Tešović Olga[*]
https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3121-8752

CONCEPTUALIZING JUDICIAL TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC TRUST – FRAMEWORKS FOR COMMUNITY-CENTERED JUSTICE

ABSTRACT: Judicial transparency and public trust represent the foundations of a functional rule of law and democratic governance. Transparency encompasses institutional openness, procedural clarity, and the public perception of fairness, forming the basis for accountability, equitable justice, and participatory governance. Despite growing global efforts, achieving substantive transparency remains a significant challenge for judicial systems. This paper examines the theoretical underpinnings of judicial transparency and trust, presenting a universal framework for integrating these principles into justice systems. Through a comparative analysis of global case studies, it identifies applicable strategies—including the use of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI) and blockchain—to improve transparency, enhance inclusivity, and address systemic inequalities. The findings show that transparent practices and participatory mechanisms strengthen public trust and inclusivity, offering practical guidance for future reforms.

Keywords: judicial transparency, public trust, participatory governance, procedural justice, emerging technologies in justice.

---

[*]LLD, Independent Research Associate, Belgrade, Serbia, e-mail: otolgates@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Judicial systems, as pillars of democratic societies, are entrusted with upholding the rule of law and delivering justice impartially. Their legitimacy hinges on the trust and confidence they inspire in the public. This legitimacy is not only derived from the formal authority vested in them but also from the perception of their integrity, transparency, and fairness (Tyler, 1990). However, in many societies, judicial systems face a crisis of trust fueled by perceived inefficiency, opacity, and systemic inequities (Mentovich, Prescott & Rabinovich-Einy, 2023).

Transparency in the judiciary serves multiple functions. It allows citizens to monitor and hold institutions accountable, understand judicial processes, and foster an informed dialogue on justice delivery. The conceptualization of transparency extends beyond merely providing access to information-it entails ensuring procedural clarity, institutional openness, and fostering a public perception that justice is accessible and fair (Bannister & Connolly, 2011). These facets collectively reinforce the legitimacy of judicial institutions (Ginsburg & Garoupa, 2015).

Despite growing global efforts to enhance transparency, many judicial systems face challenges such as inefficiency, corruption, and societal skepticism. For example, studies show that even in systems with procedural reforms, public trust often lags due to perceived inequities (Haavisto, 2002). This paper explores how judicial systems can address these challenges through conceptual models and practical mechanisms that embed transparency and public engagement.

2. Theoretical framework

Judicial transparency and public trust are deeply rooted in foundational theories of legitimacy, the public sphere, and participatory governance. These frameworks provide a comprehensive lens for understanding how judicial systems can achieve openness and accountability while fostering citizen trust and participation. In this section, we delve deeper into these theoretical underpinnings, exploring their relevance and interconnections within the judicial context.

2.1. Legitimacy theory

Legitimacy theory posits that the authority of institutions is contingent upon their acceptance by the governed. Tyler (1990) argues that this acceptance

hinges on perceptions of procedural justice rather than mere compliance through coercion. Procedural justice involves four key dimensions: fairness of decision-making, neutrality, respectful treatment of individuals, and trustworthiness of authorities. Institutions perceived as procedurally just are more likely to be viewed as legitimate and to foster voluntary compliance with their decisions.

In the context of judicial systems, legitimacy is closely tied to transparency. Transparent judicial processes allow the public to see how decisions are made, ensuring that they are based on objective criteria rather than favoritism or corruption (Ginsburg & Garoupa, 2015). For example, publishing court rulings, providing access to hearings, and explaining legal reasoning contribute to perceptions of fairness and impartiality.

Research also highlights the cyclical nature of legitimacy: public trust strengthens institutions, and strong institutions further reinforce trust (Mentovich, Prescott & Rabinovich-Einy, 2023). Thus, transparency serves both as a mechanism to build trust and as a signal of institutional commitment to fairness.

2.2. Public sphere theory

Habermas (1989) conceptualizes the public sphere as a domain where private citizens engage in rational-critical debate about public issues, shaping collective understanding and influencing institutional practices. Judicial transparency is pivotal in facilitating this discourse, providing citizens with the information necessary to evaluate and discuss the judiciary's performance.

Transparent judicial systems contribute to a vibrant public sphere by ensuring accessibility and openness in their operations. For example, livestreaming court proceedings or providing plain-language summaries of rulings enables citizens to participate meaningfully in dialogues about justice and legal reform (Fung, 2006). These practices demystify legal processes, reducing the perceived gap between legal authorities and the public.

Furthermore, Habermas emphasizes the bidirectional nature of transparency: it is not only about institutions disseminating information but also about being receptive to public input. This dynamic exchange strengthens the public's role as a check on judicial power and enhances the judiciary's responsiveness to societal needs.

2.3. Participatory governance

Participatory governance extends the principles of the public sphere by embedding citizen involvement directly into institutional decision-making

processes. Cornwall (2008) describes participatory mechanisms as tools to democratize institutions, making them more inclusive and responsive to diverse perspectives. In the judicial context, this might involve establishing advisory councils, creating forums for public consultations, or implementing participatory budgeting for legal aid services.

One of the most compelling aspects of participatory governance is its potential to address systemic inequities. Marginalized groups often face unique barriers in accessing justice, such as linguistic hurdles, socioeconomic disadvantages, or cultural stigmas. By actively involving these groups in the design and oversight of judicial practices, participatory governance ensures that transparency is coupled with equity and inclusivity (Fukuyama, 2014).

This framework also highlights the iterative nature of trust-building. Public engagement is not a one-time event but a continuous process of dialogue and adaptation. As citizens see their input reflected in institutional changes, trust deepens, creating a virtuous cycle of engagement and accountability.

2.4. Interconnectedness of frameworks

While legitimacy theory, public sphere theory, and participatory governance offer distinct insights, their interconnectedness is critical for a holistic understanding of judicial transparency and trust. Legitimacy provides the foundation for public trust; the public sphere facilitates discourse and scrutiny; and participatory governance operationalizes engagement into actionable practices.

For example, a judiciary that values legitimacy will prioritize procedural justice (Tyler, 1990) and openness to public discourse (Habermas, 1989). By incorporating participatory mechanisms (Cornwall, 2008), it ensures that transparency is not merely symbolic but genuinely responsive to societal needs. This synergy creates a robust framework for fostering trust and accountability in judicial systems.

3. Judicial transparency and its dimensions

Judicial transparency is foundational for enhancing accountability, promoting trust, and ensuring equitable access to justice. To fully understand its scope, it is vital to delve deeper into the nuances of its institutional, procedural, and perceptual dimensions. These dimensions offer a comprehensive framework for analyzing the judiciary's role in fostering democratic governance.

3.1. Institutional transparency

Institutional transparency concerns the systematic openness of judicial institutions in their structure, governance, and decision-making processes. It is the cornerstone of accountability, as it enables external actors-citizens, media, and civil society organizations-to evaluate the judiciary's performance.

Judicial independence is a key factor in maintaining public trust, as political interference in the judiciary undermines perceptions of fairness and impartiality. Research on Serbia's judiciary indicates that while institutional guarantees of independence exist, de facto implementation remains inconsistent, leading to judicial dissatisfaction and concerns about undue political influence (Dabetić, 2024).

Open access to court data, such as caseload statistics and judicial expenditures, strengthens public oversight. Studies show that countries with robust judicial data transparency tend to have higher perceived integrity in their judicial systems (Bannister & Connolly, 2011; Fukuyama, 2014).

Transparency in the appointment, promotion, and ethical oversight of judges can mitigate perceptions of bias or favoritism. Institutions like the Judicial Service Commission in South Africa publicly disclose appointment processes to ensure legitimacy (Judicial Service Commission, 2025).

Also, digital innovations, such as open-access judicial databases, amplify the judiciary's capacity for transparency. The European Court of Human Rights provides an online case-law database, HUDOC, which exemplifies institutional transparency on an international scale (European Court of Human Rights, 2025).

Emerging technologies like blockchain offer innovative tools for ensuring institutional accountability. Blockchain's decentralized and tamper-proof ledger system can enhance transparency in judicial operations, such as recording judgments, case filings, and court expenses. For example, courts could use blockchain to maintain publicly accessible and immutable records of judicial proceedings, fostering trust in institutional integrity (Bannister & Connolly, 2011).

Institutional transparency often encounters resistance due to concerns over judicial independence. Balancing openness with the judiciary's need to operate free from undue influence remains a critical challenge.

3.2. Procedural transparency

Procedural transparency emphasizes the clarity, accessibility, and predictability of legal processes. It directly influences public perceptions of fairness and inclusivity in judicial systems.

Many legal systems are criticized for their complex and technical language, which alienates the public. Initiatives like "plain language judgments," implemented in New Zealand courts, make judicial decisions more accessible to non-specialists (Fung, 2006).

Virtual hearings and e-filing systems are also important. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the adoption of virtual court hearings and electronic filing systems. These digital tools not only increase procedural transparency but also reduce barriers for individuals who cannot physically attend court proceedings (Mentovich, Prescott & Rabinovich-Einy, 2023).

The widespread shift to remote court proceedings during the pandemic has raised critical legal and ethical questions, particularly concerning fair trial rights, technological limitations, and judicial efficiency. Studies on remote trials emphasize the need to balance efficiency with procedural safeguards, ensuring that digital solutions do not compromise due process or access to justice (Krstić, Tešović, Milovanović & Dakić, 2021). A comparative analysis of international standards in remote judging further highlights the importance of maintaining procedural fairness and aligning virtual court practices with probation systems to ensure equitable legal outcomes (Tešović, 2024a).

Procedural transparency focuses on ensuring that judicial processes are clear, accessible, and predictable. AI-powered tools are increasingly being used to demystify legal processes. For instance, AI-driven chatbots and virtual assistants can guide users through court procedures, explain legal jargon, and provide updates on case statuses. These tools not only reduce barriers to justice for individuals unfamiliar with legal systems but also streamline communication between courts and the public (Mentovich, Prescott & Rabinovich-Einy, 2023).

Furthermore, AI's predictive analytics capabilities can assist courts in managing caseloads by identifying bottlenecks and suggesting resource allocation strategies. Virtual court platforms, accelerated during the COVID-19 pandemic, combine AI with video conferencing to enable remote hearings. This not only improves procedural efficiency but also expands access for geographically and economically marginalized populations.

Procedural transparency also involves educating the public about their legal rights. In India, legal literacy programs have been launched to empower marginalized communities with knowledge of procedural law.

Ensuring procedural transparency requires resources, training, and technological infrastructure, which may be limited in developing judicial systems. Additionally, overemphasis on procedural reforms without addressing deeper systemic inequities can lead to disillusionment among the public.

3.3. Perceptual transparency

Perceptual transparency focuses on the public's trust in the judiciary's commitment to openness and fairness. It is shaped not only by direct experiences but also by societal narratives and media representation.

Transparency in legal processes must be balanced with confidentiality to maintain trust in the justice system. The principle of lawyer-client confidentiality is fundamental in ensuring fair representation and upholding the right to a fair trial. European legal frameworks emphasize that any breach of this confidentiality could compromise both procedural justice and public confidence in the legal system (Bingulac & Miljenović, 2021).

Media play a crucial role in shaping public perceptions of judicial transparency. While constructive reporting can enhance public understanding, sensationalist media coverage often distorts the image of the judiciary and erodes trust. For instance, media coverage of corruption scandals often overshadows broader transparency initiatives (Cornwall, 2008). Legal frameworks must balance transparency with safeguards to protect procedural integrity and the presumption of innocence (Tešović, 2024b).

Engaging communities through town halls, public consultations, and participatory forums helps address misconceptions about the judiciary and enhances perceptual transparency. Cultural contexts shape how transparency is perceived. In collectivist societies, for example, judicial transparency might be evaluated more through outcomes benefiting the community than through procedural openness (Fukuyama, 2014).

Changing public perceptions requires sustained effort and alignment between rhetoric and practice. Transparency initiatives that fail to deliver tangible improvements in access or equity risk being perceived as performative.

4. Comparative analysis: judicial transparency and engagement across contexts

A comparative analysis of judicial transparency and engagement reveals diverse strategies adopted globally to address systemic challenges and strengthen public trust. By examining key examples across regions, this section highlights successes, challenges, and lessons learned, demonstrating how transparency and community participation can be tailored to specific legal, cultural, and social contexts.

4.1. North America: open court principles and technology integration

In North America, judicial systems have long prioritized the principle of open courts, which underpins public trust and accountability. The United States exemplifies this approach through its emphasis on access to judicial information. The Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) system provides online access to federal court documents, facilitating transparency by allowing individuals to track case progress and review court decisions. However, its subscription-based model has drawn criticism for limiting access for low-income populations, highlighting the need for equitable transparency mechanisms (Bannister & Connolly, 2011). Additionally, livestreaming high-profile court cases has expanded public engagement, although sensationalist media coverage occasionally distorts public perceptions and undermines trust (Habermas, 1989). Balancing openness with judicial independence remains a critical challenge.

Canada has advanced transparency and accessibility through initiatives such as the Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLII), which offers free online access to judicial decisions, statutes, and regulations. This institutional transparency is complemented by proactive judicial outreach programs. Canadian judges regularly engage with the public through lectures, school visits, and seminars, demystifying judicial processes and fostering trust. The Canadian model demonstrates that transparency efforts must combine open access to legal information with direct community engagement to be truly effective (Cornwall, 2008).

4.2. Europe: institutional reforms and public participation

In Europe, Finland provides a notable example of how procedural reforms can enhance judicial transparency and engagement. Finland's comprehensive judicial reform in 1993 introduced principles of orality, immediacy, and concentration to improve transparency and efficiency. Orality emphasized verbal communication during hearings, fostering direct interaction between judges, parties, and witnesses. The principle of immediacy ensured that judicial decisions were based solely on evidence presented in the main hearing, while concentration streamlined proceedings into uninterrupted sessions. These reforms reduced procedural delays, improved public understanding of judicial processes, and enhanced trust in the judiciary (Haavisto, 2002).

Finland also prioritized community participation through preliminary hearings and lay judge systems, encouraging informal dialogue and public

representation in decision-making. However, cultural resistance among legal professionals and limited technological infrastructure initially posed challenges to implementation. Over time, training and consistent adaptation of procedures ensured the reforms' success, highlighting the importance of aligning judicial transparency initiatives with cultural and institutional contexts. Finland's experience demonstrates the effectiveness of participatory approaches in enhancing procedural fairness and building trust.

On the other hand, Estonia represents a technology-driven approach to judicial transparency. Its e-Court system enables citizens to access case progress, submit filings electronically, and participate in virtual hearings. Additionally, the judiciary publishes anonymized case data to promote transparency while protecting privacy. However, digital literacy and infrastructure gaps among rural and elderly populations underscore the importance of addressing the digital divide to ensure equitable access (Fukuyama, 2014).

The United Kingdom integrates institutional transparency with grassroots engagement. Judicial annual reports provide detailed insights into court performance and reforms, ensuring accountability. Community panels in magistrate courts incorporate public input into sentencing practices, bridging the gap between judicial authorities and citizens. The U.K. example underscores that combining institutional transparency with participatory governance fosters trust and accountability (Fung, 2006).

4.3. Asia: tradition and innovation in judicial transparency

In Asia, India's judiciary has embraced innovative practices to improve transparency and engagement. Landmark cases are livestreamed from the Supreme Court, ensuring public access to critical judicial proceedings. Additionally, Lok Adalats, or People's Courts, provide accessible and affordable dispute resolution mechanisms that prioritize community involvement. Despite these advancements, persistent delays and backlogs in traditional courts erode trust, highlighting the need for broader procedural reforms (Bobocel & Gosse, 2015).

Japan's judiciary exemplifies the integration of transparency with cultural sensitivity. The Saiban-in system, introduced in 2009, involves lay judges in criminal trials, promoting public participation and trust. Public outreach programs, including judicial lectures and exhibitions, enhance legal literacy and demystify judicial processes. Japan's experience demonstrates that transparency initiatives must respect cultural norms to avoid resistance and ensure meaningful engagement (Beier, Eib, Oehmann, Fiedler & Fiedler, 2014).

4.4. Africa: grassroots engagement and localized approaches

In Africa, Kenya's Judiciary Transformation Framework (2012–2016) illustrates the power of integrating transparency and community engagement. Performance management tools evaluate courts using transparent metrics, while Court Users Committees bring together judicial officers, civil society, and citizens to address systemic challenges. However, political interference and limited resources remain significant obstacles to sustaining these initiatives (Cornwall, 2008).

Rwanda's Abunzi mediation committees provide a grassroots model for judicial engagement. Community-elected mediators resolve disputes locally, reducing reliance on formal courts and fostering public trust. By emphasizing dialogue and cultural relevance, the Abunzi system addresses systemic inequities and enhances access to justice. Rwanda's experience highlights the effectiveness of decentralized, community-driven models in building trust and addressing resource constraints (Fukuyama, 2014).

4.5. Latin America: transparency in post-conflict societies

Latin American countries such as Colombia and Brazil have leveraged judicial transparency to address systemic inequities and rebuild trust in post-conflict contexts. In Colombia, Peace and Reconciliation Courts integrate restorative justice principles, prioritizing public participation to heal societal divisions. Open Justice Platforms provide real-time access to judicial proceedings, promoting accountability and transparency. However, ensuring judicial safety and impartiality in politically sensitive cases remains a critical challenge (Mentovich, Prescott & Rabinovich-Einy, 2023).

In Brazil, Public Defender's Offices facilitate legal representation for marginalized groups and host community dialogues to enhance engagement. Digital access to court records reduces procedural delays and promotes institutional transparency. These initiatives demonstrate the importance of addressing systemic inequities through participatory and transparent practices, fostering trust among historically underserved communities (Bannister & Connolly, 2011).

4.6. Key insights from comparative analysis

Judicial transparency and engagement are essential for fostering trust and accountability, but their implementation must be tailored to each region's unique socio-political and cultural context. Technology serves as a powerful

enabler of transparency but requires substantial investment in infrastructure and digital literacy to bridge equity gaps. Balancing judicial independence with openness is critical to maintaining impartiality while enhancing accountability. Finally, grassroots and community-driven approaches, such as Finland's participatory hearings or Rwanda's Abunzi committees, underscore the importance of culturally relevant and localized solutions in addressing systemic barriers and building trust.

This comparative analysis demonstrates that while the principles of transparency and engagement are universal, their successful application depends on nuanced strategies that respect local contexts and priorities.

5. Conclusions and future directions

Judicial transparency and public trust are foundational to the legitimacy and effective functioning of legal systems. This analysis has demonstrated that transparency not only enhances accountability and procedural fairness but also reinforces public confidence in judicial institutions. Trust, in turn, sustains public engagement and institutional legitimacy, creating a positive feedback loop (Tyler, 1990).

To ensure the success of transparency and engagement initiatives, reforms must align with local socio-political contexts and address systemic barriers. Institutional transparency can be strengthened through clear policies and open data practices, while procedural reforms, such as simplifying legal language and adopting alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, improve accessibility (Fukuyama, 2014). Equally important is perceptual transparency, which requires ongoing efforts to align public perceptions with judicial realities through outreach and inclusive dialogue (Cornwall, 2008).

Emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI) and blockchain, present transformative opportunities for judicial transparency. AI tools can streamline case management, provide predictive analytics to support decision-making, and improve public access to legal information through automated systems. For example, AI-driven chatbots could answer basic legal questions and assist users in navigating judicial procedures (Mentovich, Prescott & Rabinovich-Einy, 2023). Blockchain technology, on the other hand, can enhance accountability by creating tamper-proof records of judicial decisions and proceedings, ensuring integrity and transparency (Bannister & Connolly, 2011). However, these technologies also raise concerns about data privacy, algorithmic bias, and equitable access, underscoring the need for robust governance frameworks and ethical guidelines (Habermas, 1989).

Future research should focus on the intersection of technology and judicial transparency, exploring how innovations like AI and blockchain can be harnessed responsibly to enhance trust and efficiency. Comparative studies across diverse legal systems can uncover best practices and common challenges, particularly in addressing systemic inequities (Bobocel & Gosse, 2015). Moreover, interdisciplinary approaches that integrate legal, technological, and sociological perspectives are critical to designing inclusive and effective transparency initiatives.

In envisioning the future, embedding transparency and engagement into judicial systems is not merely a reform but a transformation. By leveraging innovation, fostering inclusivity, and prioritizing trust, judicial systems can strengthen their legitimacy and ensure that justice is accessible, fair, and responsive to all members of society. Achieving this vision requires sustained commitment and collaboration across legal, technological, and community stakeholders.

Tešović Olga
Naučni saradnik, Beograd, Srbija

KONCEPTUALIZACIJA SUDSKE TRANSPARENTNOSTI I JAVNOG POVERENJA – OKVIRI ZA PRAVOSUĐE USMERENO KA ZAJEDNICI

APSTRAKT: Sudska transparentnost i javno poverenje predstavljaju temelje funkcionalne vladavine prava i demokratskog upravljanja. Transparentnost obuhvata institucionalnu otvorenost, proceduralnu jasnoću i percepciju pravičnosti u javnosti, čineći osnovu za odgovornost, pravičnu pravdu i participativno upravljanje. Uprkos rastućim globalnim naporima, postizanje suštinske transparentnosti i dalje ostaje izazov za pravosudne sisteme. Ovaj rad ispituje teorijske osnove sudske transparentnosti i poverenja, predstavljajući univerzalni okvir za integrisanje ovih principa u pravosudne sisteme. Kroz komparativnu analizu globalnih studija slučaja, identifikuju se primenljive strategije, uključujući korišćenje savremenih

tehnologija poput veštačke inteligencije (AI) i blokčejna, u cilju unapređenja transparentnosti, jačanja inkluzivnosti i rešavanja sistemskih nejednakosti. Nalazi pokazuju kako transparentne prakse i participativni mehanizmi jačaju poverenje i inkluzivnost, nudeći praktične smernice za buduće reforme.

Ključne reči: *sudska transparentnost, javno poverenje, participativno upravljanje, proceduralna pravda, savremene tehnologije u pravosuđu.*

References

1. Bannister, F., & Connolly, R. (2011). The Trouble with Transparency: A Critical Review of Openness in e-Government. *Policy & Internet*, *3*(1), pp. 1–30. DOI: http://doi.org/10.2202/1944-2866.1076

2. Beier, S., Eib, C., Oehmann, V., Fiedler, P., & Fiedler, K. (2014). Influence of Judges' Behaviors on Perceived Procedural Justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *44*(1), pp. 46–59. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12199

3. Bingulac, N., & Miljenović, D. (2021). Lawyer Confidentiality. *Pravo – teorija i praksa, 38*(3), pp. 42–52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5937/ptp2103042B

4. Bobocel, D. R., & Gosse, L. (2015). Procedural justice: A historical review and critical analysis. In: Cropanzano R. S., & Ambrose M. L. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace*. (pp. 51–87). New York: Oxford University Press, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199981410.013.3

5. Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': Models, Meanings and Practices. *Community Development Journal*, *43*(3), pp. 269–283. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn010

6. Dabetić, V. (2024). Independence of the Judiciary as a Path and a Goal – The Voice of the Profession. *Pravo – teorija i praksa, 41*(2), pp. 57–75. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5937/ptp2402057D

7. European Court of Human Rights (2025). HUDOC case-law database. Downloaded 2025, January 25 from https://www.echr.coe.int/Pages/home.aspx?p=caselaw/HUDOC

8. Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux

9. Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review*, *66*, pp. 66–75. Downloaded 2025, January 25 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4096571?origin=JSTOR-pdf

10. Ginsburg, T., & Garoupa, N. (2015). *Judicial Reputation: A Comparative Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

11. Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press

12. Haavisto, V. (2002). *Court Work in Transition: An Activity-Theoretical Study of Changing Work Practices in a Finnish District Court – academic dissertation*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki

13. Judiciary Transformation Framework (Kenya) (2012–2016). Judiciary of Kenya. Downloaded 2025, January 25 from https://kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/JudiciaryTransformationFramework.pdf

14. Judicial Service Commission (2025). *About the JSC*. Downloaded 2025, January 25 from https://www.judiciary.org.za/index.php/judicial-service-commission/about-the-jsc

15. Krstić, I., Tešović, O., Milovanović, I., & Dakić, D. (2021). *Remote Trials: Legal Framework and Practice.* Belgrade: Forum of Judges of Serbia

16. Mentovich, A., Prescott, J. J., & Rabinovich-Einy, O. (2023). Legitimacy and Online Proceedings: Procedural Justice, Access to Justice, and the Role of Income. *Law & Society Review*, *57*(2), pp. 189–213. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12653

17. Tešović, O. (2024a). Evaluating International Standards in Remote Judging: Comparative Analyses and the Intersection with Probation Practices. In: Tomita. M. & Ungureanu. R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference "Designing the Future of Criminal Justice System Under the Lens of Technology"*, (pp. 132–138). Timisoara: Univeristatea de Vest de Timisoara, Romania, DOI: http://doi.org/10.26352/I516-SPECTO-2024

18. Tešović, O. (2024b). Transparency of Criminal Proceedings and the Media: Principle, Limits, and Challenges. In: Kostić, J. & Matić Bošković, M. (eds.), *VIII International Scientific Conference – Media, Criminal Law, and Judiciary: Thematic Collection of Papers of International Importance.* (pp. 167–178). Belgrade: Institute of Comparative Law; Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research

19. Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press