**Attachment No. 3** *to the application for the commencement of the procedure for obtaining the degree of Doctor Habilitatus*

## The author's abstract
## describes scientific achievements, professional career, and significant scientific activity.

Łódź, October 4, 2023.

### 1. First and Last Name

Justyna Bieda
ORCID 0000-0003-0231-7936

### 2. Academic Degrees and Titles Held - Including the Granting Institution, Year of Attainment, and Doctoral Dissertation Title

### 2.1. Academic Degrees and Titles Held

**2004** – Master's degree in law obtained from the Faculty of Law and Administration at the University of Lodz, defending a master's thesis titled *The Law on Parliament*, prepared under Prof. Dr. Habil. Jacek Matuszewski.

**2011** – Doctor of Law degree awarded in the field of law by the resolution of the Faculty of Law and Administration at the University of Lodz based on the doctoral dissertation titled *Public Testaments in the Kingdom of Poland in Light of Notarial Practice, Illustrated by the Activities of Notary Offices in Zgierz in the Years 1826-1875*. The doctoral advisor was Prof. Dr. Habil. Jacek Matuszewski. The doctoral committee included Prof. Dr. Habil. Dorota Malec (Jagiellonian University in Cracow) and Prof. Dr. Habil. Wojciech Witkowski (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin).

**2.2. Additional Education Information**

**2005-2009** – Legal apprenticeship at the District Chamber of Lawyers in Lodz, admitted to the list of lawyers in 2009.

**2017-2018** – Postgraduate Studies at the University of Lodz – *Family Law with Elements of Psychology.*

**3. Information on Previous Employment in Academic or Artistic Institutions**

From October 1, 2004, to June 30, 2011, I was employed as an assistant at the Department of the History of Polish State and Law at the Faculty of Law and Administration of the University of Lodz. Then, from July 1, 2011, I was employed as an assistant professor at the same department. On September 1, 2016, this department was transformed into the Department of State and Law Development Studies.

**4. Discussion of Scientific Achievements as Referred to in Article 219(1)(2) of the Law of 20 July, 2018 on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws of 2022, item 574, as amended).**

**4.1. Discussion of the Scientific Achievement as Referred to in Article 219(1)(2)(a) of the Law of 20 July, 2018 on Higher Education and Science, Constituting the Main Scientific Achievement After Obtaining the Doctor of Law Degree.**

a) **Title of the Scientific Achievement:**
***Detention Facilities in the Kingdom of Poland 1815-1868: From Research on the Emergence of Modern Administration in the Polish Territories.***

b) **Author, Title of the Publication, Year of Publication, Publisher, Editorial Reviewers:**
Justyna Bieda, *Detention Facilities in the Kingdom of Poland 1815-1868: From Research on the Emergence of Modern Administration in the Polish Territories*, Lodz 2023, University of Lodz Publishing House.

**Editorial Reviewers:**

- Prof. Dr. Habil. Wojciech Witkowski
- Prof. Dr. Habil. Jacek Matuszewski

**c) Discussion of the Scientific Achievement as Referred to in Article 219(1)(2)(a) of the Law of 20 July 2018 on Higher Education.**

The aim of the research, resulting in the monograph titled *Detention Facilities in the Kingdom of Poland 1815-1868: From Research on the Emergence of Modern Administration in the Polish Territories*, was to examine, through the example of detention facilities, the challenges faced by central government administration bodies in creating a modern prison system in the Kingdom of Poland. It included the entire prison administration structure. On the one hand, it sought to illustrate the process of implementing emerging humanitarian penitentiary ideas in Polish territories. At the same time, it aimed to demonstrate that these efforts were undertaken under the constraints of the actual socio-economic situation of the state. This monograph examined the development of detention facility institutions, the creation of their organizational structure, the principles governing prison administration, and the difficulties encountered in implementing these regulations.

This turning point in penitentiary studies in Polish territories had already garnered interest in Polish literature, but prior works primarily focused on issues related to doctrinal concepts. However, the critical analysis of practical complications associated with establishing appropriate administrative structures for the new type of prison system and implementing modern solutions had yet to be addressed before. Information about detention facilities in the literature is limited to sporadic mentions, usually discussed within the context of the penitentiary system in the Kingdom of Poland.

The initial watershed was marked by 1815, corresponding to the establishment of the Kingdom of Poland. This moment can be regarded as the beginning of the formation of modern penitentiary systems, including the network of detention facilities, even though their significant development occurred mainly after 1822.

The final watershed is indicated by the year 1868, which is the date of the dissolution of the Governmental Commission for Internal Affairs[1]. This commission was responsible for

[1] In the author's abstract, changes occurring in this body's name, structure, and operating principles are omitted as irrelevant to the analyzed research issue. Therefore, it is referred to as the *Government Commission for Internal Affairs* when I put forth certain general formulations rather than specifying specific legal acts and practical documents.

detention facilities, and its legislative acts determined their operation and organization, as well as that of other penitentiary units in the Kingdom of Poland. This entity issued two fundamental normative acts that served as the basis for building the structures and organization of the studied units: *the Instruction Regarding the Proper and Uniform Maintenance of Police Detention Facilities dated April 29, 1822, and the Instruction for Prisons and Penal Institutions of the Kingdom of Poland dated August 15/27, 1859.*

The material of the dissertation is divided into seven chapters, accompanied by an introduction and conclusion, and includes a bibliography.

Chapter I, I discussed, to the extent necessary for presenting the issue of detention facilities, the concept of temporary detention from ancient times to the early 19th century. This chapter aims to illustrate the social changes, including the emerging concept of protecting fundamental human rights. It eventually led to the first attempts to base this institution on legal norms. In this part of the work, regulations from selected European criminal procedures at the turn of the 18th/19th century were presented, which were the first to introduce codified rules for the use and execution of temporary detention.

Chapter II depicts the development of pre-trial detention institutions in the Polish territories. In this section, I described issues related to the conditions and execution of pre-trial detention from medieval times to the early 19th century. Firstly, the times of the First Polish Republic were presented, including the coverage of the subject matter in customary law, urban law, and rural law. Additionally, the emergence of the first concepts of differentiating between temporarily detained individuals and convicts in the second half of the 18 th century was discussed. An essential element is also the attempt to present the emerging idea in the Duchy of Warsaw to create a significantly expanded system of penitentiary facilities, which led to the issuance of the Temporary Ministerial Judicial Organization on May 17, 1808, by the Minister of Justice. This act established the prototype for detention facilities in the Kingdom of Poland. Finally, I presented the types of detention facilities for temporarily detained individuals in the Kingdom of Poland. I highlighted the issues arising from the similarities in the functions and organization of detention facilities and police holding cells.

Chapter IV covers issues related to the detainee, starting with a discussion of permissible detention periods, the characteristics of individuals in these facilities, and their rights and obligations. The most space is dedicated to the latter issues. Topics such as nutrition principles, clothing provision, medical care, visitation, and self-sustenance from personal funds are addressed. Concerning obligations, detainees' adherence to established behavioral rules and their disciplinary responsibility are discussed, as well as the principles of assigning detainees

to work and recovering the maintenance costs. This part places significant emphasis on comparing applicable legal provisions with the actual practices, which often deviate from normative regulations.

Chapter V deals with the organization of detention centers. First, issues related to the structural location of detention centers are presented, including requirements for technical facility standards and equipment. Additionally, the challenges municipal authorities face in providing suitable premises are discussed. Next, the scope of managerial duties and supervisory activities of the mayor (president) as the managing authority of the detention center is explained. A crucial aspect of these considerations is presenting the process of shaping the financing principles of the studied penitentiary units. This chapter attempts to show the reader to what extent the realities of the functioning and organization of detention centers, often for financial reasons, deviate from legal regulations.

In the subsequent Chapter VI, a significant amount of space was devoted to issues related to the prison service, starting with the recruitment procedure, through salaries, pension rights, leaves, and ending with the termination of official employment. These analyses were conducted in the context of regulations defining the organization of detention centers and primarily by utilizing provisions related to civil service officials, including supervisors and correctional officers.

The final Chapter VII presents other functions of detention centers and their unique role as places of deprivation of liberty for individuals other than those temporarily arrested. These tasks arose from legal acts issued by government commissions (such as serving substitute detention sentences for embezzlers, serving public detention sentences, and providing overnight accommodations for transported prisoners in detention centers) or from established practices accepted by government authorities (such as serving police detention sentences, detaining individuals evading military conscription, or subject to extradition, as well as insolvent debtors). Special attention is given to why the Government Commission for Internal Affairs gradually departed from the original role of detention centers, which was to detain suspects during initial investigations.

The research relied, on the one hand, on normative acts issued by the Governor of the Kingdom of Poland, the Government Commission for Internal Affairs, the Government Commission for Justice, and the Government Commission for Revenues and Treasury.

On the other hand, I utilized primary source material confirming actual practices, including acts issued by provincial commissions (gubernatorial governments), district commissioners (county chiefs), and municipal authorities. The extensive correspondence

among public administration bodies at various levels addressing current issues related to the operation of detention centers, especially those determining financial matters, was also significant. Analyzing this correspondence allowed for a comparison between legal provisions and the actual functioning of detention centers, which often deviated from statutory regulations. However, the most valuable source of information was various reports submitted by city magistrates to provincial authorities (gubernatorial governments) or by the latter to government bodies.

The source search encompassed documents stored in the Main Archive of Ancient Documents and state archives, where documents reflecting the activities of administrative authorities in the former Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1868 were located. In total, nearly one hundred and ninety archival collections were analyzed.

In the first instance, materials from the Main Archive of Ancient Documents in the Government Commission for Internal Affairs collection, as well as in the collections of the Council of State and the Council of Ministers of the Duchy of Warsaw, were utilized.

At the provincial (gubernatorial) level, relevant documents were preserved only in the records of the Kalisz Province Commission, the Augustów Province Commission (Augustów Gubernatorial Government), and the records of the Radom Provincial Government. It is in the latter collection that the most extensive material regarding the functioning of detention centers is located. However, among the records of district (county) authorities, there are few documents related to detention centers, with some information found only in the collection of the District Commissioner of Kalisz and the District Commissioner of Łuków. The most significant number of archival collections was discovered among municipal records (134 collections). Their source material proved to be exceptionally valuable, as detention centers were under the direct administration of city mayors (presidents).

The research also encompassed printed materials published in the Official Gazette of the Duchy of Warsaw and the Kingdom of Poland and in the Collection of Administrative Regulations of the Kingdom of Poland.

The study of the development of detention center institutions in the Kingdom of Poland required familiarization with relevant literature. In the first instance, these were the works of the most prominent representatives of the era: J. Howard, C. Beccaria, J. Bentham, and J.J. Rousseau, as well as extensive literature discussing the principles of Enlightenment ideology and studies on changes in European criminal law at the turn of the 18$^{th}$ and 19$^{th}$ centuries.

It was also necessary to delve into the views of Polish 19$^{th}$ penitentiary reformers K. Potocki, F. Skarbek, J.U. Niemcewicz, and J. Pawlikowski. Historical-legal studies by

M. Senkowska, M. Czerwiec, L. Rabinowicz, E.S. Rappaport, and E. Kaczyńska proved extremely useful. The preparation of the presented publication also required a comprehensive analysis of issues related to the structure of intergovernmental relations and provisions concerning civil service officials (in this case, the works of G. Smyk were invaluable).

Introducing the subject of the functioning and organization of detention centers in the Kingdom of Poland necessitated presenting the development of the institution of temporary detention. The works of 19th -century authors such as A. Kożuchowski and A. Moldenhawer were valuable. From 20th century publications, special attention is deserved by the studies of M. Mikołajczyk, which provide an overview of the institution of temporary detention in the First Polish Republic.

The 18th century, the Enlightenment era, was called the *Age of Enlightenment*. A profound socio-political crisis that had its roots in the 17th century became apparent during this period. The Enlightenment program aimed at combating the "old order" was pursued in an atmosphere of criticism of all existing institutions in the realm of the state and law: feudal inequality and social oppression, noble privileges, peasant serfdom, property restrictions, religious fanaticism, torture instruments, the stake of the Inquisition, and indexes of banned books. The Enlightenment rejected the existing social order, advocating the creation of an entirely new legal order detached from the legacy of the *ages of darkness*. The task of legal codification was pursued under various historical conditions. However, regardless of these differences, the ideological foundation of the 18th century codifications was the philosophy of modern natural law. The call was to break away from the previous legal uncertainty, characterized by insecurity, arbitrariness, and abuses in the justice field. The new codes were meant to establish particular laws to resolve all possible cases, leaving no room for discretionary judgments.

Injustice and inhumanity were particularly evident in the realm of criminal law. The previous practice was based on the harsh traditions of this branch of law, dating back to the time of the Carolina (1532). Punishments such as the death penalty in various forms, flogging, galley slavery, and coerced testimonies through torture were employed, and the proceedings had an inquisitorial character. This state of affairs began to arouse opposition. The reformist spirit of the era made its earliest and most profound impact on criminal law as the direct instrument of state policy. An undeniable achievement of humanitarian doctrine was a new perspective on the purpose of criminal punishment, which was linked to a different assessment of human rights than in the past. All previous metaphysical concepts of punishment were challenged, and the principles of social utilitarianism were embraced. The essence of punishment was no longer retribution but rather the achievement of socially beneficial

objectives through its means. Individual and general prevention was considered the most important of these objectives.

In the second half of the 18th century, Enlightenment ideals began to find practical expression in European substantive criminal law and criminal procedure.

In most European criminal codes at the turn of the 18th/19th century, the primary emphasis shifted to imprisonment as a penalty, and the death penalty, as well as mutilating and degrading punishments, were significantly limited or eliminated from the catalog of sanctions.

The Enlightenment program of completely restructuring the existing political and legal order, more so than substantive criminal law, focused on criminal procedure. It was because the criminal process was closely intertwined with the institutions of the political system, directly expressing its character and objectives. The fight against feudal systems, absolute rule, arbitrariness, and abuse of power was particularly significant in criminal procedure since this branch of law encompassed the most essential issues related to individual personal guarantees and legal security. The natural law principles advocating for the assurance of individual rights directly challenged the realities of feudal justice and the injustice and cruelty of the inquisitorial criminal process.

The activities of 18th century humanitarians regarding the penal system shifted the emphasis toward imprisonment as a punishment. They placed the defendant as a subject of judicial proceedings, to whom fundamental human rights must be guaranteed. At the turn of the 18th/19th century, this shift provided a practical impetus for prison reform in Europe in line with humanitarian ideals.

The Enlightenment ideology, which recognized human freedom as one of the individual's fundamental rights, also paid attention to the issue of pre-trial detention. Only in the mid-18th century were the issues surrounding the principles of applying and executing temporary detention beyond legal scholars' interest. Detention occurred based on arbitrary decisions without any rules. Those temporarily arrested were held alongside convicted criminals in primitive accommodations where the conditions were unsanitary, and the suspects awaited their verdicts. No norms were defining the organization and operation of such places, and the detainees had no legal protection or the ability to defend themselves against such detention. However, thanks to eminent European penitentiary reformers, certain fundamental principles began to be advocated, which legislators should follow when determining the rules for applying and executing temporary detention.

Different legislations adopted varying regulations, but some general principles were recognized: the possibility of detaining the accused depended on the nature and gravity of the

alleged offense, the existence of a general belief in the commission of the offense, the fear of flight, confession of guilt, or conflicts between the perpetrator and the victim.

One of the most essential demands regarding the principles of executing temporary detention was the necessity to separate temporarily detained individuals from those convicted. Initially, separate cells were created for the accused in regular prisons, but in subsequent years, separate penitentiary facilities designed explicitly for temporarily detained individuals began to emerge.

In European criminal procedures, provisions regarding the organization and operation of these facilities began to emerge. As standard features of the discussed solutions, it can be noted that they required the segregation of detainees based on gender, prohibited contact between individuals suspected of jointly committing a crime, allowed visits only with the permission of the competent court, involved oversight by judicial authorities, and included regulations aimed at preventing escapes. Provisions specifying the duties of custodians were also introduced, including responsibilities such as daily inspections of detention facilities, maintaining a register of detainees, and maintaining order and discipline.

It is important to note that, on the one hand, detainees were required to adhere to discipline and prison rules. However, on the other hand, the provisions of European criminal procedures guaranteed them certain fundamental rights. Most notably, there was a need to regulate the arrangement of prison cells – these were to be rooms with access to fresh air, dry, allowing for free movement, and equipped with basic amenities. Detainees also had the right to meals (including one hot meal per day), clothing (if they did not have their own), medical care, and dignified treatment (only a court could decide to shackle a detainee).

The Enlightenment ideals in Europe did not bypass the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, where the first projects for reforming criminal law and the entire prison system appeared during the Stanislaw era.

Under the influence of the demands put forth by penitentiary reformers in Western Europe in the mid-18$^{th}$ century, specific changes can be observed in the Polish lands, such as the introduction of the principle of separating temporarily detained individuals from convicts by S. Lubomirski in the prison he opened in 1767.

However, it was only with the introduction of the *Book of Laws on Crimes and Serious Police Offenses in the Austrian partition in 1803* and *the Prussian Criminal Ordinance of 1805* in the Prussian partition that a new face was given to the institution of temporary detention, especially since these regulations were retained in the Duchy of Warsaw and later in the Kingdom of Poland.

These laws introduced specific criteria for the admissibility of detaining an accused, thereby eliminating the discretion of state authorities, whose decisions had to comply with the law. The mentioned provisions also introduced regulations regarding the principles of executing temporary detention, primarily requiring the placement of the accused in separate penitentiary facilities and specifying the principles of the organization and operation of these places.

During the Duchy of Warsaw era, demands were raised for creating a more extensive system of detention facilities, especially emphasizing the separation of places for detaining accused individuals depending on the stage of proceedings. Unfortunately, local issues prevented the comprehensive prison system reform from being carried out until the end of the existence of the Duchy of Warsaw. There was also no fundamental division between prisons for convicts and those for temporarily detained individuals, as such segregation existed only in Warsaw.

Ultimately, the government authorities of the Kingdom of Poland established a penitentiary system, which undoubtedly marked significant progress and laid the foundation for a modern prison system in the Polish territories. One of its components was the organization of detention facilities for individuals who had yet to be sentenced. Depending on the stage of the proceedings, suspects were placed in either **police detention centers, detention facilities, or investigative prisons (inquisitorial prisons).**

The concept of creating detention facilities for those accused during the initial stages of an investigation appeared in the instructions for *The temporary organization of criminal justice* issued by the Minister of Justice on May 17, 1808, during the Duchy of Warsaw era. However, it was not widely implemented at that time.

These facilities only began to operate during the time of the Kingdom of Poland, even though the instructions from May 17, 1808, were never formally introduced in the four new departments (Cracow, Lublin, Radom, and Siedlce). I could not find any legal act formally implementing these regulations in the Kingdom of Poland. Nevertheless, detention facilities were already functioning across the country in the early 1820s, starting from the issuance of the instructions by the Government Commission for Internal and Police Affairs on April 29, 1822 - *Instructions regarding the proper and uniform maintenance of police detention centers.*

The research initially led to the conclusion that, in the case of detention facilities, it can be observed that the planned administrative structure (including the organization of detention centers) utilized solutions from Prussian, Austrian, and French administrative systems, which Polish political elites had the opportunity to encounter.

The detention facilities were organized according to the French Concept and corresponded to the police detention centers established in the *French Criminal Procedure of 1808*. However, doctrinally, it undoubtedly drew from the Prussian concept of policing. These facilities' operation and organization principles were based on administrative regulations issued by government authorities, which were mainly influenced by Austrian procedures. Clear influences from the *Book of Laws on Crimes and Serious Police Offenses of 1803* can be observed regarding the segregation of detainees, nutrition, medical care, disciplinary responsibility, custodian duties, and cell arrangements. On the other hand, solutions from the *Prussian Criminal Ordinance of 1805* were primarily adopted regarding supervision, subjecting it to judicial and administrative authorities.

The analysis of the source material indicates that a significant issue was the matter of terminology. Building a modern prison administration occurred when the conceptual framework of criminal procedure terms was still taking shape. The existing chaos is evident, for example, in the lack of precision demonstrated by government authorities in using the terms *detention facility* and *police detention*, which subsequently led to frequent confusion between these two institutions, even within government administration.

Initially, detention facilities were referred to as police detention centers – such terminology can be found, for instance, in a decree issued by the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland on December 17, 1816. The following year, the Government Commission for Internal and Police Affairs issued a regulation recommending the establishment of police detention centers as a separate category of penitentiary facilities for the detention of individuals arrested by police authorities. In the subsequent years, government authorities continued to use these terms rather imprecisely. For example, the 1822 instruction regulating the internal organization of detention facilities at police courts sometimes used the terms *police detention* and *detention prison* interchangeably. Occasionally, it becomes difficult to determine which category of detention the particular document referred to. For instance, the *Instruction for the Supervisor of the Police Detention (Detention) in the Main Town Hall in Warsaw* from December 27, 1836 / January 8, 1837, did not provide a clear answer as to which type of penitentiary it concerned, or whether the authority equated these two terms in the context of detention facilities at police courts, or if the instruction was intended to apply to both types of detention facilities.

In the Kingdom of Poland, matters related to public safety, including general oversight of prisons and detention facilities, were entrusted to a central government body, namely, the Government Commission for Internal and Police Affairs. However, as the research suggests, government administration at all levels was involved in establishing detention facilities.

The principle of centralization determined the position of government administrative bodies at various levels. As A. Okolski wrote, the authority to make decisions was concentrated in the hands of the central body, which usually initiated all actions. However, it did not handle the execution of decisions independently, delegating this responsibility to intermediate authorities, such as gubernatorial governments. Acts of government commissions were typically not implemented by these authorities but were merely passed down to lower-level commissioners (county governors). Lower-level administrative bodies were not only responsible for executing the will of central authorities but also initiated their actions. Nevertheless, the principle of centralizing decision-making authority meant that the scope of autonomy for lower-level authorities was limited, and most grassroots initiatives ultimately required approval from the government commission.

The studies indicate that the principle of mutual relations between government administrative bodies also applies to the functioning and organization of detention facilities.

As revealed by the analysis of source material, almost every aspect of the operations of detention facilities fell under the jurisdiction of the Government Commission for Internal and Police Affairs. This general oversight was primarily exercised by issuing nationwide legal acts that regulated the operations of these facilities. In addition to nationwide acts, decrees specific to individual voivodeships and even individual units played a significant role due to substantial differences in the situation of each detention facility, such as the number of detainees. For example, the Government Commission for Internal and Police Affairs separately determined the staffing levels for each detention facility, the number of guards, the salaries of the prison service, approved increases in the food allowance, or the signing of lease agreements for premises. Decisions made by the government commission imposing numerous reporting or inspection obligations were also important. In line with the principle of centralization mentioned above, the government commission handed over legal acts and decisions for implementation to voivodeship commissions (gubernatorial governments). These directives were then passed down to lower levels of administration, namely county commissioners (district chiefs). They, in turn, instructed specific actions to be carried out by mayors (presidents) who were the direct authorities responsible for managing detention facilities.

As indicated by the sources, in practice, government authorities delegated some of their powers to voivodeship governments (gubernatorial authorities), such as approving quarterly liquidation reports submitted by mayors, granting permission for mayors to collect advances for the maintenance of detention facilities, or to conduct minor repairs, nominating the prison service staff, holding the prison service accountable in disciplinary and judicial matters,

approving auctions for food supply prepared by mayors if the contract amount did not exceed 5000 PLN, and issuing decisions to convert fines into substitute sentences of detention for defrauders. At times, voivodeship authorities (gubernatorial governments) also took the initiative to intervene due to the improper execution of legal acts by lower-level administrative bodies issued by government authorities.

County commissioners (district chiefs) were primarily executors of orders from higher-level authorities. As part of their duties, they communicated government legal acts to mayors (presidents) or assigned them the task of preparing reports on the condition of detention facilities, maintenance costs, or required information about current needs or tasks related to the administration of these units. County authorities also acted as intermediaries between municipal authorities and the voivodeship commission (gubernatorial government). The scope of matters left to these authorities to decide was marginal. For example, the right to appoint the prison service in county towns only emerged in 1863. County commissioners (district chiefs) essentially only took independent actions concerning the statutory supervision of detention facilities, as shown by the research.

As demonstrated by the research findings, government authorities extensively utilized territorial administration, designating mayors (presidents) as managing authorities for detention facilities and assigning them numerous responsibilities—both managerial (providing food, light, fuel, and other essential supplies) and supervisory (checking detainees upon admission to the detention facility, monitoring the population, conducting regular inspections). However, municipal authorities did not always manage these tasks effectively and often delegated some of them to supervisors (e.g., the duty of supplying food or conducting inspections upon detainee admission).

When the Kingdom of Poland was established, there were virtually no regulations defining the organization and operation of detention facilities. Therefore, central authorities had to create an entire framework of legal regulations from scratch. This task's difficulty for inexperienced government administrative staff can be observed in the legal acts governing the operation of detention facilities.

The functioning of detention facilities was based on two Instructions issued by government authorities: one dated April 29, 1822 – *Instructions for the Proper and Uniform Maintenance of Simple Police Detention Facilities*, and the other dated August 15/17, 1859 – *Instructions for Prisons and Penitentiary Institutions of the Kingdom of Poland,* dated August 15/27,1859 *(Section XXII dealt with Detention Instructions)*. These regulations contained only general principles regarding facility layout, detainee supervision, prison guard work, nutrition,

medical care, transportation, and financing. The 1822 Instructions were supplemented in subsequent years with numerous decrees addressing issues such as the categories of detainees who could be placed in these facilities, the duration of detention, control procedures, the possibility of setting up various types of detention in one place, the responsibilities of mayors for improper facility management, renovation procedures, the rights and duties of detainees, and reporting obligations.

As indicated by the analysis of legal acts issued by government authorities since the 1820s, administrative regulations often omitted many aspects of the operation of detention facilities. It includes precise rules for detainee behavior, their disciplinary responsibilities (primarily without a defined catalog of penalties), guidelines for their work, dietary requirements for individuals of the Jewish faith, duties of supervisors, responsibilities of the prison service, and procedures in case of a detainee's death. According to the research, detention facility administration managed these issues by referring to prison regulations (work rules, dietary requirements for individuals of the Jewish faith, prison service responsibilities, procedures in case of a detainee's death) or the applicable act in Warsaw, namely the *Instructions for the Supervisor of Police Detention (Detention) from January 8, 1837* (for instance, regarding detainee behavior or duties of supervisors). It is unclear why government authorities, undoubtedly aware of the existing problems, did not address these issues in the 1859 Instructions.

Analysis of archival materials revealed that the realities of the operation and organization of detention facilities often deviated from the initial legal regulations, usually due to financial constraints.

Lack of funds sometimes led to the practical impossibility of implementing regulations issued earlier by lower-level authorities. For example, the Commission for Internal and Ecclesiastical Affairs, dissatisfied with the co-location of detention facilities and police detention facilities in one place, primarily due to problems related to management and cost-sharing, decided to prohibit their combination in 1844. However, in the following years, the situation did not change significantly, mainly because of the commission's stance. They often cited a lack of funds and refused to provide municipal authorities with the means to rent a separate location or employ a separate prison service. Ultimately, government authorities accepted the situation, as they published regulations in the 1850s regarding the division of rental costs and the necessary renovations.

The fundamental issue was also the role of detention facilities in the penitentiary system of the Kingdom of Poland. Indeed, initially, the intention of the Commission for Internal and

Ecclesiastical Affairs was that detention facilities - in line with the prevailing penitentiary doctrine at the time - were intended for detainees during preliminary investigations until the indictment was filed. Although this remained their primary role throughout the existence of the Kingdom of Poland, they acquired additional functions over the years. It was due to a lack of funds and an insufficient number of penitentiary units. Non-detention-related tasks arose either from legal acts issued by government commissions (serving substitute sentences of detention for embezzlers, serving public detention sentences, and organizing overnight accommodations for transported prisoners in detention facilities) or from established practices accepted by government authorities (serving police detention sentences, detaining individuals evading military conscription or subject to extradition, as well as insolvent debtors).

From the beginning, the allowable duration of detention in detention facilities was a significant issue. Subsequent decisions of government administrative bodies in this matter vividly illustrate how challenging it was to reconcile constitutional provisions with the evolving practice of these units. The first regulations can be found in the decision of the Administrative Council from December 5/17, 1816, which invoked Article 21 of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Poland, stating that detention could last no longer than three days. The 1822 Instruction indicated a duration of eight days, and in the rescript of the Commission for Justice from May 24/June 5, 1848, detention of up to thirty days was permitted, which became an accepted practice. Adopting the thirty-day term as an allowable period of imprisonment was undoubtedly a consequence of practical experiences and an attempt to align existing regulations with the time required for conducting preliminary investigations. Therefore, the three days mentioned in Article 21 of the Constitution were ultimately recognized only as the permissible duration for police detention.

The extent to which the realities of the functioning and organization of detention facilities could deviate from the initial legal regulations is demonstrated by the issue of financing these units. Initially, according to the 1822 Instruction, the costs of maintaining detention facilities were supposed to be settled by the mayors and then reimbursed by the police courts. However, in the second half of the 1830s, settling these costs based on submissions to the gubernatorial authorities became established. Municipal authorities received reimbursement for their expenses from county treasuries rather than police courts. The 1822 Instruction mandated the monthly settlement of expenses incurred by municipal authorities from the bottom up. However, source material indicates that settlements were made annually, starting in the early 1840s, then semi-annually, and finally, the practice of quarterly settlements developed.

The 1822 Instruction stipulated that it was the mayor (president) who should cover the monthly costs of maintaining the detention facility, except for food when it was supplied by an external contractor, as the settlement of these costs was supposed to take place directly with the police court at the end of each month. However, from the 1840s onwards, there was a custom of mayors (presidents) bearing all the costs of operating detention facilities. It posed a significant challenge because municipal authorities needed more financial means. There were even cases where mayors (presidents) were forced to use their own money, which led to a situation where the costs of state operations were temporarily shifted onto officials (which can be seen as a remnant of feudal relations). Therefore, by the end of the 1830s, gubernatorial authorities began to approve advances to mayors (presidents) to maintain detention facilities. Finally, after many years, on November 9/21, 1849, the Commission for Internal Affairs issued a regulation for the entire Kingdom of Poland, instructing gubernatorial authorities to advance the necessary funds to mayors (presidents) in advance. These funds were intended to cover food costs and other needs of detention facilities. The new 1859 Instruction sanctioned settling the costs of maintaining detention facilities from gubernatorial or county treasuries but maintained the principle of monthly expense settlements from the bottom up, although mayors continued to submit quarterly settlements to the gubernatorial authorities.

Did the government authorities manage to implement Enlightenment penal ideas in detention facilities? The answer to this question takes work.

Indeed, the legislative solutions introduced, despite their shortcomings, can be positively assessed as a significant step in the construction of modern penitentiary systems in the Polish territories. They introduced the principle of separating sentenced individuals from those in pre-trial detention. In line with the demands of humanitarians, they mandated the organization of clean, heated, well-ventilated cells equipped with appropriate facilities, where no more than four individuals were to be held in a single cell. They also imposed the obligation to employ qualified prison staff and attempted to introduce regulations controlling the duration of imprisonment and the employment of detainees.

Unfortunately, the implementation of these regulations was far less successful. On the one hand, government authorities attempted to address shortcomings by issuing various disciplinary decrees aimed at lower-level bodies and imposing numerous reporting obligations on them. On the other hand, they often denied most requests from these bodies for additional funds for renovations, necessary equipment, or salary increases for detention facility workers. The lack of adequate financial resources was primarily at the root of these irregularities.

I have been engaged in a fascinating research topic, but also a challenging phase in the development of society during the transition from feudalism to the modern state. Based on the research results, we can see how difficult it was to break away from feudalism and how challenging it was to build the foundations of a modern state, where the individual began to be recognized as a subject in the individual-state relationship. The observance of fundamental human rights was to determine the actions of the state in the legislative sphere. The comprehensiveness of the research, covering social, political, economic, and legal issues, can serve as a basis for in-depth exploration and the development of society during this transitional era.

**4.2. Discussion of scientific achievements referred to in Article 2019, paragraph 1, point 2 of the Act of July 10, 2018, on Higher Education and Science, other than the monograph mentioned in point 4.1.**

**4.2.1. The organization and functioning of detention facilities in Polish territories from the Middle Ages to the 19th century.**

In addition to researching detention centers in the Kingdom of Poland from 2014 to 2022, I conducted extensive research on the organization and functioning of places of confinement from medieval times to the 19th century.

Initially, my work focused on analyzing the goals and organization of penal institutions in the First Polish Republic. These studies revealed that the functions, roles, and organization of penal institutions in historical Poland evolved by changing views on the goals of punitive institutions within the criminal justice system. They ranged from places that served as intermediate sanctions between incarceration and the death penalty (such as the "lower tower") to modern facilities emphasizing the rehabilitation of convicts (e.g., the Marshal's prison). A comprehensive presentation of my research findings can be found in the article:

- *Goals and Organization of Penal Institutions in the First Polish Republic* (Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Studies and Sketches on the History of Poland and Universal History, vol. 94, 2015, pp. 77-90).

The state of Polish prisons in the early 19th century, even by the standards of that century, was a cause for serious concern. In the Duchy of Warsaw, the prison system was based on the Prussian model, which did not consider any rehabilitation goals, focusing solely on isolation. A report submitted in 1808 by Minister of Police Aleksander Potocki paints an extremely bleak picture. Prisons were overcrowded, the prison staff neglected inmates, there was no segregation of offenders, there was a lack of clothing, the food rations were meager, and the cells were typically dark, damp, and lacked bedding. The authorities of the Duchy of

Warsaw attempted to initiate reforms, but the unstable situation in the country and a lack of funds hindered their effective implementation.

In the early years of the Kingdom of Poland, inherited from the Duchy of Warsaw, prisons remained unchanged. A pivotal moment came in 1818 when Tsar Alexander I, during his visit to Warsaw, conducted inspections of some of the capital's prisons. The dissatisfaction expressed by the Tsar with the existing conditions led to a memorandum from the State Secretary to the Minister of Justice, recommending that ministers *immediately develop a plan for the general and specific improvement of the administration and state of public prisons in Warsaw and the entire country*. The reform of the entire prison system in the Kingdom of Poland began from that moment.

These issues related to the emergence of a modern penitentiary system in the Kingdom of Poland have been the subject of my long-standing research interests.

Initially, I sought to establish the current state of knowledge, which revealed that available works devoted little attention to the organization and functioning of confinement facilities in the Kingdom of Poland. Researchers primarily focused on theoretical considerations related to penitentiary doctrines. However, historians and legal scholars largely overlooked the practical aspects of the functioning and organization of the emerging modern penitentiary system in the Kingdom of Poland. I presented my detailed findings in the article:

- *Organization and Functioning of Places of Confinement in the Kingdom of Poland (1815-1867) in Light of Sources: Current Findings and Research Perspectives* (Studies on the History of the State and Law of Poland, vol. XXI, 2018, pp. 123-139).

Subsequently, I researched state archives to identify archival materials containing information about prisons in the Kingdom of Poland. Despite significant gaps in individual archival collections, the preserved material amounts to several hundred units, essentially covering the entire range of topics related to the administration and operation of prisons in the Kingdom of Poland. The invaluable legacy of the Piotrków prison and the remnants of the Mazovian Voivodeship Commission and the Radom Provincial Government is particularly noteworthy. This archival material, until now, has largely been overlooked by historians and legal scholars who did not investigate the practical aspects of the functioning and organization of the emerging modern penitentiary system in the Kingdom of Poland. Only a few more comprehensive studies by Elżbieta Kaczyńska and Monika Senkowska have touched upon this archival material, but these authors utilized it only in a fragmented manner. I presented the entirety of the archival material I collected in the article:

*The prisons of the Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1867 in the light of state archive resources* (History-Memory-Identity in Humanities Education, vol. 4 – archives as *memory guardians*, Cracow 2016, pp. 163-175).

Next, I examined the prison system in the Kingdom of Poland, which I presented in the article:

*Types of confinement facilities in the Kingdom of Poland* (Studies on the History of the State and Law of Poland, vol. XIX, 2016, pp. 147-161).

The following research stage involved familiarizing myself with the concepts of penitentiary reform in the Kingdom of Poland by Polish penitentiary theorists in the early 19th century and comparing their views with the initial decisions issued by central government authorities. The results of this work were presented in the article:

*Decisions of central government authorities in the process of shaping the organization of the penitentiary system in the Kingdom of Poland in light of selected Polish penitentiary concepts of the early 19th century* (Legal and Economic Studies, vol. XCIV, 2015, pp. 11-31).

In the further stages of the research, I examined various aspects of the activities of penal institutions in the Kingdom of Poland. On the one hand, I analyzed the existing administrative regulations, and on the other, I examined their practical implementation using gathered archival materials. I presented the findings in several subsequent articles:

- *Pregnancy, childbirth, and childcare in prisons of the Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1867* (Studies on the History of the State and Law of Poland, vol. XVIII, 2015, pp. 55-73).

- *Spiritual care in prisons of the Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1867* (Nil nisi veritas. A Book Dedicated to Professor Jacek Matuszewski, eds. M. Głuszak, D. Wiśniewska-Jóźwiak, Lodz 2016, pp. 385-401).

- *Organization of labor of prisoners in the Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1867* (Legal-Historical Journal, vol. LXIX, no. 2, 2017, pp. 111-134).

- *Educational activities in prisons of the Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1867* (Studies on the History of the State and Law of Poland, vol. XX, 2017, pp. 135-147).

- *The work of physicians in prisons of the Kingdom of Poland – based on records of the Radom Provincial Government* (Studies on the History of the State and Law of Poland, vol. XXIII, 2020, pp. 293-316).

- *Instructions for correctional officers from March 4/16, 1853, in the light of records of the Plock Provincial Government* (Legal and Economic Studies, vol. CXV, 2020, pp. 11-31).

In addition to researching detention centers, I also explored the activities of other temporary detention facilities, such as police holding cells and inquisitorial prisons.

I paid particular attention to analyzing archival material to investigate the principles and organization of police holding cells. To date, the results of the research in this area have only been partially published in the article:

- *Organization and functioning of police holding cells in the Kingdom of Poland from 1817 to 1867*. Part I (Studies on the History of the State and Law of Poland, vol. XXII, 2019, pp. 107-126).

Furthermore, as part of the research on inquisitorial prisons, I focused on the principles of operation and organization of the Main Inquisitorial Prison in Warsaw, which I described in the article:

- *Instructions for the Main Inquisitorial Prison in Warsaw from November 26/December 8, 1835, and remarks by the Superintendent of the Main Penitentiary Prison in Warsaw from June 11/23, 1858* (Legal-Historical Journal, vol. LXXIII, 2021, pp. 215-232).

Additionally, I have authored publications:

- *On the purpose of detention facilities in the law and practice of the Kingdom of Poland* (Cracow Studies on the History of the State and Law, vol. 15, 2022, pp. 519-536).

**4.2.2. The Institution of Punishment in Historical Development**

From 2015 to 2019, in collaboration with Katarzyna Rydz-Sybilak, I researched the development of the institution of punishment from ancient times to contemporary solutions. The functions and conditions of executing punitive measures throughout history were directly dependent on the adopted concept of the goals that punishment should fulfill concerning the offender. Its image takes on a completely different shape when the punishment is primarily intended to have a rehabilitative effect, as opposed to when the fundamental premise of the penal policy is deterrence rather than the moral improvement of the offender. Our work has been presented in chapters of three monographs co-authored with Katarzyna Rydz-Sybilak:

- *Evolution of the goals and conditions of executing imprisonment from the Middle Ages to modern times* (Criminal Punishment - Historical and Penological Perspectives, eds. T. Maciejewski, W. Zalewski, Gdańsk 2019, pp. 65-81),

- *The Penalty of Deprivation of Liberty and Its Meanderings in the Polish Legal Order* (Between the Stability and Variability of Criminal Law - Legislator's Dilemmas, eds. W. Cieślak, M. Romańczuk-Grącka, Olsztyn 2017, pp. 144-157),

-*The punishment of long-term incarceration throughout history. Has history come full circle?*

In 2015-2016, I independently expanded the scope of research on imprisonment in the Kingdom of Poland. At the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, *enlightened* minds began to disdain the death penalty and the barbaric principles of criminal law. It was then believed that one human being should not have the right to take away from another fellow citizen what is most precious, namely life. Thus, during this period, there was a departure from the death penalty, and the sanction of deprivation of liberty became the primary punishment in many European penal codes. Under these circumstances, bold concepts of Polish penitentiary reformers emerged in the first half of the 19th century in the Polish territories. Among the views they expressed, the issue of the supervision of ordinary courts over the execution of deprivation of liberty sentences was a significant concern. The findings resulted in a chapter in the monograph:

- *Judicial Supervision over the Execution of Deprivation of Liberty Sentences in the Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1867* (Judiciary in Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries, eds. E. Leniart, R. Świgroń-Skok, W. Wlaźlak, Cracow 2016, pp. 23-37).

### 4.2.3. The History of Inheritance Law in the Polish Territories from the Middle Ages to Modern Times

In 2011, in collaboration with Anna Marciniak-Sikora, I researched the inheritance law in effect in the First Polish Republic. The result of this work is the article:

- *From noble statutory inheritance to freedom of testation in the Napoleonic Code* (Legal and Economic Studies vol. LXXXVI, 2012, pp. 11-31).

From 2011 to 2015, the subject of the intensive research interests was the development of modern inheritance law in the Kingdom of Poland, starting with the principles derived from the old Polish law, through the regulations adopted in the Napoleonic Code, and concluding with the rules arising from the Civil Code of the Kingdom of Poland. The research extended the research topics I had been working on until 2011 while preparing the doctoral dissertation on the topic of *Public Testaments in the Territories of the Kingdom of Poland in Light of Notarial Practice Based on the Activities of Notary Offices in Zgierz from 1826-1875*.

These studies resulted in a monograph and six scientific articles.

The most prominent work in this body of work is the monograph titled:

- *The Testament – Law and Practice in the Kingdom of Poland. In Light of the Acts of Notaries in Zgierz from 1826-1875* (University of Lodz Publishing House 2013, reviewed by Prof. Dr. Wojciech Witkowski).

In this book, I expanded previous research to cover the issues of holographic wills and secret testaments. This monograph is dedicated to the emerging 19th century institution of the testament in the territories of the Kingdom of Poland, which assumed the freedom to dispose of property in case of death as a natural right of every human being, albeit limited by the rights of the nearest relatives. The book is the first comprehensive contemporary literature on testamentary law in force in the Kingdom of Poland, presented against the background of the 19th century notary offices in Zgierz (1826-1875). The primary asset of this publication is the source material. The book analyzes 319 public testaments, ten records of court sessions regarding the opening of holographic wills, and nine secret testaments. The monograph addresses issues such as the limits of testamentary freedom, formal requirements of a testament, the capacity to dispose of property upon death, the capacity to inherit property by testament and its limits, types of testamentary dispositions, the institution of the executor of a will, and the invalidation of a will.

Regarding research into inheritance law in the Kingdom of Poland, I also collaborated with Dorota Wiśniewska, whose results were presented in three articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals:

- *Holographic Wills in Light of the Legislation of the Kingdom of Poland and the Practice Based on the Records of Notary Offices in Zgierz from 1826-1875* (Legal-Historical Journal., vol. LXIV, no. 2, 2012, pp. 331-349).

- *Formal Requirements of Secret Wills in Light of the Legislation of the Kingdom of Poland and the Practice Based on the Records of Notary Offices in Zgierz from 1826-1875* ("Legal and Economic Studies, vol. LXXXVIII, 2013, pp. 11-35).

- *The Principles of Statutory Inheritance in the Territories of the Kingdom of Poland after 1826* (Legal-Historical Journal, vol. LXVI, no. 1, 2014, pp. 105-120).

After 1918, Poland began the process of legal unification in various fields of law, which was a lengthy process. It led to the continuation of the use of foreign laws in many areas for several years. One of the last areas to be unified was inheritance law. Only after World War II, the Decree of the Council of Ministers of October 8, 1946 – Inheritance Law, which came into force on January 1, 1947, introduced uniform regulations throughout the country, repealing the foreign laws applicable in the respective regions. However, despite the formal repeal of the inheritance law provisions in force in the former Kingdom of Poland, court decisions still refer to the Napoleonic Code and the Civil Code of the Kingdom of Poland when it is necessary to regulate inheritance matters related to estates opened before 1947. As a practicing lawyer (advocate), I became interested in the judgments of the Supreme Court rendered in inheritance

cases based on the laws in force in the former Kingdom of Poland. Most frequently, contemporary judicial practice deals with intertemporal issues related to applying the inheritance law provisions of the Napoleonic Code and the Civil Code of the Kingdom of Poland and their interpretation after 1946. The results of this research were described in the article:

- *The Inheritance Law of the Kingdom of Poland in the Jurisprudence of the Supreme Court* (State and Law., no. 12, 2015, pp. 93-107).

As a practicing lawyer, I am also interested in finding contemporary legal solutions in old inheritance law. In this regard, in 2012, I collaborated with Michał Kłos, resulting in the article:

- Specific Bequest – *Back to the Past* (State and Law, no. 4, 2013, pp. 15-30).

I had the opportunity to present the results of the research on the inheritance law of the Kingdom of Poland in English in the article:

- *Testamentary Law in Congress Poland on the example of the files of the Zgierz notaries in the years 1826-1875* (Studies in the History of Polish State and Law, vol. XXIV, 2021, pp. 187-205).

### 4.2.4. From the Field of Obligations Law in the Kingdom of Poland

In 2015, I began research on the issues of obligations law in the Kingdom of Poland. I became particularly interested in the matter of personal coercion of debtors in civil cases when, during archival research on detention centers, I came across an archival unit titled *Records of the City of Radom Concerning Civil Arrests* (from January 25, 1844, to June 29, 1855) at the State Archive in Radom. The Napoleonic Code, in effect since 1808 in the Duchy of Warsaw and later in the Kingdom of Poland, provided for the institution of *personal coercion in civil matters* in Book III (concerning various methods of acquiring property) in Title XVIII. It was an enforcement measure involving the imprisonment of a debtor in custody to compel them to fulfill their obligations. The detailed rules for applying this instrument were specified in the applicable French Code of Civil Procedure from 1804. The result of the work is the article:
The Institution of Personal Coercion of Debtors in Civil Cases in the Lands of the Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1875" (Studia Iuridica Lublinensia. A Jubilee Book Dedicated to Professor Wojciech Witkowski, vol. XXV, Lublin 2015, pp. 85-105).

### 4.2.5. Donations in the Lands of the Kingdom of Poland

In 2010-2012, I cooperated with Dorota Wisniewska in researching particular types of donations made in the Kingdom of Poland. In the past, the law in force in the Polish lands knew

special types of donations, similar to the donation on death, which is the subject of contemporary discussion. The donation of future property, which functioned under the Napoleonic Code, is an excellent example of this because of its object: the property remaining after the donor's death. It could only be made in a prenup, which limited the freedom to dispose of property on death. According to source research, information on such deeds has been preserved in the records of 19th-century notary offices in Lodz. The result of the conducted work is a co-authored article with Dorota Wisniewska:

- *Special types of donations regulated by the Napoleonic Code and the practice of the first notaries of Lodz. Considerations against the background of the contemporary discussion on the introduction of donation on death* (Legal and Historical Journal Vol. LXIV, z.2, 2012, pp. 315-33).

### 4.2.6. Property Relations in the Kingdom of Poland

In 2012, I conducted research with Dorota Wiśniewska on the issue of property relations in the Kingdom of Poland, during which we paid particular attention to settlement issues in Lodz in the first half of the 19th century. One of the primary goals of the government authorities in the Kingdom of Poland was the country's economic development, including its industrialization. The possession of appropriate resources such as wool, flax, and hemp determined that textiles would be one of the main directions of industrial development. However, this required the government to create favorable conditions for the settlement of colonists. One of the cities selected by Rajmund Rembieliński (the President of the Mazovian Voivodeship Commission) in 1820 to become centers of the textile industry was Lodz. From that moment on, there was an intensive development of settlement in Lodz. The result of the collaborative work with Dorota Wiśniewska is the article:

- *Settlement Conditions in Lodz in the First Half of the 19th Century in the Light of Declared Protocols* (Studies in the History of the Polish State and Law, Vol. XVI, 2013, pp. 183-200).

### 4.2.7. Family Law in the Lands of the Kingdom of Poland

In 2011, together with Joanna Machut-Kowalczyk, I researched family law in the Kingdom of Poland. Our discussions revolved around the institutions of the advisor and the assigned guardian. According to Article 389 of the Civil Code of the Kingdom of Poland, the assigned guardian was appointed to oversee the actions taken by the main guardian and to act on behalf of the ward in case of conflicts of interest between the guardian and the ward. On the

other hand, the assigned guardian mentioned in Article 350 of the Civil Code of the Kingdom of Poland had the task of assisting a widowed mother under whose care the primary guardianship remained. Both of these institutions, albeit through different means, aimed to protect minors' financial and personal interests in the event of the death of one or both parents. However, as our source materials analysis showed, the assigned guardian's roles and responsibilities were often not distinguished from those associated with the position of advisor. The results of our work were published in the article:

- *Advisor and Assigned Guardian in the Light of the Civil Code of the Kingdom of Poland - Similarities and Differences* (Studies in the History of the Polish State and Law, Vol. XV, 2012, pp. 85-97).

### 4.2.8. History of Fiscal Criminal Law in the Polish Territories

In 2011, together with Dorota Wiśniewska and Katarzyna Rydz-Sybilak, we initiated research on the development of fiscal criminal law in the Polish territories. The formation of the foundations of modern fiscal administration can be traced back to the first half of the 19th century. The growing capitalism during that period expanded the existing criminal and criminal-administrative legislation. Most legal scholars initially classified fiscal criminal law under these branches of law. In the case of the Polish territories, which were under foreign rule at the time, the beginning of the fiscal law system and the closely related fiscal criminal law was shaped by the legislation of the occupying powers. Under these circumstances, the concept of subsidiary liability in fiscal criminal law, which involves personal financial responsibility for fines imposed on the perpetrator of fiscal offenses, first appeared in the late 19th century in the Polish territories. Our research focused explicitly on this institution, and the result is the article:

- *Development of Subsidiary Liability in the Polish Territories in Fiscal Criminal Law Until 1936 (Studies in the History of the State and Law, Vol. XV, 2012, pp. 125-145).*

### 4.2.9. History of Notaries in Polish Territories

In 2012, I initiated collaboration with Dorota Wiśniewska and Anna Marciniak-Sikora on the subject of notaries maintaining various registers of notarial acts. The results of our cooperation were presented in the academic article:

*Notarial Registers - at the Origins of the Present Day* (Rejent, No. 6 (266), June 2013, pp. 27-54).

### 4.2.10. Pedagogy

In the years 2012-2013, along with Dorota Wiśniewska, I engaged in pedagogical matters in terms of historical aspects and contemporary legal education in legal history. The research primarily focused on the latter issue concerning the scope and state of knowledge about civil law in the Kingdom of Poland being conveyed to law students. The findings were presented in the form of a chapter in the monograph:

- *Civil Law in the Kingdom of Poland in Selected Polish Academic Textbooks* (Lodz, Poland and Central-Eastern Europe in History Textbooks, eds. Z. Anusik, M. Karkoch, J. Kita, E. Wiśniewski, Lodz 2013, pp. 77-97).

After earning a doctoral degree, the research and scholarly achievements include 34 publications (2 monographs and 32 articles) in peer-reviewed scientific journals or chapters in scholarly works.

## 5. Information on Demonstrating Significant Academic or Artistic Activity Across Multiple Universities, Scientific Institutions, or Cultural Institutions, Especially Abroad.

### 5.1 Participation in International and National Scientific Conferences Organized by Higher Education Institutions:

- Justyna Bieda, Anna Marciniak-Sikora, Dorota Wiśniewska, 2012 paper on *The Notarial Bureaucracy at the Origins of Modern Times* presented at the international scientific conference *V International Symposium on the History of Bureaucracy* organized by Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń.
- Justyna Bieda, 2014, paper on *Views of Polish Penologists in the Early 19th Century* presented at the 25th Nationwide Congress of Legal Historians *Science and Teaching of Law in the Past and Present* organized by Jagiellonian University in Cracow.
- Justyna Bieda, 2015, paper on *Judicial Supervision of the Execution of Imprisonment Penalties in the Kingdom of Poland, 1815-1866* presented at the nationwide scientific conference *Judiciary in Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries* organized by the University of Rzeszów.
- Justyna Bieda, 2015, paper on *Prisons in the Kingdom of Poland, 1815-1867, in the Light of State Archives Resources* presented at the nationwide scientific conference *Archives as Guardians of Memory* organized by the KEN Pedagogical University in Cracow.

- Justyna Bieda, K. Rydz-Sybilak, 2016, paper on *The Evolution of the Goals and Conditions of Imprisonment Penalties from the Middle Ages to Modern Times* presented at the nationwide scientific conference *History of Justice: An Alternative History of Punishment* organized by the University of Gdańsk.

- Justyna Bieda, 2017, paper on T*he Institution of Pretrial Detention in the Kingdom of Poland, 1815-1866* presented at the nationwide scientific conference *Spring Meetings of the Young - New Techniques and the Source-Based Nature of Research Work in Legal History* organized by the University of Gdańsk and the University of Lodz.

- Justyna Bieda, K. Rydz-Sybilak, 2017, paper on *The Penalty of Deprivation of Liberty and Its Meanderings in the Polish Legal Order* presented at the nationwide scientific conference *4th Warmia Conference on Penal Sciences - Between Stability and Change in Criminal Law - Legislative Dilemmas* organized by the University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn.

- Justyna Bieda, 2018, paper on *Police Detention in the Kingdom of Poland, 1815-1867* presented at the national scientific conference *XXVII Nationwide Congress of Constitutional and Legal Historians, Political and Legal Doctrines* organized by Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin.

- Justyna Bieda, 2019, paper on *Organization of Local Government in Light of the Act on Partial Amendment of the Local Government System of March 23, 1933,* presented at the nationwide scientific conference *Local Government in Political and Legal Thought* organized by the University of Natural Sciences and Humanities in Siedlce.

- Justyna Bieda, Dorota Wiśniewska, Joanna Machut-Kowalczyk, 2021, paper on *Taking Over Former Law* presented at the nationwide scientific conference *XXVIII Nationwide Congress of Legal and Constitutional Historians. Lawmaking* organized by the Academy of Economics and Humanities in Warsaw.

**5.2. Research Internships**

From May 1, 2023, to June 30, 2023, I completed a research internship at the History of State and Law Department at the Faculty of Law and Administration, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin. The purpose of the internship was to collaborate and exchange experiences with the department's staff on research related to the development of modern administration in Polish territories. It included consultations with Prof. Dr. Hab. Wojciech Witkowski and participation in the department's academic seminar. Additionally, I conducted library and archival research, focusing on work at the State Archives in Lublin. It allowed me

to gather source materials regarding the functioning and organization of regional (Gubernial Government of Lublin) and municipal administration in the 19 th century.

### 5.3. Collaboration with Universities in Organizing Scientific Conferences

I collaborated with the University of Gdańsk as a member of the organizing committee for the nationwide scientific conference "Spring Meetings of the Young - New Techniques and the Source-Based Nature of Research Work in Legal History," which took place in 2017 at the Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Lodz.

### 5.4. Collaboration with Universities in the Establishment and Activities of the Polish Society for Legal History

I collaborated with faculty members from various departments, including those at Jagiellonian University in Kraków, the University of Gdańsk, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, the University of Warsaw, and Nicolaus Copernicus University in Poznań, in the establishment of the Polish Society for Legal History (of which I am one of the founding members). Currently, within the Polish Society for Legal History framework, I am collaborating with faculty members from the mentioned universities to prepare a new synthesis of the history of Polish law.

## 6. Information on Educational, Organizational, and Science or Art Popularization Achievements

### 6.1. Educational Achievements

a) I am an experienced educator, and since 2004, I have been conducting classes with students at the University of Lodz, both at the Faculty of Law and Administration and the Faculty of Economics and Sociology. In the teaching role, I deliver lectures in various courses such as administrative history, judicial history, and basic law principles. I also lead practical exercises in subjects like the history of the Polish state and law and administrative history. Additionally, I supervise undergraduate seminars (acting as a supervisor for 23 undergraduate theses) and graduate seminars (acting as a supervisor for 15 master's theses and serving as a reviewer for 11 master's theses).

b) I served as an auxiliary supervisor during the doctoral defense of Ms. Monika Strzelecka's thesis titled *Sales Contracts in the Duchy of Warsaw*, which was successfully defended in 2023.

c) I have been the academic advisor for the Student Scientific Circle of Legal History since 2013 at the Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Lodz.

d) I provided academic guidance to students participating in the nationwide historical and legal olympiad from 2013 to 2016.

**6.2. Organizational Achievements**

**a) Participation in Organizational Committees of National Scientific Conferences**

- *Will We Still Write Monographs? - 1st Methodological Conference of Legal and Historical Sciences*, 2011, Lodz – organizer of thematic sessions
- XXIX Congress of Legal Historians, *Law and Politics. Political Determinants of Law or Legal Determinants of Politics*, 2012, Lodz – organizer of plenary and panel sessions
- Scientific and Training Conference, *The Influence of Ancient Law on the Administration of Justice Today*, 2014 – organizer of thematic sessions
- *History of State and Law. From the Current Trends in Research*, 2016, Lodz – organizer of thematic sessions
- Nationwide Scientific Conference in the *Spring Meetings of the Young* series on the topic: *New Techniques and the Source-Based Nature of Research Work in Legal History*," 2017, Lodz – secretary of the scientific committee, organizer of thematic sessions
- III Nationwide Scientific Conference in the *Spring Meetings of the Young* series on the topic: *Medieval Studies, Modern and Contemporary Times* Research Perspectives, 2018 – secretary of the organizing committee, organizer of thematic sessions
- Nationwide Scientific Conference *Issues in Penitentiary Studies in the Kingdom of Poland*, 2019 – chairman of the organizing committee
- IV Nationwide Scientific Conference in the *Spring Meetings of the Young* series on the topic: *State, Administration, Family*, 2019, Lodz – organizer of thematic sessions.

**6.3. Achievements in Popularizing Science**

My activities in the field of science popularization encompass various forms of engagement, as listed below:

1. Training for the National Public Prosecutor's Office in inheritance law applicable in the former Kingdom of Poland, 2018.
2. Training sessions for private sector entities on inheritance law applicable in the former Kingdom of Poland, 2019.

3. Collaboration with the *Ubi Societas Ibi Ius* Foundation, during which I contributed to the entries for the volume of the Great Encyclopedia of Law titled *History of Polish State and Law*, 2019.
4. Collaboration with the Association of Police Pensioners and Retirees, including the preparation of a legal opinion on the issue of whether the activities carried out by officers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs Communication Department and its regional counterparts in the years 1984-1990 constituted operational-technical activities necessary for the operations of the Security Service, as referred to in Article 13b(1)(5)(d) of the Act of December 16, 2016, amending the Act on the Retirement Benefits of Police Officers, the Internal Security Agency, the Foreign Intelligence Agency, the Military Counterintelligence Service, the Military Intelligence Service, the Central Anti-Corruption Bureau, the Border Guard, the Government Protection Bureau, the State Fire Service, and the Prison Service, and their families (Journal of Laws, item 2270).
5. Publication of an article titled *A Few Words on the Principles of Document Storage in State Archives* in Abi Expert, issue 3, 2019.

**7. In addition to the matters mentioned in points 1-6, other information relevant to the applicant's career**

**7.1. Practicing as a Lawyer Since 2011**

I have been working as a lawyer, managing an Individual Law Firm specializing in family and inheritance law. It allows me to combine the academic interests with contemporary legal practice. During my legal practice, I have prepared numerous legal opinions, both for private individuals and associations, where a crucial element is the need to reference past historical laws in force on Polish lands. Primarily, these opinions concern 19th century inheritance law (especially the provisions of the Napoleonic Code). These opinions were issued based on factual circumstances arising during restitution proceedings.

**7.2. Research Grants From 2012 to 2016**

I received research funding from departmental funds (Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Lodz) as part of a competition for young academic staff to research *The Development of Prisons in the Kingdom of Poland.*

Łódź, 9. 10. 2023 Beata Kuźma