

**Enhancing the PR of the courts, means and trends of communication**

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>1. changed communication channels used by courts</b></p> | <p><b>Albania</b> - the Chief Justice has held annual press conferences with journalists</p> <p><b>Azer</b> - creating its electronic court system (!)</p> <p><b>German</b> – no changes, press releases published on the webpage of the court, in newspapers or online databases like beck-online or juris. The court spokesman gives Radio/TV interviews. Social media like facebook or twitter are rarely used by German courts</p> <p><b>Bulgaria</b> - not changed in the last two years but measures have been taken for their improvement and more intensive use – webpages, email, etc.</p>                             | <p><b>Montenegro</b> – communication goes by web-site, i.e., by organized annual press releases</p> <p><b>Czech</b> - the Constitutional Court is the only court in the Czech Republic which has created its official profile on social networks (fb, twitter)</p> <p><b>Macedonia</b> - new communication channels have been developed.<br/>- since the court started operating special department for public relations: using social media for communication with the journalists and the public</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - social media is more and more extensive. Following the National Office for the Judiciary (NOJ), some of the Courts of Judicature also established and operate a facebook profile. NOJ has also started using twitter this year</p> <p><b>Poland, Netherlands, Cyprus, Romania, Russia</b> – no changes</p> |
| <p><b>2. social media and its content</b></p>                  | <p><b>Albania</b> - social media can be useful - become more used from the public and the information spread by the courts can be faster</p> <p><b>Azer, Montenegro, Russia</b> – dont use officially social media, only website</p> <p><b>German</b> - can be useful, especially to broadcast information in a faster way and to more young people. Used for broadcasting interesting judgments of the court, amendments relating to the case, press releases of other courts and/or important verdicts of the Supreme Courts</p> <p><b>Poland</b> - can be useful to rectify press articles, to explain court proceedings</p> | <p><b>Netherlands</b> – can be useful, to give a summary of verdicts in clear language</p> <p><b>Macedonia</b> - the use of social media would be very useful for broadcasting different types of content, especially true for our main target group, which are our Facebook followers. Include Non-profit organizations (NGOs), journalists and people working in this field.<br/>- the process of receipt of information by the public and would be very helpful establishing strong connections with the public</p> <p><b>Cyprus</b> - should avoid using social media as means of communicating with the public, it may harm the integrity and trustworthiness of the judiciary. Social media may be useful, however for posting links to cases and other court</p>   |

**Enhancing the PR of the courts, means and trends of communication**

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Romania</b> – yes, because the courts achieve a public service, and the society have the right to know how the judicial system is acting</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - social media but not for communicating sentences or judicial decisions, they communicate social programs and happenings via social media</p>  | <p><b>Bulgaria</b> - part of the courts still do not use social media as public communication means, but most of the representatives in the survey (study) consider that it would be useful in the future</p>   |
| <p><b>3. benefits and detriments since the introduction of the changes</b></p> | <p><b>Albania</b> - the courts have begun to be more open and to change the approach on the realization of the public's right to information</p> <p><b>German</b> - broadcasted faster and to a wider range of judicial databases like beck-online or juris. The advantage of twitter is that the court spokesman or another person of the court who administrates the twitter-account can decide which content is published.</p> <p><b>Bulgaria</b> - in certain courts there are no changes in the communication channels and means used, while in others the changes are determined by the opening of a position and the appointment of “public relations” experts.</p> | <p><b>Montenegro, Poland, Netherlands, Cyprus, Romania, Russia</b> – no changes, all use website</p> <p><b>Macedonia</b> - cannot <i>not</i> use all of the tools that are at our disposal. The positive aspects of using them is that the public will be informed in time and we are in tune with all of the publications and comments on social networks.</p> <p><b>Czech</b> - sharing of published information, posts and comments between social networks’ users. Official profiles are regularly updated and they are followed by a large number of users.</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - facebook for reach the young generation, is to educate young people to rights awareness. We draw attention to our highlighted projects and happenings connected to courts with short posts</p> |
| <p><b>4. primarily used online platforms by court and its content</b></p>      | <p><b>Albania</b>- webpage, e-mail</p> <p><b>Poland</b> - webpage and spokesmen</p> <p><b>German</b> - homepage to publish information about relevant verdicts, news, social events etc., press releases consisting of a summary of the case and the reasons for the verdict.</p>  | <p><b>Macedonia</b> - the Court has its own website where all announcements, decisions or ruling of the court that are of interest of the public and the media are published.</p> <p>- social networks on a daily basis for publishing information that is important and in the focus of the public opinion</p> <p><b>Azer, Cyprus</b> – webpage,</p>   |

**Enhancing the PR of the courts, means and trends of communication**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p><b>Romania</b> - the ministry of justice's website, where anyone can find a link to the so called "portal of the courts", with information about all the cases pending or that had been already solved, by all the courts in the country and an own web site</p> <p><b>Russia</b> – on website: on the court, community of judges, court records, press service</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - NOJ publishes press publications about court decisions, the highlighted news and the press publications of NOJ on the website www.birosag.hu. Beside this, every Court of Judicature and Regional Court operates their own websites and the communication about social programs and Open Court happenings on facebook</p> | <p><b>Czech</b> - court runs an offensive media communication and tries to be as open to the media and the public as possible. All the publicly announced decisions are annotated in advance and all interesting judgments are published on the Court's website, Facebook and Twitter along with a press release immediately after their announcement</p> <p><b>Bulgaria</b> - use all online platforms that exist in the respective region. The decisions and events that happen are communicated both on the webpages and in the social media accounts, and in the electronic mass media. And in the last two years electronic sites take more and more media space</p> <p><b>Netherlands</b> – intranet, internet, fb, twitter, national linkedin, narrowcasting</p>          |
| <p><b>5. internal regulations on the use of social media for the judges</b></p> | <p><b>Albania, Azer, Poland, Russia</b> – no internal regulation</p> <p>permitted - <b>Netherlands</b></p> <p>forbidden – <b>Montenegro, Poland</b></p> <p><b>German</b> - internal regulations for the usage of social media at work if the usage is necessary for the work.<br/>It is not forbidden for judges, prosecutors or the judicial staff to use social media privately. But there are also recommendations how to use them at home</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - Code of Ethics includes provisions, recommendation for judges about using social media</p>   | <p><b>Macedonia</b> - no internal regulations and recommendations on the use of social media for the judges and the other court staff</p> <p><b>Cyprus</b> - no regulations nor recommendation regarding the use of social media for the judges, it is not forbidden for the judges and judicial staff to use social media</p> <p><b>Czech</b> - no regulations or recommendations on the use of social media for our judges. It is not forbidden to judges or staff use the social media. No judge of the Constitutional Court has his/her private Facebook site. The official Facebook and Twitter profile is created and managed only by the spokesperson of the court</p> <p><b>Netherlands</b> - don't have regulations or limitations because we don't believe in that</p> |

**Enhancing the PR of the courts, means and trends of communication**

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p><b>Romania</b> - two internal regulations, in the relation with the media, both of them issued by de Superior Council of Magistracy: The Manual for public advisers in relation with de media and the public; The Guide regarding the relation between the judicial system and the media. Forbidden for the judges and for the clerks too, to offer information about the cases that are pending</p>       | <p><b>Bulgaria</b> - there are no limits how judges and court officers may use them. A Public Relations Expert brings to the attention of the judges when the security policy in the most widely spread social platform Facebook changes and assists judges, where necessary, to maintain the required security level</p>   |
| <p><b>6. attack in social media against judges</b></p>                 | <p><b>Albania, Poland, Netherlands, Macedonia, German, Cyprus, Czech, Russia, Bulgaria</b> – no data or never</p> <p><b>German</b> – there was a criminal case (interpret it!)</p> <p><b>Azer</b> – rarely</p> <p><b>Montenegro</b> - statements of judge him/herself during the hearing</p>  | <p><b>Netherlands</b> – people criticise courts. never to communicate about your own cases and never to give your opinion on verdicts of other judges. It’s no regulation, but just common sense</p> <p><b>Romania</b> - judges are not allowed to use social media to offer information about their cases, it happened that judges suffered attack in terms of their work. It happened that the sentences or decision were analyzed and criticised by the media</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - after a procedure one of the clients sent private message to the judge but not with an offensive purpose, but with a question or to say thanks</p> |
| <p><b>7. social events focused on any specific group of people</b></p> | <p><b>Albania</b> - legal education of citizens, visits to courts, attendance in public hearings</p> <p><b>Poland</b> – rarely simulations hearings for students, lack of time</p> <p><b>German</b> - „Open Day“ events where all interested people can visit the court and ask questions. Special events on certain themes, i. e. inheritance law, where judges, notaries and lawyers make presentations</p> | <p><b>Azer</b> - provide mood courts for NGOs members, practical work for judge candidates and law faculty students</p> <p><b>Netherlands</b> – several activities, meet the judges, week of justice</p> <p><b>Macedonia</b> - there are no such events, that there is no need to host such events, as the citizens are given the information they require on a daily basis. If anyone requires additional information on the work of the courts, they are welcome to visit and ask</p> <p><b>Cyprus</b> - social events are mainly limited to lectures and seminars on</p>   |

**Enhancing the PR of the courts, means and trends of communication**

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Czech</b> - last year our court organised the exhibition about the history of the building in which seats. It was a very successful event</p> <p><b>Bulgaria</b> – various target groups, children that are victims of crimes or participate in court procedures, programmes targeted at victims of domestic violence</p> <p><b>Montenegro</b> – open days</p>   | <p>legal matters which are organized by the Supreme Court of Cyprus. There are no social events organized by courts in Cyprus.</p> <p><b>Romania</b> - 25<sup>th</sup> of October, it is organizing in each court of the country events called “The open doors”, witch is targeted usually to children from high school</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - „Open Court” focuses on young people, since 2012. The „Court Sziget” is specially for young people and this year the court represented itself on an other festival EFOTT, too</p>   |
| <p><b>8. courts and partner authorities, NGOs in the organisation of social events</b></p> | <p><b>Albania</b> – cooperate with the School of Magistrates, the National day of Justice (05.10.)</p> <p><b>Azer</b> – cooperate with lot of NGO-s</p> <p><b>Montenegro</b> – planning int he future</p> <p><b>Poland</b> – in particular projects: helping victims of domestic violence</p> <p><b>Cyprus</b> - there isn’t any framework for this kind of cooperation</p> <p><b>Russia</b> - signed an agreement between the two institutions on cooperation as part of the regional project “Please Meet, the Judicial System of Russia”</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - court organizes the programs in a well operated co-operation with the penal institutions, the police and the prosecutor's office. The method depends on how often, and on what kind of programs other authorities at local level participate</p> | <p><b>Netherlands</b> - prosecutors office or youth protection</p> <p><b>Macedonia</b> - the courts do not organize any social events (as previously noted), there is no need for cooperation with the partner authorities and NGOs involved</p> <p><b>German</b> - cooperation with partner authorities and NGOs in the organisation of social events like „Open Days“. The concrete framework of the cooperation is not known.</p> <p><b>Czech</b> - want to cooperate with the Moravian gallery</p> <p><b>Romania</b> –NGOs are the organizers and the court support the social event.</p> <p><b>Bulgaria</b> - cooperate with partner authorities and NGOs in the organisation of social events</p> |

**Enhancing the PR of the courts, means and trends of communication**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>9. cooperation between court and the media, cooperation agreements?</b></p> | <p><b>Albania</b> – no agreement, Office of Public Relations set up in courts,</p> <p><b>Azer, Poland, Cyprus</b>– no established cooperation</p> <p><b>Montenegro</b> - acts guarantee media’s freedom</p> <p><b>German</b> - no framework of the cooperation or cooperation agreements between our court and the media. The court spokesman respond to the media enquiries as soon as possible with a summarized report of the judgments</p> <p><b>Bulgaria</b> - no signed cooperation agreements. In some cases meetings are arranged with the media on a regional basis</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - some Courts of Judicature have direct and great relationships via press secretary network with the representatives of local media. Press brunches, roundtable discussions, background talks are regular with them. Beside personal relationships, there is also communication in a written form like the court decisions are sent via e-mail. Many Courts of Judicature has concluded co-operation agreements with the press. (For example: Szeged)</p> | <p><b>Netherlands</b> – no special agreements, but have national press guideline</p> <p><b>Macedonia</b> - no evident framework or cooperation agreement in place, simply due to the fact that we coordinate with the media on a daily basis and everything is very well communicated, without the need for a specific framework</p> <p><b>Russia</b> - courts and mass media cooperate on a free cooperation basis within the framework of the current federal laws of the Russian Federation</p> <p><b>Czech</b> - the Constitutional Court does not face any pressure by the media, so for this moment there is no need to establish such a cooperation agreement. As the court is very opened, there are friendly connections with journalists</p> <p><b>Romania</b> - there is a framework of the cooperation between the court and the local media from Timisoara. The main content of the agreement is that all the journalists that were preauthorized by the Court must be invited to all the events organized for the media by the court (such as press conference), and all the journalist preauthorized may call the public adviser of the Court for public information concerning cases ruled by the court</p> |
| <p><b>10. cooperation agreement with the media in the future</b></p>              | <p><b>Albania</b> - depends on the legal framework</p> <p><b>Montenegro, Poland</b> – no agreement, but it should be useful</p> <p><b>Netherlands</b> - national press guideline is very helpfull</p>  | <p><b>Azer</b> – can be useful to share important information with mass media, social informational advertisement on TV or on newspapers Participants in courts suffer lack of skills about law, their rights and responsibilities.</p> <p><b>Macedonia</b> - no had a framework or cooperation agreement, we function perfectly fine without it.</p>   |

***Enhancing the PR of the courts, means and trends of communication***

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p><b>German</b> - not useful, the press should be able to report freely. The constitutional right of liberty of the press which is an important right could otherwise be in danger</p> <p><b>Bulgaria</b> –the presence of rules on media communication such an agreement would be needless</p> | <p><b>Cyprus</b> - can be very useful to establish a cooperation agreement with the media. This can be used to enhance the public’s trust in justice. It may change the views or preferences of the public on the justice system in general and build faith in the Rule of Law</p> <p><b>Hungary</b> - every co-operation agreement with the press or even other authorities is useful. It appoints the frame of the co-operation, the obligations of courts and media, the form of their contacts and gives voice to the purpose of joint work</p> |
|--|--|---|