

Yağmur Gürbüz & Aras Günday

UNODC

17-18.10.2026



KFLMUN UNODC GUIDE

Agenda: Promoting Judicial Integrity and Independence to Combat High-Level Corruption

Table of Contents:

- 1- Letter of the Secretary General
- 2- Letter of the Under-Secretary General of UNODC
- 3- Introduction to the Committee
 - a- What is UNODC
- 4- Introduction to the Agenda Item
 - a- What is Judicial Integrity
 - b- What is Judicial Independence
- 5- Root Causes of the Issue and Understanding the Threats
 - a- Political Interference
 - b- Flawed Systems
- 6- Terminology and Conceptual Foundations
 - a- Petty Corruption
 - b- Grand Corruption
- 7- International Standards and Frameworks
 - a- UNCAC
 - b- Bangalore Principles and UN Basic Principles
 - c- GRECO
- 8- Safeguards and Best Practices
 - a- Independent Judicial Councils
 - b- Transparent Asset Disclosure System
 - c- Case Allocation Systems
 - d- Whistleblower
- 9- Key Words
- 10- Case Studies
 - a- Lava Jato (Operation Car Wash)
 - b- La línea corrupción case
 - c- 1MBD SCANDAL
- 11- Treaties
- 12- Questions to Address
- 12- Bibliography

1-Letter of the Secretary General

Dear Delegates,

It is my great pleasure to welcome you to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) of KFLMUN'26. There is something particularly special about being able to welcome you to this committee, because UNODC is in the hands of someone I have trusted throughout my own MUN journey.

I have known Yağmur for years and throughout our time in MUN's, I had the chance to see her passion, dedication and growth firsthand. When I was thinking about who I wanted to lead UNODC, she was one of the first people I thought of. I knew that she would bring the commitment and energy this committee deserves, and I am genuinely happy to have her as the USG of UNODC.

Our agenda, "Promoting Judicial Integrity and Independence to Combat High-Level Corruption," addresses one of the most fundamental challenges to justice and good governance. High-level corruption is not simply about individual acts of wrongdoing. It can weaken institutions, undermine public trust and threaten the independence of the systems designed to uphold justice.

As delegates, I encourage you to look beyond the surface of the issue. Consider what happens when judicial institutions face political or financial pressure, how judicial independence can be protected and how accountability can be strengthened without compromising the integrity of justice itself. Do not be afraid to approach the agenda from different perspectives. Good diplomacy is not about finding the easiest answer. It is about understanding difficult problems and working together to create solutions that can actually make a difference.

I hope UNODC will be a committee where you can challenge yourselves, learn from one another and leave with a deeper understanding of justice, institutional integrity and accountability.

KFLMUN'26 has been a dream of mine for years and every committee becomes a meaningful part of that dream through the people who bring it to life. I am proud to see UNODC take its place within that vision, and even happier to see it led by someone who has been a meaningful part of my own MUN journey.

On behalf of the KFLMUN'26 Secretariat, I wish you all an engaging, thoughtful, and memorable committee experience. I cannot wait to see what you will build together in UNODC.

Sincerely,

Tufan Kaan Karagöz
Secretary General
KFLMUN'26

2-Letter of the Under-Secretary General of UNODC

Dear Delegates,

We are most honored to welcome you to KFLMUN'26 and the committee of UNODC. We hope we will have 2 great days. We are extremely excited to meet you all and having you present with your concrete solutions regarding the topic of the committee. Throughout this committee, we hope you will discuss the work of the committee and the general definition of corruption more broadly, and consider them from different perspectives.

High-level corruption is one of the common challenges countries face at an international level and is an issue that seriously affects public trust in judicial systems. Safeguarding the independence and integrity of the judiciary is of great importance for effectively combating corruption and ensuring the rule of law. Under this agenda, delegates are invited to engage in international partnership to address this common challenge their governments face. Understanding the issue from the roots is also important in the matter. Defining the root of a problem can be seen as solving half of it so governments shall work in cooperation in order to eliminate this issue for all.

As the academic team of UNODC, we spent long hours researching the agenda to ensure the best possible experience for all of us. We sincerely hope that these 2 days will be an unforgettable and cherished memory for the future.

Sincerely yours,

Yağmur Gürbüz- Under Secretary of UNODC

yagmur.grbz1@gmail.com

Aras Günday- Academic Assistant of UNODC

arasgunday3@gmail.com

3- Introduction to the Committee

a. What is UNODC?

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is a global leader in the fight against illicit drugs and international crime, in addition to being responsible for implementing the United Nations lead program on terrorism. Established in 1997, UNODC has approximately 500 staff members worldwide. Its headquarters are in Vienna and it operates 20 field offices, as well as liaison offices in New York and Brussels.

UNODC works to educate people throughout the world about the dangers of drug abuse and to strengthen international action against illicit drug production and trafficking and drug-related crime. To achieve those aims, UNODC has launched a range of initiatives, including alternatives in the area of illicit drug crop cultivation, monitoring of illicit crops and the implementation of projects against money laundering.

UNODC also works to improve crime prevention and assist with criminal justice reform in order to strengthen the rule of law, promote stable and viable criminal justice systems and combat the growing threats of transnational organized crime and corruption. In 2002, the General Assembly approved an expanded program of activities for the Terrorism Prevention Branch of UNODC. The activities focus on providing assistance to States, on request, in ratifying and implementing the eighteen universal legal instruments against terrorism.

4- Introduction to the Agenda Item

a- What is Judicial Integrity

Integrity is among the core values expected of every judiciary and every judge, serving as a key ingredient in the successful fight against corruption. It is through integrity that the judicial system can fulfil its essential functions of safeguarding human rights and the rule of law and ensuring equal treatment for every member of society. Judicial integrity prevents judicial corruption as the two are incompatible and ensures that cases of corruption are resolved freely from undue external influence and in a way that effectively removes the negative consequences of corruption on its victims and on society as a whole. Importantly, judicial integrity also makes the judiciary trustworthy, fostering public confidence in its services and decisions.

In simple words Judicial integrity is the capacity and commitment of a judicial system and its judges to resist corruption, uphold ethical standards, and protect public trust in the rule of law

b- What is Judicial Independence

Judicial independence is the principle that courts and judges must perform their duties and make rulings free from outside pressure, control, or improper influence by government branches, private entities, or partisan groups.

5- Root Causes of the Issue and Understanding the Threats

a-Political Interference

When politicians or special interest groups interfere with the judiciary, they compromise the rule of law and transform neutral courts into tools for political leverage. This often happens through partisan judicial appointments, threats to court funding, or pressure on judges, which undermines the system of checks and balances designed to hold governments accountable. As a result, public trust in the legal system collapses, judges face career retaliation for ruling impartially, and ordinary citizens lose vital protections for their rights and civil liberties against government overreach.

b- Flawed Systems

Systemic flaws within judicial systems typically arise from structural vulnerabilities, resource shortages, and procedural barriers that prevent equal access to justice. Political manipulation in appointments and a lack of job security can make judges vulnerable to external pressure, while underfunded courts face massive case backlogs and outdated administrative processes. Furthermore, high legal costs create a divide where wealthy litigants hold a distinct advantage over low-income individuals relying on overworked public defense. When combined with weak oversight mechanisms, socioeconomic biases in sentencing, and a reliance on the executive branch to enforce rulings, these flaws severely undermine both the efficiency and fairness of the court system.

6- Terminology and Conceptual Foundations

a- Petty Corruption

Everyday abuse of entrusted power by public officials in their interactions with ordinary citizens, who often are trying to access basic goods or services in places like hospitals, schools, police departments and other agencies.

b- Grand Corruption

Definitions of grand corruption

There is no universally agreed definition of grand corruption. Instead, many general definitions have been developed over the years and they cover different elements of what they consider as grand corruption. Nonetheless, there is some consensus on

elements such as misuse or abuse of high-level power; large scale and/or large sums of money, harmful consequences. The definitions have also been useful to differentiate grand corruption from other forms of corruption, such as petty corruption. With high-level corruption scandals usually remaining unpunished, there have been increased efforts to establish a legal definition of grand corruption, as a first step towards the empowerment of national and international authorities with better legal tools to pursue corrupt high-level officials and to end impunity.

7- International Standards and Frameworks

a- UNCAC

The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) is the only legally binding universal anti-corruption instrument. It was drafted and negotiated in Vienna, Austria in 2002-2003 and subsequently adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 31 October 2003.

The adoption of the Convention represents a historic milestone as it reflects a shared commitment by countries to fight corruption. What makes the Convention unique is its comprehensive approach to tackling corruption, emphasizing the importance of preventive measures, criminalization and law enforcement, international cooperation and asset recovery.

The Convention plays a pivotal role in uniting countries against corruption and fostering effective international cooperation. Today, this landmark anti-corruption instrument enjoys near universal adherence. At the national level, the Convention has been instrumental in fostering numerous impactful anti-corruption reforms, prompting important changes to legislative and institutional frameworks while strengthening international cooperation in cross-border cases and asset recovery.

The Convention also serves as a crucial tool driving the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals forward, addressing the pervasive effects of corruption on all core values and principles of the United Nations.

The Convention's far-reaching approach and the mandatory character of many of its provisions make it a unique instrument for developing comprehensive responses to corruption at the national, regional and global levels.

b- Bangalore Principles and Basic UN Principles

The Bangalore Principles are anchored in six foundational values:

Independence: Judicial independence is a prerequisite to the rule of law. Judges must exercise their functions free from direct or indirect public, political, or economic pressures or interference

Impartiality: Judges must apply the law without bias, favor, or prejudice. Their conduct—both in and out of court—must maintain the objective appearance of neutrality.

Integrity: Honesty, high moral character, and uprightness are essential. A judge must act in a manner that preserves public trust in the moral authority of the office.

Propriety: Judges must avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all their activities, maintaining high standards of personal conduct in both professional and private life.

Equality: Ensuring equality before the law is mandatory. Judges must treat all persons—including litigants, lawyers, and witnesses—fairly and without discrimination based on race, gender, religion, or social status.

Competence and Diligence: The proper discharge of judicial duties requires professional capability. Judges must maintain their skills, manage court business efficiently, and dispose of matters promptly without undue delay.

Jurisdiction: Exclusive authority over judicial matters and competence to decide own jurisdiction.

Fair Trial & Ordinary Courts: Right to be tried by regular legal tribunals; no secret or parallel emergency courts to replace them.

State Support: Governments must provide adequate resources for courts to function properly.

c- GRECO

The Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) was established in 1999 by the Council of Europe to monitor States' compliance with the organisation's anti-corruption standards.

GRECO's objective is to improve the capacity of its members to fight corruption by monitoring their compliance with Council of Europe anti-corruption standards through a dynamic process of mutual evaluation and peer pressure. It helps to identify deficiencies in national anti-corruption policies, prompting the necessary legislative, institutional and practical reforms. GRECO also provides a platform for the sharing of best practice in the prevention and detection of corruption.

Membership in GRECO, which is an enlarged agreement, is not limited to Council of Europe member States. Any State which took part in the elaboration of the enlarged partial agreement, may join by notifying the Secretary General of the Council of Europe. Moreover, any State which becomes Party to the Criminal or Civil Law Conventions on Corruption automatically accedes to GRECO and its evaluation procedures. Currently, GRECO comprises 48 member States (46 European States, Kazakhstan and the United States of America)

8- Safeguards and Best Practice

a)Independent Judicial Councils:

Independent Judicial Councils play a critical role in protecting judges and judicial institutions from executive pressure allowing them to perform their duties freely. To ensure judicial independence processes such as the appointment and transfer of judges must be managed by independent judicial councils rather than the government or the Ministry of Justice. By law securing the budget of courts protects them from political interference and corruption risks. Furthermore, guaranteeing judges' salaries and employment rights shields them from both bribery and political pressure. Giving these councils autonomy over administrative hiring practices shield the operational independence of the justice system and since neither ministries of justice nor prison administrations should be able to exert political pressure on the courts structural separation between them is necessary.

b) Transparent Asset Disclosure System

A transparent asset declaration system is a critical preventive measure against judicial corruption. It should be mandatory for members of the judiciary and their family members to regularly declare their own income and assets. Also, to prevent the use of shell companies for money transfers, these declarations must also include business partnerships and corporate shareholdings. Establishing publicly accessible or independently audited asset records enables oversight bodies to examine financial ties that lack a clear source. Ensuring comprehensive financial transparency restores public trust in the judiciary and strengthens institutional integrity. Ultimately in cases of high-level corruption, a public official might obtain unexplained financial resources linked to their position a situation that can make detecting the corruption difficult. In conclusion, mandating regular asset declarations having these declarations reviewed by an independent body and enforcing sanctions for false declarations will prevent such abuses.

c)Case Allocation Systems

Case allocation system is the set of mechanisms that determines the methods and procedures for assigning cases or matters received by a court or judicial body to the most appropriate department or judicial panel, in suitability with specific rules. It serves as a critical structural safeguard by upholding judicial independence and preventing interference in judicial processes.

These systems, which prevent favoritism within the judiciary, ensure complete transparency in the legal process. Cases should be assigned based on predetermined, transparent rules and random selection procedures, rather than at the discretion of officials. If the selection of cases were left to the discretion of officials, abuses such as favoritism would be inevitable. A allocation system based on random selection or established rules prevents such interference.

A rule-based allocation mechanism prevents the following risks:

Cherry-picking: This prevents cases from being purposely assigned to judges who are expected to make specific decisions.

Whistleblower Obstacles: Lack of transparent distribution weakens whistleblowing mechanisms and increases pressure on whistleblowers thereby increases the risk of corruption.

d) Whistle Blowers

Whistleblowers are individuals who report unlawful activities such as corruption occurring within a public institution or the judicial system, to higher authorities. It's important to be able to make a statement without being under pressure at combating high-level corruption.

Whistleblowers can face serious career and financial risks as a result of exposing corporate illegal practices. Despite legal protections, these protections are often insufficient and whistleblowers frequently face job losses or demotions. They also become targets of various threats and retaliatory actions.

As a result of that, member states must establish anonymous reporting channels to protect whistleblowers. Also legal and institutional protections should be provided to prevent whistleblowers from facing reprisals such as dismissal. Anti-reprisal laws or guarantees including confidentiality and anonymity such as the False Claims Act in the US, allow whistle blowers to file lawsuits on behalf of the government with specific allegations. This protects the safety of whistleblowers and ensures that allegations are investigated effectively.

9- Key Words

Merit-based tenure / Security of tenure: Safeguards against arbitrary removal, forced retirement, or political transfers.

Non-partisan judicial councils: Self-governing bodies managing judicial appointments, promotions, and administration free from executive veto.

Depoliticization of judicial appointments: Shielding apex and constitutional courts from court-packing and partisan nominations.

Budgetary independence: Statutory guarantees securing judicial funding directly from state revenues to prevent executive financial coercion.

Institutional immunity: Protecting judicial officers from retaliatory civil or criminal prosecution arising from official duties.

Mandatory asset and interest declarations: Standardized financial disclosures covering assets, liabilities, external income, and beneficial holdings of judges and immediate family.

Beneficial ownership transparency: Unmasking shell corporations, trusts, and offshore entities used to conceal illicit financial flows to judicial officers.

Illicit enrichment criminalization: Statutory provisions penalizing public and judicial officials unable to reasonably explain significant assets relative to lawful income.

Integrity screening and vetting: Comprehensive background checks, financial audits, and character assessments prior to appointment or promotion.

Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct: Universal ethics code emphasizing independence, impartiality, integrity, propriety, equality, and competence.

Proportional disciplinary mechanisms: Graduated sanctions overseen by independent peer commissions with full due process rights.

Recusal and disqualification protocols: Formal procedure for mandatory judicial self-abstention in cases involving personal, financial, or political conflicts of interest.

Randomized case assignment systems: Automated algorithms for docket distribution to prevent cherry-picking judges for sensitive cases.

Digital case management & docket transparency: Public electronic registries to prevent file tampering, delay tactics, or missing records.

Kleptocracy & state capture mitigation: Strategies targeting systematic co-optation of judicial institutions by political or oligarchical elites.

Specialized anti-corruption courts: Dedicated, high-security judicial units handling high-level corruption and complex financial crimes.

Whistleblower and witness protection: Statutory and physical safeguards for court officials, clerks, and insiders reporting internal judicial bribery.

Asset recovery and extraterritorial jurisdiction: Cross-border legal mechanisms (e.g., via UNODC StAR Initiative) to trace, freeze, and repatriate proceeds of grand corruption.

10- Case Studies

a-Lava Jato (Operation Car Wash)

1. Background

Started in Brazil in 2014, Operation Car Wash exposed a massive global corruption network extending from black-market money dealers to the state-owned oil company Petrobras and major construction firms. The investigation expanded across Latin America, and evolved into a historic judicial process involving too many of high-ranking politicians and businesspeople.

2. Impact on Judicial Independence

The constitutional safeguards protecting Brazilian judges and prosecutors such as security of tenure and merit based appointments enabled figures like Judge Sérgio Moro and Prosecutor Deltan Dallagnol to bring high-ranking politicians to trial without fear of political threats.

3. Challenges and Ethical Breaches

Corporate and Political Levels: Inflated contracts and illegal election campaign financing (Caixa 2) were uncovered.

Judicial Level (Vaza Jato): Leaked messages revealed improper collaboration between Judge Moro and other judicial officials; this undermined the judge's credibility and led to the overturning of key convictions by the courts.

4. Lessons Learned and Recommendations from UNODC

Lesson: Judicial independence alone is not enough; it must be balanced with transparency and the right to a fair trial, in suitability with the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct.

Recommendation: Digital transparency in line with UNCAC standards should be ensured, and ethics training within the content of E4J (Education for Justice) programs should be expanded.

b-La línea Corrupton Case

1. Background

The "La Línea" scandal, uncovered in Guatemala in 2015, was a case involving bribery and tax evasion within the state customs administration. This network was dismantled through the efforts of CICIG a UN-backed investigative body and local prosecutors. On May 20, 2015, the Guatemalan Attorney General revealed other high-level bribery scandals involving the public health and energy sectors. On August 21, 2015, prosecutors and CICIG cite their roles in the "La Línea" case and linking

them to the other scandals demanded the arrest of Vice President Baldetti and the removal from office of former President Pérez Molina.

2. Impact on Judicial Independence

The partnership established between CICIG (the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala) and local prosecutors provided the judiciary with robust institutional protection, while CICIG's international presence simultaneously offered local prosecutors a protective shield both political and symbolic. This protection enabled them to operate independently of political pressure exerted on local institutions. The presence of CICIG and the partnership with local prosecutors evolved into a structural force that fundamentally transformed the country's justice system.

3. Challenges and Integrity Violations

The success of the *la línea* procedure deeply threatened Guatemala's entrenched political and economic elites. In 2019, these networks successfully pressured the government to expel CICIG, which systematically used the state apparatus as a weapon to dismantle judicial independence. As a result of this, prosecutors that were working with CICIG are forcibly removed from office and sent into exile.

4. UNODC Recommendations and Lessons Learned

Lessons learned: International support mechanisms can protect judicial independence temporarily, however if a definitive constitutional guarantee cannot be provided "revenge of the system" is inevitable.

Recommendation: States parties UNCAC (UN Convention against corruption) in line with its principles legal mechanisms must be established to protect judicial personnel from arbitrary assignments or forced transfers.

c-1MDB SCANDAL

1. BACKGROUND

This scandal is defined as the one of the biggest financial scandal of the World. First, it was revealed that more than \$4.5 billion had been illicitly diverted and laundered over the years by high-ranking government officials and bankers from the state investment fund known as "1MDB" (1Malaysia Development Berhad), which had been established to finance economic development. Even though it started in Malaysia, the global scope of the scandal affected institutions and individuals in fields such as politics and entertainment, and criminal investigations were conducted.

2. COMPACT OF JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE

Initially at first even though there is political pressure on courts and in time independent courts have sentenced former Prime Minister Najib Razak to prison. All for that the judge who made the decision targeted by some political parties. Despite

the reaction from political circles, the judiciary found Najib guilty again of additional corruption charges related to the 1MDB funds and extended his prison sentence. This situation proved that the rule of law and the judiciary's ability to act independently of political power.

3. CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL BREACHES

The Prime Minister suddenly dismissed Lawyer General Abdul Gani Patail (who was tasked with officially investigating the 1MDB funds) on the pretext of "health issues" just as he was about to prepare the indictment. In the initial review reports prepared by the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee and the Prime Ministry, documents of critical importance were censored from the public. The attempt by powerful suspects to intimidate the judicial mechanism investigating them through the use of police force creates a most serious violation of universal legal principles and investigative ethics.

4. UNODC RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Recommendations It is a requirement that Judges and prosecutors handling corruption cases being under legal protection against administrative pressures and security threats. 1MDB funds have been siphoned off through shell companies around the World. UNODC, recommends transparent registry systems that ensure the clear declaration of the "ultimate beneficial owner" behind companies.

Lessons Learned: The conclusions drawn by the UNODC and relevant international financial oversight mechanisms from the 1MDB scandal have revealed that corruption is no longer merely a local crime, but a systematic threat that exploits vulnerabilities in the global financial system and, by holding the power to maintain their presence in a country, "Politically Exposed Persons" (PEP) their decisions must necessarily be subject to close examination by institutional oversight mechanisms.

11- Treaties

The protection of judicial independence and combating high-level corruption are at the center of various international conventions, both legally binding and non binding. The core legal instruments established to build judicial integrity and the rule of law on a global scale are as follows:

United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC): The United Nations Convention against Corruption is the only legally binding, international, multilateral anti-corruption agreement with global scope. Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on October 31, 2003, and entering into force in 2005 UNCAC is the sole binding international legal instrument globally in the combating against corruption.

Basic articles and dimension of the judicial independence:

Preventive measures (Ep II, Article 5–14)

Article 5: It imposes an obligation on states to pursue effective and coordinated anti-corruption policies.

Article 9: It makes it mandatory to apply the principles of transparency, competition, and merit in public procurement and tendering.

Article 11: This It requires states parties to adopt measures to strengthen judicial integrity and prevent bribery provided that such measures are implemented without compromising judicial independence.

Criminalizing and sanctions (Ep III, Article 15–44)

Article 16: It requires the bribery of foreign public officials and officials of international public organizations as a criminal offense.

Article 20: It allows for criminalizing the unexplained increase in a public officials assets.

International partnership and asset management (Ep IV ve V, Article 43–59)

Article 51 and 57: It is the most innovative and significant article. It provides for the freezing the public assets stolen through corruption and regulates their return to the country of origin to the rightful owner.

Principal Parties (Example by region)

The global scope of the contract is quite spacious and it nearly includes the whole member states. The principal parties standing out by region are as follows:

Europe: Türkiye, Germany, France, Italy, United Kingdom, Holland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland

America: United States Of America, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Colombia

Asia-Pacific: Japan, China, India, South Korea, Australia, Malaysia, Indonesia

Middle East and North Africa: Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Egypt.

Africa: South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya, Morocco, Tunisia.

Countries Not Party to or Not Having Ratified the Convention (Non-Parties / Non-Ratified)

Countries that have signed but not ratified: Syria (has signed the convention but has not completed the ratification process under its domestic law).

Countries that have not signed and are not parties: Andorra, Eritrea, Monaco, North Korea (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention on Corruption-ETS No. 173

Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention on Corruption is an international legal instrument opened for signature by the Council of Europe in Strasbourg on January 27, 1999, to effectively combat corruption at both national and international levels. Main goal of the council of Europe criminal law convention is to establish a common criminal law policy at the international level against corruption and maximize judicial cooperation among states.

Basic articles of convention and dimensions of the judicial independence:

Bribery Offenses Committed by Members of the Judiciary (Article 2 - 11): The convention makes it mandatory to criminalize both active bribery (offering/giving a bribe) and passive bribery (soliciting/accepting a bribe) involving national and international judges prosecutors, and court officials in domestic criminal codes.

Trading in Influence (Article 12): It considers high level public officials, politicians, or members of the judiciary using their legal or political power for personal gain to influence decision making processes directly as an independent offense.

Limiting Judicial Immunity (Article 16): It aims to prevent the judicial immunity of judges and prosecutors from being used as a shield to obstruct high-level corruption investigations or to protect criminals.

Private Sector and Accounting Crimes (Article 14): It punishes accounting irregularities and money laundering to prevent companies that do bribery by using fake bills and covered accounts.

State Parties

1. European Union (EU) Member States

All 27 member states of the European Union have signed, ratified, and incorporated this treaty into their domestic law:

Western and Northern Europe: Germany, France, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Ireland, Austria, Sweden, Denmark, Finland.

Southern Europe: Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Republic of Cyprus, Malta.

Central and Eastern Europe: Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania.

(Note: The European Union formally acceded as a corporate/legal entity as of July 1, 2024, on which date the convention entered into force for the EU.)

2. Non-EU Council of Europe Member States

Non-EU countries located in the European region have also ratified the treaty:

- United Kingdom, Switzerland, Norway, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Andorra, San Marino.
- Balkan Countries: Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Türkiye.
- Eastern Europe and the Caucasus: Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan.

3. Parties Outside the Council of Europe (Non-European / Observer States)

The treaty is open not only to European countries but also to non-member states of the Council of Europe.

United States of America (USA): The United States signed the convention but has not ratified it.

4. Exceptions and Notable Non-Parties

Russian Federation: Although it had previously ratified the treaty, it withdrew from (denounced) it in 2023 following its expulsion from the Council of Europe in 2022.

Canada and Japan: Despite being observer members of the Council of Europe they have not yet ratified this treaty (they are parties to the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention instead).

Mexico: Mexico has not ratified the convention. It is only a signatory and has not yet attained "State Party" status as it has not completed the ratification process.

12- Questions to Address

Q1: Understanding the root causes and understanding the future solutions in the matter.

Q2: What makes a system flawed and what can be improved in the matter?

Q3: What can be changed in the frameworks and standards to ensure a fair judicial constitution?

Q4: What can be done to ensure judicial independence and integrity?

Q5: What role can NGOs and UN can play in the matter?

Q6: What role does international transparency play?

Q7: What can be done to eliminate political interference?

Q8: What can be done to legally increase the protection to the members of judiciary

Q9: What can be done to highlight the impact of international support mechanisms on judicial independence?

Q10: How can governments make sure that the transparent asset disclosure systems work in order and how can it be improved?

13-Bibliography

<https://www.unodc.org/corruption/en/learn/thematic-areas/judicial-integrity.html>
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/judicial-independence>
<https://www.judiciary.uk/about-the-judiciary/our-justice-system/jud-acc-ind/independence/>
<https://www.ncsc.org/resources-courts/ai-generated-evidence-threat-public-trust-courts>
<https://nyujlpp.org/quorum/shatzman-judiciary-accountability-act/>
https://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/Publications/Convention/08-50026_E.pdf
<https://www.unodc.org/corruption/en/uncac/learn-about-uncac.html>
<https://www.unodc.org/documents/ji/training/bangaloreprinciples.pdf>
<https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/basic-principles-independence-judiciary>
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco/about-greco>

United Nations General Assembly. (2003). United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC). Resolution 58/4. Article 11 (Civil Society and Judiciary measures).

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2007). Commentary on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct. The Judicial Integrity Group / UNODC. Vienna

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2018). United Nations Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary. Endorsed by UN General Assembly Resolutions 40/32 and 40/146.

UNODC Global Judicial Integrity Network. (2019). Non-Binding Guidelines on the Use of Social Media by Judges. Vienna: United Nations.

Council of Europe / GRECO. (2012). Fourth Evaluation Round: Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors. Group of States against Corruption (GRECO), Strasbourg.

Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE). (2010). Magna Carta of Judges (Fundamental Principles). CCJE Opinion No. (2010)3, Council of Europe.

Venice Commission. (2010). Report on the Independence of the Judicial System: Part I - The Independence of Judges. European Commission for Democracy through Law, Study No. 494/2008.

Bingham, T. (2010). The Rule of Law. London: Penguin Books. (Focus on judicial independence and access to justice).

Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2011). "The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues." *Development Policy Review*, 29(2), 220–246.

Pope, J. (2000). *Confronting Corruption: The Elements of a National Integrity System*.

Transparency International Source Book. Berlin: Transparency International.

Rose-Ackerman, S., & Palifka, B. J. (2016). *Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stephenson, M. C. (2014). "Corruption and the Rule of Law." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy*. Oxford University Press.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1MDB_scandal

<https://www.acams.org/en/opinion/the-aftermath-of-the-1mdb-scandal>

<https://www.scmp.com/comment/opinion/article/3095421/victory-malaysias-judicial-independence>

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2025/12/26/malaysia-court-convicts-ex-pm-najib-in-landmark-1mdb-abuse-of-power-case/>

https://www.theguardian-com.translate.goog/world/2018/oct/25/1mdb-scandal-explained-a-tale-of-malaysias-missing-billions?_x_tr_sl=en&_x_tr_tl=tr&_x_tr_hl=tr&_x_tr_pto=sge

<https://www.occrp.org/en/news/us-ramps-up-criminal-investigation-into-malaysias-1mdb-scam>

<https://www.occrp.org/en/news/us-ramps-up-criminal-investigation-into-malaysias-1mdb-scam>

<https://www.wola.org/analysis/guatemalas-corrupt-threaten-historic-anti-corruption-legacy/>

<https://www.cicig.org/history/index.php?page=mandate>

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00104140221139386>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/La_L%C3%ADnea_corruption_case

<https://insightcrime.org/news/analysis/guatemala-la-linea-customs-scandal-explained/>

https://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comisi%C3%B3n_Internacional_Contra_la_Impunidad_en_Guatemala

<https://www.cfr.org/reports/lessons-guatemalas-commission-against-impunity>

<https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/podcasts/talking-justice-corruption-busting-in-guatemala>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Car_Wash

<https://clp.law.harvard.edu/knowledge-hub/magazine/issues/brazilian-legal-profession/operation-car-wash/>

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jun/01/brazil-operation-car-wash-is-this-the-biggest-corruption-scandal-in-history>

<https://utppublishing.com/doi/10.3138/utlj-2021-0043>

<https://globalinvestigationsreview.com/review/the-investigations-review-of-the-americas-archived/2025/article/corporate-investigations-and-compliance-in-brazils-post-lava-jato-anti-corruption-landscape>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1756061618302209>

<https://progresiftr.com/2025/11/21/hukuk-silaha-donusunce-lula-davasi-lawfare-brezilya/>
chrome-
extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgicfindmkaj/https://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/LimaEGM2018/Presentations/Lava_Jato_-_Ana_Cristina_Bandeira_Lins.pdf
chrome-
extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgicfindmkaj/https://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/COSP/session7/SpecialEvents/Apresentacao_CoSP_2017_Dra.Monica.pdf
<https://www.u4.no/publications/uncac-in-a-nutshell-2017/fullversion>
<https://www.unodc.org/corruption/en/learn/what-is-uncac/international-cooperation.html>
<https://www.enforcementdirector.gov.in/international-cooperation/uncac/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_Convention_Against_Corruption
<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/country-profile/static-country-list.html>
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list;?module=signatures-by-treaty&treatyenum=173>
<https://www.u4.no/publications/uncac-in-a-nutshell-2017/fullversion>
<https://www.unodc.org/corruption/en/uncac/index.html>