JOURNAL OF MODERN SCIENCE
SPECIAL ISSUE
5/59/2024
www.jomswsge.com

DOI: doi.org/10.13166/jms/194481

TOMASZ DEMENDECKI
Maria Curie-Sklodowska University
in Lublin, Poland
ORCID iD: orcid.org/0000-0001-6150-6337

DE-FORMALIZATION AND ELECTRONICIZATION CIVIL PROCEEDINGS AND PROCEDURAL GUARANTEES OF ITS SUBJECTS

Summary

Modern civil procedure should, as an example, fully ensure the right to a court for its participants and, at the same time, guarantee obtaining a just and lawful judgment within reasonable time in public proceedings before an impartial and independent court in an effective manner. Not in every case is the overriding goal of obtaining legal protection in the form of a just and lawful judgment easy to achieve. Often, obtaining delayed protection destroys its effectiveness. An unenforceable court judgment becomes merely a *paper* one. A natural obstacle in civil proceedings, which often prevents immediate provision of legal protection to entities seeking it, is the applicable principle of formalism, expressed as a rule in the obligation to comply with the requirements regarding the form, place and time when undertaking activities, failure to comply with which may result in procedural sanctions in a given civil proceeding. The regulations introducing the principle in question are absolute in nature, they are not subject to waiver or modification. The remedy for the stiffening of civil proceedings with the *straitjacket of formalism* is its simplification (de-formalization), either by introducing new types of proceedings, shaped by special regulations differently from the regulations defining the general model of proceedings, or by introducing individual procedural institutions, the use of which in the proceedings will allow for a simpler and at the same time faster search for protection of subjective rights. One of the ways of simplifying court procedures, in line with the trend of recent years, is also their electronicization, which replaces the traditional communication channel between the adjudicating body and the participants in the proceedings with a transmission channel in the ICT network, and even, in a basic form for now, enriching the proceedings with structures based on artificial intelligence. Although electronicization should serve in principle to both de-formalize and simplify court proceedings, it does not always lead to this effect, and the designations of the content and scopes of the concepts used remain autonomous and different from each other. The insurmountable limit of the processes modifying the modern model of civil proceedings should undoubtedly be the maintenance of guarantees and procedural principles, serving primarily to protect the asserted subjective rights and legally protected interests of the participants in the proceedings. Simplification or electronicization cannot remain a goal in itself. The effects of the recently conducted legislative processes, especially in the area of civil procedural law, are excellent evidence of this.

The attempt to demonstrate the presented research theses is possible thanks to the use of basic methodological and research instruments (using the dogmatic-legal method, comparative law method and case law analysis).

Keywords: *civil court proceedings, procedural rights and guarantees of the parties, parties to the proceedings, civil case, de-formalization of court proceedings, electronicization of court proceedings, right to a court*

The purpose of civil proceedings is to implement – by a judicial body of the State in an appropriately regulated procedure – legal norms in accordance with their content and to introduce a state of legal certainty in the field of civil law relations. The institution of civil proceedings is therefore to serve to protect the interests of individual legal entities in the scope of their civil law relations. Such an understanding of the institution of civil p`roceedings and its purpose can be considered the result of the historical evolution of this institution, the starting point of which was the protection of the individual interests of individuals (Siedlecki, 1959, p. 96). Fulfilment of this purpose of civil proceedings is a reminiscence of the fundamental human right – the right to acourt; the constitutionally defined (Article 45, Section 1 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997, Journal of Laws of 1997, No. 78, item 483 as amended) right to a fair and public hearing of the case without unjustified delay by a competent, independent, impartial and unbiased court. The right to a court is commonly perceived as a directive addressed to the legislature, derived from the principle of democratic state governed by law, the validity of which in the system necessitates the adaptation of previous provisions excluding judicial protection of citizens' rights to the constitutional principle as an interpretative guide (Wyrzykowski, 998, p. 81). This directive is included in the components of the right to a court, which include the right of access to a court, the right to a fair and just determination of the court procedure, in accordance with the requirements of justice and publicity, the right to have the case heard by a court that meets the requirements of: jurisdiction; independence; impartiality and independence, and finally the right to a court judgment. The essence of the right to a fair and just determination of the court procedure, in accordance with the requirements of justice and publicity, involves providing the parties with procedural rights adequate to the subject of the proceedings. In practice, this means that the participants in the proceedings must have a real opportunity to present their arguments, and the court is obliged to consider them. According to the established position of the case law and scholarly opinion, they consist of: a) the right to be heard; b) allowing the parties to participate in the proceedings; c) the obligation to disclose in a clear manner the reasons for the decision, which is to

prevent its arbitrariness; d) and ensuring the predictability of its course for the participant in the proceedings (Szanciło, Stępień-Załucka, 2023, p. 225 et seq.).

Civil procedural law, when properly shaped, remains a *safeguard* for the correct implementation of the right to court of participants in the proceedings in accordance with all the procedural guarantees provided.

The currently applicable Polish Code of Civil Procedure of 1964 (The Act of 17 November 1964 – the Code of Civil Procedure, consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2023, item 1550, as amended; hereinafter referred to as the Code of Civil Procedure) regulates the basic principles of the construction of the court model of civil proceedings. At the same time, due to various historical accretions (this procedural law has been in force for almost 60 years with many modifications), it is subject to major and minor amendments, periodic trends. Nowadays, alongside many other processe, the process of de-formalization of civil proceedings (*reducing the degree of formalization of the proceedings*. According to S. Cieślak, whose view should be considered fully accurate, there is no alternative to the formalism of the proceedings, and the legislature only has the possibility of determining the degree of formalization of the procedure (Cieślak, 2008, pp. 94-99) is undoubtedly noticeable, associated both with its electronicization and computerization (Janowski, 2011, passim).

The entry *deformalize* (*odformalizować*) included in the PWN Dictionary of the Polish Language defines the word as: *to remove formalities, to simplify something* (https://sjp.pwn.pl/szukaj/odformalizowa%C4%87.html). The purpose of such a process, in relation not only to civil proceedings, but basically to any formalized proceedings, is to create for the authorized entity seeking protection the possibility of examining and resolving the case in accordance with its intention and interest, without unnecessary formalities.

Civil procedural law should create a framework for the actions of civil procedure participants, ultimately aimed at resolving a dispute arising from a civil case. Procedural regulations should therefore be as simple, coherent and friendly as possible for citizens, who, even without the assistance of a professional attorney, should be able to independently conduct relatively uncomplicated proceedings. It should be remembered that the procedure plays a supporting role in resolving the case, and procedural regulations are not a value in themselves. They are important insofar as they aim to protect

the rights of the procedure participants, to ensure the correct, efficient course of the proceedings or to implement other important values. This means that it is not desirable to create complicated regulations concerning the formal requirements of procedural documents, appeals, the course of the preparatory session, the course of the evidentiary proceedings, unless the adoption of specific regulations is absolutely necessary to ensure the correct course of the proceedings. It is necessary to postulate the maximum simplification and de-formalization of civil proceedings (as proposed by the Legislative Council under the Prime Minister in the opinion of 24 April 2020 on the changes proposed by the Legislative Council to the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure). De-formalization (gradual) usually concerns individual stages (phases) or the structure of specific procedural institutions, not the entire procedure, although one can sometimes get a false impression about this in external reception (an example of which are numerous separate proceedings that have not been fully and thoroughly regulated by the legislature under the procedural law, as well as completely different from the model of ordinary procedure, and to which, therefore, both special regulations and, to an unregulated extent, general regulations on *ordinary* civil procedure apply). Basically, court proceedings are *a contrario* based on a rule of formalism (most scholars in the field recognize procedural formalism as one of the fundamental procedural principles. See, among others, Siedlecki, 2001, p. 58; Broniewicz, 1983, p. 51; Dolecki, 2006, p. 48; H. Mądrzak, 1997, pp. 44–46; Jakubecki, 2006, pp. 349 et seq.) more or less strictly defined by the legislature, which is expressed in regulations of an absolutely binding nature, regulating individual procedural institutions. The principle of formalism is usually expressed in the obligation to comply with the requirements regarding the form, place and time when undertaking activities, failure to comply with which may result in negative procedural sanctions for the participant in the procedure concerned. It has an ordering character. It prevents uncertainty that could occur if the form of procedural actions were within the arbitrary discretion of the court or participants in the proceedings (Kaczmarek-Templin, 2007, p. 11). As scholars in the field correctly point out, compliance with formal requirements, primarily those concerning individual procedural actions that make up the entire proceedings as such, assessed by the adjudicating body, is of fundamental importance

from the perspective of protecting the interests and rights of the parties to the proceedings. Fulfilling formal requirements is a guarantee that the party has effectively performed a specific procedural action, and the content of its request defines the subject of the proceedings. However, as a stabilizing element, it usually does not keep up with constantly changing institutions. As it is correctly emphasized in the literature (Kaczmarek-Templin, 2007, p. 12), an inherent feature of civil proceedings is that they are legally regulated, i.e. they are subject to formal requirements (formalized). Completely de-formalized proceedings do not exist as a legal construct, because their existence would be contrary to the basic purpose of civil proceedings (Baur, 1973, p. 63). However, the legislature has the possibility to determine the degree of formalization of civil procedure.

The (gradual) de-formalization of court proceedings, provided that the party to the proceedings meets the minimum requirements or precisely articulates its request, can and should lead to an acceleration but also to a simplified (however, simplification of the proceedings will not always mean their less formalization. See resolution of the Supreme Court of 30 May 2000, III CZP 19/01, OSNC 2001, no. 12, item 170. See also resolution of the Supreme Court of 14 December 2022, II PZ 8/22, not published; resolution of the Supreme Court of 26 May 2021, III CZP 94/20, OSNC 2022, no. 1, item 2.) examination and ultimately also resolution of the case.

Initially, the tendency to de-formalize the proceedings was reflected in the Polish procedural law of 1964 at the institutional level, for example in the abolition of previously existing (in pre-war procedural legislation) rigorous provisions on the rejection of a claim due to the lack of jurisdiction of the court or improper procedure, on the change of the claim and in the introduction of new provisions, such as the court's ex officio summoning of non-defendants, against whom the case can only be examined jointly. This tendency is also reflected in the informal application of individual provisions of the Code, but taking into account their purpose and their relationship with other provisions. However, it should not manifest itself in failure to comply with the provisions of the Code or in the application of some simplifications in the proceedings, contrary to these regulations, because this is opposed by the rule of law (Siedlecki, 1959, pp. 103-104). This trend is of course maintained through subsequent, numerous amendments to the Code of Civil Procedure,

including the de-formalization of individual procedural activities, recording the course of court hearings, taking individual pieces of evidence within the evidentiary proceedings stage, issuing judgments or appealing against decisions made. Just as an example, among the numerous amendments to the procedural act, one can indicate the Act of 4 July 2019 amending the Act – the Code of Civil Procedure and certain other acts (Journal of Laws of 2019, item 1469). The justification for the draft of this act provides for: rationalization of the procedure with a civil case in terms of the objectives and costs of the proceedings; introduction of a preparatory proceedings phase aimed at ending the dispute without a hearing, and if this is not possible – preparation of the case for resolution at the first hearing date; setting a timetable for the proceedings in the case, indicating the date of completion of the case in the court of first instance; relieving the hearing of organizational and technical activities; including the parties in planning the court's activities in their case, and thus making the parties jointly responsible for the manner and time of examining the case in court; creating conditions and tools for effective search for alternative forms of resolving legal disputes; activating judges in the process of mediation between the parties. Of course, it should be clearly emphasized that multiple and fragmentary amendments have resulted in many regulations of the procedural law currently being inconsistent and sometimes even contradictory. The Code has lost its transparency and internal logic.

Another characteristic way of de-formalizing civil procedure is the introduction by the legislature of different types of proceedings (separate proceedings), which are characterized by a number of differences in relation to the model procedure. These proceedings, called separate proceedings, are regulated in Title VII of Book One, Part One of the Code of Civil Procedure, in individual sections, the current number of which does not correspond to the total number of separate proceedings. There are much more of these proceedings, as evidenced by the arrangement of Section III of Title VII adopted by the legislature (May, 2022, p. 279 et seq.). The criteria for distinguishing separate proceedings in the Code of Civil Procedure of 1930 were different, and what is more, they changed over the years. Initially, the differentiation was justified by the need to speed up uncomplicated cases (this concerned payment order proceedings and writ-of-payment proceedings); then the introduction of subsequent separate

proceedings was based on a different assumption, namely it was related to the nature of the cases and legal relations examined in separate proceedings, which, due to their social significance, required differentiation of legal and procedural protection. The establishment of procedural privileges for this category of cases was achieved by introducing specific general solutions or by creating new separate proceedings (Ereciński, 2009, p. 8 et seq.). Article 13 § 1 sentence 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure introduces the rule that the court hears cases according to the provisions on separate proceedings. This means that the provisions on such proceedings take precedence over the provisions on ordinary (general) procedural proceedings. It is possible to refer to the provisions on ordinary proceedings if a given issue is not regulated in separate proceedings. It should be remembered that the simplification of civil proceedings does not always involve its de-formalization. A characteristic example of this may be simplifications aimed at increasing the speed of proceedings, provided for in simplified proceedings. Simplified proceedings, as one of the types of separate proceedings, were introduced to the Code of Civil Procedure by the Act of 24 May 2000 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure, the Act on Registered Pledges and the Register of Pledges, the Act on Court Costs in Civil Cases and the Act on Court Bailiffs and Enforcement (Journal of Laws of 2000, No. 48, item 554, as amended), to include the examination of *minor*, *trivial* cases occurring in general, consumer trade. Simplifications concerning the indicated procedure consist, on the one hand, in streamlining and optimizing the evidentiary and appeal proceedings by accelerating and de-formalizing the court's activities, and on the other hand, in increasing formal requirements towards the parties, disciplining them when taking procedural actions (See justification of the resolution of the Supreme Court of 30 May 2001, III CZP 19/01, OSNC 2001, no. 12, item 170). Undoubtedly, for cases that are simple from the factual and legal side, simplified proceedings can be considered an effective means of pursuing claims, in which the speed of the protection provided can be combined with its quality (maintaining procedural standards and guarantees). The legislative actions of the legislature which still designs subsequent separate proceedings are assessed differently in the science of procedural law. The ongoing discourse among scholars of civil procedural law concerns not only the advisability of maintaining such a large number

of separate proceedings, but also the possible reconstruction of the Code of Civil Procedure or the creation of a new code, in order to return to a uniform model of examining civil cases in a process in which ordinary proceedings conducted on general principles are the rule, and separate proceedings are an exception confirming this rule (May, 2022, pp. 290-291).

In addition to the idea of de-formalization of civil proceedings, in recent years, its electronicization and even the use of artificial intelligence elements have also been pushed forward as part of the broadly understood computerization of the justice system. These terms are autonomous in nature, they are not synonyms; they are also not identical in scope. Undoubtedly, the implementation of all these ideas and the postulates they assume is aimed at obtaining a decision in the case faster, and thus effectively providing the state justice system with legal protection for the claim filed in civil proceedings.

The dissemination of advanced technologies extends to the interpretation of IT processes of establishing, applying and executing law. This is related to the computerization of law and the electronicization of legal transactions, and, as emphasized in the literature, computerization is treated as the one that arose earlier, which led to electronicization (Arkuszewska, 2019, p.22; Kościółek, 2012, p. 18). However, a different view on this issue can also be noted in the literature. J. Kosowski assumes, based on the exegesis of the concepts from everyday language: *computerization* and *electronization*, that the concept of electronization is primary, while computerization is secondary. The Dictionary of the Polish Language defines computerization as the use of modern methods of information processing in proceedings (https://sjp.pwn.pl/szukaj/informatyzacja/.html). Electronization, on the other hand, is the introduction of electronic devices to proceedings (https://sjp.pwn.pl/szukaj/elektronizacja.html). According to the cited Author, it is the introduction of electronic devices into the proceedings that opens the way to computerization, i.e. the use of modern methods of information processing. As the Author aptly emphasizes, electronicization does not always assume the use of modern methods of information processing, but only the simplest use of equipment, including videoconferencing, making an electronic signature, conducting e-evidence (Kosowski, 2022, p. 152).

In a broader sense, computerization refers to activities carried out on the basis of, within the framework of and for the needs of the law, and electronicization

is their effect. In a narrower sense, computerization refers to the operation of legal institutions, and electronicization refers to legal procedures, including court procedures (Janowski, 2011, p. 154). Technological development affects the improvement and refinement of most reactions undertaken by an entity. The most important role in this respect is played by the development of so-called information technology, which can be defined as the combination of the use of IT solutions – in particular computer hardware and software – with technological communication solutions in order to provide modern mechanisms that enable the performance of activities related to data processing. The development of information technology is accompanied primarily by two basic processes – electronicization and computerization. The Internet and technological advancement in the field of information and communication technologies have significantly changed the way of doing business and led to the increasingly widespread use of electronic means of communication, but also to the storage of data in electronic form instead of paper. These revolutionary and innovative applications have been equally extended to the justice system in a way that has transmuted extrajudicial dispute resolution techniques to ensure efficiency, fairness, speed, and economy of proceedings.

This expansion also covered the field of law, including civil procedural law (Arkuszewska, 2019, p. 5 et seq.). Today, electronicization in the area of civil procedural law includes, among others, the following institutions: electronic proceedings, service of documents, records, random case allocation system or videoconferencing, as well as electronic court repertories and court portals. Electronicization of civil proceedings is one of the forms of a broader process called computerization (Flaga-Gieruszyńska, 2016, pp. 2 et seq.). This concept was introduced into Polish legislation by the Act of 17 February 2005 on the computerization of the activities of entities performing public tasks (consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2014, item 1114)

Electronicization is a method and form of implementing the Act of 2005 on the computerization of the activities of entities performing public tasks in individual fields of its implementation. It is understood as allowing the use of ITC systems and means of collecting and transmitting information in civil proceedings, as well as the possibility of creating and using information in electronic form. Electronicization opens up a field for discussion on the issues

of admissibility and effectiveness of electronic procedural activities, as well as maintaining the standards of fair procedure that court proceedings should meet, so as not to lead to digital exclusion and not to deprive access to effective and efficient court protection at the same time. In practice, however, electronicization of proceedings requires continuous technological development Łazarska, 2023, p. 233). It should be noted that the first initiatives in the area of computerization of the public sector in Poland appeared together with the focus of legislative activities on the adjustment of legal regulations in the field of the use of information and communication technologies in administration and public services (Demendecki, 2021, passim). In 2000, a regulation was introduced in civil proceedings allowing the submission of procedural documents on electronic data carriers (Act of 24 May 2000 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure, the Act on Registered Pledges and the Register of Pledges, the Act on Court Costs in Civil Cases and the Act on Court Bailiffs and Enforcement, Journal of Laws of 2000, No. 48, item 554, as amended). In 2001, computerization of land and mortgage register proceedings was implemented (Act of 11 May 2001 amending the Act on Land and Mortgage Registers, the Code of Civil Procedure, the Act on Court Costs in Civil Cases and the Act on Notarial Services, Journal of Laws of 2001, No. 63, item 635), followed by interactive forms in the context of administrative proceedings in 2005 (Act of 17 February 2005 on the computerization of the activities of entities performing public tasks, consolidated text Journal of Laws of 2021, item 2070, as amended). In 2010, electronic payment proceedings (Act of 9 January 2009 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure, Journal of Laws of 2009, No. 26, item 156, as amended) and court records in electronic form (Act of 1 July 2010 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure, Journal of Laws of 2010, No. 108, item 684) were introduced into the Polish legal system within civil proceedings. In 2015, the issue of using electronic documents within evidentiary proceedings was precisely regulated in civil procedural law (in connection with the previously made amendment to the Civil Code), the automation of enforcement proceedings for the seizure of receivables from a bank account was provided for, and public databases of professional legal representatives were established, electronic access to public registers was ensured, the role of electronic communication in land and mortgage

register proceedings was strengthened, it was deemed permissible to conduct evidentiary activities and court hearings using modern technologies ensuring remote communication, additional procedural instruments were introduced for the parties in electronic payment proceedings, the use of electronic communication in the European order of payment procedure was made possible, and a legal framework was created for the Electronic Filing Office, which is to ensure interactive exchange of information between the court and the participants in the proceedings (Act of 10 July 2015 amending the Civil Code Act, the Code of Civil Procedure Act and certain other acts, Journal of Laws of 2015, item 1311. See also Regulation of the Minister of Justice of 26 April 2016 on the procedure for setting up and making an account available in the IT system supporting court proceedings, Journal of Laws of 2016, item 637, as amended).

As noted in the literature, despite the development of software development technologies, it has still not been possible to develop software in the field of law that would enable the generation of decisions with justification. This would require the introduction of complex software that would assess the dispute in terms of its merits, taking into account various substantive decisions or procedural configurations (Kościółek, Banaszewska, 2016, p. 22). The difficulty is undoubtedly posed by the individual way of resolving cases and their unpredictable course, which excludes the automation of all activities, especially since the participation of the human factor is important in the evaluation of evidence and sentencing (Sikorski, 2016, p. 47). A decision made with the participation of a human judge is based not only on similar decisions made in similar factual situations, the provision of law and the material collected in the case, but also on knowledge and life experience, which artificial intelligence does not possess so far. Above all, however, a robot judge cannot enjoy the attribute of independence and impartiality, which are essential components that guarantee the participants in the proceedings the proper exercise of their right to a court (Article 45, paragraph 1 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland). The need to use modern technologies has been and continues to be repeatedly postulated in the literature, especially in the context of streamlining the proceedings regulated by the currently applicable Code of Civil Procedure; in this case, attention is also drawn to the phenomenon of *obsolescence of the Act*, which has intensified *in connection with the development of science*

and technology (Łazarska, 2023, p. 233). The basic regulations contained in the Code of Civil Procedure, which directly regulate electronic institutions in the procedure, are relatively few. The following are worth mentioning, among others: Article 125 § 2, which allows for the submission of procedural documents on electronic data carriers; Article 187^{2}, which provides for the possibility of filing a lawsuit on electronic data carriers in certain cases; Article 235, which allows for videoconferencing; Articles 505^{28}-505^{37}, which regulate the principles and course of electronic writ-of-payment proceedings; Article 783 § 4, which provides for an electronic enforcement title (Szkurłat, 2010, pp. 11-12). The postulates concerning the further electronicization of civil proceedings include the introduction for the future of: as a rule – electronic communication with the court, including electronic service of documents and issuing judgments electronically; solutions protecting the rights of digitally excluded persons; electronic files and ensuring access to files via the Internet and in court registries (The Legislative Council at the President of the Council of Ministers in the opinion of 24 April 2020 on the changes proposed by the Legislative Council to the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure). At the same time, it seems inadmissible at the current stage of development of science and civilization, due to the guarantees of a fair trial, for a machine to be able to issue substantive judgments. Deficiencies of technical solutions will probably not be the only barrier for a long time to come. The fundamental problem is that there is no guarantee of creating impartial and independent software for adjudication. The justice system is based not only on legal assessments but also on moral, equitable and ethical ones. The justice system is therefore reserved for humans and the existing systems are not able to replace it today (Łazarska, 2023, p. 248).

The general idea of de-formalization and electronicization, and consequently: streamlining and accelerating civil court proceedings, which guided the national legislature in its legislative activity and resulted in numerous amendments to the procedural act, undoubtedly deserves full approval. This is because it corresponds to the right of citizens to a quick resolution of a civil case. Of course, one cannot directly equate quick court proceedings with the right to a fair trial, but rather, as part of the search for the *golden mean*, establish the right balance between these assumptions. Nevertheless, the aforementioned intention of the legislature should respect the universal

standards of protection of individual rights in civil proceedings, set by the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, EU law and international law, as well as the principle of procedural justice. The statement that the provisions of court proceedings *are primarily aimed at organizing the process in such a way that they provide the greatest possible sum of guarantees aimed at ensuring a proper and impartial administration of justice* is timeless (Miszewski, 1933, p. 11). The uncrossable boundary of these processes modifying the modern model of civil procedure should be the maintenance of guarantees and procedural principles.

It should be recalled that according to the CBOS (https://www.cbos.pl/SPISKOM.POL/2017/K_031_17.PDF.) survey conducted between 2-9 February 2017 (on a sample of 1016 people – direct method, with computer support), 51% of Poles assessed the activity of the justice system negatively. The respondents listed its most important problems as follows:

- excessive length of proceedings (48% of indications),
- ruling on the basis of insufficient evidence (15% of indications),
- frequent delays in hearings (15% of indications),
- poor work organization (11% of indications),
- improper treatment of citizens (8% of indications).

These studies indirectly show that the main expectation of the justice system is efficient and quick (https://prawo.gazetaprawna.pl/artykuly/1423876,zmiany-w-kpc-nowelizacja-postepowania-cywilnego.html), and at the same time reliably conducted proceedings (https://www.prawo.pl/prawnicy-sady/zmiany-w-procedurze-cywilnej-przyspiesza-procesy kosztem,496084.html).

This should also be the guiding principle for further legislative initiatives and actions in the area of civil procedural law.

References

Arkuszewska, A. (2019). Informatyzacja postępowania arbitrażowego. Warszawa. Wolters Kluwer.

Baur, F. (1973). Współczesne przemiany w procesie cywilnym (trans. J. Sobkowski), no. 3, pp. 60-63. Państwo i Prawo.

Broniewicz, W. (1983). Postępowanie cywilne w zarysie, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo PWN.

Cieślak, S. (2008). Formalizm postępowania cywilnego, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Beck

Demendecki, T. (2021). Sztuczna inteligencja a postępowania sądowe: (procedury prawne). Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Instytutu Wymiaru Sprawiedliwości.

Dolecki, H. (2006). Postępowanie cywilne. Zarys wykładu, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo PWN.

Ereciński, T. (2009). Postępowania odrębne *de lege lata* i *de lege ferenda* in: H. Dolecki, K. Flaga-Gieruszyńska eds., Ewolucja postępowania cywilnego wobec przemian politycznych, społecznych i gospodarczych. Materiały konferencyjne Ogólnopolskiego Zjazdu Katedr Postępowania Cywilnego, Szczecin–Niechorze, 28–30.9.2007 r., pp. 8-14. Warszawa, Wolters Kluwer.

Flaga-Gieruszyńska, K. (2016). Nowe oblicze prawa i informacji o prawie w dobie informatyzacji, in: K. Flaga-Gieruszyńska, J. Gołaczyński, D. Szostek (eds.), Informatyzacja postępowania cywilnego: teoria i praktyka, pp. 1-12. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Beck.

Jakubecki, A. (2006). Naczelne zasady postępowania cywilnego w świetle nowelizacji kodeksu postępowania cywilnego in: A. Oklejak (ed.), Czterdziestolecie kodeksu postępowania cywilnego, Zjazd katedr postępowania cywilnego w Zakopanem (7–9.10.2005 r.), pp. 349-370. Kraków, Zakamycze.

Janowski, J. (2011). Informatyka prawa. Zadania i znaczenie w związku z kształtowaniem się elektronicznego obrotu prawnego, Lublin, Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Kaczmarek-Templin, B. (2007). Formalizm procesowy a nowe przepisy odnoszące się do dokumentów w procesie cywilnym, no. 1, pp. 11-16. Prawo Mediów Elektronicznych.
Kosowski, J. (2022). Kierunki skutecznej elektronizacji procesu karnego, t. XVII, 19 (1), pp. 151-170. Biuletyn Stowarzyszenia Absolwentów i Przyjaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.

Kościółek, A. (2012). Elektroniczne czynności procesowe w sądowym postępowaniu cywilnym. Warszawa, Wolters Kluwer.

Kościółek, A. Banaszewska, A. (2016). Automatyzacja orzekania w europejskim postępowaniu nakazowym, in: B. Śliwczyński, L. Łuczak-Noworolnik (eds.), e-Wymiar sprawiedliwości w aspekcie europejskim, pp. 37-52. Poznań, Instytut Logistyki i Magazynowania.

Łazarska, A. (2023). Wpływ nowoczesnych technologii na metodykę pracy sędziego w postępowaniu cywilnym, in: R.A. Stefański ed., Srebrna księga jubileuszowa upamiętniająca XXV-lecie Wydziału Prawa i Administracji, pp. 231-248.Warszawa, Oficyna Wydawnicza. Uczelnia Łazarskiego.

May, J. (2022). Celowość utrzymania postępowania w sprawach z zakresu prawa pracy jako postępowania odrębnego. No 5, pp. 279-293. Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze
Mądrzak, H. Krupa, D. Marszałkowska-Krześ, E. (1997). Postępowanie cywilne, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Beck.
Miszewski, W. (1933). Jawność w procesie cywilnym w związku z przepisami kodeksu postępowania cywilnego, no. 1, pp. 11-23. Polski Proces Cywilny.
Siedlecki W., Świeboda, Z. (2001). Postępowanie cywilne. Zarys wykładu, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo PWN.
Siedlecki, W. (1959). Przebudowa sądowego postępowania cywilnego w Polsce Ludowej, no. 3, pp. 91-106, Ruch Prawniczy i Ekonomiczny.
Sikorski, G. (2016). Geneza, rozwój i perspektywy systemów informatycznych wspomagających procesy merytoryczne w sądach powszechnych, in: B. Śliwczyński, L. Łuczak-Noworolnik ed., e-Wymiar sprawiedliwości w aspekcie europejskim, pp. 47-63. Poznań, Instytut Logistyki i Magazynowania.
Szanciło, T. Stępień-Załucka, B. (2023). Sędzia robotem a robot sędzią w postępowaniu cywilnym w ujęciu konstytucyjnym i procesowym, no. 4, pp. 217-247 Prawo i Więź
Szkurłat, A. (2010). Wykorzystanie nowoczesnych technologii w postępowaniu cywilnym, Łódź.
Wyrzykowski, M. (1998). Zasada demokratycznego państwa prawnego in: W. Sokolewicz (ed.), Zasady podstawowe polskiej Konstytucji, pp. 81-92. Warszawa. Wydawnictwo Sejmowe.

Legal Acts

Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997, Journal of Laws of 1997, No. 78, item 483, as amended.
The Act of 17 November 1964 – the Code of Civil Procedure, consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2023, item 1550, as amended.
The Act of 4 July 2019 amending the Act – the Code of Civil Procedure and certain other acts Journal of Laws of 2019, item 1469.
The Act of 11 May 2001 amending the Act on Land and Mortgage Registers, the Code of Civil Procedure, the Act on Court Costs in Civil Cases and the Act on Notarial Services, Journal of Laws of 2001, No. 63, item 635.
The Act of 17 February 2005 on the computerization of the activities of entities performing public tasks, consolidated text Journal of Laws of 2021, item 2070, as amended
The Act of 9 January 2009 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure, Journal of Laws of 2009, No. 26, item 156, as amended.
The Act of 1 July 2010 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure, Journal of Laws of 2010, No. 108, item 684.
The Act of 24 May 2000 amending the Act – Code of Civil Procedure, the Act on Registered Pledges and the Register of Pledges, the Act on Court Costs in Civil

Cases and the Act on Court Bailiffs and Enforcement, Journal of Laws of 2000, No. 48, item 554, as amended.
The Act of 17 February 2005 on the computerization of the activities of entities performing public tasks, consolidated text, Journal of Laws of 2014, item 1114.
The Act of 10 July 2015 amending the Civil Code Act, the Code of Civil Procedure Act and certain other acts, Journal of Laws of 2015, item 1311.
The Regulation of the Minister of Justice of 26 April 2016 on the procedure for setting up and making an account available in the IT system supporting court proceedings, Journal of Laws of 2016, item 637, as amended.
Resolution of the Supreme Court of 30 May 2000, III CZP 19/01, OSNC 2001, no. 12, item 170.
Resolve of the Supreme Court of 14 December 2022, II PZ 8/22, not published;
Resolution of the Supreme Court of 26 May 2021, III CZP 94/20, OSNC 2022, no. 1, item 2.

Netography

https://www.cbos.pl/spiskom.Pol/2017/k_031_17.Pdf
https://prawo.gazetaprawna.pl/artykuly/1423876,zmiany-w-kpc-nowelizacja-postepowania-cywilnego.html
https://www.prawo.pl/prawnicy-sady/zmiany-w-procedurze-cywilnej-przyspiesza-procesy kosztem,496084.html
Odformalizować. Dostęp 10.08.2024 z https://sjp.pwn.pl/szukaj/odformalizowa%C4%87.html