

**ORGANIZATIONAL AND LEGAL MECHANISMS OF THE ACTIVITIES OF BODIES AND INSTITUTIONS IMPLEMENTING THE PREVENTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

**Dinara Rakhmatilла Qosimjonova,**  
Officer of the Ministry of Internal Affairs,  
Guard Troops Command

**Abstract:** This article provides an in-depth analysis of the organizational and legal mechanisms of the bodies and institutions implementing the prevention of domestic violence in the Republic of Uzbekistan. Recent legislative reforms, particularly the criminalization of domestic violence as a separate criminal offense, are highly acknowledged, while systemic gaps in law enforcement practice are identified. Based on empirical data, the study reveals such problems as coercing victims into forced reconciliation, weak interagency information exchange, and an increase in female criminality due to economic and legal vulnerability. To address these issues, through a comparative study of the advanced experiences of developed countries such as the UK, Spain, and the US (the MARAC system, specialized courts, electronic monitoring bracelets), scientifically grounded proposals have been developed to improve national legislation and preventive practices.

**Keywords:** domestic violence, organizational and legal mechanism, prevention, protection order, forced reconciliation, multi-agency system, specialized courts, risk assessment, female criminality.

**ОИЛАВИЙ ЗЎРАВОНЛИК ПРОФИЛАКТИКАСИНИ АМАЛГА ОШИРУВЧИ  
ОРГАНЛАР ВА МУАССАСАЛАР ФАОЛИЯТИНИНГ ТАШКИЛИЙ-ХУҚУҚИЙ  
МЕХАНИЗМИ**

**Қосимжонова Динара Рахматилла қизи,**  
Ички ишлар вазирлиги Қоровул қўшинлари  
қўмондонлиги ҳарбий хизматчиси

**Аннотация:** Ушбу мақолада Ўзбекистон Республикасида оилавий зўравонлик профилактикасини амалга оширувчи органлар ва муассасалар фаолиятининг ташкилий-ҳуқуқий механизмлари чуқур таҳлил қилинган. Қонунчиликдаги сўнгги ислохотлар, хусусан, оилавий зўравонликнинг алоҳида жиноят таркиби сифатида криминализация қилиниши эътироф этилиб, шу билан бирга ҳуқуқни қўллаш амалиётидаги тизимли бўшлиқлар кўрсатиб ўтилган. Жумладан, жабрланувчиларни мажбурий яраштиришга ундаш, идоралараро ахборот алмашинувининг суғлиги ҳамда иқтисодий-ҳуқуқий ҳимоясизлик оқибатида аёллар жиноятчилигининг ортиши

каби муаммолар эмпирик маълумотлар асосида очиб берилган. Муаммоларни бартараф этиш мақсадида Буюк Британия, Испания ва АҚШ каби ривожланган давлатларнинг илғор тажрибаси (MARAC тизими, ихтисослашган судлар, электрон назорат браслетлари) қиёсий ўрганилиб, миллий қонунчилик ва профилактика амалиётини такомиллаштириш бўйича илмий асосланган таклифлар ишлаб чиқилган.

**Калит сўзлар:** оилавий зўравонлик, ташкилий-ҳуқуқий механизм, профилактика, ҳимоя ордери, мажбурий яраштирув, мульти-идоравий тизим, ихтисослашган судлар, хавфни баҳолаш, аёллар жинойтчилиги.

### **ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННО-ПРАВОВОЙ МЕХАНИЗМ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ОРГАНОВ И УЧРЕЖДЕНИЙ, ОСУЩЕСТВЛЯЮЩИХ ПРОФИЛАКТИКУ ДОМАШНЕГО НАСИЛИЯ**

**Аннотация:** В данной статье проводится глубокий анализ организационно-правовых механизмов деятельности органов и учреждений, осуществляющих профилактику домашнего насилия в Республике Узбекистан. Высоко оцениваются последние законодательные реформы, в частности криминализация домашнего насилия как отдельного состава преступления, и в то же время выявляются системные пробелы в правоприменительной практике. На основе эмпирических данных раскрываются такие проблемы, как принуждение жертв к примирению, слабое межведомственное информационное взаимодействие, а также рост женской преступности вследствие экономико-правовой незащищенности. В целях устранения выявленных проблем на основе сравнительного изучения передового опыта развитых стран, таких как Великобритания, Испания и США (система MARAC, специализированные суды, электронные контрольные браслеты), разработаны научно обоснованные предложения по совершенствованию национального законодательства и профилактической практики.

**Ключевые слова:** домашнее насилие, организационно-правовой механизм, профилактика, охранный ордер, принудительное примирение, межведомственная система, специализированные суды, оценка рисков, женская преступность.

In recent years, in the new Uzbekistan, the protection of human rights and freedoms, particularly the rights and legal interests of women and children, has been elevated to one of the most priority strategic directions of state policy. Under the direct initiative and political will of President Sh. M. Mirziyoyev of the Republic of Uzbekistan, to increase the socio-political activity of women in society, revolutionary, systemic, and large-scale reforms are being implemented to protect them from various forms of oppression and violence. Under the direct initiative and political will of the Head of State, the concept that "The issue of women and the family is not only

about our present, but is also a decisive factor that will determine our future"—a conceptual idea put forward by the head of state—has laid the new institutional, legal, and socio-psychological foundation for combating domestic violence in our country[1].

As the highest and most historic peak of reforms in this area, the Law No. 829 of April 11, 2023, for the first time in the legislation of Uzbekistan, established the family (domestic) violence as a separate criminal offense (Article 1261 of the Criminal Code) was recognized, marking the highest and most historic peak of reforms in this area[2]. This historic step made Uzbekistan the fifth country in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia region (after Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, and Ukraine) to define domestic violence as a standalone crime[3]. Furthermore, As a logical continuation of the reforms, in February 2025, the practice of courts imposing a mandatory conciliation period in divorce cases involving signs of domestic violence was abolished, and in February 2026, a punitive measure for violence measures to further strengthen the new state program aimed at combating domestic violence were approved[4]. This means that domestic violence is no longer considered a “private family matter” as it was traditionally understood, but is now regarded as a very serious social crime that threatens society, state security, and human dignity[5].

At the same time, the prevention of domestic violence is not limited to the introduction of strict punitive norms. This process primarily involves state bodies that carry out prevention, law enforcement agencies, local self-government bodies, It is a complex organizational-legal mechanism that requires the integral and synchronized cooperation of state bodies, law enforcement agencies, local self-government bodies, institutions of the healthcare and education systems, non-governmental non-profit organizations, and civil society institutions[6]. Precisely the effectiveness of this institutional mechanism determines the real-life implementation of the protective order institution, as well as the success of the processes of social rehabilitation for victims and the psychological correction of violent behavior. However, today, despite significant positive changes in legislation and the firm stance of the head of state, the activities of the bodies responsible for implementing domestic violence prevention in the field of law enforcement practice are characterized by systemic fragmentation, a duplication of powers, a number of organizational-legal and mental gaps persist, such as weak inter-agency information exchange and a tendency to reconcile the family under any circumstances and pressure rather than protecting the victim. Therefore, the organizational activities of these state and non-governmental institutions remain characterized by systemic disorganization, a duplication of authority,poor inter-agency information exchange, and a tendency to reconcile the family under any circumstances and pressures rather than protecting the victim, among other organizational, legal, and mental gaps. -

legal mechanism from a scientific-empirical perspective and improving it based on the advanced experience of foreign countries is emerging as one of the most pressing and urgent tasks for the national legal science of today.

*At this point, let us turn to the scientific-theoretical views of domestic and foreign scholars on the mechanisms for preventing domestic violence. In particular, the mechanisms for preventing domestic violence and the institutional nature of the entities that implement them are a complex phenomenon that has been the subject of extensive debate in legal, sociological, and criminological sciences. Local and foreign scholars have conducted in-depth analyses of this issue from various theoretical perspectives—institutional, feminist, socio-ecological, legal pluralism, and dominance theories.*

In particular, a cross-national study conducted in 44 countries by renowned researchers L. Heise and A. Kotsadam

*-national studies show that the type of legislation regulating domestic violence, its intensity, and the quality of its enforcement mechanisms are crucial in reducing the level of crime's latency [7]. According to scholars, rather than traditional, general “family law,” laws that are specifically dedicated to domestic violence, the adoption of dedicated, gender-sensitive laws (dedicated DV laws), as well as the existence of specialized institutional structures to enforce them, significantly reduces the dynamics of this type of violation. This concept affirms that the state's organizational mechanism should not be limited to a general law enforcement function, but should also operate in a specialized, narrow capacity and be victim-centered.*

In turn, M. Schwartz and other sociologists, based on the socio-ecological paradigm, have scientifically demonstrated that violence prevention should not be confined solely to the police or other procedural enforcement agencies[8].

According to their approach, effective prevention requires multi-institutional (multi-agency) integration that combines resources from the education, health, and employment sectors, as well as those at the local community level.

Scholar B. Meyersfeld, who has researched the international-legal aspects of this issue, firmly emphasizes that in the theory of domestic violence, state intervention is not limited solely to a post-facto punitive mechanism[1].

According to him, the modern state's positive obligation should consist of early warning systems to detect the systemic causes (determinants) of violence and the development of timely, early intervention mechanisms.

At the same time, traditional models of combating domestic violence in contemporary Western academic circles that rely solely on the “criminal justice system” (criminalization and

incarceration) are being critically re-examined. For example, R. Peterson and other researchers criticize the repressive practices of the United States, pointing out that this mechanism often fails to meet victims' economic and social needs[2]. According to their conclusion, it is a requirement of the times for the system of prevention and protection agencies to have an architecture geared more toward socio-legal support and rehabilitation than toward punitive measures.

In local legal and social sciences, the issue of domestic violence is extensively analyzed through the prism of a distinctive national mentality, traditional family values, and legal culture. Uzbek scholars and international researchers have conducted in-depth studies of the collisions between formal law and informal social norms (living law) in these types of violations. In particular, researcher R. Уринбоев, in his ethnographic studies conducted in Tashkent city and Farg'ona region, relying on E. Ehrlich's theories of "living law" and "dominance," highlighted that in Uzbekistan, the mahalla institution and traditional social structures often have a stronger practical impact than formal laws. According to his scientific conclusions, although victims of domestic violence are well aware of their legal rights, they are forced to submit to the informal "conciliation" policy of the neighborhood rather than turn to formal law enforcement agencies due to social pressure and stigmatization.

This, in turn, is one of the main socio-cultural barriers that reduces the effectiveness of the activities of official prevention agencies.

This phenomenon is also confirmed by representatives of the foreign schools of criminology and legal anthropology. For example, the renowned researcher S.E. Merry, in her work on the "vernacularization of law" (vernacularization of law) theory, scientifically demonstrated that when global legal norms collide with local traditions and patriarchal structures, enforcement mechanisms are often deformed and the law's real power to influence is lost[3].

National researchers, including A. According to Mirzaeva, in Uzbekistan, it is necessary to strengthen the early warning functions of the mechanisms for preventing violence against women, not only for physical but also for economic and psychological violence, which often manifest in hidden (latent) forms, as well as the full implementation of the principles of humanism and gender equality in the activities of state bodies[4]. Indian scholar K. Choudhoury notes in his empirical research on domestic violence in Uzbekistan that victims' appeals to internal affairs agencies are often seen as a "last resort" when the situation has become critical[5]. According to the scholar, the lack of a strong and effective legal mechanism, the economic dependence of women, and the improper (stereotypical) approach of officials to the problem are the main factors that lead to recidivism of violence.

Regarding the solution to these problems, D.V. Rivman and E. Schneider, representatives of CIS and Western victimology, propose the concept of the state's "positive obligation" (due diligence)[6]. According to their theoretical views, in societies where social pressure (shame and stigma) exists, the state must abandon a reactive model that acts only in response to the victim's complaint. Instead, in order to prevent latent violence, the introduction of proactive protection and monitoring mechanisms that ensure the real enforcement of the protection order system, are independent of the influence of local communities (neighborhoods), and are based on digital technologies (Smart Justice), is an objective necessity.

Summarizing the theoretical perspectives of domestic and foreign scholars, it can be concluded that the organizational activities of state and non-state institutions implementing domestic violence prevention are -legal mechanism should not be limited to the supervision of law enforcement agencies and reliance on administrative and punitive measures. This mechanism must be a comprehensive "multi-agency" system that integrates risk assessment, social and material support, psychological rehabilitation, and mandatory legal sanctions[7]. Forced reconciliation practices that humiliate the victim, endanger their life, and conceal violence under the slogan of preserving family values are completely contrary to the fundamental purpose of legal state institutions[8].

At this point, let us turn to a scientific analysis of the mechanisms in national legislation and legal practice. In particular, today the organizational and legal mechanism for the activities of the bodies and institutions implementing the prevention of domestic violence in the country is a number of normative legal acts, first and foremost,

is regulated by the Law No.

561-OZ "On the Protection of Women from Harassment and Violence," adopted in 2019.

This law introduced the "protection order" institution into our national legislation for the first time and defined the institutional framework of the prevention subjects. In accordance with the law, the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, local executive authorities, internal affairs bodies,

the labor and employment authorities, the state education management bodies, the healthcare institutions, and the Council of the Federation of Trade Unions of Uzbekistan are designated as the main entities implementing prevention.

The most recent, radical changes in legislation were implemented in 2023 and 2024, The introduction of separate criminal liability for domestic violence in the Criminal Code expanded the system's capabilities for ensuring accountability. Additionally, Presidential decrees established the "Mahalla Yetiligi" (neighborhood council) in mahallas (neighborhoods) (neighborhood

chairperson, women's activist, prevention inspector, deputy mayor, youth leader, tax inspector, and social worker) was introduced, with the direct responsibility of addressing social and criminogenic problems at the grassroots level.

However, a deep content and empirical analysis of national legislative norms and their real-life implementation reveals the following conceptual, structural, and practical gaps, i.e., legal loopholes, in the -legal mechanisms: -legal mechanisms reveal the following conceptual, structural, and practical shortcomings, i.e., legal gaps:

First, let us address the issue of the artificial and mandatory prioritization of the “reconciliation” institution in the activities of preventive and law enforcement agencies. In particular, despite the inclusion of a provision on domestic violence in the Criminal Code, research and official statistical data from 2024-2025 show that, over 55 percent of criminal and administrative cases related to domestic violence were resolved through conciliation (based on Article 661 of the Criminal Code)[9]. Prevention inspectors and neighborhood chairpersons often prioritize “saving the family” at all costs over ensuring the victim's actual safety and assessing their psychological state,

are psychologically and socially coercing victims to reconcile with their abusers in order to artificially reduce divorce and crime statistics by region[10]. This situation shows that the organizational mechanism of law enforcement agencies is not victim-centered, but rather that state bodies operate based on outdated, conservative stereotypes. As a result, it ensures that the perpetrator goes unpunished and that violence is repeated in even more severe forms (recidivism).

Secondly, let us address the problem of the increasing criminalization of women (an analysis of data from the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan), which is a consequence of the dysfunction of organizational mechanisms. In particular, systemic shortcomings in state agencies at the early prevention stage are leading to extremely serious criminogenic consequences. If the state fails to protect victims of domestic violence in a timely and effective manner, these women, due to economic and psychological vulnerability, are driven to either property crimes, or are forced to commit serious crimes against their abusers in order to save their own lives. An analytical note prepared in 2026 by the Criminology Research Institute of the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan, titled “Criminogenic Situation Regarding Female Crime in the Country,” confirms this tragic trend with numbers[11].

According to this analytical report, between 2022 and 2024, a total of 22,706 crimes were committed by 20,639 women in the republic. Of these offenders, 50 percent are married women, and 81.2 percent are individuals who have never been held criminally responsible before. These

figures show that those committing crimes are not professional criminals, but ordinary women who have become victims of social and domestic problems[12].

The inactivity of preventive agencies is particularly evident when examining the causes of serious and especially heinous crimes against the person committed by women:

Table 1[13]. Objective Causes of Certain Serious Crimes Committed by Women (Based on an Analysis of Court Sentencing from 2022-2024).

Жиноят тури (Жиноят кодекси моддаси)	Содир этилишининг асосий объектив сабаблари (фоиз хисобида)
<b>Қотиллик (97-модда)</b>	<b>26,4%</b> – оилавий-маиший низолар; 13,2% – алкоголь; 11,3% – жабрланувчининг номуносиб хатти-ҳаракати; <b>9,4%</b> – ўзини-ўзи ҳимоя қилиш; 5,6% – рашк.
<b>Қасдан баданга оғир шикаст етказиш (104-модда)</b>	<b>40,6%</b> – оилавий-маиший низолар; 18,1% – кўни-кўшни ўртасидаги келишмовчилик; 13,1% – жабрланувчининг номуносиб хатти-ҳаракати; 6,8% – рашк.
<b>Қасдан баданга ўртача оғир шикаст етказиш (105-модда)</b>	37,0% – кўни-кўшни ўртасидаги низолар; <b>34,3%</b> – оилавий-маиший низолар; 7,5% – эски адоват.
<b>Қасдан баданга енгил шикаст етказиш (109-модда)</b>	<b>32,7%</b> – оилавий-маиший низолар; 27,9% – кўни-кўшнилари ўртасидаги келишмовчилик; 12,7% – эски адоват.

As the table above shows, the primary root cause of women killing their husbands, mothers-in-law, or other family members, or inflicting serious bodily harm on them, is domestic disputes and the need for self-defense. Women who, over the years, have been subjected to constant psychological and physical violence by their spouse or mother-in-law, who have received no real help from protection orders or community leaders, and who have lost faith in the system, finally - as a result, they are committing extremely serious crimes in a state of emotional distress or to save their own lives. Thus, organizational gaps in the mechanism for preventing domestic violence are

leading not only to violations of women's rights but also to their subsequent criminalization and the complete breakdown of families.

Third, let us address the problem of socioeconomic vulnerability and the rise in property crimes. Specifically, the primary task of prevention structures is not only to provide legal assistance but also to offer socioeconomic support. However, Prosecutor General's Office research confirms that the largest share of female crime is property crime: for example, theft (Article 169 of the Criminal Code) – 3,622 cases, robbery (Article 166 of the Criminal Code) – 134 cases. For 69.7% of the women who committed theft, the objective cause of the crime was recorded as “the desire for quick and easy money and material deprivation.” These figures indicate that the mechanisms for the social rehabilitation and permanent employment of women in neighborhoods and employment agencies are formal and superficial. Despite systems like the “Women's Register,” in many cases, women in need are unable to escape real financial dependency. A woman who has fled domestic violence or divorced, lacking an economic foundation for independent living, resorts to property crimes out of desperation.

Fourth, let us address the issue of cooperation between the “Mahalla Yetiligi” and state institutions. For example, today in the neighborhoods, preventive work is carried out by the “Mahalla Yetiligi.” Although the law specifies the duties of each of them, in practice there is no real integration or electronic information exchange between them. For example, when a medical professional observes injuries on a woman's body, there is no automated algorithm to promptly notify the prevention inspector or the women's affairs officer. Information about families at high risk of violence is not exchanged promptly between agencies. Preventive talks, however, are often conducted for formality (to fill reports) and fail to address the psychological, economic, and criminological roots of the problem.

Fifth, let us address the problem of a lack of legal authority and free legal aid. In particular, the state-funded system of free legal aid within the national mechanism does not fully take into account the gender aspects and the specific characteristics of domestic violence. More than 90 percent of violence victims do not have a qualified legal representative (attorney) during court and investigation proceedings because they lack the funds for it[1]. Additionally, the limited number of shelters (rehabilitation and adaptation centers), their limited number, their location only in provincial centers, and the various bureaucratic procedures for admission make the rapid relocation of women from rural areas to a safe environment nearly impossible[2].

In national legislation and law enforcement practice, a number of systemic problems persist in the prevention of domestic violence, the protection of victims, and the fair organization of judicial and investigative processes. The institutional models of developed foreign states (the

United Kingdom, the United States, and Spain) are of unparalleled scientific and practical importance in addressing these inconsistencies. International experience shows that the philosophy of combating domestic violence has moved away from traditional reactive (post-facto punishment) methods and adopted the following three fundamental preventive principles:

1. A comprehensive system for preemptive risk assessment (Risk Assessment). In foreign practice, law enforcement agencies analyze potential risks in advance rather than waiting for an act of violence to occur. In particular, in the United Kingdom, the “DASH” (Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour Risk Identification) algorithm, developed by the College of Policing and the organization SafeLives, is used[3]. Based on this questionnaire, the police assess the level of violence escalation. “VioGén,” launched in 2007 by the Spanish Ministry of the Interior, (Sistema de Seguimiento Integral en los casos de Violencia de Género) digital system integrates data from the police, courts, and social services to automatically calculate the risk of repeat violence against the victim and determine protective measures[4].

2. Specialized Approach and Institutional Structures. In the U.S. and Spanish models, “Specialized Courts” have been established that exclusively handle domestic violence cases. According to research by the U.S. Center for Justice Innovation, specialized victimology training for judges and prosecutors in Domestic Violence Courts has increased the efficiency of case processing, significantly reduced recidivism rates[5]. Additionally, the Courts for Violence Against Women (Juzgados de Violencia sobre la Mujer), established under Spain's 2004 Organic Law (Ley Orgánica 1/2004), have the authority to handle both criminal and civil cases (divorce, alimony, child custody) simultaneously, thereby preventing victimization and

and also have the authority to hear civil cases (divorce, alimony, child custody), preventing victim re-traumatization[6].

3. The Philosophy of a Victim-Centered Approach.

Under this model, the purpose of the criminal process is not only to imprison the offender but also to guarantee the victim's safety. In accordance with the standards of UN Women and the American Bar Association (ABA), this model includes providing victims with active protective orders, assigning a free public defender (attorney) during court proceedings, and funding a shelter system[7]. This approach increases the victim's confidence in the justice system and prevents crimes from remaining latent (hidden).

Criteria for analysis (Organizati	Uzbekistan's National Practice	The UK Experience (MARAC and IDVA Model)	The Spanish Experience (IPV Courts and
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

onal mechanism)			comprehensive legislation)
Cooperation and information exchange among the bodies of the responsible state organization	Disjointed system. Direct, rapid integration and electronic information exchange between the “Mahalla Etligi,” the IIB, and the healthcare systems is weak. Report-driven priorities prevail.	MARAC (Multisystem Risk Assessment Conference). Representatives from the police, health care, housing, child protection, and social services regularly meet to develop a joint and coordinated action plan for victims at risk[1].	A single electronic integration among the police, social services, courts, and medical institutions. The victim receives legal, medical, and psychosocial support all at one center.
Legal and social accompaniment for the victim	The women's advocate primarily engages in mediation, counseling, and general advice. Professional, free legal aid mechanisms are limited.	IDVA (Independent Domestic Violence Advisors). They are not civil servants; they serve only the victim's interests. At MARAC meetings, they participate on behalf of the victim and advocate for their voice[1].	During court and police proceedings, specially trained social workers and psychologists provide the victim with constant support from the investigation until the court issues its verdict.
Judicial and Procedural	Family violence cases are heard in general jurisdiction criminal	Specialized Domestic Abuse Courts (SDACs) and a	Juzgados de Violencia sobre la Mujer (JIV). Fully

Institutional Mechanism	and administrative courts by non-specialized judges. Case durations are prolonged.	parallel integrated model of criminal courts (IDACs). In violence court proceedings, the safety of children and women is placed first (child-centered)[1].	specialized local courts for domestic violence. They handle only cases in this category. The judges have special qualifications[1].
Ensuring the victim's safety (Order enforcement)	A protection order is often issued in a formal manner. In practice, no continuous monitoring or electronic tracking (GPS) mechanisms have been implemented for its enforcement.	“Cocoon Watch” (Pupa Monitoring). The police place the home of an at-risk victim under constant visual and technical surveillance, installing panic alarms in the houses. <sup>21</sup>	The offender is required by the court to wear electronic bracelets (GPS). Violating the protection order (the no-contact distance) automatically results in arrest.

**Table 2. Comparative analysis of mechanisms for implementing domestic violence prevention.**

According to the first organizational gap analysis, there is no integrated (multi-agency) model for information exchange and risk management. In the UK, the MARAC (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences) system, which has been operating successfully since 2003, is considered the most advanced and effective organizational mechanism for domestic violence prevention[1]. The essence of this system is that a single agency (for example, the police alone) cannot see the full picture of the violence. Therefore, within the MARAC framework, the police, healthcare system, housing services, specialists from the police, health system, housing services, child protection agencies, and probation service meet regularly to exchange information on victims in the highest risk group (high risk) and to develop a coordinated protection plan for them[2]. At

the heart of the MARAC system are the IDVAs (Independent Domestic Violence Advisors)[3]. They are not government officials, but specialists who exclusively protect the victim's interests, providing them with legal and emotional support, speaking on the victim's behalf to government agencies, and conveying their voice. Studies confirm that after the systematic intervention of MARAC and IDVA, at least 60 percent of victims experienced no recurrence of violence. In Uzbekistan, however, the “Mahalla Yettiligi” lacks such deep integration and professional training; their work often overlaps, or the case of violence is overlooked due to an information gap between the healthcare or internal affairs systems.

According to the second organizational gap analysis, the second is the lack of specialization in judicial mechanisms and law enforcement. The highly complex psychological, emotional, and latent (hidden) characteristics of domestic violence crimes require a separate, non-standard approach from the judicial and investigative system. The experiences of Spain and the United States demonstrate the most successful models in this regard. In Spain, under the 2004 Organic Law, the “Juzgados de Violencia sobre la Mujer” (Courts for Violence Against Women) were established[4].<sup>24</sup> These specialized courts handle only cases of domestic and family violence. As a result, judges' expertise is focused solely on this category of cases, preventing secondary trauma (re-victimization) of the victim during court proceedings. Empirical research shows that the introduction of specialized courts has reduced case processing time from 110 days in ordinary investigative courts to 50 days and has led to a sharp increase in the reporting of violent incidents to the police, increased by nearly 22 percent[5]. Furthermore, the architecture of these court buildings includes separate pathways, curtains, and remote testimony systems to prevent face-to-face encounters between victims and perpetrators, as well as dedicated rooms for psychologists and social workers. [6]. Similarly, in the United States, the local police departments and the prosecutor's office system have “Special Victims Units,” which are composed exclusively of inspectors and in-house attorneys who deal solely with domestic violence[7]. In Uzbekistan, however, such cases are heard in general jurisdiction criminal and administrative courts on a routine basis. Victimized women feel defenseless in the courtroom and are often subjected to intense psychological pressure that forces them to reconcile with the perpetrator (their spouse or mother-in-law).

According to the third organizational gap analysis, the stereotype of “saving the family” has permeated legal mechanisms and reconciliation is being abused. Turkey's withdrawal from the Council of Europe's Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention) for political reasons [8] has shown globally the negative consequences that an artificial conflict between “traditional family values” and “human

rights” can have in the prevention policies of states. In Uzbekistan as well, despite positive legislative developments, the institution of “Reconciliation” by law enforcement agencies and community activists in cases of domestic violence has led to negative consequences for victims. Article 661 of the Criminal Code) is being artificially and baselessly widely applied, leading to a recurrence of violence against victims and a complete loss of their trust in the rule of law and state protection[9]. From the perspective of legal and international standards, reconciliation must be entirely voluntary, but in practice, it occurs under various social (especially from the neighborhood and relatives) and institutional pressures. International human rights organizations (Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, IPHR) have specifically highlighted in their 2024-2025 reports that this very institution of reconciliation is the main obstacle to impunity for perpetrators and the denial of justice in Uzbekistan[10].

Summarizing the content and empirical analyses of national legislation and practice, as well as the successful experiences of the developed foreign states (the United Kingdom, the USA, Spain) reviewed in detail above, In order to qualitatively elevate the organizational and legal mechanism of the activities of the bodies and institutions implementing domestic violence prevention in the Republic of Uzbekistan to a new level, the following substantiated scientific and practical proposals and recommendations are put forward:

**First, to codify and implement a multi-agency system for assessing and managing the risk of domestic violence (the MARAC model, adapted for the Uzbek context) into legislation.** In order to transition from the fragmented and largely reporting-oriented “Mahalla Yettiligi” model to a truly integrated, inter-agency system, the district It is proposed to establish an Interagency Council for the Assessment and Management of Domestic Violence Risk (ICAMDR) with legal status under the (city) Internal Affairs Departments. Organizational Mechanism: The composition of this Council includes a prevention inspector, a representative from the district medical association, a specialist from the family and women's affairs department, a representative from an educational institution, a probation officer, and of course, independent legal advisors (analogous to the UK's IDVA, or “Independent Domestic Violence Advisor”) must be included. The practical advantage is that this allows information on every high-risk violence case to be rapidly consolidated in a single digital database. A medical professional immediately reports the woman's bodily injuries, the police ensure security, and the social worker finds her shelter. The introduction of the Independent Advisory Lawyer institution protects women from state bureaucracy and traditional neighborhood “reconciliation” pressure, and participates free of charge as their legal representative in all judicial and investigative stages[11].

Secondly, establishing specialized court benches and special units within law enforcement agencies (based on Spain's IPV Courts and the U.S. SVU model) to handle domestic violence cases. Within the district (city) courts for criminal cases and the district courts for civil cases, it is necessary to establish narrowly specialized "Family and Women's" chambers that handle only cases of domestic violence and family conflicts. -girls protection issues" corps of judges is necessary[12]. From a legal and procedural standpoint, judges hearing cases in this category must have completed specialized courses not only in law but also in gender sensitivity and psychological preparedness. In the buildings where these court hearings are held, separate waiting rooms and corridors should be established to prevent the victim and the perpetrator from coming face-to-face, as well as the option for the victim to give testimony remotely via videoconference. Criminal -procedural code as an imperative norm. Furthermore, it is advisable to create special investigative teams within the Ministry of Internal Affairs composed exclusively of female personnel to investigate cases of violence.

**Third, legally restrict the application of the "Reconciliation" institution in cases of domestic violence and strengthen probation supervision.** The provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code on the institution of conciliation in criminal cases initiated under Article 1261 of the Criminal Code (Domestic Violence) (Article 661 of the Criminal Code) requires a conceptual review. In particular, it is proposed to introduce a provision strictly prohibiting the application of the reconciliation institution to violence committed under paragraph 2 of this article and subsequent aggravating circumstances, as well as to violence that is repeatedly (in recidivism) committed. No social or moral reason can justify pardoning a crime that threatens a person's health and life. Furthermore, it is necessary to integrate the institutional mechanism of "Risk and Need Assessment" into the process of executing sentences for domestic violence in the Criminal Code and the Code of Administrative Liability. If the court imposes a non-custodial sentence (e.g., community service or a fine) on the perpetrator, the probation service must require the perpetrator to participate in mandatory psychological rehabilitation programs.

(BIP - Batterer Intervention Programs) as a legal obligation and add this to the requirements of a protective order[13].

Fourth, increase the effectiveness of the protective order institution and digitally automate the enforcement mechanism.

To ensure that protection orders issued by law enforcement agencies can provide real and effective protection for the victim, it is necessary to fundamentally reform the organizational mechanism for monitoring their enforcement. Based on developed foreign practice (the Spanish

and British models), further stiffen liability for violating protection order requirements (e.g., not approaching the victim within a certain distance, not contacting them).

(criminal prosecution) and to introduce the practice of requiring high-risk perpetrators to wear electronic bracelets (GPS trackers) under a court order as part of a protection order. This will allow law enforcement agencies to monitor in real time (online) if the perpetrator violates the designated distance and approaches the victim, and to take prompt preventive action to prevent a tragedy. Also, it eliminates the cumbersome bureaucratic procedure of artificially and repeatedly extending the protection order, It is therefore appropriate to codify in legislation the authority to automatically extend the order through the court until the victim's safety is fully and guaranteed (for example, up to one year)[14].

**Fifth, eliminating the criminogenic environment by providing socio-economic support to women.** Considering that Prosecutor General's Office research has identified material deprivation and unemployment as the primary reasons for women committing property crimes (theft, robbery), It is necessary to create a mechanism within the activities of local executive and employment agencies to unconditionally provide guaranteed jobs for women who have experienced violence and for divorced women, funded by state subsidies. Financial independence is the most powerful and primary tool for breaking the cycle of violence and preventing women from turning to crime (deviant behavior).

In conclusion, it is important to emphasize that at the center of the organizational-legal mechanism for the activities of the bodies and institutions implementing the prevention of domestic violence in the Republic of Uzbekistan is formal paperwork, The primary criterion must be the absolute inviolability of human dignity, and the life and health of women and children, not formal paperwork, the pursuit of statistics, and the stereotype of “saving the family at all costs.” The implementation of the scientifically substantiated proposals, both empirical and theoretical, into national legislation will expand the institutional capabilities of state bodies in combating domestic violence, ensures real inter-agency integration and, most importantly, guarantees reliable legal protection for women and children from this serious social evil. This, in turn, serves as an important and unbreakable foundation for the real-life implementation of the principle of the primacy of human rights, which is the very essence of the “New Uzbekistan” development strategy.

[1] Learn more about the MARAC – SafeLives // <https://safelives.org.uk/about-domestic-abuse/domestic-abuse-response-in-the-uk/what-is-a-marac/>

[2] Pamela Davies, Charlotte Barlow, Rebecca Fish. The hard and complex work of implementing new multi-agency risk assessment approaches to policing domestic abuse – PMC // <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10073790/>

[3] Learn more about the MARAC – SafeLives // <https://safelives.org.uk/about-domestic-abuse/domestic-abuse-response-in-the-uk/what-is-a-marac/>

[4] Specialized Courts for Violence Against Women (Spain) | Plataforma de Evidencias // <https://plataformadeevidencias.iadb.org/en/casos-avaliados/specialized-courts-violence-against-women-spain>

[5] Specialized Courts and the Reporting of Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence from Spain – OECD // <https://webfs.oecd.org/els-com/VaW/OECD-VaW-WhatWorks-16May2025-Garc%C3%ADa-Hombrados.pdf>

[6] Specialized Courts and the Reporting of Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence from Spain - IZA Institute of Labor Economics // <https://docs.iza.org/dp14936.pdf>

[7] Stop violence against women // <https://hrlibrary.umn.edu/svaw/domestic/link/dedicated-courts.htm>[8] Turkey's withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention was a blow to the rights of women and girls // <https://www.icj.org>.

[9] Analysis of Judicial Practice on Domestic Violence Cases (Criminal cases) // <https://www.undp.org/uzbekistan/publications/analysis-judicial-practice-domestic-violence-cases-criminal-cases>

[10] Uzbekistan: Parliament passes long-overdue legislation criminalizing domestic violence // <https://www.amnesty.org>

[11] Why Legal Aid Provision Needs to be Gender-sensitive: Case of Uzbekistan // <https://www.undp.org/uzbekistan/blog/why-legal-aid-provision-needs-be-gender-sensitive-case-uzbekistan>

[12] Specialized Courts for Violence Against Women (Spain) | Plataforma de Evidencias // <https://plataformadeevidencias.iadb.org/en/casos-avaliados/specialized-courts-violence-against-women-spain>

[13] 2. Introduction: framework guiding domestic violence law | Uzbekistan // <https://resourcehub.bakermckenzie.com/en/resources/fighting-domestic-violence/asia/uzbekistan/topics/2-introduction-framework-guiding-domestic-violence-law>

[14] Why Legal Aid Provision Needs to be Gender-sensitive: Case of Uzbekistan // <https://www.undp.org/uzbekistan/blog/why-legal-aid-provision-needs-be-gender-sensitive-case-uzbekistan>

[1] Mirziyoyev S.M. In a country where women are honored, peace and prosperity are sustained / Speech by the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan at the ceremonial event dedicated to International Women's Day. – Tashkent, March 7, 2022. // Official website of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

URL: <https://president.uz/uz/lists/view/5036>

[2] Analysis of Court Practice in Domestic Violence Cases (Criminal Cases) // <https://www.undp.org/uzbekistan/publications/analysis-judicial-practice-domestic-violence-cases-criminal-cases>

[3] Uzbekistan: Parliament passes long-overdue legislation criminalizing domestic violence // <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2023/04/uzbekistan-parliament-passes-long-overdue-legislation-criminalizing-domestic-violence/>

[4] Mihra Rittmann. “Uzbekistan's Domestic Violence Reforms Fall Short” // <https://www.hrw.org/news/2026/03/04/uzbekistans-domestic-violence-reforms-fall-short>

[5] Reform and Reality: Measuring Uzbekistan's Progress in the Fight Against Domestic Violence – IPHR // <https://iphronline.org/articles/reform-and-reality-measuring-uzbekistans-progress-in-the-fight-against-domestic-violence>

[6] Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On the Protection of Women from Violence and Abuse” No. 562-XII // National Database of Legislative Acts, September 3, 2019, No. 03/19/562/3670.

[7] Heise L., Kotsadam A. Cross-national and multilevel correlates of partner violence: an analysis of data from population-based surveys // *The Lancet Global Health*. – London, 2015. – Vol. 3. – No. 6. – P. 332-340.

[8] Schwartz M.D., DeKeseredy W.S. Interpersonal Violence against Women: The Role of Men // *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. – 1997. – Vol. 13. – No. 1. – P. 48-55.

[1] Meyersfeld B. *Domestic Violence and International Law*. – Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2010. – P. 45-48.

[2] Peterson R.R. The Impact of the Criminal Justice System on Domestic Violence // *American Behavioral Scientist*. – 1999. – Vol. 43. – No. 8. – P. 1235-1238.

[3] Merry S. E. *Human Rights and Gender Violence: Translating International Law into Local Justice*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006. – 269 p.

[4] Mirzaeva A. A. Legal regulation of counteraction to domestic violence in the Republic of Uzbekistan // *International Engineering Journal For Research & Development*. – 2022. – Vol. 7, No. 4. – P. 1-6.

[5] Choudhoury K. An Empirical Study Of Domestic Violence In Central Asia With Special Reference To Uzbekistan // Journal of Namibian Studies. – 2023. – Vol. 33 (S1). – P. 1791-1800.

[6] Rivman D. V. Criminal Victimology. – St. Petersburg: Piter, 2002. – 304 p.;

Schneider E. M. Battered Women and Feminist Lawmaking. – New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. – 336 p.

[7] Hester M. Making it through the criminal justice system: building a multi-agency response to domestic violence // Social Policy and Society. – 2006. – Vol. 5, No. 1. – P. 79-90.

[8] Sacrificing Women to Save the Family?: Domestic Violence in Uzbekistan – Refworld // <https://www.refworld.org/reference/countryrep/hrw/2001/en/20864>

[9] Analysis of Judicial Practice in Domestic Violence Cases (Criminal Cases) // <https://www.undp.org>

[10] Reform and Reality: Measuring Uzbekistan's Progress in the Fight Against Domestic Violence – IPHR // <https://iphronline.org/articles/reform-and-reality-measuring-uzbekistans-progress-in-the-fight-against-domestic-violence/>

[11] Analytical Report on the Criminogenic Situation, Factors and Causes of Female Crime in the Country and Measures to Address It, prepared by the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the Institute of Criminological Research.

Tashkent – 2026.

[12] Ibid.: Chapter I (Studies on Women Who Committed Crimes), § 1.1 (Statistical Analysis of Women Who Committed Crimes), p. 7.

[13] A scientific-practical analytical review prepared by the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the Institute of Criminological Research on the criminogenic situation, factors, and causes of female crime in the country, as well as measures for its elimination. Tashkent – 2026, p. 60.

[1] Rittmann M. Uzbekistan's Domestic Violence Reforms Fall Short // Human Rights Watch official website. – March 4, 2026. – Paragraph 3. – URL: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2026/03/04/-uzbekistans-domestic-violence-reforms-fall-short>

[2] Reform and Reality: Measuring Uzbekistan's Progress in the Fight Against Domestic Violence – IPHR // <https://iphronline.org/articles/reform-and-reality-measuring-uzbekistans-progress-in-the-fight-against-domestic-violence/>

[3] SafeLives (UK). DASH risk assessment for domestic abuse practitioners. Official website: [safelives.org.uk](https://safelives.org.uk)

[4] López-Ossorio, J. J., et al. (2020). The VioGén System: Police risk assessment of gender-based violence in Spain. Official reports of the Ministry of the Interior (Spain) and the scientific journal "Psychosocial Intervention," 29(2), pp. 67-77.

[5] Center for Justice Innovation (USA). Domestic Violence Courts: A Global Perspective. // courtinnovation.org

[6] Ley Orgánica 1/2004, de 28 de diciembre, de Medidas de Protección Integral contra la Violencia de Género. Boletín Oficial del Estado

[7] UN Women (2012). Handbook for National Action Plans on Violence Against Women.