68. Doi: 10.3390/laws12040068.
- Buribayev, Y.A., Oryntayev, Z.K., Khamzina, Z.A., Kussainov, S.Z., & Yermekov, A.T. (2015). Evaluation of the reform efficiency in public social sector management of the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 191-198. Doi: 10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n3s5p191.
- Capus, N., & Bozinova, M. (2023). Impression management in corporate corruption settlements: The storied self of the prosecutorial authority. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 73, 100578. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2023.100578.
- Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1995). -- Text available at the site <https://www.akorda.kz/en/constitution-of-the-republic-of-kazakhstan-50912>, 01.07.2025.
- Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (1997). -- Text available at the site <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0293>, 01.07.2025.
- Corneau, J.A. (2023). The implementation of criminal compliance as a criminal policy to combat corruption. *Journal of Law and Corruption Review*, 5, e047. Doi: 10.37497/corruptionreview.5.2023.47.
- Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1997). -- Text available at the site <https://adilet.zan.kz/eng/docs/K970000167>, 30.06.2025.
- Criminal Code of Ukraine (2001). -- Text available at the site <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2341-14?lang=en>, 23.06.2025.
- Damijan, S. (2023). Corruption: A review of issues. *Economic and Business Review*, 25 (1), 1-10. Doi: 10.15458/2335-4216.1314.
- Denega, V. (2022). Regulatory and legal ensuring optimization of local government bodies competencies. *Democratic Governance*, 15(2), 98-108. Doi: 10.23939/dg2022.02.098.

- Dudchenko, V.V., Tsurkan-Saifulina, Y.V., & Tsurkan, O.V. (2018). On the issue of sense benchmarks of behavior (Economic-legal aspects). *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 9(8): 2562-2569. Doi: 10.14505/jarle.v9.8(38).05.
- Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (1980). -- Text available at the site <https://www.justice.gov/criminal/criminal-fraud/foreign-corrupt-practices-act>, 22.06.2025.
- German Criminal Code (1998). -- Text available at the site https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_stgb/index.html, 22.06.2025.
- Ivaniuk, V. (2024). Theoretical and legal fundamentals of administrative offences prevention. *Law, Policy and Security*, 2(1), 46-57. Doi: 10.62566/lps/1.2024.46.
- Ketners, K., Jargalsaikhan, Z., Miller, A., Millienco, O., & Malkhasyan, L. (2025). Evaluation of effective anti-corruption strategies in state institutions. *Ceridap*, (1), 93-118. Doi: 10.13130/2723-9195/2025-1-48.
- Kostiuk, V., & Iryna, I. (2024). Effectiveness of international legal instruments to combat corruption. *Scientific Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs*, 29(2), 18-31. Doi: 10.56215/naia-herald/2.2024.18.
- Kussainov, K., Goncharuk, N., Prokopenko, L., Pershko, L., Vyshnivska, B., & Akimov, O. (2023). Anti-corruption management mechanisms and the construction of a security landscape in the financial sector of the EU economic system against the background of challenges to European integration: Implications for artificial intelligence technologies. *Economic Affairs*, 68(1), 509-521. Doi: 10.46852/0424-2513.1.2023.20.
- Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 107 “On Administrative Procedures” (2000). -- Text available at the site <https://adilet.zan.kz/eng/docs/Z000000107>, 27.06.2025.
- Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 410-IV LRK “On Combating Corruption” (2008). -- Text available at the site <https://adilet.zan.kz/eng/docs/Z1500000410>, 27.06.2025.
- Lytvyn, N.A., Artemenko, O.V., Kovalova, S.S., Kobets, M.P., & Kashtan (Grygorieva), E.V. (2021). Administrative and legal mechanisms for combating corruption. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 30(1), 154-166. Doi: 10.1108/jfc-11-2021-0241.
- Mahendra, J.R., Setiawan, E., & Van Hellend, A.F. (2024). Corruption eradication in four Asian countries: A comparative legal analysis. *Journal of Law, Environmental and Justice*. 2(2), 162-184.
- Mitskaya, E. (2023). Fighting corruption in Kazakhstan by force of criminal law. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 15(2), 1-18. Doi: 10.5130/ccs.v15.i2.8346.
- Mukhamadiyeva, G.N., Mukaldyeva, G., Karasheva, Z.T., Khamzin, A.S., Buribayev, Y.A., & Khamzina, Z.A. (2017). Modernization of social security system legal regulation in Kazakhstan: Experience and standards of the OECD members implementation. *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 8(8): 2498-2503.

- Omelchuk, O.M., Haiur, I.Y., Kozytska, O.G., Prysiashna, A.V., & Khmelevska, N.V. (2021). Analysis of the activities of law enforcement authorities in the field of combating crime and corruption offences. *Journal of Money Laundering Control*, 25(3), 700-716. Doi: 10.1108/jmlc-07-2021-0073.
- Pane, M., Pudjiastuti, D. 2020. The legal aspect of new normal and the corruption eradication in Indonesia. *PADJADJARAN Journal of Law*, 7(2), 181-206. Doi: 10.22304/pjih.v7n2.a3.
- Priyanto, B.B., Santiago, F., & Fakrulloh, Z.A. (2023). The role of the Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC) in carrying out its functions and authorities to eradicate corruption. *Journal of Indonesian Social Science*, 4(07): 607-616. Doi: 10.59141/jiss.v4i07.857.
- Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act (2019). --Text available at the site <https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/POFMA2019?TransactionDate=20191001235959>, 02.07.2025.
- Ramashov, O., Duisenov, E., Musin, K., Kalisheva, N., & Nursaliyeva, G. (2023). Constitutional and legal framework of anti-corruption measures in the Republic of Kazakhstan: Problems, trends, solutions. *Deviant Behavior*, 45(6), 870-881. Doi: 10.1080/01639625.2023.2268249.
- Saragih, Y.M., Armanda, W., & Novaisal, A. (2023). Juridical study on abuse of authority in corruption crimes: Analysis of law No. 19 of 2019 concerning the corruption eradication commission. *Journal of Progressive Law and Legal Studies*, 1(02), 115-130. Doi: 10.59653/jplls.v1i02.92.
- Sloma, V., Butryn-Boka, N., Trufanova, Yu., Zaitseva-Kalaur, I., & Tsvigun, I. (2024). Modern technologies and European standards: Their impact on Ukrainian contract law. *Law, Policy and Security*, 2(2), 12-27. Doi: 10.62566/lps/2.2024.12.
- Suyanto, S., Siburian, H.K., Nugroho, E.S.N., Manullang, S.O., & Sipayung, B. (2023). Comparative analysis of corruption criminal regulations between the new criminal law and the corruption act. *Awang Long Law Review*, 5(2), 535-544. Doi: 10.56301/awl.v5i2.753.
- Swedish Criminal Code (1962). -- Text available at the site <https://www.government.se/contentassets/7a2dcae0787e465e9a2431554b5eab03/the-swedish-criminal-code.pdf>, 02.07.2025.
- Teichmann, F.M.J., & Wittmann, C. (2022). International implications of corruption in Eastern European prosecution offices: A field report. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 30(2), 512-521. Doi: 10.1108/jfc-01-2022-0006.
- Tsurkan-Saifulina, Y.V., & Dudchenko, V.V. (2018). Authority of law system formation: Applied analysis of legal system unity. *Journal of Legal Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 21(1), 1-11. -- <https://dspace.onua.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/d685f29d-f42a-43a5-a717-d790a82a1928/content>.
- Tymoshenko, V., Bondar, S., & Ivanchuk, N. (2022). Corruption as a threat to human rights and freedoms. *Scientific Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs*, 27(4), 31-39. Doi: 10.56215/0122274.31.
- United Nations Convention against Corruption (2006). -- Text available at the site https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_c16?lang=en#Text, 20.06.2025.