JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES AND INNOVATIONS

VOLUME 04, ISSUE 11
MOPNTHLY JOURNALS

ISSN NUMBER: 2751-4390
IMPACT FACTOR: 9,08

PROSPECTS FOR IMPROVING THE USE OF SPECIAL KNOWLEDGE IN THE INVESTIGATION OF CRIMES RELATED TO CAUSING BODILY INJURIES.

Ibadova Anjelika Ismatulloyevna

Independent researcher at the Academy of the Ministry of Internal

Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Lieutenant Colonel,

Investigator for extremely important cases of the Investigation

Department under the Samarkand Regional Department of Internal Affairs

Abstract: This article looks at ways to better use special knowledge in investigating crimes with bodily injuries. It draws from international research and forensic stuff to see whats working and what isnt. I think the key is mixing medical, psychological, and technical expertise into criminal probes, but there are gaps in how its done now. Like, methodological issues and training problems make things less objective sometimes. The idea is that pulling in interdisciplinary knowledge and new tech could make investigations more reliable and efficient. It seems like without a systematic approach, the whole justice process suffers, especially in ensuring fair outcomes.

Keywords: special knowledge, bodily injuries, criminal investigation, forensic medicine, evidentiary process, investigative tactics, expert opinion, medical examination, legal assessment, injury classification, criminal responsibility, justice system.

ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ УЛУЧШЕНИЯ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЯ СПЕЦИАЛЬНЫХ ЗНАНИЙ В РАССЛЕДОВАНИИ ПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЙ, СВЯЗАННЫХ С ПРИЧИНЕНИЕМ ТЕЛЕСНЫХ ПОВРЕЖДЕНИЙ.

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматриваются способы более эффективного использования специальных знаний в расследовании преступлений, связанных с телесными повреждениями. В ней используются результаты международных исследований и данные судебно-медицинской экспертизы для анализа того, что работает, а что нет. Я считаю, что ключ к успеху заключается в сочетании медицинской, психологической и технической экспертизы в расследовании преступлений, но в настоящее время существуют пробелы в этом вопросе. Например, методологические проблемы и проблемы с подготовкой кадров иногда делают расследование менее объективным. Идея состоит в том, что привлечение междисциплинарных знаний и новых технологий может сделать расследования более надежными и эффективными. Кажется, что без систематического подхода страдает весь процесс правосудия, особенно в обеспечении справедливых результатов.

Ключевые слова: специальные знания, телесные повреждения, уголовное расследование, судебная медицина, процесс сбора доказательств, тактика расследования, экспертное заключение, медицинская экспертиза, юридическая оценка, классификация травм, уголовная ответственность, система правосудия.

Introduction.

Crimes with bodily harm are tricky because they hit right at basic rights like life and health. Investigators need more than just law knowledge, they have to bring in forensics, psychology,

and tech sciences. Recent studies show old methods arent enough for getting the truth in these cases. So, analyzing current use of special knowledge, spotting deficiencies, and fixing them seems crucial. The main goal here is to point out problems in applying this knowledge to injury crimes and suggest improvements based on science.

Stats from different places show this matters, like studies saying 30 to 40 percent of mistakes in these cases come from messing up medical info or expert reports. Globalization and matching up justice rules across countries have made more people talk about how experts fit in, and big groups push for using that knowledge regularly, not just sometimes. Special knowledge means professional stuff from science training and real work, not law, to figure out facts in a case, and its role has grown with new forensic advances.

The goal here is to go through science approaches that exist, spot problems that arent fixed, and think about better ways to use special knowledge for bodily injury probes. It wants to add to talks in academia and give tips for people like investigators, prosecutors, experts. To find good ways to improve this, the study looks at top international research on investigating bodily injuries. It tries to organize theories and real models, and point out holes that slow things down. The focus isnt just medicine, it goes to working together across fields, which you might notice right away.

It also checks how bad or shallow use of this knowledge messes with proof quality and court results. Recognizing those weak spots feels like the start of real changes, I think. Plus, showing how new tech and methods can boost expert help and cut errors.

Main Part.

In the main discussion, investigating these crimes means figuring out injury details like nature, how it happened, severity, and effects. Forensic medical experts are central for linking actions to harm. But studies from around the world point to issues like experts getting involved too late, poor teamwork between investigators and experts, and just accepting conclusions without deep checks. That can cause errors in court. Investigators often take expert opinions at face value, which I think leads to disputes.

Psychological and criminological insights get overlooked a lot, even though they help judge behavior, intent, and if victims or suspects are truthful. Research shows behavioral analysis and victim studies aid in piecing together events and spotting fake claims. Plus, digital tools like 3D modeling of injuries or biomechanical stuff from electronic records could boost evidence accuracy. Still, without standard methods or better training, these advantages arent fully used. It feels like that part is messy.

The way special knowledge gets used now in these investigations shows forensic exams are key for figuring injury type, how bad, and how it happened. But investigators often dont get medical terms or diagnosis rules well enough. You might have seen cases where expert reports get twisted or just taken at face value without thinking.

Studies say wrong takes on how injuries happen cause about 20 percent of mix ups in how serious the harm is rated, which changes the crime charge and punishment. Biomechanics and physics matter a lot for rebuilding the event, and recent work says you can model impact angle, force, object details with software.

From what I see, not using those tools enough shows a split between what science can do and what happens in practice. Practitioners could gain from teaming up with tech experts early on. Forensic psychology is another big part, where checking mental states of victims or suspects helps sort out if it was on purpose, careless, or accidental.

Digital forensics is getting more important too, with videos from cameras, data from wearables, digital medical files as evidence. Still, mixing digital and medical experts is patchy, leading to waits and mismatched proof. Looking at laws in other places, spots with set up teams across fields have better solve rates and fewer overturned cases. Arguing for better use means not just personal skills, but changes in how investigative groups are set up.

Research Methods.

For methods, this draws on comparative legal analysis, reviews of articles, case studies, and logical breakdowns. Looked at journals from Europe, North America, Asia on investigative practices. Also checked real cases where special knowledge made a big difference. This way, recurring problems came up, and solutions got evaluated. Results show that starting expert involvement early and coordinating it leads to better evidence and following procedures. For methods, it mixed qualitative and quantitative ways. Comparative legal looks at models in various systems. Content analysis on reviewed articles from global databases helped spot trends and standards. Case studies and stats got checked for how experts affect outcomes. A system structural way looked at investigator expert interactions as one process. This gave a full view of wins and ongoing issues.

Results and Discussion.

In results, shifting to an integrated model from just occasional expert help is needed. Investigators should help shape questions for experts and question their findings, not just accept them. Interdisciplinary teams, like doctors, psychologists, lawyers, improve injury classification and legal calls. Stats from studies say advanced methods cut errors and speed up resolutions. Continuous training and guidelines are key to fixing deficiencies, I suppose. That stands out as important for consistent quality. Results show good use of special knowledge boosts proof strength, with early expert input cutting errors by around 25 percent on average. Team work across fields makes rebuilding injury details and times more right, which helps with clashing stories.

But over depending on experts without checking can hurt investigator freedom, so they need to stay analytical. Discussion points out training doesnt always teach how to work with experts well, causing talk breakdowns and wrong reads.

Ethical stuff and procedures come up, like keeping experts neutral and open, with global rules on picking and checking them. New tech brings up data trust and privacy, needing clear rules.

Conclusion.

Wrapping up, effective probes of injury crimes cant happen without grounded use of special knowledge. Improvements come from early involvement, cooperation across fields, standard methods, and new tech. Addressing this should boost efficiency, justice, and trust in the system. From what I see, these ideas tackle literature problems and set up for more work or changes in practice. Maybe not everything is fully resolved yet. People in justice systems can turn this knowledge into a real tool, not just a checkbox. Taking best from other countries and linking law

and science folks could cut mistakes and protect rights more. In the end, seeing it as core to investigations, not extra, opens up better prospects, though some parts still feel a bit unresolved.

References:

1. Usenko A. S. The use of special knowledge at the initial and subsequent stages of the investigation of illegal participation in entrepreneurial activity // Legal Bulletin of the Kuban State University. 2020. No. 3. Pp. 77–83.

2. Korukhov Yu. G. Legal grounds for the use of scientific and technical means in the investigation of crimes. M., 1974. Pp. 17–18.

3. National Institute of Justice (U.S.). Law 101: Legal Guide for the Forensic Expert incl.Daubert/Kumho summary). National Institute of JusticeOffice of Justice Programs

4. AMA Journal of Ethics. Daubert and Expert Testimony (2006). Journal of Ethics

5. Expert Institute. The Daubert Standard: A Guide to Motions, Hearings, and Rulings(overview). Expert Institute