

to deal with these conflicts in a moral and ethical manner. A final way to combat corruption in law enforcement is through civilian review boards. It is the job of law enforcement civil review boards to investigate allegations of corruption. The board can also make recommendations for change in terms of punishment meted out and policies on dealing with corruption. Many people like review boards that are independent of police departments because of the increase in impartiality that is associated with them. They believe that these types of boards are able to fully investigate issues of corruption and look at everyone's side of the story.

*Language adviser* **Korshenko A.Ye.**

UDC 343.352

**Maltsev V.V.**

*Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs*

### **Police Against Corruption**

Police misconduct and corruption are abuses of police authority. Sometimes used interchangeably, the terms refer to a wide range of procedural, criminal, and civil violations. Misconduct is the broadest category. Misconduct is "procedural" when it refers to police who violate police department rules and regulations; "criminal" when it refers to police who violate state and federal laws; "unconstitutional" when it refers to police who violate a citizen's civil rights; or any combination thereof. Common forms of misconduct are excessive use of physical or deadly force, discriminatory arrest, physical or verbal harassment, and selective enforcement of the law.

Police corruption is the abuse of police authority for personal gain. Corruption may involve profit or another type of material benefit gained illegally as a consequence of the officer's authority. Typical forms of corruption include bribery, extortion, receiving or fencing stolen goods, and selling drugs.

Through both criminal and civil statutes, federal law specifically targets police misconduct. Federal law is applicable to all state, county, and local officers, including those who work in correctional facilities. The law makes it unlawful for anyone acting with police authority to deprive or conspire to deprive another person of any right protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. Additionally, federal law prohibits conduct ranging from racial slurs and unjustified arrests to the refusal of departments to respond to discrimination complaints.

Most problematically of all for plaintiffs, police are protected by the defense of immunity—an exemption from penalties and burdens that the law generally places on other citizens. This immunity is limited, unlike the absolute immunity enjoyed by judges or legislators.

The local and state agencies are more susceptible to corruption than federal agencies. For example, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is held in high regard and is thought to be an example of what a law enforcement organization should be and its agents are considered exemplary police officers. The federal pay scales are greater and the educational standards are higher, as well. In other words, the federal agencies have the “cream of the crop” of law enforcement officers. Lower pay and less integrity are identified as two major reasons for corruption and these conditions exist far more often in local and state agencies. The expectation of the police to regulate morality while respecting civil liberties, cracking down on clandestine activities while obeying regulations on how information is obtained and evidence gathered, enforcing regulations dealing with economic enterprise while remaining immune to the temptations create tension and contradiction. One result of this is corruption.

*Language adviser* **Levashov O.S.**

UDC 343.352

**MurzoYe.O.**

*National Academy of Internal Affairs*

### **Singapore. Police Experience in Fighting Corruption**

Given Ukraine's European prospects and its integration into the European Union, there is an urgent need to build an effective and effective mechanism for preventing and combating corruption in a particular area.

Singapore is one of the countries that managed to overcome or substantially reduce corruption. The Government of the country was aware that the penalties provided for by law would not be effective unless they were based on effective enforcement. Therefore, it was decided to create a Bureau - a universal anti-corruption agency. The Law on the Prevention of Corruption, adopted on June 17, 1960, with the amendments and additions, which is still valid today, is the main legal act in this area, as a guarantee of the successful functioning of the Bureau for the Investigation of Corruption in Singapore.

For the effective enforcement of investigations, the Bureau has extraordinary powers. They have the exclusive right, without the court's decision, to detain and search persons suspected of corruption in which there are claims based on information from reliable sources, they can investigate their wives, children, relatives and guarantors. The lawful practice was to provide citizens, upon request, with confidential information they need. Refusal to cooperate with the investigation and concealment of information