

OPINION

by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ivaylo Asenov Tsonkov,

**As defined by Order № RD-22-42/09.01.2026.
the Rector of the University of Plovdiv "Paisii Hilendarski"
for a member of the scientific jury in a competition
on the acquisition of the academic position of "Professor"**

in tertiary education: 3.Social, economic and legal sciences, professional field: 3.6.

Law,

Criminal procedure scientific specialty

with the only candidate Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ekaterina Salkova Getova

1. Contest information

The competition is announced in State Gazette No 96 of the 11th of November 2025.

The scientific jury was appointed by Order № RD-22-42/09.01.2026 of the Rector of the University of Plovdiv "Paisii Hilendarski".

Only one candidate, Assoc. Dr. Ekaterina Salkova Getova, has submitted documents for participation in the competition.

In accordance with Article 29b(1) of the Law on the Development of Academic Staff in the Republic of Bulgaria, the candidate Ekaterina Salkova has provided evidence that she meets all the conditions under Article 29(1) of the LDASRB. A statement of compliance with the minimum national requirements referred to in Article 2b(2) and (3) of the LDASRB and the annex referred to in Article 1a(1) of the LDASRB Implementing Rules were also provided, showing that the applicant not only met the minimum national requirements, but even exceeded them several times in three of the groups of indicators.

At its first meeting held on the 20th of January 2026, the scientific jury decided on the admission of the candidate to the evaluation and appointed a chairperson of the scientific jury (Prof. Dr. Daniela Doncheva) and reviewers (Prof. Boris Velchev, PhD, Prof. Georgi Mitov, PhD, and Prof. Gergana Marinova, PhD), and the other members of the scientific jury should submit opinions.

There were no reports of violations in the procedure, as well as plagiarism.

2. Data about the applicant and his/her training activities

Ekaterina Salkova Getova graduated in Law from the Faculty of Law of the University of Sofia "St. Kliment Ohridski" in 2000. In 2006 she acquired the Educational and scientific degree 'Doctor'. Since the 1st of November 2001 she has held successively the academic positions of Research Fellow, Chief Assistant and Associate Professor (since the 8th of January 2013) at the Institute of Economics at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. She has also held important management positions at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences - Head of the Department of Criminal Science (2013 to date); Chairman of the General Assembly of the scientists in the Institute of Information Technology, member of the General Assembly of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and Chairman of the Committee on normative and general academic acts at the General Assembly of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. He has extensive teaching experience in criminal procedural law as an associate professor at the University of Plovdiv "Paisii Hilendarski" (from the 1st of January 2019 to date) and at the University of Ruse "Angel Kanchev" (from the 1st of October 2016 to the 31st of August 2019), as well as as a part-time assistant at the University of Sofia "St. Kliment Ohridski", the University of Plovdiv "Paisii Hilendarski" and UNWE. Ekaterina Salkova has also carried out extensive expert work as a chief expert assistant at the Legal Affairs Committee of the 42nd and 43rd National Assembly, expert at various structures of the Ministry of Justice, legal adviser to the Deputy Minister of Justice, Director of the Legal Affairs Directorate at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, etc. It should also be explicitly stressed that from the 1st of November 2010 until now Assoc. Salkova is an *ad hoc* judge at the European Court of Human Rights.

As a result of the above-mentioned long teaching and expert experience, including as an associate professor in criminal proceedings, Ekaterina Salkova has established herself as a recognized and established lecturer, as a lecturer with an undisputed contribution to the teaching, educational and pedagogical development at both university and national level. Her lecture courses are at an extremely high academic level, through which she successfully transmits the accumulated knowledge and experience to her students and thus contributes significantly to their development as competent lawyers.

Along with this teaching and expert activity, Assoc. Salkova has participated in 46 procedures for obtaining scientific degrees and for holding academic positions, on which she has submitted 10 reviews and 36 opinions. She has managed 14 PhD students, of which 8 have already successfully defended their PhD thesis, as well as 3 Erasmus+ graduate students. In the period 2015-2026 she participated in 17 scientific forums. He is a co-author of a collection of tests and cases in criminal proceedings (which has undergone two editions); She is a scientific editor of both a monograph and 4 books (volumes) of the practical guides in which magistrates are trained at the National Institute of Justice; She has participated in 97 examination committees at various higher education institutions. At the same time, Assoc. Salkova has also actively participated in five external analytical projects, which received funding from national, European and international programmes and funds.

In summary, it can be said that not only the teaching, but the entire academic activity of Assoc. Salkova is at the highest level, which leads to the conclusion that she is fully prepared and competent to hold the academic position of professor.

3. Characteristics and assessment of the scientific and applied contributions in the submitted scientific works of the candidate

It is apparent from the report on the fulfilment of the minimum national requirements that the applicant Assoc. Ekaterina Salkova has submitted the following scientific works for participation in the competition:

- two monographs, one of which is based on the defended dissertation;
- six studies and eighteen articles, of which one study and one article have been published in scientific journals, referenced and indexed in world-famous scientific information databases, and the rest have been published in non-referred peer-reviewed journals or in edited collective volumes.

In this way, the relevant groups of indicators from the minimum national requirements have been met - the necessary points for group C have been achieved and the necessary points for group D have been significantly exceeded.

In accordance with Article 29(1)(3) of the LDASRB, the monograph 'Termination of Criminal Proceedings' (Sofia, Fenea, 2007) published on the basis of the protected dissertation is not subject to review.

3.1. Monograph 'Current Issues of Criminal Procedure Functions', "Paisii Hilendarski" University Publishing House, Plovdiv, 2026, ISBN 978-619-281-112-9.

The monograph has a volume of 187 pages (standard 201 pages), consisting of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and a bibliography. The footnotes are 270. Chapter one is devoted to the management and decision-making function in criminal proceedings, Chapter two to the two opposite main functions, and Chapter three - to the two opposite additional procedural functions. Each of the chapters is structured with paragraphs, representing separate parts with a specific subject of study (subject to the general theme of the respective chapter), and the specific problems investigated are most often separated as points and sub-points of the paragraphs.

This work is a precise scientific study of the current problems related to a theoretical concept traditional for the contemporary Bulgarian criminal procedural theory: the separation in the activity carried out in the criminal proceedings of independent parts with a specific purpose - the so-called criminal procedural functions. The detailed and in-depth analysis carried out has led the author to scientific ideas and proposals *de lege ferenda*, always supported by strong and convincing arguments, which should be assessed as essential contributions of a theoretical and applied scientific nature or essential for the successful training of students and magistrates in criminal procedural law. The reasons for this conclusion are numerous.

First of all, on the basis of a precise clarification of the essence of the procedural guidance (pp. 13-21) and a detailed distinction between the control and supervision carried out in the criminal process (pp. 21-27) Assoc. Salkova justifies the essential specificity (guidance) of the activity carried out by the court in the preparatory phase of the trial and traditionally referred to as 'judicial review of the pre-trial proceedings'. The author convincingly proves that **in fact this activity cannot be equated with control activity, but is an independent function in the criminal process**, which is called *a human rights function (a function of judicial protection of the rights and legitimate interests of citizens and legal persons)* – pp. 77-88. It should be emphasised that it is this understanding that most accurately reflects the real nature and tasks of the court's activities in the first phase of criminal proceedings.

Next, new and strong arguments have been put forward in support of the idea of the existence of an independent *investigative function*. This idea has been in the background for more than 30 years, mainly because the practical meaning of separating such a function from the wide-ranging managerial and decision-making function was not visible. Assoc. Salkova proves that the recognition of the collection and verification of evidence as an independent function has not only theoretical grounds, but also an important practical significance - it will create a clearer conceptual basis for future legislative changes relevant to the investigating authorities, as well as for adjusting the powers of the prosecutor so as not to completely erase the operational autonomy of the investigating authorities (pp. 34-41, 49-52). This conceptual basis is also supported by **de lege ferenda proposals**: *first*, to limit the mandatory instructions of the public prosecutor to the investigating authorities to procedural acts other than those of the investigation (pp. 47-48); *and second*, to provide for a power for the investigating authority to object to those instructions of the public prosecutor that would make it difficult to investigate and uncover the objective truth (pp. 48-49). I also fully share the thesis that a clear distinction between the functions of the prosecutor and the investigating authorities has the potential to reduce the risk of indictment and to ensure more effective protection of the rights and legitimate interests of the participants in the process.

It is also a contributing point that the indictment function has been revealed in its fullness and nuances, with four independent (albeit interrelated) aspects (parts) of the **indictment being outlined and examined – raising, proving, upholding and substantiating the indictment** (pp. 103-109). It is therefore quite appropriate to suggest that the existence of the four aspects in question should also be reflected in the name or in the definition of that essential function. Similarly, the content and title of the **function of claiming, maintaining, proving and justifying the cause and the amount of the damage suffered** are specified (pp. 148-149).

Assoc. Salkova rightly **criticises the excessive interference of the state in the indictment activity**, which is carried out by a combination of two means: a legal limitation of prosecutorial powers, combined with an increase in the factual impact on prosecutors. As an appropriate means of overcoming public distrust in the activities of prosecutors, it is proposed that *de lege ferenda* create **more guarantees in the Judiciary Act in the organisation and conduct of competitions for magistrates**, while at the same time removing from the CPC the requirement for sufficient data as

a prerequisite for initiating pre-trial proceedings (or, alternatively, the requirement for initiating pre-trial proceedings by a formal act) - pp. 116-121.

It is convincingly proven that the **special representative under Article 101 of the CPC should also be included among the** subjects of the indictment function, and it is proposed that *de lege ferenda* be included among the parties in the trial phase (pp. 130-131). Similar conclusions have been drawn with regard to the special representative under Article 101a of the CPC (p. 147).

After a thorough analysis of the reasons for introducing the figure of the **legal person concerned** into the CPC and also in the light of the case-law of the Court of Justice, it has been unequivocally established that that new procedural entity performs a defence function (pp. 141-146).

A valuable contribution of scientific and applied nature are the **presented new and strong arguments**, helping to find the right answer in solving controversial issues of criminal procedural theory and practice. A typical example is the arguments **in support of**:

- the proposition that the rule on the initiation of criminal proceedings under Article 212(2) of the CPC is a **fiction and** not a legal presumption (pp. 32-33) and that the indictment under Article 219(2) of the CPC should take place **after, and not before**, the first investigative measure against the person (pp. 105-107);

- the criticism of the notion of '**prosecution**' maintained in Constitutional Court ruling № 10 of 27.07.1992 (pp. 96-101);

- the thesis that, despite the real problems related to **the civil claim in criminal proceedings**, this institute is undoubtedly necessary and useful, and the existing problems should be solved by further improving the CPC and not by abolishing the criminal procedural institute in question.

Unfortunately, the limited volume of an opinion cannot identify all the scientific or applied contributions characteristic of the peer-reviewed monograph. I focused only on some of the more significant points, but I fully share the availability of the scientific contributions made by the candidate.

Finally, I would also like to stress **the essential importance of the work under discussion for the study of criminal procedure**. The fine-tuning of the conceptual apparatus and the detailed clarification of the content of the basic and additional procedural functions will be **very useful to students, doctoral students and other legal professionals insofar** as, in our doctrine, the concept of procedural functions is the basis of the theoretical model of criminal proceedings.

3.2. Studies and articles submitted for participation in the competition.

The submitted for participation in the competition studies and articles of Assoc. Salkova demonstrates **the broad scientific interests of the applicant**, covering not only various aspects of criminal procedural law, but also issues of substantive criminal law, administrative law and forensic science. In addition, these publications prove the ability of **extremely thorough analysis** of each subject of study, as a result of which the candidate manages to formulate new theoretical concepts, convincing proposals to the legislator and recommendations to law enforcement authorities. It should be emphasised that the analysis in question is always based on **a thorough knowledge of the law of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and EU law, respectively the case-law of the ECHR and the CJEU.**

3.2.1. Publications on fundamental problems of criminal justice.

Subject of research by Assoc. Salkova were the reasons for the ineffectiveness of criminal justice in the Republic of Bulgaria. As their source are identified both penal policy and legislation, as well as the enforcement of the Criminal Code and the CPC, including the activity of enforcement of penalties. The need for a comprehensive approach to ensure rational and stable legislation, the authority of state power, the legal culture of society and the qualitative selection of personnel involved in criminal justice has been demonstrated (*the article ‘On the (in)effectiveness of criminal justice’ - In: Law and order: Justice in five steps., Sofia, Move.bg, 2016, pp. 40-49.*

In the light of the positive obligation of the Bulgarian State to provide effective remedies for violations of fundamental rights (an obligation stemming primarily from the ECHR and the case-law of the ECtHR), the availability of accessible and real remedies in our criminal proceedings has been examined. The critical analysis carried out led to the conclusion that the national standards did not comply with those of the ECHR and the case-law of the ECtHR, respectively proposals were made to overcome this inconsistency (*the article ‘The right to an effective remedy and the criminal procedure as a means of protecting substantive rights’ – C: Criminal Law - Traditions and Perspectives, University Publishing House ‘St. Kliment Ohridski’, 2016; ISBN 978-954-07-4170-3, pp. 381-393.*

The question of the permissible restriction of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the context of the effective fight against terrorism is also analysed in depth. The need to establish in national law real safeguards against arbitrariness that meet the standards of the case-law of the ECtHR and ensure the primacy of law *is justified* (*the article ‘Human rights in the context of counter-terrorism’ - In: Globalization, the State and the Individual, 2(14), 2017, ISSN:2367-4555, pp. 85-93, co-authored with Yanko Roychev.*

Problems in national law with regard to ensuring effective remedies for suspects and accused persons or with regard to compliance with the principle of proportionality, resulting from incomplete and/or incorrect transposition of EU law, have also been investigated. Such problems have been identified in particular with the introduction of the European Arrest Warrant, the European Investigation Order and the rules on freezing and confiscating property (*the ‘Bulgaria: the EAW, EIO and Regulation 1805/2018 in the Bulgarian Legislation and Case Law.’ - In: Facilitating Judicial*

Cooperation in the EU. A Computable Approach to Mutual Recognition in Criminal Matters. Leiden / Boston, Brill / Nijhoff, 2025, ISBN 978-90-04-70578-4 (hardback), ISBN 978-90-04-70579-1 (e-book), DOI 10.1163/9789004705791, p. 69 - 101, co-authored with Miroslava Manolova).

Insofar as the effectiveness of the investigation is a problematic moment in the criminal process, the study of the historical development of the regulatory framework of the investigating authorities can also be assessed as a valuable contribution. The need for future legislative changes to be based on a coherent criminal policy and an integrated strategy ensuring the professionalism and specialisation of investigative bodies has been demonstrated (*the article 'The legislative concept of investigative bodies' – C: Ministry of Interior 2030: challenges to security policies. Sofia, Society and Security Foundation, Burgas Free University, 2022, ISBN:978-619-92306-0-2, 29-42, pp. 27-40).*

The candidate has also explored issues of basic criminal procedural principles. Their nature is analyzed, as well as their role as the foundation of the criminal process. The discrepancies between specific norms of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the basic principles, as well as the reasons for them, have been established. The need to overcome such inconsistencies is shown in so far as they limit the effectiveness of fundamental principles and are a prerequisite for conflicting law enforcement practice (*the article 'Inconsistencies of specific legal rules with principles of criminal procedure' - C: Scientific readings on 'Legal norms and legal principles'. Collection of reports, University Publishing House "St. Kliment Ohridski", 2017, ISBN 978-954-07-4321-9, pp. 235-245, co-authored with Yanko Roychev).*

3.2.2. Publications on specific aspects and problems of the criminal process.

The submitted studies and articles also examine a number of specific procedural institutes, respectively their legal framework in the CPC. In line with the already commented interest in international standards for the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms, the candidate has also analysed the controversial issues concerning the start and end times, as well as the maximum duration of the two most severe supervision measures (*the 'Maximum duration of pre-trial detention and house arrest in criminal matters' study - De Jure, 2019, № 2, ISSN:2367-8410 (Online), 1314-2593 (Print), c. 138-162, co-authored by Yanko Roychev).*

Current and practically significant issues of procedural proof have also been examined. The characteristics of the evidence materials according to Bulgarian theory and practice (relevance, admissibility, credibility and sufficiency) are examined in view of the need for full and adequate implementation of the requirements of EU law on the European Investigation Order. Problematic issues are outlined in relation to the standards of admissibility of evidence (*the article "Evaluation of evidence in criminal proceedings - a challenge to the introduction of the European Investigation Order" - C: European perspectives for the development of criminal legislation. Collection of reports. University Publishing House "St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, 2014, ISBN 978-954-07- 3722-5, pp. 319-331).* Another publication conducted a broad and in-depth analysis of the difficulties in investigating

and proving document crimes, driven by the current intensive development of technology and the widespread use of digital documents (*the article ‘Specificities in the investigation of document crimes’ - In: Scientific conference dedicated to the 110th anniversary of the birth of Prof. Dr. Ivan Nenov and the 90th anniversary of the birth of Prof. Dr. Tseko Tsekov, Publishing house of Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 2023, ISBN: 9789540758084, pp. 245-258).*

Important issues related to the court as the main subject of the criminal proceedings have also been investigated. The national legal framework is analysed through the prism of an absolute standard of fair trial – the examination of the criminal charge by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The focus is on the contradictions in practice regarding the size of the composition of the court, as well as on the importance of the principle of random allocation of cases (*the article ‘The notion of an illegitimate judicial panel in criminal proceedings’. - C: Spring Legal Days 2020. Volume 2. University Publishing House “Paisii Hilendarski”, Plovdiv, 2021, ISBN: 978-619-202-724-7, pp. 301-316).* Some practically significant powers of the court have also been studied. First, the historical development in Bulgaria of the judicial power to return the case from the court to the pre-trial proceedings has been traced, its impact on the effectiveness of the criminal process has been studied and the effects of the legislative changes to this institute made in 2017 have been predicted (*the article ‘Return of the case from the court to the pre-trial phase of the criminal process.’ – In: Criminal justice - traditions and perspectives. University Publishing House ‘St. Kliment Ohridski’, 2018, ISBN 978-954-07-4405-6, pp. 44-60).* Secondly, another, problematic from a number of aspects, decision of the legislature, adopted again in 2017, is analysed - conferring on the criminal court the power to acquit the defendant of the charge by imposing an administrative penalty on him if the act constitutes an administrative offence. It has been found that, in the present case, the procedural means cannot be sufficient, since the problem to be eliminated is in fact rooted in shortcomings in substantive legal regulation (*the article ‘On the power of the criminal court to impose an administrative penalty’ - C: 50 years of Law on Administrative Violations and Penalties - History, Traditions, Future. Proceedings of a scientific conference. University Publishing House ‘St. Kliment Ohridski”, 2020, ISBN:978-954-07-4975-4, pp. 175-191, co-authored with Yanko Roychev).*

The subject of the scientific interest of the candidate were also two specific institutes of our criminal process. Both historically and in view of the current legislation, an in-depth study has been carried out on the advantages and disadvantages of examining a civil claim in criminal proceedings, including the controversial issues of the admissibility of a claim for compensation for non-common damages and the possibility of continuing the examination of a civil claim after the termination of criminal proceedings (*the article ‘Examination of a civil claim in criminal proceedings.’ - In: Scientific readings in memory of Venelin Ganev and Nikola Dolapchiev. Collection of reports. Sofia, University Publishing House ‘St. Kliment Ohridski’, 2017, ISBN 978-954-07-4260-1, pp. 199-217.* The next criminal-procedural institute is that of the receivers. The reasons for its creation and its effectiveness *de lege lata* have been studied. Analysed are the legal requirements for the persons to be admitted, their procedural status and other issues of high theoretical and practical value (*the study*

'Institute of the persons to be admitted to the Bulgarian criminal procedure' - *Legal Thought*, 2018, № 4, ISSN 1310-7348, pp. 101-122, in co-authorship with Yanko Roychev).

Assoc. Salkova has also devoted considerable attention to the **specifics of criminal proceedings for crimes committed by minors**. I will start with a publication in which criminal procedural aspects are closely intertwined with aspects of substantive criminal law and judicial planning (*the article 'Věk trestní odpovědnosti a prevence kriminality mládeže.'* - In: *Pravnik*, 11, 2017, ISSN:0231-6625, p. 989-998, co-authored with Yanko Roychev). There, through the prism of the mental and social peculiarities of child development, the issues of the minimum age of criminal responsibility and its role in the prevention of juvenile delinquency are analyzed. The criminality of the so-called 'status offences' has been critically discussed and the need for specialised procedures and bodies, including the introduction of restorative justice, has been justified. In another publication (*the article 'Procedures for the liability of juvenile perpetrators of socially dangerous acts and their preventive importance for the growth of crime.'* - C: *The role of criminology and related sciences in combating crime. Proceedings, Mediatech*, 2018, ISBN:978-619-207-150-9, pp. 14-22, in co-authorship with Yanko Roychev) continue the research in this direction. It is justified that the maximum prevention of juvenile delinquency presupposes the creation of a clear and comprehensive concept, based on a comprehensive analysis of the causes of juvenile delinquency and providing for specific measures to address existing legislative, structural and organisational gaps. It is also undeniable that speed in criminal cases against minors is important, both for the prevention of child crime and for the protection of the rights of the accused minor. Therefore, it is quite understandable that the subject of the study was the compliance in criminal proceedings under Chapter 30 of the CPC with the basic principle of hearing and resolving cases within a reasonable time (*the article 'Manifestation of the principle of hearing and resolving cases within a reasonable time in criminal cases against minors'* - C: *Thirty years since the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child: Challenges and Perspectives. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference, 10 December 2019, New Bulgarian University, New Bulgarian University Publishing House*, 2021, ISBN:978-619-233-198-6 (electronic edition), 978-619-233-200-6 (printed edition), pp. 226-237 in co-authorship with Yanko Roychev). In another publication, it is justified that, in addition to breaching the principle of hearing and resolving cases within a reasonable time (where, however, appropriate and sufficient compensation is possible), the delay in criminal proceedings may also lead to another adverse effect - the accused's reaching the age of majority, thus eliminating the possibility of applying Articles 61 and 64 of the Criminal Code and the rules under Chapter 30 of the CPC. The end result of such a delay will be unequal treatment of persons who have committed crimes as minors – and this due to circumstances that do not depend on those persons (*the 'Legal consequences of breaches of the provisions on procedural time limits in criminal cases against minors'* – *Legal Thought*, 2020, № 1, ISSN: 1310-7348, pp. 72-97, co-authored with Yanko Roychev).

I will conclude this subset of the peer-reviewed publications with *the article 'Victim of crime and the harmed by the crime - the relationship between substantive and procedural criminal law'* - C: *Law in the XXI century*, 2, "Paisii Hilendarski" University Publishing House, 2023, ISBN:9786192029043, pp. 282 - 293, in co-authorship with Daniela Doncheva. The reason for

addressing it here is its interdisciplinary nature, which allows for a smooth transition to the next subset of publications, the ones exploring substantive criminal law issues. This article compares and distinguishes between the substantive concept of ‘victim of the crime’ and the procedural concept of ‘*the harmed by the crime*’. Contradictory case-law is analysed on the question of whether it is permissible to constitute a victim in criminal proceedings conducted for a crime which is not directly directed against the person – e.g. document crimes, crimes against justice. The answer to that question in the affirmative is convincingly justified and follows from that answer the unlawfulness of that case-law, which requires that a person be found to be a victim in criminal proceedings.

3.2.3. Publications on specific aspects and problems of substantive criminal law.

One of these publications is devoted to clarifying a specific legislative technique – making criminal liability conditional on previously implemented administrative responsibility. The historical development of the Institute of Administrative Preliminary Ruling and the gradual expansion of its application are traced. Procedural difficulties in proving such crimes arising from the need to establish specific legal features shall also be investigated; the contradictory case-law on proving the subjective side of offences subject to administrative prejudicing has been analysed (*the article ‘Construction of the composition of the offence through administrative prejudicing.’ – C: Law in the 21st century, 2, “Paisii Hilendarski” University Publishing House, 2023, ISBN: 9786192029043, pp. 272-281, co-authored with Daniela Doncheva*).

An in-depth retrospective analysis of the institute of the continuing crime was also carried out, clarifying the reasons for the inconsistency of the legislator in the legislative framework of this institute. A clear distinction has been made between the continuous crime and the actual homogeneous real set of crimes (*the ‘Continued crime – occurrence, development and prospects’ study in C: Research papers of the Institute of Legal Studies. Volume I (2004). Current legal issues. Sofia, BAS, 2004, ISSN 1312-3149, pp. 7-72*).

Two publications are devoted to the prerequisites for abolishing the criminality of active bribery under Article 306 of the Criminal Code. The historical development of the provision is clarified, as well as its nature, objectives and characteristics. The legislative expediency of the current version of the provision in question, which requires all the conditions *to be met cumulatively, is convincingly justified* (*the ‘Failure to punish active bribery under Article 306 of the Criminal Code’ study - De Jure, 2019, 1, ISSN:2367-8410 (Online), 1314-2593 (Print), c. 12-33 (42 standard pages without the bibliography and with it, 66 pages), co-authored with Yanko Roychev*). Two of these prerequisites (*voluntaryness and promptness of bribery reporting*) have been specifically examined and it has been clarified that, despite their interconnectedness, they have an independent meaning. Immediateness should be assessed according to the specificities of the specific case, and the leading criterion for the voluntary nature of the communication is the presence or absence of an impact by a competent state authority (*the article ‘Voluntary and immediate nature of the notification of active bribery as requirements for the elimination of criminality under Article 306 of the Criminal Code’ - C: Countering Corruption in the*

Republic of Bulgaria, Ruse University Academic Publishing House, 2019, ISBN:978-954-712-758-6, 31-38, pp. 31-38, co-authored with Yanko Roychev).

3.2.4. A publication dedicated to the legal framework for the development of academic staff.

The last article submitted for participation in the competition once again proves the breadth of scientific interests and expert knowledge of Assoc. Salkova. Through an in-depth critical analysis, the main shortcomings of the 2010 normative regulation of the subject for the development of academic staff have been identified, as well as the negative effect it has on the quality of higher education and research. It also clarifies the main directions of the amendments to the legal framework implemented in 2018 (*the article ‘Sustainable development of academic staff and the ongoing reform of their legal regulation.’ - C: Legislation on Academic Development in the Republic of Bulgaria, ICL - BAS, 2018, ISBN 978-954-9583-35-9, pp. 9-21).*

From the analysis of all publications submitted for participation in the competition, it is unequivocally clear that the research of Assoc. Ekaterina Salkova is significant, has led to numerous and high-value scientific and applied results, which represent a significant upgrade of the level of knowledge reached and contribute to the development of scientific discussion. Some of these scientific achievements have already contributed to the improvement of legislation and to the improvement of the practice of state authorities in the criminal process, while others have serious potential to contribute to this in the future. A characteristic feature of all the publications discussed is the combination of thorough and comprehensive analysis of the research problem, clarity and precision of the speech, of the formulations and of the ideas / concepts defended, strict adherence to scientific ethics and impressive readability. The vast amount of knowledge and practical experience that has found expression in the peer-reviewed works are a guarantee that the publications of Assoc. Salkova will always have an important role in the training of students, doctoral students and specialists.

3.3. Quotations

There are presented data on 157 citations in scientific publications of Assoc. Salkova – 116 citations in scientific peer-reviewed monographs and collective volumes, as well as 41 citations in non-referred peer-reviewed journals.

3.4. Other scientific work

Assoc. Salkova has presented data for the management of 8 successfully defended PhD students, for the management of 3 national scientific or educational projects, as well as for participation in 5 international and 4 national scientific or educational projects.

There is also data for publication of 2 university teaching materials, created in co-authorship with Gergana Marinova and Yanko Roychev.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the presented monographic work, other publications, as well as the overall research and teaching activity of Assoc. Prof. Ekaterina Salkova Getova justify the conclusion that she meets all the requirements of the LDASRB and the Implementing Rules for the LDASRB for holding the academic position of "professor," which is why I strongly recommend that the Scientific Jury propose to the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Law at the University of Plovdiv "Paisii Hilendarski" to elect Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ekaterina Salkova Getova to the position of "professor" in Criminal Procedure in professional field 3.6. Law.

Member of the Scientific Jury:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ivaylo Tsonkov

09.03.2026