

The Legal System of Terek Oblast in 1870-1917: The Organizational Characteristics and Separating Jurisdictions

Alexey Abazov*

Abstract

The aim of the paper is to investigate the legal system of the Terek Oblast from the end of the 19th to the beginning of the 20th centuries. The roles and the functions of Vladikavkaz district court, magistrates and general sessions, mountain oral court, stanitsa and sloboda courts, aul and precinct courts as well as mediation courts (intermediate courts and plectrum courts) are put under study. The article concludes that at the end of 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century the legal system in the Terek Oblast combined common principles of legal structure and some features of indigenous traditional justice (jurisdiction).

Keywords: legal system, Terek Oblast, Vladikavkaz district court, courts.

Terek Oblastı'nda 1870-1917 Yıllarında Hukuk Sistemi: Organizasyon Özellikleri ve Yetki Alanlarının Ayrımı

Özet

Bu makalenin amacı 19. yüzyıl sonu ve 20. yüzyıl başında Terek Oblastı'nın hukuk sistemini araştırmaktır. Vladikavkaz bölge mahkemesinin, sulh hakimlerinin ve genel oturumlarının, sözlü Dağlı mahkemelerinin, köy ve yerleşim mahkemelerinin, kasaba ve bölge mahkemelerinin rollerinin ve işlevlerinin yanı sıra arabuluculuk mahkemeleri (ara mahkemeler ve müşavir mahkemeleri) mercek altına alınmıştır. Makale, 19. yüzyılın sonunda ve 20. yüzyılın başlarında, Terek Oblastı'nda yasal sistemin, hukuki yapıya ilişkin ortak ilkeleri ile bölgenin yerli nüfusunun adalet (yargı) geleneğinin bazı özelliklerini birleştirdiği sonucuna varmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: hukuk sistemi, Terek Oblastı, Vladikavkaz bölge mahkemesi, mahkemeler.

* Alexey Abazov, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Senior Research Associate, Medieval and Modern History, Kabardino-Balkarian Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Assoc. Prof., H.M. Berbekov State University of Kabardino-Balkaria; Russian Federation; alex_abazov@list.ru.

(Gönderim / Received: 04.03.2018; Yayın Kabul / Accepted: 04.06.2018)

1. General Terms

The history of the legal system in the Terek Oblast from the end of 19th century to the beginning of 20th century has always been an appealing research subject (Abazov; Arsanukayeva; Babich; Dumanov and Ketov; Dumanov and Kushkov; Gladunets; Khasbulatov; Kalmykov; Kempinsky and Zozulya; Kobakhidze; Maltsev; Muratova; Zozulya; Saydumov; Serduk etc.). The structure, compilation order, and law-enforcement practice of certain legal agencies in certain regional districts have been investigated in detail. Nevertheless, there is no integrative study regarding the history of the court and legal agencies in the Terek Oblast within the period given. Therefore, this paper is aimed to describe the legal system in the Terek Oblast and to determine and identify the role, functions and jurisdiction of its legal agencies.

To study the features of the legal system in the Terek Oblast in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, one must consider the administrative and territorial division of the region. At that time, Caucasian Viceroyalty included the Tiflis, Kutaisi, Erivan, Elisavetpol, Baku, and Chernomorie (Black Sea Coast) Governorates; the Kuban, Terek, Dagestan, Kara, and Batumi Oblasts and the Zakatala and Sukhumi okrugs. The legal system featured a complex hierarchy, where each branch had its own range of powers. Still, in 1912 a senator M.N. Reinke claimed that 'although the judicial statutes of November the 20th 1864 were established everywhere within the Caucasian Viceroyalty, numerous considerable deviations were detected in different parts of the region, which made the pattern of a united legal system, adopted at the territory, quite delusive...' (Anthology of monuments 457). He particularly denoted, that 'in the Terek Oblast there are no jurors present when criminal cases are heard, but there are general sessions for cases of world jurisdiction, and the Governing Senate is a cassational source' (Anthology of monuments 457).

The complex multilevel legal system was shaped and introduced in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It should also be considered that the legal authorities were trying to preserve the basic features of the indigenous population's traditional jurisdiction adopted. They were thus elaborating the patterns of how it should function in courts,

created upon a Russian platform. This system included: Vladikavkaz district court, magistrates and general sessions, mountain oral courts, stanitsa and sloboda courts, aul and precinct courts, as well as mediation courts.

2. Vladikavkaz District Court

The Vladikavkaz district court and prosecutor's supervision, the magisterial precinct and investigation districts, and the notarial archives and offices were established on January, 1 in 1871, causing the termination of the Terek and Kizlyar district courts, the Mozdok city hall and Terek regional prosecutor posts, and Kizlyar and Mozdok solicitors. All these changes sought to realize the guidelines of the 1864 judicial reform. The Caucasus Viceroy's act, as of December 30th 1869, put in force the judicial statutes of November 20th 1864 in the Kuban and Terek Oblasts, as well as statutes on notaries in the Chernomorje Okrug of April 14th 1866. These transformations were to abide by the following principles: the native population of the Terek Oblast, for criminal and civil cases, were to be considered at aul and precinct courts, as well as at oral, stanitsa and sloboda courts, and by magistrates at Vladikavkaz district court for other cases.

Vladikavkaz district court was at the top of the judiciary hierarchy, functioning across the entire territory of the Terek Oblast. Its jurisdiction encompassed criminal and civil cases, performed within the Terek Oblast and referred to district courts by the statutes of November 20th 1864.

Criminal cases considered by Vladikavkaz district court were to undergo preliminary investigation by the inquisitor before being referred to the court. Complaints and claims were lodged in simple written form to either a policeman or an investigating judge of the area of investigation, to which the case belonged. The complaint was to include 'the date and the place where the case took place, who is accused or suspected and why; if the injured party is demanding a recuperation for the damage, and what the damage and the recuperation amount is.' (Central State Archive, 23). The aggrieved could engage witnesses on their behalf and provide evidence in favor of their claim (suit), be present at all of the investigating actions, and, with the inquisitor's agreement, pose questions to the accused and the witnesses at the stage of preliminary investigation. The parties

had the right to file complaints about investigatory actions that seemed to violate their rights. Such complaints were addressed to the prosecutor of the Vladikavkaz district court and to the regional court if the complaint concerned the inquisitor's actions. After the investigation, it was referred to the prosecutor and the parties were informed (Central State Archive, 23).

Civil suits were filed to the Vladikavkaz district people's court in written form in Russian. Each lawsuit was to be supplied with a special petition (Central State Archive, 23). The petition was provided to the court by the claimant, his public attorney, or sent by post. The letter of attorney, for its lodgment, could be provided on the petition itself. The complaint (the statement of claim) was to include the following points: '1) the court, to which it is provided 2) the names and the addresses of the plaintiff as well as the defendant 3) the price of the suit (claim), except for the positions impossible to estimate 4) the summary of the case 5) the proof and the laws the suit (claim) is based on 6) the pleading point which covers the demands of the plaintiff, or the case for which they request a decision.' (Central State Archive, 23). Other documents can be added to the complaint (the statement of claim) if needed. The copies of the complaint (the statement of claim) and the supplements were provided according to the number of the defendants. In cases of neglecting the requirements on the form of the complaint (the statement of claim), they could be rejected without consideration.

The claimant and the defendant, prosecutor and the person filing a suit for property damages in a criminal case, could delegate public attorneys to the court to advocate their rights. Public attorneys were considered to be those 'having the abilities demanded (art. 246 of the Civil Court Law), introduced by a formal letter of attorney (if they are not official public attorneys), written on a stamped 2-ruble denomination paper and notarized.' (Central State Archive, 23). Rural communities authorized their public attorneys by common resolutions. For everything performed by a public attorney, within the letter of attorney, it was obligatory to perform for the person providing the letter.

Vladikavkaz district court sessions were performed in public on all types of cases, except for those 'impossible to consider in public for

religious, public order and ethical reasons.' (Central State Archive, 23). Moreover, the session on civil cases could be performed behind closed doors, if both parties provided such a claim and the court considered their claim legitimate (Central State Archive, 23).

The authority superior to the Vladikavkaz district court was the Tiflis court of justice. Appeler reports on court verdicts on criminal cases could be filed within two weeks of being announced. For civil cases, according to judicial procedure, a month or 4-month term was established to file appeal petitions. (Central State Archive, 24) The term for lodging a complaint started from the day of the verdict announcement. Appeler reports and complaints were filed to Vladikavkaz district court to address them to Tiflis court of justice. The verdicts of the court of justice were considered unappealable and could be challenged only on appeal.

3. Magistrates and General Sessions

Magistrates and General Sessions were a significant part of the legal system of the Terek Oblast in 1870-1917. Judiciary reforms of 1860s-70s divided the Terek Oblast into two districts (Vladikavkaz and Kizlyar districts), with each including four magisterial precincts.

Magistrate courts considered all of the cases, initiated against the non-mountain population of the Terek Oblast. The cases involving mountaineers were considered at magister courts, if they presented one of the parties (the claimant or the defendant, the prosecutor or the accused; the other party was represented by a non-mountain member of the region population) (Central State Archive, 21).

Criminal cases were considered at magistrate courts, if they concerned offences, specified in the 'Statute on penalties administered by magistrates' as of November the 20th 1864. Exceptions involved the following cases: '1) when an offence performed at a district administered by a stanitsa or sloboda court, should be considered by this court; 2) when the injured party provides a lawsuit for damages higher than 500 rubles along with the main complaint; 3) when the penalty involves the delinquent's removal from community (commorancy) along with a ban on trade and craft business or a shutdown of trade or craft establishment.' (Central State Archive, 21).

Civil cases administered by magistrates include: '1) lawsuits on personal recognizance and agreements on movables costing up to 500 rubles; 2) lawsuits on damages up to 500 rubles; 3) lawsuits on personal offences and abuse; 4) lawsuits on restoring real estate ownership when the violation term is less than 6 months 5) lawsuits on private easement if the violation term is less than 12 months.' (Central State Archive, 21). The civil disputes mentioned were not considered by magistrates '1) if the lawsuits based on the case is to be considered by stanitsa or sloboda courts; 2) when the lawsuits concerns the interests of a public establishment except for the lawsuits on real property ownership.' (Central State Archive, 21). Moreover, the magistrate reserved the right to consider any civil dispute except for those filed by mountain-population of the Terek Oblast on both parties. In this case the verdict was considered final and unappealable (Central State Archive, 21).

The lawsuits on real property ownership regardless of its cost and suits (claims), based on a formal act of ownership right (right of possession) for property of such kind, were not considered by magistrates, but by Vladikavkaz district court (Central State Archive, 21).

Apart from magistrates, supervising magisterial precincts, the Honorable Justice of the Peace functioned at the Terek Oblast. Unlike magisterial precinct courts, the Honorable Justice of the Peace court (besides fulfilling its basic legal functions at some certain district) delivered justice in the whole administrative division. Civil and criminal cases referred to magistrate courts could be considered by a police officer as well as the Honorable Justice of Peace. Still, cases could be referred to the Honorable Justice of the Peace court provided there was an agreement between both parties. In accordance with the particular law, 'if a case is considered by the Honorable Justice of Peace, it cannot be considered at another court later.' (Central State Archive, 21).

Complaints and declarations were filed in oral or simple written form to the police officer or Honorable Justice of the Peace, according to the territory, in which the case took place or where the defendant lived (Central State Archive, 21). There were certain standards for the complaints and declarations forms. A complaint lodged both in oral or

written form was to cover: '1) the names and the addresses of the complainant or the plaintiff; 2) the case, the date and the scene of the case; 3) the damages; 4) the suspect or the accused person and their address; 5) the witnesses or any evidence which supports the claim; 6) the date of the complaint.' (Central State Archive, 21). In the civil claim, the plaintiff had to specify: '1) the names and the addresses of the claimant and the witnesses (if there are any), as well as of the defendant; 2) provide the evidence the lawsuit is based upon; 3) provide the compensation cost for the claim, except for positions impossible to estimate; 4) explain what exactly the demand is for.' (Central State Archive, 21).

The parties and the witnesses were invited to court proceedings by summons, where default appearance consequences were mentioned as well. If the accused in a criminal case lived in the same district where the magistrate court was located, he could be invited to court proceedings by an oral order of the Honorable Justice of Peace. Notice papers were served in person and the person summoned (or their representative) had to sign one of the copies of the paper. In the event of the absence of the person summoned, the notice paper was served to the elder member of their family or village chief, or a police officer to hand it over to the person summoned (Central State Archive, 21).

Both the claimant and the defendant in civil cases, and the prosecutor and the complainant in criminal cases (in some categories of cases the accused person as well), were permitted to delegate a representative to advocate their rights.

It is noteworthy that the legislation of that period satisfied certain demands of the attorneys, taking part in court proceedings. Thus, an attorney was considered to 'possess the abilities demanded and provided in the law (art. 45 Civil Law) and is able to run the case in one of the following ways: 1) by a formal letter of attorney written on a stamped 2-ruble denomination paper and notarized (by a magistrate); 2) by a written claim on the complaint itself, with the attorney's signature notarized by a magistrate or police department, or local village chief office; 3) by an oral claim filed to the judge considering the case.' (Central State Archive, 21). In criminal cases, where the punishment involved arrest or deportation, the accused

had to be present in court when their case was being heard (Central State Archive, 21).

The magistrates and the Honorable Justice of the Peace considered cases both orally and publicly. Closed sessions were used for cases, where publicity could break ethical norms and for some criminal cases based on special appeals (private complaints). They were also used in civil suits provided that both parties filed a claim in a closed court session and the magistrate considered it reasonable.

Verdicts and decisions of the district magistrate or Honorable Justice of the Peace were considered as final and beyond appeal in the following cases: '1) when the verdict imposes a reprimand or an admonition, a fine of up to 15 rubles per capita or arrest of up to 3 three days and the damages claim does not exceed 30 rubles; 2) when the lawsuit in a civil case is not over 30 rubles.' (Central State Archive, 22). Other verdicts of the district magistrate or Honorable Justice of the Peace could be appealed or reported on. This is the reason why the judges were obliged to explain the order of appeal to the parties after the verdict was announced.

The Justice of the Peace (J.P.) Congress was the supreme authority, which considered these appeals. The Justice of the Peace Congress was an assembly of honorable and district Justices of the Peace from the J.P. districts of the Terek Oblast. There were regulations, providing the way the trials on the Justice of the Peace Congresses were held. The Vladikavkaz J.P. Congress of the Terek Oblast was held monthly at the beginning of the month, and by turns in Vladikavkaz or in Georgievsk. The Kizlyar J.P. Congress was also held monthly after the 14th on the scheme arranged beforehand in Kizlyar, Mozdok and Grozny. If the majority of dwellers lived in the same territory, the violation of the turn was allowed and it was announced in the newspaper "Terskie Vedomosti". Moreover, in several cases, urgent Justice of the Peace conventions were stipulated.

The trial was held for similar reasons to the ones considered in the justice's court. The sides of the criminal case weren't summoned, except in the event that the accused may be imprisoned.

The participation of civil cases parts was compulsory. Non-attendance of one part was not regarded as a reason to postpone the trial. The trial could be rescheduled only if both parts failed to appear.

Verdicts and decisions made at the Justice of the Peace Congress were final and couldn't be appealed. However, an appeal remained possible if, after the trial, cases of violation of acting legislation, jurisdiction or trial were registered. The J.P. Congress appeals could be lodged in the Governing Senate.

4. Mountain Oral Courts

Mountain oral courts were also established during the judiciary reform; the official starting date was 1st of January, 1871. The oral courts were launched in Vladikavkaz and Grozny, in the stanitsas of Nalchik, Hasav-Urt, Shatoi, Vedenov, and in the Nazran fortification. However, according to the decision of Caucasian Viceroy, the Vladikavkaz mountain oral court was not put into operation. Mountain oral courts had to deal with lawsuits of mountaineers, who lived within the territorial jurisdiction of this inhabited locality.

N. M. Reinke wrote that "the Mountain courts of the Kuban and Terek Oblasts, and also the People's court of Transcaucasia, are the first degree of jurisdiction; they are the court's administrative establishments; they act uninterruptedly while consisting of the chairman designated by the administration, deputies (judges) and kadhi, appointed by the people" (Anthology of monuments 457).

The main normative document regulating their activity was "Mountain courts of Kuban and Terek Oblasts" (Kuban Help Book). According to the document, crimes committed by mountaineers against mountaineers were under the jurisdiction of criminal cases, including: "1) offence, imposed by the Justice of the Peace indicated in the sentence charter, except for the cases considered by a mountain village court; 2) wounding, maiming and even murder in a quarrel or a fight, which started without an intention to murder or wound; 3) murder, wounding or maiming or some other damage to health, committed without an intention or by chance; 4) breach of the limits of allowable personal defense actions; 5) defilement and rape of a female; 6) burglary and theft, when the guilty possessed any kind of weapon with which the wounding could be committed; however, if the third burglary was committed or the cost of the stolen items exceeded 300 rubles of silver, then the case should be considered in the Vladikavkaz district court. Moreover, mountain oral courts were entitled to consider murder cases only if they failed to

identify the criminal. Their function within the framework of this situation was to prevent or terminate the blood feud. Exceptions included the cases when the criminal was a person who wasn't a mountaineer, or if 'the crime wasn't committed only against the mountaineers'. These cases were to be considered by the Justice of the Peace or by Vladikavkaz district court. In addition, the offences within the jurisdiction of mountain oral courts could be considered by Vladikavkaz district court if the offended party lodged a petition.

Civil cases within the jurisdiction of mountain oral courts of the Terek Oblast included: 1) suits with costs of no more than 500 rubles by silver, or concerned with movable property, recovery of the losses and damages, and also those originating from promissory notes and personal recognizance; 2) suits involving the restoration of disrupted real estate possessions, if less than 6 months had passed since the breach was committed; 3) suits involving the private participation right, on the condition that not more than year had passed since the breach was committed; 4) suits involving personal assaults and insults; 5) suits involving costs of no more than 2000 rubles on promissory note, under the obligation of the immovable property recognizance and right on real estate ownership, and if these suits weren't based on a formal act; 6) probate actions, distribution of inheritance disputes as well as concerning the last will and testament, based on mountain customs". Apart from this, there was a rule that mountain oral courts of the Terek Oblast could consider any civil suit of the mountain population, in the case when the parts provided a written application with the refusal of liberty to apply. The suits of p. 5 and 6 could be considered by Vladikavkaz district court, if both parts applied before the case proceeding was initiated in the mountain oral court.

The complaints on the criminal cases and civil suits could be applied to the mountain oral courts in oral or written form. Appeals on the criminal cases were to be filed to the mountain oral courts according to the district where the offence was committed. The jurisdiction of the civil dispute was defined of the defendant's place of residence. The parts were invited to the session by written summon, which indicated the consequences of non-appearances. The litigation was conducted in oral form in the open court. The verdicts

and passed judgments were registered in a special journal and were announced in court.

According to temporary regulations, verdicts of civil and criminal cases in mountain oral courts of the Terek Oblast were passed within the framework of the common law of the mountain population. If the common law hadn't worked out a norm for a definite group of cases, then the regulations of the Russian Empire were valid for them. Cases of conclusion and annulment of marriage, family, personal and property law, legality of juridical decisions and heritage right were considered on the basis of the *shariah*. Verdicts of mountain oral courts were final and were unliable to appellation: if "in criminal cases - the verdicts implied monetary redress of no more than 30 rubles per person, arrest no more than a month, and when the compensation of losses amounted to no more than 100 rubles in silver; in civil suits – verdicts on the suits with the price at no more than 100 rubles" (Central State Archive, 24). Verdicts of other cases could be appealed, and the complaints procedure was to be announced to the parts. The appeals were considered by the Governor of the Terek Oblast. His decisions were final.

5. Rural (Aul) Precinct Courts

For minor delinquencies and moderate offences of the indigenous population of the Terek Oblast (particularly in Vladikavkaz and Georgievsk Okrugs (later in Nalchik Okrug), partial Grozny and Hasav-Urt district rural (aul) courts were established; and precinct courts for Argunsk and Vedensky, and in mountain parts of Grozny and Hasav-Urtov districts. These establishments had equal rights in the court system of the Terek Oblast.

Rural and precinct courts considered minor criminal cases, committed by the dwellers and against them. Their jurisdiction included:

- insult by a word or an action without a causing of injury;
- malicious tillage or destruction of crops, damage of fences, hedges etc.;
- spoiling of water by harmful substances in rivers, ditches, wells; sale of spoiled food;
- use of defective weighing scales;
- concealment of lost cattle with the intention to use it;

- concealment of property deliberately stolen;
- obstructing the finding of property; non-provision of assistance after floods, fires and different kinds of emergencies; intentional embezzlement of property by wage-worker or salesclerk;
- theft or fraud, when the cost of the stolen item makes up no more than 10 rubles in silver, and if the crime was committed for the first or second time without aggravating circumstances.

Moreover, a number of rules defining the jurisdiction of these establishments were set. For instance, if dwellers of two or more aul communities were guilty, then the case was considered by the aul court upon the territory where the crime was committed. If the delinquency was committed by a mountaineer against another mountaineer not under the jurisdiction of the aul court, then the case could be considered only if the aggrieved person wanted it.

Rural and precinct courts of the Terek Oblast considered mountaineers civil suits with a cost of no more than 30 rubles. Suits with price of more than 30 rubles, and suits over the right of real estate property not placed on the territory of a definite populated locality, and suits with bodies not under aul court jurisdiction, could be considered if both parts agreed. As a result of this reform, the legislative act enabled mountaineers to consider cases within the jurisdiction of rural courts in arbitration (mediator) courts. The only exceptions were juvenile and mental cases and noncriminal cases.

Appeals and statement of claims were filed in the oral form. The litigation was public. The verdicts and judgments were passed in written form. Rural and precinct courts passed the judgments according to the common law. They were entitled to impose punishment by community service of up to 6 days, monetary sanctions of up to 3 rubles, and arrest of up to 7 days apart from material considerations.

Decisions and verdicts of aul and arbitral courts were final and couldn't be appealed. However, there were a number of regulations according to which the parts could appeal. For instance, if the case was considered in absentia or if the case was not in the jurisdiction of the aul court, the parts could appeal to the mountain oral court if less than one month had passed since the verdict was passed.

6. Stanitsa and Sloboda Courts

The establishments which possessed similar authorities to the aul and precinct courts were stanitsa and sloboda courts of the Terek Oblast. Stanitsa courts were established in the stanitsas of Terek Cossack army, and sloboda courts in the villages which had a village administration. The jurisdiction of stanitsa courts was valid on the stanitsa territory, which included the population of stanitsa and its rural settlements. The slobodas were in the jurisdiction of the sloboda courts.

Stanitsa courts considered the cases of “military inhabitants of different rank temporary or permanently living on the stanitsa territory and resigned indefinitely lower military ranks and their families” (Central State Archive, 25). The Stanitsa court also had to deal with minor criminal cases of offences committed by the dwellers of a definite stanitsa allotment or against them. On civil cases, stanitsa courts considered claims and suits with costs of no more than 100 rubles. The subject of the suit could be movable and immovable property, which was located within the territory of the definite stanitsa allotment. Suits with costs of more than 100 rubles, and all of the suits with Cossack participation, were subordinate to a certain stanitsa court if both parts would claim. In addition, dwellers of the Cossack stanitsa of the Terek Oblast were allowed to file a claim to arbitral courts if the suits didn't involve any part under disability (children and mentally ill). Sloboda courts possessed the same powers.

As comparable with aul and precinct courts, stanitsa and sloboda claims and suits were filed in an oral form. The sessions were also verbal. The main feature of these courts was the publicity. All of the verdicts were registered in special books which every stanitsa and sloboda court had in their possession. All of the decisions of tribunal courts were to be registered in them.

Stanitsa and sloboda courts passed the verdicts according to “customs and regulations accepted in the local community” (Central State Archive, 25). Stanitsa and sloboda courts, as well as rural and precinct courts in criminal cases, were entitled to impose punishments by community service of up to 6 days, sanctions of up to 3 rubles, and arrest of up to 7 days.

According to the regulations, verdicts and decisions of the stanitsa and sloboda courts were final and couldn't be appealed. Nor could the decisions of tribunal courts acting within the territory of stanitsa and sloboda courts be reconsidered. However, if the court delivered the verdict in absentia or abused their authority, the parts could appeal if less than a month had passed since the date of the trial.

In the last third of the 19th and early 20th century, arbitrary (mediator) courts had an ambiguous position in the judiciary system of the Terek Oblast. Most of the cases were considered in accordance to the norms of the common law, and sometimes that of *shariah*. They weren't permanently acting bodies, but were rather convoked as and when necessary, mainly if both parts decided it to be so. What was complex about their status is that: on the one hand, these were the bodies which preserved the forms of traditional proceedings of the indigenous population of the region; and on the other hand – the authorities tried to integrate them into the judiciary system. In any case, the historical definition of their place remains relevant for the researchers of contemporary historic and legal sciences.

7. Conclusion

Thus, in the third part of the 19th and early 20th century, a court system was created in the Terek Oblast, which included all-Russian principles for a judicial system with elements of traditional justice administration, derived from the indigenous law. It is crucial to emphasize that some of these regions, during the time, elaborated special features of legal proceedings. Their analysis is possible with a wide range of sources. The main principles of their work, however, have been indicated in this paper.

References

Abazov A.H., "Formation of multilevel judicial system in Kabarda at the end of XVIII – the beginning of the 20th century: stages, features" *CAUCASICA. Works of Institute of political and social researches of the Black Sea and Caspian region*. 2011. Vol. 1. 93–108.

Anthology of monuments of the right of the people of the Caucasus. T. 3. *Monuments of the right of Adyghe (Circassians)*. Rostov N/Д. 2011.

Arsanukayeva M.S., "Rural (aulny) courts in mountain areas of the Northeast Caucasus (the second half of XIX – the beginning of the 20th century)" *The Bulletin of the Russian legal academy*. 2012. №. 2. 11–15.

Babich I.L., *Evolution of legal culture of Adyghe (1860-1990th years)*. Moscow. 1999.

Dumanov H.M., Ketov M.Y., *Adyghe habze and court in Kabarda in the second half of the XVIII–XIX century*. Nalchik. 2000.

Dumanov H.M. Kushkhov H.S., "To the issue of the judicial system and legal proceedings in Kabarda in the second half of XIX – the beginning of the 20th century" *Culture and life of Adyghe (Ethnographic researches)*. Maykop. 1986. VI. 41–51.

Gladunets A.V., "Judiciary system in the North Caucasus in the second half of XIX – the beginning of the 20th century" *Right and the politician*. 2009. № 9. 196–199.

Kalmykov Zh.A. *Establishment of the Russian administration in Kabarda and Balkaria (the end of XVIII – the beginning of the 20th century)*. Nalchik. 1995.

Khasbulatov A.I., "Court and judicial reforms in Chechnya (the second half of XIX — the beginning of the 20th century)" *The Scientific thought of the Caucasus*. 2007. №. 1. 67–77.

Kempinsky E.V. and Zozulya I.V., "The judicial system of the Tersky region at the beginning of the 20th century" *Jury in the North Caucasus*. Stavropol. 2007. 60–64.

Kobakhidze E.I. "Not by the uniform force of weapon ..." *Ossetia of the end XVIII – the beginning of the 20th century: experience of historical interaction traditional and state administrative management*. Vladikavkaz. 2010.

Kobakhidze E.I. "K.L. Khetagurov's sketch "Mountain verbal court" and problems of reorganization of legal proceedings for mountaineers of the

North Caucasus in the 70th of XIX – the beginning of the 20th century” *News of SOIGSI*. 2010. №. 4. 37–47.

Kobakhidze E.I. “Integration of Ossetia into the judicial management system of the Russian Empire” *Russian history*. 2012. №. 4. 3–15.

Kuban help book. Ekaterinodar. 1891. №. 2. 232-242.

Maltsev V.N. “Political and legal aspect of reforming of mountain vessels in the Kuban and Tersky regions in the late sixties – the beginning of the 70th of the 19th century” *Messenger of the Adygei state university. Series 1: Regional studies: philosophy, history, sociology, law, political science, cultural science*. 2008. №. 8. 96–108.

Muratova E.G. “Judicial system in the transformed societies (on the example of Balkaria 19th century)” *The Right in a life mirror: researches on legal anthropology*. Moscow. 2006. 199–214.

Saydumov D.H., “Rural (aulny) and mountain courts of the Tersky region: order of production and solution of affairs in rural court” *European social science journal*. 2010. №. 3. 132–137.

Serduk A.V., “Features of legal proceedings of the North Caucasus as a part of the Russian Empire in the middle of XIX – the beginning of the 20th century” *Science and education: economy and economy; business, right and management*. 2012. №. 4. 150–153.

Central State Archive of the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania, f. 12, op. 3, ed. hr. 1477.

Zozulya I.V., *History of development of judicial system in the North Caucasus in the second half of XIX – the beginning of the 20th centuries*, master's thesis. Stavropol. 1999.