UDC 342.9
DOI https://doi.org/10.17721/2227-796X.2020.1.04

THE OBJECT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFENSE IN THE QUALIFICATION AND SYSTEMATISATION OF DOMESTIC ADMINISTRATIVE-TORT LEGISLATION ON ROAD TRANSPORT

The article deals with the subject of administrative misconduct in road transport and its role in the rulemaking and enforcement activities. The basic doctrinal approaches to understanding the object of administrative misconduct in road transport are summarized. It is concluded that there is no single vision of their nature and content in domestic administrative law. The necessity to harmonize scientific positions and develop a unified concept of the object of administrative misconduct (including administrative misconduct in road transport) at all levels of its generalization and objectification is substantiated.

On the basis of the analysis of modern scientific researches and the current administrative-tort legislation the classification of objects of administrative offenses in the road transport is made. The author's definitions of the concepts of general, generic, species and direct object of administrative offenses in road transport are formulated. Their actual content is specified. The essence of the main and additional object of administrative misconduct is revealed. The polysubjectiveness of the majority of administrative offenses in the road transport is ascertained.

The role of the object of administrative misconduct in the structuring and systematization of domestic administrative-tort legislation is investigated. It is determined that the generic object of administrative misconduct is the main criterion for the division of the Special part of the Code of Administrative Offenses into separate Chapters. Topical issues of legal regulation of administrative-tort relations in road transport are highlighted. A set of legislative proposals aimed at harmonizing the structure of the Code of Administrative Offenses, in particular, regarding the regulation of liability for administrative offenses in road transport, has been elaborated.

Key words: object of administrative misconduct, qualification of administrative misconduct, road transport, administrative liability, administrative misconduct.

Alona Nefedova,
Postgraduate Student
at the Department
of Administrative, Financial
and Information Law
Kyiv National University
of Trade and Economics
31051984@ukr.net

Tatiana Shyrmova,
Senior Lecturer
at the Modern European
Languages Department
Kyiv National University
of Trade and Economics
orcid.org/0000-0003-3408-9448
t.tatyana1201@gmail.com

1. Introduction

An important element of the structuring of the legislation of Ukraine on administrative liability and the qualification of administrative misconduct is the determination of their object. It is the object of administrative misconduct that characterizes its antisocial orientation and social danger. In many cases, it is it that allows to distinguish a specific administrative offense from other such offenses. And, after all, it is the criterion for structuring the Code of Administrative Offenses as the pivotal act of administrative and tort legislation.

As a mandatory feature of administrative misconduct, the object of the assault determines the orientation, the course and the results of the qualification. On its basis the factual action is identified as a tort of a certain type (criminal, administrative, civil or otherwise), it is concluded in which proceedings it should be considered, the range of subjects of qualification is defined, its tools, algorithm and procedural forms are determined. Without defining the object, qualification of an administrative offense, a priori, is impossible. Because its absence or uncertainty does not allow to consider human behavior as socially dangerous and entailing legal (in particular, administrative) responsibility.

Against this background, issues of administrative misconduct have traditionally attracted the attention of the wide scientific community. Their importance for administrative law science, rulemaking and jurisprudence is ascertained by V.B. Averyanov, Y.P. Bityak, V.K. Kolpakov, O.V. Kuzmenko, S.G. Stetsenko and many other well-known scientists. Researchers of organizational and legal aspects of responsibility for misconduct in transport A.V. Gurzhiy, D.Y. Veselov, G.K. Golubeva, V.V. Donenko, O.V. Drozdov, E.V. Tsiba also recognize importance of these issues. However, despite the unanimous emphasis on the role of the object of administrative misconduct, the representatives of national administrative law do not show a unified view of its essence, structure, classification and a number of other important aspects.

The purpose of the article is to identify the object of administrative misconduct in road transport and to formulate a unified approach to its understanding of its nature, content and levels of concretization.

2. Presenting the main material

Domestic theory of administrative law posits a rule according to which any administrative offense has a destructive effect not only on the correspondent social connection, but also on the macrosystem of social relations (Gurzhii, 2003). Of course, the impact of a certain administrative misconduct on such a system is almost imperceptible. However, on a social scale, administrative misconduct, the actual number of which reaches almost astronomical indicators, undoubtedly undermines the stability of the whole system of relations protected by administrative and tort law. In view of this, such a system is regarded as *a common object of administrative misconduct*. This approach underlies virtually all current research on liability for administrative offenses in road transport. However, their authors are far from equally defining the borders of the common object of such misdeeds. For example, N. Bortnyk and S. Esimov extend them to: "the totality of social relations, the protection of which is ensured by the rules of the Code of Administrative Offenses" (Bortnik, Eshimov, 2016). From G.K. Golubieva's viewpoint, they cover: "public relations, regulated by the rules of administrative legislation, protected by administrative sanctions in order to ensure the proper functioning of the order of administration, protection of property, rights and freedoms of citizens" (Golubeva, 2008). In turn, A.V. Gurzhiy understands under the general object of administrative misconduct in road transport the whole multitude of public relations protected by administrative penalties (Gurzhi, 2012).

In our view, the most reasonable approach seems to be the latest one. On the one hand, the current Code of Administrative Offenses is by far not the only act of domestic legislation that regulates administrative liability and protects public relations from unlawful encroachment (therefore, under neither conditions, nor can it, nor the sanctions provided by it, determine the limits of the general administrative misconduct). On the other hand, it is well-known that administrative-tort norms provide giude and protection of public relations regulated by many different branches of law, in particular, administrative, civil, economic, criminal-procedural, criminal-executive, transport, land, etc. All of these relationships suffer from the negative impact of administrative misconduct and thus, in their totality, serve as a common object.

3. The object of administrative misconduct in road transport

Certainly, the general object of administrative misconduct in road transport is of great importance for their proper qualification. A.O. Storozhenko quite rightly emphasizes: "often, on the basis of features of a common object, an authorized subject of qualification can make a grounded conclusion about the administrative-tort nature of the act, or vice versa – about his criminal-legal, civil-legal, business law, etc. Nature (Storozhenko, 2008)". However, this is not enough to determine on a basis of the object the specific administrative-tort standard required for the application, to distinguish between "related" administrative offenses or something else.

This predetermines necessity of the analysis of the object of administrative misconduct (including misconduct in road transport) at different stages of its

specification. In particular, within the common object it is customary to distinguish certain groups of public relations, which more defined and clearly characterize the anti-social orientation of administrative misconduct. Such groups of social relations are referred to as "generic objects".

4. Axiological and branch objects of administrative misconduct

As a rule, in domestic administrative law, generic objects of administrative misconduct are distinguished by two main criteria: axiological and brunch. The first (axiological) criterion is the general social values around which the social relations protected by the administrative-tort law are formed. According to this criterion public relations concerning property; public relations regarding public order; public relations regarding the exercise of popular will, etc. can be defined as generic objects.

Instead, the second criterion is the branch or sphere of social life in which relevant social relations are formed. According to this criterion, the following generic objects of administrative misconduct are distinguished: public relations in industry; public relations in the field of trade; public relations in the field of standardization; public relations in the military sphere; public relations in transport, etc.

Both of these criteria formed the basis for the structuring of the Special Section of the Administrative Code into separate chapters (Gurzhii, 2009; Gurzhi, 2015). Some chapters of this part of the Code have accumulated rules on liability for administrative misconduct that infringe upon certain socially significant values (above all, these are Chapters 6, 14, 15 and 15-A of the Code of Administrative Offenses). The rest states about responsibility for misconduct in a particular field or field of public life (Chapters 5, 7–13 of the Code of Administrative Offenses have been formed on the basis of an industry criterion). In this connection, the following fact cannot be overlooked. Almost all researchers recognize the generic object of administrative misconduct as the main criterion for structuring the Code of Administrative Offenses and, in particular, the allocation of Chapter 10 "Administrative Offenses in the Transport, Road and Communications:" in its structure (Gurzhii, 2010). The logical continuation of this approach should be the statement that the public relations in the field of transport and communications are the generic object for all administrative offenses envisaged by this chapter of the Administrative Code. However, contrary to this logic, the vast majority of scholars, speaking of the specific administrative misconduct included in Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses, interprete their generic object much more narrowly.

Traffic law offenses have been systematized by the legislature within Chapter 10, – N. Bortnik and S. Eshimov write, but they add that: the generic object of these crimes (retained author's edition – A.N.) is road safety (Bortnik, Eshimov, 2016). Some other authors hold similar views, recognizing the generic object of certain industrial offenses: "road safety" (O.Yu. Salmanova, R.V. Yarova; Salmanova, 2002; Yarova, 2016), "public relations on road safety" (E.V. Tsiba)

(Tsyba, 2016), "public relations regarding road safety or the road safety itself" (A.S. Sobakar) (Sobakar, 2015), "the established order of public relations in the field of road safety " (V.V. Donenko) (Donenko, 2003), "specific relations that fall under the category of "road traffic" (that is, they have certain generic characteristics) and are protected by administrative and legal norms that provide for liability for unlawful encroachment on them" (V. Gorkava) (Gorkava, 2017), "provided state of protection of life, health of people, their interests, as well as the interests of others while moving people and goods by motor vehicles, as well as people without vehicles on the roads" (Koller, 2011).

Without going into the terminological nuances of these definitions, it should be noted that some of them contradict both the position of the legislator and the initial principles of the research within which they were formulated. At the same time, their authors, as a rule, do not burden themselves with detailed arguments. However, single attempts to justify the anchoring of a generic object of particular violations to the field of the road traffic are unconvincing. It is worth noting that, basing on an individual vision of its content and scope, some researchers propose to review the structure of Chapter 10 and the Specific part of the Code of Administrative Offenses. Some of them insist on the separation of norms about responsibility for administrative offenses in the field of road traffic into the independent chapter of the Code of Administrative Offenses (Sobakar, 2015). Instead, others consider it advisable to "break" Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses into several independent chapters which would regulate liability for: administrative misconduct in transport; administrative misconduct in the field of road economy; administrative misconduct in the sphere of communications (Gurzhii, 2013).

In our view, both the idea of fragmentation of Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses, and the proposed ways of its implementation, are highly doubtful. Moreover, both the theoretical validity of this step and its practical expediency are in doubt. In particular, the allocation of rules on liability for administrative offenses in the field of road traffic in the independent chapter of the Code of Administrative Offenses (along with Chapter 10) will destroy the architectonics of the Special part of the Code of Administrative Offenses, based on the structural model: "a separate chapter of the Code of Administrative Offenses protection of separate branch / sphere of public relations". In turn, though the division of Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses into several "branch chapters", does not contradict to this principle, but it is deprived of practical sense. After all, as a result of this division, the vast majority of the provisions of Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses, will be "transferred" to the chapter on liability for administrative offenses in transport. The only notable novelty will be the emergence of two small chapters (each of them consists of 2–3 articles) in the structure of the Special part of the Code of Administrative Offenses about responsibility for misconduct in the field of road economy and in the sphere of communications.

5. Cocretization of the object of administrative misconduct in road transport

Going to the next (species) level of concretization of the object of administrative misconduct in road transport, it should be noted that its analysis is more scientific and theoretical than practical. In fact, to date, domestic science has not formed a clear criterion for the selection of a specific object of administrative misconduct.

One of the few known attempts to outline such a criterion was made by V.K. Kolpakov, O.K. Chernovsky and V.V. Gordiev, according to whom: "the existence of systematic legislation within the generic object (which testifies to its corresponding independence and systematic nature) should become a correct criterion for the determination of a species object of administrative misconduct" (Kolpakov, Chernovsky, Gordev, 2010). But it is quite obvious that such an approach cannot be considered universal. By and large, it allows to define species objects only for those administrative misconduct that encroaches on public relations, regulated by specialized complex legal acts (for example, the Law of Ukraine "On Road Transport"). At the same time, this criterion makes it impossible to define a species object for violations of the direct prohibitions of the Code of Administrative Offenses, such as: petty hooliganism, forgery of travel tickets, damage to payphones, etc.

In general, the definitions of the species object of administrative misconduct in the legal literature are not lacking, but for the most part they are not informative enough. Almost all scientists, while constructing authorial definitions, are limited to stating that a species object of administrative misconduct is a group of homogeneous public relations, allocated within a certain generic object (Milovidova, 2016), (Vasilyov, 2016). In this case, the species objects of certain administrative misdeeds are determined utilitarianly, taking into account one or another scientific purpose. As a consequence, many different concepts of the species object of administrative misconduct in transport can be found in the domestic scientific and legal literature. Their specificity depends on which subsystem of social relations the author focuses on.

We are not going to determine the most successful concept of a species object, since the content of most of them is determined by the context of specialized scientific research. Let us note only that they can all be useful for the in-depth systematization of the regulatory material of Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses. For today, in the systematization of the provisions of this Chapter, only brunch criterion is more or less traced. At the same time, at the lower level, that is, "inside" the normative blocks on liability for different means of transport, separate articles (groups of articles) of the Code of Administrative Offenses are located without a clear logical sequence. The same can be said about the internal structure of some articles. Their division into parts and points is not always logical. Undoubtedly, all this regulatory array needs to be organized into a harmonious regulatory system, and at several levels at once: sectoral, sub-sectoral, functional and so on. And then the main doctrinal approaches to the definition and classification of species objects of administrative misconduct can come useful for a legislator.

6. Direct object of administrative misconduct

The next and highest level of specification of an administrative misconduct object is the so-called direct object. According to the analysis of the scientific and legal literature, practically it is impossible to study the substantive aspects of liability for administrative offenses in transport without consideration of their direct objects. However, at the same time many researchers in this brunch do not reveal the essence of this concept and do not define it, but only specify the social relations, which, in their opinion, are the direct object of this or that misconduct. It should be noted that conceptual differences in the understanding of the direct object of administrative misconduct in transport become apparent while considering such concretizations.

In particular, referring to the direct object of administrative misconduct in the field of road safety, Y.S. Koller emphasizes that such object is the specific public relations in the field of traffic safety, taken under the protection of a certain article of the Code of Administrative Offenses (Sobakar, 2015). Speaking about the direct object of speeding, V.K. Kolpakov and V.V. Gordyev propose to understand under it: "state of safety on a certain road" (thus the authors consider specific public relations protected by the administrative sanction as the direct object of an administrative misdemeanor) (Kolpakov, Gordeev, 2016). According to V.V. Donenko, the direct object of driving a vehicle in a state of intoxication may be: public relations in the field of road safety, as well as life, health and property, and the relations in the field of traffic management, that is, the the established order of management" (Donenko, 2003). But O.V. Drozdov and A.O. Sobakar came to the conclusion that the objects of road traffic offenses were the life, health and property of its participants, their rights and legitimate interests, and established management order (Drozdov, Sobakar, 2015).

In this connection, first of all, it should be emphasized on the falseness of the thesis that public relations protected by a certain article of the Code of Administrative Offenses is a direct object of the administrative misconduct. The direct object is a single phenomenon. It is associated only with those relationships that have been broken (destabilized) in the result of commiting a specific offense. Instead, the vast majority of articles in Section 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses provide for liability for a number (sometimes several dozen) of administrative misconduct, many of which encroach on different social relationships. Thus, one article of the Code of Administrative Offenses can protect a very wide range of public relations, which are not always broken by a particular misdemeanor, and therefore do not act as a direct object of it.

For the same reason, it is impossible to agree with the excessive extension of the borders of a direct object by including in it a large variety of social relations (concerning the protection of the right to life and health, property protection, established management procedures, etc.). None of the administrative offenses provided for in Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses directly affect such a large number of objects. It can only impinge them indirectly – through

the destabilization of certain social ties in the field of transport. Therefore, only the latter can be considered as its direct object.

On the whole, the most justified is the position of V.K. Kolpakov and V.V. Gordeev, who in this context are talking about specific social relations protected by administrative sanction. However, this position can also be clarified, since the relevant public relations are not always the object of administrative misconduct, but only in the case of enroachment on their security (speaking simplier, there is no object of the offense without the offense itself). In our opinion, this fact should be obligatory reflected both in the general definition of the direct object of administrative misconduct and in the concretization of the direct objects of specific misdeeds in road transport.

With this in mind, the direct object of an administrative offense can be defined as: *protected by administrative-tort sanction public relations whose security and stability are violated as a result of an unlawful encroachment.*

7. The main and additional objects of administrative misconduct

Along with the classification of objects of administrative misconduct by degree of concretization (general-generic-specific-direct), in the theory of administrative law, it is customary to divide the objects of administrative misconduct into basic and additional. This division is based on the idea that some administrative misconduct always encroaches on two or more objects, that is, the are polyobjects. At the same time, from the point of view of systematization of administrative-tort legislation, qualification of misdemeanors and prosecution of offenders, only one of them, which lies in the plane of the generic object (the main object), is crucial. Simultaneously, other objects, although they suffer from the same misdemeanor, do not directly affect its qualification and legislative classification as a specific category of offenses (additional objects).

A clear example is the administrative misconduct provided by the Article 124 of the Code of Administrative Offenses "Violation of traffic rules, which caused damage to vehicles, cargo, roads, streets, railroad crossings, road structures or other property". This category of misconduct at the same time encroah on both public relations about road safety and property relations. The first ones determine the place of Article 124 in the structure of the Code of Administrative Offenses (in particular, its affiliation with Chapter 10), determine the specifics of penalties provided by this article (for example, deprivation of the right to drive a vehicle) and are subject to mandatory establishment in qualification. For this reason, they are considered the main object of misconduct. Instead, property relations in this case serve as an additional object, the clarification of which is purely ancillary.

In general, the classification of the object of administrative misconduct as major or additional is determined by the position of the legislator. The main object is considered to be the object of administrative misconduct, which is in the plane of the generic object, reflected in the name of the corresponding chapter of the Special part of the Administrative Code (Gurzhii, 2011).

No denying the role of the legislator in the classification of objects of administrative misconduct, it should be noted that the position of the legislator in this case is not always indisputable. At present, it is difficult to call some articles (parts of articles) of Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses as its organic component. Against the background of the generic object outlined in the title of this chapter, they seem to be an artificial "incorporation" into the general logic of its construction.

First of all, it concerns the Article 119 of the Code of Administrative Offenses "Violation of the rules of using road transport and electric transport". Despite its highly expressive name, this article provides for responsibility not only for violations of the rules of using transport, but for violations in other spheres of social life. It is quite obvious that the main direct objects of the offenses provided by it are the public relations concerning: property (Part 1 of Article 119 of the Code of Administrative Offenses), environmental protection (Part 2 of Article 119 of the Code of Administrative Offenses), ensuring public order (Part 3 of Art. 119 of the Code of Administrative Offenses). Instead, relations in the field of transport services, relations in the field of fire safety, relations in the field of health care are additional objects of the offense.

Such an approach to the systematization of the content of the Code of Administrative Offenses does not fit into the common notion of qualitative technique of rulemaking. Weak correlation between the names of Chapters (generic object) and individual articles (main direct object), cloning of virtually identical administrative and tort bans – all this leads to unjustified accumulation of the normative array, breaks its logical structure, complicates the qualification of administrative misconduct and application of administrative and tort standards.

The highlighted problem is complex. By and large, it concerns not only the Article 119 of the Code of Administrative Offenses, but also a number of other articles (parts of articles) of Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses, which provide for liability for administrative misconduct in the various modes of transport and communications. Therefore, this problem should be solved on the basis of a comprehensive approach. In our view, all the provisions of Chapter 10 of the Code of Administrative Offenses, which provide for liability for property damage, environmental damage and public nuisance, should be transferred to Chapters 6, 7 and 14 of the Code of Conduct, respectively.

8. Conclusions

Summarizing the above, we can conclude that the exact identification of the object of administrative misconduct in road transport is of great scientific and practical importance. It has a significant impact on the systematization of administrative and tort legislation, defines measures for its improvement. It is the guaranty of the proper qualification of traffic offenses, the rationality of administrative proceedings and the proper application of certain administrative and tort rules.

However, many issues related to the doctrinal definition and practical identification of the object of administrative misconduct in road transport remain

unresolved. These include, in particular, the issue of its definition, the issue of its classifications, its role in rulemaking, and many others. Mostly, they are multidimensional and debatable. However, in the light of reforming domestic administrative-tort legislation (in particular, the prospect of adopting the new Code of Administrative Offenses (Gurzhii, 2004) there is an objective need to harmonize scientific positions and develop a single concept of administrative object. misdeeds at all levels of its generalization and objectification.

Bibliography:

1. Гуржій Т.О. Логіко-філософські категорії і класифікація об'єктів адміністративного делікту. *Право України*. 2003. № 1. С. 13–17.

2. Бортник Н., Єсімов С. Зміст адміністративної відповідальності за вчинення правопорушень у сфері забезпечення безпеки дорожнього руху *Вісник Національного університету "Львівська політехніка"*. 2016. № 855. С. 38–47.

3. Голубєва Г.К. Адміністративно-правова кваліфікація порушень водіями правил експлуатації автотранспортних засобів : дис. ... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.07. Київ, 2008. С. 233.

4. Гуржій А.В. Сутність і значення адміністративно-правової кваліфікації. *Право і суспільство*. 2012. № 1. С. 197–200.

5. Стороженко О.М. Адміністративно-правова кваліфікація зловживань монопольним (домінуючим) становищем на ринку : дис... к. ю. н. : 12.00.07. Київ, 2008. С. 183.

6. Гуржій Т.О. Актуальні проблеми законодавчого регулювання адміністративно-деліктних відносин у сфері безпеки дорожнього руху. *Право України*. 2009. № 3. С. 90–95.

7. Гуржій А.В. Об'єкт правопорушення як критерій структуризації адміністративно-деліктного законодавства. *Юридична наука*. 2015. № 4. С. 14–19.

8. Гуржій Т.О. Адміністративно-правові проблеми забезпечення безпеки дорожнього руху в Україні : монографія : Харків : Тимченко, С. 480.

9. Салманова О.Ю. Адміністративно-правові засоби забезпечення міліцією безпеки дорожнього руху : дис… канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.07. Харків. 2002, С. 232.

10. Ярова Р.В. Адміністративна відповідальність спеціальних суб'єктів – водіїв автотранспортних засобів : дис... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.07. Київ. 2016, С. 235.

11. Циба Є.В. Адміністративна відповідальність за порушення правил перевезення пасажирів та вантажів автомобільним транспортом в Україні : дис... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.07. Донецьк, 2011. С. 228.

12. Собакарь А.О. Адміністративна відповідальність за правопорушення у сфері безпеки дорожнього руху : монографія / Ю.С. Коллер, А.О. Собакарь. Київ, 2015. С. 204.

13. Доненко В.В. Керування транспортом у стані сп'яніння: адміністративно-деліктні проблеми : монографія / В.В. Доненко, В.К. Колпаков. Дніпропетровськ : Юридична академія, 2003. С. 196.

14. Горкава В. Адміністративна відповідальність у сфері дорожнього руху: теоретико-правові аспекти. *Вісник Національного університету "Львівська політехніка"*. 2017. № 865. С. 190–197

15. Коллер Ю.С. Об'єкт адміністративного правопорушення у сфері безпеки дорожнього руху. *Право і суспільство*. 2011. № 2. С. 134–138.

16. Гуржій А.В. Адміністративна відповідальність за порушення правил дорожнього перевезення небезпечних вантажів та проїзду великогабаритних і великовагових транспортних засобів : дис. ... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.07. Київ. 2013 С. 210 .

17. Колпаков В.К., Черновський О.К., Гордєєв В.В. Порушення правил дорожнього руху : колізійність новел і правове регулювання : монографія. Чернівці : Чернівецький нац. ун-т, 2010. С. 328.

18. Міловідова С.В. Попередження та протидія адміністративним правопорушенням в Україні : дис. ... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.07. Київ. 2016. С. 231.

19. Василів С.С. Адміністративно-правові засади підвідомчості розгляду справ про адміністративні правопорушення : дис. ... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.07. Львів, 2016, С. 245.

20. Колпаков В.К., Гордєєв В.В. Теорія адміністративного проступку : монографія. Харків, 2016. С. 344.

21. Дроздов О.В., Собакарь А.О. Адміністративно-юрисдикційна діяльність *Державної автомобільної інспекції МВС України*: монографія / Дроздов О.В., Собакарь А.О. Київ. 2015 С. 194.

22. Гуржій Т.О. Адміністративне право України : [навчальний посібник]. Київ. 2011. С. 680.

23. Гуржій Т.О. Перспективи розвитку вітчизняного адміністративно-деліктного законодавства. *Адміністративне право і процес*. 2004. № 3. С. 156–158.

References:

1. Gurzhii T.O. (2003) Logical and philosophical categories and classification of objects of administrative tort / Law of Ukraine. № 1. Pp. 13–17.

2. Bortnik N., Eshimov S. (2016) Contents of administrative responsibility for committing offenses in the field of traffic safety. *Bulletin of the National University* "Lviv Polytechnic". Law. 855, pp. 38–47.

3. Golubeva G.K. (2008) Administrative and legal qualification of violations by drivers of the rules of operation of vehicles : dis. ... Cand. lawyer. Sciences : 12.00.07 / Golubieva Galina Kyrylivna. Kyiv, pp. 233.

4. Gurzhii A.V. (2012) The essence and importance of administrative and legal qualifications. *Law and Society*. No. 1. Pp. 197–200.

5. Storozhenko O.M. (2008) Administrative and legal qualification of abuse of monopoly (dominant) position in the market: Dis ... k. date: 12.00.07. Kyiv : VMURL "Ukraine", pp. 183.

6. Gurzhii T.O. (2009) Actual problems of legislative regulation of administrative-tort relations in the field of road safety. *Law of Ukraine.* № 3. Pp. 90–95.

7. Gurzhi A.V. (2015) The object of an offense as a criterion for structuring administrative-tort legislation. *Law*. № 4. Pp. 14–19.

8. Gurzhii T.O. (2010) Administrative and legal problems of road safety in Ukraine. Monograph: Kharkiv : Timchenko, Pp. 480.

9. Salmanova O.Yu. (2002) Administrative and legal means of ensuring traffic safety by the police: dis. lawyer. Sciences: 12.00.07 / Salmanova Elena Yurievna. Kharkiv, pp. 232.

10. Yarova R.V. (2016) Administrative responsibility of special subjects – drivers of vehicles : dis ... Cand. lawyer. Sciences : 12.00.07 / Yarova Ruslana Vasylivna. Kyiv, pp. 235.

11. Tsyba E.V. (2016) Administrative responsibility for violation of the rules of carriage of passengers and goods by road in Ukraine : dis ... Cand. lawyer. Sciences : 12.00.07 / Tsiba Evgeniy Vladimirovich. Donetsk, 2011. Pp. 228.

12. Sobakar A.A. (2015) Administrative liability for traffic safety offenses: a monograph / Yu.S. Koller, AO Sobakar. Kyiv : MP Lesya, Pp. 204.

13. Donenko V.V. (2003) Management of intoxicated transport: administrative and tort problems : [monograph] / V.V. Donenko, V.K. Kolpakov. Dnepropetrovsk : Law Academy, pp. 196.

14. Gorkava V. (2017) Administrative responsibility in the field of traffic: theoretical and legal aspects. *Bulletin of the National university "Lviv Polytechnic". Law*. No. 865. Pp. 190–197

15. Koller Y.S. (2011) The object of an administrative offense in the field of road safety // Law and Society. No 2. Pp. 134–138.

16. Gurzhii A.V. (2013) Administrative responsibility for violation of the rules of road transportation of dangerous goods and passage of large and heavy vehicles : dis. ... Cand. lawyer. Sciences : 12.00.07 / Gurzhiy Anna Valerievna. Kyiv, pp. 210

17. Kolpakov V.K., Chernovsky O.K., Gordev V.V. (2010) Traffic Violations : *Novel Conflicts and Legal Regulation* : A Monograph. Chernivtsi : Chernivtsi Nat. Univ., pp. 328.

18. Milovidova S.V. (2016) Prevention and Countering Administrative Offenses in Ukraine : Dis. ... Cand. lawyer. Sciences : 12.00.07 / Milovidova Svetlana Valerievna; State Higher Educational Institution "Kyiv Vadim Hetman National Economic University". Kyiv, pp. 231.

19. Vasilyov S.S. (2016) Administrative and legal principles of the jurisdiction of consideration of cases of administrative offenses : diss. ... Cand. lawyer. Sciences : 12.00.07 / Vasilyov Solomiya Stepanovna; Lviv Polytechnic National University. Lviv, 2016, pp. 245.

20. Kolpakov V.K., Gordeev V.V. (2016) The theory of administrative misconduct. Monograph. Kharkiv : Kharkov legal. Pp. 344.

21. Drozdov O.V., Sobakar A.A. (2015) Administrative and Jurisdictional Activity of the State Automobile Inspectorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine: monograph / Drozdov, V., Sobakar, A.O. Kyiv : "MP Lesya", pp. 194 .

22. Gurzhii T.O. (2011) Administrative Law of Ukraine: [textbook] / Kyiv: CST, pp. 680.

23. Gurzhii T.O. (2004) Prospects for the development of national administrative-tort legislation. *Administrative Law and Process*. 2004. № 3. Pp. 156–158.

ОБ'ЄКТ АДМІНІСТРАТИВНОГО ПРОСТУПКУ У КВАЛІФІКАЦІЇ ТА СИСТЕМАТИЗАЦІЇ ВІТЧИЗНЯНОГО АДМІНІСТРАТИВНО-ДЕЛІКТНОГО ЗАКОНОДАВСТВА ЩОДО АВТОМОБІЛЬНОГО ТРАНСПОРТУ

Альона Нефедова,
аспірантка кафедри адміністративного, фінансового та інформаційного права Київського національного торгово-економічного університету
31051984@ukr.net

Тетяна Ширмова,
старший викладач кафедри сучасних європейських мов Київського національного торгово-економічного університету
orcid.org/0000-0003-3408-9448
t.tatyana1201@gmail.com

Стаття присвячена питанням об'єкта адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті та його ролі в нормотворчій і правозастосовній діяльності. Узагальнено основні доктринальні підходи до розуміння об'єкта адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті. Зроблено висновок про відсутність єдиного бачення їх природи та змісту у вітчизняній адміністративно-правовій науці. Обґрунтовано необхідність

узгодження наукових позицій та вироблення єдиного концепту об'єкта адміністративних проступків (в тому числі адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті) на всіх рівнях його узагальнення та об'єктивізації.

На підставі аналізу сучасних наукових досліджень та чинного адміністративно-деліктного законодавства здійснено класифікацію об'єктів адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті. Сформульовано авторські дефініції понять загального, родового, видового та безпосереднього об'єкта адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті. Конкретизовано їх фактичний зміст. Розкрито сутність основного та додаткового об'єкта адміністративних проступків. Констатовано полісуб'єктність більшості адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті.

Досліджено роль об'єкта адміністративних проступків у структуризації та систематизації вітчизняного адміністративно-деліктного законодавства. Встановлено, що родовий об'єкт адміністративного проступку є головним критерієм поділу Особливої частини Кодексу України про адміністративні правопорушення на окремі Глави. Висвітлено актуальні проблеми правового регулювання адміністративно-деліктних відносин на автомобільному транспорті. Вироблено комплекс законодавчих пропозицій, спрямованих на гармонізацію структури Кодексу України про адміністративні правопорушення, зокрема в частині регулювання питань відповідальності за адміністративні проступки на автомобільному транспорті.

***Метою статті** є визначення об'єкта адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті та формування єдиного підходу до розуміння його природи, змісту та рівнів конкретизації.*

***Система методів**, що використовується під час дослідження окремих питань статті: історичний метод (коли і ким вперше було запроваджено), діалектичний метод (місце та роль держави в регулюванні визначень об'єкта адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті), метод моделювання (яким має бути адміністративно-правовий механізм регулювання визначення об'єкта адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті).*

***Результати.** Важливим елементом структуризації законодавства України про адміністративну відповідальність та кваліфікації адміністративних проступків є визначення їх об'єкта. Саме об'єкт адміністративного проступку характеризує його антисоціальну спрямованість та суспільну небезпеку. У багатьох випадках саме він дозволяє відмежувати конкретний адміністративний проступок від інших подібних правопорушень. І саме він є критерієм структурування КУпАП як стрижневого акту адміністративно-деліктного законодавства.*

Будучи обов'язковою ознакою складу адміністративного проступку, об'єкт посягання визначає спрямованість, перебіг і результати кваліфікації. На його основі фактичне діяння ідентифікується як делікт певного типу (кримінальний, адміністративний, цивільний тощо). Робиться висновок про те, у рамках якого провадження його слід розглядати, окреслюється коло суб'єктів кваліфікації, визначаються її інструменти, алгоритм і процесуальні форми. Без встановлення об'єкта кваліфікація адміністративного проступку a priori неможлива. Адже його відсутність або невизначеність не дозволяють розглядати людську поведінку як суспільно небезпечну й таку, що тягне за собою юридичну (зокрема адміністративну) відповідальність.

***Висновки.** Підсумовуючи викладене, можемо констатувати, що точне встановлення об'єкта адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті має важливе наукове і практичне значення. Воно чинить помітний вплив на систематизацію адміністративно-*

деліктного законодавства, визначає заходи його вдосконалення. Воно є запорукою правильної кваліфікації транспортних правопорушень, раціональності адміністративного провадження та належного застосування окремих адміністративно-деліктних норм.
Водночас чимало питань, пов'язаних із доктринальним визначенням та практичним встановленням об'єкта адміністративних проступків на автомобільному транспорті, лишаються до кінця не вирішеними. Це, зокрема, і питання його дефініції, і питання його класифікацій, і його роль у нормотворенні, і багато інших. Здебільшого вони мають багатоаспектний і дискусійний характер. Тим не менш, у світлі реформування вітчизняного адміністративно-деліктного законодавства (зокрема перспективи прийняття нового КУпАП – Кодексу України про адміністративні проступки [23, с. 156]) є об'єктивна потреба в узгодженні наукових позицій та виробленні єдиного концепту об'єкта адміністративних проступків на всіх рівнях його узагальнення та об'єктивізації.

Ключові слова: об'єкт адміністративного проступку, кваліфікація адміністративних проступків, автомобільний транспорт, адміністративна відповідальність, адміністративний проступок.